

**Negative**

# Solvency

# 1NC Solvency

## **Plan can't solve indirect surveillance**

**Kalhan '14** [Anil, J.D. from Yale Law School, Associate Professor of Law, Drexel University. A.B., Brown University, "Immigration Surveillance," Maryland Law Review, Volume 74, Issue 1, <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3646&context=mlr>]

Especially over the past decade, these direct **post-entry enforcement programs have been supplemented by a growing number of indirect enforcement initiatives.**<sup>85</sup> **These** indirect initiatives **restrict access to rights, benefits, and services on the basis of immigration or citizenship status,** thereby **requiring** both **public and private actors**—including social service agencies, educational institutions, hospitals, driver's license bureaus, employers, landlords, and transportation carriers—**to verify immigration and citizenship status to make eligibility determinations.** **These** initiatives enforce immigration law indirectly insofar as they are not always intended primarily to apprehend potentially deportable individuals but nevertheless seek to **encourage "self-deportation."**<sup>86</sup> **They** also can **facilitate direct enforcement by collecting and storing information that later can be used to identify and arrest potentially deportable individuals.** Indirect enforcement programs can operate more directly when they require reporting of individuals suspected to be potentially deportable to immigration officials.<sup>87</sup>

## **Federal action alone fails- other actors will continue crackdowns**

**Kalhan '14** [Anil, J.D. from Yale Law School, Associate Professor of Law, Drexel University. A.B., Brown University, "Immigration Surveillance," Maryland Law Review, Volume 74, Issue 1, <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3646&context=mlr>]

This emphasis on interoperability in immigration governance has been particularly great as the **federal institutions involved in immigration regulation have become more fragmented.** With the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, most immigration policy functions were transferred from a single agency within the Department of Justice (the INS) to multiple agencies within DHS (USCIS, CBP, and ICE)—even as other immigration-related functions have remained vested within the Department of Justice, Department of State, Department of Health and Human Services, and Department of Labor. Moreover, **as immigration control activities have proliferated in a variety of new state, local, and private institutions, and the overall scale of enforcement has skyrocketed, the number of public and private actors performing immigration enforcement functions has grown exponentially.** In this context, the post-2001 emphasis on information sharing for national security purposes has also given a boost to initiatives to make the technological systems used for immigration control by different agencies interoperable with each other and more widely accessible to different actors involved in immigration enforcement.<sup>158</sup>

## **Undocumented migration is inevitable- current policies don't deter immigrants**

**Johnson 2-13-15** [Kevin R. Johnson, Professor of Public Interest Law and Chicana/o Studies, University of California at Davis School of Law, "Possible Reforms of the U.S. Immigration Laws," <http://www.chapmanlawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Johnson.pdf>]

To this point, the addition of incremental **enforcement measures** has **had a limited impact on** undocumented **immigration** from Mexico.<sup>15</sup> **The U.S. government simply has been unable to keep migrants—who are so determined that they are willing to risk their lives—from unlawfully entering, and remaining in, the country.**<sup>16</sup> It makes little sense from an immigration or security standpoint to simply continue to throw resources at fortifying the borders, increasing border enforcement, and engaging in the futile attempt to keep all undocumented immigrants out of the country. The U.S. government has engaged in limited efforts to remove noncitizens who lawfully entered the country on temporary visas, such as students and tourists, but overstayed their terms. Visa overstays likely constitute somewhere between twenty-five and forty percent of the undocumented population.<sup>17</sup> **Increased monitoring** of nonimmigrant visa holders after September 11 **does not appear to have had much of an impact** on reducing visa overstays. **Raids** and increased interior enforcement pursued by the Bush administration also **have not reduced the undocumented population in the U**<sub>nited</sub> **S**<sub>tates.<sup>18</sup></sub>

## **Ext- Other actors inevitable**

### **State and local governments will continue immigrant surveillance**

**Kalhan '14** [Anil, J.D. from Yale Law School, Associate Professor of Law, Drexel University. A.B., Brown University, "Immigration Surveillance," Maryland Law Review, Volume 74, Issue 1, <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3646&context=mlr>]

**State and local governments also have been active in adopting indirect enforcement initiatives.**<sup>95</sup>

For example, some jurisdictions have supplemented IRCA with employer sanctions regimes of their own, for which the Supreme Court has recently held that IRCA itself leaves some room.<sup>96</sup> Other **indirect initiatives go well beyond employer sanctions laws by significantly expanding the circumstances in which eligibility criteria for various services and benefits are based on citizenship or immigration status. These initiatives have dramatically expanded the categories of public and private actors that are placed in the position of collecting, storing, verifying, and disseminating immigration and citizenship status information,** together with large quantities of other personal information, on a day-to-day basis.<sup>97</sup>

### **Federal action can't prevent states from immigrant crackdowns**

**Ferrell '04** [Craig E. Ferrell Jr., Deputy Director and Administration General Counsel, Chief's Command Legal Services, Houston Police Department, "Immigration Enforcement: Is It a Local Issue?"]

[http://www.policiechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display\\_arch&article\\_id=224&issue\\_id=22004](http://www.policiechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=224&issue_id=22004)]

Immigration Regulation Is a Federal Power: **State and local police are not required to enforce federal immigration**

**laws.** The federal government and its agencies are the authorities responsible for enforcement of immigration law. "The power to regulate immigration is unquestionably a federal power."<sup>4</sup> With such power, the federal government has enacted laws, such as the Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA), that regulate a person's entry into the United States, his or her ability to remain in the country, and numerous other aspects of immigration. But these **federal laws do not contain any provisions that "require state law enforcement agencies to assist in enforcing** the INA." This was the conclusion of a memorandum of opinion by the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of California dated February 5, 1996. **Even where Congress has the authority under the Constitution to pass laws requiring or prohibiting certain acts, it lacks the power directly to compel the state to require or prohibit those acts.**<sup>5</sup> Congress "may not directly force states to assume enforcement of administrative responsibilities constitutionally vested in the federal government."<sup>6</sup> Therefore, **federal law does not require state agencies to assist the federal government in enforcement of immigration laws.**

# Human Rights Fail Immigrants

**Human rights fail immigrants because they are not members of the state they migrate to**

Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Università IUAV di Venezia. 1996 [Means without End, pp 31-36]

This is not the place to retrace the history of the various international organizations through which single states, the League of Nations, and later, the United Nations have tried to face the refugee problem, from the Nansen Bureau for the Russian and Armenian refugees (1921) to the High Commission for Refugees from Germany (1936) to the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees (1938) to the UN's International Refugee Organization (1946) to the present Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (1951), whose activity, according to its statute, does not have a political character but rather only a "social and humanitarian" one. What is essential is that each and every time refugees no longer represent individual cases but rather a mass phenomenon (as was the case between the two world wars and is now once again), these organizations as well as the single states-all the solemn evocations of the inalienable rights of human beings notwithstanding-have proved to be absolutely incapable not only of solving the problem but also of facing it in an adequate manner. The whole question, therefore, was handed over to humanitarian organizations and to the police. The reasons for such impotence lie not only in the selfishness and blindness of bureaucratic apparatuses, but also in the very ambiguity of the fundamental notions regulating the inscription of the native (that is, of life) in the juridical order of the nation-state. Hannah Arendt titled the chapter of her book Imperialism that concerns the refugee problem "The Decline of the Nation-State and the End of the Rights of Man."<sup>2</sup> One should try to take seriously this formulation, which indissolubly links the fate of the Rights of Man with the fate of the modern nation-state in such a way that the waning of the latter necessarily implies the obsolescence of the former. Here the paradox is that precisely the figure that should have embodied human rights more than any other-namely, the refugee - marked instead the radical crisis of the concept. The conception of human rights based on the supposed existence of a human being as such, Arendt tells us, proves to be untenable as soon as those who profess it find themselves confronted for the first time with people who have really lost every quality and every specific relation except for the pure fact of being human. **3 In the system of the nation-state, so-called sacred and inalienable human rights are revealed to be without any protection precisely when it is no longer possible to conceive of them as rights of the citizens of a state.** This is implicit, after all, in the ambiguity of the very title of the 1789 Declaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen, in which it is unclear whether the two terms are to name two distinct realities or whether they are to form, instead, a hendiadys in which the first term is actually always already contained in the second.

# Biopolitics Links

**Biopolitical attempts to manage populations through migration control attempt to create order by uniting the world as “people without fracture” – this attempt to eliminate divisions between people becomes a campaign to eliminate difference by exterminating different populations.**

Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Università IUAV di Venezia. 1996 [Means without End, pp 31-36]

ANY INTERPRETATION of the political meaning of the term people ought to start from the peculiar fact that in modern European languages this term always indicates also the poor, the underprivileged, and the excluded. The same term names the constitutive political subject as well as the class that is excluded-de facto, if not de jure from politics. The Italian term popolo, the French term peuple, and the Spanish term pueblo-along with the corresponding adjectives popolare, populaire, popular-and the late-Latin terms populus and popularis from which they all derive, designate in common parlance and in the political lexicon alike the whole of the citizenry as a unitary body politic (as in "the Italian people" or in "giudire popolare" [juryman]) as well as those who belong to inferior classes (as in homme du peuple [man of the people], none popolare [working-class neighborhood], front populaire [popular front]). Even the English people-whose sense is more undifferentiated-does retain the meaning of ordinary people as opposed to the rich and the aristocracy. In the American Constitution one thus reads with-out any sort of distinction: "We, the people of the United States .. ."; but when Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address invokes a "government of the people, by the people, for the people," the repetition implicitly sets another people against the first. The extent to which such an ambiguity was essential even during the French Revolution (that is, at the very moment in which people's sovereignty was claimed as a principle) is witnessed by the decisive role played in it by a sense of compassion for the people in-tended as the excluded class. Hannah Arendt reminds us that: The very definition of the word was born out of compassion, and the term became the equivalent for misfortune and unhappiness-le peuple, les malheureux m'applaudissent, as Robespierre was wont to say; le peuple tours ma/heureux, as even Sieyes, one of the least sentimental and most sober figures of the Revolution, would put it.<sup>1</sup> But this is already a double concept for Jean Bodin albeit in a different sense-in the chapter of Les Six Livres de la Republique in which he defines Democracy or Etat Populaire: while the menu people is that which it is wise to exclude from political power, the peuple en corps is intended as entitled to sovereignty. Such a widespread and constant semantic ambiguity can-not be accidental: it surely reflects an ambiguity inherent in the nature and function of the concept of people in Western politics. It is as if, in other words, what we call people was actually not a unitary subject but rather a dialectical oscillation between two opposite poles: on the one hand, the People as a whole and as an integral body politic and, on the other hand, the people as a subset and as fragmentary multiplicity of needy and excluded bodies; on the one hand, an inclusive concept that pretends to be without remainder while, on the other hand, an exclusive concept known to afford no hope; at one pole, the total state of the sovereign and integrated citizens and, at the other pole, the banishment-either court of miracles or camp-of the wretched, the oppressed, and the vanquished. There exists no single and compact referent for the term people anywhere: like many fundamental political concepts (which, in this respect, are similar to Abel and Freud's Urworte or to Dutoit's hierarchical relations), people is a polar concept that indicates a double movement and a complex relation between two extremes. This also means, however, that the constitution of the human species into a body politic comes into being through a fundamental split and that in the concept of people we can easily recognize the conceptual pair identified earlier as the defining category of the original political structure: naked life (people) and political existence (People), exclusion and inclusion, zoe and bios. The concept of people always already contains within itself the fundamental biopolitical fracture. It is what cannot be included in the whole of which it is a part as well as what cannot belong to the whole in which it is always already included. Hence the contradictions and aporias that such a concept creates every time that it is invoked and brought into play on the political stage. It is what always already is, as well as what has yet to be realized; it is the pure source of identity and yet it has to redefine and purify itself continuously according to exclusion, language, blood, and territory. It is what has in its opposite pole the very essence that it itself lacks; its realization therefore coincides with its own abolition; it must negate itself through its opposite in order to be. (Hence the specific aporias of the workers' movement that turns toward the people and at the same time aims at its abolition.) The concept of people-brandished each and every time as the bloody flag of reaction and as the faltering banner of revolutions and popular fronts-always contains a more original split than the one between enemy and friend, an incessant civil war that at once divides this concept more radically than any conflict and keeps it united and constitutes it more

firmly than any identity. As a matter of fact, what Marx calls class struggle--which occupies such a central place in his thought, even though he never defines it substantially--is nothing other than this internecine war that divides every people and that shall come to an end only when People and people coincide, in the classless society or in the messianic kingdom, and only when there shall no longer be, properly speaking, any people. If this is the case-if the concept of people necessarily contains

within itself the fundamental biopolitical fracture-it is possible to read anew some decisive pages of the history of our century. If the struggle between the two peoples has always been in process, in fact, it has undergone in our time one last and paroxysmal acceleration. In ancient Rome, the split internal to the people was juridically sanctioned by the clear distinction between *populus* and *plebs*-each with its own institutions and magistrates---just as in the Middle Ages the division between artisans [*popolo minutoj*] and merchants [*popolo grasso*] used to correspond to a precise articulation of different arts and crafts. But when, starting with the French Revolution, sovereignty is entrusted solely to the people, the people become an embarrassing presence, and poverty and exclusion appear for the first time as an intolerable scandal in every sense. In the modern age, poverty and exclusion are not only economic and social concepts but also eminently political categories. (The economism and "socialism" that seem to dominate modern politics actually have a political, or, rather, a biopolitical, meaning.) From this perspective, our time is nothing other than the methodical and implacable attempt to fill the split that divides the people by radically eliminating the people of the excluded. Such an attempt brings together, according to different modalities and horizons, both the right and the left, both capitalist countries and socialist countries, which have all been united in the plan to produce one single and undivided people an ultimately futile plan that, however, has been partially realized in all industrialized countries. The obsession with development is so effective in our time because it coincides with the biopolitical plan to produce a people with-out fracture. When seen in this light, the extermination of the Jews in Nazi Germany acquires a radically new meaning. As a people that refuses integration in the national body politic (it is assumed, in fact, that its assimilation is actually only a feigned one), the Jews are the representatives par excellence and almost the living symbol of the people, of that naked life that modernity necessarily creates within itself but whose presence it is no longer able to tolerate in any way. We ought to understand the lucid fury with which the German Volk--- representative par excellence of the people as integral body politic---tried to eliminate the Jews forever as precisely the terminal phase of the internecine struggle that divides People and people. With the final solution---which included Gypsies and other unassimilable elements for a reason---Nazism tried obscurely and in vain to free the Western political stage from this intolerable shadow so as to produce finally the German Volk as the people that has been able to heal the original biopolitical fracture. (And that is why the Nazi chiefs repeated so obstinately that by eliminating Jews and Gypsies they were actually working also for the other European peoples.) Paraphrasing the Freudian postulate on the relation between Es and Ich, one might say that modern biopolitics is supported by the principle according to which "where there is naked life, there has to be a People," as long as one adds immediately that this principle is valid also in its inverse formulation, which prescribes that "where there is a People, there shall be naked life." The fracture that was believed to have been healed by eliminating the people--namely, the Jews, who are its symbol--reproduced itself anew, thereby turning the whole German people into sacred life that is doomed to death and into a biological body that has to be infinitely purified (by eliminating the mentally ill and the carriers of hereditary diseases). And today, in a different and yet analogous way, the capitalistic-democratic plan to eliminate the poor not only reproduces inside itself the people of the excluded but also turns all the populations of the Third World into naked life. Only a politics that has been able to come to terms with the fundamental biopolitical split of the West will be able to arrest this oscillation and put an end to the civil war that divides the peoples and the cities of the Earth.

**Immigrants are defined as stateless persons – the state’s sovereign ability to protect populations is also the power to exclude populations, stripping them down to “the bare life”. Nazi Germany proves that this reduction leaves them vulnerable to the worst atrocities.**

Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Università IUAV di Venezia. 1996  
[Means without End, pp 31-36]

What is at stake here is not to evaluate the scientific accuracy of this thesis but rather not to let its liberating power slip out of our hands. Once our gaze is focused on this matter, the perverse and tenacious machines that govern our political imaginary suddenly lose their power. It should be evident to everybody, after all, that we are talking about an imaginary, especially nowadays when the idea of a people has long lost any substantial reality. Even if we admit that this idea never had any real content other than the insipid catalog of characteristics listed by the old philosophical anthropologies, it was already made meaningless, in any case, by the same modern state that presented itself as its keeper and its expression. All well-meaning chatter notwithstanding, the idea of a people today is nothing other than the empty support of state identity and is recognized only as such. For those who might still nurture some doubt on the matter, it would be instructive to take a look at what is happening around us from this point of view: on the one hand, the world powers take up arms to defend a state without a people (Kuwait) and, on the other hand, the peoples without a state (Kurds, Armenians, Palestinians, Basques, Jews of the Diaspora) can be oppressed and exterminated with impunity, so as to make clear that the destiny of a people can only be a state identity and that the concept of people makes sense only if recodified within the concept of citizenship. In this regard, it is also important to note the peculiar status of those languages that have no state dignity (Catalan, Basque, Gaelic, etc.), which linguists treat naturally as languages, but which practically operate rather as jargons or dialects and almost always assume an immediately political significance. The vicious entwining of language, people, and the state appears particularly evident in the case of Zionism. A movement that wanted to constitute the people par excellence (Israel) as a state took it upon itself, for this very reason, to reactualize a purely cult language (Hebrew) that had been replaced in daily use by other languages and dialects (Ladino, Yiddish). In the eyes of the keepers of tradition, however, precisely this reactualization of the sacred language appeared to be a grotesque profanity, upon which language would have taken revenge one day. (On December 26, 1926, Gershom Scholem writes to Franz Rosenzweig from Jerusalem: "We live in our language like blind men walking on the edge of an abyss.... This language is laden with future catastrophes.... The day will come when it will turn against those who speak it.

biopolitical control of migrants is critical to maintaining their poverty – they are defined as portable resources

Sara Kalm, Department of Political Science University of Lund, 2005 [ (Ph.D. cand.), Sweden  
Towards global migration management? - a biopolitical approach Paper prepared for ISA,  
Honolulu, March 1-5. [http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\\_mla\\_apa\\_research\\_citation/0/6/9/4/6/pages69460/p69460-1.php](http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/6/9/4/6/pages69460/p69460-1.php)

As we have seen, Foucault dated the birth of biopolitics to the 18th century. However, when it comes to the biopolitics of mobility, it is interesting to note that demography as a discipline developed out of 17th century political arithmetic in England (Sussman 2004; Hacking 1975). Political arithmetic was, in short, the process of calculating the financial worth of a population. It developed in the context of colonial expansion and its first proponents (Graunt, Petty) were inspired by the mercantile assumption that "people are the wealth of the nation". During this era, then, population came to be considered a natural resource, like land or mineral reserves, a resource which should be managed to maximize national wealth. The idea was that a population should be run by the state in a similar manner as a businessman runs his company. This was to be done by the state



interfering in sexual relations, reproduction, and also migration. In political arithmetic, people were classified on basis of their labour, thus marking the importance of class identities rather than religious or regional ones. It thus contributed to the creation of new categories – an early case of “dynamic nominalism”. This had important consequences in terms of mobility. When persons are understood to be valuable in terms of their labour power, rather than their regional or religious loyalties, in theory they become portable. Thus early population theorists often counted people for the purposes of moving them around – in imagination at least [...]. The distinction between mobile and immobile populations, then, became a significant aspect of the rhetoric that distinguished subaltern populations from dominant groups (Sussman 2004: 103). Apart from size and value, these early demographers often assessed the “portability” of the poor, the disenfranchised and the colonial populations, and the proponents developed schemes on counting, increasing and transporting populations. Portability was thus one way of distinguishing between national and peripheral populations, but also between wanted and unwanted parts of the national populations. Groups were rendered subaltern not only because of where they came from, but also because of the nature of their relation to that place, their vulnerability of being displaced by the colonial powers and used someplace else. It is interesting to note the relationship between mobility and immobility in terms of power seem to have been the reverse of today. As we have seen, Bauman (1998) claims that mobility is becoming the most important power asset in today’s world. In those days, being mobile instead signified powerlessness. Insofar as “mobility” connotes voluntary movement, whereas “portability” signifies the risk of being moved against one’s will, the difference in perhaps obvious.

## **Our alternative is necessary to solve – only criticism can raise questions about biopower which are key to preventing abusive state migration policies**

Sara Kalm, Department of Political Science University of Lund, 2005 [ (Ph.D. cand.), Sweden  
Towards global migration management? - a biopolitical approach Paper prepared for ISA,  
Honolulu, March 1-5. [http://www.allacademica.com//meta/p\\_mla\\_apa\\_research\\_citation/0/6/9/4/6/pages69460/p69460-1.php](http://www.allacademica.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/6/9/4/6/pages69460/p69460-1.php)

If biopolitics is only a useful tool if we can confidently talk about a “world population”, its limits become apparent as the continuing central role of the state in the new proposals has to be emphasized. State sovereignty in regulating mobility over their borders is in all the initiatives explicitly guarded. To that end it is also one of the greatest concerns to combat irregular migration. Mobility is to be managed and regulated at the will of the state, not happening haphazardly and chaotically at the will of individual people. Neither should the states be left with responsibility for its unwanted migrants, something that is shown by the emphasis that is put on readmission agreement to ease deportations. Also, the benefits of migrations are not formulated in terms of the world population. Instead, they are formulated in win-win-terms, meaning that both sending and receiving states stand to gain, not the whole world conceptualized as a whole. So, the state is certainly of continuing relevance. Then, a few questions arise: Is it still meaningful to talk about biopolitics on the global level? What is the relation between the national and the global levels in terms of biopolitics? And how are we to understand the biopolitics of statecraft related to the management of mobility on the global level? Another, related question for further investigation would be to what end the international cooperation works. In Soguk’s (1999) study of the international regime for refugees, one of the conclusions is that the regime activities should be seen as instances of statecraft in that the “refugee problem” is normalized into one that should be solved within the realms of the state. Therefore, the international cooperation on this issue allows for the continuing relevance of the state rather than challenges it. In further study it would be interesting to see if the cooperative activities investigated in this study could be regarded in this manner. In one of the quotes of Karlsson and Ramphel above, it is suggested that the permanence of international movement forces us to rethink our

understandings of migration as well as of nationality and belonging. However, in the way the issue is handled in the arguments, this potentially radical idea is left and mass migration clearly becomes a matter to be 'solved' within the state system's normal conceptualizations.

## Capitalism Links

**Immigration is multi-dimensional—influenced by multiple factors of capitalism**

**Kaye '10** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for NewsHour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, “Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration”, p. 4-5)//cl

On the world’s political stages, **the often fierce rhetoric over migration tends to overlook** the issues that propel people to move, **forces such as global supply chains, money flows, nomadic businesses, inequality, and trade policies**. Instead, we fall into questions of control and management: How best to keep out unwanted foreigners and let in more desirable ones? What to do about the millions of illegal migrants who sneak across borders or overstay visas? **While people obviously migrate for many reasons, a chief focus of this book is the movement of labor**. I began writing this book before the global recession hit. **The economic downturn led to somewhat of a decline in labor migration, but nonetheless the same basic issues and trends persist.** **If anything, the increased competition for jobs has only sharpened the debates over immigration.** The United Nations has estimated that nearly ninety million people worldwide are migrant workers. As many as forty million of them are believed to be illegal migrants. Millions more move as a result of conflicts, natural disasters, environmental degradation, or a combination of factors. Even though migration can be complex, **much of the political debate, at least in the United States, is one-dimensional, viewing migration through one prism, the legal status of migrants**. The legal arguments mask a convenient historical amnesia and obscure more fundamental issues.

Repealing immigration policies stimulates the economy and bolsters the capitalistic country

**Kaye 10-** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for News Hour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, “Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration”, p.183-185, TS)

**The pursuit of business - friendly immigration policies has been a priority for companies that have come to rely on migrant workforces.** **Although the language is often couched according to circumstances and political currents, the overriding objectives of employers have been consistent. The immigration laws they favor would have the effect of providing a cheap, disposable, compliant labor force by authorizing additional work visas.** **They would like the current illegal workforce legalized, and, beyond gathering paperwork and consulting computer records, employers do not want to be held responsible or penalized for hiring immigrant workers with the wrong identification documents.** **Advocates for business groups pushing at both the federal and state levels to ease immigration restrictions have often**

formed alliances with migrants' rights organizations, sometimes joining with them to pursue lawsuits that challenge attempts to inhibit the use of migrant labor. The convergence by business interests and civil rights groups involved in immigration politics has made for strange bedfellow coalitions. The public side of the pro - immigration debate is more likely to feature a representative of the National Council of La Raza than of the Chamber of Commerce. Nonetheless, marriages of convenience have been forged between organizations that under different circumstances are generally on opposite sides. One organization, the National Immigration Forum, has established itself as the go - to group for journalists wanting the liberal take on immigration issues. Its representatives, such as the executive director Ali Noorani, the son of Pakistani immigrants, speak out at rallies and on TV talk shows. But behind the scenes, the forum ' s less visible leaders have expressed more concern for the value of migrant workers than for their rights. In 2009, its board, claiming to " collectively reflect the broad pro - immigrant community, " included the chairman John Gay, at the time the chief lobbyist for the National Restaurant Association, and Randel Johnson, a vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In 2007, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security announced plans to implement a " no match " rule to prosecute employers for hiring workers who presented Social Security numbers that don ' t match those on fi le with the Social Security Administration. Civil rights groups such as the National Council of La Raza and the AFL - CIO predictably and immediately cried foul. Their lawsuits were backed up by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Nursery and Landscape Association, and the National Roofi ng Contractors Association — the latter groups all representing employers normally at odds with unions. The odd political groupings also have played out in immigration disputes at the local level. For instance, after Hazleton, Pennsylvania, enacted its anti - illegal immigrant ordinance, such usual suspects as the American Civil Liberties Union and various Latino organizations quickly mounted court challenges. Less noticed were the business groups that joined them. High - powered lawyers fi led amicus curiae (friend of the court) briefs on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as well as chambers representing the states of Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and West Virginia. The business community ' s political message about the need for migrant workers has remained consistent, with its arguments for easy access and looser regulations tailored to fi t the occasion. During periods of prosperity, the case made by business leaders and their allies is that **bringing in or legalizing migrant workers helps the economy grow and gives the nation an edge in a globally competitive environment.** When downturns or threats emerge, they contend that migrants will assist in getting the economy back on track. To the business community, migrants are like aspirin, magic potions, or keys to a successful marriage — to be used in sickness and in health.

Maintaining the security at the Mexican border is necessary to defeat the capitalistic monster that this country has become

**Kaye 10-** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for News Hour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, "Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration", p.188, TS)

**"If the migrants don't show up for the next harvest, Nick says he'll have to destroy entire orchards that were planted more than a century ago,"** reported ABC News correspondent John Quiñones after interviewing a pear grower in Lake County, in northern California. **"Most of his crop, almost two million pounds, lies on the ground, rotting away. Thanks to increased security along the Mexican border, thousands of migrant workers who harvest the nation's fruits and vegetables never showed up to work."** Across the country, an apple farmer in upstate New York had the same lament, **"We need to import this labor to pick crops or we're going to be importing our crops,"** John Teeple, told a newspaper reporter. **The flurry of apocalyptic - sounding news reports prompted a sober analysis of the claims by the migration expert Philip L. Martin, a professor of agricultural economics at the University of California, Davis. Examining the pear industry, Martin found not only that the business was in decline anyway, but also that the Lake County pear harvest actually increased in 2006 over the previous year. "These reports of farm labor shortages are not accompanied by data that would buttress the anecdotes, like lower production of fruits and vegetables or a rise in farm wages as growers scrambled for the fewer workers available,"** Martin pointed out.

The financial vulnerability of Mexican immigrants is exploited by American companies for a capitalistic gain—they are paid less and treated less than human

**Kaye 10-** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for News Hour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, "Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration", p.168, TS)

**Loose controls accommodated industry's needs, allowing Mexican laborers to travel freely back and forth across the border. The policy was essentially "easy come, easy go."** The U.S. Commissioner - General of Immigration, an agency then under the Department of Commerce and Labor, **did not even bother to get an accurate count of the number of incoming Mexicans, estimated at more than fifty thousand a year.** Labor contractors and recruiters fanned out throughout the border areas to ensure a steady stream of Mexican workers, disregarding an 1885 federal law that

specifically prohibited American employers from signing contracts promising jobs to migrants before they arrived in the country. Unregulated migration served both countries. Mexico had an escape valve for its poorest citizens, who were unemployed and potentially revolutionary. U.S. industries were provided a ready source of cheap labor. Representatives of large industrial enterprises told Congress that they were so dependent on Mexican labor that immigration restrictions would leave them on the verge of bankruptcy. A 1910 U.S. congressional commission reported that Mexican railroad workers were not only plentiful, they also were cheap, at least compared to “ the English - speaking races formerly employed by most of the railroad companies.” Railroad companies paid nearly all their Mexican track maintenance workers less than \$ 1.25 a day, compared to the daily rate of \$ 1.50 or more (a 20 percent difference) earned by just about every English, Greek, Irish, and Norwegian employee. The report noted that in addition to their low pay rates, the railroads prized Mexicans for their docility, finding that they were well suited to the hot climate “ and regarded as being very tractable; in fact, they are noted for their passive obedience. ” A Texas cotton grower said, “ They are content with whatever you give them. [T]hey’ re more subservient, if that ’ s the word. ”

**The loosening of immigrant restrictions perpetuates the ‘coyote capitalism’ that smuggles workers without consideration—this also encourages businesses and governments to pass around workers like simple objects, reinforcing the dehumanization they experience**

**Kaye ’10** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for NewsHour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, “Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration”, p. 5-6)//cl

In other words, **immigration should be seen more as a symptom or a reaction to policies and conditions than as a problem.** Immigration is a fact of life. Given the right set of circumstances, people (not to mention our prehuman ancestors) have always moved and always will. **Labor migration persists for at least two main reasons. First, global and local businesses rely on human mobility and on ready, vulnerable pools of labor, often available at bargain basement prices. Second, successful migrants — who number among the most assertive, determined, and entrepreneurial people in the world — are able to overcome the forces and obstacles arrayed against them.** It’s the law of supply and demand. Just as the drug trade feeds apparently insatiable appetites, **overwhelming borders and policing, the world ’ s migrants as well as the businesses and economies that love them make sure the human flow continues. It is a global**

**system that may be called “coyote capitalism.” Coyotes are human smugglers, or as professors Gilbert G. Gonzalez and Raul A. Fernandez described them, “unauthorized Mexican labor recruiters.” This neutral - sounding phrase filters out the legal baggage** to arrive at a basic job description. **It allows us to think of coyotes in economic terms rather than as fanged creatures of the underworld.** Similarly, coyote capitalism straddles the realms of the legitimate and the unlawful, evoking a netherworld in which many migrants find themselves. This is not to suggest that most migrants are smuggled, although many are. **Coyote capitalism describes a system of interlocking, dependent relationships, some “authorized,” some not.** It is also a system of avoidance and transference. The coyotes’ job is to ensure that human cargo gets from one place to another. **They are shippers who take no responsibility for the consequences of moving freight, either at the place of departure or the destination. Coyote capitalism allows businesses and governments (in both developed and developing nations) to pass workers around and pass the buck.** If your policy is to export labor, there are fewer expectations to create jobs. If you import workers, you can excuse yourself for developing an economy dependent on migrant labor. And if you develop business or trade policies that encourage people to move around in search of opportunities, you are only the middleman, just the coyote.

**Any action that encourages immigrants across the border only further objectifies them under the capitalist enterprise where migrant policies are used to further labor demands of businesses, trading off with the needs and rights of the worker**

**Kaye ’10** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for NewsHour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, “Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration”, p. 6-8)//cl

Across the globe, **migrants commonly perform the so -called- D jobs — labor that is dirty, dangerous, or demeaning.** The migrant - dependent industries are the same everywhere. Many of the world’s farms, fields, hospitals, nursing homes, and construction sites would be losing enterprises if not for the work of foreign laborers. Ditto for hotels and restaurants, labor - intensive manufacturing, and low - skilled services. **Armies of migrant domestic workers clean, nanny, and nurse. Some are victims of ruthless traffickers, serving masters who keep them in conditions of indentured servitude.** Although migrants are overrepresented in low - wage, lower - skilled work, at the opposite end of the skills spectrum, global industries often compete for well - trained professionals. Taken together, **the promise of jobs, the willingness of employers to hire migrants, and the calculation by migrants that leaving is better than staying are all powerful incentives for crossing borders — legally or not.** Migrant incomes are lubricants for the often extensive networks of recruiters, traffickers, and smugglers who get them to their destinations. Industries rely on the billions of dollars migrants send back to their homelands. **The interconnected machinery comprising today’s labor market forms a complex, global migration industry. In the face of such forces, efforts to fashion rational,**

**consistent, and humane migration policies have been elusive**. Benjamin E. Johnson, director of the migrant advocacy group the Immigration Policy Center, eloquently summed up the conundrum: “**We send two messages at our border: ‘ Help Wanted ’ and ‘ Keep Out , ’**” he told a congressional committee. Johnson nailed it, describing the default official approach as “schizophrenia.” Formulating sensible policy requires rulemakers to weigh competing interests. But a key issue is basic: **Is it possible to formulate migration policies that balance the labor requirements of businesses and economies with the needs and rights of migrant workers?** Or **are migrant workers interchangeable parts, expendable widgets whose export and import should be calibrated and adjusted according to our needs?** Other questions flow from those.

Clearly, importing nations have come to rely on migrants as integral to their labor force. But what should be done in exchange? Do migrant - dependent businesses or economies have obligations to the families, communities, and countries left behind? Developed nations and companies often adopt policies — both domestic and global — that have the effect of promoting migration. Should there be checks on such strategies? At the same time, less wealthy nations actually encourage their citizens to leave, for both political and economic purposes. Should more be done to encourage sustainable economies that don ’ t rely on the sacrifices that migration often entails? Increasingly, businesses are forming tentative and unusual coalitions with immigrant advocacy groups. Who wins when partners in the “strange bedfellows ” alliances have competing priorities? Most Western countries argue over how many immigrants are too many. We focus on the size of the fences or the number of visas. But should we also pay more attention to the behavior of people importers? We go after human smugglers, but what about the other middlemen, the legal recruiters? Just as we try to monitor the importers of foreign food or toys, do we need to keep a closer eye on those in the people import business and hold them more accountable for the treatment of their human cargo? Migration is a global phenomenon. Given that fact, how reasonable is it for politicians to adopt national immigration policies as if they were the equivalent of local zoning ordinances passed with a nod toward placating homeowners ’ associations with a NIMBY (not in my backyard) mentality?

**Policymakers need to not only make sure economic interests do not trump human rights; they also should recognize that migration does not take place in a vacuum.** Besides considering the international context, they need to reject the disease model of immigration that tries to treat it in isolation from its causes. Taking account of the reasons people migrate will allow them to shape humane and rational migration policies.

## **Immigrants that cross the border end up trapped in cycles like the padrone system**

**Kaye ’10** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for NewsHour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, “Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration”, p. 81-82)//cl

This line of conversation was common for the times. The period of mass migration from Europe had kindled a virtual obsession among restrictionist politicians and their enablers in the pseudoscientific eugenics movement who were fanatical about cataloging the relative and what they considered innate abilities of ethnic and racial groups. “What is the poorest?” the chairman remembered asking the mine owner. “The dagos,” was the reply. The Alabama congressman expressed surprise. “Worse than the Negro?” he pressed. “Yes,” replied the coal operator,



explaining that even so, he would prefer to hire Italians than Negroes. Burnett was confused. "Then why do you want the Italian?" he asked. The preference was a matter of pure economics. **"For the purpose of regulating the price, not the quantity,"** the businessman explained. **A fellow committee member understood immediately why Italian immigrants were a better value.** **"The padrone system,"** clarified Congressman William G. Brown of West Virginia. **The padrone system was a corrupt practice in which international networks of recruiters, placement agents, bankers, contractors, and subcontractors trafficked in Italian immigrants, turning most of them into indentured laborers.** The system flourished after the Civil War, when American industries needed a supply of workers to sustain production. **In 1864, Congress had obligingly passed the Act to Encourage Immigration, allowing employers to require migrant workers to "pledge the wages of their labor" for up to a year to "repay the expenses of emigration."** Even though the law was repealed four years later, **abusive practices of private recruitment and placement agencies continued for decades.** In 1890, congressional investigator Victor L. Ricketts described the padrone system as "probably the worst evil connected with our modern immigration." **"Twenty - seven thousand Italian immigrants were landed at New York last year, and probably two - thirds of them are subject to a bondage almost as pernicious as the African slave system that prevailed in the Southern states thirty years ago,"** Ricketts told a newspaper reporter.

**Similarly, increased migration to the U.S. in the twentieth century resulted in the 'el enganche' system where migrants were exploited for even more profit** **Kaye '10** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for NewsHour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, "Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration", p. 82-83)//cl While the padrone arrangement was a particularly odious practice, **U.S. immigration history is bound up with the active recruitment of migrants, a practice dating back to the colonial era when businesses advertised in Europe their growing need for workmen and artisans.** In the early nineteenth century, construction firms sent agents to Europe hoping to attract canal builders. At the end of the century, **U.S. railway companies and farmers seeking cheap labor looked south, to Mexico. They developed a system known as el enganche** (the hooking), in which labor contractors along the U.S. side of the border paid commissions to agents in Mexico (enganchadores ) to procure hundreds of thousands of Mexican workers. **Like the padroni, the contractors often made their money by renting housing in labor camps to migrants and charging them inflated prices for food and supplies.** Recruitment of migrant workers during the nineteenth century provided the English language with colorful expressions. In the garment business, the widespread use of contracted labor was referred to as the sweating system. The middlemen were known as sweaters because **they made their profits by sweating the difference between what they earned from contractors and what they paid their workers. Sweatshops were the places where the work was done.** In China, flesh peddlers abducted

people from the streets to be used as laborers in colonies in Southeast Asia, South Africa, Cuba, Australia, and Canada. Those tricked into working were said to have been Shanghaied.

### **Many migrants fall under the spell of opportunity, seeking out a more prosperous life but often end up swindled, abused, traded off like toys, and threatened with deportation by companies**

**Kaye '10** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for NewsHour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, "Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration", p. 87-88)//cl

In Edison, New Jersey, I met **Subbu** (he asked me not to use his full name), an Indian national, in the United States on a work visa. He had just returned from taking his wife, an Indian - trained scientist, for her New Jersey driver ' s test. As we left their sparsely furnished apartment and drove down Oak Tree Road, one of America ' s most densely populated areas for Indian ex - pats, Subbu **said the concentration of Indian - owned businesses and restaurants and the sari - clad women made him feel as if he were back in India.** Subbu moved to New Jersey from Bangalore in 2007. **He had expected to work full - time, but after a year he lost his job as a systems analyst for JP Morgan Chase, even before the financial tailspin.** When I met him, he was biding his time, hoping for another placement. At any given time, as many as fi ve hundred thousand people — there are no accurate figures — are working in the United States on nonimmigrant " specialty occupation" H- 1B temporary work visas. Each year, the government issues eighty - five thousand such visas (sixty- fi ve thousand for holders of bachelor ' s degrees or higher, and, since 2005, an additional twenty thousand for foreigners with masters ' or Ph.D. degrees from an American university), good for a maximum of six years. During the go - go economic boom years of 2007 and 2008, so many companies were applying for foreign workers that the quota was reached soon after the April application period started, and federal immigration officials cut off petitions after the first week. But the recession of 2008 – 2009 seemed to dampen enthusiasm for importing workers. The number of applications dropped, and the application window reverted to preboom levels of months instead of a week. Subbu had been sending money home to his mother in his hometown of Mysore near Bangalore, and had planned to return there himself with his wife and children. He wanted to care for his mother and see that his kids become fluent in Kannada, his native tongue and one of India ' s offi cial languages. So, like many migrants, Subbu was not planning a permanent stay in the United States. **He paid a body shop a \$ 3,500 fee and arrived in New Jersey** from India in 2007. He expected to be hired out as a systems analyst earning about \$ 70,000 a year. Once settled, he would send for his family. **As a condition of employment, the recruiter had him sign a seven - page agreement pledging to work for the agency for eighteen months or face a lawsuit if he didn't.** **Subbu didn't know it, but that requirement is illegal** according to an immigration attorney I asked to review the agreement. **The recruiter was attempting to treat Subbu as a bonded laborer.** But as it turned out, the contract was the least of Subbu ' s difficulties. **There was no job.** The recruiter, who has offices in India and New Jersey, put him up in a four - bedroom house in New Jersey with eleven other recruits. (The recruiter was later cited for operating an illegal boardinghouse.) Subbu stayed there for five months, and in that time was paid \$ 500. Unemployment is common in the recruitment industry, despite assurances to the contrary. H - 1B workers describe the downtime as being " on the bench. " Another Indian H - 1B worker who was at the house at the same time confirmed Subbu' s story, and said he had similar problems — no work for three months. **The recruiter eventually placed Subbu after transferring the visa to another body shop. As he put it, one recruiter " rented me out to another one, and then rented me out to JP Morgan Chase.** " He said the bank, his ultimate employer, was unaware of the convoluted arrangements. Each of the body shops took a cut from his pay, even though he wound up with a still respectable \$ 100,000 for the year he worked there. **Subbu reckoned that he was owed about \$ 6,000 by the recruiter who brought him to the United States, and he was**

**bitter.** “ I have been exploited to the maximum, ” he said. He was angry at fellow Indians, those who run recruitment agencies and tell their workers that if they complain, they’ll be sent back to India. “ They are trying to swindle us by not giving us proper salary and creating fear. People who are coming with this type of visa are not coming as illegal immigrants. They are coming in with a valid visa. They have valid degrees and a valid education, so they are afraid [that if they speak out] they will not only spoil their image, they will spoil their family ’ s reputation also. ” **Subbu ’ s experience is not isolated**. I spoke to half a dozen H - 1B employees with similar stories, who asked to remain anonymous. In 2000, the Baltimore Sun , after reviewing hundreds of court records and government documents, found **numerous cases in which unscrupulous body shops billed U.S. companies at rates three to four times the salaries they actually paid the workers.** They also interviewed H - 1B workers who were not paid what they had been promised and were **threatened with deportation** if they challenged their employers. In 2007, Patni Computer Systems, a global technology company headquartered in India, agreed to pay more than \$ 2.4 million to 607 H - 1B workers following a U.S. Department of Labor investigation that determined the workers had been underpaid. Patni supplied IT workers to such companies as State Farm Insurance, MetLife, and General Electric.

## Immigrants come to the US for cheap labor and that furthers the capitalist gap in the economy

**Kaye 10-** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for News Hour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, “Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration”, p.166-167, TS)

**The federal foray into migration management came during a period when a growing economy needed more workers and consumers. It was the beginning of a series of immigration laws and policies in the United States that often have tracked national fortunes and business cycles, opening and closing the doors as the demand for labor increased and dipped. The 1864 law established the U.S. Immigration Bureau, which was supposed to increase the supply of migrants to American industry to meet its production needs during the Civil War.** (Because the law allowed recruiters to require workers to sign contracts pledging their wages for a year, organized labor and their supporters attacked the legislation for creating a “ species of servitude. ” It was repealed in 1886.) In the late nineteenth century, America shifted from an agricultural to an urban and industrial power. **The growth of railroad companies, mines, steel, meatpacking industries, and industrial farming required more and more migrant workers.** Railroads — among them Illinois Central, the Burlington, and the Northern Pacific — sent agents to Europe to entice migrants to move. Owners of mines and factories also sent emissaries abroad on recruiting expeditions. **The captains of enterprise found migration to be as great a boon as the expansion of industry: “ Were the owners of every gold and silver mine in the world compelled to send to the Treasury at Washington, at their own expense, every ounce of the precious metals produced, the national wealth would not be enhanced one - half as much as it is from the golden stream which flows into the country every year through immigration,**

" wrote the industrialist Andrew Carnegie. During the 1860s and 1870s — years of post – Civil War Reconstruction, territorial expansion, and rapid industrialization — new settlers were in great demand. So much so that twenty - fi ve of the thirty - eight states provided migrants with economic incentives, including good deals on property and real estate tax exemptions. Southern states were part of the scramble. They desperately needed cheap labor to replace emancipated slaves.

The economy is addicted to foreign labor. Any withdrawal from it will crush capitalism.

**Kaye 10-** (Jeffrey Kaye, Los Angeles Emmy Award winning author for News Hour and a former magazine writer and freelance reporter that worked on four continents, "Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration", p.251, TS)

Microsoft ' s long - term plan for more migrant employees to spur economic growth stood in sharp contrast to the firm ' s immediate financial reality. With declining revenue, Microsoft needed to control costs. As one arm of the company pushed to be allowed to import more foreign workers, another was preparing dismissal notices. Two and half weeks after making its case to import " people from around the world, " the company announced that it would be eliminating fourteen hundred jobs right away, and might lay off up to twenty - six hundred additional employees over the next eighteen months. To the Microsofts of the world, the globe is a mighty chessboard with pieces that need to be moved around in accordance with longterm goals, grand strategies, challenges from other major players, and the circumstances of play. Mobility is key, and if the rules of play inhibit movement, then the players seek to change them. Generally missing from the calculation is a sense of the common good. It's a global system that I earlier referred to as "coyote capitalism," one whose skewed priorities place the welfare of migrants at the bottom of the list. Properly addressing migration requires not only a commitment to address its causes, but a reexamination of values, a better understanding of enforcement regimes and vested interests, and the realization that an international issue entails a global approach. Even though the demand for migrant workers rises and dips over time and with economic fluctuations, the overall appetite in the developed world for the brains and brawn of foreign labor seems unrelenting. Like addicts, we need the next fi x. We are hooked. The cravings come from all sectors of the economy. " There are only so many brains available, " the president of a U.S. high - tech market research firm told Investor ' s Business Daily. " And either they ' re going to get them or we are. "



## Immigration Bad – Disease

Illegal immigrants are spreading diseases throughout the US

Gibson in 9

Dave Gibson, Writer: Washington Times, EXAMINER, "Illegal immigration is exposing Americans to dangerous diseases," June 3, 2009

**It is often said that the flood of illegal immigrants into this country is reaching 'epidemic proportions.' While that statement is true, it is just as true that the illegal immigrants pouring over the U.S./Mexican border are endangering this country with actual epidemics. Tuberculosis, hepatitis, dengue fever, chagas, and even leprosy are being imported into the U.S. inside the bodies of illegal aliens. A virtual 'hot-zone' of disease can be found in this nations border states. Illegal immigrants have set up so-called "colonias" just inside the states of New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The shanty towns are comprised mostly of cardboard shacks and huts made with cast-off building materials. They have no sanitation, and are surrounded by mounds of garbage. The estimated 185,000 illegals share their makeshift towns with armies of rats. Of course, diseases only common to Central and South America run rampant in these places.**

Lack of health care access for noncitizens deters them from cooperating with quarantines that stop the spread of disease...

**Calvo 2008**

[Janet M., Professor, City University School of Law, "The Consequences of Restricted Health Care Access for Immigrants: Lessons from Medicaid and SCHIP," 17 Ann. Health L. 175, Summer, LN]

The CDC has recognized that controlling contagion through isolation and quarantine ultimately depends on the cooperation of those who are infected. n172 However, **the lack of health care access and the immigration consequences of seeking medical care are significant barriers to access.** A recent case involving an Atlanta teen illustrates this concept. In this instance, the local public health authorities discovered that a young Mexican immigrant had a variation of drug-resistant TB. n173 Instead of treating the young man and his family and friends in an appropriate outpatient or inpatient setting, the authorities incarcerated him and contacted the immigration authorities. n174 These actions undermined cooperation by the terrified young man and his family. **Instead of promoting the public health by eliciting cooperation, threats of incarceration and deportation undermine it. There can be no realistic expectation that a noncitizen will come forward for a diagnosis and cooperate in the treatment of a serious contagious disease when the consequences of coming forward are being jailed and reported to immigration authorities.**

Access to primary care is key to check infectious diseases, including new influenza strains...

**Calvo 2008**

[Janet M., Professor, City University School of Law, "The Consequences of Restricted Health Care Access for Immigrants: Lessons from Medicaid and SCHIP," 17 Ann. Health L. 175, Summer, LN]

**Another important element of communicable disease control is the early detection and treatment of contagious diseases, such as SARS, TB, influenza, hepatitis, and venereal disease.** For such diseases, **access to primary care is essential to contain the risk of contagion for the larger community. These diseases may** be asymptomatic and can **only be detected through primary care screenings**, particularly sexually transmitted diseases. n145 Moreover, contagious diseases may have common symptoms that require careful medical screening to assess. n146 Influenza is an example. Influenza, or the "flu", is transmitted by respiratory secretions, direct contact, and contact with infected surfaces and objects. n147 Its symptoms and severity vary; they can be non-specific and include fever, chills, cough, and headache. n148 **The challenge to those in public health is that the "flu" may be minor or it may be caused by a new respiratory pathogen that can [\*195] lead to an epidemic if not detected and controlled.** n149 **With proper primary care, these diseases can be treated during their early stages, thereby reducing, containing, and eliminating their risks.**

An influenza outbreak could kill hundreds of thousands and cost over 100 billion dollars...

**Calvo 2008**

[Janet M., Professor, City University School of Law, "The Consequences of Restricted Health Care Access for Immigrants: Lessons from Medicaid and SCHIP," 17 Ann. Health L. 175, Summer, LN]

[\*194] **Vaccinations for influenza are important to addressing public health concerns, because influenza epidemics occur almost annually.** n140 **During severe outbreaks, influenza has been associated with thousands of deaths in the United States.** n141 The vaccine available is not always effective - it might not have a similarity to the influenza strain that attacks the public. n142 However, the vaccine is still the most effective means to diminish the disease and protect the public health. n143 **The Centers for Disease Control ("CDC") estimates that a moderately severe influenza pandemic could cause between 89,000 and 207,000 deaths and cost \$ 71 to \$ 166 billion.** n144 Thus, access to vaccination for influenza for individuals is important for the health of the public.

Tuberculosis CANNOT be treated properly and contained while public health benefits are denied to immigrants...

David J. **Deterding**, J.D. Candidate Saint Louis University, "A Deference-Based Dilemma: The Implications of Lewis v. Thompson For Access to Non-Emergency Health Benefits For Undocumented Alien Children," Sain Louis University Law Journal, 52 St. Louis L.J. 951, Spring 2008, LN

[\*982] It is also evident that denying health care to undocumented children can create serious adverse health consequences for the rest of the country. n255 By deferring the treatment of non-citizen children until an emergency situation arises, these children could expose numerous other individuals to communicable diseases. n256 For example, **the rate of tuberculosis and many other infectious diseases is ten to thirty times higher in the country of origin for many immigrants than in**

the United States. n257 Diseases such as tuberculosis can remain dormant for long periods of time thus making detection improbable without continuous access to medical treatment and care. n258 However, if access to preventative medical care is given, doctors will be able to protect U.S. citizens from the dangers of diseases which originate abroad by eliminating infectious diseases before they can spread. For these reasons, it is in the interests of Congress to make sure diseases within the illegal immigrant community are diagnosed and treated early in order to preserve the health of both immigrants and U.S. citizens. This objective cannot be accomplished unless the current statutory denial of publicly funded preventative health care to unqualified non-citizen children is altered or revoked.



# Immigration Bad – US Economy

## **Immigration Does Not Reform Mexican Politics/ Democracy**

**PRI OPPOSES EFFORTS TO ALLOW MEXICANS LIVING IN THE US TO VOTE--VIEW IT AS A THREAT TO MEXICAN DEMOCRACY**

Joseph Contreras, **Former *Newsweek* Reporter, 2009**, In the Shadow of the Giant: The Americanization of Modern Mexico, p. 171-2

Until recently, the money sent by migrants to their hometowns never brought them any political dividends. Under their nation's election laws, Mexican workers living in the United States had to physically return to the country to vote, and successive PRI governments resisted proposals to grant migrants dual residency status and the right to cast absentee ballots from abroad. A population who had voted with their feet seemed like a poor bet to support a party that had governed Mexico for seventy-one years and stood to be held accountable for the corruption and mismanagement that drove millions of Mexicans to leave the country in the first place. The many years these migrants spent living in a foreign country with a true, functioning democracy was an additional deterrent for PRI politicians, argues Manuel de la Cruz, who won his seat in the state legislature in 2004 as a candidate of the left-wing Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD). "Their greatest fear is the participation of immigrants in elections because we have learned a lot about democracy from living in the United States where there are two real political parties," says de la Cruz. "That democracy will destroy [the PRI's] castle of glass."

## Immigration Does Not Benefit US Economy

### NO EVIDENCE OF POSITIVE EXTERNALITIES FROM IMMIGRATION—SPECULATION RISKS BAD POLICY

Borjas '99

(George, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, Heavens Door, pg 96-8)

Although these intangibles are believed to be important by many observers of the immigrant experience, there is no empirical evidence supporting their existence, let alone measuring their magnitude. One could also argue that it would be difficult for immigrants to generate many of these externalities in an economy as large as that of the United States, particularly in an era when information travels instantaneously across national borders. In principle, American workers and firms could conceivably obtain much of the knowledge that potential immigrants presumably possess—and that Americans do not—by surfing the information highway for a few minutes. There is yet another difficulty with the belief that accounting for positive externalities would substantially increase the size of the immigration surplus. Although many Americans benefit from the ways in which immigration alters the social and economic environment, many other Americans do not. Put bluntly, a positive externality to some may well be a negative externality to others. The sweet perfumes emanating from Thai restaurants (my personal favorite) might be considered an unpleasant stench by those who dislike what the new cuisine has done to the look, feel, and smell of American cities. In the end, the problem with stressing externalities in the immigration debate is that although they might exist and could be very important, it is extremely difficult to measure their impact. Would Intel—or an Intel look-alike—never have been incorporated if Andrew Grove had remained in Hungary? How would the computer industry have evolved if Federico Faggin, the Italian-born physicist who built the first microprocessor, had not moved to California? Would California's population in the late 1990s be a third smaller if there had been no immigration, and what value would the American people attach to driving on that state's freeways and visiting its parks and beaches if they were a lot less crowded? What would be the impact of removing all the cultural and linguistic barriers that now hamper social and economic exchanges among large segments of the American population? What would be the political structure of the world today if Enrico Fermi had not migrated to the United States on the eve of World War II, and carried out the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction on the campus of the University of Chicago in 1942? None of these questions can be answered with objective evidence. The case for or against the externality is essentially a case based on one's very subjective beliefs about how immigrants affect certain parts of the social, political, and economic environment. Immigration probably generates both positive and negative externalities for the United States, and both types of externalities have the potential to be very important. But there is little to be gained—and a lot of potential mischief to be had—by basing important social policy decisions on "facts" that can never be measured objectively, far less verified. In the absence of any systematic evidence on the impact of these externalities, therefore, it is wise to emphasize the gains that can be quantified, and the best available evidence indicates that the immigration surplus is quite small.

## **Immigration Bad: Social Costs/Crime**

### **ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION IMPOSES HUGE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COSTS**

Nicole A. Blair, Law Student, 2012, "Illegal Immigration Overstays its Welcome," Ave Maria Law Review, 10 Ave Maria L. Rev. 203, p. 210-1

The rise in the number of illegal immigrants entering the United States has also caused major social and economic problems. Two main difficulties with illegal immigration are increased crime rates and the large cost to the American economy. It is estimated that in 2003, there were approximately 46,000 criminal aliens in federal prisons, at a cost of \$ 1.3 billion. That same year, approximately 74,000 illegal aliens resided in state prisons at a cost of \$ 880 million, with approximately 147,000 individuals in local jails.

The Government Accountability Office ("GAO") investigated 55,332 illegal aliens and found that recidivism was high, with each immigrant having been arrested on average about eight times. Approximately fifteen percent of these crimes were "property-related offenses," including "burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and property damage." Twelve percent of these crimes were "violent offenses such as murder, robbery, assault, and sex-related crimes." Since many illegal aliens who are convicted criminals are supposed to be removed, the high recidivism rate is somewhat surprising. Generally, most illegal immigrants come into the custody of Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") after they are turned over by state and local governments following an arrest. After the illegal immigrants bond out of state custody or complete their sentence, they are then put in ICE custody and arrangements are made for their removal from the United States. Some individuals have maintained that one of the reasons that these criminal aliens may not be removed is because of the existence of state "sanctuary" policies forbidding police officers from arresting criminals based on their immigration status. [http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1370100719345&returnToKey=20\\_T17516319730&parent=docview&target=results\\_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.849850.3175989724 - n36](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1370100719345&returnToKey=20_T17516319730&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.849850.3175989724 - n36)

# Immigration Bad: Hurts US Economy - 1N

## IMMIGRATION KILLS THE ECONOMY

### Chortareas Katirtzidis and Tsoukalas '8

(George, University of Athens and University of Essex, Kostas, University of Athens, and John, University of Nottingham, "Macroeconomic Effects of Immigration in a New Keynesian Model," March)

Theoretically, the model of Canova-Ravn (2000), which examines immigration effects on the host country, constitutes a starting point for future research on immigration at the macro-economy, in a business cycle framework. Among other things, **immigration inflows should not be ignored by the policy makers as a potential source of economic fluctuations for the host country.** Canova-Ravn focused on low-skilled immigration, examining the implications of different degrees of substitutability between native and foreign workers. Under a real business cycle context, **Canova-Ravn observed that immigration shocks create welfare redistribution in favor of natives, but recessionary short-term effects on the macro-economy.**

## NUCLEAR WAR

### Friedberg & Schoenfeld '8

[Aaron, professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, Gabriel, Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, The Dangers of a Diminished America, WSJ, 10/21, Proquest]

**Protectionist sentiments** are sure to **grow stronger as jobs disappear** in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, **calls to save jobs by restricting imports** had begun to **gather** support among many Democrats and some Republicans. **In a prolonged recession, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow.** Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from **al Qaeda** and Islamic terrorist affiliates **has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are** continuing on their **bellicose** paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. **Russia's new militancy and China's** seemingly relentless **rise** also **give** cause for **concern. If America** now **tries to pull back** from the world stage, **it will leave a dangerous power vacuum.** The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, **when global trade and finance ground** nearly **to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers** led by the remorseless fanatics who **rose up** on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue **states may** choose to **become** ever more **reckless with their nuclear toys,** just **at our moment of maximum vulnerability.** The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the **authoritarian leaders** of these countries **seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.**

## Immigration Bad: US Economy - Strain Public Resources

### **ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS POSE HUGE DRAIN ON PUBLIC RESOURCES**

Nicole A. Blair, Law Student, 2012, "Illegal Immigration Overstays its Welcome," Ave Maria Law Review, 10 Ave Maria L. Rev. 203, p. 211-2

United States citizens bear the cost, and the national economy is poorer when it comes to supporting the needs of illegal immigrants. Brian Gattton, a professor of history at Arizona State University, said that unskilled immigrants use "more in public services than they pay in taxes." For example, many are concerned that the American people are bearing the cost of education and health care for illegal immigrants and their children. The total cost of educating the children of illegal immigrants is estimated to be about \$ 29 billion a year. It costs taxpayers \$ 12 billion a year for illegal immigrant children and \$ 17 billion a year for the U.S.-born children of illegal immigrants already residing here. After the U.S. Supreme Court decided Plyler v. Doe in 1982, it became impermissible for states to deny public education to illegal immigrant students. In that case, the Court struck down a Texas law which discriminated against kids on the basis of a "legal characteristic of which children can have little control."

Such an extreme interpretation of the Constitution is not without a high cost, both financially and socially. Some are worried that schools are focused on boosting enrollment to get the maximum funding possible even if it means enrolling illegal immigrants, rather than ensuring that U.S.-citizen students get the best education possible. This is a legitimate concern that, when coupled with the rising costs in education, will need to be considered by the federal government in refining immigration policy.

Similarly, under the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, illegal immigrants cannot be deprived of emergency medical treatment. This has opened the door for many who are unlawfully present to seek "emergency" treatment for many common ailments, using the emergency room as a clinic, thus burdening the resources of hospitals and other medical facilities nationwide. Border counties alone estimated that at least \$ 190 million dollars of uncompensated care went to illegal immigrants in 2000. Several million illegal immigrants are reported to have been taking advantage of this benefit in 2003, representing approximately twenty-five percent of welfare recipients. Children who are U.S. citizens, but whose parents are unlawfully present in the United States, are also entitled to welfare benefits, including Medicaid and Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") disability payments, which are costing taxpayers a very large amount of money.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreases Wages and Employment

## **IMMIGRATION RAPIDLY DECREASES WAGES AND EMPLOYMENT**

**Borjas '3**

(George J. Borjas, Robert W. Scrivner Professor of Economics and Social Policy, Harvard University, "THE LABOR DEMAND CURVE IS DOWNWARD SLOPING: REEXAMINING THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ON THE LABOR MARKET," The Quarterly Journal of Economics, November)

The laws of supply and demand have unambiguous implications for how immigration should affect labor market conditions in the short run. The shift in supply lowers the real wage of competing native workers. Further, as long as the native supply curve is upward sloping, immigration should also reduce the amount of labor supplied by the native workforce.

## **THESE PHENOMENA APPLY TO ALL TYPES OF WORKERS**

**Krikorian '7**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, master's degree from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a bachelor's degree from Georgetown University, The New Case Against Immigration, pg 138-9)

More recent research has found a quite pronounced loss to native-born American workers. Harvard economist George Borjas has found that the immigration wave of the 1980s and 1990s caused a drop in the annual earnings of all categories of American workers, including a 3.6 percent drop for male college graduates and a 7.4 percent drop for male high-school dropouts.<sup>11</sup> Lest these numbers seem small, Borjas calculates that immigration reduced the average American high-school dropout's income in 2000 by about \$1,800, while the American college graduate saw his salary reduced by \$2,600. Since education is not distributed evenly among Americans, some groups of American workers will experience a disproportionately large effect from immigration. Borjas found that the immigrant influx from 1980 to 2000 caused the annual wages of native-born white workers overall to fall 3.5 percent, but those of black workers fell 4.5 percent, and the wages of native-born Hispanic workers fell 5 percent.<sup>12</sup> As he writes: "The adverse impact of immigration, therefore, is largest for the most disadvantaged native-born minorities."

## **IMMIGRANTS FLOOD THE LABOR MARKET, CRUSHING WAGES, CAUSING UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISCOURAGING INNOVATION**

**Krikorian '7**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, master's degree from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a bachelor's degree from Georgetown University, The New Case Against Immigration, pg 133)

The key to the economic facet of the conflict between mass immigration and modern society is the fact that immigration floods the job market with low-skilled workers, creating what economists call a slack, or loose, labor market. This results in a buyer's market for labor, where employers can pick and choose among workers rather than having to compete with one another to attract and keep staff. This has two major implications for the economy: First, a loose labor market reduces the bargaining power of workers compared to employers, resulting in lower earnings and less opportunity for advancement for the poorest and most marginal of Americans. And second, by artificially keeping wages lower than they would be otherwise, mass immigration reduces the incentives for more-efficient use of labor, slowing the natural progress of mechanization and other productivity increases in the low-wage industries where immigrants are concentrated. In other words, while immigration certainly increases the overall size of our economy, it subverts the widely shared economic goals of a modern society: a large middle class open to all, working in high-wage, knowledge-intensive, and capital-intensive jobs exhibiting growing labor productivity and avoiding too skewed a distribution of income.

## **IMMIGRATION INCREASES UNEMPLOYMENT AND DEPRESSES WAGES—BREAKING DOWN BY SKILL AND EDUCATION PROVES DESPITE CONFUSING RESULTS**

**Borjas '3**

(George J, Robert W. Scrivner Professor of Economics and Social Policy, Harvard University, "THE LABOR DEMAND CURVE IS DOWNWARD SLOPING: REEXAMINING THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ON THE LABOR MARKET," The Quarterly Journal of Economics, November)

My analysis uses data drawn from the 1960–1990 U. S. Decennial Censuses, as well as the 1998–2001 Current Population Surveys, and assumes that workers with the same education but different levels of work experience participate in a national labor market and are not perfect substitutes. It turns out that immigration—even within a particular schooling group—is not balanced evenly across all experience cells in that group, and the nature of the supply imbalance changes over time. This fact generates a great deal of variation—across schooling groups, experience cells, and over time—that helps to identify the impact of immigration on the labor market. Most importantly, the size of the native workforce in each of the skill groups is relatively fixed, so that there is less potential for native flows to contaminate the comparison of outcomes across skill groups. In contrast to the confusing array of results that now permeate the literature, the evidence consistently suggests that immigration has indeed harmed the employment opportunities of competing native workers.

### **IMMIGRATION HARMS NATIVE EMPLOYMENT—SPATIAL CORRELATIONS FAIL TO DETECT THE DIFFERENCE BECAUSE THE EFFECT IS DISPERSED NATIONALLY**

**Borjas '3**

(George J, Robert W. Scrivner Professor of Economics and Social Policy, Harvard University, "THE LABOR DEMAND CURVE IS DOWNWARD SLOPING: REEXAMINING THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ON THE LABOR MARKET," The Quarterly Journal of Economics, November)

The concern over the adverse labor market impact of immigration has always played a central role in the immigration debate. The resurgence of large-scale immigration in recent decades stimulated a great deal of research that attempts to measure these labor market effects. This research effort, based mainly on comparing native employment opportunities across regions, has not been entirely successful. The weak spatial correlations typically estimated in these studies, although often construed as showing that immigrants do not lower native wages, are difficult to interpret. In fact, economic theory implies that the more that firms and workers adjust to the immigrant supply shock, the smaller these cross-region correlations will be—regardless of the true impact of immigration on the national economy. This paper introduces a new approach for estimating the labor market impact of immigration. The analysis builds on the assumption that similarly educated workers who have different levels of experience are not perfect substitutes. Defining skill groups in terms of educational attainment and work experience introduces a great deal of variation in the data. In some years, the influx of immigrants with a particular level of schooling mainly affects younger workers; in other years it mainly affects older workers. In contrast to the existing literature, the evidence reported in this paper consistently indicates that immigration reduces the wage and labor supply of competing native workers, as suggested by the simplest textbook model of a competitive labor market. Moreover, the evidence indicates that spatial correlations conceal around two-thirds of the national impact of immigration on wages. My estimates of the own factor price elasticity cluster between 0.3 and 0.4. These estimates, combined with the very large immigrant influx in recent decades, imply that immigration has substantially worsened the labor market opportunities faced by many native workers. Between 1980 and 2000, immigration increased the labor supply of working men by 11.0 percent. Even after accounting for the beneficial cross effects of low-skill (highskill) immigration on the earnings of high-skill (low-skill) workers, my analysis implies that this immigrant influx reduced the wage of the average native worker by 3.2 percent. The wage impact differed dramatically across education groups, with the wage falling by 8.9 percent for high school dropouts, 4.9 percent for college graduates, 2.6 percent for high school graduates, and barely changing for workers with some college.

### **IMMIGRANTS DO COMPETE WITH NATIVES—NO EVIDENCE OF LOWER JOB QUALITY**

**Hamermesh and Bean '98**

(Daniel S, Sue Killam Professor in the Foundation of Economics at the University of Texas at Austin and Professor of Labor Economics, Maastricht University. His A.B. is from the University of Chicago, his Ph.D. from Yale, and Frank D, Director, Center for Research on Immigration, Population and Public Policy PH.D., Duke University, Help or Hindrance?, Pg 101-4)

Throughout American history the possibility that immigrants "take jobs away from natives" has probably been the biggest spur to nativist sentiment. Economists have addressed this issue during the last twenty years directly by treating immigrants and natives as separate inputs into production and measuring the extent to which they are substitutes, or indirectly by examining how natives' wages or earnings are related to the presence of immigrants. The results of the now myriad studies using these approaches are somewhat conflicting. Here I take an alternative tack, asking whether the preconditions for the absence of direct labor-market competition exist in the form of immigrants' willingness to accept working conditions, and thus find jobs, in fields where jobs would otherwise not exist. To the extent that immigrants will take jobs that



natives refuse to accept, one might conclude that they and native workers might be noncompeting groups in American labor markets, with any substitution between them coming only through product-market competition between firms using native labor and those using immigrants. I interpret the preconditions as implying that immigrants will accept a job that has amenities inferior to one that an otherwise identical native would accept. I examine objective data from the Current Population Survey of May 1991 describing the timing of work over the day and the June 1991 CPS data (which contained information on immigrant status) linked to industry workplace injury rates and duration. I also examine this possibility using a variety of subjective responses about job amenities in the Quality of American Life surveys conducted in 1971 and 1978. **There is at most only very weak evidence of any difference between immigrants and natives generally in the amenities associated with the jobs they hold**, given the observable characteristics that they bring to the labor market. **It thus seems fair to conclude that the preconditions for the absence of direct labor-market competition between immigrants and natives do not exist. Despite occasional anecdotal evidence along a variety of nonwage outcomes I find no evidence that immigrants in general are willing to "take jobs that [observationally identical] natives don't want."**

## **LOW-SKILLED IMMIGRATION CAUSES UNEMPLOYMENT AND DEPRESSES WAGES**

**Krikorian '7**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, master's degree from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a bachelor's degree from Georgetown University, The New Case Against Immigration, pg 140-3)

JOB DISPLACEMENT

But the loose labor market created by immigration doesn't just reduce the wages paid to low-skilled American workers—it also makes it less likely they will be hired in the first place and more likely they will drop out of the job market altogether. Of course, there is no simple, one-to-one relationship between the arrival of immigrants and job losses for Americans. But the evidence is piling up that immigration does indeed crowd out

American workers. A recent analysis has found that during the first half of this decade, almost all the net increase in jobs for working-age adults went to immigrants, despite the fact that the native born accounted for the large majority of the increase in the working-age population." Over this period, from 2000 to 2005, the number of adult immigrant workers with a high-school education or less increased by 1.6 million, while unemployment among similarly educated Americans grew by nearly 1 million, and an additional 1.5 million such Americans left the labor force altogether (i.e., stopped even looking for work). This wasn't just coincidence; the fall in the proportion of low-skilled Americans working was greatest in precisely those states with the biggest growth in the immigrant population, while unemployment among the native born in immigrant-heavy job categories was 10 percent, double the overall national rate. The connection between immigration and the decline in employment is especially clear in the case of black Americans. Much field research has shown that employers prefer to hire immigrants over black Americans. Two scholars who studied the interaction of blacks and immigrants in New York have written: Native-born applicants are at a disadvantage compared to legal immigrants in securing entry-level work. In fact, even though central Harlem residents are nearly all African American, recent immigrants have a higher probability of being hired for Harlem's fast-food jobs than anyone else. Interviews with employers suggest that they believe immigrants are easier to manage in part because they come from countries where \$4.25 an hour represents a king's ransom. Whether or not employers are right about the tractability of immigrants, such attitudes make it harder for the native-born to obtain low-wage jobs.<sup>1</sup> William Julius Wilson found the same thing in his study of inner-city Chicago; Hispanics, he wrote, "continue to funnel into manufacturing because employers prefer Hispanics over blacks and they like to hire by referrals from current employees, which Hispanics can readily furnish, being already embedded in migration networks."<sup>15</sup> The exodus of black men from the labor market has been dramatic. From 1960 to 2000, the employment rate for black men (the proportion of black men not in jail who are actually holding jobs) fell significantly, from about 90 percent to 76 percent (the employment rate for white men fell much less, from 96 percent to 91 percent).<sup>16</sup> The drop in employment for black high-school dropouts was even more dramatic, from 89 percent to 56 percent (the decline for white dropouts was from 94 percent to 76 percent). In other words, nearly half of black American men with less than a high-school education are not working. There were a variety of reasons for this huge drop in the employment of black men: the explosion in illegitimate births, racial discrimination, the loss of manufacturing jobs, the spread of welfare dependency, the shift of economic activity out of the inner city, increased drug use and criminality, and other factors. But economists have confirmed the field studies of sociologists in finding that immigration contributes significantly to the reduction in black employment. A 2006 paper by Harvard economist George Borjas and two colleagues found that one third of the decline in the employment rate of black male high-school dropouts between 1980 and 2000 was due to immigration (in addition to about 10 percent of the increase in the proportion of them in prison). As the authors write, "As immigrants disproportionately increased the supply of workers in a particular skill group, we find a reduction in the wage of black workers in that group, a reduction in the employment rate, and a

corresponding increase in the incarceration rate."<sup>17</sup> If immigration caused one third of the decline in black men's employment, then of course two thirds of it was caused by other factors. Wilson found a variety of concerns expressed by Chicago employers (including black employers) about hiring inner-city black men: "Employer comments about inner-city black males revealed a wide range of complaints, including assertions that they procrastinate, are lazy, belligerent, and dangerous, have high rates of tardiness and absenteeism, carry employment histories with many job turnovers, and frequently fail to pass drug screening tests."<sup>18</sup> Whether or not employers exaggerate these concerns, and whatever other factors are involved, it's undoubtedly true, as Borjas and his colleagues wrote, "We would have witnessed much of the decline in black employment and the concurrent increase in black incarceration rates even if there had been no immigration in the past few decades."<sup>19</sup> But the ability of government to effect change in many of the areas of concern is limited; huge expenditures have not halted the decline of urban schools, for instance, while other problems are the bailiwick of society rather than government. Immigration, however, is one important area where government can make a difference, in-creasing incentives for constructive work by preventing mass immigration from artificially

flooding the job market with low-skilled workers. Inner-city black men are not the only ones being displaced from the job market by immigration. Young Americans are obviously also natural candidates for entry-level jobs—students looking for summer or part-time jobs, or recent entrants to the job market (whatever their level of education) who still do not have much work experience. Researchers at Northeastern University have concluded, "It appears that employers are substituting new immigrant workers for young native-born workers. The estimated sizes of these displacement effects were frequently quite large."<sup>21</sup> These researchers found that between 2000 and 2005, the number of young (ages 16 to 34) native-born American men who were employed fell by 1.7 million, while the number of new male immigrant workers grew by 1.9 million. This was not because there were fewer young American men, but rather because "the ability of the nation's teen and young adult (20-24) population to become employed has deteriorated badly over the past five years."<sup>21</sup>

#### **ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS DEPRESS WAGES AND CONSTRAIN LABOR MARKET OPPORTUNITIES**

Nicole A. Blair, *Law Student*, 2012, "Illegal Immigration Overstays its Welcome," *Ave Maria Law Review*, 10 *Ave Maria L. Rev.* 203, p. 211

There is no doubt that the presence of illegal immigrants in the United States carries a high price tag. Illegal immigrants cost more than they contribute. While many claim that the presence of illegal immigrants benefits the economy because they are simply performing those jobs that American citizens are not willing to take, the facts paint a somewhat different picture. The two groups that benefit most from employing illegal immigrants are the immigrants themselves and the employers who hire them at a lower wage. Foreign-born workers earn less than native workers, which reduces overall earnings growth for the United States workforce as a whole. It is estimated that four to six million jobs in the United States have moved to the underground economy, where workers are paid "under the table" in cash in order to avoid paying income taxes. Approximately \$ 35 billion a year in income taxes are not recovered due to jobs that are "off the books." Many of these jobs are in labor-intensive fields such as landscaping and construction.

## Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreases Wages and Employment: Tipping Point

**EVEN IF IMMIGRATION DOESN'T ALWAYS DEPRESS WAGES, IT WILL IN THE CASE OF THE AFF. FIRST, THE THEORY: ONLY PAST A CERTAIN "TIPPING POINT," IMMIGRATION DECREASES WAGES FOR ALL WORKERS**

**Batalova '6**

(Jeanne, Policy analyst at the Migration Policy Institute, PhD in Sociology, Skilled Immigrant and Native Workers in the United States, pg 94)

Third, my analysis emphasizes the need to consider the structural features of employment of skilled workers. The multi-level models show that in jobs with few immigrants, no significant differences in earnings among native and immigrant groups exist. In contrast, as the percent of immigrants reaches a certain tipping point, these jobs become "immigrant," and earnings begin to decrease for all workers. The literatures on labor market segmentation and occupational segregation suggest that occupations and sectors dominated by a minority group (i.e., women, low-skilled Latino immigrants, blacks) tend to be devalued by employers. My analysis suggests a similar process might occur at the highly skilled level. As the job composition tilts toward a higher percent of immigrants, whose labor is more dispensable (Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002), every worker starts paying earnings penalties. As the US economy increasingly demands a skilled and educated labor force and relies on immigration as a method to expand this labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004b; Horrigan 2004), questions regarding the economic impact of immigrants will continue to dominate public and political discourse. My findings challenge the exclusive focus on immigrants as individual workers in discussions of their economic impacts. Instead, I suggest placing such discussions in the larger context of the American economy, which is characterized by labor market segmentation and occupational segregation as well as gender and racial inequality.

**SECOND, WE'RE AT THAT POINT OF DECREASE NOW:**

**A. HIGH-TECH INDUSTRIES HAVE DISPROPORTIONATELY MANY IMMIGRANTS ALREADY**

**Batalova '6**

(Jeanne, Policy analyst at the Migration Policy Institute, PhD in Sociology, Skilled Immigrant and Native Workers in the United States, pg 123-4)

One of the core tenets of the segmentation labor market theory is the importance of structural features of employment in explaining workers' labor market outcomes. To date, the theory has been mainly used to analyze the determinants of earnings and employment of low-skilled native and immigrant workforce. My study extends the theory to the case of highly skilled workers. The results of the multi-level models indicate a positive but non-linear relationship between nativity composition of skilled jobs and the earnings of workers in these jobs. I find that in jobs with a lower percentage (less than 2 percent) of immigrants, there are no significant differences in earnings among native and immigrant groups. In contrast, after the percent of immigrants reaches a certain tipping point – about 35 percent – a higher presence of immigrants results in a decline in earnings for native and earlier immigrant workers (the tipping point for recent immigrants is lower, about 26 percent). It suggests that these jobs might become defined as "immigrant" jobs. The literatures on labor market segmentation and occupational segregation argue that work is devalued in occupations and sectors that are dominated by certain groups of workers – women, low-skilled Latino immigrants, and blacks. And, as a result, everyone in such workplaces suffers earnings penalties (Catanzarite 1998; Cohen and Huffman 2003a; England 1992; England et al. 1994). My analysis shows that a similar process might take place at the highly skilled level as well. Jobs with a high percentage of immigrants tend to be in high-tech and science occupations and concentrated in education and professional/science industries. As the US economy increasingly demands a skilled and educated labor force in high-tech, science, medicine, and education and relies on immigration as a method to expand it, the questions of economic impacts of immigrants have to be considered in the context of deepening labor market segmentation and occupational segregation.

**B. STRUCTURAL FACTORS: THE "TIPPING POINT" DEPENDS ON THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY AND UNEMPLOYMENT**

**Coats '8**

(David, Associate Director of Policy at the Work Foundation, "Migration Myths: Employment, Wages and Labour Market Performance," April)

For the avoidance of doubt it should be made clear that at some level inward migration can have an adverse impact on the wages and employment prospects of native-born workers – certainly if the flow is at a sustained high level. The real question of course is: when do we reach such a tipping point? Many people would like there to be a clear answer so that they can say: we already have enough migrants and we want no more. But the 'right' level of migration depends on a

wide range of factors including demographic trends, the state of the economy, the skills demands of employers and the level of unemployment. In other words, this is an essentially empirical question, the answer to which will depend on the circumstances of the time. One can never be certain that there is a 'right' level of immigration (defined as a level that is self-evident and unchallengeable) to be determined through some mechanistic process, just as one cannot be certain that there is a 'right' level for the National Minimum Wage. Inevitably these issues will be contested. Indeed, we would probably make worse policy if everyone agreed, simply because having our preconceptions challenged is one of the principal routes to social advance. It is for these reasons that the establishment of the Migration Advisory Committee is an important step towards better informed policy making.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreases Wages and Employment-AT: Studies Disprove Link

## STUDIES THAT DON'T DETECT WAGE EFFECTS MAKE KEY FAULTY ASSUMPTIONS

Borjas '99

(George, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, Heavens Door, pg 66-83)

What happens when immigration increases the supply of workers in a particular labor market? The traditional approach to this question—the one that has greatly influenced the direction of the immigration debate—takes a myopic, short-run perspective. The entry of **immigrants** into the local labor market should **lower the wage of** competing **workers** (workers who have the same types of skills as immigrants) and perhaps increase the wage of complementary workers (workers whose skills become more valuable because of immigration). For example, an influx of foreign-born laborers reduces the economic opportunities for laborers who already live in the locality—all laborers now face stiffer competition in the labor market. At the same time, highly skilled natives may gain substantially. They pay less for the services that laborers provide, such as painting the house and mowing the lawn, and natives who hire these laborers can now specialize in producing the goods and services that better suit their skills. This short-run perspective, however, can be very misleading. Over time, **natives**—both those who live in the city targeted by immigrants as well as those living in other cities—will likely **respond to the entry of immigrants**. It is not in the best interest of native-owned firms or native workers to sit still and watch immigrants change economic opportunities. All natives now have incentives to change their behavior in ways that take advantage of the altered economic landscape. For example, **native-owned firms see that cities flooded by** less-skilled **immigrants tend to pay lower wages to laborers**. **Employers** who hire laborers will want to **relocate** to those cities, and entrepreneurs thinking about starting up new firms will find it more profitable to open them in immigrant areas. In other words, immigration increases the returns to capitalists in the affected cities, and capital will naturally flow to those areas where the returns are highest. The flow of jobs to the immigrant receiving hit areas helps cushion the adverse effect of immigration on the wage of competing workers in these localities. **These capital flows create difficult problems if one wants to measure the labor market impact of immigration by comparing economic opportunities in different cities**. After all, the jobs that flow into the immigrant areas are moving from someplace else—the job gains in the immigrant areas are another city's actual or potential job losses. **These capital flows** help **dampen the adverse effects of immigration** on the immigrant cities, **while worsening economic conditions in the nonimmigrant cities**. Because the capital flows tend to equalize economic conditions across cities, intercity comparisons will not be very revealing: the capital flows effectively diffuse the impact of immigration to the national economy. **In the end, all laborers, regardless of where they live, are worse off** because there are now many more of them. The forces that tend to equalize employment opportunities across labor markets are reinforced by the fact that **native workers will also respond**. Laborers living in Michigan or Mississippi were perhaps thinking about moving to California before the immigrants entered that state. These laborers quickly learn that immigration has reduced their potential wages in California. As a result, **many will decide to remain where they are or move elsewhere**—and some Californians **might** actually find it worthwhile to **incur the cost of leaving the state** to search for better opportunities. **The migration of native workers** within the United States, in effect, **accomplishes** what the immigrant flow, with its tendency to cluster in a small number of gateway cities, could not—**a "spreading out" of the additional workers over the entire nation**, rather than in just a limited number of localities. And again, a comparison of the employment opportunities of native workers in California and other states might show little or no difference because, in the end, immigration affected every city, not just the ones that actually received immigrants. If nothing else, the possibility that native-owned firms and native workers might respond to immigration, and effectively diffuse the impact of immigration over the national economy, should make one wary of measuring the impact of immigration from comparisons of economic conditions in different cities. **Nevertheless, almost all existing discussions of the labor market impact of immigration rely precisely on these types of spatial correlations**, the relation between native labor market outcomes in an area and a measure of immigrant penetration in that area." The native response to immigration suggests that these spatial correlations are probably most meaningful in the period immediately after the immigrants enter the labor market, but become essentially meaningless in the long run, as firms and native workers take advantage of the economic changes unleashed by immigration. The Statistical Evidence So what do the empirical studies that compare native economic opportunities across cities conclude? Well, to put it kindly, these studies offer something for everyone. If one believes that immigrants adversely affect native economic outcomes, the evidence reported in some reputable academic publications substantiates that claim." If, in contrast, one believes that immigrants do not change native economic outcomes-or perhaps even improve them-there are equally reputable academic studies substantiating that claim." In fact, the **conflicting findings sometimes even appear in the same study**. To illustrate the inherent instability of the spatial correlation approach, consider the evidence provided by two recent-and somewhat encyclopedic-studies (see Table 4-1).<sup>14</sup> These studies correlated changes in the weekly earnings of native workers over a ten-year period with the increase in immigration that occurred over that period in a particular locality (either a state or a metropolitan area). So, for example, the impact of immigration on native wages would be obtained by correlating the change in the native wage between 1980 and 1990 with the change in the number of immigrants in the locality over the same period. The most striking characteristic of the statistical results is the huge dispersion in the estimated effects, making it extremely difficult to generalize about the impact of immigration on labor market outcomes. **The sign of the spatial correlation seems to change erratically over time**. The correlation between changes in native earnings and immigration is positive and large in some decades and negative and large in others. If one interprets these spatial correlations as measures of the impact of immigration on native wages, the entry of one more immigrant for every ten native workers increases the wage of native men by 6 percent if the immigrants entered in the 1960s, increases it by 1 percent if the immigrants entered in the 1970s, and reduces it by 1 percent if the immigrants entered in the 1980s. A similar change in the number of immigrants reduces the

wage of native men who are high school graduates by 3 percent in the 1970s, but increases it by 2 percent in the 1980s. **One potential problem** with the spatial correlation approach **is that immigrants are not randomly distributed** across the United States. **Immigrants "pick" only certain labor markets and avoid others.** If the areas where immigrants cluster, such as California, have done well in some time periods and poorly in others, this would produce a spurious correlation between immigration and economic outcomes. Put differently, **when California's economy booms**—as it did for much of the postwar era—**there is a built-in positive correlation between immigration and the economic status of natives**, and it will seem as if immigrants help economic conditions in that state. The statistical problem created by this spurious correlation is one of causality: is California's economy booming because immigrants entered the state, or did immigrants pick California because the state's economy was booming? It turns out, however, that **when the spatial correlation approach attempts to correct for this statistical problem, the evidence is even more confusing.** Adjusting the data for the possible two-way causality increases the dispersion in the estimated spatial correlations. An additional immigrant for every ten natives now reduces the wage of native high school graduates by 8 percent if the immigrants entered in the 1970s, but increases it by 8 percent if the immigrants entered in the 1980s. In short, one can pick and choose from the very diverse spatial correlations reported in a single study and conclude—by picking the "right" period, the "right" group, and the "right" methodology—that immigration has either a hugely beneficial or a very harmful impact on the labor market opportunities of native workers. But why does **the sign of the spatial correlation switch between the 1970s and the 1980s?**

The 1980s witnessed major changes in the U.S. wage structure, with the wage gap between skilled and unskilled workers increasing rapidly during the period. It also turns out that there was a major change in the regional wage structure in the 1980s—a **change that** is not well understood and that probably **has little, if anything, to do with immigration.** The top panel of Figure 4-3 shows the striking nature of this change by illustrating the relation between the wage growth experienced by a particular state in the 1980s and that state's wage growth in the 1970s. One need not use fancy statistical techniques to see the obvious: there is a strong negative correlation in wage growth by state across the two decades. In other words, the states where the wage grew the fastest in the 1970s were the states where the wage grew most slowly in the 1980s. Little is known about why this change in the regional wage structure occurred. But it did, and the fact that it did has crucial implications for interpreting the spatial correlation between native labor market outcomes and immigration. After all, the same states continued to receive large numbers of immigrants in the 1970s and 1980s (see the bottom panel of Figure 4-3). So consider what happened during this period. The same states continued to receive large numbers of immigrants, but the states with the fastest wage growth in the 1970s became the states with the slowest wage growth in the 1980s. So, for example, if the immigrants entered the states where the wage grew relatively fast in the 1970s, they must have entered the states where the wage grew relatively slowly in the 1980s. As a result, it is inevitable that the sign of the spatial correlation between wages and immigration switched over the period. An observer will then draw different inferences about the impact of immigration by estimating spatial correlations in different decades. Unless one can net out the impact of the shift in the regional wage structure (and that would require an understanding of why the shift occurred in the first place), **it is literally impossible to pry out the economic impact**

**of immigration from spatial correlations.** A somewhat different approach appears in an influential case study of the Mariel immigrant flow. On April 20, 1980, Fidel Castro declared that Cuban nationals wishing to move to the United States could leave freely from the port of Mariel. By September 1980, about 125,000 Cubans had chosen to undertake the journey. Almost overnight, **the Mariel "natural experiment"** increased Miami's labor force by 7 percent. It turns out that labor market trends in Miami between 1979 and 1981—in terms of wage levels and unemployment rates—were similar or better than those experienced by such cities as Los Angeles, Houston and Atlanta, cities that did not experience the Mariel flow (see Table 4-2).<sup>21</sup> For instance, the unemployment rate for Miami's blacks rose from 8.3 to 9.6 percent between 1979 and 1981, but the black unemployment rate in a set of comparison cities was rising even faster, from 10.3 to 12.6 percent, presumably because of changing economic conditions. The obvious inference: the Marielitos did not adversely affect the employment opportunities of African Americans in the Miami area. Although the case study of the Mariel flow seems to estimate the impact of immigration from a natural experiment set in motion by Fidel Castro, there is an important sense in which the Mariel study **is simply calculating yet another spatial correlation.** The impact of immigration is still being estimated by comparing the native labor market in a city flooded by immigrants with native labor markets in other cities. Moreover, recent research has raised some questions about the interpretation of the evidence generated by the "experimental approach" implicit in the Mariel study.<sup>22</sup> Consider, in particular, the impact of immigration that can be estimated from yet another natural experiment involving Cuba and the Miami labor market. In the summer of 1994, economic and political conditions in Cuba were ripe for the onset of a new boatlift of refugees into the Miami area, and thousands began the hazardous journey. To prevent the rafters from reaching the Florida shores, the Clinton administration ordered the Coast Guard to redirect all the refugees to the American military base in Guantanamo Bay. As a result, relatively few of the potential migrants were able to migrate to Miami. One can replicate the methodological design of the Mariel study by comparing Miami's labor market conditions (relative to those of control cities) before and after **"the Mariel boatlift that didn't happen."** It turns out that this nonevent may have **had a substantial impact on Miami's unemployment rate**—particularly for blacks (again, see Table 4-2).<sup>24</sup> The black unemployment rate in Miami rose from 10.1 to 13.7 percent between 1993 and 1995, as compared to a decline from 11.5 to 8.8 percent in a set of comparison cities. If one interprets this finding in the traditional way, it would seem to indicate that **a phantom immigrant flow had a substantial harmful impact on the economic opportunities of black native workers.** And this raises an important question: can one confidently interpret the evidence from the Mariel boatlift that did happen as indicating that immigration had little impact on Miami's labor market? One way to interpret the confusing mosaic of spatial correlations estimated for the 1960-90 period is that the economic impact of immigration on native labor market outcomes simply changes over time and varies by sex. In other words, the spatial correlations provide the "right" estimates of the labor market impact of immigration, but it just happens that this impact varies a great deal. In one period or for one group, immigration reduces native economic opportunities; in another period or for another group, it has no effect; and in yet other periods and for yet other groups, it improves native opportunities. If this were a correct interpretation of the evidence, the historical record would provide virtually no information about the future effects of immigration on native economic outcomes. It seems that a different story is needed to understand how immigration affects different labor markets in different time periods. And one would be left wondering which story to use to predict the economic impact of the next immigrant wave. I interpret these spatial correlations differently: they do not measure the impact of immigration on the native labor market. **Put bluntly, the spatial correlations are completely uninformative.** Do NATIVE WORKERS VOTE WITH THEIR FEET? The main problem with the spatial correlation approach is that it ignores the possibility that natives respond to the changing economic environment. Is there any evidence that native workers do, in fact, respond to immigration? Because of the significance of the

underlying issues, it is not surprising that there is a heated debate on this question. This debate involves not only the usual arcane technical and data issues, but also exposes a fundamental disagreement over how the problem should be approached conceptually. **There is clear and unambiguous evidence of a potential relation between immigration and native migration decisions** (see Figure 4-4).<sup>26</sup> The resurgence of immigration in the United States began, circa 1968, when the policy changes in the 1965 Amendments became effective. It seems natural, therefore, to measure the impact of immigration by contrasting pre-1970 changes in the residential location of the native population with post-1970 changes. Not surprisingly, the share of natives who lived in California, the major immigrant-receiving state, was rising rapidly prior to 1970. What is surprising, however, is that the share of natives living in California barely budged between 1970 and 1990, and declined somewhat during the 1990s.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, California's share of the total population kept rising continuously until 1990, from 7 percent in 1950 to 10 percent in 1970 and 12 percent in 1990. Put differently, an extrapolation of the population growth that existed before 1970—before the resurgence of immigration—would have predicted the state's 1990 share of the population quite accurately. But while natives pouring into the state fueled California's population growth before 1970, immigrants alone fueled the post-1970 growth. But how should this fact be interpreted? One interpretation is that around 1970, for reasons unknown, Americans simply changed their mind about the magnetic attraction of sun, surf, and silicon, and stopped moving to California. In other words, had it not been for immigration, California's rapid population growth would have stalled in the 1970s and 1980s. An alternative—and more provocative—interpretation is that immigration into California essentially "displaced" the population growth that would have occurred in the immigrants' absence, and this displacement effectively diffused the economic impact of immigration from California to the rest of the country. The relation between California's population trends and immigration is not unique. Consider what happened to Miami's population after the entry of the Mariel flow in 1980.<sup>28</sup> Miami's population was growing at an annual rate of 2.5 percent in the 1970s, as compared to a growth rate of 3.9 percent for the rest of Florida. After the arrival of the Marielitos, Miami's annual growth rate slowed to 1.4 percent, as compared to 3.4 percent in the rest of Florida. As a result of this slowdown in the relative number of persons moving to the Miami area, the actual population of Dade County in 1986 was roughly the same as the pre-Mariel projection made by the University of Florida. In both California and Miami, therefore, an observer who was familiar with the demographic trends of the region prior to the entry of immigrants could have almost perfectly predicted what the region's population would have been at some future time. Remarkably, the observer did not need to know that each of these regions would experience an unexpected and sizable increase in immigration. Despite these trends, there remains substantial disagreement over whether native workers, in fact, vote with their feet. Figure 4-5 illustrates the relation between the change in a state's native population over the 1970-90 period and the change in the number of immigrants in that state over the same period. There obviously exists a strong positive correlation between native population growth and immigration: states that are growing are growing in every dimension. In fact, the trend line suggests that the number of natives living in a particular state grows by eight persons for every ten immigrants who move into that state. This positive correlation has been interpreted to imply that natives do not respond to immigration, or even that perhaps natives respond by moving to areas penetrated by immigrants. But this interpretation may be wrong. The population of some states, such as California, has been growing rapidly for quite some time, while the population of other states, such as Iowa, Ohio, and Rhode Island, has been relatively stagnant. The fact that both natives and immigrants move to California, and not to Iowa, need not indicate that immigration "causes" the native population in California to grow. It may just suggest that all workers would rather live in places where the economy is growing and the sun is shining. It seems, therefore, that **the data need to be adjusted for preexisting "magnetic effects" that attract persons to some states**. This can be done by comparing the state's rate of population growth before and after the resurgence of immigration. Figure 4-6 illustrates this relationship, which looks at a state's population growth in 1970-90 relative to that state's growth in 1960-70. For instance, each data point in this figure links the number of natives who moved into a particular state (relative to the number of natives who had been moving there prior to the entry of immigrants) with the number of immigrants who chose to move into that state (again, relative to the number of immigrants who had been moving there prior to 1970). These data can then be used to assess how the state's population growth from 1970 through 1990 deviated from the state's preexisting trend. Figure 4-6 shows that **the correlation between native population growth and immigration—relative to the long-run trend—is clearly negative**. The trend line suggests that the native population declined by about eight persons for every ten immigrants who moved into the state, relative to what the state could have expected from its long-run trend. This conceptual approach, therefore, suggests that **natives more than just voted with their feet. Natives, in fact, stampeded out of the immigrant-receiving states**. In the end, whether one finds that natives move into or out of immigrant-receiving states depends on how the question is posed. One conceptual approach ignores the state's preexisting trends in population growth, and finds that the same states "attract" both immigrants and natives. This approach, however, suffers from a severe flaw: it **ignores the fact that different states had different rates of population growth prior to the surge in immigration**. An alternative approach looks at a state's population growth relative to the trend that existed in the preimmigration period, and finds a considerable native response, with natives moving out of (or avoiding) the immigrant-receiving states. This approach, however, also has its problems. It assumes that the preexisting population trends would have continued in the absence of immigration. It is impossible to determine conclusively how the regional distribution of the American population would have evolved if the Second Great Migration had never occurred, so some assumption is inevitably required to establish a hypothetical baseline. If one is willing to assume that the preexisting trends would have continued, the evidence suggests that the native response to immigration helped diffuse much of the economic impact of immigration over the entire country. Which Natives Voted with Their Feet? The migration response of native workers would completely diffuse the impact of immigration on particular localities if the natives who moved—or who chose not to move—belonged to the "right" skill groups. An influx of less-skilled immigrants into California should curtail the migration of less-skilled natives into that state, and should push some of the less-skilled natives who already lived there out. The entry of less-skilled immigrants into California, therefore, should alter the distribution of educational attainment among the native workers who remain there. As one might suspect, the number of native college graduates relative to the number of high school dropouts rose much faster in California than in other parts of the country, and this trend accelerated after 1970 (see Figure 4-7). As California's population of less-skilled workers surged with immigration—making it harder for less-skilled natives to "make it" there—the natives who remained in California tended to be much better educated. In sum, it seems that natives do vote with their feet when one views the impact of immigration from a long-run perspective. Moreover, this native response may be sufficiently large to diffuse much of the effect of immigration from the affected regions to the entire economy. As a result, it should not be surprising that spatial correlations between immigration and native economic outcomes behave erratically. Put simply, the local labor markets penetrated by immigrants are probably the wrong place to look if one wants to measure the impact of immigration on the employment opportunities of native workers. Do FIRMS RESPOND TO IMMIGRATION? Native workers are not alone in responding to the changes in the economic environment induced by immigration. **Native-owned firms**—as well as capital flows from abroad—will also want to **take advantage of these changes**. It is well known that immigrants enter occupations and industries that differ from the occupations and industries that employ the native work force (see Table 4-3). Not surprisingly, immigrants are more concentrated in the less-skilled occupations and industries. Many immigrants work in farming, in service jobs, as private household workers, and as operators and fabricators. There are relatively more immigrants in the agricultural sector, in manufacturing, and in wholesale and retail trade. In contrast, immigrants are underrepresented in white-collar jobs, such as managerial and professional specialties, administration, and sales. Part of the differences in these occupation and industry distributions can obviously be attributed to the lower educational attainment of immigrants. **The fact that immigrants and natives, on average, do somewhat different types of jobs leads many to conclude that immigrants do not harm native employment** opportunities because "immigrants take

jobs that natives do not want." In my view, **this inference is not justified**. Even though the occupational distributions of immigrants and natives differ, **there is also a great deal of overlap**. It is certainly true that 15 percent of immigrant workers are operators and fabricators, but so are 11 percent of natives. Similarly, 28 percent of native workers are managers and professionals, but so are 21 percent of immigrants. A more sensible inference may well be that immigrants take jobs that natives do not want at the going wage. In other words, it might be the case that natives might not want to work in some of the jobs that immigrants have. This does not say, however, that natives would refuse to work in those jobs if the immigrants had never arrived and employers were forced to raise wages to fill the positions. Moreover, if immigrants indeed took jobs that natives did not want, the nonwage aspects of the jobs employing the typical immigrant and those employing the typical native would differ significantly. For instance, one might expect immigrants to face more unpleasant working conditions. There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that this is the case. In fact, the available evidence indicates that immigrants and natives have roughly similar working conditions." The typical native works in a job that has 4.6 injuries per hundred workers annually, while the typical immigrant works in one that has 4.4 injuries. Similarly, about 8 percent of both immigrants and natives are employed in the midnight shift. Immigration does tend to change the skill composition of the work force in the immigrant-receiving area, possibly altering the industrial structure of the region. Industries that employ workers who "look like" the immigrants will find it cheaper to hire in the immigrant region, and these industries will expand. Moreover, competing firms located in other states (or even abroad) will see the profit opportunities opened up by immigration, and will choose to move to or invest in the immigrant-receiving areas. It turns out that employment growth in immigrant-intensive industries has been much stronger in California than in other parts of the country (see Table 4-4)." The immigrant-intensive industries are those that employ a disproportionately large number of immigrants, such as manufacturing or personal services. Between 1970 and 1990, employment in these industries rose at a 2.5 percent annual rate in California, as compared to a 1.3 percent annual rate in other immigrant-receiving states and a 1.4 percent annual rate in the rest of the country. In fact, manufacturing employment was stagnant every-where in the United States except in California. In contrast, employment growth in the industries that do not employ many immigrants was much more similar across the various regions. Employment in professional services, for instance, grew at about 3 percent annually throughout the entire United States. Obviously, the influx of less-skilled immigrants is not the only factor that determines the evolution of industries in different parts of the country. Many other things matter: the tax policies of state and local governments, the quality of local schools, zoning regulations, and so on. Nevertheless, there seems to be some evidence suggesting that the industrial structure of California adjusted to the post-1965 immigrant influx. These observed changes in the industry mix provide yet another channel for diffusing the impact of immigration away from the areas that received the immigrants. Less-skilled natives employed by manufacturing firms in Georgia, for example, may have suffered job losses and wage reductions from competition with California's manufacturing firms, who may have expanded and lowered prices because of the increased supply of immigrants. In the end, these responses by capitalists and entrepreneurs who are always seeking out investment opportunities where they can earn the best return-help to further diffuse the adverse impact of immigration from California to other labor markets. THE NATIONAL LABOR MARKET By now, the message should be clear. Because natives respond to changes in the economic environment, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to detect the impact of immigration by looking at economic conditions in the local areas hardest hit. The responses by native workers and by native capitalists ensure that the adverse (or beneficial) effects of immigration are diffused to the rest of the country, so one may have to look at the national labor market to discern if immigration indeed had an impact. The "factor proportions" approach compares a nation's actual supplies of workers in particular skill groups to those it would have had in the absence of immigration, and then uses outside information on how relative wages respond to changes in the relative supplies of workers to calculate the wage consequences of immigration." To give a very simple example, suppose that in the absence of immigration there would have been one unskilled worker per skilled worker in the national economy. Immigration changes this "factor proportion" so that there are now, say, two unskilled workers per skilled worker. Such a change in factor proportions will probably change the wage gap between skilled and unskilled workers. In particular, the abundance of unskilled workers in the postimmigration period should widen the gap. If existing economic research provided a measure of the responsiveness of relative wages to changes in factor proportions, one could then use this estimate to simulate the impact of immigration on the wage gap between skilled and unskilled workers in the national economy." Many studies of the American labor market—studies that have little to do with immigration—indeed report that increases in the relative supply of less-educated workers reduce their relative wages." Similar evidence has been documented for labor markets in many other countries, including Great Britain, Canada, South Korea, and Sweden." In other words, the laws of supply and demand play an important role in the national labor market: an increase in the relative number of a particular skill group will typically lower its relative wage. A practical difficulty with this approach is that one has to define which group of workers is "skilled" and which group is "unskilled"—and, inevitably, some arbitrariness will enter the calculations. Studies that use the factor proportions approach often assume that workers with the same educational attainment belong to the same skill groups." It turns out, however, that one obtains very different estimates of the economic impact of immigration depending on how the skill groups are defined. Table 4-5 summarizes the results from this type of simulation, using two alternative classifications of the skill groups. Initially, define workers who are high school dropouts to be "unskilled," and all other workers to be "skilled." In 1980, workers with at least a high school education earned about 30 per-cent more than high school dropouts, and this gap grew to 41 percent by 1995.' How much of the widening in this wage gap can be attributed to immigration? Between 1979 and 1995, immigration increased the supply of workers who were high school dropouts by 21 percent, but increased the supply of workers with at least a high school diploma by only 4 percent." In other words, **immigration changed the factor proportions in the American labor market—generating a relative abundance of less-skilled workers**. The available evidence on how relative wages respond to changes in relative supplies implies that immigration reduced the relative wage of high school dropouts by about 5 percentage points.<sup>4</sup> In other words, about **44 percent of the widening wage gap** between high school dropouts and high school graduates **can be attributed to** the large impact of **immigration** on the relative number of high school dropouts.

## HUGE SAMPLING BIAS

### Borjas '10

(George, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, "Attenuation Bias in Measuring the Wage Impact of Immigration," NBER, July)

This paper argues that the differences in estimated coefficients across the fast-growing set of national labor market studies, as well as many of the very **weak coefficients** reported in the spatial correlation literature, **may well be explained by** a simple statistical fact: **There is a lot of sampling error in the measures of the immigrant supply shift commonly used in the literature, and this sampling error leads to substantial attenuation bias in the estimated wage impact of immigration.** **Measurement error plays a central role in these studies** because of the longitudinal nature of the exercise that is conducted. The immigration-induced supply shift is often measured by the "immigrant share," the fraction of the workforce in a particular labor market that is foreign-born. The analyst then examines the relation between the wage and the immigrant share within a particular labor market. To net out market-specific wage effects, the study typically includes various vectors of fixed effects (e.g., regional fixed effects or skill-level fixed effects) that absorb these permanent factors. The inclusion of these fixed effects implies that there is very little identifying variation left in the variable that captures the immigrant supply shift, permitting any sampling error in the immigrant share to play a disproportionately large role. As a result, **even very small amounts of sampling error get magnified and easily dominate the remaining**



variation in the immigrant share. Because the immigrant share variable is a proportion, its sampling error can be easily derived from the properties of the hypergeometric distribution. The statistical properties of this random variable provide a great deal of information that can be used to measure the extent of attenuation bias in these types of models as well as to construct relatively simple corrections for measurement error. Our empirical analysis uses data for both Canada and the United States to show the numerical importance of sampling error in attenuating the wage impact of immigration. We have access to the entire Census files maintained by Statistics Canada. These Census files represent a sizable sampling of the Canadian population: a 33.3 percent sample in 1971 and a 20 percent sample thereafter.<sup>5</sup> The application of the national labor market model proposed by Borjas (2003) to these entire samples reveals a significant negative correlation between wages of specific skill groups and immigrant supply shifts. It turns out, however, that when the identical regression is estimated in smaller samples (even on those that are publicly released by Statistics Canada), the regression coefficient is numerically much smaller and much less likely to be statistically significant. We also find the same pattern of attenuation bias in our study of U.S. Census data. A regression model estimated on the largest samples available reveals significant effects, but the effects become exponentially weaker as the analyst calculates the immigrant share on progressively smaller samples.

## Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreases Wages and Employment-Link Magnifier

**FIRST, EVEN TINY LABOR SURPLUSES HAVE HUGE IMPACTS BECAUSE WAGES ARE SO IMPORTANT**  
**Borjas '99**

(George, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, Heavens Door, pg 91)

**Even though the immigration surplus is astonishingly small, immigration can still have a substantial economic impact.** Immigration redistributes wealth from labor to capital. To get an idea of how large this redistribution can be, recall that **70 percent of GDP goes to workers** (with the rest going to the owners of the firms), and that natives make up 90 percent of the population. Therefore, native workers take home about 63 percent of GDP in the form of wages and salaries. **If immigration reduces native wages by 3 percent, the share of GDP accruing to native workers falls by 1.9** percentage points (or .63 times .03). **In an \$8 trillion economy, native earnings would drop by about \$152 billion.**

**SECOND, DEMAND-SIDE RIPPLE EFFECTS: EVEN LOW-SKILL JOB LOSSES GET NEARLY DOUBLED FROM THE MULTIPLIER EFFECT OF REDUCED SPENDING**

**Pagan '4**

(Jose, University of Pennsylvania, "The Economic Impact of Worker Displacement in the US/Mexico Border Region," Worker Displacement in the US/Mexico Border Region, pg 41-42)

Table 4.3 reports that a loss of 16,881 direct jobs generated additional employment losses in local communities of 11,327 workers (6,244 indirectly and 5,083 induced). On average, **for every three local jobs lost due to displacement an additional two local jobs are lost due to indirect/induced effects resulting from reduced spending.** In terms of total employment losses, the hardest hit counties are Bexar, El Paso, Nueces, Hidalgo and Cameron. These four counties account for 90 percent of the total employment losses related to displacement in the 43-county sub-border region. However, when it comes to the share of indirect/induced employment losses out of total employment, the hardest hit counties are Nueces (69.3 percent), Kerr (50 percent) and Bexar (40.8 percent). **About 40.2 percent of total employment losses related to job displacement are due to indirect/induced losses.**

Tables 4.4 through 4.6 report the results of adding up the county results and then disaggregating them by industry. Again, the results are reported in terms of lost value added, labor income and employment. All the three tables show that the direct effects of displacement concentrate in the manufacturing sector followed by services and trade. However, **the indirect effects are more spread out,** and they substantially affect transp./const./utilities, trade, finance/insurance/real estate and manufacturing. The induced effects are mostly felt in trade, finance/insurance/real estate and services. These results point out that **although job displacement directly impacts the manufacturing and services sectors particularly hard, there are also other important sectors of the local economies that are substantially affected by job dislocation. Thus, when one looks at the economic impact of displacement we must not only assess the direct impact but also the indirect/induced multiplier effects.**

**THIRD, SUPPLY-SIDE RIPPLE EFFECTS: THE LOSS OF HIGH-QUALITY JOBS HURTS SUPPORTING INDUSTRIES**

**Klonsinski '10**

(Mike, executive director of the Wisconsin Manufacturing Extension Partnership "Q&A with mike Klonsinski: a national manufacturing leader," Manufacturing & Technology News, 3-5, <http://www.allbusiness.com/economy-economic-indicators/economic-indicators/14135570-1.html>)

Q: **What is the impact on the U.S. economy** if the country loses 90,000 manufacturing companies?

Klonsinski: **Devastating** for all the obvious reasons but also in ways that will not be immediately apparent. It will have a disproportionate impact on rural communities where a manufacturer is often the primary employer in the area. **There is the ripple effect of losing high-quality jobs in supplier and service industries** that support those manufacturers. There are extra stresses on the state and local governments as the regional wealth creation of manufacturing disappears. **More insidious is the erosion of the nation's competitive manufacturing capability and the impact on our economy** and standard of living. The loss of one manufacturer can be absorbed but ongoing losses deplete critical talent and capability.

#### **FOURTH, CHAIN MIGRATION MEANS MORE PEOPLE WILL FOLLOW**

**Wegge '98**

("Chain Migration and Information Networks: Evidence From Nineteenth- Century Hesse-Cassel," The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 58, No. 4)

Over twenty-five million Europeans emigrated in the nineteenth century to overseas destinations. Social scientists have posed many theories to suggest what may have motivated so many to leave, in particular, the process of chain migration. Most studies, however, do not have the proper data to test this. In this article I use a new data source that allows for an appropriate test of chain migration as a motivating factor in the decision to migrate. By chain migration I mean a process in which previous migration from a village is an influence on the migration decisions of present villagers, decisions I model in a utility maximization framework. I assume that chain migrants are linked by ties in the home country and not necessarily by connections at the destination. In other words, chain migrants do not have to end up living together in the adopted country. **Chain migration** matters for two separate reasons. First, over time it **encourages more migration**. Second, it produces different migrants: later cohorts are distinct from previous cohorts, especially in terms of their ages and their wealth. If chain migration plays a role in explaining migration behavior, it has larger ramifications; namely, that current village migration, in terms of its numbers and the characteristics of migrants, then depends partly on the village history of migration. Under this framework, a community's or country's emigration history is pathdependent because current migration depends on the past history of migrants. Thus, **even a large one-time shock in village migration rates can have longlasting effects**. Chain migration has a place in our understanding of long-run economic and demographic adjustment, as the evidence indicates for Ireland. According to Kevin O'Rourke the nineteenth-century potato famine, which generated mass migrations, had long-term effects on the Irish economy, and "is crucial to an understanding of subsequent Irish demographic development."<sup>2</sup> Timothy Guinnane's work on nineteenth-century Irish demographic history specifies how: the migration shocks it generated forever changed marriage and household formation patterns and the age at which young people left home.<sup>3</sup> Many studies of migrants who came to the United States in the last few decades have documented the strong effects of previous migrations.<sup>4</sup> Primarily they show that the probability of migration increased if the potential migrant knew someone in the United States or had relatives in the United States.<sup>5</sup> A problem with drawing conclusions from these recent studies is that since 1965 American immigration laws encourage the reunification of families. These laws provide large incentives for migrants to take advantage of family ties, a distinct form of chain migration behavior. Studies of contemporary migration movements thus must be examined with care because we do not know the extent to which these laws induce chain migration patterns. By studying nineteenth-century migrants in an era of "free migration" I overcome this limitation

#### **FIFTH, REMITTANCES CONVINC OTHERS TO COME—PROVE LIFE IN THE US IS PROFITABLE**

**Wegge '98**

("Chain Migration and Information Networks: Evidence From Nineteenth- Century Hesse-Cassel," The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 58, No. 4)

The exchange of information between previous migrants and potential migrants took place in a variety of ways. At the most elemental level, the first migrant from a village made an impression just by leaving. He or she contributed to the common legacy of the village, affecting future migrations. **If the emigrant sent back news in the form of letters or better yet, money, he or she made the point that a livelihood was actually possible somewhere else. The effect of such information should have been important in the short run**. More directly, such news from previous migrants changed the villagers' calculations of expected utility for the destination country; the revised calculations were more precise because they incorporated the latest information

## Immigration Bad: US Economy - Immigration Cause Deflation

### INFLOWS OF WORKERS ARE DEFLATIONARY—UK PROVES

-FEAR OF UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG NATIVES PREVENTS SPENDING

-REMITTANCES

-SUBSTITUTION OF LABOR FOR CAPITAL DECREASES INVESTMENT

### BLANCHFLOWER '7

(David, the Bruce V. Rauner Professor, Dartmouth College and NBER, "Fear, Unemployment and Migration," October, [www.nber.org/papers/w13506](http://www.nber.org/papers/w13506))

However, the effects of immigration are not only on the supply side. On the demand side, immigrants are extra consumers and thus they raise aggregate consumption demand. However, it is likely that immigrants spend a lower fraction of their income when compared to domestic workers, perhaps because they send remittances back home or spend less on durable goods while temporarily resident in the UK – this would, on its own, suggest that immigrants raise demand by less than they raise supply. However, the funds that migrants send home might be recycled back to the UK through greater export demand, and UK consumers might also benefit from lower prices as a result of the extra productivity of migrants. Aggregate demand might also rise because of increased investment. On balance I would suggest that at present it appears that the recent inflow of workers from the A10 is likely to have raised potential supply by more than it has raised demand, and thereby has acted to reduce inflationary pressures. This argument holds for three reasons. First, the consumption behaviour of native workers may have been affected by the increased 'fear' of unemployment resulting from a more flexible labour market. Second, the recycling of remitted funds back to the UK is unlikely to be perfect. Third, firms may be able to substitute between capital and labour, offsetting some of the potential for investment spending to rise.

### IMMIGRATION IS DEFLATIONARY, BECAUSE REMITTANCES REMOVE MONEY FROM THE ECONOMY

#### Chortareas Katirtzidis and Tsoukalas '8

(George, University of Athens and University of Essex, Kostas, University of Athens, and John, University of Nottingham, "Macroeconomic Effects of Immigration in a New Keynesian Model," March)

By investigating the impact of immigration inflows on the optimal paths of host countries' macroeconomic magnitudes, we derive three basic results: First, an immigration shock constitutes by itself a destabilizing force for the host economy, with potentially permanent effects on its macroeconomic position. Under the context of nominal price rigidities, immigration inflows may create a positive output effect in the short-run. In the long-run, economy may return back to steady-state equilibrium or deviate permanently. Long-run effects depend on the "deep" parameters of the model, as well as on whether immigration alters the composition of total workforce permanently. Nominal variables such as inflation and interest rate are only temporarily affected showing a hump-shaped behavior. Second, the model verifies the re-distributional effects of immigration in favor of domestic households, identified by existing studies (Canova-Ravn, 2000). In fact, with respect to disaggregated variables, domestic consumption and labor market outcomes for natives are positively affected by immigration shocks, as long as newcomers compete with existing immigrants for job opportunities and affect negatively only the labor market of foreign-born agents. Third, the analysis suggests that even though the standard New Keynesian model does not verify the deflationary effect of immigration, potential shocks on immigrants' preference behavior, called them remittances shocks, create a positive response of total output and a downward movement of inflation rate. The industrious behavior of immigrants, pointed out by immigration literature, may justify the bottom line adopted by central banks that immigration may be placed among the disinflation forces in host economies.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreased Wages Cause Deflation

## **WAGE DECREASES ARE THE BACKBONE OF DEFLATION**

**Herr and Kazandziska '10**

(Hansjörg and Milka, Berlin School of Economics, The labour market and deflation in Japan," International Journal of Labour Research 2010 Vol. 2 Issue 1)

John Maynard Keynes (1930) added another important element to the analysis of recessions. He argued that **changes in nominal wages**, more precisely nominal unit labour costs, **are the backbone of** inflationary and **deflationary processes**. Unit labour costs depend on nominal wage increases and productivity increases. **If nominal wage increases are identical with productivity increases, there are no changes in wage costs and there is neither wage inflation nor wage deflation**. During an economic boom with falling unemployment rates, there is always the danger that demand-driven inflation in the goods market will trigger wage inflation. More importantly in our context, **a demand-driven deflation, falling production and increasing unemployment can lead to wage deflation if nominal wages do not increase at least in line with productivity**. Keynes' wage deflation argument can easily be combined with Fisher's debt deflation model. Then it becomes more understandable that **not all asset price deflations lead to disastrous goods market deflation. As long as the nominal wage anchor is upheld even in situations of high unemployment, an asset price deflation and a demand deflation do not lead to a cumulative deflation. Only falling nominal wages open the floodgates to a destructive deflationary process** (Herr, 2009).

## **UNEMPLOYMENT AND WAGE CUTS RISK DEFLATION**

**Herr and Kazandziska '10**

(Hansjörg and Milka, Berlin School of Economics, The labour market and deflation in Japan," International Journal of Labour Research 2010 Vol. 2 Issue 1)

However, **we should be cautious about assuming that a deflationary wage development as in Japan would not be possible in the United States, Europe or other industrial countries**. Deflation in Japan came around five years after the end of the bubble. What will happen in other developed countries after such a long period of low growth as in Japan? **There is a high likelihood that many industrial countries will follow the deflationary Japanese development if there are no far-reaching policy interventions. What is needed is a macroeconomic policy to stimulate growth, so as to prevent the escalation of unemployment. Nominal wages should increase according to trend productivity and the target inflation rate of the central bank**. Minimum wages that are in close contact with the lowest wages paid, and minimum wage increases that are also in accordance with trend productivity and the target inflation rate, can help to prevent the erosion of the nominal wage anchor (Herr, Kazandziska and Mahnkopf-Praprotnik, 2009). The strengthening of unions and collective wage bargaining mechanisms is necessary in order to help establish such a policy – including in mercantilist-oriented countries like Japan or Germany. This shows that unions in capitalist economies are not only institutions for promoting justice and giving workers a voice. They are needed as stabilizing factors to prevent deflation when monetary policy becomes ineffective.

## **WAGES ARE THE KEY FACTOR THAT DETERMINE PRICES IN BOTH DIRECTIONS—US AND GERMANY PROVE**

**Herr and Kazandziska '10**

(Hansjörg and Milka, Berlin School of Economics, The labour market and deflation in Japan," International Journal of Labour Research 2010 Vol. 2 Issue 1)

**Nominal unit labour costs are the most important factor in the determination of price levels. Unit labour costs depend**, as mentioned, on productivity changes and **on changes in nominal wages**. Trend productivity in Japan increased continuously even after the end of the bubble. Taking nominal wage development into account, it is no surprise that unit labour costs in the second half of the 1990s started to decrease substantially in Japan (see figure 7). Overall, **the level of nominal unit labour costs in the United Kingdom and the United States increased in a way that led to moderate inflation rates**, which were very much in line with the implicit or explicit inflation targets of the central bank. **Due to the low nominal wage increases, unit labour costs in Germany stagnated and brought the country close to deflation**. Keynes' argument that nominal wages do not determine real wages is fully confirmed in Japan. In spite of falling nominal unit labour costs, real hourly compensation of employees in Japan did not decline. Indeed, it increased, reflecting productivity gains (see figure 8).

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreased Wages Undermine Competitiveness

## OUR WAGE LINKS TURN THE CASE: CHEAP LABOR JACKS COMPETITIVENESS—DISCOURAGES DEVELOPMENT OF LABOR-SAVING TECHNOLOGIES

Krikorian '7

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, master's degree from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a bachelor's degree from Georgetown University, The New Case Against Immigration, pg 149-156)

But in the longer run, the superabundance of cheap labor harms the future competitiveness of industries where the immigrants are most heavily concentrated. The entire history of economic development— starting with the first ape-man to pick up a stick—is a story of increasing the productivity of labor, so each worker is able to create more and more output. But capital will be substituted for labor only when the price of labor rises, something the federal government's mass-immigration program is specifically intended to prevent. A 2001 report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston highlights this problem by warning that a new wave of low-skilled immigrants over the course of this century may slow growth in U.S. productivity.<sup>4</sup> By artificially holding down the natural process of wage growth in labor-intensive industries, mass immigration thus serves as a kind of subsidy for low-wage, low-productivity ways of doing business, retarding technological progress and productivity growth. In effect, mass illegal immigration is an unintentional, but very real, Luddite force in our economy. Germany experienced the same thing when it imported large numbers of Turkish and Yugoslav workers in the 1950s and 1960s; as two of the foremost scholars of immigration have written, "Economists began reporting that the program was slowing investments in automation and mechanization, so that 'Japan [was] getting robots while Germany [got] Turks.'"<sup>45</sup> That this is so should not be a surprise. Julian Simon, in his 1981 classic, *The Ultimate Resource*, wrote about how scarcity leads to innovation: It is all-important to recognize that discoveries of improved methods and of substitute products are not just luck. They happen in response to scarcity—a rise in cost. Even after a discovery is made, there is a good chance that it will not be put into operation until there is need for it due to rising cost. This point is important: Scarcity and technological advance are not two unrelated competitors in a Malthusian race; rather, each influences the other.<sup>46</sup> This is true for copper or oil, and just as true for labor—as wages have risen over the generations, innovators have devised new ways of substituting capital for labor, increasing productivity to the benefit of all. The reverse is also true; the artificial superabundance of a resource will tend to remove much of the incentive for innovation. Stagnating innovation caused by mass immigration is perhaps most apparent in the most immigrant-dependent activity—the harvest of fresh fruit and vegetables. Academic researchers have warned about the long-term viability of the industry: "New technologies and mechanization appear to offer the only solution to significantly reduce production costs and maintain competitiveness." write three prominent agricultural economists.<sup>47</sup> But immigration is an obstacle to adoption of such technologies, according to Orachos Napasintuwong, an economist at the University of Florida: Because of "the augmentation of labor supply through unauthorized foreign workers . . . the incentive for new labor-saving technologies is reduced from what it would be in the absence of international labor mobility."<sup>48</sup> It wasn't always this way. The period from 1960 to 1975 was a time of considerable agricultural mechanization, precisely because it was a period of relative scarcity of agricultural labor, roughly from the end of the Bracero program, which imported Mexican farmworkers, to the beginning of the mass illegal immigration we are still experiencing to-day.<sup>49</sup> During hearings on the proposed termination of the Bracero program in the early 1960s, California farmers claimed that "the use of braceros is absolutely essential to the survival of the tomato industry." But Congress ended the program anyway, causing harvest mechanization to accelerate; as a result, the production of tomatoes grown for processing (juice, sauce, and so forth) actually quintupled, demand for harvest labor dropped 89 percent, and the real price of tomato products fell.<sup>5</sup> But a continuing increase in the acreage and number of crops harvested mechanically did not materialize as expected, in large part because the supply of workers grew artificially large due to the growing illegal immigration wave that the federal government was unwilling to stop. An example of a productivity improvement that "will not be put into operation until there is need for it due to rising cost," in Simon's words, is in raisin grapes.<sup>51</sup> The production of raisins in California's Central Valley is one of the most labor-intensive activities in North America. Conventional methods require bunches of grapes to be cut by hand, manually placed on trays for drying, manually turned, and manually collected. But starting in the 1950s in Australia (where the climate was suitable but there was no large supply of foreign farm labor), farmers were compelled by circumstances to develop a labor-saving method called dried-on-the-vine (DOV) production. This involves growing the grapevines on trellises, then, when the grapes are ready, cutting the base of the vine instead of cutting each bunch of grapes individually. This new method radically reduces labor demand at harvest time and increases yield per acre by up to 200 percent. But this high-productivity, innovative method of production has spread very slowly in the United States because the mass availability of foreign workers has served as a disincentive to farmers to make the necessary capital investment. In fact, fully half a century after their invention, DOV methods are still used for less than a third of California's raisin crop. And it's not just raisins. Florida citrus farmers have belatedly come to realize that they can never drive down their labor costs enough to match producers in the third world; as the New York Times writes, "Facing increased competition from Brazil and a glut of oranges on world markets, alarmed growers here have been turning to labor-saving technology as their best hope for survival." Mass immigration enabled farmers to avoid making such a commitment for many years, meaning that in 2006, only about 5 percent of Florida's orange groves used mechanical harvesting.<sup>52</sup> Florida's sugar cane harvest is a good example of how farming modernizes when immigrant labor is no longer cheap.<sup>54</sup> In the 1930s, Eleanor Roosevelt decried the working conditions endured by sugar harvesters—using a machete, bending at the waist, dealing with heat, mosquitoes, and snakes—which had changed little since the Middle Ages. It was so bad that in 1942, U.S. Sugar was actually indicted on federal charges of slavery because of its treatment of black American cane-cutters. As a result, the sugar companies began to import West Indians through a federal guest worker visa program. But starting in the 1980s, the industry was hit by a persistent wave of lawsuits filed on behalf of farmworkers whose contracts had been violated by their employers, contracts that guaranteed a certain level of pay along with housing and transportation. Despite years of farmers' claims that it was impossible to mechanize the harvest of sugar cane, these lawsuits raised the real cost of employing the foreign labor so much that the farmers finally concluded that it

would be more profitable to mechanize than to honor all the legally required terms of the farmworker contracts. So, by the 1997-98 growing season, U.S. Sugar, the biggest producer, harvested 100 percent of its cane by machine, resulting in increased productivity, plus higher wages and more civilized working conditions for the re-maining harvesters. **The threat to the continued competitiveness of U.S. agriculture posed by mass immigration doesn't come just from the inability to compete on the basis of wages with third-world countries; there is also the danger that the slowing of technological innovation brought about by artificial infusions of labor will allow our economic competitors in other developed countries to leap ahead of us.** This is per-haps most disturbing in the field of robotic harvesting.<sup>55</sup> Automated picking of fruits and vegetables by a robotic system is the third wave of agricultural mechanization (after labor aids, which facilitate harvesting work but don't reduce labor demand, and labor-saving machines, which improve productivity and reduce labor needs). The development of viable robotic harvesting technologies is still in its infancy, but great progress is being made. Unfortunately, because of the mass availability of alien labor in the United States, the European Union is well ahead of us in bringing this potentially revolutionary technology to market. Mass **immigration's role in retarding economic modernization is not confined to agriculture**, which is, after all, very different from the rest of the economy. **Other parts of the economy experience the same phenomenon** of a scarcity of low-skilled labor yielding innovation, while a surfeit yields stagnation. An example of the latter: A 1995 report on Southern California's apparel industry warned of the danger to the industry of reliance on cheap immigrant labor: While a large, low-cost labor pool has been a boon to apparel production in the past, overreliance on relatively low-cost sources of labor may now cost the industry dearly. The fact is, southern California has fallen behind both domestic and international competitors, even some of its lowest-labor-cost competitors, in applying the array of production and communications technologies available to the industry (such as computer aided design and electronic data interchange).<sup>56</sup> As with agriculture, the limited academic inquiry that has been made into **manufacturing** has found that mass **immigration is slowing the spread of labor-saving technology**. An economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia has written that "plants in areas experiencing faster less-skilled relative labor supply growth adopted automation technology more slowly, both overall and relative to expectations, and **even de-adoption was not uncommon,**" adding that the effect was even stronger when the growth in less-skilled labor came specifically from immigration.<sup>57</sup> That's de-adoption—**some factories actually stopped using labor-saving technology once immigration drove down the price of labor sufficiently.** A purer example cannot be found of the conflict between mass immigration and the goals of a modern society. Home construction is another field in which modernization is slowed by mass immigration. The form this modernization takes is modular construction. Modular, or prefab, homes are manufactured in pieces in the controlled environment of a factory, protected from the weather and meeting exact specifications. The modules are then trucked to the building site and assembled and finished off, resulting in a much higher-quality product than a "stick-built" home (one constructed from scratch on-site), and one that is completed faster with much less labor. Technological advances mean that such buildings are nothing like the trailer homes of the past, and the methods can be used even for luxury residences. According to Gopal Ahluwalia, director of research at the National Association of Home Builders, "In the long run, we'll see a move toward homes built in factories."<sup>58</sup> But the home-building industry has moved very slowly to embrace this transformative technology. According to a 2002 report from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "The housing industry is fragmented, resistant to change, labor intensive, inefficient, unresponsive, and wary of new processes and technologies" and "is far behind other industries in the adoption of new process and technology innovations."<sup>59</sup> As a result, only 3 percent of new homes are built using modular construction. The demand that does exist among builders for modular construction is driven by labor costs. As one modular home manufacturer put it, "With our systems, it's almost always about labor when we sign up a new builder." But although labor costs have been increasing, they're lower than they would be otherwise—because of mass immigration. In the words of one building magazine, "Immigrant labor has for years seemed like a bottomless cornucopia of workers."<sup>61</sup> **Even in the service sector, there is enormous potential for labor-saving measures that have been rendered less attractive because of the artificial glut of cheap foreign labor.** After all, immigrants were not imported to pump gas, so now Americans pump their own gas, aided by technology that lets buyers pay at the pump—thus there are fewer attendants but more gas stations, and customers get in and out faster than before. Likewise with bank tellers, many of whose routine functions are now performed by ATMs, and telephone operators, most of whom were long ago replaced by automated switches. There are plenty of other innovations in the service sector that would spread more quickly if the low-skilled labor market were tightened through lower levels of immigration: Continuous-batch or "tunnel" washing machines can reduce labor demand for hotels, restaurants can install ordering kiosks, movie theaters can use ATM-style devices to sell tickets, the retail industry can adopt increasingly sophisticated vending machines as an alternative to hiring more immigrant clerks. As science fiction as it might seem, many Veterans Administration **hospitals are now using mobile robots to ferry medicines from their pharmacies to various nurse's stations, eliminating the need for workers to perform that task.**<sup>62</sup> And devices like automatic vacuum cleaners, lawn mowers, and pool cleaners are increasingly available to consumers. These last examples point to perhaps **the greatest competitive threat** from mass illegal immigration: **its inhibiting effect on the development and spread of robotics.** Japan's society is aging much more rapidly than our own because of its much lower birthrate, but it has decided not to import large numbers of foreign workers, investing instead in robots. Media coverage of this development has focused on cute robotic pets, but this is no laughing matter—Toyota in 2006 announced a major initiative to augment workers with robots at all its Japanese plants, robots much more sophisticated than the thousands of less-advanced devices it already uses for hazardous jobs like welding and painting.<sup>63</sup> And the automaking giant plans to start retail sales of household robots by 2010, which the firm expects to become one of its major business units.<sup>64</sup> **Without a change in immigration policy, we run the risk of future ob-servers noting that "Japan got robots while America got Mexicans."** Historian Otis Graham tied together the impact of mass immigration on American competitiveness and on its workforce: **"The U.S. can either evolve towards a high-technology economy with a labor force of constantly advancing productivity, wage levels, and skills, or it can drift towards a low technology, low-skill, and low-wage economy, marked by widespread job instability and growing income disparity. Immigration policy will be important to the outcome."**

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Unemployment Undermines Economy in Many Ways

## **UNEMPLOYMENT RESULTS IN LOSS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, INFLATION, DECREASED CONSUMER SPENDING AND FISCAL BURDENS**

**Kwiatkowski and Kucharski '8**

(Eugeniusz and Leszek, "Long-term unemployment in Poland in the years 1995-2007,")

When we analyse the macroeconomic significance of long-term unemployment, the overall effects of unemployment are worth highlighting. Because of its various and far-reaching consequences, unemployment has been in the centre of economic, social and political debates for long years. These consequences have their economic and social dimensions, but particularly sociological and psychological dimensions. Considering the economic effects of unemployment, it is worth stressing that: • unemployment translates into output loss, because of underutilised labour force and depreciating human capital in the period of occupational inactivity, • unemployment impairs the economic situation of the unemployed themselves and their families, because unemployment is a period of declining income, • unemployment is detrimental to the condition of the national budget, unemployment increases potential workers' rivalry for jobs, boosting the motivation for seeking educational opportunities and investing in human capital, • because unemployment determines the impact of wage pressures, it plays a significant role in shaping the dynamism of inflationary processes and the effectiveness of anti-inflationary policy (Kwiatkowski, 2002, pp. 78-86). The structure of unemployment and particularly the proportion of long-term unemployment are crucial to all the consequences it generates. Firstly, as far as unemployment effect on lower output is concerned, we must stress that a higher percentage of the long-term unemployed workers makes output losses bigger, because such workers lose a large portion of their human capital. Secondly, the longer duration of unemployment, the more detrimental it becomes to the economic situation of the unemployed and their families, because the time-limited entitlement to drawing unemployment benefits lowers the compensation ratio for the entire period of unemployment. Thirdly, the national budget suffers more severely when the rate of long-term unemployment goes up; its higher values both decrease budget revenues and increase budget expenditures (allocated to finance occupational activation and social aid). Fourthly, the influence of long-term unemployment on the competition for jobs (either positive or negative) is largely determined by factors such as the scale of human capital depreciation among the long-term unemployed, the decline in their reservation wage, amounts spent on education and improvement of qualifications. Because the long-term unemployed persons lose a considerable portion of their human capital (depreciation), their growing share in total unemployment can adversely affect the competition for jobs. Fifthly, long-term unemployment is important as a factor affecting inflation and the effectiveness of anti-inflationary policy. Because the mechanism underlying this influence is rather complex, let us consider the last point more in-depth.

## **UNEMPLOYMENT RESULTS IN INFLATION—PEOPLE DON'T ADJUST TO THE HIGHER NAIRU**

**Kwiatkowski and Kucharski '8**

(Eugeniusz and Leszek, "Long-term unemployment in Poland in the years 1995-2007,")

From equilibrium unemployment theory it follows that actual unemployment falling below the level of equilibrium unemployment accelerates inflationary processes in the economy; on the other hand, if actual unemployment grows in excess of equilibrium unemployment, then the inflationary processes slow down. This suggests that appropriately restrictive macroeconomic policy (and especially monetary policy), implying the emergence of actual unemployment surplus over equilibrium unemployment, is necessary to reduce inflation. However, the same relationships allow drawing another conclusion, that anti-inflationary policy could be made more effective (as measured by inflation decline) with the same degree of restrictiveness, if the level of equilibrium unemployment were lower. In these circumstances, we need to ask the questions about factors determining the level of equilibrium unemployment and the ways in which long-term unemployment affects its evolution. The NAIRU theory explains that the level of equilibrium unemployment is at the point where the realistic wages, i.e. wages affordable for the potential of the economy (mainly determined by labour productivity), meet the targeted wages. The latter are shaped by several factors, such as the rate of unemployment, the share of long-term unemployment in total unemployment, the generosity of the system paying unemployment benefits, the power of the trade unions, the intensity of searching for jobs and the size of structural gaps separating labour supply and labour demand (Kwiatkowski, 2002, pp. 149-152). The search for the level of equilibrium unemployment is illustrated in graph 1, where the straight line P<sub>Ro</sub> stands for the existing level of realistic wages and the curve line P<sub>Po</sub> shows the targeted real wages as a diminishing function of the rate of unemployment. The latter curve is plotted ceteris paribus, i.e. assuming that all other determinants of the targeted wages are stable, including the level of long-term unemployment. The NAIRU equilibrium unemployment is given at the intersection of the realistic wages P<sub>Ro</sub> and the targeted wages P<sub>Po</sub> (point A).



## **SLOWING JOB MARKETS RESULT IN LESS WORKER PRODUCTIVITY**

**CTI '10**

(City Town Info, "Unemployment Claims Reach An Unexpected High," 8-13, <http://www.citytowninfo.com/career-and-education-news/articles/unemployment-claims-reach-an-unexpected-high-10081302>)

**The result of the slowing job market is less worker productivity.** According to CNN Money, worker **productivity** for the second quarter of 2010 **fell by nearly one percent**--the first decline in productivity in 18 months.

With workers being stretched too thin, all indications point to companies and employers needing to start hiring again. Yet, companies remain skeptical of the overall economic outlook, meaning they are spending capital not on payroll, but on capital and equipment.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Unemployment Causes

## Deflation

### **UNEMPLOYMENT PREVENTS INFLATIONARY WAGE GROWTH AND CAUSES DEFLATION—DEFLATION DISCOURAGES INVESTMENT, CRUSHES INCOME AND JOBS AND INCREASES THE VALUE OF DEBT**

**Roubini '8**

(Nouriel, Professor at NYU, "How to avoid the horrors of 'stag-deflation' ," Financial Times, 12-2, [http://us.ft.com/ftgateway/superpage.ft?news\\_id=fto120220081502315684](http://us.ft.com/ftgateway/superpage.ft?news_id=fto120220081502315684))

A **severe global recession will lead to deflationary pressures**. Falling demand will lead to lower inflation as companies cut prices to reduce excess inventory. **Slack in labour markets from rising unemployment will control labor costs and wage growth**. Further slack in commodity markets as prices fall will lead to sharply lower inflation. Thus **inflation in advanced economies will fall towards the 1 per cent level that leads to concerns about deflation. Deflation is dangerous as it leads to a liquidity trap, a deflation trap and a debt deflation trap**; **nominal policy rates cannot fall below zero and thus monetary policy becomes ineffective**. We are already in this liquidity trap since the Fed funds target rate is still 1 per cent but the effective one is close to zero as the Federal Reserve has flooded the financial system with liquidity; and by early 2009 the target Fed funds rate will formally hit 0 per cent. Also, **in deflation the fall in prices means the real cost of capital is high** - despite policy rates close to zero - **leading to further falls in consumption and investment. This fall in demand and prices leads to a vicious circle: incomes and jobs are cut, leading to further falls in demand and prices (a deflation trap); and the real value of nominal debts rises** (a debt deflation trap) **making debtors' problems more severe and leading to a rising risk of corporate and household defaults that will exacerbate credit losses** of financial institutions.

### **UNEMPLOYMENT AND WAGE CUTS RISK DEFLATION**

**Herr and Kazantziska '10**

(Hansjörg and Milka, Berlin School of Economics, "The labour market and deflation in Japan," International Journal of Labour Research 2010 Vol. 2 Issue 1)

However, **we should be cautious about assuming that a deflationary wage development as in Japan would not be possible in the United States, Europe or other industrial countries**. Deflation in Japan came around five years after the end of the bubble. What will happen in other developed countries after such a long period of low growth as in Japan? **There is a high likelihood that many industrial countries will follow the deflationary Japanese development if there are no far-reaching policy interventions. What is needed is a macroeconomic policy to stimulate growth, so as to prevent the escalation of unemployment. Nominal wages should increase according to trend productivity and the target inflation rate of the central bank**. Minimum wages that are in close contact with the lowest wages paid, and minimum wage increases that are also in accordance with trend productivity and the target inflation rate, can help to prevent the erosion of the nominal wage anchor (Herr, Kazantziska and Mahnkopf-Praprotnik, 2009). The strengthening of unions and collective wage bargaining mechanisms is necessary in order to help establish such a policy – including in mercantilist-oriented countries like Japan or Germany. This shows that unions in capitalist economies are not only institutions for promoting justice and giving workers a voice. They are needed as stabilizing factors to prevent deflation when monetary policy becomes ineffective.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Immigration Cause Deflation

## "Fed Fix Deflation" Answers

**FINE. DEFLATION WON'T HAPPEN YET, BUT FED PERCEPTION OF DEFLATION CAUSES THEM TO PANIC AND PRINT MONEY—THAT CAUSES DEVASTATING HYPERINFLATION**

**Macdonald '10**

(Elizabeth, "The Deflation Debate," 8-19, <http://emac.blogs.foxbusiness.com/2010/08/19/deflation-debate>)

So **what will happen if the Fed believes deflation is upon us?** A big kahuna of quantitative **easing that will make the Fed's recent moves look like a piker, and will create hyperinflation.** Meaning: **deflation tautologies at the Fed will hasten frenetic, panicked monetary intervention, increasing the odds of hyperinflation.** That deflation/more QE scenario is now being encouraged by inflation hawk James Bullard, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, who surprisingly said recently that because the US faces Japan-style deflation, quantitative easing needs to be ramped up, meaning much more Fed purchases of Treasury securities. By how much? Moody's Analytics Mark Zandi says that, because he sees a one in three chance that deflation will be accompanied by a recessionary double dip, the Fed may be forced to resume QE on the order of central bank purchases of maybe \$2 trillion or more of securities, doubling its balance sheet from the current \$2.3 trillion. And Fed chairman Ben **Bernanke** has already **said** in a 2002 speech: **"The US government has a technology, called a printing press, that allows it to produce as many US dollars as it wishes at essentially no cost."** Societe Generale's perma-bear Albert Edwards said the **"the coming deflationary maelstrom will be additional money printing that will make the recent QE seem insignificant."**

Meanwhile, despite the central bank's monetization of about \$1.7 T of government and Fannie and Freddie debt, imputed M3—which is a key measure of money meaning credit supply—has drifted south. Once that money, on top of the expected extra round of QE, is unleashed in the markets, you will see too much money chasing too few goods, which is inflation. Peter Bookvar, equity strategist at Miller Tabak also not only says deflation is not upon us, he dismantles the current monetary policy towards battling what the US central bank sees as incipient deflation: "With Treasury bond yields at, or near historically low levels on one hand, but with commodity prices near eight month highs; and, with the personal feeling that outside of a home, a computer and a flat screen TV, the cost of living seems to only go higher on the other hand, here is another perspective on the inflation/deflation debate." "Since June 1981, when [former Federal Reserve chairman Paul] Volcker started to lower interest rates from 20%, as high inflation rates started to fall, the absolute level of CPI rose 142% to the high in July '08 (90.5 to 217)." "Deflation is defined as a decrease in the general price level of goods and services; but, to quantify the current fall in prices, the CPI has fallen just 1% from its all time high." "This **tiny price move, notwithstanding we are still near an all time high in the daily cost of living, has led to talk that the Fed needs to do more to avoid deflation at all costs** and thus create inflation via more QE (quantitative easing). An example, oil goes from \$50 to \$85 in one year and the next year falls 1% to \$84.15 and we're told there is deflation and deflation is bad." "The view is that with excess capacity and a lack of demand combining for softer prices, we must have even lower interest rates to spur more borrowing and thus more economic activity to increase demand and thus reduce the large output gap." "Think about this, policy makers think we should raise the cost of goods and services in order to cure a lack of demand. The law of supply and demand says lower demand must be met by lower prices in order to get to the proper equilibrium."

"What the Fed really wants to do is create inflation in order to not deal with an overleveraged economy in the most responsible way, either paying debt off or writing it down. They want us to pay off the debts with inflation." "Inflation is a hidden tax on every single one of us and thus the corollary to deflation is a tax cut. Inflation is good for those who are highly indebted, as those debts get paid back with inflated money while deflation or flat prices are good for those who save and have little debt and vice versa." "In the state of deleveraging the US is in, where the low cost of money doesn't matter much to an individual or a business in making spending and investment decisions, artificially low rates mostly spur just refinancing and higher commodity prices." "While maybe, or maybe not, higher commodity prices make their way into government consumer price statistics, the commodity inflation is still there and has to be eaten by someone. Food for thought." What's the better route? Bernanke in his 2002 speech noted tax cuts are "essentially equivalent to Milton Friedman's famous 'helicopter drop' of money." He said: "The effectiveness of anti-deflation policy" is linked to a "broad-based tax cut, and open-market purchases" of government securities, (Helicopter Ben is really Tax Cut Ben.) Here's more on the deflation debate from Jeffrey D. Saut, managing director,

Raymond James & Associates: **"Currently, however, deflationary concerns are swirling on the 'street of dreams;'"** **and, I don't believe them. I think the present-day policies will actually prove inflationary."** "While it's true **transfer payments** to middle/lower-income recipients are not going to be all that stimulative (or inflationary) given falling housing prices, that **still does not spell deflation."**

**HYPERINFLATION MAKES THE ECONOMY EXPLODE AND CAUSES WAR—GERMANY PROVES**

**Goodman '8**

(Avery, "What Effect Will Hyperinflation Have?," <http://seekingalpha.com/article/96723-what-effect-will-hyperinflation-have>)

**Hyperinflation is a devastating phenomenon. It wipes out the middle class by destroying the value of cash, savings, bonds and other paper instruments.**

But, how does it affect stock markets? With the Federal government just having added \$5.2 trillion in Fannie/Freddie liabilities of which about \$600 billion will likely default, the Federal Reserve having now polluted its balance sheet by some \$700 billion worth of toxic mortgage bonds with a 41.6% default rate (\$291 billion in likely defaults), an \$85 billion bailout for AIG, and, now, the Administration asking for some \$700 billion more to bail out financial firms, it seems clear that the winds of hyperinflation are upon us. What will be the comparative effect of hyperinflation upon index funds, like DIA, QQQ, and SPY, versus bonds and cash? Hyperinflation is not a particularly uncommon episode in human history. It has occurred in the following countries in the following countries, in the last 150 years. Weimar Republic of Germany 1920 – 23 (1/466 billionth of starting value), Zimbabwe 2003 - Now (6 quadrillionth of the starting value and continuing to fall), Former Soviet Union 1993 – 2002 (1/14th of starting value), Argentina 1975 – 1983 (1/1,000th of starting value), Austria 1921 – 23 (about ¼ of starting value), Bolivia 1984 - 86 (1/1,000 of starting value); Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992 – 93 (1/100,000th of starting value), Brazil 1960 – 94 (1 trillionth of starting value), Chile 1971 – 73 (1/3rd of starting value), China 1947 – 55 (1/10,000th of starting value), Greece 1943 – 53 (1/50 trillionth of starting value), Hungary 1945 – 46 (100 quintillionth of the starting value), Hungary 1922 – 23 (1/4 of starting value), Israel 1976 – 86 (1/16th of starting value), Japan 1934 – 51 (1/362nd of starting value), Poland 1990 – 94 (1/10,000th of starting value), U.S.A. (Confederate States of America) 1861 – 65 (1/90th of starting value, and then, by the end of the Civil War, the Confederate Dollar depreciated to zero). It also happened in the ancient Roman Empire, when the silver and gold coinage of that day was progressively debased with base metals, in order to fund wars, giveaways to the Plebeians, and various other adventures. There are many additional examples that I have not bothered to cover here. The most studied hyperinflation episode was the early 1920s, in the Weimar Republic of Germany. At the end of the First World War, the mark to dollar ratio was trading at 9:1. By July 1921 the ratio had risen to 77:1, and prices more than doubled again by January 1922, as the ratio of marks to the dollar climbed to 192:1. By the time that the Weimar government introduced the Rentenmark in November 1923, which replaced the

deflated mark, the exchange rate had risen to 4.2 trillion marks to the dollar. **Germany's economic situation in the early 1920s**, except for being a defeated combatant in World War I, **is frighteningly similar to our own economic situation, today**. We can trace the **road to hyperinflation**, step by step, **and compare Germany's path to the path that is now being travelled by the U.S.** Germany abandoned the gold standard in 1914. America abandoned the gold standard, 60 years later, in 1974. Back in 1914, the **German government did not expect World War I to last very long, and the war wasn't properly budgeted, and, instead, it was financed by deficit spending**. Similarly, in 2003, the **Iraq War was** not expected to last very long, and was financed by deficit spending. However, in comparison to the size of the German economy in 1914 and the U.S. economy in 2003, the Iraq War is a somewhat cheaper war. After WWI, Germany suffered a severe current account deficit, just like the current account deficit we now have in the USA. About 1/3rd of their deficit was generated by the need to pay gold to European allied governments as war "reparations". But, the rest was due to economic mismanagement, and 2/3rd of the German current account deficit was composed of non-war related spending. Back then, other than for war reparations, America was Germany's biggest creditor, with American financial institutions, particularly J.P. Morgan, Jr., arranging for consortium loans to the Weimar government, its businesses and industries. News accounts, from that time, indicate that **the Weimar German government**, like the American government now, **was far more concerned with avoiding recession**, lowering the unemployment rate, and stimulating business activity **than** it was about **inflation**. German economists in the 1920s thought, just as American economists think now, that a cheaper currency helps stimulate export activity and industrial production. Germany needed exports to buy raw materials, just as the U.S. needs them, now, to buy oil and Asian made consumer goods. Back then, however, the United States was a net creditor nation. It played that role in relation to Germany, similar to the role played by Asian nations, including China and Japan, toward the USA, except that, instead of exporting consumer goods, the 1920s USA exported mostly raw materials to Germany. United States financial firms, in the early 1920s had great faith in Germany, and were buying German government bonds, and supplying loans to facilitate purchase of American commodities. These **loans offset the German trade imbalance, just as Chinese Treasury bill and bond buying now offsets the U.S. current account deficit**. When financiers like JP Morgan, Jr., however, finally decided that Germany was no longer a good credit risk, they cut off funds. After that, everything fell apart very quickly. By 1923, you needed a trillion marks to buy one dollar. **The German financial class managed, to some extent, to avoid some of the losses, by purchasing large quantities of gold and other hard assets**. **The German middle class, however, lost everything. This** led to a deep resentment of Jews, who dominated the German financial industry, and, later, **it gave birth to the Nazi movement and the murder of millions of innocent Jewish people**. All factories, houses and buildings were still standing, before, during and after 1920s German hyperinflation, just as they will be in 2011 America. **Germany in the roaring 20's was still a potentially rich nation, just as America will be in 2011. But, the stored work product of a generation**, represented by the symbols of stored wealth, in the form of cash, savings, stocks, bonds and other paper instruments, **became essentially worthless, almost overnight. The same may happen here**.

## Immigration Bad: US Economy - Increases Capital Costs

UNSKILLED IMMIGRANTS DON'T BRING ANY CAPITAL AND DON'T HAVE ACCESS TO DOMESTIC MARKETS, CAUSING A SPIKE IN THE PRICE

Chortareas Katirtzidis and Tsoukalas '8

(George, University of Athens and University of Essex, Kostas, University of Athens, and John, University of Nottingham, "Macroeconomic Effects of Immigration in a New Keynesian Model," March)

Unskilled immigration shock increases the rental price of capital as long as immigrants' influx reduces the capital-labor ratio. Unskilled immigrants neither have access to domestic capital markets nor bring with them from their home-country any capital stock. As a result, the rise of foreign-born population decreases the total capital stock per capita ( $\hat{k}_t$ ), and increases the capital holdings per domestic household ( $\hat{k}_{d;t}$ ). The aggregate capital stock of the host country belongs to domestic households, and thus only to a fraction of total population. As long as the inflow of immigrants increases the ratio of foreign-born population and decreases accordingly the fraction of natives on total population, total capital stock corresponds to a lower portion of population. Domestic households are motivated by the higher price of capital to invest more in real assets. Domestic investment shows a hump-shaped behavior, capital holdings of natives increase steadily, but the total capital stock declines sharply in the short-run by the unexpected increase of population.

## **Immigration Bad: US Economy - Deflation Crushes US Economy**

### **AND, UNEMPLOYMENT CAUSES DEFLATION, WHICH CRUSHES THE ECONOMY**

Roubini '8

(Nouriel, Professor at NYU, "How to avoid the horrors of 'stag-deflation' ," Financial Times, 12-2, [http://us.ft.com/ftgateway/superpage.ft?news\\_id=fto120220081502315684](http://us.ft.com/ftgateway/superpage.ft?news_id=fto120220081502315684))

A **severe global recession will lead to deflationary pressures**. Falling demand will lead to lower inflation as companies cut prices to reduce excess inventory. **Slack in labour markets from rising unemployment will control labor costs and wage growth**. Further slack in commodity markets as prices fall will lead to sharply lower inflation. Thus **inflation in advanced economies will fall towards the 1 per cent level that leads to concerns about deflation. Deflation is dangerous as it leads to a liquidity trap, a deflation trap and a debt deflation trap; nominal policy rates cannot fall below zero and thus monetary policy becomes ineffective**. We are already in this liquidity trap since the Fed funds target rate is still 1 per cent but the effective one is close to zero as the Federal Reserve has flooded the financial system with liquidity; and by early 2009 the target Fed funds rate will formally hit 0 per cent. Also, **in deflation the fall in prices means the real cost of capital is high** - despite policy rates close to zero - **leading to further falls in consumption and investment. This fall in demand and prices leads to a vicious circle: incomes and jobs are cut, leading to further falls in demand and prices (a deflation trap); and the real value of nominal debts rises (a debt deflation trap) making debtors' problems more severe and leading to a rising risk of corporate and household defaults that will exacerbate credit losses** of financial institutions.

### **OUR FASTER LINKS PRECLUDE THEIR OFFENSE—A CYCLE OF DEFLATION IS IRREVERSIBLE AND OVERWHELMS ECONOMIC GAINS**

Straits Times '8

(Tion Kwa, Senior Writer "Beware deflation's spiral," 11-11)

But what's perhaps more notable in the pace and now the size of interest rate actions is fear of another kind of problem. **The global crisis has evolved quickly from financial turmoil into an economic meltdown. And the scale the latter might eventually take is just beginning to sink in.** Though we worried just six months ago about high oil prices and other commodity costs pushing up inflation, **the looming threat is something more damaging and more difficult to address: deflation**. No one likes out-of-control prices. Nevertheless, inflation is the easier of the two opposite price situations to fix. Consumers and industry react reasonably fast to tighter money signals such as interest rate hikes. Faced with the threat of punishment for excessive spending - in the form of a higher cost of money - consumers and businesses react fairly quickly to bring down inflation. **Deflation is another matter. Deflation is not just a temporary fall in prices that occasionally occurs. It is a punishing, persistent, downward spiral in prices across a range of goods that makes everyone poorer.** Deflation occurs when people and companies hoard cash out of an overwhelming fear of the future. There are already signs this may be happening. The massive October sell-down in global stock markets indicates a fall in trust that investments will soon recover, sparking liquidation in favour of cash. **In an overarching climate of fear, people stop spending. And as goods are shunned, prices fall. This cuts into companies' earnings until shrinking profits become losses and losses start to pile up. Businesses put off expansion.** They fire staff. Rising unemployment rates then erode consumer confidence further, and the cycle starts all over again. Even people and companies with the capacity to spend hold back, calculating that prices will fall further if they can wait. And so on and on, businesses are hit by progressively lower demand for goods. **The problem with deflation is that the psychology is difficult to turn around. It's easier to frighten people into cutting spending. Converting deep, visceral pessimism into faith in the future - convincing people to stop hoarding cash - is much harder to accomplish.** Japan endured deflation for a decade from the early 1990s. **Even with interest rates at zero, people couldn't be persuaded to stop deferring spending. That's why deflation is so frightening. It sticks.** In the newest instalment of the global crisis, the source of greatest concern once again is America, where ominous signs are appearing. In October, the US lost 240,000 jobs, bringing the total for the year to 1.2 million. More than half that total occurred in the last three months, moving the unemployment rate up to 6.5 per cent - the highest in 14 years. In the same month of October, weekly wages for those still working grew at less than the rate of inflation. As expected, retail spending has dropped in tandem. If this continues, the entrenchment of price falls will have immense ramifications for the rest of the world. Just as in good times the world looks to the US to be the engine of growth, **a dismal American economy threatens to pull everyone down with it.** That's why Asia and the rest of the world must hope the US can do something to pre-empt the possibility of its first taste of deflation since the 1930s. It will require something bold to meet the extraordinary stress the economy faces. To that end, Democratic leaders are proposing another round of spending. True, this is the usual Democratic response to problems. But sometimes, spending is the right thing to do. Republicans, on the other hand, have an instinctive distaste for increased government expenditure. But sometimes, they have to let up. In both cases, this is the time. The most important part of current proposals are plans for new infrastructure spending and for improving existing ones. This is useful in the circumstance because it maintains existing jobs

and creates new ones for a construction industry hit hard in the past year. The trick is to avoid Japan's mistakes - paving forest streams and building roads to nowhere. More importantly, public works spending allows money to circulate through many layers of the economy. This may be the best way of instilling confidence, as a stream of spending begets more spending, saving jobs.

## **DEFLATION CRUSHES THE ECONOMY—PEOPLE WAIT BEFORE BUYING, ASSETS VALUES DECLINE AND DEBTS ARE WORTH MORE**

**MSNBC.COM '10**

(August 10, 2010, p. online)

On Tuesday, the FOMC voted to reinvest cash from maturing mortgage bonds back into U.S. Treasuries but stopped short of increasing its overall holdings.

Since the ruinous inflation of the 1970s, the Fed has fought to control it and keep prices from rising too quickly. Now, with the economy weakening - and consumers, businesses and banks hoarding cash - the Fed is confronting the threat of a prolonged bout of declining prices known as deflation.

Though consumers might welcome an occasional price cut, a prolonged period of deflation would wreak havoc on the U.S. economy. Deflation creates a serious drag on growth because consumers and businesses postpone spending, waiting for prices to fall further. The resulting decline in profits hurts stocks; falling house prices further erode home equity. Debts, repaid with money that has more and more buying power, become more burdensome. One of the few deflation refuges is cash, which prompts consumers and businesses to spend less, worsening the cycle. Deflation has not been seen in the United States since the Great Depression, although Japan is struggling to break out of a deflationary cycle that has stifled its economy for over a decade. Debate over the Fed's response to the threat of deflation intensified last month after St. Louis Fed President James Bullard, a voting member of the FOMC, published a paper warning that the central bank's current "zero interest rate" policy could be inadvertently pushing the U.S. toward a deflationary vortex. Most forecasters put the odds of U.S. deflation at less than 50-50. But the risks are so severe, Bullard argued in his paper, that the Fed needs to act now to prevent it from happening - rather than wait until the downward price spiral has taken hold. "Anybody who has any doubt about how dangerous deflation is should get on a plane and go to Japan," said El-Erian. "Two things happen when you get into a deflationary trap. One is policy becomes totally ineffective. Second, the politics of deflation are really hard. No one agrees on what to do, because there is no optimal policy solution. So the sooner you get off the road to deflation, the better."

## **DEFLATION CRUSHES KEY SECTORS OF THE ECONOMY, INCREASES COST OF DEBT AND INCREASES UNEMPLOYMENT**

**Reicher '9**

(Christopher, PhD in Economics, "Preventing Deflation Through Fiscal Policy," The Crisis and Beyond, November)

In a low interest rate environment where central banks cannot reliably influence spending, a self-fulfilling deflation becomes a major threat. Since central banks cannot cut interest rates in response to deflation, any expected future path of prices is consistent with rational behavior, so long as the central bank cannot commit credibly to a future price level. But this means that expected changes in prices can have a large effect on real demand. if people have to pay back their loans in more expensive dollars in the future, this increases the cost of whatever the loan is used for, be it consumption or investment in housing or equipment. People become unemployed and incomes fall. Interest-rate sensitive sectors of the economy, such as construction and autos, are those hurt the most by deflation. This effect is particularly strong when markets are not perfect. Since prices and wages can take some time to adjust to the new reality, changes in prices can possibly have large effects, even when future deflation is not anticipated. Gertler and Trigari (2009) show how the price level feeds through into labor market outcomes in an economy with unemployment. Basically, if prices fall faster than wages (because wages are only negotiated infrequently), then it becomes less profitable for firms to hire workers. Firms in fact hire fewer workers, and unemployment rises. Since it takes time for unemployed workers to then find new jobs, unemployment remains high for some time even after the deflation has ended. Reicher (2009) claims that expectations of future price movements played an important role in the Depression, and Eggertsson (2008) claims that fiscal policy had a role to play in forming these expectations

# **Immigration Bad: US Economy - Undermines US Competitiveness**

## **DEFLATION INCREASES EXCHANGE RATES (BY DEFINITION)**

**Mofatt no date**

(Mike, academic researcher in the areas of optimal pricing, taxation, exchange rates and free-market environmental policy, "Purchasing Power Parity: Link Between Exchange Rates and Inflation,"

<http://economics.about.com/od/purchasingpowerparity/a/ppp.htm>)

If two countries have differing rates of inflation, then the relative prices of goods in the two countries, such as footballs, will change. The relative price of goods is linked to the exchange rate through the theory of Purchasing Power Parity. As we have seen, PPP tells us that **if a country has a relatively high inflation rate we should see the value of its currency decline.**

## **CURRENT LOW VALUE OF THE DOLLAR IS KEY TO COMPETITIVENESS**

**Bergsten '9**

(Fred, Peterson Institute for International Economics, "The Dollar and the Deficits: How Washington Can Prevent the Next Crisis," Article in Foreign Affairs, Volume 88 No. 6, November/December,

<http://www.iie.com/publications/papers/paper.cfm?ResearchID=1312>)uy

As the global economy recovers, both private market actors and official monetary authorities will seek steady and sizable increases in their foreign exchange holdings. As long as the dollar remains the dominant international currency, this demand will generate **capital inflows to the United States and push up the dollar's exchange rate, hurting US competitiveness** and creating even larger US external deficits. For the United States to avoid the resulting trade imbalances and debt buildup, some of this incremental demand should be channeled into euros, renminbi, and SDRs. Both international monetary reform and a lesser role for the dollar are very much in the interest of the United States. One Deficit Leads to Another **The problems described above become acute only if the trade and current account deficits of the United States return to high levels in the future. One of the few pieces of good news that has come out of the current crisis has been the sharp reduction in those imbalances.** After rising to a record level of \$800 billion and more than six percent of GDP in 2005, the US current account deficit seems poised to shrink by about 50 percent in 2009. About one-quarter of this improvement stems from lower oil prices—despite their temporary surge in 2008—and another portion derives from the fact that the US recession has had a bigger impact on imports than the decline in foreign demand has had on exports. **Another important explanation is the improvement in US competitiveness due to the gradual and orderly fall in the value of the dollar:** about 25 percent from 2002 through early 2008. This gain in the "real" trade balance kept US output growing through the first half of 2008 despite the downturn in domestic demand that began in late 2007, and it limited the extent of the recession in early 2009.



## Immigration Bad: US Economy - Deflation Causes War

### DEFLATION EMPIRICALLY CAUSES WAR

#### STANDER '3

(Simon, Peace and Conflict Monitor, "Deflation and War," 6-9,

[http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id\\_article=34](http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id_article=34))

**Deflation and War** In the twenties and thirties of the last century, deflation and falling trade and investment was a curse, and the horrors of the Second World War are sometimes supposed to have been built on this underlying economic base. Now deflation, after decades of inflation in the West, is beginning to raise fears again, and, given that images of war and threats of war are becoming more and more common-place, the question is: does deflation in anyway increase the possibility of violent conflict? Does deflation in some convoluted way result in war? Japan has suffered from deflation for some time now. Interest rates and prices are close to rock bottom in the USA, in Europe and falling sharply in Germany. In the long period of inflation in Western economies from 1940, the standard way out of falling prices, the symptom of recession, has been for the government to manipulate interest rates. Central Banks cut interest rates to stimulate growth. When, however, interest rates have fallen to nearly zero, there is nothing to cut. Consumers cannot be induced to spend more, prices fall further, unemployment rises, international trade stagnates. **It is the nineteen thirties all over again**, as the doom-sayers have been "predicting", ever since the sharp fall of the DOW and on the NASDAQ in the USA. With the situation so potentially serious, according to economists and business journalists (and farmers!), **the G8** might have been expected to come up with prescriptions at its recent summit in Evian. However, Andrew Walker of the BBC reported on 4 June: "just as in the diplomatic talks, **there was a flavour of 'don't mention the war'**, with leaders disinclined to dwell on two major economic wars – deflation and the weak dollar." While Chirac went as far as indicating that the conditions were favourable for worldwide economic growth, Greenspan back in Washington argued that the risk of "corrosive deflation" was low. But economic commentators have now firmly seized on discussing the dangers of deflation.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Deflation Undermines Global Democracy

## GLOBAL DEFLATION PRODUCES POLITICAL REVOLT THAT CRUSHES DEMOCRACY WORLDWIDE

Korea Times 1-16-'9

**Deflation** that emanates from the financial sector **is lethal**. It is more difficult to deal with than inflation, in part for the technical reason that interest rates can be reduced only to zero. The closer to zero they fall, the more problematic monetary policy becomes. The **policy instruments no longer work**. Central banks have expanding balance sheets, but prices continue to fall and uncertainty rises. There is a further reason why deflation is such a threat, and why policymakers setting out to eliminate it have a much tougher task than inflation fighters: all prices do not move down; in particular debts do not adjust because they are fixed in nominal terms. Inflation and deflation of debts produce very different outcomes. Inflation reduces the value of debt, which for many people and companies feels like slowly sipping champagne, producing a nice buzz of light-headed excitement as they are unburdened. **Deflation**, on the other hand, **increases debt, and feels like being smothered by a lead blanket**. In the interwar Great Depression, the economist Irving Fisher accurately described the process of debt deflation, in which lenders, worried by the deterioration of their asset quality, called in their loans, pushing borrowers to liquidate assets. That, in turn, merely drove down prices further, leading to more credit rationing, bankruptcies, and bank failures. **The political response to deflation is to call for a stronger state**. Dealing with deflation is impossible within the bounds of normal market operations. **Only the state is reliable enough to take on all debt**, which private institutions are too risk-intolerant to hold. But economists' abstract description of the resulting state intervention as an expansion of "aggregate demand" conceals the fact that the government conducts specific expenditures and makes political decisions that rescue specific businesses and individuals. **In the climate of scarcity that characterizes debt deflations, the specificity of bailout operations inevitably leads to intense political debate**. We see this in the current discussion about the distributional effects of rescuing the automobile industry; or the worry that hedge funds, which are widely blamed for today's financial malaise, should have access to the Fed's emergency credit lines. Currently, parallels are being drawn to Japan's experience in the 1990s - a "lost decade" in economic terms that also undermined the legitimacy of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party. **The Great Depression produced more alarming outcomes, as the political response to deflation** throughout Central Europe and Latin America **destroyed the prevailing order, including several democracies**. **Statism has been a characteristically twentieth-century response to new uncertainty. Its inadequacy may lead to the formulation of a much older answer: revulsion against the market economy, accompanied by indiscriminate condemnation of debt and debt instruments**. Indeed, as governments scramble to respond to the current crisis, we should remember that **deflation tends to produce not only radical anti-capitalism, but also a profound hostility to any kind of economic or political organization**.

## EXTINCTION

Larry Diamond, Hoover Fellow @ Stanford, Fmr. Advisor to the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq, 10-1995

### A report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. **Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered**. Most of these new and unconventional **threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy**, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. **Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another**. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run **they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible** because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the

rule of law, **democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.**

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreases Confidence/Increases Fears

## **REGARDLESS OF OBJECTIVE CONDITIONS, IMMIGRATION FANTASIES CAUSE NATIVES TO FEAR FOR THEIR LIVELIHOOD**

**Fetzer '00**

(Joel S, professor of West European politics and international relations at Central Michigan University, Public Attitudes toward Immigration in the United States, France and Germany, pages 3-5)

Each of these perspectives has its advocates in the literature on attitude towards immigrants and immigration. Espenshade and Calhoun (1993; see also Betz 1994: 100-101; Martinez-Ebers and Deng 1996; Soule 1997), for example, seem to hold to something approximating cultural-marginality theory. In their view, "cultural affinity" is one of the most important determinants of immigration-related public opinion: "Cultural and ethnic ties to immigrants promote pro-immigrant attitudes and support for a more open immigration policy." More economic interpretations seem to dominate not only popular explanations of anti-immigrant sentiments but also many scholarly studies of public attitudes. One of the principal proponents of the economic self-interest school, Harwood (1986) first appears to cast doubt on the culturally based theories: "[T]he public opinion data do not support the hypothesis that neorestrictionism is motivated by racial or ethnic prejudice." Instead, "[e]conomic concerns appear to be the main reason for the increase in opposition to both legal and illegal immigrants" (Harwood 1983). Simon (1987; see also Simon and Alexander 1993:29-47) seems to endorse a similar hypothesis focusing on labor-market competition: Immigrants represent a greater threat to the livelihoods and living standards of lower-status respondents than they do to persons with higher education and more skills. So, the poorer the person, the greater the fear that more immigrants will mean fewer jobs, lower rates of pay, fewer opportunities for mobility, and more competition for housing, schools and social services. Illegal immigrants are feared most because they are viewed as the strongest contenders for lower-status jobs and benefits. Ultimately, according to these theorists, opposition to immigration arises from economic deprivation and the fear of further financial decline. Finally, contact analysis by Perrineau (1985) of support for the anti-immigrant Front national (FN) party represents one form of the third major theory. Showing the lack of correlation between the vote for the Front national in 1984 and the percentage of immigrants in a given city precinct (*commune*), Perrineau first dismisses the hypothesis that close, personal contact causes xenophobia (see also Charbit and Lamy 1975; Mayer 1987; Loch 1990:90-94). The high correlation between the vote for Le Pen's FN and the proportion of foreigners in the much larger *departement*, however, remains high (Perrineau 1985; Le Bras 1986:64-66, 214-221). Perrineau's explanation (1985) of these paradoxical results reminds one of the "casual contact" thesis to be examined later in this chapter: "[T]he zones where the extreme right achieves its best results are often regions where the more or less distant outlying areas have heavy concentrations of immigrants. Thus, the fears, repulsions or worries that feed voting for the National Front sometimes seem to arise more from fantasy than from the actual perception of objective lived difficulties or dangers. It is the unknown person who is disturbing, the stranger with whom one doesn't live but who one senses at the city limits...The modern [European] town seems to revive fears of the medieval town for whom the edges of the city were the realm of crime, marginality, and destitution. In France, contrary to the situation in the United States, the suburbs contain society's disadvantaged. Upper- and middle-class French city dwellers would therefore experience little or no close personal contact with immigrants. According to contact theory, natives might increasingly become aware of the rising foreign population in the suburbs via such superficial or "casual" contacts as riding the Metro with immigrant, passing the ubiquitous North African sanitation worker on the street, or even watching a television news program on "crime in the suburbs." Such interactions, scholars such as Perrineau would probably argue, can only breed suspicion and exacerbate hostility.

## **FEAR OF UNEMPLOYMENT IS JUST AS BAD AS ACTUAL UNEMPLOYMENT AS A RESPONSE TO IMMIGRATION**

**O'Rourke and Sinot '6**

(Kevin H, Department of Economics and IIS, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland, NBER, and Richard, Department of Politics and ISSC, University College Dublin, Belfield, "The determinants of individual attitudes towards Immigration," European Journal of Political Economy 22)

A key economic variable missing from the analysis up to now is unemployment, and we include in our empirical analysis a variable indicating whether the respondent is unemployed or not. One might think that the unemployed would be more anti-immigrant than the employed, for example because they view labour market competition from immigrants as the reason for their being unemployed or because immigrants provide an additional drain on the welfare system that may eventually leave them less well off.<sup>13</sup> Yet fear of unemployment might lead those with jobs

to be just as hostile to immigration as those already out of work, in which case one would not see the unemployed being more anti-immigrant.

## **FEAR OF UNEMPLOYMENT DEPRESSES WAGES**

### **BLANCHFLOWER '7**

(David, the Bruce V. Rauner Professor, Dartmouth College and NBER, "Fear, Unemployment and Migration," October, [www.nber.org/papers/w13506](http://www.nber.org/papers/w13506))

We can identify the characteristics of those individuals who are most fearful about losing their job by modeling the responses to this question across the available countries. We find that the fear of unemployment is higher the longer a job has been held, controlling for characteristics such as age, gender, schooling, immigrant, type of contract, years of job tenure, private sector along with country dummies. It is also apparent that fear is lower for the more educated, for those on indefinite contracts, full-timers and those who work in the public sector. These results are as we might expect. We can also model the direct impact 'fear' of unemployment has on earnings. We control for similar characteristics as before, these being pretty much standard for wage equations; additional controls are added for days and hours worked. The results confirm that the 'fear' of unemployment lowers wages. Also, and perhaps somewhat unsurprisingly, the measure we use to proxy for fear of unemployment becomes more significant (i.e. the fear rises) for those who 'strongly agree' that they are likely to be made unemployed in the next six months. The effects appear to be large.

## **FEAR ABOUT THE ECONOMY KILLS CONSUMER CONFIDENCE**

### **NPR '10**

(National Public Radio, "Latino Immigrants Brace For Arizona Immigration Law," 7-29, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128847364>)

Mr. DE LA MELENA: Well, as a small business owner, you know, it's important to be connected with your consumer. And you talk to your consumers and you get a sense of what's driving their behavior and a lot of them are scared. And as a result of that, consumer confidence drops. MARTIN: Well, tell me exactly what people are saying to you. Are they saying they literally don't want to come out in public because they're afraid of being harassed? Mr. DE LA MELENA: Yes. And there's been several incidences of crime suppression or raids that have happened in certain areas of town or on certain businesses. And that creates that direct linkage of the fear factor which, again, has that direct negative impact on people's consumer confidence and going out into town.

## **FEARS OF UNEMPLOYMENT TANK CONSUMER CONFIDENCE**

### **The Gazette '10**

("Confidence cools," 7-28, Lexis)

Consumer confidence in the North American economy is dwindling rapidly, led lower by fears about dim job prospects. In every Canadian province, sentiment fell in July, dropping 3.7 percentage points to a reading of 80, the Conference Board of Canada reported yesterday. In Quebec, the index fell 2.1 points to 81. In the U.S., it fell more than expected to a five-month low and is still mired at recession-like levels, with a reading of 50.4. A reading of 100 is considered par.

## **CONSUMER CONFIDENCE IS CENTRAL TO RECOVERY**

### **Indiviglio '10**

(Daniel, staff editor at TheAtlantic.com, Prior to joining The Atlantic, he wrote for Forbes. He also worked as an investment banker and a consultant, 8-31, <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2010/08/consumer-confidence-improves-modestly-in-august/62303/>)

The Conference Board's other sentiment-related indicators shed a little light onto the change in confidence. Americans actually felt their present situation was worse in August, with that index declining to 24.9 from 26.4 last month. Yet they're more optimistic about the future, with the Expectations Index increasing moderately to 72.5 from 67.5 in July. So even though Americans felt their economic situation was worse in August, they expect it to get better. It's hard to overstate how important consumer sentiment is right now. It's arguably the factor most central to the recovery. Once Americans begin broadly feeling better about the economy, their demand for products and services will increase. That will cause firms to begin hiring again, pushing down the jobless rate.



# Immigration Bad: US Economy - US Economic Decline Causes

## War

FIRST, economic decline kills democratic cooperation and spurs protectionism and a power vacuum as US influence wanes. Their historical evidence doesn't assume the withdrawal of a unipolar hegemon, threats of transnational terrorism or authoritarian wars of distraction—that's the 1NC Friedberg evidence.

SECOND, economic decline undermines the key foundations of peace. Prefer our evidence about the current international security climate

Mandelbaum '10

(Michael, Professor Foreign Policy-Johns Hopkins University, The Frugal Superpower: America's Global Leadership in a Cash-Strapped Era, p. 105-8)

It is the dominance of peace, democracy, and free markets, supplemented and bolstered by the reassurance that the United States supplies, that have made the twenty-first century a peaceful period—so far. But their domination, and the global peace they underpin, are not necessarily destined to last forever; and the recent turmoil in the global economy does raise the possibility that their era of dominance will turn out to be a short one. The severe global economic downturn that the financial collapse of September 15, 2008, catalyzed threatens not only the American role in helping to maintain peace in the world but also the foundations of the stable twenty-first-century global security itself. The international economic and security systems are not, after all, hermetically sealed off one from the other. To the contrary, each affects the other, and in the 1930s economics had a profound—and profoundly malignant—effect on politics. The crisis of the global economy led to the outbreak of the bloodiest episode in the history of international security, World War II, by bringing to power in Germany and Japan the brutal governments that started that dreadful conflict. In the 1930s the financial crash and the high unemployment that followed all over the world discredited the shaky democratic governments in place in Germany and Japan, which fell from power. The fascist regimes that replaced them proclaimed themselves models of governance for the rest of the world and did win admirers and imitators in other countries. These regimes disdained democratic politics and practices extensive (although not, as in the case of the Soviet Union, total) government control of economic affairs. Far from believing in peace, the two enthusiastically embraced aggressive war for the purpose of expanding the territories under their sway and subjugating—even, in some cases, attempting to exterminate—the people living there. Japan launched a brutal campaign of conquest in China in 1931; in 1939 Germany embarked on the murderous acquisition of an Eastern European empire and in the process conquered much of Western Europe as well. The two countries forged a nominal alliance that included fascist Italy as well. During World War II they were known as the Axis powers. Japan subdued much of Asia and Germany became the master of most of Europe before the two were finally beaten, at great cost in blood and treasure, in 1945. Could anything like the ghastly experience of the 1930s and 1940s occur in the twenty-first century? The precipitating event did, after all, repeat itself after a fashion: the economic slump that began in 2008 became, by most accounts the most severe since the 1930s. And while Germany and Japan have long since become firmly democratic in their politics and quasi-pacifist in their foreign policies, two other countries could conceivably play the roles that the fascist powers assumed in the interwar period. Those two countries are China and Russia. Each was, as the first decade of the new century ended, a large and military formidable country that had the potential to upset existing political and economic arrangements in East Asia and Europe, respectively. For much of the second half of the twentieth century the two had been governed by communist regimes that aspired to spread their form of government, by force when necessary. In the first decade of the twenty-first century neither had discarded all the trappings of its former communist identity: a communist party still ruled China, and Russians harbored nostalgia for the disbanded communist empire of the Soviet Union. In the mid-1990s, in no small part of resentment at the dominant global role of the United States, the two formed what they called a “strategic partnership.” In that term could be heard, however, faintly, the echo of the Axis alliance of World War II. China and Russia became charter members, along with five Central Asian countries, of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, founded in 2001, one of whose apparent purposes was to offset American power. Like virtually every country, China and Russia each suffered, as had Germany and Japan in the 1930s, from the financial crisis of 2008 and the resulting economic distress.

**THIRD, THE RISK IS A FUNCTION OF OUR INTERNAL LINKS—IF WE WIN A BIG ONE, THEN THERE WOULD BE A WAR**

Mandelbaum '10

(Michael, Professor Foreign Policy-Johns Hopkins University, The Frugal Superpower: America's Global Leadership in a Cash-Strapped Era, p. 111-2)

The unlikelihood of a full recurrence of all the horrors of the 1930s and 1940s does not, however, mean that the global security order is certain to remain entirely free from threats of war in the years ahead.

Avoiding the worst of all possible futures does not guarantee the best of them. Even if China and Russia do not unleash murderous campaigns of conquest, this does not mean that each will settle comfortably

into a twenty-first-century routine as a staunch supporter of the post-Cold War security and economic orders. Each has grievances, actual and potential, against the existing order of things. The extent to which either or both choose to act on these grievances will matter a great deal. Those choices, in turn, will depend in part on the strength of the American position in their respective regions, East Asia and Europe; and the economic constraints on the United States will weaken that position in both places.



# Immigration Bad: US Economy - US Economic Decline Causes

## Anti-Immigrant Backlash/Xenophobia

**ECONOMIC DECLINE INCREASES ANTI-IMMIGRANT SENTIMENT AND CAUSES BACKLASH**

**Wall Street Journal '10**

("Worried Americans Look Inward," 8-17,

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703908704575433211709341320.html?mod=WSJ\\_hps\\_RIGHTTopCarousel\\_5](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703908704575433211709341320.html?mod=WSJ_hps_RIGHTTopCarousel_5))

**Economic stress has a way of bringing underlying tensions and suppressed emotions to the surface**, for people and nations alike. That's certainly true **for the U.S.**, where **economic anxiety tends to bubble up in** three related forms: isolationism, protectionism and **anti-immigration sentiment**.

Sure enough, as if on cue, whiffs of all three are in the air this summer, a natural byproduct of a long-slumping economy showing precious few signs of bouncing back to full health. The real question isn't why these feelings are in the air—that's obvious enough—but which leaders in both political parties will push back against them, in this fall's campaign and beyond. **The most obvious example is the capital's newly revived debate over immigration.** That debate has just taken a strange new twist in the form of calls to modify the provision of the Constitution's 14th Amendment that guarantees citizenship to children—including babies of illegal immigrants—born on American soil. The Senate's Republican leaders have called for hearings to explore changing the way the amendment is implemented to block citizenship for offspring of illegal aliens—a call that got a rocket boost last week from a report by the Pew Hispanic Center saying that one in 12 babies in the U.S. are born to illegal immigrants. **The push may be coming mostly from Republicans, but it has a strange bipartisan twist.** It turns out that the Senate's top Democrat, Majority Leader Harry Reid, back in 1993 sponsored a bill that also included a provision to block citizenship for children of illegal immigrants. Sen. Reid later called the bill a mistake and profusely apologized for offering it. Now, locked in a tough re-election campaign in which he badly needs Hispanic votes in his home state of Nevada, he's chiding Republicans for advancing an idea he once proposed.

# Immigration Bad: US Economy - Decreased Confidence Hurts Mexican Economy

## US CONSUMER CONFIDENCE KEY TO MEXICAN ECONOMY

Reuters '10

("EMERGING MARKETS-Latam stocks rise, but end month broadly lower," 8-31  
<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN3126570020100831>)

**U.S. economic data helped** on Tuesday. **Consumer confidence rose** modestly in August and U.S. homes prices gained more than expected in June, a change from a recent slew of worrisome figures from the world's biggest economy. For details, see [ID:nN31237504] **The most important news was consumer confidence,** Jaime Aguilera, an equity strategist at HSBC **in Mexico City.** "After two weeks of losses, **the levels are attractive and there's an entrance in the market.**" **Mexico's economy is particularly tied to that of its northern neighbor.** The IPC index .MXX gained 0.95 percent for the session. Nevertheless, the IPC still retreated 1.95 percent in August.

## MEXICAN ECONOMIC COLLAPSE SPREADS WORLDWIDE

Dallas Morning News '95

[November 28; l/n]

**Mexico's troubled peso translates into the same problem no matter where you live in the world.** All year long, thousands of foreign **investors have nervously watched Mexico's** volatile financial **markets** as the Clinton administration and congressional leaders debated the pros and cons of bailing out a battered currency. With the exception of 1982 - when Mexico defaulted on its foreign debt and a handful of giant New York banks worried they would lose billions of dollars in loans - few people abroad ever cared about a weak peso. But now it's different, experts say. This time, **the world is keeping a close eye on Mexico's** unfolding financial **crisis** for one simple reason: **Mexico is a major international player. If its economy were to collapse it would drag down** a few **other countries and** thousands of foreign **investors. If recovery is prolonged, the world economy will feel the slowdown.** "It took a peso devaluation so that **other countries** could **notice the key role that Mexico plays in today's global economy,**" said economist Victor Lopez Villafane of the Monterrey Institute of Technology. "I hate to say it, but if Mexico were to default on its debts, that would trigger an international financial collapse" not seen since the Great Depression said Dr. Lopez who has conducted comparative studies of the Mexican economy and the economies of some Asian and Latin American countries.

## Immigration Bad: Inequality

### **IMMIGRATION ONLY BENEFITS THE WEALTHY AND EXACERBATES INEQUALITY—THIS IN TURN UNDERMINES CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

**Krikorian '7**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, master's degree from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a bachelor's degree from Georgetown University, The New Case Against Immigration, pg 145-9)

In addition to the harmful economic consequences for particular groups of people, mass immigration affects society as a whole by swelling the ranks of the poor, thinning out the middle class, and transferring wealth to the already wealthy. In other words, mass immigration in-creases economic inequality. Income inequality is not in itself a bad thing. In the tenth Federalist Paper, James Madison traced its source to "different and unequal faculties of acquiring property," and accepted it as simply a part of the human condition that had to be accommodated. Americans have long shown a greater tolerance for income inequality than people elsewhere because, unlike most other nations, the sin of envy manifests itself in Americans more usually as an aspiration for personal advancement rather than a leveling desire to bring others down. As the Economist magazine put it, "Whereas Europeans fret about the way the economic pie is divided, Americans want to join the rich, not soak them."<sup>31</sup> In other words, Americans have generally—and correctly—placed more stock in equality of opportunity than equality of result. Likewise, the actual measures of economic inequality often exaggerate the problem.<sup>1</sup> They do not take account of nominal benefits for the poor, which amount to a transfer of hundreds of billions of dollars in assistance for health care, food, and housing from the top half of earners (who are the source of virtually all tax revenue) to the bottom half. Also, the distribution of income is skewed by the fact that those at the top simply work more hours than those at the bottom. Nevertheless, as President Bush has said, "The fact is that income inequality is real; it's been rising for more than 25 years."<sup>33</sup> This steady growth in income inequality cannot safely be dismissed. Tocqueville noted the importance of "the general equality of condition among the people" in shaping both the government and civil society in the United States. While perfect equality of result is neither possible nor desirable, too great a degree of inequality can give rise to social dysfunction. Research has found that greater economic inequality is related to less social trust and civic engagement, less political participation, higher crime, and worse health.<sup>34</sup> And inequality has unquestionably been growing during the course of this latest wave of mass immigration. One measure of inequality is the Gini coefficient, which ranges from a value of 0 (perfect income equality, where each 1 percent of the population earns exactly 1 percent of total national income) to a value of 1 (perfect inequality, where one person earns all the income, and everyone else has zero income). So, the bigger the number, the greater the inequality. By this measure, the United States has seen its traditionally high degree of income inequality grow further; Census Bureau figures show the Gini coefficient climbing steadily from .399 in 1967 to .466 in 2001.<sup>35</sup> This may not seem like much, but it means that there was a significant increase in the share of the nation's income that went to the top earners. The highest-earning fifth of the population went from receiving about 44 percent of all income in 1967 to more than 50 percent in 2001, while the top 5 percent of households went from 17.5 percent of all income to more than 22 percent. All other groups saw their share of national income decline.<sup>36</sup> The reason this happened is that the real after-tax income of the poorest one fifth of Americans rose by 9 percent between 1979 and 2004, while that of the richest one fifth rose by 69 percent, and that of the top 1 percent rose by fully 176 percent.<sup>37</sup> Interestingly, the graph tracking the share of national income going to the top 1 percent of the population follows very closely the graph showing the foreign-born share of the population—both are high in the 1910s and 1920s, then fall steadily until about 1970, and then start rising steadily. Overlapping graphs don't prove anything in themselves. There's a variety of factors that contribute to increased income inequality, most of them manifestations of the modern world—such as growing international trade and outsourcing, technological change, and postindustrial economic restructuring. But if modern society is bound to experience some increase in economic inequality from unavoidable causes, there is all the more reason not to exacerbate that trend through an optional federal policy of mass immigration. And yet that is precisely what we're doing; in the words of a scholar from the liberal Brookings Institution, "It seems likely that immigrants are contributing to widening income inequality in the United States." It could not be otherwise, given that mass immigration "benefits high-skilled workers and the owners of capital but not low-skilled workers or those who do not own capital."<sup>39</sup> Between 1989 and 1997, immigration and children born to immigrants accounted for 75 percent of the increase in the poverty population.<sup>40</sup> This has led to a situation in which immigrants and their native-born young children accounted for 23 percent—nearly one in four—of all the people in the United States living in poverty in 2005, thus swelling the number of people at the bottom of the income distribution. And children with immigrant mothers account for fully 27 percent of all children in poverty. In California, the state most heavily affected by the current immigration wave, real wages for the top tenth of male workers grew 13 percent from 1969 to 1997, while the bottom quarter saw its real wages fall 40 percent during the same period. The Public Policy Institute of California found that the leading causes of this phenomenon were the increasing share of immigrants in the workforce and falling wages for less-educated men (a phenomenon itself partly caused, as we have seen, by an abundance of low-skilled immigrant labor).<sup>41</sup> Looking at growing inequality from another angle also shows the impact of immigration. Although the concept of the middle class is extraordinarily broad and hard to pin down, an examination of the 1990 and 2000 censuses demonstrates a link between mass immigration and a declining percentage of middle-income households.<sup>1</sup> All the states in the study experienced a decline in the percentage of middle-income families during the 1990s, but the decline was largest for states with the greatest increase in immigration. The same was true for metropolitan areas—more immigration equals a smaller middle class; over the 1990s, the metro areas with the largest share of immigrants in the population saw the proportion of low-income households (those in or near poverty) increase, while the low-immigration metro areas saw their low-income shares decrease. So, while other factors also play a part, immigration is an important reason for increased income polarization. One need not be a socialist to sense that the growing, immigration induced gap between rich and poor, approaching the stratospheric levels of income inequality seen in Brazil and Mexico, is moving us away from the kind of society modern America aspires to. In this regard, Michael Lind has written that mass immigration contributes to the "Brazilianization" of our society and has noted the "striking dependence on immigrant menials by the families of the upper-middle and upper classes, whose lifestyle could not be sustained without a supporting cast of deferential helots."<sup>1</sup> Though we're not quite there yet, mass immigration under modern conditions is actually moving us backward, toward a master-servant, plantation-style economy,

more reminiscent of the antebellum South or today's Persian Gulf sheikhdoms than of the middle-class commercial republic we imagine ourselves to inhabit.

## Immigration Bad: Environment

### **HIGHER IMMIGRATION RATES ARE ECOLOGICALLY UNSUSTAINABLE – THEY DEGRADE THE ENVIRONMENT AND CAUSE EXTINCTION**

**Kolankiewicz 10**, Leon Kolankiewicz, environmental scientist and national natural resources planner, Center for Immigration Studies, March 2010, “From Big to Bigger How Mass Immigration and Population Growth Have Exacerbated America’s Ecological Footprint,”

<http://www.progressivesforimmigrationreform.org/2010/03/05/from-big-to-bigger-how-mass-immigration-and-population-growth-have-exacerbated-americas-ecological-footprint/>

Yet it is misleading to imply that increased births would be the dominant force behind this massive population growth. That is because many of those births would not occur, or at least would not occur in the United States, were it not for the persistently high levels of net immigration that are assumed by the Census Bureau in these projections. In 2050, the Bureau’s projections assume “net international migration” (immigration minus emigration) of 2.05 million, an increase from 1.34 million in 2010. This assumption reflects the Bureau’s professional judgment that domestic and international pressures to further increase already high immigration rates will only intensify. If the factors behind demographic change are divided between “net natural increase” (births minus deaths) and “net migration” (immigration minus emigration), then in 2050, 41 percent of the annual increment of 3.45 million would be attributable to net natural increase, and 59 percent would be due to net migration. However, even this breakdown understates the decisive influence that the level of immigration has in determining America’s demographic future. The full impact of immigration on demographic trends only becomes apparent when the U.S.-born descendants of immigrants are accounted for because, after all, these U.S. births would not have occurred but for the prior acts of migration by eventual parents that made them possible.

When births to immigrants are accounted for, demographers at the Pew Research Center calculated recently that: If current trends continue, the population of the United States will rise to 438 million in 2050, from 296 million in 2005, and 82 percent of the increase will be due to immigrants arriving from 2005 to 2050 and their U.S.-born descendants.<sup>36</sup> [emphasis added] Figures 8-10 graphically illustrate the powerful role of immigration policy in shaping current and future U.S. demographic trends. Figure 8 shows U.S. population growth from 1790 to 1970; the steepening curve, one characterized by larger and larger increments over time is a shape characteristic of all phenomena experiencing exponential growth. If, however, the 1970 levels of demographic components (net immigration, fertility or birth rates, and mortality rates) had been maintained over the decades that followed, the growth trajectory would have appeared more like that of the curve in Figure 9, rather than the much steeper curve in Figure 8. At the time of the first celebration of Earth Day in 1970, young environmentalists who had just finished reading Paul Ehrlich’s best-selling 1968 book *The Population Bomb* and listening to one of Earth Day Founder Senator Gaylord Nelson’s moving speeches believed whole-heartedly in the cause and necessity of U.S. and global population stabilization. They endorsed the view of popular cartoonist Walt Kelly’s character Pogo that, “We have met the enemy and he is us” (a play on words of the famous line by Commodore Perry: “We have met the enemy, and they are ours”). In other words, the more of “us” there are, the more “enemies,” or at least environmental burdens Mother Earth faces. If this generation had been able to realize its vision of slowing and then stopping U.S. population growth and reining in the environmental degradation it caused, the trajectory might have looked something like that of the curve in Figure 9. Growth would have tapered off and America’s population would never have hit 300 million. Instead, because of the rapidly rising wave of immigration unleashed by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, Americans and their environment are facing the grim, and utterly unsustainable, future of ever-greater demographic pressures represented by Figure 10. What bearing do these “inconvenient truths” have on America’s Ecological Footprint? In a nutshell — everything. Current immigration levels are enlarging the already enormous U.S. Ecological Footprint and ecological deficit. With the U.S. population booming by more than 10 percent a decade, the only way to maintain — much less reduce the current, unacceptable size of our EF is to reduce our per capita consumption every decade by more than 10 percent — not just for one or five decades, but indefinitely, for as long as population growth continues. One doesn’t have to be a physicist or a political scientist to recognize that an achievement of this magnitude would be technically and politically unrealistic, if not impossible. America is already in ecological overshoot, and massive population growth driven by high immigration rates only serves to exacerbate the situation. Figure 11 shows current trends with respect to the Ecological Footprint and Biocapacity of the United States from 1961 through 2006.<sup>37</sup> As is evident from the crossing lines in this graph, America’s EF first surpassed its biocapacity in the late 1960s, just prior to the first Earth Day. Since then the gap or ecological deficit has only continued to widen. While the addition of each new American does not necessarily increase our per capita or per person (as opposed to our aggregate) EF — only increased per capita resource consumption and CO2 generation does that, it does directly decrease our per capita biocapacity, and thus increases our ecological deficit. Population growth does this in two ways. First, given a fixed biocapacity — that is, a land base that is demonstrably finite and constant, with fixed maximum acreages of potential cropland, grazing land, forestland, and fishing grounds — it is a simple mathematical reality that adding more people who depend on this ecologically productive land base reduces per capita biocapacity. Second, the more than three million new Americans added every year require space and area in which to live, work, play, shop, and attend school. As open space is converted into the “built-up land” category, some combination of forestland, cropland, and grazing land is inevitably developed. (In the 1950s, Orange County, California, home to Disneyland, was touted by developers as “Smog Free Orange County,” but by the 1990s, after four decades of relentless sprawl development to accommodate Southern California’s multiplying millions, it became known as “Orange Free Smog County”). In this way, our country’s biocapacity is steadily and inexorably diminished by a growing population. The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service’s (NRCS’s) National Resources Inventory (NRI) estimated that the United States lost 44 million acres of cropland, 12 million acres of pastureland, and 11 million acres of rangeland from 1982 to 1997, for a total loss to our agricultural land base of 67 million acres over this 15-year period.<sup>38</sup> (One explanation of the much higher acreage of lost cropland than pastureland and rangeland was that a larger fraction of the cropland acreage was not “lost” per se, but deliberately “retired” from active production into the so-called Conservation Reserve Program or CRP, a program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Farm Service Agency. These were lands of marginal quality and high erodibility, lands on which modern, intensive agriculture is unsustainable). All 49 states inventoried lost cropland. Overall cropland losses continued in the next NRI published in 2007.<sup>39</sup> The impacts of the loss of this land extend beyond agriculture. The USDA has estimated that each person added to the U.S. population requires slightly more than one acre of land for urbanization and highways.<sup>40</sup> Clearly, more land is required as more people are added to our population. A comparison of NRI acreage — 25 million acres of newly developed land over the 1982-1997 period and 67 million acres of agricultural land lost shows that development per se is not responsible for all or even half of agricultural land loss.

Arable land is also subject to other natural and manmade phenomena such as soil erosion (from both water and wind), salinization, and waterlogging that can rob its fertility, degrade its productivity and eventually force its retirement or increase its dependency on ever greater quantities of costly inputs like (fossil-fuel derived) nitrogen fertilizers. Arguably, however, much of these losses are due to over-exploitation by intensive agricultural practices needed to constantly raise agricultural productivity (yield per acre) in order to provide ever more food for America's and the world's growing populations and meat-rich diets. Thus, the potent combination of relentless development and land degradation from soil erosion and other factors is reducing America's productive agricultural land base even as the demands on that same land base from a growing population are increasing. If the rates of agricultural land loss that have prevailed in recent years were to continue to 2050, the nation will have lost 53 million of its remaining 377 million acres of cropland, or 14 percent, even as the U.S. population grows by 43 percent from 308 million to 440 million.<sup>41</sup> Continuing on to 2100, the discrepancy between booming population numbers and declining cropland acreage widens even further (Figure 12). The Census Bureau's "middle series" projection (made in the year 2000) is 571 million, more than a doubling of U.S. population in 2000.<sup>42</sup> (The "highest serious" projection was 1.2 billion, and actual growth since these projections were made has been between the middle and highest series). If the same rate of cropland loss were to continue, the United States would lose approximately 106 million acres of its remaining 377 million acres of cropland, or nearly 30 percent. Cropland per capita, that is, the acreage of land to grow grains and other crops for each resident, would decline from 1.4 acres in 1997 to 0.47 acres in 2100, a 66 percent reduction. If this occurs, biotechnology will need to work miracles to raise yields per acre in order to maintain the sort of diet Americans have come to expect. These ominous, divergent trends — an increasing population and declining arable land, have actually led some scientists to think the unthinkable: that one day America may no longer be able to feed itself, let alone boast a food surplus for export to the world. In the 1990s, Cornell University agricultural and food scientists David and Marcia Pimentel and Mario Giampietro of the Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione in Rome, Italy, argued that by approximately 2025, the United States would most likely cease to be a food exporter, and that food grown in this country would be needed for domestic consumption. These findings suggest that by 2050, the amount of arable land per capita may have dropped to the point that, "the diet of the average American will, of necessity, include more grains, legumes, tubers, fruits and vegetables, and significantly less animal products."<sup>43</sup> While this might, in fact, constitute a healthier diet both for terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and for many calorically and cholesterol-challenged Americans, it would also represent a significant loss of dietary choice. As nations get wealthier, they tend to "move up the food chain" in the phrase of the Earth Policy Institute's Lester Brown, that is they consume higher trophic level, more ecologically demanding and damaging meat and dairy products, but were these predictions to hold true, Americans, for better or worse, would be moving in the opposite direction. From 2005 to 2006, the U.S. per capita ecological deficit widened from 10.9 to 11.3 acres, continuing the long-term trend depicted in Figure 11. Assuming the Census Bureau's official population projections for 2050 actually do happen, the U.S. population would be 43 percent larger than at present. Even if there were no further increase in the U.S. per capita EF, which is, as can be seen from the 45-year trend in Figure 11, a rather generous assumption, a 43 percent increase in the U.S. population would correspond to a further 43 percent reduction in biocapacity per capita, even without the types of continuing land and resource degradation just discussed above for cropland. The 2006 U.S. biocapacity was 10.9 global acres (ga) per capita. By 2050, if current U.S. demographic trends and projections hold, this will have been reduced to 6.2 ga per capita. If the per capita American EF of consumption were to remain at the 2006 value of 22.3 ga, the ecological deficit in 2050 would increase to 16.1 ga per capita. In essence, if we American "Bigfeet" do not opt for a different demographic path than the one we are treading now, Ecological Footprint analysis indicates unequivocally that we will continue plodding ever deeper into the forbidden zone of Ecological Overshoot, trampling our prospects for a sustainable future. Incidentally, we would also be trampling the survival prospects for many hundreds of endangered species with which we share our country. These birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, reptiles, butterflies, mussels, and other taxa are menaced with extinction by our aggressive exploitation of nearly every ecological niche, nook, and cranny. In nature, no organism in overshoot remains there for long. Sooner or later, ecosystem and/or population collapse ensues. Are we humans, because of our unique scientific acumen, immune from the laws of nature that dictate the implacable terms of existence to all other species on the planet? Our political, economic, and cultural elites seem to think so, and en masse, we certainly act so. Yet ironically, many scientists themselves believe otherwise: that all-too-human hubris, unless checked by collective wisdom and self-restraint, will prove to be our undoing, and that civilization as we know it may unravel.<sup>44</sup>

## IMMIGRATION KEY FACTOR IN POPULATION GROWTH – MUST REIGN IT IN TO PREVENT ENVIRONMENTAL CATASTROPHE

Federation for American Immigration Reform, September 2009, "The United States Is Already Over-Populated," <http://www.fairus.org/site/News2/569516980?page=NewsArticle&id=21533&securit>  
The United States is already overpopulated in the sense that we are consuming our national ecological resources at an unsustainable rate. Our growing dependence on foreign energy supplies is a prime example. We now depend on foreign imports for 28.8 percent of our energy consumption: two-thirds of our petroleum products and about one-sixth of our natural gas consumption.<sup>1</sup> Because of the abundance of our nation's resources, we have long been careless about our level of consumption, but it is the precipitous rise in the U.S. population over the last four decades that has resulted in our outstripping of our national resources. We are living beyond our means and are doing so increasingly as our population expands. This is a serious problem with major implications for future generations. This imbalance can not be remedied without curbing both population growth and consumption as well as increasing productivity. We most become

more sensitive to the issue of consumption of finite, non-renewable resources and to the limits of renewable resources. **Reining in population growth requires immigration reduction**, and that objective should be at the top of the agenda for policy makers because it is the most immediate and the most amenable to change through public policy. In 1972, the Presidential Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended population stabilization, concluding: "The health of our country does not depend on [population growth], nor does the vitality of business nor the welfare of the average person." The Commission's recommendation was based on the 1970 Census finding that the population had reached more than 203 million residents. Since 1970, the U.S. population has added more than 100 million residents, about a 50 percent growth in fewer than 40 years. As the root cause of land and resource shortages, ecological degradation and urban congestion, sustained and growing overpopulation is jeopardizing the natural inheritance we leave for future generations. The United States has a national environmental policy but no national population policy. As a result, environmental policy decisions are made in a vacuum. By determining the long-term ecological carrying capacity of the United States, Congress would be able to make informed decisions regarding the impact of U.S. population change on achievement of long-term environmental objectives. This report does not attempt to quantify the carrying capacity of the United States - that must be a priority of the scientific community it simply explains how current population growth is damaging the U.S. environment and lowering the average American's quality of life. A local example of what should be undertaken at the federal level has been launched in Albemarle County, Va. (Charlottesville) where Advocates for a Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP) is promoting a population limit for the county. Its focus is to, "use 'smart growth' tools to manage development in the short term, but simultaneously insist that local governments identify an optimal sustainable population size to cap growth in the community, and use this "right size" as a basis for municipal planning decisions."<sup>2</sup> An obvious drawback to dealing with overpopulation at the local level is that the possibility for dealing with the issue of immigration — which ASAP acknowledges accounts for 85 percent of national population growth — is very limited. Back to Top **WHAT IS OVER-POPULATION? National over-population simply means the population of the country in excess of the ability of available resources to sustain it without degrading the environment.** The theory that underscores this concept is the population size magnified by both per capita consumption (affluence) and offset by technology determines the environmental impact of that population.  $I = PAT: \text{Environmental Impact} = \text{Population} \times \text{Affluence} (\text{Consumption} \ \& \ \text{Waste}) \times \text{Technology}$  Environmental Impact: The impact on biodiversity, natural resources and ecosystems. Population: The total number of people impacting an environment. Affluence: Per capita consumption and the waste generated through resource consumption. Technology: The efficiency with which resources are used and disposed of. Source: Ehrlich, Paul and Holdren, John. 1971. IPAT, Stanford University. Nations with high consumption levels generally have large ecological footprints, i.e. environmental impact. **Add to the equation a large population with a high level of consumption — as is the case with the United States — and the situation becomes unsustainable.** Population growth is steadily diluting the U.S. biocapacity, leaving only about 5 hectares [about 12.4 acres] of productive land available per person. Meanwhile, the steady rise in consumption has increased Americans' per capita ecological footprint — in part because of our growing dependence on imported energy resources — to more than 9.4 hectares [about 23.3 acres].<sup>3</sup> In the last four decades, the U.S. has gone from a positive net ecological surplus of 2.1 hectares per capita to a deficit of -4.4 hectares per capita.<sup>4</sup> Another aspect of this same trend into unsustainable consumption is that the U.S. per capita ecological footprint has increased gradually — six percent since 1980 — while per capita biocapacity has decreased rapidly — 26 percent — due to a 30 percent increase in the U.S. population.<sup>5</sup> **POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND REGIONAL OVERPOPULATION** In 1933, President Herbert Hoover's Committee on Social Trends projected that "we shall probably attain a population of between 145 and 150 million during the present century."<sup>6</sup> Because of the unanticipated post World War II "baby boom" and the 1965 change in immigration policy that opened the door to ever-increasing annual admission of immigrants, the Commission's projection was off by more than 130 million — the U.S. population surpassed 281 million in 2000. Sixty-three years later the U.S. Census Bureau released its projection for growth in the 21st century. The "middle series" — the most likely scenario — showed a population of about 394 million residents in 2050. That projection was shown by the results of the 2000 Census to be already understated. The latest projection by the Census Bureau (2008) — based on current demographic trends — is for a population of more than 439 million in 2050. **Unless we adopt policies that moderate our current demographic trend, we are destined to continue to exacerbate the over-consumption of our fixed and nonrenewable resources. What is propelling the nation's rapid population growth? In a word, it is immigration.** That is because new immigrants and their U.S.-born children currently account for 75 to 80 percent of our annual population growth. **And, that share of population growth due to immigration has been rising along with the rising number of new immigrants.** The Pew Hispanic Center researchers estimated in 2008 that given current trends 82 percent of population growth from 2005 to 2050 will result from immigrants and their descendants.<sup>7</sup> Much of the rest of the population growth results from continuing ripples from the baby boom and some slight increase in life expectancy. **With succeeding generations, those population effects are expected to diminish and we will be left with virtually all population growth resulting from the expansion of immigration.**

## IMMIGRANTS CONSUME MORE IN THE US

**Cafaro and Staples 09**, Phillip Cafaro and Winthrop Staples III, Department of Philosophy, Colorado State University, and wildlife biologist, 2009, "The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States," [http://www.fairus.org/site/DocServer/Phil\\_Cafaro\\_enviro\\_argument\\_for\\_reducing\\_immigration.pdf?docID=2921](http://www.fairus.org/site/DocServer/Phil_Cafaro_enviro_argument_for_reducing_immigration.pdf?docID=2921)

However, cosmopolitan ethical universalists who reject our parochialism should still support our proposal to reduce immigration into the United States, since doing so would also benefit the rest of the world. They should do so because **moving people to America**, far from being environmentally neutral, **increases overall global resource consumption and pollution. This increase in consumption in turn threatens to weaken the already stressed global ecosystem services that we all depend upon**—with the world's poorest people facing the greatest danger from possible ecological failures. Consider a table comparing the average U.S. "ecological footprint" with averages from our ten largest immigration "source"

countries. On average, **immigrating** from nine of these ten countries **greatly increases** an individual's **ecological footprint**— and the ecological footprints of his or her descendants—by 100 percent to 1,000 percent or more. In the case of Mexico, which accounts for nearly a third of all immigration into America, **immigration increases** individuals' **consumption and pollution** **approximately 350 percent**.<sup>34</sup> There probably are cases where immigrants consume more but do less ecological damage than they would have had they remained in their countries of origin (slash-and-burn agriculturalists inhabiting biologically rich forests?), but clearly these are the exceptions. More Americans is bad news for America's native flora and fauna. But given global warming, it is also bad news for poor people living in the Sahel or in the Bhrmaputra Delta.



## **Immigration Bad: Developing Country Population**

### **IMMIGRATION TO THE US BOOSTS FERTILITY IN SENDING COUNTRIES AND CAUSES OVERSHOOT**

**Durham 08**, David Durham, chairman of the board of Washington-based group Population-Environment Balance, May-June 2008, "Immigration: two views,"

[http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1594/is\\_3\\_19/ai\\_n28023898/](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1594/is_3_19/ai_n28023898/)

E Magazine: What do you say to the charge that groups like PEB are anti-immigrant? [ILLUSTRATION OMITTED] Durham: We are not scapegoating immigrants by setting limits; instead we are recognizing ecological realities such as limited potable water, topsoil and infrastructure. Current U.S. immigration policy is far too lax from an ecological perspective because we are overshooting our long-term carrying capacity. Studies have shown that a permissive U.S. immigration policy drives up fertility rates in the sending countries, which is the last thing these sending countries need. Through our foreign aid programs, can we succeed in reducing the push factors that lead people to migrate? While family planning programs that include incentives for replacement-level fertility might make a dent in fertility rates, probably the most effective thing we could do to lower fertility rates is to dramatically lower immigration into the U.S. To be sustainable in the long term, we need to achieve U.S. population stabilization, because a number of studies show we have overshot our long-term carrying capacity. We need to work for a zero-net immigration moratorium, and dramatically reduce illegal immigration. A zero-net policy would allow 100,000 spouses and minor children of U.S. citizens as well as a select few truly needed workers and refugees annually. What are the environmental effects of our current high immigration rate? For every person added to the U.S. population, one acre of wild or farmland is converted to human use or degraded. In addition, rampant U.S. population growth increases infrastructure burdens, including the need for new schools and healthcare facilities, and results in increased waste and pollution.

### **EXPECTATION OF A CHILD'S INEVITABLE EMIGRATION CAUSES HIGHER BIRTH RATES**

Virginia D. **Abernethy, prof. emeritus of psychiatry (anthropology) @ Vanderbilt MS, 2000**, Population Politics, p. 41

Incentives related to migration opportunities—or conversely, the need to absorb a nation's own youth—are insufficiently studied. Nevertheless, recent data from high-fertility countries in the Caribbean suggest that **fertility stays high because parents expect that some of their children will emigrate.** Anthropologist Ann Brittain (1991) reports a positive relationship between marital fertility and emigration, by district, in present-day St. Vincent and the Grenadines. She concludes that the "anticipated loss of children to migration may be an important factor in maintaining high reproductive rates." Brittain cites supportive studies, specifically Friedlander (1983), who found that those nineteenth-century English and Welsh districts which "had high rates of emigration showed much less reduction in marital fertility ... than would have been predicted."

## Immigration Bad: Terrorism

Increasing immigration allows terrorists to enter and hide within the United States-  
**IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS ARE A CRITICAL BARRIER TO PREVENTING TERRORISTS ATTACKS**  
**Krikorian 2008**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, MA from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, "Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat", p. 37-38, May 2008)  
The **security challenges posed by immigration are usually viewed as discrete problems that can be addressed through better watch lists**, for example, or through additional resources for consular staff who conduct visa interviews. But **this is a mistake. Under modern conditions, mass immigration itself is incompatible with security. This is true for two reasons: first, immigration overwhelms our efforts to screen out security threats; and, second, it creates large immigrant communities that shield and incubate terrorists.** In the past, references to the "home front" were metaphorical, intended to create among civilians at home a greater sense of solidarity with soldiers at war fronts. But **advances in communications, transportation, and weapons technology mean that today-and in the indefinite future-that home front is no longer a metaphor, but is an actual war front.** As President George W. Bush has said, "our country is a battlefield in the first war of the 21<sup>st</sup> century" (White House, 2003). The **new context makes immigration a central issue-perhaps the central issue-in considerations of national security.** The staff report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States on "terrorist travel" opens by stating, **"it is perhaps obvious to state that terrorists cannot plan and carry out attacks in the United States if they are unable to enter the country"** (Eldridgr et al., 2004). **Enemy operatives not only need to enter the United States, or whatever they are targeting, but also often need to remain under the radar,** as it were, for an extended period of time. **This means that keeping foreign terrorists out-and keeping them on the run or arresting them if they do get in-is a security imperative.**

**INCREASED PRESENCE OF TERRORISTS IN THE UNITED STATES RISKS NUCLEAR TERRORISM**  
**Krikorian 2004**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, MA from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, "Keeping Terror Out: Immigration Policy and Asymmetric Warfare", April 2004, <http://www.cis.org/node/380>)  
Because of the asymmetric nature of the threat, the burden of homeland defense is not borne mainly by our armed forces but by agencies formerly seen as civilian entities - mainly the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). And of DHS's expansive portfolio, **immigration control is central.** The reason is elementary: **no matter the weapon or delivery system - hijacked airliners, shipping containers, suitcase nukes, anthrax spores - operatives are required to carry out the attacks. Those operatives have to enter and work in the United States. In a very real sense, the primary weapons of our enemies are not inanimate objects at all, but rather the terrorists themselves** - especially in the case of suicide attackers. Thus **keeping the terrorists out or apprehending them after they get in is indispensable to victory.** As President Bush said recently, "Our country is a battlefield in the first war of the 21st century."

**TERRORIST ATTACK ON U.S. SOIL WOULD RESULT A GLOBAL NUCLEAR AND EXTINCTION**  
**Corsi 05**

Jerome R. Corsi, author who holds a Ph.D. from Harvard University, 2005 [" Sleeper Cells and Nuclear Bombs: The Threat To American Security," Atomic Iran: how the terrorist regime bought the bomb and American politicians, Published by WorldNetDaily Books, ISBN 1581824580, p. 176-179]  
The **combination of horror and outrage that will surge upon the nation will demand that the president retaliate for the incomprehensible damage done by the attack.** The problem will be that the president will not immediately know how to respond or against whom. The perpetrators will have been incinerated by the explosion that destroyed New York City. Unlike 9-11, there will have been no interval during the attack when those hijacked could make phone calls to loved ones telling them before they died that the hijackers were radical Islamic extremists. There will be no such phone calls when the attack will not have been anticipated until the instant the terrorists detonate their improvised nuclear device inside the truck parked on a curb at the Empire State Building. Nor will there be any possibility of finding any clues, which either were vaporized instantly or are now lying physically inaccessible under tons of radioactive rubble. Still, **the president, members of Congress, the military, and the public at large will suspect another attack by our known enemy – Islamic terrorists.** The **first impulse will be to launch a nuclear strike on Mecca, to destroy the whole religion of Islam.** Medina could possibly be added to the target list just to make the point with crystal clarity. Yet what would we gain? **The moment Mecca and Medina were wiped off the map, the Islamic world –**

**more than 1 billion human beings in countless different nations – would feel attacked. Nothing would emerge intact after a war between the United States and Islam. The apocalypse would be upon us.**

Then, too, **we would face an immediate threat from our long-term enemy, the former Soviet Union.** Many in the Kremlin would see this as an opportunity to grasp the victory that had been snatched from them by Ronald Reagan when the Berlin Wall came down. **A missile strike by the Russians on a score of American cities could possibly be pre-emptive.** Would the U.S. strategic defense system be so in shock that immediate retaliation would not be possible? **Hardliners in Moscow might argue that there was never a better opportunity to destroy America.** In China, our newer Communist enemies might not care if we could retaliate. With a population already over 1.3 billion people and with their population not concentrated in a few major cities, **the Chinese might calculate to initiate a nuclear blow on the United States.** What if the United States retaliated with a nuclear counterattack upon China? The Chinese might be able to absorb the blow and recover. The **North Koreans might calculate even more recklessly. Why not launch upon America the few missiles they have that could reach our soil?** More confusion and chaos might only advance their position. If Russia, China, and the United States could be drawn into attacking one another, North Korea might emerge stronger just because it was overlooked while the great nations focus on attacking one another. So, too, **our supposed allies in Europe might relish the immediate reduction in power suddenly inflicted upon America. Many of the great egos in Europe have never fully recovered from the disgrace of World War II,** when in the last century the Americans a second time in just over two decades had been forced to come to their rescue. If the French did not start launching nuclear weapons themselves, they might be happy to fan the diplomatic fire beginning to burn under the Russians and the Chinese. **Or the president might decide simply to launch a limited nuclear strike on Tehran itself.** This might be the most rational option in the attempt to retaliate but still communicate restraint. The problem is that a **strike on Tehran would add more nuclear devastation to the world calculation. Muslims around the world would still see the retaliation as an attack on Islam,** especially when the United States had no positive proof that the destruction of New York City had been triggered by radical Islamic extremists with assistance from Iran. **But for the president not to retaliate might be unacceptable to the American people. So weakened by the loss of New York, Americans would feel vulnerable in every city in the nation.** "Who is going to be next?" would be the question on everyone's mind. For this there would be no effective answer. That the president might think politically at this instant seems almost petty, yet every president is by nature a politician. The political party in power at the time of the attack would be destroyed unless the president retaliated with a nuclear strike against somebody. **The American people would feel a price had to be paid while the country was still capable of exacting revenge.** None of these scenarios bodes anything but more disaster. The point is simple: America cannot tolerate the risk that some insane group of radical Islamic terrorists might want to buy their way into heaven by exploding a nuclear device in the heart of New York City. **The consequences are too devastating to imagine, let alone experience. As a nation we must realize that this type of attack can happen.** It may only be a matter of time, unless we act right now. **We must not permit the mad mullahs to have a nuclear capability they can turn clandestinely into a nuclear weapon to use in attacking America.** That we might believe we can solve the problem diplomatically is exactly the conclusion the mullahs are praying we will come to.

## **LOOSENING IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS DESTROYS OUR ABILITY TO SOLVE ASYMMETRIC THREATS**

**Krikorian 2004**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, MA from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, "Keeping Terror Out: Immigration Policy and Asymmetric Warfare", April 2004, <http://www.cis.org/node/380>)

**Prior to the growth of militant Islam, the only foreign threat to our population and territory in recent history has been the specter of nuclear attack by the Soviet Union. To continue that analogy, since the terrorists are themselves the weapons, immigration control is to asymmetric warfare what missile defense is to strategic warfare.** There are other weapons we must use against an enemy employing asymmetric means - more effective international coordination, improved intelligence gathering and distribution, special military operations - but in the end, **the lack of effective immigration control leaves us naked in the face of the enemy.** This **lack of defensive capability** may have made sense with regard to the strategic nuclear threat under the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, but it **makes no sense with regard to the asymmetric threats we face today and in the future.**

## **INCREASED IMMIGRATION DESTROYS THE DHS'S ABILITY TO DETECT THREATS AND PREVENT TERRORIST ATTACKS**

**Krikorian 2008**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, MA from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, "Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat", p. 38-39, May 2008)

**One security problem created by excessive immigration is that it overwhelms a country's ability to detect and exclude malefactors.** In the United States, **the lead agencies in this task are not part of the military.** Instead, **they fall under** the State Department's **Bureau of Consular Affairs** (which issues visas) **and** the immigration-related elements of the Department of Homeland Security (**DHS**). **When we examine the immigration histories of prior terrorists, the need for these agencies to be effective becomes clear.** One **analysis of 48 foreign-born al-Qaeda operatives who committed crimes in the United States between 1993-2001** (including the 9/11 hijackers) **found that they had penetrated almost every part of the immigration system** (Camarota, 2002). Of the 48, **one-third were in the United States on various temporary visas, one-third were legal residents or naturalized,** one-fourth were illegal aliens, and the remainder were former illegal aliens with pending asylum applications. **Nearly half of them had, at one point or another, violated ordinary immigration laws.** **Another examination of 94 foreign-born terrorists in the United States,** who belonged to al-Qaeda, Hamas, Hexbollah, and other groups, **found that about two-thirds (59) had committed immigration violations** prior to or in conjunction with taking part in terrorist activity, and some had multiple violations (Kephart, 2005). These **statistics demonstrate that strict enforcement of regular immigration laws could yield significant security benefits by keeping terrorists out and making it harder for them to operate. Strict enforcement could also result in the arrest of terrorists who are already here, thus disrupting conspiracies and providing subjects for interrogation.** This enforcement is related to but separate from security-specific tools such as watch lists.

#### **ONLY AN EFFECTIVE DHS CAN SOLVE THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM**

##### **Krikorian 2004**

(Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, MA from Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, "Keeping Terror Out: Immigration Policy and Asymmetric Warfare", April 2004, <http://www.cis.org/node/380>)

Because of the asymmetric nature of the threat, **the burden of homeland defense is not borne mainly by our armed forces but by agencies formerly seen as civilian entities - mainly** the Department of Homeland Security (**DHS**). And of **DHS's expansive portfolio, immigration control is central.** The reason is elementary: **no matter the weapon or delivery system - hijacked airliners, shipping containers, suitcase nukes, anthrax spores -** operatives are required to carry out the attacks. Those operatives have to enter and work in the United States. In a very real sense, the primary weapons of our enemies are not inanimate objects at all, but rather the terrorists themselves - especially in the case of suicide attackers. Thus **keeping the terrorists out or apprehending them after they get in is indispensable to victory.** As President Bush said recently, "Our country is a battlefield in the first war of the 21st century."

#### **LEGAL IMMIGRATION IS ESPECIALLY DANGEROUS-STUDIES AND STATISTICS PROVE IT WILL INCREASE PRESENCE OF TERRORISTS**

##### **Leiken and Brooke 2006**

(Robert S., Director of the Immigration and National Security Program at The Nixon Center and Steven, Master's degree in Middle Eastern history from George Mason University, "The Quantitative Analysis of Terrorism and Immigration: An Initial Exploration", December 2006, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 18:4, 503 – 521)

The **United States remains Al Qaeda's premier target.** A **comparative analysis of Matrix data with immigration data not only revealed a significant presence of operatives in the United States, but it also charts** who they are, **how they got here,** and allowed an analysis of the relationship between illegal immigration and terrorism in the American case. The **U.S. serves as a host country for 25 percent of the total subjects in the Matrix, and 11 percent of the total sample are U.S. citizens.** Forty-two percent of those hosted in the U.S. are citizens. In the Matrix, 38 percent of the U.S. citizens are naturalized. In contrast, the overall naturalization rate among immigrants from the Middle East to the U.S. has been calculated at about 55 percent.<sup>61</sup> **Thirty-three percent of those hosted in the U.S. on whom we have entry data entered with tourist visas. Thirteen percent utilized student visas, and eight percent entered with asylum. Four percent utilized a permanent resident card, or green card, usually won in a lottery. Illegal entrants and business visas posted three percent each. Two, as described above, entered under the Visa Waiver Program.** The remainder was natural-born U.S. citizens who were detained in the U.S.

## **MORE IMMIGRANTS FROM MEXICO WOULD BE DEVASTATING-A FLOOD OF TERRORISTS WILL ENTER THE COUNTRY**

**Winter 2010**

(Jana, FoxNews staff writer, "Feds Issue Terror Watch for the Texas/Mexico Border", May 26, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/05/26/terror-alert-mexican-border/>)

The Department of Homeland Security is alerting Texas authorities to be on the lookout for a suspected member of the Somalia-based Al Shabaab terrorist group who might be attempting to travel to the U.S. through Mexico, a security expert who has seen the memo tells FOXNews.com. The warning follows an indictment unsealed this month in Texas federal court that accuses a Somali man in Texas of running a "large-scale smuggling enterprise" responsible for bringing hundreds of Somalis from Brazil through South America and eventually across the Mexican border. Many of the illegal immigrants, who court records say were given fake IDs, are alleged to have ties to other now-defunct Somalian terror organizations that have merged with active organizations like Al Shabaab, al-Barakat and Al-Ittihad Al-Islami. In 2008, the U.S. government designated Al Shabaab a terrorist organization. Al Shabaab has said its priority is to impose Sharia, or Islamic law, on Somalia; the group has aligned itself with Al Qaeda and has made statements about its intent to harm the United States. In recent years, American Somalis have been recruited by Al Shabaab to travel to Somalia, where they are often radicalized by more extremist or operational anti-American terror groups, which Al Shabaab supports. The recruiters coming through the Mexican border are the ones who could be the most dangerous, according to law enforcement officials. Security experts tell FOXNews.com that the influx of hundreds of Somalis over the U.S. border who allegedly have ties to suspected terror cells is evidence of a porous and unsecured border being exploited by groups intent on wrecking deadly havoc on American soil. The DHS alert was issued to police and sheriff's deputies in Houston, asking them to keep their eyes open for a Somali man named Mohamed Ali who is believed to be in Mexico preparing to make the illegal crossing into Texas. Officials believe Ali has ties to Al Shabaab, a Somali terrorist organization aligned with Al Qaeda, said Joan Neuhaus Schaan, the homeland security and terrorism fellow at Rice University's Baker Institute, who has seen the alert. An indictment was unsealed in Texas federal court earlier this month that revealed that a Somali man, Ahmed Muhammed Dhakane, led a human smuggling ring that brought East Africans, including Somalis with ties to terror groups, from Brazil and across the Mexican border and into Texas. In a separate case, Anthony Joseph Tracy, of Virginia, who admitted to having ties to Al Shabaab, is currently being prosecuted for his alleged role in an international ring that illegally brought more than 200 Somalis across the Mexican border. Prosecutors say Tracy used his Kenya-based travel business as a cover to fraudulently obtain Cuban travel documents for the Somalis. The smuggled Somalis are believed to have spread out across the United States and remain mostly at large, court records show. Somalis are classified by border and immigration officials as "special interest" — illegal immigrants who get caught trying to cross the Mexican border into the U.S. who come from countries that are considered a high threat to the U.S., Neuhaus Schaan explained. DHS did not respond to multiple e-mail and phone requests for comment. In addition to the Somali immigration issue, Mexican smugglers are coaching some Middle Eastern immigrants before they cross the border — schooling them on how to dress and giving them phrases to help them look and sound like Latinos, law enforcement sources told FoxNews.com. "There have been a number of certain communities that have noticed this, villages in northern Mexico where Middle Easterners try to move into town and learn Spanish," Neuhaus Schaan said. "People were changing their names from Middle Eastern names to Hispanic names." Security experts say the push by illegal immigrants to try to fit in also could be the realization of what officials have feared for years: Latin American drug cartels are helping jihadist groups bring terrorists across the Mexican border. J. Peter Pham, senior fellow and director of the Africa Project at the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, said that for the past ten years there's been suspicion by U.S. law enforcement that drug cartels could align with international terrorist organizations to bring would-be-jihadists into the U.S. That kind of collaboration is already being seen in Africa, said Dr. Walid Phares, director of the Future Terrorism Project at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. "Al Qaeda could easily say, "Ok, now we want your help getting these guys into the United States," Phares said. "Eventually the federal government will pay more attention, but there is a window of time now where they can get anyone they want to get in already." Experts also say the DHS alert and recent court case highlights the threat of terrorists penetrating the Mexican/Texas border — and the growing threat of Somali recruitment efforts to bring Americans of Somali descent back to Somalia for jihadist training, creating homegrown terrorists.

## Immigration Bad – A2: Helps Economy

**CIR doesn't solve the economy – trades of with native jobs and will use welfare programs more than they provide in job creation**

**Ruark and Graham 11** [Eric Ruark and Matthew Graham – Directors of Research at the Federation for American Immigration Reform, “Immigration, Poverty and Low-Wage Earners the Harmful effect of Unskilled immigrants on American Workers”, May 2011, [http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty\\_rev.pdf](http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty_rev.pdf), Chetan]

Current **calls for “comprehensive immigration reform” are nothing short of a push for a massive amnesty that would give permanent status to millions of illegal aliens who are not needed in the workforce**, and it would reward unscrupulous employers who profited from hiring illegal workers, providing them with a legal low-wage workforce that would continue to have a negative impact on native workers. The border is not secured and there is much opposition to the mandatory use of E-Verify and interior enforcement. Those who argue against enforcement are not going to decide overnight to support these measures, and politicians have long ago proven that their promise to enforce immigration laws after granting amnesty are not to be believed. This report contains the following findings: · In 2009, **less than 6 percent of legal immigrants were admitted because they possessed skills deemed essential to the U.S. economy.** · Studies that find minimal or no negative effects on native workers from low-skill immigration are based upon lawed assumptions and skewed economic models, not upon observations of actual labor market conditions. · **There is no such thing as an “immigrant job.”** The reality is that **immigrants and natives compete for the same jobs and native workers are increasingly at a disadvantage because employers have access to a steady supply of low-wage foreign workers.** · **Low-skilled immigrants are more likely** than their native-born counterparts **to live in poverty, lack health insurance, and to utilize welfare programs.** Immigrants and their children made up 32 percent of those in the United States without health insurance in 2009. · Research done by the Center for American Progress has found that reducing the illegal alien population in the United States by one-third would raise the income of unskilled workers by \$400 a year. · **Defenders** of illegal immigration often tout the findings of the so-called Perryman Report to **argue that illegal aliens are responsible for job creation** in the United States; **yet**, if one accepts the Perryman findings as true, **that would mean that only one job is created in the United States for every three illegal workers in the workforce.** · It is true that if the illegal alien population decreased the overall number of jobs in the U.S. would be reduced, but there would be many more jobs available to native workers – jobs that paid higher wages and offered better working conditions

**CIR doesn't increase the tax intake – full amnesty more than doubles their accessed welfare and they don't acquire enough jobs to compensate in taxes**

**Ruark and Graham 11** [Eric Ruark and Matthew Graham – Directors of Research at the Federation for American Immigration Reform, “Immigration, Poverty and Low-Wage Earners the Harmful effect of Unskilled immigrants on American Workers”, May 2011, [http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty\\_rev.pdf](http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty_rev.pdf), Chetan]

**Proponents** of amnesty often **tout the fact that amnestied illegal aliens would become taxpayers**, and some proposals even stipulate that these people would have to pay back taxes. Amnesty advocates also highlight the fact that most illegal immigrants pay Social Security taxes, ignoring the fact that this happens largely because 75 percent of illegal aliens use a stolen Social Security number (usually from children, who more easily fall victim to this type of fraud).<sup>63</sup> It is true that illegal aliens do account for a meager tax contribution. **However, amnesty would make them eligible for the full range of tax credits and welfare benefits** (the wait period before amnestied individuals would be eligible to receive government benefits varies according to which amnesty bill one references). **The argument that amnesty would turn illegal immigrants into taxpaying citizens is designed to disguise the proposals harmful fiscal impact.** Steven Camarotas analysis of Current Population Survey data revealed that in 2002, **the average illegal immigrant household used \$2,700 more in federal government services than it paid in taxes** **However, if illegal aliens were amnestied and accessed welfare** at the same rate as immigrants of the same income and education level, **this number would rise to**

**\$7.700**.<sup>\*4</sup> These findings should not surprise anyone, as it is well known that the poor pay very little in taxes, are eligible for tax credits that may be larger than their tax payment, and use many government services. **The large tax subsidies and wage impacts on the poor are not justified by the supposed economic benefits claimed by supporters of amnesty and large-scale unskilled migration.** Often, the impact of a particular immigration policy on the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is used to argue that even illegal aliens benefit the economy. **GDP measures the total amount of production of goods and services,** meaning that even a person who earned or spent just one dollar in the U.S. last year technically made a contribution to its GDP. **A GDP increase does little to measure the accompanying benefits or consequences. The extremely small GDP increase that results from illegal or unskilled legal immigration does not translate into improvements in the standards of living of the quality of life for most Americans,** especially the poor. The immigration of legal and illegal unskilled workers has contributed to the overall size of the U.S. economy, but this has not translated into overall economic benefits for Americans. In fact, even **the estimates cited by those who tout an economic windfall from immigration often reveal less than impressive results when put in context. A 2008 study** by the Perryman Group **estimated that the economic impact of illegal immigration supports 2.8 million permanent jobs** in the U.S. Using the Pew Research Centers estimates of 8.3 million illegal aliens in the workforce, **this works out to one permanent job for every three illegal workers. Their claimed \$245 billion contribution** to the GDP **amounts to less than \$20,000 per illegal worker**.<sup>.67\*</sup> Illegal aliens increase the overall size of the pie (creating more potential profit for the corporations that fund pro-amnesty groups), but they do not improve each individuals slice.

# **Immigration Bad -- Mexico**



## Immigration Bad: Huge Costs on Mexico

### **ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION IMPOSES HUGE COSTS ON MEXICO AS WELL**

Devon Roepcke, Law Student, 2009, "'Should I Stay or Should I Go': Preventing Illegal Immigration by Creating New Opportunity in Mexico through Microcredit Lending," California Western International Law Journal, 38 Cal. W. Int'l L.J. 455, p. 456-7

I was standing at the staging area where thousands of Mexicans who enter the United States illegally each year begin their trek. From here, it is a three-day walk through the desert to make it safely past the U.S. Border Patrol. Every year hundreds of people die trying to cross. All of this, just to stand in front of Home Depot and fight for a job making eight dollars an hour.

The current debate over immigration is fueled by concerns that illegal immigrants cause a loss of U.S. citizens' jobs and a decrease in U.S. citizens' salaries. Additionally, the cost of providing services to immigrants, both legal and undocumented, exceeds the amount immigrants pay in state taxes. Illegal immigration is also a problem because the fact that millions of people circumvent the legal immigration system contradicts and challenges the ideals of this nation of laws. While the American public is aware of the domestic problems associated with illegal immigration, the flow of people from Mexico to the United States has devastating effects on Mexico as well.

### **IMMIGRATION TAKES HUGE TOLL ON MEXICO -- BRAIN DRAIN**

Devon Roepcke, Law Student, 2009, "'Should I Stay or Should I Go': Preventing Illegal Immigration by Creating New Opportunity in Mexico through Microcredit Lending," California Western International Law Journal, 38 Cal. W. Int'l L.J. 455, p. 477-8

Contrary to some popular sentiment, preventing illegal immigration is not anti-Mexican. In addition to creating problems in the United States, illegal immigration creates problems in Mexico as well. As a result of mass emigration, Mexico is suffering from a "brain drain," a loss of human capital, and is facing the threat of losing a generation of youth.

Historically, Mexico's economy has relied on its cheap and plentiful labor to compete in the global marketplace. This reliance is threatened by the mass exodus of immigrants seeking higher wages in the United States. The problem created by the number of workers being lost to immigration is exacerbated by the quality of workers being lost. Currently, there is a widespread misconception that the people who immigrate illegally to the United States are the poorest and least skilled of the population. On the contrary, the level of education of migrants coming from Mexico has risen in recent decades. According to one study, Mexican immigrants to the United States have higher education levels than the mean level of education of their communities of origin. The individuals that Mexico is losing to illegal immigration are seeking opportunity because they are both motivated and skilled. This is evident in the results of a survey showing that ninety-five percent of the Mexican immigrants to the United States were employed in Mexico before they left. With Mexico's human capital considered one of its greatest assets, this loss is frightening when considering Mexico's future.

# **Immigration Bad – Overpopulation**

## CIR causes Opop

### **CIR leads to immediate population explosion**

**Ting, '13** [2/8/13, Jan Ting is professor of law at Temple University in Philadelphia, "Just say no to amnesty redux", <http://www.cis.org/OpedsandArticles/Jan-Ting-Just-Say-No-to-Amnesty>]

**The so-called comprehensive immigration reform proposed by a group of senators and President Obama amounts to immediate amnesty for millions of immigration-law violators, and the lifting of limits on future immigration, with some window dressing designed to assuage skeptical voters. We've seen this act before. The 1986 amnesty promised to fix the immigration problem by granting amnesty to three million immigration-law violators, strengthening the border, and penalizing employers for hiring illegal immigrants. It didn't work then, and it won't work now. We know that merely strengthening the border and threatening employers who hire illegal immigrants are not sufficient to limit the numbers of foreigners seeking a better life in the United States.**

An **amnesty simply attracts more illegal immigrants, now conservatively estimated at 11 million. Illegal immigrants make a rational choice when they decide to violate our immigration laws.** They weigh the costs, including the risks of getting caught, against the benefits of a better life. **We attract more illegal immigrants by reducing the costs through discretionary enforcement and improving the benefits through amnesty.** The Pew Research Center estimates that **the U.S. population will increase from 300 million to more than 400 million by 2050, mainly because of immigration, and that's if we do nothing. Another amnesty would accelerate that rapid population growth. Where will an additional 100 million people obtain schooling and health care and energy to heat their homes? Where will they drive and park their cars?**

Both my parents were immigrants. I respect and admire immigrants, as we all should. But that's not the issue. **The issue is: How many? The United States is experiencing a protracted period of unemployment that is still hovering around 8 percent. Prolonged unemployment is a tragedy** of broken lives, broken families, foreclosed homes, and life without health insurance. Legal immigrants, including those amnestied, will be able to compete with unemployed Americans for jobs. **If we're willing to accept unlimited immigration in order to keep wages low and corporate profits high, we should just say so and stop paying for all the immigration enforcement window dressing. But if we want to set and enforce a limit on immigration, we have to be willing to say no to would-be immigrants** who look a lot like our own ancestors, not because there's anything wrong with them, **but simply because admitting them would exceed our legal limit.** If those immigrants come anyway in violation of our immigration laws, **we have to be willing to deport them, in order to raise the costs and decrease the benefits of illegal immigration, and to deter future immigration-law violators.** That's not an easy choice. But **I think the American people want to enforce a numerical limit on immigration, even if it means turning away people who look like our ancestors.** To do so, they will have to repeatedly contact their members of Congress to tell them to stop the amnesty.

### **CIR is a path to amnesty---leads to floods of immigrants**

**Nunez, '13** [2/17/13, Peter Nunez is a Prof of Political Science @ the University of San Diego, "Immigration: Amnesty plan a bad idea", <http://www.cis.org/OpedsandArticles/Nunez-Union-Tribune-021613-Obama>]

**When President George W. Bush tried to ram through the McCain-Kennedy "comprehensive" immigration reform proposal, the American people rose in opposition and brought the bill to a screeching halt.** Why? Because ordinary Americans understood then what a sham "comprehensive" immigration reform was, just as they understand now that the current proposals put forward by President Obama and the "Gang of Eight" senators are virtually the same as Bush/McCain/Kennedy. **"Comprehensive" immigration reform, as envisioned in the**

**two similar plans, consists essentially of two components: an amnesty for up to 11 million illegal aliens, and enhanced guest worker provisions that would allow employers to import cheaper workers from outside the U.S., regardless of the impact on the domestic work force.**

The only thing new in the Obama/Gang of Eight proposals is that the “path to citizenship” will not go into effect until after the border is secure, which raises several problems. First, how do we determine when the border is “secure,” and who makes that decision? The short answer: Politicians will decide, without any objective way to measure border security. **But of greatest concern is the so-called “trigger,” that we are told will delay the “path to citizenship” until the border is secure. This is an illusion meant to fool the public into believing that amnesty will only take place after the border is secure.** Nothing could be further from the truth. **Because on Day One, every one of the 11 million illegal aliens will be eligible for a temporary document allowing them to stay and work in the U.S., their two most important goals. Despite the “trigger,” all 11 million receive what they want at the beginning of the process, not the end, and there will be no way to take that away from them.** Does anyone seriously believe that after they have been living here for years that the government would say, “Sorry, but we cannot secure the border, you will all have to leave now”? That the president and eight senators would propose such a transparently fraudulent idea brings discredit to all of them. **Amnesty, or a “path to citizenship” as its proponents call it, is bad for a number of reasons.** First, it rewards illegal conduct, never a good idea, because it erodes the concept of the rule of law. **But even worse, it encourages future illegal immigration, by demonstrating to the 4 billion people living in poverty around the world that the U.S. is not serious about enforcing its laws, and that it is worth the effort to immigrate illegally so they will benefit from the next amnesty. We gave amnesty to 2.7 million illegal aliens after the 1986 “reform,”** but there have been smaller, less publicized “amnesties” handed out to particular groups since then, and the president wants amnesty for another 11 million. **What message are we sending to those who would love nothing better than to live and work in this bountiful country? “Come on down,”** as the announcer used to say on “The Price is Right.” **But there is a third evil in an amnesty, and that is the effect it has on future legal immigration. Under current law, every one of those 11 million will be able to sponsor family members to immigrate legally.** Based upon the 1986 amnesty, on average **five legal immigrants were added to the population for each person who received amnesty. So the 11 million could add another 55 million legal immigrants in the next two decades. Is population growth at that level good for the national interest?** The Obama/Gang of Eight proposals promise some sort of workplace enforcement to make sure that illegal aliens are not able to find work. Why should we believe them? **The 1986 law promised workplace enforcement but failed miserably.** Since then, proposals to improve workplace enforcement, such as E-Verify, a simple system that allows employers to verify employee eligibility, have been opposed by all the same groups that today support amnesty. \

## **Link booster---poor enforcement**

**Krikorian, '13** [1/17/13, Mark Krikorian is the executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, a think-tank in Washington, D.C. that promotes stricter immigration control, “Missing the point on immigration”, <http://www.cis.org/OpedsandArticles/Washington-Post-Mark-Krikorian-Missing-the-Point>]

**A recent report on immigration enforcement from the Migration Policy Institute, touted in these pages by one of its authors [“Beyond secure borders,” op-ed, Jan. 7], was both mistaken and missed the point.**

The news release about the report announced: “The U.S. government spends more on federal immigration enforcement than on all other principal federal criminal law enforcement agencies combined.” This finding was the basis of widespread media coverage and will, as intended, be cited in the coming congressional debate over President Obama’s plans to legalize the illegal-immigrant population and increase legal immigration beyond the level of 1 million people each year.

**The political purpose of the report is to enable supporters of the president’s approach, both Democrats and Republicans, to claim that the “enforcement first” demand that sank President George W. Bush’s amnesty effort in 2007 has finally been satisfied, so no legitimate objection remains to “moving beyond” enforcement. The first problem with this is that the report’s**

**central claim is false. As the names of the relevant agencies suggest — Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE); Customs and Border Protection (CBP) — much of what they do has nothing to do with immigration.** Recent ICE news releases, for instance, highlight a drug seizure, the sentencing of a child pornographer and a guilty plea by someone trying to smuggle dinosaur fossils. Important activities, no doubt, but ones clearly unrelated to immigration enforcement. Beyond that, the report focuses on the wrong thing. In typical Washington bureaucratic fashion, it confuses resource inputs with policy results. **There has indeed been a significant increase in funding for immigration enforcement, and this increase was desperately needed after decades of neglect — something that became undeniable after 9/11.** But to claim, as Doris Meissner wrote in The Post, **that a certain percentage increase in appropriated funds has allowed the nation to build “a formidable immigration enforcement machinery” is incorrect. The report suggests that the billions spent on immigration enforcement have reached a point of diminishing returns.** But take the example of the U.S. Border Patrol, a CBP agency. The number of agents has doubled over the past decade, to more than 21,000. **That seems impressive until you consider that the Border Patrol is still smaller than the New York Police Department — and has 8,000 miles to monitor.** It’s certainly possible that the Border Patrol doesn’t need more agents, but that’s not evident merely by doubling the previously small number of agents. Something similar can be said of deportations: **As the report and administration spokesmen have pointed out, the number of people deported** (technically, “removed”) is **at a record level: about 400,000 per year. But the steady growth in the number of deportations, starting in the Clinton administration, came to a halt with Obama’s inauguration.** Perhaps 400,000 deportations a year, **out of 11 million to 12 million illegal immigrants, is enough — but not just because it’s a “record.” And although one might be able to argue that the U.S. immigration enforcement machinery is adequate at the border or for deportations, fundamental pieces are still not in place despite the money that has been spent. For instance, the online E-Verify screening system is still not used for all new hires.** The Social Security Administration and the IRS know **the identities and locations of millions of people who are in this country illegally but shield them based on a fanciful interpretation of privacy law.** The United States has only the most rudimentary system for tracking the departures of foreign visitors — **and if you don’t know who has left the country, you can’t know who is still here. This is important because nearly half of the illegal-immigrant population came here legally but then didn’t leave. These are not trivial, last-minute agenda items designed to postpone consideration of an amnesty. An immigration enforcement machinery that lacks these elements is simply incomplete.** And any law enforcement infrastructure is only as effective as the use to which it is put. The Obama administration has made clear **that it views immigration violations as secondary matters, like not wearing a seat belt, which can lead to a citation only if some other, “real” law is violated.** The most lavishly funded, gold-plated **enforcement system in the world can’t make up for systematic nullification of the immigration law through prosecutorial discretion, deferred action and other means used by this administration to protect illegal immigrants.**

## **Immigration increases global CO2 emissions**

**Camarota and Kolankiewicz, '08** [August 2008, Leon Kolankiewicz is an environmental scientist and national natural resources planner. He has a B.S. in forestry and wildlife management from Virginia Tech and an M.S. in environmental planning and natural resources management from the University of British Columbia, Steven A. Camarota is the senior demographic analyst at the Center of Immigration Studies]

**The findings of this study indicate that future levels of immigration will have a significant impact on efforts to reduce global CO2 emissions. Immigration to the United States significantly increases world-wide CO2 emissions because it transfers population from lower-polluting parts of the world to the United States, which is a higher-polluting country. On average immigrants increase their emissions four-fold by coming to America.** Among the findings: The

estimated CO2 emissions of the average immigrant (legal or illegal) in the United States are 18 percent less than those of the average native-born American. However, immigrants in the United States produce an estimated four times more CO2 in the United States as they would have in their countries of origin. **U.S. immigrants produce an estimated 637 million metric tons of CO2 emissions annually — equal to Great Britain and Sweden combined.** The estimated 637 tons of CO2 U.S. immigrants produce annually is 482 million tons more than they would have produced had they remained in their home countries. If the 482 million ton increase in global CO2 emissions caused by immigration to the United States were a separate country, it would rank 10th in the world in emissions. **The impact of immigration to the United States on global emissions is equal to approximately 5 percent of the increase in annual world-wide CO2 emissions since 1980**

## **Immigration key factor in population growth – must reign it in to prevent environmental catastrophe**

**Federation for American Immigration Reform, '9** [September 2009, Federation for American Immigration Reform is a national, nonprofit, public-interest, membership organization of concerned citizens who share a common belief that our nation's immigration policies must be reformed to serve the national interest. FAIR seeks to improve border security, to stop illegal immigration, and to promote immigration levels consistent with the national interest—more traditional rates of about 300,000 a year. With more than 250,000 members and supporters nationwide, FAIR is a non-partisan group whose membership runs the gamut from liberal to conservative. Our grassroots networks help concerned citizens use their voices to speak up for effective, sensible immigration policies that work for America's best interests. FAIR's publications and research are used by academics and government officials in preparing new legislation. National and international media regularly turn to us to understand the latest immigration developments and to shed light on this complex subject. FAIR has been called to testify on immigration bills before Congress more than any organization in America., “The United States Is Already Overpopulated” <http://www.fairus.org/issue/the-united-states-is-already-overpopulated>]

**The United States is already overpopulated in the sense that we are consuming our national ecological resources at an unsustainable rate. Our growing dependence on foreign energy supplies is a prime example.** We now depend on foreign imports for 28.8 percent of our energy consumption: two-thirds of our petroleum products and about one-sixth of our natural gas consumption.<sup>1</sup> **Because of the abundance of our nation's resources, we have long been careless about our level of consumption, but it is the precipitous rise in the U.S. population over the last four decades that has resulted in our outstripping of our national resources.** We are living beyond our means and are doing so increasingly as our population expands. This is a serious problem with major implications for future generations. **This imbalance cannot be remedied without curbing both population growth** and consumption as well as increasing productivity. **We must become more sensitive to the issue of consumption of finite, non-renewable resources and to the limits of renewable resources.** **Reining in population growth requires immigration reduction,** and that objective should be at the top of the agenda for policy makers because it is

the most immediate and the most amenable to change through public policy. In 1972, **the Presidential Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended population stabilization,** concluding: “The health of our country does not depend on [population growth], nor does the vitality of business nor the welfare of the average person.” The Commission's recommendation was based on the 1970 Census finding that the population had reached more than 203 million residents. Since 1970, the U.S. population has added more than 100 million residents, about a 50 percent growth in fewer than 40 years. As the root cause of land and resource shortages, ecological degradation and urban congestion, sustained and growing overpopulation is jeopardizing the natural inheritance we leave for future generations. **The United States has a national environmental policy but no national population policy. As a result, environmental policy decisions are made in a vacuum. By determining the long-term ecological carrying**

**capacity of the United States, Congress would be able to make informed decisions regarding the impact of U.S. population change on achievement of long-term environmental objectives. This report does not attempt to quantify the carrying capacity of the United States; it simply explains how current population growth is damaging the U.S. environment and lowering the average American's quality of life.**

## **Immigrants cause overpopulation that causes an environmental crisis**

Political Research Associates a progressive think tank February 2002 <The Defending , devoted to supporting movements that are building a more just and inclusive democratic society. Expose movements, institutions, and ideologies that undermine human rights. <http://www.publiceye.org/ark/immigrants/pdf/defending-immigrant-rights/Section%203%20-%20Issues%20&%20Views.pdf> >

POPULATION GROWTH Virtually all the anti-immigrant organizations and spokespeople use population growth in the United States as a keystone in their views about immigrants. They say: ■ Paul Ehrlich was right (The Population Bomb, 1968) when he forecast an environmental crisis as a result of overpopulation. ■ Rapid immigration growth is a main cause of the population problem in the United States. ■ Overflow from developing countries, which have by far the fastest population growth rates in the world, contributes to the United States' "out of control" growth rate. ■ We have far exceeded the optimum population size for the United States, and we are now too crowded. ■ We can't solve the world's population problem by "being nice" and accepting more immigrants. Examples: Roy Beck. (1996). The Case Against Immigration. New York: W.W. Norton. ch. 1, "A Nation of (Too Many) Immigrants?"; "Why Excess Immigration Damages the Environment." (1992). Balance DATA, no. 27a, June. Washington, DC: Population-Environment Balance; Jason Din-Alt. (1997). "The Environmental Impact of Immigration into the United States." Focus, v. 4, n. 2. Washington, DC: Carrying Capacity Network.

## **US has a moral obligation to help stop global warming, this is impossible if US population continues to grow**

Cafaro,09, environmental policy and ethics professor at Colorado State University(Winthrop Staples III, Philip Cafaro, environmental policy and ethics professor at Colorado State University , Center for Immigration Studies, "The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration to the United States", June 2009, <http://www.cis.org/EnvironmentalArgument>)

A growing population increases America's large environmental footprint beyond our borders and our disproportionate role in stressing global environmental systems. Consider global warming. Nothing mortifies American environmentalists more than our country's failure to show leadership in dealing with this, the most important environmental challenge facing the world in the 21st century. As the world's largest economy and historically largest greenhouse gas emitter, the United States has a moral obligation to lead the world in meeting this challenge. A good start would be striving to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels (the Kyoto protocol, rejected by the United States, calls for an initial reduction of 5 percent below 1990 levels). Meeting even this modest objective will prove difficult, however, if our population continues to grow.

## **Overpopulation and population growth are key to global and domestic environmental problems**

Cafaro,09, environmental policy and ethics professor at Colorado State University(Winthrop Staples III, Philip Cafaro, environmental policy and ethics professor at Colorado State University , Center for Immigration Studies, "The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration to the United States", June 2009, <http://www.cis.org/EnvironmentalArgument>)

However, re-engineering the world's largest economy and changing the consumption patterns of hundreds of millions of people are immense undertakings that will be difficult, expensive and (we may assume) only partly successful. Al Gore has stated that global warming is "the moral challenge of our time;" many of us agree with him. But if Americans are serious about doing our part to limit global warming, the "multiplier effect" of population growth is too important to ignore. Again, look at the numbers. Between 1990 and 2003, U.S. per capita CO2 emissions increased 3.2 percent, while total U.S. CO2 emissions increased 20.2 percent.<sup>12</sup> Why the discrepancy? During that same period, America's population increased 16.1 percent.<sup>13</sup> More people drove more cars, built more houses, etc. Population growth greatly increased total emissions, and it is total emissions, not per capita emissions, that quantify our full contribution to global warming. Before we go on, please note: we do not claim that by itself, halting U.S. population growth will solve sprawl, or meet our global warming responsibilities. On the contrary, Americans must reduce our per capita consumption of land and energy in order to meet these challenges. On the other hand, the evidence clearly shows that recent population growth has increased Americans' total land and energy consumption and made these problems even worse. Americans must address both overconsumption and overpopulation if we hope to create a sustainable society and contribute to a sustainable world.<sup>14</sup> Clearly premises two and three are true: U.S. population growth contributes seriously to both domestic and global environmental problems. Can we go further, and state that reining in population growth is essential to environmental success? Yes, we can.

### **We are morally obligated to address environmental "problem". Immigration is key to solving environmental problem**

Cafaro,<sup>09</sup> environmental policy and ethics professor at Colorado State University(Winthrop Staples III, Philip Cafaro, environmental policy and ethics professor at Colorado State University , Center for Immigration Studies, "The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration to the United States", June 2009, <http://www.cis.org/EnvironmentalArgument>)

We are morally obligated to address our environmental problems and become good global environmental citizens. We will not argue for this premise here, or provide a detailed statement of what it amounts to in practice. Environmentalism means many things to many people. Still, there are two general goals to which most environmentalists subscribe: (1) creating societies that leave sufficient natural resources for future human generations to live good lives; and (2) sharing the landscape generously with nonhuman beings. Let's call this "generous sustainability," to differentiate it from more selfish, economically-defined conceptions of sustainability.<sup>16</sup> We believe a moral commitment to "generous sustainability" captures the core of environmentalism. Numerous surveys in recent decades have shown that a large majority of Americans, from across the political spectrum, support these environmental goals. A commitment to generous sustainability is also explicitly endorsed by almost all philosophers writing about environmental ethics today. However, trying to convince skeptics of the truth of our fifth premise would require an article in itself (or perhaps a whole book!).<sup>17</sup> Here, then, we take this moral commitment as a given, for the purpose of our argument. To sum up, we claim that premises 1 through 5 of "the environmental argument for reducing immigration" are true — or at least that any serious environmentalist needs to treat them as true. But our conclusion necessarily follows from them. Therefore, our conclusion is also true: we should limit immigration into the United States to the extent needed to stop U.S. population growth.

### **Immigration causes overpopulation which leads to US degrading the environment. To reduce damage immigration must be reduced**



Anthony, 02 (Nancy Anthony, President of Fernwood Advisors, Inc., an investment advisory firm 2002 [How Immigration Hastens Destruction of the Environment October [http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=16924&security=1601&news\\_iv\\_ctrl=1009](http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=16924&security=1601&news_iv_ctrl=1009)]

But it is not just that immigrants' individual rates of environment degradation goes up after they get here (although that is obviously a serious problem in itself). The worst thing about immigration for the environment is that it is causing overpopulation. Environment degradation is not simply about the rate at which individuals degrade the environment; it is also a result of how many people there are. The more people there are in the United States, the more we as a whole degrade the environment. This is the problem of population growth, and immigration worsens it severely. Immigration is responsible for over forty percent of the population growth since 1970. The United States will never be able to level off or reduce the amount of overall damage we do to the environment unless we can get the size of our population to level off. But the size of our population can never level off as long as we continue to have the heavy immigration we have now. For sake of our environment, we need a moratorium on immigration.

# Environment impact

## **Risks extinction from environmental destruction**

**Kolankiewicz, '10** [3/1/10, Leon Kolankiewicz is an environmental scientist and national natural resources planner. He has a B.S. in forestry and wildlife management from Virginia Tech and an M.S. in environmental planning and natural resources management from the University of British Columbia, "From Big to Bigger How Mass Immigration and Population Growth Have Exacerbated America's Ecological Footprint",

<http://www.progressivesforimmigrationreform.org/publication/from-big-to-bigger-how-mass-immigration-and-population-growth-have-exacerbated-americas-ecological-footprint/>]

What bearing do these "inconvenient truths" have on America's Ecological Footprint? In a nutshell — everything. **Current immigration levels are enlarging the already enormous U.S. Ecological Footprint and ecological deficit. With the U.S. population booming by more than 10 percent a decade, the only way to maintain** — much less reduce the current, unacceptable size of our EF is to reduce our per capita consumption every decade by

more than 10 percent — **not just for one or five decades, but indefinitely, for as long as population growth continues.** One doesn't have to be a physicist or a political scientist to recognize that an achievement of this

magnitude would be technically and politically unrealistic, if not impossible. **America is already in ecological overshoot, and massive population growth driven by high immigration rates only serves to exacerbate the situation.** Figure 11 shows current trends with respect to the Ecological Footprint and Biocapacity of the

United States from 1961 through 2006.<sup>37</sup> **As is evident from the crossing lines in this graph, America's EF first surpassed its biocapacity in the late 1960s,** just prior to the first Earth Day. Since then **the gap or ecological deficit has only continued to widen.**

While the addition of each new American does not necessarily increase our per capita or per person (as opposed to our aggregate) EF — only increased per capita resource consumption and CO2 generation does that, it does directly decrease our per capita biocapacity, and **thus increases our ecological deficit.**

**Population growth does this in two ways. First, given a fixed biocapacity — that is, a land base that is demonstrably finite and constant,** with fixed maximum acreages of potential cropland, grazing land, forestland, and fishing grounds — it is a simple mathematical reality that adding more people who depend on this ecologically productive land base reduces per capita biocapacity. **Second, the more than three million new Americans added every year require space and area in which to live, work, play, shop, and attend school.**

**As open space is converted into the "built-up land" category,** some combination of forestland, cropland, and grazing land is inevitably developed. (In the 1950s, Orange County, California, home to Disneyland, was touted by developers as "Smog Free Orange County," but by the 1990s, after four decades of relentless sprawl development to accommodate Southern California's multiplying millions, it became known as "Orange Free Smog County"). **In this way, our country's**

**biocapacity is steadily and inexorably diminished by a growing population.** The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS's) National Resources Inventory (NRI) estimated that the United States lost 44 million acres of cropland, 12 million acres of pastureland, and 11 million acres of rangeland from 1982 to 1997, for a total loss to our agricultural land base of 67 million acres over this 15-year period.<sup>38</sup> (One explanation of the much higher acreage of lost cropland than pastureland and rangeland was that a larger fraction of the cropland acreage was not "lost" per se, but deliberately "retired" from active production into the so-called Conservation Reserve Program or CRP, a program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farm Service Agency. These were lands of marginal quality and high erodibility, lands on which modern, intensive agriculture is unsustainable). All 49 states inventoried lost cropland. Overall cropland losses continued in the next NRI published in

2007.<sup>39</sup> **The impacts of the loss of this land extend beyond agriculture. The USDA has estimated that each person added to the U.S. population requires slightly more than one acre of land for urbanization and highways.**<sup>40</sup> Clearly, more land is required as more people are added to our population. A comparison of

NRI acreage — 25 million acres of newly developed land over the 1982-1997 period and 67 million acres of agricultural land lost shows that development per se is not responsible for all or even half of agricultural land loss. Arable land is also subject to other natural and manmade phenomena such as soil erosion (from both water and wind), salinization, and waterlogging that can rob its

fertility, degrade its productivity and eventually force its retirement or increase its dependency on ever greater quantities of costly inputs like (fossil-fuel derived) nitrogen fertilizers. Arguably, however, much of these losses are due to over-exploitation by intensive agricultural practices needed to constantly raise agricultural productivity (yield per acre) in order to provide ever more food for America's and the world's growing populations and meat-rich diets. **Thus, the potent combination of relentless development and land degradation from soil erosion and other factors is reducing America's productive agricultural land base even as the demands on that same land base from a growing population are increasing.** If the rates of agricultural land loss that have prevailed in recent years were to continue to 2050, the nation will have lost 53 million of its remaining 377 million acres of cropland, or 14 percent, even as the U.S. population grows by 43 percent from 308 million to 440 million.<sup>41</sup> Continuing on to 2100, the discrepancy between booming population numbers and declining cropland acreage widens even further (Figure 12). The Census Bureau's "middle series" projection (made in the year 2000) is 571 million, more than a doubling of U.S. population in 2000.<sup>42</sup> (The "highest serious" projection was 1.2 billion, and actual growth since these projections were made has been between the middle and highest series). If the same rate of cropland loss were to continue, the United States would lose approximately 106 million acres of its remaining 377 million acres of cropland, or nearly 30 percent. Cropland per capita, that is, the acreage of land to grow grains and other crops for each resident, would decline from 1.4 acres in 1997 to 0.47 acres in 2100, a 66 percent reduction. If this occurs, biotechnology will need to work miracles to raise yields per acre in order to maintain the sort of diet Americans have come to expect. These ominous, divergent trends — an increasing population and declining arable land, have actually led some scientists to think the unthinkable: that one day America may no longer be able to feed itself, let alone boast a food surplus for export to the world. In the 1990s, Cornell University agricultural and food scientists David and Marcia Pimentel and Mario Giampietro of the Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione in Rome, Italy, argued that by approximately 2025, the United States would most likely cease to be a food exporter, and that food grown in this country would be needed for domestic consumption. These findings suggest that by 2050, the amount of arable land per capita may have dropped to the point that, "the diet of the average American will, of necessity, include more grains, legumes, tubers, fruits and vegetables, and significantly less animal products."<sup>43</sup> While this might, in fact, constitute a healthier diet both for terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and for many calorically and cholesterol-challenged Americans, it would also represent a significant loss of dietary choice. As nations get wealthier, they tend to "move up the food chain" in the phrase of the Earth Policy Institute's Lester Brown, that is they consume higher trophic level, more ecologically demanding and damaging meat and dairy products, but were these predictions to hold true, Americans, for better or worse, would be moving in the opposite direction. From 2005 to 2006, the U.S. per capita ecological deficit widened from 10.9 to 11.3 acres, continuing the long-term trend depicted in Figure 11. Assuming the Census Bureau's official population projections for 2050 actually do happen, the U.S. population would be 43 percent larger than at present. Even if there were no further increase in the U.S. per capita EF, which is, as can be seen from the 45-year trend in Figure 11, a rather generous assumption, a 43 percent increase in the U.S. population would correspond to a further 43 percent reduction in biocapacity per capita, even without the types of continuing land and resource degradation just discussed above for cropland. The 2006 U.S. biocapacity was 10.9 global acres (ga) per capita. By 2050, if current U.S. demographic trends and projections hold, this will have been reduced to 6.2 ga per capita. If the per capita American EF of consumption were to remain at the 2006 value of 22.3 ga, the ecological deficit in 2050 would increase to 16.1 ga per capita. **In essence, if we American "Bigfeet" do not opt for a different demographic path than the one we are treading now, Ecological Footprint analysis indicates unequivocally that we will continue plodding ever deeper into the forbidden zone of Ecological Overshoot, trampling our prospects for a sustainable future.** Incidentally, **we would also be trampling the survival prospects for many hundreds of endangered species with which we share our country.** These birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, reptiles, butterflies, mussels, and other taxa are menaced with extinction by our aggressive exploitation of nearly every ecological niche, nook, and cranny. **In nature, no organism in overshoot remains there for long. Sooner or later, ecosystem and/or population collapse ensues. Are we humans, because of our unique scientific acumen, immune from the laws of nature that dictate the implacable terms of existence to all other species on the planet?** Our political, economic, and cultural elites seem to think so, and en masse, we certainly act so. **Yet ironically, many scientists themselves believe otherwise: that all-too-human hubris, unless checked by collective wisdom and self-restraint, will prove to be our undoing, and that civilization as we know it may unravel.**<sup>44</sup>

## **A2: Human Rights Leadership**

Many human rights violations need to be solved before immigration to regain human rights leadership – Even their authors agree

Powell, Associate Prof. of Law, 08

(Catherine, American Constitutional Society, “Human Rights at Home: A Domestic Policy Blueprint for the New Administration”, 10/08 <http://www.acslaw.org/files/C%20Powell%20Blueprint.pdf>)

RECOMMENDATIONS To advance American values and interests more effectively, this Blueprint makes a series of short-term and long-term recommendations for the new Administration. Briefly summarized, they are as follows. Actions During the First 100 Days • The President should issue an Executive Order to reconstitute and revitalize an Interagency Working Group on Human Rights which will serve as a coordinating body among federal agencies and departments for the promotion and respect of human rights and the implementation of human rights obligations in U.S. domestic policy. Such a working group was created by Executive Order 13107 issued by President Bill Clinton on Human Rights Day in December 1998, but it was effectively disbanded during the administration of President George W. Bush. While it was nominally replaced by a new policy coordination committee, the program of action laid out in the Executive Order was never implemented. The next President should issue a new Executive Order modeled on E.O. 13107, but containing an expanded list of relevant agencies as well as other refinements to ensure the success of the new Working Group. A proposed Executive Order with these revisions is attached to this Blueprint as Appendix B (with the proposed amendments to E.O. 13107 indicated). 4 • To underscore the new President’s commitment to leadership on human rights, he should speak out forcefully, early in his tenure, in support of human rights principles both abroad and at home. The occasion could be the Inaugural Address, the first State of the Union Address, or a separate, high-profile speech devoted to this topic. To demonstrate the seriousness of his commitment, the address should be accompanied by concrete action – such as issuance of the Executive Order described above. • From the outset of his Administration, the new President should ensure that human rights principles are incorporated into the mainstream of U.S. policymaking. He can do this by, for example, ensuring that individuals with a demonstrated commitment to human rights are selected for key appointments in the Department of Justice, Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, National Security Council, and elsewhere, and by ensuring that the people in high-level positions in his Administration share a broad vision of the role of human rights in U.S. policy. • The new Administration should also seize opportunities for action on specific treaty obligations early on. For example, there will be an opportunity for action in early 2009 in connection with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (the Race Convention). In early 2008, the U.S. reported on its record under the Race Convention to the U.N. Committee that monitors the Convention. On March 5, 2008, the Committee issued its Concluding Observations on that report, requesting additional information from the U.S. on steps taken to address racial profiling, life sentences without parole for juveniles, Katrina recovery, and other matters. The U.S. will need to report back to the committee in early 2009, and this provides an opportunity for the new Administration to demonstrate its commitment to the Race Convention with a timely and complete report. Beyond the First 100 Days • The new Administration should build and support two distinct types of human rights institutions: an implementation body and a monitoring body. o Implementation Body. Following issuance of an Executive Order revitalizing the Interagency Working Group on Human Rights (as outlined above), the Working Group should become an effective focal point for implementing human rights domestically. With high-level leadership in the White House, the Working Group should play a proactive role, crossing the domestic-international divide by ensuring that U.S. international human rights responsibilities are implemented and coordinated

among all relevant executive branch agencies and departments. o Monitoring Body. In addition to establishing an effective implementation body, the new Administration should work toward the creation of a human rights monitoring body that would be established and financed by the government but would operate as an independent, nonpartisan entity. This new body should take the form of a national human rights commission, which would provide expertise and oversight to ensure human rights progress in the United States. The new Administration should support legislation to establish such a body, which could be created by restructuring and strengthening the existing U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and converting it into an effective U.S. Commission on Civil and Human Rights. The Commission should be empowered to: issue reports and recommendations to the executive branch and Congress; contribute to the reports the United States submits to international bodies; develop programs for teaching and training on human rights issues; and conduct investigations and hearings into human rights complaints. The new Administration should support legislation to establish such a body. • The Administration should support the ratification, accompanied by fully adequate implementing legislation, of important human rights treaties to which the United States is not yet a party, as well as legislation to implement ratified treaties. The new Administration should support ratification and full implementation of (in alphabetical order): the American Convention on Human Rights; the Convention on Disappearances; the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW); the Convention on the Rights of the Child; the Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities; the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances; International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families; and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture. In addition, the new President should work with Congress to develop legislation to implement the treaties that have already been ratified. The United States has declared many of these treaties non-self-executing. Thus, implementing legislation is needed to effectuate rights guaranteed by the Race Convention (to address the persistence of discrimination) as well as rights guaranteed by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (which, among things, includes the rights of prisoners as well as suspects detained in the course of U.S. counterterrorism efforts). • The new Administration should undertake periodic review of reservations, understandings, and declarations (RUDs) that the United States has adopted in ratifying treaties, and should take steps to withdraw those that are unnecessary and harmful. The United States has attached numerous RUDs to human rights treaties upon ratification, which often limit the impact of a treaty. Over time, the only RUDs that should be retained are those that are strictly required because of irreconcilable differences between U.S. constitutional law and treaty law. • The Administration should take steps to support the judicial branch in its efforts to recognize and honor human rights principles. The new President should nominate judges who will follow the rule of law, which includes recognition that ratified treaties and customary international law are the law of the land. Additionally, the Administration should support judicial human rights education and support the role of courts in providing full and appropriate hearings on allegations of human rights violations. 6 By adopting these recommendations, the new Administration will embrace our American roots as architects of the first rights revolution and strengthen the leadership position of the United States in the world as chief promoter of human rights.



# **Agriculture Answers**

# INC

## **US agriculture is strong now**

**Caspers-Simmet 2-24-15** [Jean, writer for AgriNews.com, "US economy slowly improving, farm economy weathering low prices," [http://www.agrinews.com/news/iowa\\_news/us-economy-slowly-improving-farm-economy-weathering-low-prices/article\\_ef6f69b6-b9bb-5e2c-9734-4ee78c3ece79.html](http://www.agrinews.com/news/iowa_news/us-economy-slowly-improving-farm-economy-weathering-low-prices/article_ef6f69b6-b9bb-5e2c-9734-4ee78c3ece79.html)]

**The farm economy**, which experienced some of its highest real income levels since the 1970s from 2009-13, **is weathering lower crop prices**, said David Oppedahl, senior business economist with the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Oppedahl, who directs the Chicago Fed's survey of agricultural banks on land values and credit conditions, spoke at last week's Money Smart Ag Conference at Hawkeye Community College. With economic turmoil in other parts of the world, the exchange value of the U.S. dollar has strengthened but it is still far below its 2002 peak, Oppedahl said. U.S. trade is exceeding earlier peaks and while imports are greater than exports, the margin is tightening with oil and agriculture playing a role. A stronger dollar means U.S. exports are more expensive, which is a factor contributing to USDA's projection that agricultural exports will be down in 2015, although **ag exports, which have been at record levels, will continue to be strong**. "With a rising middle class around the world and more mouths to feed, **agricultural exports will continue to grow in the long term**," Oppedahl said. What happens in agriculture is important to the Chicago Federal Reserve because it remains the backbone of the economy, Oppedahl said. The states which make up the Chicago Fed, Iowa and most of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin, are leaders in corn, soybean, hog, egg, dairy and beef production. Fed stakeholders are commercial banks that make agriculture. Increasing surpluses have brought lower corn and soybean prices, Oppedahl said. Dairy and hog prices, which finished the year very strong, have started falling. Indications are that high cattle prices may be headed down in the coming year. "Everyone in agriculture needs land and that's why we follow farmland value carefully," Oppedahl said. "It accounts for over 75 percent of the sector's asset value and is an indicator of agriculture's health. Farmland values affect collateral values and portfolio quality and have an impact on lending institutions." Dramatically declining land values were a factor in the 1980s farm crisis, but Oppedahl said this downturn won't be as dramatic. The Chicago Federal Reserve released its most recent farmland value survey on Feb. 12, two days after Oppedahl's speech. The Seventh Federal Reserve District reported an annual decrease of 3 percent in "good" farmland values for 2014, marking the first yearly decline since 1986. Farmland values in the fourth quarter of 2014 remained largely the same as in the third quarter, according to survey respondents from 224 banks across the District. Farmland values were down 2 percent for the district as a whole for the July 1 to Oct. 1, 2014 quarter. Iowa values were down 7 percent for 2014 and 1 percent for the fourth quarter after dropping 6 percent in the third quarter, according to the survey. Cash rents, which lag behind land values, have headed up in recent years and have started to come down as well. **Net farm income** while down **is relatively strong**, Oppedahl said. Government farm payments are lower but more **risk management tools available to farmers**. **Credit conditions on agricultural loans have improved in recent years** because of strong farm income with only about 2 percent of loans in troubled status, although in 2014 conditions have weakened some, Oppedahl said. Real farm sector assets and equity are at record levels. Interest rates are low but will likely climb slowly in the next few years. "While it's an uncertain future, it's not the 1980s," Oppedahl said. "**The fundamentals** are mixed on the direction of farmland values, but **remain positive for the longer term**."

## **Immigration policies can't solve agriculture**

**Perkowski 2-26-15** [Mateusz Perkowski, reporter for The Capital Press, "Expert: Immigration reform won't fix farm labor shortage," [http://www.capitalpress.com/Nation\\_World/Nation/20150226/expert-immigration-reform-wont-fix-farm-labor-shortage](http://www.capitalpress.com/Nation_World/Nation/20150226/expert-immigration-reform-wont-fix-farm-labor-shortage)]

**Immigration policy reforms cannot overcome broader economic forces that are reducing farm labor supplies**, an expert says. **Shortages of farm labor will likely persist in the long term regardless of possible changes to immigration law**, according to an agricultural economist. U.S. immigration policy is often cited as a key factor in the availability of farm workers, but **larger economic forces are reducing the agricultural labor pool**, said Ed Taylor, a professor at the University of California-Davis who is studying the phenomenon. "Hoping the workers come back is a non-starter," he said at the recent Oregon Wine Symposium in Portland, Ore. **The number of potential farm workers is falling due to changes in Mexico that are beyond the control of U.S. lawmakers** or immigration regulators, Taylor said. Immigration policy can't solve the farm labor problem unless there enough people to do the work, he said. The birthrate in Mexico is falling fast and has now roughly "converged" with the U.S. average of about two children per woman, Taylor said. **Mexico has also invested in schools in recent decades, significantly boosting** the years of **education received by young people and steering them toward other occupations**, he said.

## **No resource wars- best studies prove**

**Pinker '11** [Steven, Harvard College Professor and Johnstone Family Professor in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University, "The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined," Google Books]



Once again it seems to me that the appropriate response is "maybe, but maybe not." Though climate change can cause plenty of misery and deserves to be mitigated for that reason alone, it will not necessarily lead to armed conflict. The **political scientists who track war and peace**, such as Halvard Buhaug, Idean Salehyan, Ole Theisen, and Nils Gleditsch, **are skeptical of the popular idea that people fight wars over scarce resources**. **Hunger and resource shortages are tragically common** in sub-Saharan countries such as Malawi, Zambia, and Tanzania, **but wars involving them are not**. Hurricanes, floods, droughts, and tsunamis (such as the disastrous one in the Indian Ocean in 2004) **do not generally lead to armed conflict**. The American dust bowl in the 1930s, to take another example, **caused plenty of deprivation but no civil war**. And while temperatures have been rising steadily in Africa during the past fifteen years, **civil wars and war deaths have been falling**. Pressures on access to land and water can certainly **cause local skirmishes**, but a genuine **war** requires that hostile forces be **organized and armed, and that depends more on the influence of bad governments, closed economies, and militant ideologies than on the sheer availability of land and water**. Certainly any connection to terrorism is in the imagination of the terror warriors: terrorists tend to be underemployed lower-middle-class men, not subsistence farmers. As for genocide, the Sudanese government finds it convenient to blame violence in Darfur on desertification, distracting the world from its own role in tolerating or encouraging the ethnic cleansing. **In a regression analysis on armed conflicts** from 1980 to 1992, Theisen found that **conflict was more likely if a country was poor, populous, politically unstable, and abundant in oil, but not if it had suffered from droughts, water shortages, or mild land degradation**. (Severe land degradation did have a small effect.) **Reviewing analyses that examined a large number (N) of countries rather than cherry-picking one or two**, he concluded, "those who foresee doom, because of the relationship between resource scarcity and violent internal conflict, have very little support in the large-N literature." Salehyan adds that **relatively inexpensive advances in water use and agriculture practices** in the developing world can **yield massive increases in productivity with a constant or even shrinking amount of land**, and that **better governance can mitigate** the human costs of **environmental damage**, as it does in developed democracies. Since the **state of the environment is at most one ingredient in a mixture that depends far more on political and social organization**, **resource wars are far from inevitable**, even in a climate-changed world.

## Status quo solves food insecurity

Lewis 1-10-14 [Kim, international broadcaster for VOA News, "Expanded Research Puts Global Food Security on the Horizon," <http://www.voanews.com/content/cgiar-agriculture-food-africa-asia-maize-rice-nutrient-crops-research-scientists/1827211.html>]

**Scientists and food experts have high hopes in achieving global food security** as the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) **recently announced a billion-dollar funding milestone**.¶ The world's largest agriculture research partnership says **funding for research and development went** from \$500 million dollars in 2008 **to \$1 billion** dollars in 2013.¶ CGIAR partners around the world conduct research to reduce poverty in rural areas to overcome complex challenges in areas such as climate change, water scarcity, land degradation and chronic malnutrition. **The new funding allows the consortium to expand their focus** on their 16 global research programs in developing policies and technologies. ¶ **The increased funding has also allows the partnership to commit to providing 12 million** African households **with sustainable irrigation; saving 1.7 million hectares of forest from destruction; and providing 50 million poor people with access to highly nutritious food crops**. Two major crops that have already been improved upon due to expanded research are maize and rice.¶ "Results of those changes, for example, have allowed for a large expansion in the work on drought tolerant maize, particularly in Africa, and in Asia on flood tolerant rice, where the fruits of research have gotten into the hands of farmers in a very, very rapid way," says Jonathan Wadsworth, executive secretary of the CGIAR Fund Council.¶ He uses rice as an example. Four years **after the release of new types of rice that withstand** temporary **flooding** in Asia, he said **over four million farm families are reaping the benefits**.¶ "In Africa, on drought tolerant maize, hundreds of thousands of farmers are now using varieties which give them a harvest even in times of drought," says Wadsworth.¶ In severe drought conditions of sub-Saharan Africa and in the Sahel region, **agroforestry is being incorporated into the production of maize** production. ¶ In looking ahead into the year 2014, Wadsworth sees challenges throughout the agriculture production cycle. However, **scientists are already meeting** these **challenges head on**.¶ "I think one thing which we have shown in the CGIAR is that food security is not only a question of the amount of food, it's also to do with the quality of the food which is produced and available both to rural households, and to urban

population," he explains.¶ He points out that one of the areas that CGIAR has been developing over the last few years and will expand on this year is increasing the nutritional value of staple crops to ensure higher levels of protein, micro-nutrients, and vitamins that are essential to the health of the population, particularly for pregnant and lactating women, and children.¶ He highlights **new research** done in Latin America that **has yielded new types of sweet potato**. Now more nutrient-enriched, this crop has been introduced in Africa, and the **high levels of vitamin A** in the sweet potato **will improve** the vitamin A deficient **diets** in many African countries.

## Ext- Farms strong now

### **Status quo solves farm profits and sustainable agriculture**

**Seedstock '14** [Seedstock is a news service covering food sustainability and farming, works with governmental agencies and private stakeholders, "U.S. to See More Urban Farming in 2015 as Economics Improve, Consumer Demand Increases and More Incentives are Added," 12-10-14, <http://seedstock.com/2014/12/10/u-s-to-see-more-urban-farming-in-2015-as-economics-improve-consumer-demand-increases-and-more-incentives-are-added/>]

Urban agriculture is expected to maintain strong growth in the United States in 2015 as cities and states provide more incentives, more start-up farmers enter the field, smaller operations improve their profitability and consumer demand for locally grown food remains strong, according to Seedstock.com. The growth outlook for land, production and jobs connected with urban farming was generated from Seedstock's recent annual conference at UCLA where more than 250 farmers, entrepreneurs, policy makers, investors and others gathered to hear experts discuss current factors driving robust local food systems in dozens of urban settings across the country. "Urban agriculture will truly emerge as one of this country's most visible economic and cultural forces in 2015. We'll see strong job growth, continued innovation, more commercial-scale farming in cities and greater production numbers of locally grown food," said Robert Puro, co-founder of Seedstock, the nation's leading information, consulting and networking company promoting innovation in urban and sustainable agriculture. Direct to consumer local food sales via community supported agriculture (CSA), farmers markets and farm stands increased from approximately \$600 million to \$1.2 billion from 1997 to 2007. USDA estimates that farm-level value of local food sales totaled about \$4.8 billion in 2008 (1.7 percent of revenue from all farm production) and are expected to continue double-digit growth into 2015 and beyond. The top five trends or changes for urban and sustainable agriculture in the U.S. in 2015, according to Seedstock, are: More government incentives, primarily through land-use policy changes, job training and economic programs. For example, a new law in California authorizes tax breaks for land-owners who lend their property to urban farmers. Cities across the U.S. are approving similar policies to stimulate more commercial-scale urban farming. An increase in aggregation and distribution centers catering to smaller farm operations. The U.S. Department of Agriculture set aside millions of dollars in the last farm bill to support these efforts, mostly through marketing assistance. Demand for locally grown food will increase among consumers. Grocers, such as Whole Foods Market, have already placed heavy emphasis on marketing locally grown produce. Locally sourced meats, seafood and produce will remain the top trends in 2015 among the nation's chefs, according to a survey by the National Restaurant Association. The rise of local food business incubators. Grocers and restaurants won't be the only buyers of locally grown produce. Consumers already are looking to buy more regionally produced food products, which is prompting more business start-ups. In 2015, Los Angeles will open its first food production business incubator to provide entrepreneurs a staging area to develop, market and scale their fledgling food businesses. More controlled-environment farms. Hydroponic and aquaponic farming are increasing – driven by a scarcity of affordable land in urban areas, reductions in the costs of technology and local food demand. The popularity of an indoor-ag conference in Las Vegas, and government incentives to convert abandoned buildings to farms are two indicators this industry is taking off. Also, more rooftop gardens will appear in more urban areas. "As start-up costs go down and consumer demand continues to climb, the U.S. will continue to see many more people enter the field of urban, sustainable farming," Puro said. You also can't overlook the significant societal change we're witnessing – more and more young people are abandoning the typical office job or changing their career search to do something good for the environment. They are discovering they can make a decent living by growing food in or near urban areas on smaller plots." Another key to continued growth in urban, sustainable farming is education. Groups like Seedstock have become necessary to new farmers who need resources and networking. As highlighted in one of Seedstock's recent articles, a variety of factors will determine whether an individual urban agriculture operation will be profitable. "Smaller farms can face greater financial risks because their liabilities are not spread over as large an area as an industrial-scale farm, or they don't enjoy the same economies of scale when it comes to purchasing supplies," Puro said. "Those obstacles are beginning to fade as technology improves, more small farms emerge and entrepreneurs figure out the right business model. As a result, financing is becoming more available and profits are being realized."

## Ext- No food crises now

### Global food systems are stabilizing

**Schwab '14** [Charles Schwab is a financial services firm with a 40-year history, "3 Factors Helping Food Stocks," <http://www.schwab.com/public/schwab/nn/articles/3-Factors-Helping-Food-Stocks>]

In 2013, investors were hungry for food companies as record-low interest rates led them to seek out dividend-paying stocks. This interest in food stocks helped the sector to a 22% gain for the year as of mid-October,<sup>1</sup> outpacing the S&P 500® Index's 19% increase. But with interest rates possibly on the rise, will food stocks lose their appeal?¶ Not necessarily, says Brad Sorensen, Director of Market and Sector Analysis at the Schwab Center for Financial Research. Three factors are leaning in food stocks' favor:¶ Stable prices. Global commodity prices may be nearing the end of an extended upward trend, so any resulting price stability could boost food makers' profits. "These companies operate in a pretty low-margin environment, so any cost savings certainly benefits them," Brad says.¶ Low sensitivity to interest rate changes. Historically, food stocks haven't been as affected by higher interest rates as other consumer staples because demand for food stays relatively constant.¶ Long-term outlook. The United Nations expects the world population to add almost one billion people over the next 12 years.<sup>2</sup> Given how closely food sales are linked with population growth, Brad believes equity investors should consider food companies as part of their long-term core portfolio.

### Empirics prove- global food security can survive crises

**FPD '13** [Food Product Design, multi-media brand focused on the application of science based ingredients that drive innovative & compliant food and beverage products for the consumer market, "Despite Challenges, Global Food Security Stable," <http://www.foodproductdesign.com/news/2013/07/despite-challenges-global-food-security-stable.aspx>]

Global food security has remained largely stable over the past year despite challenges, including food price volatility, new areas of political unrest, the ongoing European economic crisis, and a severe summer drought in the Midwestern U.S. and Eastern Europe, according to the Global Food Security Index 2013 Report from Economist Intelligence Unit.¶ While the global average food security score remained virtually unchanged in the latest index (53.5) compared with a year ago (53.6), some notable trends emerged. Developing countries made the greatest food security gains in the past year. Ethiopia, Botswana and the Dominican Republic led the way, rising eight places on average in the global food security rankings, based largely on greater food availability and income growth.¶ High-income countries still dominate the top 25% of the index, but falling national incomes hurt food security in many cases, especially in countries on the periphery of Europe. The United States retained the top ranking in the 2013 GFSI, with some shifts in the Top 10 group resulting in Norway taking the second spot, and France the third.¶ Prices for some key food crops, especially grains, spiked last year, raising food costs globally," said Leo Abruzzese, global forecasting director for the Economist Intelligence Unit. "Fortunately, those prices have retreated in the last six months, although they remain higher than they were just a few years ago. The EIU expects the prices of wheat and other grains to fall further during 2013, which is good news for global food security."¶ The GFSI, developed by the EIU and sponsored by DuPont is intended to deepen the dialogue on food security by examining the core issues of food affordability, availability and quality across a set of 107 developed and developing countries worldwide. The dynamic benchmarking model evaluates 27 qualitative and quantitative indicators which collectively create the conditions for food security in a country.¶ The 2013 Global Food Security Index builds on the insights from last year's assessment and includes two new indicators—corruption and urban absorption capacity, and two new countries—Ireland and Singapore.¶ Key findings from this year's index include:¶ Overall average food security remained consistent with last year. No region's score improved dramatically, but Sub-Saharan Africa showed the biggest gain, climbing by around one point in the index. Last year's drought in some key growing regions will have reduced food security for a period of time, as grain prices rose, although that trend eased later in the year.

## Ext- No impact

### **Food shortages don't cause war**

**Allouche '11** [Jeremy, professor at MIT, Research Fellow, Water Supply and Sanitation at the Institute for Development Studies, "The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade," Food Policy, Vol. 36, S3-S8, January, online]

The question of resource scarcity has led to many **debates on whether scarcity** (whether **of food or water**) **will lead to conflict** and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars **comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between** the economic availability of natural **resources and population growth** since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that **most empirical studies do not support** any of **these** neo-Malthusian **arguments**. **Tech**nological change **and** greater inputs of **capital have dramatically increased** labour **productivity** in agriculture. More generally, **the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because** during the last two centuries **humankind has breached** many **resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable**. Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of **alarmist scenarios** have **linked** the increasing **use of water resources and food insecurity with wars**. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that 'water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict' (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level. **In the Middle East**, presidents, prime ministers and **foreign ministers** have also **used this bellicose rhetoric**. Boutros Boutros-Gali said; 'the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics' (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. **The evidence seems quite weak**. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, **none of these declarations have been followed up by military action**. The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can be used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems. **None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli**. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, **Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause** for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about **80% of the incidents relating to water were limited** purely **to governmental rhetoric** intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18). As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, **more than two-thirds of** over **1800 water-related 'events' fall on the 'cooperative' scale** (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), **organized political bodies signed** between the year 805 and 1984 **more than 3600 water-related treaties**, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984). The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. **There is** however **no** direct **correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict**. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000]). **Water rich countries have been involved in** a number of **disputes with other** relatively **water rich countries** (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state's estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, **perceptions of the amount of available water** shapes people's attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity **drives** the process of **co-operation among riparians** (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006). In terms of international relations, **the threat of water wars** due to increasing scarcity **does not make** much **sense in the light of the recent historical record**. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and

appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable. The **debates over** the likely impacts of **climate change** have again **popularised** the idea of **water wars**. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). **Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin** ([Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

### No food wars- empirics prove

Salehyan '07 [Idean, Professor of Political Science, University of North Texas, "The New Myth About Climate Change," Foreign Policy, Summer, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\\_id=3922](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3922)]

First, **aside from** a few **anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity** and changing environmental conditions **lead to conflict**. In fact, **several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict**. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that **5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But** famine-wracked **Malawi has yet to experience** a major civil **war. Similarly, the** Asian **tsunami in 2004** killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and **led to severe shortages of** shelter, **food**, clean water, and electricity. **Yet the tsunami**, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, **did not lead to** an outbreak of **resource wars. Clearly** then, **there is much more to** armed **conflict than resource scarcity** and natural disasters.

## AT: Disease

### **Extinction impossible and ahistorical**

**Posner 05** [Richard A., Judge U.S. Court of Appeals 7th Circuit, Professor at the Chicago School of Law, "Catastrophe: Risk and Response," 1-1-05 [http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract](http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract)]

Yet the fact that **Homo sapiens** has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time. That the human race has not yet been destroyed by germs created or made more lethal by modern science, as distinct from completely natural disease agents such as the flu and AIDS viruses, is even less reassuring. We haven't had these products long enough to be able to infer survivability from our experience with them. A recent study suggests that as immunity to smallpox declines because people are no longer being vaccinated against it, monkeypox may evolve into "a successful human pathogen," (9) yet one that vaccination against smallpox would provide at least some protection against; and even before the discovery of the smallpox vaccine, smallpox did not wipe out the human race. What is new is the possibility that science, bypassing evolution, will enable monkeypox to be "juiced up" through gene splicing into a far more lethal pathogen than smallpox ever was.

### **Disease extinction claims are hype**

**Fitzpatrick '10** [Michael Fitzpatrick, General Practitioner at Barton House Health Center, "Pandemic Flu: Public Health and the Culture of Fear," November, [http://www.rsis.edu.sg/NTS/resources/research\\_papers/NTS%20Working%20Paper2.pdf](http://www.rsis.edu.sg/NTS/resources/research_papers/NTS%20Working%20Paper2.pdf)]

Projections by leading public health officials of rates of disease and death from pandemic flu on a catastrophic scale had a major impact. While WHO experts such as Keiji Fukuda speculated that global death rates would be in the millions, if not tens of millions, television reports featured images of the 1918-19 pandemic and accounts of the devastating effects of that (historically unprecedented) viral pestilence.<sup>10</sup> Patients fearful for their own health and that of their children, their elderly relatives, and family members with chronic illnesses sought medical advice and whatever preventative measures were available. There is however little evidence that raising awareness of the emerging threat of swine flu had any protective value. Given the rapid spread of the virus, it appears that none of the measures taken in the early 'containment' phase of the outbreak, such as more assiduous hand-washing, face masks, social distancing measures (school closures, etc.) and the provision of prophylactic antivirals to contacts had an appreciable effect on its spread. Pregnant women, deemed to be particularly at risk, were particularly susceptible to pandemic fears - and their anxieties were subsequently compounded by the development of vaccines that rival scaremongers claimed were unsafe. It soon emerged that early reports from Mexico provided unreliable figures for deaths resulting from swine flu and an uncertain number of cases of infection to use as a denominator with which to calculate the mortality rate. As it also became clear that most cases were mild, projections for the impact of the pandemic were steadily scaled down." In July, British authorities anticipated that 30 per cent of the population (19 million people) would become infected, with a complication rate of 15 per cent, a hospitalisation rate of 2 per cent and a death rate between 0.1 per cent and 0.35 per cent (between 19,000 and 65,000 people). By September the figure of 19,000 had become the worst-case scenario; the following month this was reduced to 1,000. In December, the official report on the mortality statistics for the first six months of the pandemic in England estimated a mortality rate of 0.026 per cent (138 confirmed deaths, and cases of swine flu in 1 per cent of the population), a rate substantially lower than the most optimistic scenario of six months earlier.<sup>12</sup> The contrast with earlier influenza pandemics was dramatic: the death rate in 1918-19 was 2-3 per cent, and that in the less severe pandemics of 1957-58 and 1967-68 around 0.2 per cent. In the judgement of the Hine Report, ministers and officials placed excessive faith in mathematical modelling. They had come to regard this as 'hard, quantitative science' that could provide 'easily understandable figures' which had the aura of appearing 'scientifically very robust'.<sup>13</sup> Though the mathematicians had warned, at the first

pandemic planning meeting in April, that **in the absence of reliable data** **their modelling capability was low**, they were under pressure from the politicians to 'produce forecasts'. The high level of uncertainty surrounding these projections does not seem to have deterred the modellers from producing them or the politicians from projecting them into the public realm. The Hine Report observes that by the end of the first wave of swine flu cases in September, sufficient data were available to guarantee accurate modelling of the second wave. However, official statements still sought to warn against complacency about future dangers and did nothing to allay the anxieties provoked by earlier doomsday scenarios. The Hine Report is critical of the public promotion of 'reasonable worst-case scenarios', which imply 'a reasonably likely event', focusing in particular on CMO Professor Liam Donaldson's July statement. The report says: The English CMO's citing of the 'reasonable worst-case' planning assumption of 65,000 fatalities on 16 July 2009 was widely reported in headlines in somewhat alarmist terms.<sup>14</sup> It seems unfair to blame the media for the alarmist tone of their reports, when it was echoed by the newly appointed health minister Andy Burnham, who told parliament that the swine flu pandemic could no longer be controlled and that there could be 100,000 cases a day by the end of August. It is striking that British authorities chose to promote such gloomy projections at a time when other prominent health figures had already declared such figures improbable. A month earlier, on the occasion of declaring the swine flu outbreak a global pandemic, WHO chief Margaret Chan had already recognised that most cases were mild and that she did not expect to see a sudden and dramatic jump in severe or fatal infections.<sup>15</sup> While the Hine Report is generally highly congratulatory of the UK response to the swine flu pandemic, **it suggests that the authorities may have adhered too strictly to the contingency plan they had developed over the previous decade to cope with the emergence of an influenza pandemic** on the scale of the 1918-19 outbreak. As a result they **'did not consider sufficiently the possibility that a pandemic might be far less severe'** than the one envisioned in that contingency plan. Their response was 'tailored to the plan, not the nature of the virus' and thus lacked flexibility. The report tentatively suggests that the authorities might consider as an alternative approach, a policy of preparing for the most likely outcome, while being prepared to monitor and change tack as necessary. **The alarmist response** to the swine flu outbreak **reflects the wider trend** of the past decade in which **'crying wolf has emerged as the appropriate official response** to diverse real and imaginary threats, from the millennium bug to bioterrorism, obesity to global warming.'<sup>5</sup> **For the authorities,** the over-riding principle is to avoid blame for unforeseen disasters, by **always proclaiming the worst-case scenario** and repeating the mantra 'prepare for the worst, hope for the best'. From this perspective, rational contingency planning gives way to scaremongering. Instead of making discreet preparations for probable, predictable emergencies (snow in winter, drought in summer), the authorities engage in speculation about the grimmest possible eventualities (massive loss of life resulting from disease or climate change) with the aim of promoting more responsible behaviour and healthier lifestyles.<sup>17</sup> Rather than communicating realistic assessments of risk to the public, the authorities engage in sharing their anxieties and promoting fears. Instead of guiding practical professional interventions in response to real social problems, politicians and public health officials engage in dramatic posturing.



# **Economy Answers**

# INC

## **No economic recession now**

**Schweppe 5-13-15** [Sarah, assistant editor at The Cheat Sheet, a daily news publication, “Is It Time to Worry About the Health of the U.S. Economy?” <http://www.cheatsheet.com/politics/is-the-u-s-economy-slipping-into-another-recession.html/?a=viewall>]

While we’re supposed to be in a period of recovery from the Great Recession, **the economy has been lagging** more than expected lately. Does this lack of growth mean we’re slipping back into a recession? If we are, **it’s not** one **similar to what we saw in 2008** **because the unemployment rate isn’t soaring** up. Rather growth has been stalling this year, enough to make the Federal Reserve question whether to hike interest rates in June as it has said it wants to. ADVERTISING **Growth stalled a lot in the winter**. Annual gross domestic product growth dropped to 0.2%, and according to the Atlanta Fed’s GDPNow model, it’s only increased to 0.9% since. And the Washington Post suspects that any positive growth in the first quarter could be revised now that we know the U.S. trade deficit grew to the highest level in more than six years in March. The gap increased 43.1% to \$51.4 billion, according to the Commerce Department, exceeding the estimates of 70 economists surveyed by Bloomberg. Foreign goods, capital goods, and consumer products were purchased at record rates, while demand for petroleum dropped. Those facts are what make economists nervous, **but employment growth may be keeping us from falling into a real recession**. How is this affecting jobs? Despite adding 591,000 jobs this year, the the unemployment rate remained unchanged at 5.4%, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. In April, the number of unemployed persons (8.5 million) stayed about the same as the previous month. Overall, the unemployment rate went down by 0.8 percentage point for the month, and the number of unemployed dropped by 1.1 million for the month. “We see this report as reducing concerns that weak first-quarter growth represents a loss of economic momentum,” Michael Gapen, chief U.S. economist at Barclays in New York, said to Reuters. The BLS said in its latest report that total nonfarm payroll employment increased by 223,000 in April, slightly below the monthly average of 257,000 jobs added over the past year. **Though it’s not as strong as economists would like**, this **growth is probably still enough that to keep the Fed on track to raise interest rates, a sign that they think the economy is safely recovering**.

## **No impact to the economy**

**Brandt and Ulfelder ‘11** [Patrick T. Brandt, Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University, Assistant Professor of Political Science in the School of Social Science at the University of Texas at Dallas, Jay Ulfelder, Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University, “Economic Growth and Political Instability,” April, Social Science Research Network, online]

These **statements anticipating political fallout from the global economic crisis of 2008–2010** reflect a widely held view that economic growth has rapid and profound effects on countries’ political stability. When economies grow at a healthy clip, citizens are presumed to be too busy and too content to engage in protest or rebellion, and governments are thought to be flush with revenues they can use to enhance their own stability by producing public goods or rewarding cronies, depending on the type of regime they inhabit. When growth slows, however, citizens and cronies alike are presumed to grow frustrated with their governments, and the leaders at the receiving end of that frustration are thought to lack the financial resources to respond effectively. The expected result is an increase in the risks of social unrest, civil war, coup attempts, and regime breakdown. Although it is pervasive, **the assumption that countries’ economic growth rates strongly affect their political stability has not been subjected to a great deal of careful empirical analysis, and evidence from social science research to date does not unambiguously support it**. Theoretical models of civil wars, coups d’etat, and transitions to and from democracy often **specify slow economic growth as an important cause or catalyst** of those events, **but empirical studies on the effects of economic growth on these phenomena have produced mixed results**. Meanwhile, **the effects of economic growth** on the occurrence or incidence of social unrest **seem** to have **hardly** been **studied in recent years**, as empirical analysis of contentious collective action has concentrated on political opportunity structures and dynamics of protest and repression. **This paper helps fill that gap by rigorously re-examining the effects of short-term variations in economic growth on the occurrence of several forms of political instability in countries worldwide over the past few decades**. In this paper, we do not seek to develop and test new theories of political instability. Instead, we aim to subject a hypothesis common to many prior theories of political instability to more careful empirical scrutiny. The goal is to provide a detailed empirical characterization of the relationship between economic growth and political instability in a broad sense. In effect, we describe the conventional wisdom as seen in the data. We do so with statistical models that use smoothing splines and multiple lags to allow for nonlinear and dynamic effects from economic growth on political stability. We also do so with an instrumented measure of growth that explicitly accounts for endogeneity in the relationship between political instability and economic growth. To our knowledge, **ours is the first statistical study of this relationship to simultaneously address the possibility of nonlinearity**

and problems of **endogeneity**. As such, we believe **this paper offers what is probably the most rigorous general evaluation of this argument to date**. As the results show, some of our findings are surprising. Consistent with conventional assumptions, we find that social unrest and civil violence are more likely to occur and democratic regimes are more susceptible to coup attempts around periods of slow economic growth. At the same time, our analysis shows no significant relationship between variation in growth and the risk of civil-war onset, and results from our analysis of regime changes contradict the widely accepted claim that economic crises cause transitions from autocracy to democracy. While we would hardly pretend to have the last word on any of these relationships, our findings do suggest that **the relationship between economic growth and political stability is neither as uniform nor as strong as the conventional wisdom(s) presume(s)**. We think **these findings** also **help explain why the global recession of 2008–2010 has failed thus far to produce the** wave of coups and regime failures that some observers had anticipated, in spite of the expected and apparent uptick in social **unrest** associated with the crisis.

## Immigration won't save the economy

**Bingham '14** [John Bingham is a reporter for the Daily Telegraph, citing a study of OECD immigration, "Mass Immigration Not the Secret to Economic Growth, Says OECD," <http://www.amren.com/news/2014/06/mass-immigration-not-the-secret-to-economic-growth-says-oecd/>]

**Mass immigration has brought little or no overall financial benefit to the UK and other countries, a study by the club of the world's leading economies has concluded. Evidence from around the world over the last 50 years shows that immigrants are not a "panacea" to boost economic growth** but nor are they a "major burden" on the taxpayer, new analysis by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) finds. Overall, **the fiscal impact of migration in OECD countries has been "broadly neutral" with taxes paid by new arrivals usually matching what they receive in benefits**, it finds. Although in some countries the amount immigrants contribute to the public purse exceeds what they receive, **new arrivals contribute less overall than the existing population, because many are less well paid**. It comes in marked contrast to the findings of a report by University College London last year which concluded that European migrants contributed £8.8 billion more to the British taxpayer than they received over a 16-year period. Campaigners for tougher immigration restrictions said it amounted to a "nail in the coffin" of the argument that immigration provides a major economic boost to Britain. "Measuring the impact of migration on the public purse is a complex task," the study by Jean-Christophe Dumont, head of the OECD's International Migration Division, concludes. "Nevertheless, over the past 50 years migrants appear to have had a broadly neutral impact in OECD countries. "In other words, **the cost of whatever state benefits they received was largely covered by the taxes they paid.**" **"Where migrants did have a fiscal impact, it rarely exceeded plus or minus 0.5 per cent of GDP.**" **"But while the impact** of immigrants on the public purse is, broadly speaking, neutral, it **is less favourable than that of native-born people.**

## The economy is resilient

**Lanman '14** [Scott, business reporter for Bloomberg News, "Growth Surge Shows Resilient U.S. as Mediocrity Reigns Overseas," 12-23-14, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-12-23/growth-in-u-s-shows-flexibility-as-mediocrity-reigns-overseas>]

**America's recovery is picking up speed** while much of the rest of the world settles into what the International Monetary Fund's Christine Lagarde calls the "new mediocre." As Europe verges on recession, Japan's economy sinks from a consumption-tax increase and China is weighed down by stimulus-induced leverage, the U.S. grew at a 5 percent annual pace in the third quarter that was the fastest since 2003, revised government figures showed today. The U.S. comeback rests on three pillars, according to Torsten Slok, chief international economist at Deutsche Bank AG: The Federal Reserve pushed more aggressively than its peers with record monetary easing. **The economy has more built-in flexibility, with labor-market conditions that make it easier to trim or expand workforces. And the financial system has been restored to relative health.** "The policy response was swifter and deeper," said Slok, who's based in New York and formerly worked at the IMF. In addition, **the U.S. economy "is simply more dynamic and resilient," with greater competition and openness to the rest of the world.** Slok said. Another reason: The U.S. has rid itself of the drag from slowing fiscal spending, after cutbacks at the federal, state and local levels spanning the past four years, according to Jay Bryson, global economist at Wells Fargo Securities LLC in Charlotte, North Carolina. IMF forecasts "Fiscal policy has kind of gotten out of the way," said Bryson, who worked as a Fed economist in the 1990s. The IMF in October projected the U.S. would have the fastest growth among major advanced economies in 2015 at 3.1 percent, ahead of nations including Germany at 1.5 percent and Japan at 0.8 percent. The stagnation prompted IMF Managing Director Lagarde last month to exhort Group of 20 leaders at a summit in Brisbane, Australia, to use all tools at their disposal to avoid what she called a "new mediocre" period of sub-par growth. Since the IMF forecasts were made, the European Central Bank's outlook worsened and Japan reported its economy contracted in the third quarter, while Russia faces the worst crisis since its 1998 default, amid plunging oil prices. The U.S. isn't completely alone in showing economic strength. British household spending helped drive GDP in the U.K. to its seventh straight quarter of growth in the three months through September, with a 0.7 percent advance from the previous period, the government said today. The performance reflects greater economic flexibility than most of Europe, Wells

Fargo's Bryson said. "The Bank of England was pretty aggressive, at least early on, in terms of providing stimulus as well," he said. While the American consumer leads the rebound in the world's largest economy, lagging growth overseas may be restraining investment in U.S.-produced equipment. Orders for durable goods, those meant to last at least three years, unexpectedly dropped in November from the previous month, according to Commerce Department data. Demand for computers, metals and electrical equipment declined or was little changed last month. Export Share Still, cooling demand overseas may not be much of a drag on U.S. growth. Exports made up just 0.6 percentage point of last quarter's 5 percent expansion in GDP, while domestic consumption contributed 2.2 percentage points. As a share of GDP, imports and exports "are relatively low for the U.S., at least relative to most other countries in the world," Slok said. "If the U.S. grows, that's actually good for the U.S. and it's good for the rest of the world." "But if the rest of the world has relatively slow growth, the impact on the U.S. is much smaller." What keeps the U.S. economy going? Flexibility and creativity, says Bryson. **"The U.S. economy is more flexible than other economies in the world,"** he said. Moreover, "we still remain the bastion of new intellectual ideas that get applied economically. It's the most creative economy in the world."

## Ext- No recession

### **The economy is recovering- labor markets are improving**

**CNN Money 6-5-15** ["America has added over 1 million jobs in 2015,"

<http://money.cnn.com/2015/06/05/news/economy/may-jobs-report-280000-added/>]

In a good sign for people looking for work, **the U.S. economy gained 280,000 jobs in May**. Economists surveyed by CNNMoney projected there would only be 222,000 jobs gains. The unemployment rate ticked up slightly in May to 5.5%, according to the Labor Department. That increase is a sign that more people returned to look for work in May, economists say. **"It's a strong report, stronger than we had expected,"** says Jesse Hurwitz, senior economist at Barclays. **"The U.S. labor market strength remains very much in fact."** May's jobs report is welcome news after the winter slowdown. The economy actually contracted in the first three months of this year, sparking concerns that hiring would taper off. Show me the wage growth: On Thursday, the International Monetary Fund expressed concern over the U.S. job market, especially how worker pay isn't going up much. Wages grew only 2.3% in May, well below the 3.5% wage growth the Federal Reserve wants to see. Still, that beat expectations in May and is the highest level in nearly two years. Wages remain the last major economic measure to turn the corner and make significant progress. "Employers recognize that in order to attract skilled workers, they need to increase wages," says Sharon Stark, managing director at D.A. Davidson. May's job gains are a good omen for wage growth. Many experts say that pay should pick up as it gets harder and harder to find workers. March was the worst month of job growth this year, but the Labor Department revised up March's job gains from 85,000 to 119,000 on Friday. April's job gains were revised down slightly to 221,000. May brings more high quality jobs: Job gains were across the board in May too. **A number of high-quality job areas made meaningful progress.** In fact, **service-sector job growth** so far this year **has outpaced** the gains from the same time **last year**, according to Luke Tilley, chief economist at Wilmington Trust Investment Advisors in Delaware. Health care increased by 47,000 jobs, while business services -- which includes marketing and accounting jobs -- gained 63,000 jobs. **Construction also had a good month, adding 17,000 new jobs**, according to the Labor Department. The one drag is energy companies. They continued to slash jobs due to low gas and oil prices. Mining and drilling jobs dropped by 17,000 in May -- the fifth consecutive month of energy job losses. But overall, the job market made strong gains. **It's timely progress for the economy** as the Federal Reserve board meets on June 17. The Fed is widely expected not to raise its main interest rate in June, but Fed Chair Janet Yellen will speak to the press and offer her outlook on the economy. If conditions continue to improve, **interest rates could rise** for the first time in about a decade -- **another healthy sign for America's economy.**

### **The economy is fundamentally strong**

**Mutikani 5-29-15** [Lucia, writer for Business Insider, "U.S. economy likely shrank in first quarter, but fundamentals strong," <http://www.businessinsider.com/r-us-economy-likely-shrank-in-first-quarter-but-fundamentals-strong-2015-5>]

**The U.S. economy** likely **contracted** in the first quarter as it buckled under the weight of unusually heavy snowfalls and a resurgent dollar, **but activity** since **has rebounded** modestly. The government is expected to report on Friday that gross domestic product shrank at a 0.8 percent annual rate instead of growing at the 0.2 percent pace it estimated last month, according to a Reuters survey of economists. A larger trade deficit and a smaller accumulation of inventories by businesses than previously thought will probably account for much of the expected downward revision. With growth estimates so far for the second quarter around 2 percent, the economy appears poised for its worst first half performance since 2011. **Economists** however, **caution against reading too much into the expected slump in output.** They argue the GDP figure for the first quarter was held down by a confluence of temporary factors, including a problem with the model the government uses to smooth the data for seasonal fluctuations. **"The weakness in the U.S. recovery is not like a cart losing its wheels because the labor market remains healthy and housing activity is picking up,"** said Thomas Costerg, a U.S. economist at Standard Chartered Bank in New York.

## Ext- No econ impact

### **Econ decline doesn't cause war**

**Jervis '11** [Robert Jervis, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December, "Force in Our Times," Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425]

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

### **No economic war impact**

**Katoch '09** [Rajan Katoch, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi The Global Economic Crisis Some Strategic Implications, First Published: August 2009]

Despite the above factors, the situation is not the same as in the 1930s, and in today's world, it is highly improbable that the global economic crisis could lead to a world war as it did then. The international order is relatively more stable, with all major powers working with greater coordination, and mostly seeking to stick to the status quo. Learning from experience, the current national economic policy responses are better formulated, and therefore the economic crisis is unlikely to reach the severity of and linger on for as long as the Great Depression. The greater role being played by fora like the G20 in seeking solutions to the crisis indicates the recognition amongst the key players from both industrialised and developing countries that a broad consensus is needed to move forward. And finally, all this is backed by the hard fact of the overwhelming military dominance of the US; this acts as a force for stability. Localised conflicts remain possible; perhaps a serious threat arising out of collapse of critical states at worst, but a world war—most unlikely.

## Ext- Econ resilient

### **The US economy is resilient**

**Hamilton '09** [Brian, CEO of Sageworks, Inc., member of the Texas Society of Certified Public Accountants, "The United States Will be Just Fine,"

<http://www.tscpa.org/Currents/EconomyCommentary.asp>]

There is probably something in humans and in every generation that makes us think that the problems we face are uniquely difficult. Much has been written about the economy and, if you accept certain assumptions from what you read, you might think that we are in the midst of a global depression. Yet, it is important to put the current economy in perspective. We might even try reviewing and analyzing some objective data. Last quarter, GDP fell at a rate of 0.5%, which means that the total value of goods and services produced in the U.S. fell by a half of one percentage point last quarter over the previous quarter. (1) For the first two quarters of this year, GDP grew by 0.9% and 2.8%, indicating that economic growth is relatively flat this year, but that it is not falling off a cliff. This isn't the first time GDP has fallen and it won't be the last. A decrease in GDP after almost 6 years of increases is not positive, but almost predictable. **No economy grows indefinitely and consistently; there are always**

**temporary lapses.** In fact, if you consider the media coverage of the economy over the past year and the consequent way people have been scared, it is remarkable that anyone is buying anything. Some would say that we cannot only look at GDP, so let's look at other factors. Interest rates remain at historically low levels. (2) This means that if you want to borrow money, you can borrow money inexpensively as a business or as a person. Loan volume in the country, according to the FDIC and contrary to what you read about the credit crisis, actually increased last quarter compared to the same quarter last year. (3) Someone is getting loans and they are not paying excessive interest rates for them. How about employment? According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment sits at 6.7%. At this time last year, unemployment was 4.7%. The decrease in employment is not favorable, but historically an unemployment rate of 6.7% is not close to devastating. The 50-year historical rate of unemployment is 5.97%. (4) Most economists agree that **the natural rate of unemployment**, which is the lowest rate due to the fact that people change jobs or are between jobs, **is around 4%. So, today we sit at 2.7% above that rate.** Once again, the very recent trend is not good but **it is certainly not horrifying.** I have noticed many recent media references to the Great Depression (the period of time between late 1929 and around 1938 or so, depending upon the definitions used and personal inclinations). It might be illuminating to note that by 1933, during the height of the Depression, the unemployment rate was 24.9%. During that same time period, GDP was falling dramatically, which created a devastating impact on the country. Americans have good hearts and empathize (as they should) with those who are unemployed, yet it would be easy to go too far in our assumptions on how the working population is currently affected in aggregate. If 6% of the people are unemployed, approximately 94% of the people are working. We should always shoot for full employment, but why would we view our efforts as poor when we don't quite make that mark? A good student might try to get straight A's, but getting an occasional "B" or "C" won't end the world. Look at personal income today. Personal income is income received by individuals from all sources, including employers and the government. Personal income rose last quarter compared to a year ago according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. Compared to five years ago, personal income has risen by 32.1%. Even considering that inflation was 18.13% over this period, people are generally making more money than they used to. This is another one of those statistics that can easily get bent to fit a story. You often hear things like "personal income fell last month by 23%", but writers tend to leave larger and more important statistics out. In this case, wouldn't you be more interested in trends over a quarter or a year? using isolated statistics to fit your view is something that has become accepted and rarely challenged. Next, there is inflation. The inflation rate measures the strength of the dollar you hold today as compared to a year ago. The inflation rate is currently 3.66%. **Over the past 50 years, the inflation rate has averaged about 4.2% . Inflation**

**remains well within control.** Yet, would you be surprised to read a story next month citing an X% jump in inflation over the last day, month? I wouldn't be. (Ironically, the one thing about the economy that is alarming from a historical standpoint is our national debt, which gets some but not enough media coverage. We now owe \$10.6 trillion and have become a debtor nation over the past several decades. We now depend on the goodwill and investments of outside countries, while we continue to spend more than we make). Now, the skeptics reading this will undoubtedly point to other (I believe, far lesser) statistics that validate their gloomy view of the economy and the direction of the country. I ask the reader: if people are employed, are making good wages, can borrow inexpensively, hold a dollar that is worth largely what it was worth a year or five years ago, and live in a country where the value of goods and services is rising, tell me exactly where the crisis is? There is no doubt that **the economy has slowed, but slowness does not equal death.** It is true that the financial markets are a mess (and the depreciation of the value of equities is both scary and bad), but **analysts typically go too far in ascribing the fall of the financial markets with the fall of a whole economy.** The markets are an important component of the economy, but the **markets are not the totality of the economy.** No one can say whether conditions will worsen in the future.

However, we have learned that **the United States economy has been tremendously resilient over the past 200 years and will** probably **remain so**, as long as the structural philosophies that it has been built upon are left intact. Americans are hard-working and innovative people and the country will be just fine.

## **Negative – Brain Drain**



# **India Brain Drain**

## Brain Gain Now

### Indian Brain Gain Now

**Mishra, '13** [5/21/13, Alya Mishra is a reporter for the Chronicle, "India Takes Steps To Prevent 'Brain Drain'", <http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/139429/>]

**India's new science policy aims to position the nation among the top five global scientific powers by 2020. This cannot be achieved without qualified academics, researchers, and scientists**, yet India has to contend with large numbers of postgraduate students leaving to complete Ph.D.'s or postdocs – **a majority to the U.S. – and staying away to pursue a career. Now the government and industry, along with India's elite universities and technical institutions, have united to implement a series of measures to stem the tide while also encouraging large numbers of researchers to return home.** India's problem starts with the already small pool of students who choose to do a Ph.D. Between 1991 and 2001, the number of doctorates awarded increased by only 20 percent compared to an 85 percent jump in China. Today, no more than 1 percent of students with undergraduate degrees opt for doctoral studies and the substantial number who do prefer to go abroad. India produces only up to 125 Ph.D.'s in computer engineering a year, despite nearly 1.7 million engineering students graduating each year. Pankaj Jalote, director of the Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology in Delhi, conducted a survey among undergraduate and masters students in Indian Institutes of Technology in Bombay, Delhi, and Kanpur. "I tried to understand the students' perception of pursuing a Ph.D. in India. A large number of students still think that becoming an academic is the only career option after completing a Ph.D. Several did not want to do a Ph.D. in India because they felt the research work was poor and an Indian Ph.D. had low market value." For Devasmita Chakraverty, a doctoral student at the University of Virginia, the U.S. was the default choice for pursuing a Ph.D. because of its "leadership in science, research, education, and technology." "Most Ph.D. programs in good U.S. schools are very competitive...and have a lot to offer in terms of resources and lifestyle. For example, facilities for research, lab facilities, funding, conference opportunities, travel opportunities, etc," Chakraverty said. Brain Drain Only 5 percent of Indians who go to the U.S. to earn a doctorate degree return home, as was revealed in a study on the mobility patterns of Ph.D. graduates in science, engineering, and health. According to the study International Mobility and Employment Characteristics among Recent Recipients of U.S. Doctorates by the U.S. National Science Foundation, around 5,000 Indians join U.S. universities every year for doctoral studies in these fields. India also has the largest diaspora, with 40 percent of its home-born researchers working overseas and 75 percent of its scientists going to the U.S. A major reason behind the brain drain is the divide between universities and specialised research institutions, with most universities not engaged in cutting-edge research and unable to attract the best minds. "Teaching and research do not go together as happens in the world's leading universities. Researchers across institutions also have no occasion to engage with young minds," said Deepak Pental, a professor of genetics at the University of Delhi. While universities in the developed world get the largest share of research funds from their governments, only about 10 percent of government research funds in India goes to universities. The brain drain is also reflected in the lack of qualified manpower for Indian higher-education and research institutions. Across the elite Indian Institutes of Technology, or IITs, there is a 43 percent vacancy of faculty posts while half the positions in the national institutes of technology and central universities are vacant. Brain Gain **But the tide is slowly turning. With rapid expansion of higher-education infrastructure and enabling environments, India has been successful in attracting young researchers back home. As the nation's elite institutions try to morph from world-class teaching institutions to world-class research centers, they have put in place flexible recruitment policies**, generous research grants, and industry-academe collaborations to attract their researchers back from foreign institutions. **At IIT Delhi, two-thirds of academics have a Ph.D. or postdoc from a foreign university. IIT Bombay has hired more than 100 young Indian assistant professors in the past three years, all with international experience.** When Vinay Joseph Ribeiro, an assistant professor at IIT Delhi, returned to India it was for personal reasons: "While doing my Ph.D. at Rice University in Houston, I worked with a Catholic community that wanted some work done in Delhi. I wanted to pitch in, and thus applied at IIT Delhi," Ribeiro said. "That work is long over but I stayed on because India has changed so much. There is a lot of scope for research that we couldn't have imagined during our BTech years. Moreover, the students are very bright and teaching is a pleasure." Devang Khakhar, director of IIT Bombay, confirmed the brain-gain phenomenon, noting that the number of Ph.D.'s returning has certainly increased: "One of the major reasons is that we are hiring many more faculty ... several IIT Bombay alumni are faculty in foreign institutions and we have an alumni network that facilitates recruiting faculty." **Increased financial support for research has also helped. In the past 10 years, IIT Bombay has had a 10-fold increase in research funds.** Making the Ph.D. Attractive At IIT Delhi, a joint Ph.D. with Queensland University of Technology has met the needs of several Ph.D. students. Pankaj Jalote said the doctoral students spend equal amounts of time at each institution and are also guided by supervisors from both institutions. International collaborations attract students and academics alike. IIT Bombay has a major joint Ph.D. program with Monash University in Australia and more than 100 students are enrolled. **"We encourage collaborations, both within India and internationally, and do provide**

**some funds for faculty mobility. Such programmes make a faculty position at IIT Bombay more attractive,” said Khakhar. Industry in India is also contributing support in establishing research laboratories, creating collaborative projects between academics and students, and sponsoring research projects. IIT Kharagpur has attracted significant funds from a leading corporation to carry out advanced research in power technology. The Indian government launched a prime minister’s fellowship scheme for doctoral research with industry partnership last year for science, technology, engineering, agriculture, and medicine. Under the scheme, 100 fellowships will be given to selected candidates working on research projects jointly with industry.** “Several small and medium companies have approached us to support the fellowships to take their research and development work forward. It’s a win-win situation for the industry and the scholars,” said Shalini Sharma, head of higher education at the Confederation of Indian Industry, which has had to decline several requests from Indian scholars working outside India for support under the fellowship. “I am hopeful that this and several other measures by government, industry and academia will be successful in retaining talent in the country,” Sharma said.

## Econ

### **Brain Drain hurts Indian Economy**

**Krishnadas, '1** [7/19/01, Kariyatil Krishnadas is editor of TechIndia, "Brain drain hurts developing nations, U.N. reports", [http://www.eetimes.com/document.asp?doc\\_id=1143665&](http://www.eetimes.com/document.asp?doc_id=1143665&)] BANGALORE, India — **The exodus of Indian engineers mostly to the United States costs India \$2 billion annually, according to a recent U.N. study.** While the United Nations Human Development Report 2001 stresses that "**technology itself has become a source of economic growth" for countries like India, many of the benefits are being outweighed by the brain drain of engineering talent. "Rich nations have been opening their doors to developing-country professionals at a high cost to the home countries."** the U.N. study warned. Based on the \$15,000 to \$20,000 average total cost of providing a university education in India, the country losses as much as \$2 billion a year in technical investment. **While migrating Indian engineers enjoy a higher social status, they are often derided as "slaves to the almighty dollar,"** or as individuals who, while benefiting from a highly subsidized government education here, **have no incentive to help the Indian society that has trained them.**

### **Growth Solves South Asian Conflict**

**Mamoon and Murshed, '08** [5/5/08, Dawood Mamoon works for Institute of Social Studies in the Netherlands, S. Mansoob Murshed works The Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham and Centre for the Study of Civil War (CSCW), "The conflict mitigating effects of trade in the India-Pakistan case", <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10101-010-0074-y.pdf>]

However, **if India is able to export or import more, this would at least put a check on any rise in the severity of conflict and hostilities would adjust to some average level. Any decline in Indian trade will enhance hostilities. The current low levels of bilateral trade between Pakistan and India is conflict enhancing, so more trade with increased exports by both sides to each other should be encouraged.** More access to Pakistani markets on the Indian side may not lead to conflict mitigation if Pakistan is not able to also export more to India. **A rise in education expenditure puts a check on hostilities,** as seen in Graph 1e. Graph 1f is the standard representation of India-Pakistan conflict, and not only best fits historical trends but also explain the rationale behind recent India-Pakistan peace initiatives with decreasing hostilities when not only India but Pakistan also has had economic growth rates as high as 7% per annum. The forecasts suggest that **conflict will rise, even if there is a significant increase in combined democracy scores, if growth rates plummet. Both Pakistan and India have seen many such years, when hostilities between both countries rose significantly when at least one of the countries is performing poorly, but were channeling more resources on the military as a proportion of their GDPs.** The forecasts favour the economic version over the democratic version of the liberal peace. Thus one may look at current peace talks between both countries with optimism as both are performing well on the economic front and channeling fewer resources on the military as a proportion of national income, while at the same time having a divergent set of political institutions, though

recently Pakistan has edged towards greater democracy with elections in February 2008.

## **Escalates- draws in China and US**

Margolis, 2010

(Eric, International Author and Policy Analyst for New York Time and International Herald Tribune, "Kashmir: Three Minutes From Nuclear War", <http://www.lewrockwell.com/margolis/margolis206.html>)

In my first book, War at the Top of the World, which explores the Afghanistan and Kashmir conflicts, **I described Kashmir as "the world's most dangerous crisis" and warned of the manifest risks of an all-out war between India and Pakistan that could quickly go nuclear. This awesome danger remains. India and Pakistan, both with large nuclear arsenals, have fought three major wars over Kashmir. They remain at scimitars drawn over the divided state. The United States is actively helping India build its nuclear arsenal as a counterweight to China.** India keeps 500,000 troops and paramilitary police in Kashmir. In 1999, Pakistani troops moved into the Indian-ruled Ladakh region of Kashmir, nearly provoking another war between the two old foes. Both sides put their nuclear forces in high alert. **India and Pakistan have only a hair-trigger three-minute alert window once they get warnings of enemy attack. This is almost launch on warning; the potential for an accidental war is enormous. A nuclear war between Indian and Pakistan would kill and injure tens of millions — and produce clouds of radioactive dust that would pollute all of Asia's major rivers and, eventually, the entire globe.**

## **Indo Pak war causes extinction**

**Fox, '8** [4/8/08, Maggie Fox is a reporter for Reuters, "India-Pakistan Nuclear War Would Cause Ozone Hole", <http://www.planetark.com/dailynewsstory.cfm/newsid/47829/story.htm>]

**Fires from burning cities would send 5 million metric tonnes of soot or more into the lowest part of Earth's atmosphere known as the troposphere, and heat from the sun would carry these blackened particles into the stratosphere, the team at the University of Colorado reported.** "The sunlight really heats it up and sends it up to the top of the stratosphere," said Michael Mills of the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, who chose India and Pakistan as one of several possible examples. Up there, the soot would absorb radiation from the sun and heat surrounding gases, causing chemical reactions that break down ozone. "We find column ozone losses in excess of 20 percent globally, 25 percent to 45 percent at midlatitudes, and 50 percent to 70 percent at northern high latitudes persisting for five years, with substantial losses continuing for five additional years," Mills' team wrote in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. This would let in enough ultraviolet radiation to cause cancer, damage eyes and skin, damage crops and other plants and injure animals. **Mills and colleagues based their computer model on other research on how much fire would be produced by a regional nuclear conflict.** "Certainly there is a growing number of large nuclear-armed states that have a growing number of weapons. This could be typical of what you might see," Mills said in a telephone interview. **SMOKE IS KEY Eight nations are known to have nuclear weapons, and Pakistan and India are believed to have at least 50 weapons apiece, each with the power of the weapon the United States used to destroy Hiroshima in 1945. Mills said the study added a new factor to the**

**worries about what might damage the world's ozone layer, as well as to research about the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange.** "The smoke is the key and it is coming from these firestorms that build up actually several hours after the explosions," he said. **"We are talking about modern megacities that have a lot of material in them that would burn. We saw these kinds of megafires in World War Two in Dresden and Tokyo. The difference is we are talking about a large number of cities that would be bombed within a few days."** Nothing natural could create this much black smoke in the same way, Mill noted. Volcanic ash, dust and smoke is of a different nature, for example, and forest fires are not big or hot enough. The University of Colorado's Brian Toon, who also worked on the study, said **the damage to the ozone layer would be worse than what has been predicted by "nuclear winter" and "ultraviolet spring" scenarios. "The big surprise is that this study demonstrates that a small-scale, regional nuclear conflict is capable of triggering ozone losses even larger than losses that were predicted following a full-scale nuclear war," Toon said in a statement.** Mills noted **the United States is currently working on a controversial deal that would give India access to US nuclear fuel and equipment for the first time in 30 years even though India refused to join nonproliferation agreements. Nonproliferation advocates believe it undermines the global system designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.**

## Biotech

### **India is now becoming the frontrunner in biotechnology**

**Exim bank of India, '10** [January 2010, EXIM Bank's Occasional Paper Series is an attempt to disseminate the findings of research studies carried out in the Bank. The results of research studies can interest exporters, policy makers, industrialists, export promotion agencies as well as researchers, Project Team: Mr. S. Prahalathan, General Manager, Research & Planning Group Mr. Ashish Kumar, Chief Manager, Research & Planning Group Mr. Rahul Mazumdar, Manager, Research & Planning Group, "OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 137 BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY IN INDIA: OPPORTUNITIES FOR GROWTH", <http://www.eximbankindia.com/op/op137.pdf>]

**India is already being reckoned as a frontrunner in the biotechnology industry. With a huge base of talented, skilled and cost competitive manpower, and a well developed scientific infrastructure, India is poised to become a leading global player in biotechnology.** The vast population of India helps not only in creating significant domestic demand, but also provides biotech research companies with a vast gene pool. The institutional infrastructure in the country offers a strong foundation for these strengths to get transformed into business opportunities. **Indian firms could focus on acquiring overseas biotechnology units in countries like the US, which have seen plunging valuations due to the global meltdown.** Though India has a long way to go in terms of innovations in processes, instruments, and funding, **the future looks bright for the industry with India poised to become one of the global leaders in this industry. India, with all its inherent strengths, can definitely use biotechnology as a vehicle to improve the lives of billions across the world.**

### **Biotech Industry is booming and key to the economy**

**TechVision, '10** [2010, Report by MM Activ Sci-Tech Communications- a research composed of Indian science graduates, "Biotechnology Sector for India (2009-10)", [http://www.techvision.com/bpi/pdf/reportsresources/India\\_Biotechnology\\_Sector\\_byMMActiv.pdf](http://www.techvision.com/bpi/pdf/reportsresources/India_Biotechnology_Sector_byMMActiv.pdf)]

Introduction **Biotechnology has really taken off not only as a discipline in college textbooks but also has yielded fruit in terms of profitmaking business enterprises. The success of the Biotechnology industry has led to sustained economic growth in the developed nations** like US, European countries and Canada. **India is also fast emerging as a key player in biotechnology related**

**activities and investments.** Currently, although **the biotechnology market in India contributes only a 2% share in the global market, it is on the threshold of a colossal growth in the coming decade. The importance of the biotech market in India and its prospective growth can be grasped from the steps taken by the Indian government to further development of research and entrepreneurship initiatives in the country.** The Department of Biotechnology (DBT) and the various Centres of Excellence provide **the backbone of furthering research activities and laying the foundation for generating knowledge and trained manpower to assist entrepreneurship programs and the biotech private industry in India.** Several industry houses from the "old industry" have already jumped in the Indian biotechnology market to take advantage of the opportunities this new and exciting field. **Statistics The Indian biotech industry grew threefold in just five years to report revenues of US\$ 3 billion in 2009-10, a rise of 17 per cent over the previous year, according to the eighth annual survey conducted by the Association of Biotechnology-Led Enterprises (ABLE)** and a monthly journal, BioSpectrum, based on inputs from over 150 biotech companies.

## **That solves starvation – biotech spinoffs are key to agricultural sectors**

**McGloughlin 2K** (Martina McGloughlin is a professor at UC Davis, Journal of Agrobiotechnology Management, 2000, “Ten Reasons Why Biotechnology Will Be Important to the Developing World”, <http://www.agbioforum.org/v2n34/v2n34a04-mcgloughlin.htm>)

**Biotechnology companies, national and international organizations, including the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), and numerous academics (e.g., Ruttan 1999) have continued to argue for the need to increase agricultural productivity so that sufficient food supplies exist to meet the demand forthcoming from a swelling world population.** Despite Altieri and Rosset's (this issue) assertion, **population density is hardly the issue. In the absence of significant productivity gains, or expansion of agriculture into marginal lands (e.g., forests), there will be not be sufficient food quantities to feed the projected levels of population.** This simple reality is independent of income distribution or the location of the population. And hardly anyone, including Altieri and Rosset, will argue about the pragmatism of population projections. **So in the absence of a good alternative – and in the face of a proven slow down in the productivity gains from the Green Revolution – biotechnology is by default our best, and maybe, only, way to increase production to meet future food needs.**

## **Food insecurity sparks World War 3**

**Calvin 98** (William, Theoretical Neurophysiologist – U Washington, Atlantic Monthly, January, Vol 281, No. 1, p. 47-64)

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. **Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands -- if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem -- and could lead to a Third World War --** but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.



## **-Russia Brain Drain**

## Brain Drain Low

### **No Russia Brain Drain Now- unexpected events like CIR will change that**

**Adomanis, '13** [2/27/13, Mark Adomanis is a graduate of Harvard and Oxford Universities, have been a Forbes contributor since June 2011, and also work as a Management Consultant for Booz Allen Hamilton in Washington DC and a specialist in Russian economic and demographics, "The Myth of Russia's Brain Drain",

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2013/02/27/the-myth-of-russias-brain-drain/>]

Now it is true that there are certain countries, such as Spain, France, and Italy, where the flow of people from Russia increased during the 2000-10 period. However, those countries were never major destinations for Russians to begin with, and **the**

**massive declines in movement to places such as the United States and Germany more than**

**compensate for any increase.** The OECD data table is a bit patchy, **I decided to highlight the countries**

**above largely because the data they provided didn't omit any years in the relevant time**

**period and thus seemed more reliable,** but even if you simply do a straight sum of all of the rows you learn that the

movement of people out of **Russia peaked in 2002 and has since declined by about a third.**\* Maybe I have

different standards, **but a 33% decrease in emigration out of Russia doesn't sound like a harbinger**

**of an epochal emigration crisis. Could Russia be threatened by increase in emigration at some**

**point in the future, perhaps even in the very near future? Absolutely. That seems perfectly**

**plausible,** particularly as austerity-crushed countries such as Spain sell permanent residency permits to anyone with sufficient

cash on hand (if you're financially secure and can live off of accumulated assets, Spain is actually a pretty attractive destination). But

**the narrative of a Russia that is quickly emptying out, that is massively "exporting" its people**

**to other more democratic and law-abiding countries simply doesn't seem to be true:** pretty much

regardless of whose data you look at, **emigration from Russia in the 2010's is much, much lower than it**

**was in the 2000's or in the 1990's.** I'm not particularly wedded to any particular narrative of migration patterns so if,

when the 2012 data is released, it turns out there was a massive uptick in movement out of Russia I won't have any problem taking

that into account. **But before we get too worked up about Russia's "brain drain" we should try to**

**make sure that it's actually taking place. As things stand, emigration from Russia is lower now**

**than at any other point in the country's post-Soviet history.**

## Reforms attracts Russians

### **Immigration reform attracts Russian high skilled laborers**

**Malakha, '02** [September 27-28 2002 , Irina Malakha researcher funded by Russian Foundation for Humanities, "external migrations in Russia in 1992-2000: evaluation of educational structure," <http://website1.wider.unu.edu/conference/conference-2002-3/conference%20papers/malakha.pdf>]

**The emigration flow towards the USA having enough big share of migrants of Russian nationality and those originated from Moscow and St. Petersburg significantly differed from the flows to Germany and Israel. Despite of a relatively big share of elder age group in the flow to the USA (that reflects most likely the process of families reunification) we can speak about keeping on the high qualification and professional level of migrants and may be even about its increase. Amendments to the USA Immigration Act adopted in 1996 rendered significant privileges to prominent scientists and high skilled specialists which are requested by the American economy. This new situation undoubtedly permit to attract high skilled specialists from other countries including Russia.** A smaller emigration flow of high skilled labour force in particular researchers and academic teachers forwarded to the EU countries (besides Germany), to Canada and Australia. **European immigration legislation limits inflow of high skilled specialist trying to keep on labour market equilibrium and in particular the high skilled labour sector. The emigration to such countries as Canada, Australia doesn't have at all an ethnic or family reunification character. The emigration legislation of these countries like the American one defines privileges to high skilled migrants. This, of course, has as a result a higher indexes of educational and qualification levels of migrants.** But at the same time these countries do not have a highly developed R&D sphere and are not leaders in science and technology. So, we can assume that the share of leading researchers emigrated to these countries was not big enough. The priority of countries - leaders in R&D sphere is explicitly tracing in migrations of the Russian scientists. Thus, **a certain part of mainly ethnic migration flow represents an intellectual emigration or "brain drain" that are a irretrievable losses of the high skilled human capital and first of all national intellectual potential.**

## Russian Econ Collapse

### **Russian Economic Downturn causes World economic collapse**

**Cooper, '09** [6/29/09, William H. Cooper is a Specialist in International Trade and Finance, "Russia's Economic Performance and Policies and Their Implications for the United States", <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL34512.pdf>]

**The greater importance of Russia's economic policies and prospects to the United States lie in their indirect effect on the overall economic and political environment** in which the United States

and Russia operate. From this perspective, **Russia's continuing economic stability and growth**

**can**

**be considered positive for the United States.** **Because financial markets are interrelated, chaos in**

**even some of the smaller economies can** **cause uncertainty throughout the rest of the world.**

Such

was the case during Russia's financial meltdown in 1998 and more recently with the 2008-2009 crisis. **Promotion of economic stability in Russia has been a basis for U.S. support for Russia's membership in international economic organizations,** including the IMF, the World Bank, and the

WTO. As **a major oil producer and exporter, Russia influences world oil prices that affect U.S. consumers**

### **Russia is insulated from the U.S. economy**

**Green, '08** [2008, Christopher Green is senior economist at VTB Bank Europe Research, "VTB Europe GDP Indicator: Russia's economy weakens further in March", [http://www.ruscham.com/en/news/business\\_news/1/866.html](http://www.ruscham.com/en/news/business_news/1/866.html)]

Relative to previous episodes of global economic weakness, emerging markets are relatively better placed to endure a bout of US-led weakness, reflecting: --Cycles of global growth have recently been less synchronised than in the past, --The improved macroeconomic and financial market positions of most emerging markets, --The center of recent turmoil in credit markets has primarily been problems in the developed rather than the emerging markets, and -- The current phase of US weakness has been accompanied by a pre-emptive easing in interest rates from the Federal Reserve. • While Russian growth rates are likely to be dampened in the face of a sharp slowing in US activity, the strength of Russia's macroeconomic fundamentals, together with a backdrop of supportive commodity prices, places it in a relatively strong position. • Over the past decade, the relationship between US and Russian growth rates has been reasonably weak and the direct trade linkages between the two countries are relatively small.

## **Key to diversify the economy – prevents collapse**

**Institute of Contemporary Development, '10** [2010, Institute of Contemporary Development engages Russia's and the world's leading academics, corporate, and government leaders in open and candid dialogue on practical ways of creating a modern Russian society. The Institute initiates expert panels and conferences, conducts high-quality, independent research and represents a forum for transparent and democratic exchange of ideas and views. We are not wedded to a particular point of view; rather we have an unwavering commitment to the principle of comprehensive, open and honest dialogue about Russia's future. The Institute's research and discussions are formulated into innovative and practical action recommendations for the President and Government of the Russian Federation as well as analytical and informational materials for the public, "Information Technology and Russia's Future", [http://www.insor-russia.ru/en/\\_priorities/competitive\\_economy](http://www.insor-russia.ru/en/_priorities/competitive_economy)]

**Russia's extremely strong economic growth is one of the country's recent major accomplishments. Undoubtedly, the natural resources sector has played a significant role in this achievement.** However, **economic growth based solely on the natural resources sector is neither sufficient nor sustainable. We** are entering the era of the **global information society, where knowledge is the core resource and mechanism of accelerated development**. Russia's continued economic **growth will depend on the successful development of the innovative industries of the nation's economy**, particularly innovative infrastructure. **The advanced development of high-tech industries, including the Information and Communication Technology Sector (ICT), is also a key condition for a strong and growing economy.** In most developed countries, ICT represents 8-12% of a country's GDP and is one of the leading sectors in terms of capitalization of the global economy. This sector's role will only strengthen with time. Alongside oil & gas, **Russia's ICT is one of the two drivers of economic development. Since 2000, this sector has developed four times faster than the average performance of the Russian economy. ICT has demonstrated rapid, steady and stable growth in all of its segments.** The implementation of a number of key national projects and other large-scale government programs **will also encourage the development of innovative industries. The task of developing innovative sectors of the economy is one of Russia's top priorities.** The Strategy for the Development of Russia's Information Society, approved in 2007 by the Security Council of the Russian Federation, **serves as a basis for government policies and priorities for the development of the innovation economy.** The Strategy is designed to facilitate a qualitative breakthrough in three key areas: national information and communication infrastructure; **creation of a scientific and technical basis for innovations**; and provision of sufficient, affordable and secure ICT-services.

## **Nuclear war**

**Filger 9** – Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, "Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction" <http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356>

In Russia historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant than the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

## Russia Biotech

**Skilled workers are key to Russian biotech --- the government is successfully attracting them now- Solves Russian Disease**

**Global Health Progress, '10** [2010, Global Health Progress initiative seeks to bring research-based biopharmaceutical companies and global health leaders together to improve access to medicine and health care in the developing world. In addition to serving as a convening point for the industry on global health topics, the initiative engages with global health organizations; lends advocacy support to shared goals; identifies best practices for programs that address health needs, and facilitates partnership and research and development efforts to fight neglected diseases in the developing world. Through meaningful public-private partnerships with others in the field, including policymakers in the developed and developing world, multi-lateral institutions, non-governmental organizations, and academia we can help shape sustainable solutions that improve the health of all people, "Russia Reveals Renewed Commitment to Expand, Promote Biotechnology Sector", <http://globalhealthprogress.org/russia-reveals-renewed-commitment-expand-promote-biotechnology-sector>]

Global Health Progress (GHP) released a new fact sheet highlighting **Russia's commitment to expanding and promoting its biotechnology sector. Although the biopharmaceutical sector in Russia is less developed than other markets, the sector is making progress by implementing public policies that support pharmaceutical research and development (R&D) for life-changing treatments, contribute high-quality, high wage jobs to the region and increase the number of clinical trials offered to the population to improve access to drugs and help reduce the overall burden of disease.** Currently, Russia accounts for approximately 0.5% of the world biotechnology market, two-thirds of which are biopharmaceuticals. **In 2010, the value of the biopharmaceutical market in Russia was estimated to be approximately US \$17.2 billion, compared with US \$10.4 billion in 2006.** According to analysts, the Russian market is predicted to expand at a compound annual growth rate of 8.3% over the next few years and approximately 53% of the biopharmaceuticals market in Russia is comprised of innovative medicines. As part of a national 10-year plan to promote biotechnology, the government is enacting policies to strengthen Russia's pharmaceutical research and development (R&D) areas that have been historically strong. For example, special economic zones will focus on attracting investors to commercialize biotechnology and related innovations. Additionally, the Russian government is investing in "bioparks," R&D clusters of biotechnology and related sectors. **Russia is well-known for its highly skilled scientific workforce and the biopharmaceutical sector has emerged as an important source of high-quality, highly skilled jobs. As the presence of biopharmaceutical companies increases, so does the pool of highly skilled doctors, scientists and researchers.** According to Burrill & Company, the biopharmaceutical sector currently employs approximately 12,000 people with the average salary for a PhD scientist in Russia approximately US \$1,800. Currently, Russia ranks 12 out of 25 in terms of active clinical trials with 1,084 sites with an average relative annual growth rate of 33%. However, as of February 2010, there were 304 medicines in development in Russia, making the country one of the fastest annual growth rates. **The growth in share of global clinical trials can bring health benefits, including the diffusion of medical knowledge and effective medical practice, greater patient access to high quality care and improve access to drugs. Clinical trials can also help reduce the overall burden of disease on the Russian population. Russia's recognition that the biopharmaceutical sector has the potential to develop tomorrow's medicines, improve the population's access to drugs, create economic growth and help alleviate the population's burden of disease is leading to robust investment and progress in the region.** Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin emphasized this commitment, "We have allocated substantial resources for the development of such promising areas as nano-and biotechnology, nuclear energy, aerospace and other research."

## Russian disease goes global

**Zuger, '2K** [12/5/2000, Abigail Zuger, MD, is Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, "Infectious Diseases Rising Again In Russia", <http://www.globalaging.org/health/world/russia3.htm>]

**VORONEZH, Russia — Russia's political turmoil, its economic crisis and its new freedoms have been accompanied by a wave of old diseases. Tuberculosis is flooding the country, producing what some authorities are calling the world's largest outbreak of the drug-resistant variety, one of medicine's most ominous problems. Rates of other infections, including hepatitis, syphilis and AIDS, are skyrocketing. An epidemic of diphtheria swept through in the mid-1990's. Reports of smaller, regional outbreaks of encephalitis, typhoid fever, malaria, polio, pneumonia and influenza pepper the nightly news.** Health experts describe Russia's prison system as an

"epidemiologic pump," continuously seeding the country with pockets of tuberculosis that can spread on their own. Increasingly, TB cases of Russian origin are turning up in the Baltic countries and even farther afield — for instance, Germany and Israel.

**Specialists worry that if the rising rates of infectious diseases in Russia continue unabated, the country itself may turn into an epidemiologic pump, sending infectious diseases into the rest of the world.**

## Disease causes extinction

**Greger 08** (Michael, M.D., is Director of Public Health and Animal Agriculture at The Humane Society of the United States, Bird Flu: A Virus of Our Own Hatching, <http://birdflubook.com/a.php?id=111>)

Senate Majority Leader Frist describes the recent slew of emerging diseases in almost biblical terms: "**All of these [new diseases] were advance patrols of a great army that is preparing way out of sight.**"<sup>3146</sup> Scientists like Joshua Lederberg don't think this is mere rhetoric. He should know. **Lederberg won the Nobel Prize in medicine at age 33 for his discoveries in bacterial evolution.** Lederberg went on to become president of Rockefeller University. "**Some people think I am being hysterical,**" he said, referring to pandemic influenza, "**but there are catastrophes ahead. We live in evolutionary competition with microbes—bacteria and viruses. There is no guarantee that we will be the survivors.**"<sup>3147</sup> There is a concept in host-parasite evolutionary dynamics called **the Red Queen hypothesis, which attempts to describe the unremitting struggle between immune systems and the pathogens against which they fight, each constantly evolving to try to outsmart the other.**<sup>3148</sup> The name is taken from Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass* in which the Red Queen instructs Alice, "Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place."<sup>3149</sup> **Because the pathogens keep evolving, our immune systems have to keep adapting as well just to keep up.** According to the theory, **animals who "stop running" go extinct. So far our immune systems have largely retained the upper hand, but the fear is that given the current rate of disease emergence, the human race is losing the race.**

## Russian disease crisis causes hypernationalism

**Twigg, '4** [November 2004, Judyth Twigg is a professor at Virginia Commonwealth University, "National Security Implications of Russia's Health and Demographic Crisis", [http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/assets/docs/ponars/pm\\_0360.pdf](http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/assets/docs/ponars/pm_0360.pdf)]



**While the population and health status of ethnic Russians, Slavs, and those of the Orthodox faith continue to decline, the reverse is true of Russia's Muslims.** Throughout most of the Soviet period and continuing through the present day, **the regions of Russia that are predominantly Muslim have enjoyed, on average, significantly higher life expectancy and birth rates, and significantly lower morbidity and mortality rates,** than those for Russia as a whole. As is the case globally, **the fastest growing religion in Russia is Islam, largely due to demographic factors rather than to conversion. A large percentage of the immigrants** (legal and illegal) **to Russia that have mitigated the country's demographic decline over the last decade, compensating at least partially for the overall excess of deaths over births,** have been Muslims from the Caucasus and Central Asia. Indeed, an **acceleration of legal immigration is frequently touted as the ultimate solution to Russia's demographic distress. To be sure, hostility toward immigrants and minority ethnic groups predates the global war on terror and Russia's conflict in Chechnya.** But Nord Ost and Beslan have upped the ante when it comes to race relations. **How will the Russian military react to the probability that it will have to recruit an increasing number of Russian Muslim soldiers in order to maintain adequate staff levels? How will Russian industry respond to a similar imperative? The ranks of neo-Nazi and skinhead youth groups across the country, still relatively small but growing at an alarming rate, routinely and violently target nonRussians,** particularly those from the Caucasus. Incidents of racial violence, including murder, are now routine occurrences in Moscow and other large Russian cities. **As the ratio of Muslims to Slavs inevitably increases, Russia's political landscape could undergo significant change as a result, with ultra-nationalist political parties following the lead of their counterparts in France, Austria, and Germany.**

## **Nationalism causes nuke war**

**ISRAELYAN 1998** [1998, Victor Israelyan was a Soviet ambassador, diplomat, arms control negotiator, and leading political scientist, Washington Quarterly, Winter, EBSCO]

The first and by far most dangerous possibility is what I call **the power scenario.** Supporters of this option **would,** in the name of a "united and undivided Russia," **radically change domestic and foreign policies. Many would seek to revive a dictatorship and take urgent military steps to mobilize the people against the outside "enemy."** Such steps would include Russia's denunciation of the commitment to no-first-use of nuclear weapons; suspension of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) I and refusal to ratify both START II and the Chemical Weapons Convention; denunciation of the Biological Weapons Convention; and reinstatement of a full-scale armed force, including the acquisition of additional intercontinental ballistic missiles with multiple warheads, as well as medium- and short-range missiles such as the SS-20. Some of these measures will demand substantial financing, whereas others, such as the denunciation and refusal to ratify arms control treaties, would, according to proponents, save money by alleviating the obligations of those agreements. In this scenario, **Russia's military planners would shift Western countries from the category of strategic partners to the category of countries representing a threat to national security. This will revive the strategy of nuclear deterrence -- and indeed, realizing its unfavorable odds against the expanded NATO, Russia will place new emphasis on the first-use of nuclear weapons,** a trend that is underway already. The power scenario envisages a hard-line policy toward the CIS countries, and in such circumstances the problem of the Russian diaspora in those countries would be greatly magnified. Moscow would use all the means at its disposal, including economic sanctions and political ultimatums, to ensure the rights of ethnic Russians in CIS countries as well as to have an influence on other issues. Of those means, even the use of **direct military force** in places like the Baltics **cannot be ruled out.** Some will object that this scenario is implausible because no potential dictator exists in Russia who could carry out this strategy. I am not so sure. Some Duma members -- such as Victor Antipov, Sergei Baburin, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, and Albert Makashov, who are leading politicians in ultranationalistic parties and fractions in the parliament -- are ready to follow this path to save a "united Russia." Baburin's "Anti-NATO" deputy group boasts a membership of more than 240 Duma members. One cannot help but remember that when Weimar Germany was isolated, exhausted, and humiliated as a result of World War I and the Versailles Treaty, Adolf Hitler took it upon himself to "save" his country. It took the former corporal only a few years to plunge the world into a second world war that cost humanity more than 50 million lives. I do not believe that Russia has the economic strength to implement such a scenario successfully, but then again, Germany's economic situation in the 1920s was hardly that strong either. Thus, I am afraid that **economics will not deter the power scenario's would-be authors from attempting it.** Baburin, for

example, warned that any political leader who would "dare to encroach upon Russia" would be decisively repulsed by the Russian Federation "by all measures on heaven and earth up to the use of nuclear weapons." n10 In autumn 1996 Oleg Grynevsky, Russian ambassador to Sweden and former Soviet arms control negotiator, while saying that NATO expansion increases the risk of nuclear war, reminded his Western listeners that Russia has enough missiles to destroy both the United States and Europe. n11 Former Russian minister of defense Igor Rodionov warned several times that Russia's vast nuclear arsenal could become uncontrollable. In this context, one should keep in mind that, despite dramatically reduced nuclear arsenals -- and tensions -- Russia and the United States remain poised to launch their missiles in minutes. I cannot but agree with Anatol Lieven, who wrote, "It may be, therefore, that with all the new Russian order's many problems and weaknesses, it will for a long time be able to stumble on, until we all fall down together." n12

## Russian Aerospace

### **Russian space program is teetering due to shortage of skilled workers— continued erosion will destroy the space program**

**Oberg, '10** [6/15/10, James Oberg is a NBC News space analyst and spent 22 years at the Johnson Space Center as a Mission Control operator and an orbital designer. He has written numerous books on the U.S. and Russian space efforts, including "Star-Crossed Orbits: Inside the U.S.-Russian Space Alliance," "How risky is it to rely on Russian spaceflight?", [http://www.nbcnews.com/id/37713521/ns/technology\\_and\\_science-space/#.UfPin9Lqn80](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/37713521/ns/technology_and_science-space/#.UfPin9Lqn80)]

6. Demographics: **The saddest secret of Russia's space program is the aging workforce, retiring or dying off at their posts. These critical experts are only partially being replaced by new employees willing to work for laughably low wages because they are devoted to the ideal of spaceflight. Even recent cosmonaut recruitment efforts actually had to actively seek candidates for the job — there simply weren't enough qualified applicants mailing in their forms. Combined with a cultural trait of not documenting procedures and past events (**the fewer people who know something, the more essential become those who can remember it**), **these staffing trends are alarming in terms of the diminution of skills and corporate memory through continued hemorrhage of irreplaceable skilled workers.** In the long run, NASA will be able to turn to U.S. commercial launch providers as well as the Russians for rides to space. And even in the short run, the risks associated with Russian spaceflight are by no means a guarantee that something will go wrong. Rather, they define areas where constant alertness and remedial work is needed. **Absence or inadequacy of that kind of work could then open the door to sudden failure.****

### **The impact is extinction by asteroid collision—the US dismisses the threat Russian Press Digest, '10** [5/19/10, RusDataLine, "Russia is developing equipment for exploration of a potentially dangerous asteroid"]

**Russian scientists are promising to develop a cosmic device for exploration of a celestial body which, according to certain astronomers, presents a certain threat to life on Earth.** On Tuesday, director of the Space Research Institute, RAS, academician Lev Zeleny, told journalists that **the leading domestic enterprise in the rocket and space industry - Lavochkin Scientific Production Association, is creating a device for the exploration of the asteroid Apophis.** "In 2029, the trajectory of Apophis will be at a fairly close distance from the Earth, and during the second cycle of movement, in 2036, **there is a probability that it will collide with our planet,**" cautioned academician Zeleny. According to him, the damage resulting from such a collision will be three times more severe than the destruction that was caused by the Tunguska meteorite. Scientists believe that the space object that caused the explosion near the Podkamennaya Tunguska River on June 30, 1908, was 50 meters in diameter and could have weighed 1-2 million tons. For comparison: the size of Apophis, discovered in 2004, is 270 by 60 meters, and the asteroid's total weight, according to various estimates, amounts to anywhere from 26 to 45 tons. **The likelihood that the giant cosmic "cobblestone" will collide with the Earth in 2029 is negligible: according to official estimates, published by NASA, the probability of a collision is 1 in 250,000. However, Apophis will "come near" our planet;** according to the latest estimates, in 2029, the asteroid will pass the Earth's surface at a distance of 28,900 kilometers (give or take 200-300 km). **Such proximity could have an effect on the orbit of a small celestial body. Deviation from the previous route could result in the Apophis to once again pass the Earth at a dangerously close distance 7 years later,** in 2036. According to NASA, in the event the "celestial guest" collides with the Earth, an explosion with the force of more than 500 megatons is possible (for comparison: the effects of the Tunguska meteorite's landing are estimated at about 10 megatons, which is equivalent to an explosion of a hydrogen bomb). Scientists, who based their estimates on a maximum possible size of the asteroid - 390 meters - concluded that if such a celestial body were to enter the Earth's atmosphere at a speed of 12.6 km/s, then the collision would form a crater on the Earth's surface of almost 6 km in diameter and trigger an earthquake, measuring 6.5 on the Richter scale, within a 10 km radius. If the asteroid falls into an ocean, it would result in an enormous tsunami; and, if a densely populated area is stricken, the destruction will affect several hundreds of kilometers. However, scientists note that even such a pessimistic scenario does not assume that this will be a global-scale catastrophe, similar to the one which led to the distinction of the dinosaurs - Apophis is simply too small for this. According to the hypothesis of a Nobel Prize laureate, Luis Alvarez, the "stone" that caused a nuclear winter 65

million years ago was about 10 km in diameter. "People's lives are in danger. It is better we spend a few hundred million dollars and create a system that will allow us to avoid a collision, than sit and wait for this to happen and thousands of people lose their lives," Anatoly Perminov, head of Russia's Federal Space Agency Roscosmos, warned the public in January of this year. However, astronomers say that one should not expect the end of the world to come in 2036; the probability Apophis will collide with Earth is very small, but, as was noted by academician Lev Zeleny, this is not a "zero probability". In order to obtain some more precise data on the behavior of the asteroid it was suggested to place a special beacon on Apophis. This, according to Mr. Zeleny, should be accomplished in 2029 as the asteroid approaches the Earth. "The beacon will make it possible to obtain very precise trajectory measurements of the asteroid, which will allow making a more precise forecast as to whether or not it will collide with the Earth 7 years later as well as taking the necessary measures to divert it from its dangerous course," explained the director of the Space Research Institute, RAS. The topic of protection of the Earth from the asteroid threat has not only been discussed within the scientific community for a long time, but has also become a part of the mass culture - take the Hollywood production, Armageddon, as an example, which was filmed six years prior to the discovery of Apophis in 1998. In the movie, an American expedition lands on an asteroid, as it approaches the Earth, and destroys it with a nuclear explosion. Scientists are offering measures for eliminating the uninvited celestial guest that are no-less-effective and, at a first glance, equally science-fictional. For example, the space device could deploy a "solar sail" - a thin light-reflecting film - on the asteroid. It is believed that the pressure of electromagnetic rays could alter the asteroid's speed and direction. Experts of the European Space Agency proposed changing the trajectory of Apophis with the use of a special "orbit evacuator". The asteroid should be approached by a space ship, which will hover above it at the nearest possible proximity, which will be made possible by engines powered by solar batteries. The "cosmic traction engine" will pull the asteroid, while slightly accelerating its movement, and eventually bring the celestial body to a safer orbit. The development of such a "traction ship" or a "cosmic traction device" has been promised by the British corporation, EADS Atrium. In turn, the Lavochkin Scientific Production Association, which has not only produced artificial Earth satellites Lunokhod-1, and devices for the exploration of Venus and Mars, but also intercontinental cruise missiles, could use its designs. However, as was noted last December by the head of Roscosmos, Anatoly Perminov, there are no plans to destroy the asteroid. "No nuclear explosions, everything will be done based on the laws of physics," stressed the head of the space agency.

## **-Generic Brain Drain**

## High Skilled Shortage Now

### **Lack of visas for skilled workers is causing returns to their home countries**

**Kauffman Foundation, '10** [8/12/10, Research team from Duke University, New York University, and Harvard Law's Labor and Worklife Program, "Intellectual Property, the Immigration Backlog, and a Reverse Brain-Drain", <http://www.kauffman.org/research-and-policy/reverse-brain-drain.asp>]

**More than one million skilled immigrant workers, including scientists, engineers, doctors and researchers and their families, are competing for 120,000 permanent U.S. resident visas each year, creating a sizeable imbalance likely to fuel a "reverse brain-drain" with skilled workers returning to their home country,** according to a new report released by the Kauffman

**Foundation.** The situation is even bleaker as **the number of employment visas issued to immigrants from any single country is less than 10,000 per year with a wait time of several years.** Conducted by researchers at Duke University, New York University and Harvard University, the study is the third in a series of studies focusing on immigrants' contributions to the competitiveness of the U.S. economy. Earlier research revealed a dramatic increase in the contributions of foreign nationals to U.S. intellectual property over an eight-year period. **In this study, "Intellectual Property, the Immigration Backlog, and a Reverse Brain-Drain," researchers offer a more refined measure of this rise in contributions of foreign nationals to U.S. intellectual property and seek to explain this increase with an analysis of the immigrant-visa backlog for skilled workers.** The key finding from this research is that **the number of skilled workers waiting for visas is significantly larger than the number that can be admitted to the United States.** This imbalance **creates the potential for a sizeable reverse brain-drain from the United States to the skilled workers' home countries.**

### **High Skilled Shortage Now**

**Wadhwa, 7/25** [7/25/13, Vivek Wadhwa, director of research at Pratt School of Engineering, Duke University and a fellow at Stanford Law School, questions that claim. He responds to Wednesday's post on the Making Sense Business Desk from Hal Salzman, B. Lindsay Lowell and Daniel Kuehn, in which they argued that competition from high-tech guest workers is keeping domestic workers' wages low and making it harder for native STEM graduates to find jobs in their fields, "The Immigrant Brain Drain: How America Is Losing Its High-Tech Talent", <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/businessdesk/2013/07/the-immigrant-brain-drain-how.html>]

**Vivek Wadhwa: Early in my academic career, at Duke University, I researched the graduation rates of engineers in India and China. Based on the numbers, I concluded that India's IT industry would perish, China would rule the world in innovation, and the U.S. was doing just**

**fine.** I also read papers by academics who analyzed U.S. science and engineering graduation data. They said that the U.S. was graduating three times as many engineers and scientists as it needed and that the excess graduates were moving into other professions. They also claimed that U.S. student performance on mathematics, science and reading tests had improved relative to other countries -- and that U.S. enrollment in math and science courses was increasing. The concerns that parents, academics, businesses and policymakers have about U.S. science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education were therefore, the papers claimed, unfounded. I believed them and wrote about this in a BusinessWeek article titled "The Science Education Myth." Then I learned an important lesson: numbers never tell the complete story and some academics spend too much time in ivory towers. Data may say it's a sunny day, but you need to open the window to make sure that it isn't actually raining. **The graduation data were indeed misleading. Subsequent research that I performed by traveling to India, China and Silicon Valley revealed that India's IT industry was booming, China's graduates could not innovate and U.S. tech centers were starved for engineering talent.** I also

**researched the secret of Silicon Valley's success. I learned that diversity and openness gave it a global advantage. I was surprised to find that immigrants were dominating the Valley's entrepreneurial ecosystem and fueling U.S. innovation and job growth.** My research team documented that from 1995 to 2005, immigrants founded 52 percent of Silicon Valley's technology companies and contributed disproportionately to the patents filed by leading tech companies such as Qualcomm (72 percent) and Cisco (60 percent). I realized that flawed data analysis and protectionist demands by nativists are causing our political leaders to advocate immigration policies that are choking U.S. innovation and economic growth. **Because there are not enough permanent-resident visas for the skilled foreign workers who are already in the U.S. on temporary visas, immigrant entrepreneurship has stalled.** Tight limits on temporary guest worker visas, known as **H-1B visas, are preventing technology companies from bringing in new foreign workers, so these companies are being forced to grow their operations abroad.** This means that we are limiting the benefits that come from domestic innovation and reducing the numbers of U.S.-based service, construction and administrative jobs. In trying to protect the jobs of the few, we are hurting the many. **I learned of the dire need that the tech industry has for skilled workers by speaking to the founders of technology companies and observing the bidding wars for talent.** Things are so bad in Silicon Valley that, as NPR's "All Tech Considered" reported, big companies are buying hot startups -- not for their products, but for their people. They call these "acqui-hires." They are paying ridiculously high prices for top talent.

**Brain drain to Russia/China/India now because of failing US immigration policy--high skilled workers would stay here if they could**

**Gustin, '12** [10/11/12, Sam Gustin is a reporter at TIME focused on business, technology, and public policy, "Vivek Wadhwa: Stop the U.S. Highly-Skilled 'Immigrant Exodus'", <http://business.time.com/2012/10/11/vivek-wadhwa-stop-the-u-s-highly-skilled-immigrant-exodus-now/>]

**United States policymakers are failing to address the departure from this country of tens of thousands of talented immigrants — including engineers, doctors, lawyers and teachers. These highly-skilled workers are leaving the U.S. because they can't obtain permanent residency here.** Outdated immigration laws and regulations, bureaucratic delays and partisan bickering have created a Kafka-esque situation where the U.S. is inexplicably **telling the smartest immigrants to go home.** In the midst of a hotly contested presidential race in which immigration is a key issue, forget about actual immigration reform anytime soon. As per usual, U.S. politicians are all talk, but no action. **America's "immigrant exodus," as described by author Vivek Wadhwa** (pictured above), should be very alarming for a country built on the backs and minds of immigrants. After over 200 years of welcoming immigrants into this country, the U.S. is now telling the best immigrants to go away, Wadhwa argues in his new book, *The Immigrant Exodus: Why America Is Losing the Global Race to Capture Entrepreneurial Talent*. How many times in U.S. history have yesterday's poor, tired, huddled masses spawned the next great entrepreneur, doctor, lawyer, or teacher? New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles were built by immigrants. Most attention gets focused on success stories like Andy Grove, Sergey Brin, and Elon Musk, but **there are tens of thousands of less well-known immigrant entrepreneurs and other skilled professionals who want to stay in the United States but can't, due to our byzantine and outdated immigration laws.** (MORE: The Policy Dilemma) **This is but one example of a U.S. immigration system that's terribly broken.** We can fix it. It's an issue that policymakers should pay attention to because their actions will have a direct impact on U.S. competitiveness over the next several decades. By now, the value of immigrant entrepreneurs to the U.S. economy is beyond doubt. But the appeal of the United States as an immigrant business incubator may be slipping away. A new study co-authored by Wadhwa and released by the Kauffman Foundation shows that the proportion of immigrant-founded companies nationwide has slipped from 25.3% to 24.3% since 2005, and in Silicon Valley, the percentage of immigrant-founded startups declined from 52.4% to 43.9% during that time. This is the wrong direction. **"For several years, anecdotal evidence has suggested that an unwelcoming immigration system and environment in the U.S. has created a 'reverse brain drain.' This report confirms it with data," said Dane Stangler, director of Research and Policy at the Kauffman Foundation.** "To maintain a dynamic economy, the U.S. needs to embrace immigrant entrepreneurs." According to the study, immigrant founders are most likely to start companies in the "innovation/manufacturing-related services (45%) and software (22%) industries," and employed some 560,000 workers nationwide. These companies generated an estimated \$63 billion

in sales from 2006 to 2012, the study found. Last week, I had the opportunity to chat with Wadhwa, who came to the U.S. as an immigrant entrepreneur two decades ago, and has since become a U.S. citizen. Wadhwa, a journalist and college professor with appointments at Duke and Stanford, has developed a reputation as a smart tech policy commentator. "Skilled immigrants have contributed disproportionately to U.S. competitiveness," Wadhwa told me in a phone interview. "They start an extraordinary number of companies and they file an extraordinary number of patents. They've been giving America its edge." **Wadhwa says the neglected state of U.S. immigration policy has created a situation where we are kicking highly skilled workers out of the country before they've had a chance to fully realize their promise in America.** The U.S. grants tens of thousands of education and work visas to skilled-immigrants every year, **but because of arbitrary caps, the demand and need for such visas has now out-stripped supply.** "We bring people in as students, we bring them in to work for American companies, but we won't let them stay beyond a short period of time." (MORE: Broken and Obsolete) **As a result of this "reverse brain drain," as Wadhwa and his colleagues called it in earlier research on this topic, highly skilled workers and professionals are increasingly looking to other global markets to locate their businesses. "We're seeing a boom in technology entrepreneurship in India, China, and even Russia, because the U.S. won't let people stay here,"** Wadhwa told TIME. **Their first choice is to be here.** They came here, they're working here, **they want to stay here, but we won't give them visas.** This is a very bad trend for the U.S., especially at a time when we need to encourage and cultivate entrepreneurship and job creation at home. **The toxic U.S. political climate — partisan bickering, congressional inaction, and bureaucratic inertia — have only worsened the problem. Both political parties are to blame — and the over-arching debate over undocumented immigrant amnesty has all but ruled out progress during an election year.** "Both the Democrats and the Republicans agree that we want the entrepreneurs, the scientists, the doctors, the researchers," says Wadhwa. **"Everyone agrees that we want these people to stay. But there's a stalemate on the issue of amnesty for illegal workers."** "The Democrats won't let any legislation pass unless it solves the problem of the illegals," Wadhwa adds. "The Republicans won't let any legislation pass if it solves the problem of the illegals. It's a quagmire, because they refuse to agree with each other. It's two sides fighting each other mindlessly." Wadhwa says the United States Congress should pass a law reforming our immigration system that allows the most talented immigrant entrepreneurs, engineers, lawyers, doctors to gain U.S. citizenship. **Until then, our cash-strapped education system is simply going to train these people, before we send them back home.**



## H-1B Bad

### **Turn- Workers come to America but don't stay- hurts industry**

**Harkinson, '13** [2/22/13, Josh Harkinson is a staff reporter at Mother Jones, "How H-1B Visas Are Screwing Tech Workers", <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/02/silicon-valley-h1b-visas-hurt-tech-workers>]

A few years ago, the pharmaceutical giant Pfizer informed hundreds of tech workers at its Connecticut R&D facilities that they'd soon be laid off. **Before getting their final paychecks, however, they'd need to train their replacements: guest workers from India who'd come to the United States on H-1B visas. "It's a very, very stressful work environment," one soon-to-be-axed worker told Connecticut's The Day newspaper. "I haven't been able to sleep in weeks." Established in 1990, the federal H-1B visa program allows employers to import up to 65,000 foreign workers each year to fill jobs that require "highly specialized knowledge." The Senate's bipartisan Immigration Innovation Act of 2013, or "I-Squared Act," would increase that cap to as many as 300,000 foreign workers. "The smartest, hardest-working, most talented people on this planet, we should want them to come here," Sen. Marco Rubio, (R-Fla.) said upon introducing the bill last month. "I, for one, have no fear that this country is going to be overrun by Ph.D.s."** To be sure, America's tech economy has long depended on foreign-born workers. "Immigrants have founded 40 percent of companies in the tech sector that were financed by venture capital and went on to become public in the U.S., among them Yahoo, eBay, Intel, and Google," writes Laszlo Bock, Google's senior VP of "people operations," which, along with other tech giants such as HP and Microsoft, strongly supports a big increase in H-1B visas. "In 2012, these companies employed roughly 560,000 workers and generated \$63 billion in sales." **But in reality, most of today's H-1B workers don't stick around to become the next Albert Einstein or Sergey Brin. ComputerWorld revealed last week that the top 10 users of H-1B visas last year were all offshore outsourcing firms such as Tata and Infosys. Together these firms hired nearly half of all H-1B workers, and less than 3 percent of them applied to become permanent residents. "The H-1B worker learns the job and then rotates back to the home country and takes the work with him,"** explains Ron Hira, an immigration expert who teaches at the Rochester Institute of Technology. None other than **India's former commerce secretary once dubbed the H-1B the "outsourcing visa." Of course, the big tech companies claim H-1B workers are their last resort, and that they can't find qualified Americans to fill jobs. Pressing to raise the visa cap last year, Microsoft pointed to 6,000 job openings at the company. Yet if tech workers are in such short supply, why are so many of them unemployed or underpaid? According to the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), tech employment rates still haven't rebounded to pre-recession levels.** And from 2001 to 2011, the mean hourly wage for computer programmers didn't even increase enough to beat inflation. The ease of hiring H-1B workers certainly hasn't helped. More than 80 percent of H-1B visa holders are approved to be hired at wages below those paid to American-born workers for comparable positions, according to EPI. Experts who track labor conditions in the technology sector say that older, more expensive workers are particularly vulnerable to being undercut by their foreign counterparts. "You can be an exact match and never even get a phone call because you are too expensive," says Norman Matloff, a computer science professor at the University of California-Davis. "The minute that they see you've got 10 or 15 years of experience, they don't want you." **A 2007 study by the Urban Institute concluded that America was producing plenty of students with majors in science, technology, engineering, and math (the "STEM" professions)—many more than necessary to fill entry-level jobs.** Yet Matloff sees this changing as H-1B workers cause Americans to major in more-lucrative fields such as law and business. "In terms of the number of people with graduate degrees in STEM," he says, "H-1B is the problem, not the solution."

# **“Illegal” Immigrant K**

# 1NC – “Illegal Immigrant” Kritik

**“Illegal Immigrant” dehumanizes migrants – they reduce people to one action and deny their legality**

**Golash-Boza 2013 - Professor of Sociology at the University of California**, (Tanya Golash-Boza, “ No human being is illegal: It's time to drop the 'i-word',” Aljazeera, 4/8/13, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/04/201347111531424247.html>, Accessed 7/31/13)

People who live in the US without permission from the US government are commonly referred to as illegals, illegal immigrants, illegal aliens, undocumented immigrants, or unauthorised migrants. The term you select to describe them has consequences. The first term "illegal" is grammatically incorrect - as it uses an adjective (illegal) as a noun. A person could have entered the country illegally, but that does not mean it is appropriate to call them an "illegal". The US government prefers to use the terms "illegal alien" and "illegal immigrant". However, the fact that the government had adopted a moniker does not mean that the word is accurate or unproblematic. The US government also uses terms such as "criminal alien" and "fugitive alien", which are dehumanising and politically motivated. To universally refer to people who live in the country without authorisation as "illegal immigrants" is incorrect. As David Leopold points out, people who are victims of human trafficking and in the US without authorisation merit protection, not prosecution. The terms "illegal immigrant" and "illegal alien" are problematic because they focus all of our attention on one aspect of a person - the fact that they do not have permission to remain in the country. This is problematic because having crossed the border without permission does not render a person necessarily an "illegal immigrant". You can cross the border without permission, and later obtain legalisation and even citizenship. Just as going over the speed limit once does not make you an "illegal driver", nor does crossing the border once make you an "illegal immigrant" or an "illegal alien". Furthermore, as Professor Otto Santa Ana of the University of California, Los Angeles, explains, the use of the adjective illegal implies criminality, and overstaying your visa or evading immigration inspectors is a civil offence.

**Dehumanization is the worst impact, it brings the society to total damnation: a loss of all value to life, justifies all genocides and atrocities.**

**Fasching, Professor of Religious Studies in the University of South Florida 1993** [Darrell J., Part II of The ethical challenge of Auschwitz and Hiroshima: Apocalypse or Utopia?, Chapter 4 "The Ethical Challenge of Auschwitz and Hiroshima to Technological Utopianism", part 4 "The Challenge of Auschwitz and Hiroshima: From Sacred Morality to Alienation and Ethics", Ebooks]

Although every culture is inherently utopian in its potentiality, the internal social dynamic through which its symbolic world-view is maintained as a sacred order has a tendency to transform it into a closed ideological universe (in Karl Mannheim's sense of the ideological; namely, a world-view that promises change while actually reinforcing the status quo) that tends to define human identity in terms advantageous to some and at the expense of others. Historically the process of dehumanization has typically begun by redefining the other as, by nature, less than human. So the Nazis did to the Jews, and European Americans did to the Native Americans, men have done to women, and whites to blacks. By relegating these social definitions to the realm of nature they are removed from the realm of choice and ethical reflection. Hence those in the superior categories need feel no responsibility toward those in the inferior categories. It is simply a matter of recognizing reality. Those who are the objects of such definitions find themselves robbed of their humanity. They are defined by and confined to the present horizon of culture and their place in it, which seeks to rob them of their utopian capacity for theonomous self-transcending self-definition. The cosmicization of social identities is inevitably legitimated by sacred narratives, whether religious or secular-scientific (e.g., the Nazi biological myth of Aryan racial superiority), which dehumanize not only the victims but also the victors. For to create such a demonic social order the victors must deny not only the humanity of the other who is treated as totally alien but also their own humanity as well. That is, to imprison

the alien in his or her enforced subhuman identity (an identity that attempts to deny the victim the possibility of self-transcendence) the victor must imprison himself or herself in this same world as it has been defined and deny his or her own self-transcendence as well. The bureaucratic process that appears historically with the advent of urbanization increases the demonic potential of this process, especially the modern state bureaucracy organized around the use of the most efficient techniques to control every area of human activity. The result is, as Rubenstein reminds us, the society of total domination in which virtually nothing is sacred, not even human life. The heart of such a bureaucratic social order is the sacralization of professional roles within the bureaucratic structure such that technical experts completely identify themselves with their roles as experts in the use of techniques while totally surrendering the question of what those technical skills will be used for to the expertise of those above them in the bureaucratic hierarchy. It is no accident that the two cultures that drew the world into the cataclysm of World War II, Germany and Japan, were militaristic cultures, cultures that prized and valued the militaristic ideal of the unquestioningly obedient warrior. In these nations, the state and bureaucratic order became one and the same. As Lewis Mumford has argued, the army as an invention of urban civilization is a near-perfect social embodiment of the ideal of the machine. <sup>37</sup> The army brings mechanical order to near perfection in its bureaucratic structure, where human beings are stripped of their freedom to choose and question and where each individual soldier becomes an automaton carrying out orders always "from higher up" with unquestioning obedience.

**Rejecting "Illegal Immigrant" representations is key to rehumanizing people – it allows us to see our laws in a different light**

**Golash-Boza 2013 - Professor of Sociology at the University of California,** (Tanya Golash-Boza, "No human being is illegal: It's time to drop the 'i-word'," Aljazeera, 4/8/13, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/04/201347111531424247.html>, Accessed 7/31/13)

This decision by the AP to refer to actions as "illegal" and not people is crucial because it will help us avoid dehumanising language. One action a person committed - crossing the border without permission or overstaying his/her visa - should not define him/her. In reality, it does not. People who overstay their visa may be eligible for legalisation, and eventually citizenship. And, once they obtain legalisation, they are no longer living in the country without permission. They no longer have to live with the burden of illegality. Changing our language allows us to see how our laws render people unauthorised migrants just as much as their actions do. It permits us to shift our focus from thinking of a person as an "illegal immigrant" and remembering that we are talking about a relationship between what they did - violate the terms of their visa, and the laws that shape which actions are authorised and which are not. Most importantly, it helps us to remember that we are talking about people. It is a big step forward for the AP, and perhaps next the New York Times and other major news outlets, to stop using the "i-word". No human being is illegal. The term "illegal immigrant" simultaneously dehumanises and criminalises people who are denied the opportunity to obtain authorisation from the US government to live in the country they call home.

**Language comes first – metaphoric terms hardwire assumptions into the national dialogue**

**PR Newswire 2006** (PR Newswire, "NABJ Cautions Media Over Language Use in Immigration Debate; Stands in Support of Accuracy in Journalism," PR Newswire, ProQuest, Accessed 7/31/13)

At the 1994 Unity convention, the four minority journalism groups -- NABJ, NAHJ, the Asian American Journalists Association and the Native American Journalists Association -- issued a joint statement on the term "illegal aliens": "Except in direct quotations, do not use the phrase illegal alien or the word alien, in copy or in headlines, to refer to citizens of a foreign country who have come to the U.S. with no documents to show that they are legally entitled to visit, work or live here. Such terms are considered pejorative not only by those to whom they are applied but by many people of the same ethnic and national backgrounds who are in the U.S. legally." George Lakoff, a linguistics professor at the University of California at Berkeley was quoted in the New York Times recently: "Metaphors repeated often enough eventually become part of your

physical brain," he said. "Use the word 'illegal' often enough, which suggests criminal, which suggests immoral, and you have framed the issue of immigration to a remarkable degree."



## Illegal Links

### **“Illegal” is offensive because it attacks a person, not an action**

**McEwan, 2008**, [Melissa, writer for the Feminist Texican, “Stop Saying ‘Illegal’”-Feminist Texican, ?/?/08, <http://thefeministtexican.wordpress.com/stop-saying-illegal/>, 7/31/13]

While many national news outlets use the term “illegal immigrant,” this handbook calls for the discussion and re-evaluation of its use. Instead of using illegal immigrant, alternative labels recommended are “undocumented worker” or “undocumented immigrant.” Illegal immigrant is a term used to describe the immigration status of people who do not have the federal documentation to show they are legally entitled to work, visit or live here. People who are undocumented according to federal authorities do not have the proper visas to be in the United States legally. Many enter the country illegally, but a large number of this group initially had valid visas, but did not return to their native countries when their visas expired. Some former students fall into the latter category. The term criminalizes the person rather than the actual act of illegally entering or residing in the United States without federal documents. Terms such as illegal alien or illegal immigrant can often be used pejoratively in common parlance and can pack a powerful emotional wallop for those on the receiving end. Instead, use undocumented immigrant or undocumented worker, both of which are terms that convey the same descriptive information without carrying the psychological baggage. Avoid using illegal(s) as a noun.

### **“Illegal” endorses a political agenda – it reflects a racist history**

**Flock, 2013**, [Elizabeth, Former print journalist Elizabeth Flock reported for TIME and PEOPLE magazines before becoming an on-air correspondent for CBS News, “Some law makers will continue to say ‘Illegal Immigrant’”-US News, 4/5/13, <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2013/04/05/some-lawmakers-will-continue-to-say-illegal-immigrant>, 7/31/13]

“The phrasing is more about signaling one's political affiliation than about trying to describe immigration,” says Rosa. “We see the promotion of illegality as staking out a claim to a conservative political agenda, while the use of 'undocumented' is staking out a claim to a progressive political ideology. Neither one is neutral.” Immigration-related phrases are often politically charged, and in part that may lie in their history. Geoffrey Nunberg, a linguist and professor at the University of California—Berkeley's School of Information, says both "illegal" and "alien" have rather sordid pasts. He notes that the word “illegal” was first used as a noun in the 1930s and 1940s by the British to describe the Jews who entered Palestine without official permission, and the word “alien,” though used in a pejorative way to describe a foreigner even early in the 20th century, became more negative and scary after science fiction authors began using it to refer to extraterrestrials.

### **“Illegal” entrenches racism – it can trace its history to the Holocaust**

**Garcia, 2012**, [Charles, served in the administrations of four presidents, of both parties, is the CEO of Garcia Trujillo, a business focused on the Hispanic market. He was named in the book “Hispanics in the USA: Making History” as one of 14 Hispanic role models for the nation. “Why ‘Illegal Immigrant’ Is a Slur”-CNN, 7/6/12, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/05/opinion/garcia-illegal-immigrants>,

When you label someone an “illegal alien” or “illegal immigrant” or just plain “illegal,” you are effectively saying the individual, as opposed to the actions the person has taken, is unlawful. The terms imply the very existence of an unauthorized migrant in America is criminal. In this country, there is still a presumption of innocence that requires a jury to convict someone of a crime. If you don't pay your taxes, are you an illegal? What if you get a speeding ticket? A murder conviction? No. You're still not an illegal. Even alleged terrorists and child molesters aren't labeled illegals. By becoming judge, jury and executioner, you dehumanize the individual and generate animosity toward them. New York Times editorial writer Lawrence Downes says “illegal” is often “a code word for racial and ethnic hatred.” The term “illegal immigrant” was first used in 1939 as a slur by the British toward Jews who were fleeing the Nazis and entering Palestine without authorization. Holocaust survivor and Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel aptly said that “no human being is illegal.” Migrant workers residing unlawfully in the U.S. are not -- and never have been -- criminals. They are

subject to deportation, through a civil administrative procedure that differs from criminal prosecution, and where judges have wide discretion to allow certain foreign nationals to remain here.



## Kritik Turns Case

**Turn – using “Illegal Immigrant” undermines discussion of immigration – it reflects a narrow viewpoint**

**Golash-Boza 2013 - Professor of Sociology at the University of California**, (Tanya Golash-Boza, “No human being is illegal: It's time to drop the 'i-word',” Aljazeera, 4/8/13, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/04/201347111531424247.html>, Accessed 7/31/13)

This debate over language drives home the point that all language is politicised. If you choose to continue to call people "illegal" or "illegal immigrant", you make your position on the immigration debate clear. You also make it difficult to have a logical conversation about the problems associated with millions of people living with illegality. In contrast, if you choose to frame the debate around people who live in the US without access to full citizenship, and who must deal daily with the burden of illegality, it allows us to have a conversation about how to move forward and fix the problem - which lies with the burden of illegality, not with the people who came to the US in search of a better life for themselves and their families.

**“Illegal” has political consequences – dehumanization paves the way for regressive immigration policies**

**McEwan, 2008**, [Melissa, writer for the Feminist Texican, “Stop Saying ‘Illegal’”-Feminist Texican, ?/?/08, <http://thefeministtexican.wordpress.com/stop-saying-illegal/>, 7/31/13]

Saying “illegal(s),” “illegal immigrant(s),” and that pesky double whammy, “illegal alien” (which “Others” a person not once, but twice), only serves to reinforce negative stereotypes and dehumanize people. Furthermore, “illegal [insert-noun-here]” has become synonymous with “Mexican,” so let’s just stop saying “illegal,” shall we? By repeating the phrase “illegal immigrants,” the media and politicians have created a misleading framework to talk about immigration. The repeated use of the term “illegal immigrants” is leading to all sorts of policies created to stop them. Many of them were repeated in the debates. More border fences. Prohibiting driver’s licenses. Some want to stop their kids from attending neighborhood elementary schools.

**Representations of “Illegality” reinforce the vision of immigrants – this reinforces restrictionist policies**

**Leopold 2013 - Past President of American Immigration Lawyers Association** (David Leopold, General Counsel and, “no human being should ever be described as "illegal," Huffington Post, 4/3/2013, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/ap-illegal-immigrant\\_b\\_3006392.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/ap-illegal-immigrant_b_3006392.html), Accessed 7/31/13)

After years and years of video loops running on the cable television networks, for many Americans the term "illegal alien" conjures up images of people illegally jumping over the Southern border. Most people would be surprised to learn that nearly half the undocumented population entered the U.S. legally. Some came as visitors, others as students, and others as temporary workers. Some fell out of status because they took ill and were forced to drop out of school, others because they fell victim to domestic violence or other crimes, and others because their sponsoring employer mistreated them. Even those foreign nationals that entered the country surreptitiously in direct violation of the immigration law are not "illegal". Some, like victims of human trafficking, are eligible for protection, not prosecution, under our immigration law. Over the past two decades the restrictionists -- those who seek to cut off virtually all immigration and hang a "Closed for Business" sign around the neck of the Statue of Liberty -- have cynically promoted terms like "illegal alien", "illegal" and "illegals" to dehumanize noncitizens who are in the U.S. with or without lawful immigration status. The

effort is designed to scare the American public and appeal to peoples' darkest, most base instincts.

## Rejection Alternative

**“Illegal” reflects racist assumptions – it should be rejected in immigration discussions**

**Leopold 2013 - Past President of American Immigration Lawyers Association** (David Leopold, General Counsel and, “no human being should ever be described as “illegal,” Huffington Post, 4/3/2013, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/ap-illegal-immigrant\\_b\\_3006392.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/ap-illegal-immigrant_b_3006392.html), Accessed 7/31/13)

And for many years it was an effective, albeit nefarious, strategy. In 2007, the last time Congress considered immigration reform legislation, a small cadre of nativist groups virtually overloaded the telephone lines to the U.S. Capitol with bitter attacks on "amnesty for illegals". Thankfully, with the increasing political clout of Latino voters -- as demonstrated by the last election -- politicians and the media are taking a hard look at the words they use to talk about immigration. It would be unimaginable today for a presidential candidate -- Republican or Democrat -- to again run a national campaign using the terms "illegal alien," "illegal" or "illegals." These obnoxious words have been revealed for what they are -- racially charged slurs which have no place in America's national immigration conversation or in the media that reports about it.

## Language Alternative

### **The alternative solves – Undocumented immigrant solves dehumanization**

**McEwan, 2008**, [Melissa, writer for the Feminist Texican, "Stop Saying 'Illegal'" - Feminist Texican, ?/?/08, <http://thefeministtexican.wordpress.com/stop-saying-illegal/>, 7/31/13]

Illegal alien Avoid. Alternative terms are "undocumented worker," or "undocumented immigrant." The pertinent federal agencies use this term for individuals who do not have documents to show they can legally visit, work or live here. Many find the term offensive and dehumanizing because it criminalizes the person rather than the actual act of illegally entering or residing in the United States. The term does not give an accurate description of a person's conditional U.S. status, but rather demeans an individual by describing them as an alien. At the 1994 Unity convention, the four minority journalism groups – NAHJ, Asian American Journalists Association, Native American Journalists Association and National Association of Black Journalists – issued the following statement on this term: "Except in direct quotations, do not use the phrase illegal alien or the word alien, in copy or in headlines, to refer to citizens of a foreign country who have come to the U.S. with no documents to show that they are legally entitled to visit, work or live here. Such terms are considered pejorative not only by those to whom they are applied but by many people of the same ethnic and national backgrounds who are in the U.S. legally."

### **"Undocumented immigrant" is a better alternative – it is more accurate and less dehumanizing**

**McEwan, 2008**, [Melissa, writer for the Feminist Texican, "Stop Saying 'Illegal'" - Feminist Texican, ?/?/08, <http://thefeministtexican.wordpress.com/stop-saying-illegal/>, 7/31/13]

Avoid. Alternative terms are "undocumented immigrant" or "undocumented worker." This term has been used to describe the immigration status of people who do not have the federal documentation to show they are legally entitled to work, visit or live here. The term criminalizes the person rather than the actual act of illegally entering, residing in the U.S. without documents. Immigrant Similar to reporting about a person's race, mentioning that a person is a first-generation immigrant could be used to provide readers or viewers with background information, but the relevancy of using the term should be made apparent in the story. Also, the status of undocumented workers should be discussed between source, reporter and editors because of the risk of deportation. Undocumented immigrant Preferred term to "illegal immigrant," "illegal(s)" and "illegal alien." This term describes the immigration status of people who do not have the federal documentation to show they are legally entitled to work, visit or live here. Some Latinos say this term more accurately describes people who are in the United States illegally because the word points out that they are undocumented, but does not dehumanize them in the manner that such terms as "aliens" and "illegals" do. Undocumented worker Preferred term to "illegal alien," "illegal immigrant," or "illegal(s)." This term describes the immigration status of people who do not have the federal documentation to show they are legally entitled to work, visit or live here.

### **"Unauthorized Migrant" or "people living in a country illegally" are better alternatives – they accurately reflect a difference between status and action**

**Golash-Boza 2013 - Professor of Sociology at the University of California**, (Tanya Golash-Boza, "No human being is illegal: It's time to drop the 'i-word'," Aljazeera, 4/8/13, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/04/201347111531424247.html>, Accessed 7/31/13)

The term "undocumented immigrant" is imprecise, as people may live in a country without legal permission, yet have plenty of documents - including birth certificates, passports and consular cards. For this reason, organisations such as the Migration Policy Institute prefer "unauthorised migrant". Unlike "illegal immigrant", "unauthorised migrant" does not have a criminalising tone. If you are driving without a licence, it would make more sense to call you an "unauthorised driver" than an "illegal driver". And, we don't call employers who employ unauthorised immigrants "illegal employers". The Associated Press made the decision to refer to people as living in the country illegally instead of as illegal immigrants because it is more accurate to refer to people's

behaviour than to label them because of their behaviour. The AP draws a parallel between this discussion about immigrants and "saying someone was 'diagnosed with schizophrenia' instead of schizophrenic". By focusing on people's behaviour instead of labelling them, we can avoid using people's behaviour to define them.

## Discourse First

### **Discourse should come first – the word “Illegal” taints the discussion before it occurs**

**Johnson, 2010 – Dean of the University of California Davis School of Law** [Kevin, with Michel Martin, host for National Public Radio, “Which is Acceptable: ‘Undocumented’ or ‘Illegal’?”-National Public Radio, 1/7/10, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=122314131>, 7/31/13]

Prof. JOHNSON: I agree with Ruben. I think that terminology is important. And as you say, the power of words has meaning particularly when we talk about a divisive issue like immigration, which is controversial and is very contentious. And for that reason, I think, we need to try to ensure that we have calm, reason and rationality in the debate. And I fear that illegal immigrant - the term - is a loaded term. It's not as loaded as some of its predecessors like illegal alien or wetback. But it still is a loaded term. And when we talk about drivers who violate the driving laws, we don't talk about illegal drivers. We talk about children who work in violation of the child labor laws. We don't talk about illegal children. And I think it's much too comprehensive to talk about illegal immigrants when, as Ruben's column accurately points out, that could be somebody who's reentered after committing felonies. It could be somebody who overstayed a business visa or a tourist visa, but really it creates bad connotations from the outset and it's easy to give in to people to treat dehumanized illegal immigrants in a harsh way than it is to treat people in a harsh way. MARTIN: Dean, can I push you on this point? Just because a term may create bad connotations for some people doesn't mean it's by definition not to be used. Like affirmative action for some people offers bad connotations, they don't think that's a good term, but it does - you know, affirmative action does, more or less, exist. It doesn't - it's not an intrinsically negative term unless one chooses to make it so. So is there something about illegal immigrant per se that you think is by definition so dehumanizing that it can't be used or shouldn't be used in polite discourse? In polite discourse - for people who really are trying to have an honest conversation and aren't trying to spin it one way or the other. Mr. JOHNSON: No, and I wouldn't - I'm not one of the people writing to try to get Ruben's column pulled from the newspaper, and he can use the term, but when you start the discussion by labeling a the person's status as illegal without defining what that precisely means, you create connotations and ill-will toward that person. I mean, there's other terms used in political debates that we know are loaded. We know that the welfare queen is a loaded term. We know that quota queen is a loaded term. MARTIN: Yeah, but that's slang. Mr. JOHNSON: That is slang. This is slang too. This is nothing in the immigration laws. You're not pulling anything out of the statute.

### **“Illegal immigrant” expands racist discourse – language is important because it is offensive**

**Golash-Boza 2013 - Professor of Sociology at the University of California**, (Tanya Golash-Boza, “No human being is illegal: It's time to drop the 'i-word'”, Aljazeera, 4/8/13, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/04/201347111531424247.html>, Accessed 7/31/13)

Language has been in the news lately. Last Tuesday, on April 2, the Associated Press announced it would no longer use "illegal immigrant" to refer to people living in a country without permission. The previous week, Alaska Republican Congressman Don Young referred workers in his father's farm as "wetbacks", although he subsequently apologised for the racialised slander. Why is language so important? What are people so upset about? The word "wetback" is a reference to the fact that many people who cross into the United States without authorisation must cross the Rio Grande. Mexicans and non-Mexicans use the term colloquially. The US government referred to their 1954 mass repatriation campaigns along the southern border as "Operation Wetback". In her research with Mexican immigrants, Ruth Gomberg-Munoz found that undocumented Mexicans use the Spanish equivalent (mojados) to describe themselves, even if they had not actually gotten their backs wet in the Rio Grande. Nevertheless, Gomberg-Munoz chooses not to use the word in her own writing, because many people find the word offensive. It should not be difficult to see why wetback is offensive. It makes light of a dangerous crossing: last year, at least 477 people died attempting to cross over from Mexico to the US. Aside from that, when you call someone a name like wetback, you are making one action they committed into a permanent aspect of who they are. This critique can also be applied to the "i-word".

### **“Illegal Immigrant” reinforces stereotypes of immigrants as criminals because language constructs opinion**

**Leopold 2013 - Past President of American Immigration Lawyers Association** (David Leopold, General Counsel and, "no human being should ever be described as "illegal," Huffington Post, 4/3/2013, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/ap-illegal-immigrant\\_b\\_3006392.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/ap-illegal-immigrant_b_3006392.html), Accessed 7/31/13)

Yes, you read it correctly. There really is no such thing. And not because the Associated Press announced a long overdue change to its Stylebook yesterday and will no longer use "illegal alien", "illegal" or "illegals" to describe noncitizens unlawfully present in the U.S. It's because "no human being should ever be described as "illegal." Period. These insensitive terms are also legally incorrect. They erroneously imply that a noncitizen unlawfully in the U.S. is, by virtue of his or her very presence, committing a criminal offense, rather than a civil immigration violation. Is it surprising then that many Americans buy the false restrictionist line that all unlawfully present foreign nationals are criminals? In fact, there is only a discrete group of non-citizens whose very presence in the U.S. is a crime, including those who illegally reentered the country after deportation. But the argument against the use of these words to describe people is not merely technical. Words really matter in the age of Twitter where 140 character tweets can fly around the world in nanoseconds. Reference to a human being as "illegal" overly simplifies and unfairly characterizes the complexities of the national immigration reform debate. The dysfunctional immigration law which plagues American families and business is a convoluted web of nonsensical rules and regulations that can easily trap any foreign national into an unfixable civil immigration violation.





## AT: No Spillover

### **Stereotypes of "Illegals" affect everyone because racism spills over**

**PR Newswire 2006** (PR Newswire, "NABJ Cautions Media Over Language Use in Immigration Debate; Stands in Support of Accuracy in Journalism," PR Newswire, ProQuest, Accessed 7/31/13)

The debate is not just one focused on Hispanics, added Ernie Suggs, NABJ vice president for print and a reporter at the Atlanta Journal Constitution. "At the same time blacks faced discrimination in the South, Hispanics -- particularly Mexicans -- faced similar discrimination in the Southwest," Suggs said. "This is an issue for all of us." According to the U.S. Census, more than three million of the suspected 12-15 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. come from countries outside Mexico and Latin America, including Russia, Poland, Ireland, China, India and Canada. The NABJ Stylebook -- a digital guide for language usage in newsrooms found online at <http://www.nabj.org/newsroom/stylebook> -- also suggests more accurate terms such as "undocumented immigrant." "On TV especially, what is said, along with what is seen, has a powerful impact on viewers," said Barbara Ciara, anchor and managing editor at WTKR in Norfolk and NABJ vice president for broadcast. "It's a matter of accuracy."

## AT: Factually Correct

### **“Illegal” isn’t even factually correct – it is only selectively applied**

**McEwan, 2008**, [Melissa, writer for the Feminist Texican, “Stop Saying ‘Illegal’”-Feminist Texican, ?/?/08, <http://thefeministtexican.wordpress.com/stop-saying-illegal/>, 7/31/13]

But the phrase “illegal immigrant” is misleading. There’s a grain of truth, but the emphasis is only selectively applied — it’s misapplied — we don’t call speeders “illegal drivers” or people who jaywalk “illegals.” And that selective application to immigrants is harmful. The National Association of Hispanic Journalists lays it all out for us: Alien A word used by the U.S. government to describe a foreign-born person who is not a citizen by naturalization or parentage. People who enter the United States legally are called resident aliens and they carry alien registration cards also known as “green cards,” because they used to be green. While Webster’s first definition of the term “alien” is in accordance with the government’s interpretation, the dictionary also includes other, darker, meanings for the word, such as “a non-terrestrial being,” “strange,” “not belonging to one,” “adverse,” “hostile.” And the Encyclopedia Britannica points out that “in early times, the tendency was to look upon the alien as an enemy and to treat him as a criminal or an outlaw.” It is not surprising then that in 1798, in anticipation of a possible war with France, the U.S. Congress passed the Alien and Sedition Acts, which restricted “aliens” and curtailed press freedoms. By 1800 the laws had been repealed or had expired but they still cast a negative shadow over the word. In modern times, with science-fiction growing in popularity, “alien” has come to mean a creature from outer space, and is considered pejorative by most immigrants.

### **The alternative “Undocumented migrant” is more accurate – accuracy is key to framing the debate**

**PR Newswire 2006** (PR Newswire, “NABJ Cautions Media Over Language Use in Immigration Debate; Stands in Support of Accuracy in Journalism,” PR Newswire, ProQuest, Accessed 7/31/13)

NABJ stands firmly in support of its sister organization, the National Association of Hispanic Journalists, in its plea that newspapers, television and radio outlets avoid using the term “illegal aliens” in the context of the current debate, as it is inaccurate and susceptible to misinterpretation. Terms such as “undocumented immigrant” or “economic refugee” are more accurate, do not unfairly criminalize a human being and are more widely accepted terms in use by such respected journalism organizations as the New York Times and Associated Press. “The words we use can in fact frame the debate,” said NABJ President Bryan Monroe, assistant vice president for news at Knight Ridder, “and we all need to make sure those words are not loaded with baggage and off-the-mark. Language does matter. If we can’t be accurate, we’re not doing our jobs.”

## AT: “Illegal” is Inevitable

**“Illegal” isn’t inevitable – the Supreme Court stopped using it**

**Garcia, 2012**, [Charles, served in the administrations of four presidents, of both parties, is the CEO of Garcia Trujillo, a business focused on the Hispanic market. He was named in the book "Hispanics in the USA: Making History" as one of 14 Hispanic role models for the nation. "Why 'Illegal Immigrant' Is a Slur"-CNN, 7/6/12, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/05/opinion/garcia-illegal-immigrants>.

(CNN) -- Last month's Supreme Court decision in the landmark Arizona immigration case was groundbreaking for what it omitted: the words "illegal immigrants" and "illegal aliens," except when quoting other sources. The court's nonjudgmental language established a humanistic approach to our current restructuring of immigration policy.

## **Negative -- Ag Robots Counterplans**

# 1NC

## **Text:**

**The United States Federal Government should substantially increase funding for the development of robotic harvesting and planting technology for domestic agricultural use.**

**The United States Federal Government should raise the minimum wage to \$15 per hour for workers aged 18 and older.**

## **Ag robots solve farm productivity and worker shortages**

**LDL Voice 4-30-15** [Load Delivered Voice is a communication outlet for Load Delivered Logistics is a technology-enabled third-party logistics (3PL) firm, “Using Robots to Combat the Farm Labor Shortage,” <http://www.loaddelivered.com/blog/communications/using-robots-to-combat-the-farm-labor-shortage/>]

During the last century, there were an estimated 3 million migrant and seasonal farm workers in the U.S., but that number has declined significantly to around 1 million today. Despite offering better wages in recent years, farms are struggling to attract workers due to the nature of the work. People don't want to take on back-breaking labor when there are other options available. Farms now face up to a 30 percent shortage of workers, and that number may increase if they don't adjust the way they do business (CNBC). Fortunately, technological advances are making it possible for robots to handle laborious farming tasks, which could benefit U.S. farms that are currently struggling with a labor shortage. Enter the Robots To offset the labor shortage, many farms have turned to technology as a solution. Growers of corn and other commodity crops led the charge on this front, replacing most of their workers decades ago with giant combines and other machines used to cut and gather grain. Now, we're seeing the emergence of robots that can perform more tedious jobs like picking produce and plants. A Spanish company recently developed what they call an Agrobot, an automated harvester that automates the process of picking small produce like strawberries. This 14-armed machine uses high-powered computing, color sensors, and small metal baskets to gently pluck ripe strawberries, ignoring any unripe fruit in its path. Devices that handle tasks like planting vegetable seedlings, harvesting lettuce, transplanting roses, and pulling weeds are also emerging. These mechanized solutions that assume delicate tasks formerly only possible by human workers could have a huge impact on the fresh-produce industry (The Wall Street Journal). Added Value Though this new technology has a high upfront cost, the return on investment can be significant. For example, each Agrobot currently costs \$100,000, but the cost of leaving a field unpicked due to no workers available can be a lot more expensive—sometimes resulting in millions of dollars lost. Mechanization of the fresh-produce industry could especially help California produce farmers, who are struggling with a devastating drought. Farming robots can also drastically increase speed of operations. Tanimura & Antle Fresh Foods Inc., one of the country's largest vegetable farms, found that they could reduce work hours for growing romaine and celery by up to 15 percent with an automated tool that transplants seedlings from greenhouse to field (The Wall Street Journal). Getting tasks like these done faster frees up worker hours that can be used for other important tasks, further increasing productivity. Weeding robots, such as LettuceBot by Blue River Technology, are also being developed, which could potentially reverse the use of harmful herbicides that threaten the health of insect and animal life. These robots bring more precision through spot spraying weeds, rather than blanket spraying entire fields (Earth Island Journal).

## **Raising the minimum wage is an economic silver bullet**

**Solomon '14** [Marty Solomon is a retired University of Kentucky professor of business and economics, “Marty Solomon: \$15 minimum wage would be economic silver bullet,” [http://www.kentucky.com/2014/11/17/3542896\\_marty-solomon-15-minimum-wage.html?rh=1](http://www.kentucky.com/2014/11/17/3542896_marty-solomon-15-minimum-wage.html?rh=1)]

Despite corporate profits near all-time highs and the stock market's record levels, middle class incomes have fallen. The disparity between rich and the rest has never been greater. The average income of the 400 richest Americans is \$130,000 an hour. The average income of the top million taxpayers is \$800 an hour. Yet the average American earns \$24 an hour. While the bottom 40 percent of Americans earn 7 percent of the income, the top 1 percent earns 20 percent. This disparity seems to be the new normal. What is the answer? Many things

have been tried — stimulus, quantitative easing, earned income credits — yet most Americans have been left out. **There is** something that has not been tried and could make an immense difference — **a silver bullet**. Drum roll, please. **It's the \$15 minimum wage for workers 18 or older**. Today 40 percent of households earn less than \$25,000 a year. That is \$11 an hour and that's **poverty for a family of four**, so even a \$10.10 minimum wage seems too puny. But a \$15 minimum wage could change things overnight. Guess what? **None of America's millions of adult full-time workers would be in poverty**. Imagine that. And guess what else? **It would pump at least \$400 billion annually into the economy, creating enormous demand for retail, housing and autos; requiring businesses to increase hiring, and, at the same time, permit millions of American families to enjoy a better standard of living. Billions in welfare payments would be saved; federal income tax revenues would rise, helping to reduce the federal deficit**. State income tax revenues would also increase.

## Ext- Ag robots solve agriculture

### Ag robots solve farm production

Plumer '14 [Brad, senior editor at Vox.com, where he oversees the site's science, energy, and environmental coverage, "America is running out of farm workers. Will robots step in?" July 2, <http://www.vox.com/2014/7/2/5861274/americas-running-out-of-farmworkers-will-robots-help>]

Labor-saving techniques have been a mainstay of agriculture since the very beginning. Farmers have always tried to do more with less. To take one example: The recent growth of "no-till farming," which involves less plowing and more herbicides to kill weeds, has reduced demand for labor on some farms. But if a massive farmworker shortage really is on the way in the decades ahead, those labor-saving techniques will have to have to expand massively. Enter the machines. In recent years, companies have been developing driverless tractors guided by GPS. Or drones that can monitor plant health from afar. Or sensors that can automatically figure out where fields need water. Or fully autonomous cow milkers. In Australia, there are even robots that herd cows and sheep around: Robots are slowly expanding into other areas, too. Blue River Technology is developing a robot that uses sensors and algorithms to identify weeds and pluck them. In 2012, the company unveiled a prototype that can thin out lettuce crops in order to give the remaining plants room to grow — a task that usually requires dozens of workers. Fruit-picking is another area where robots could make a real difference. New Scientist notes that the state of Washington produces 17 billion apples each year — each one plucked by a human hand. A labor shortage would threaten that harvest. So a research team at Washington State University is spending the next five years developing a robot to do the job. That said, there are certainly skeptics. At the Oxford Farming Conference in the United Kingdom in January, some experts argued that many existing ideas for agricultural robots would take decades to catch on — if at all. A lot will depend on how quickly the price of human labor rises and how fast the price of machines falls. But if they do catch on, how would this shake out economically? In a 2012 presentation, Taylor and his colleague Diane Charlton looked at the lessons from "shake-and-catch" machines that surround a tree and shake out the fruits or nuts into a large basket. Whenever these machines have been adopted, they note, they typically displace large numbers of low-skilled foreign workers with a few native-born workers with high-school or college degrees. That suggests that a larger-scale shift to farm robots could be a boon to domestic farm workers (studies have found that 23 percent of US farm worker families are below the poverty line). But Taylor and Charlton noted that a shift to robot farmers would likely have other effects as well. The US may see increased demand for higher-skilled agricultural laborers from abroad, for instance.

### Robots solve agricultural productivity

Merritt '14 [Ginger, holds a degree in agricultural journalism from the University of Missouri, "Can Ag Robots Clear The Obstacles?" July 9, <http://www.precisionag.com/institute/can-ag-robots-clear-the-obstacles-pa-institute-content/>]

That scenario might seem far-fetched and futuristic, but with automation in agriculture exploding, it might not be so off-base. Technological advances in agriculture are growing by leaps and bounds, and farmers and agricultural companies are boarding the ag robotic train. They see a bright future. "I picture a small shed in the corner of every 160-acre field with a tractor and a multi-purpose tillage/planter/sprayer tool," said Todd Golly, Winnebago, MN, farmer. "The tractors will be fully autonomous, identically built for cost savings." Industry experts can see that vision, too. Jorge Heraud, CEO of Blue River Technologies, said that ag robotics is a complicated topic, but he believes it will take the industry by storm. "Ag robotics will be everywhere," he said. "The question is when." Mike Gomes, Topcon director of agriculture business development, agrees that the ag robotics industry is strong and growing. He said he sees agriculture transforming from one machine per operator to many machines per operator. "We're ready to help the industry move on to the next levels of automation," he said. From the cotton gin in the 1830s to the monster combines of current day, agriculture has undergone a technology revolution that is not even close to ending. One of the first ways that robotics made their way into agriculture was in the form of autosteer in tractors. "Our farm, like many others, has used autosteer for years; this was probably the first form of widely accepted 'robotic' technology," Golly said. Farmers have fully embraced that technology and are welcoming more updates and equipment that make their everyday lives easier. "We have now moved into using fully autonomous unmanned aerial systems for crop scouting," said Golly, who farms his family's 7,000-acre corn and soybean farm in southern Minnesota. "We can scout hundreds of acres in the time it used to take to do only a few." Ag robotics increase efficiency on the farm. Many experts feel that one of the biggest ways this technology can help the industry is in the form of labor, which is becoming increasingly difficult to secure, especially in the labor-intensive fruit and vegetable fields. The amount of manual labor in agriculture lends itself to robotics, Heraud said, and his work at Blue River Technologies in California recognizes that opportunity. Their lettuce bot will mechanically thin the fields — a task that is currently done by humans. Heraud said that using robots for this type of work not only answers the labor-shortage call but performs at a higher level. "The better you thin the lettuce, the more uniform stand you have and the more yield you get," he said. "So, we have created this machine that can thin much better than a human can." Blue River currently has three lettuce bots in operation that are hired by farmers and operated by Blue River staff. The company has only been working on the technology for a little more than a year, but the robot is already in its third generation. Heraud said that they are rolling the equipment out in this way to ensure that the farmer gets the best results from the machines in its early stages of development. "It's very possible that we will mass produce this robot, but the first thing that needs to happen is to get the technology stable." he said.

## Funding key to ag robots

### **More government funding is key to effective agriculture technology**

**Tobe '14** [Frank, "Will agricultural robots arrive in time to keep fruit and vegetable costs down?" July 11, <http://robohub.org/will-agricultural-robots-arrive-in-time-to-keep-fruit-and-vegetable-costs-down/>]

The race has been slow-going up until now. **Farmers are very pragmatic and cost conscious**. They have gradually moved toward precision agriculture (AKA satellite farming or site specific crop management (SSCM)). (Precision agriculture is farming management based on observing and responding to intra-field variations.) But **they have not yet embraced robotics**. They are beginning to experiment with data from aerial robots, kits that enable self-driving of tractors, and advanced GPS and communications systems, but for a variety of reasons have not moved past the experimental phase. If and when new robotic products do their jobs efficiently, reliably and economically AND low-cost labor cannot be found, farmers will change their methods and begin to deploy robots. They haven't needed to until now. **The only real questions are** (1) **whether the robots will be funded, developed, field tested and produced in time**, (2) will these new devices do their jobs properly and economically, or (3) will consumer prices need to rise to compensate for higher wages because no robots could be adapted to the work? Here are some of the factors effecting change: Migrant labor: Farm wages in Mexico are rising, giving jobs to those that used to go to the US for work Other less gruelling jobs are becoming available within Mexico and in the US, providing choices where there were few before Fewer migrant workers are coming to the US each year States are passing and enforcing stricter immigration laws deterring undocumented workers Income is a major factor in the migration away from farming: Farm production expenses in the US average \$109,359 per year per farm while less than 1 in 4 of the farms produce gross revenues in excess of \$50,000 Use of robots: Researchers are forecasting expansion of the agricultural robot market from \$817 million in 2013 to an anticipated \$16.3 billion by 2020 Robotic harvesting, irrigation, pruning, weeding and thinning devices are being field-tested all around the world Robotic spraying and seeding have been going on in Japan and Australia for years Driverless tractors are beginning to be deployed and provide less compaction than do traditional tractors Robotic cow milking systems are making inroads in the US Nurseries are beginning to use pick-and-place robots Aerial observation robots will likely add to the precision of the global precision agricultural movement once FAA regulations are in place in late 2015 ABB, KUKA and Yaskawa have made little inroads in the industry although they do provide robots to help make farm tools and tractors and material handling equipment Fanuc, KUKA and Adept have a presence in food sorting and processing but not in growing or harvesting Other drivers: Using LED lighting has enabled year-around indoor farming which further enables the metrics for greenhouse robotic processing Better and more specific crop, chemical, air and soil sensors – all at low cost – enables better understanding of crop variability and improves precision methods **Learning systems and big data processing help farmers overlay more and more data to understand their farms better and make their precision methods more accurate** Swarm **technologies** and better telematic systems **can optimize equipment and control swarm activity**, e.g., variable rate swath control **to save on seed, minerals, fertilizer and herbicides** by reducing overlapping **Governmental funding in the US has been paltry**: the USDA has awarded grants totaling \$4.5 million for robotics research. Growers Associations and large ag equipment producers have given research grants or done internal R&D supplementing the USDA. Venture capital firms, in a quest to incubate new technology for the industry, have invested \$71.1 million in 8 ag-related start-up companies in the last two years<sup>5</sup>. European public-private-partnerships for various agricultural projects (shown below) has been sufficient to give an edge to EU ag equipment providers as well as start-up companies.



## Ext- Higher wages solve econ

### **Raising wages is essential to the economy**

**Furman '14** [Jason Furman is the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers,

“Unemployment is down, and we still have work to do,”

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/unemployment-is-down-and-we-still-have-work-to-do/2014/07/04/7172bec6-0383-11e4-b8ff-89afd3fad6bd\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/unemployment-is-down-and-we-still-have-work-to-do/2014/07/04/7172bec6-0383-11e4-b8ff-89afd3fad6bd_story.html)]

Even with this good news, it is essential to dig into the numbers to understand what they mean both for families still struggling to make ends meet and for the work **we** still **need to do to create more jobs at higher wages. We have further to go** – especially given a long-term unemployment rate that is still too high and **wages that have been stagnant for decades** – but our challenges should not distract us from understanding the progress we have made. Skeptics point to the higher unemployment indicated by a broader gauge of unemployment and underemployment that includes people involuntarily working part time and those who have not looked for a job recently but who still want to work. But this criticism ignores that this measure is always higher than the official unemployment rate and that it has also come down steadily, falling by more than 5 percentage points from its peak in early 2010. Another claim is that the only reason unemployment has fallen is because **people are dropping out of the workforce**, what economists call a decline in the participation rate. In fact, since October the participation rate has been stable, so the 1.1-percentage-point decline in unemployment since then stems entirely from more people finding jobs. It is true that the participation rate has fallen over the course of the recession and recovery. But it is important to put that fact in context. According to a range of studies, including our own analysis at the Council of Economic Advisers, about half of the decline is due to the beginning of a retirement boom as the first baby boomers turned 62 and became eligible for Social Security benefits in 2008. This fully anticipated economic event will continue to put downward pressure on the participation rate for decades. The retirement boom is layered on top of other trends unrelated to aging, such as the decline in participation by men between ages 25 and 54 since the 1950s and the decline by women in those same prime working years since the late 1990s. In fact, a 2006 study by economists at the Federal Reserve that considered these trends projected that the labor force participation rate would fall to 62.9 percent this year, almost exactly its current level. Of course, in addition to these trends, whenever the unemployment rate is elevated, the participation rate will be lower, as people seek further schooling, delay reentering the workforce after leaving for reasons such as caring for a newborn, or get discouraged and stop looking for work. These effects have likely been exacerbated by the unique challenges associated with the worst recession since the Great Depression, but they have diminished as the labor market healed, and further healing will continue to push the participation rate up, roughly offsetting the continued decline due to the population aging. **Correctly diagnosing the challenges we face points us to what we can do to spur more job creation, raise wages and bring more people into the labor market.** First, Congress should take steps to invest in infrastructure, extend unemployment insurance benefits and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. In the absence of action from Congress, President Obama will press forward by using his executive authority to expand credit in mortgage markets, speed the permitting of infrastructure projects, launch new hubs of manufacturing innovation and attract foreign investment. While a strong overall recovery is the most powerful solution to long-term unemployment, **we should not overlook some of the unique challenges the long-term unemployed can face.** That is why this year the president required the federal government to improve its hiring practices, announced new grants to expand some of the most promising public-private efforts to connect the long-term jobless with work, and rallied some of the nation's largest employers to commit to best practices for hiring the long-term unemployed. Second, a stronger economy will help raise wages, and, conversely, **higher wages will help strengthen the economy. That is why it is essential to raise the minimum wage.** While Congress has waited to act, many states and businesses are moving ahead. At the same time, investments in everything from preschool to college will raise longer-term wage growth.

### **Higher wages bolsters the economy**

**Perez et al '14** [U.S. Secretary of Labor Tom Perez was sworn in on July 23, 2013, as the nation's 26th secretary of labor. Tom Harkin is a Democratic senator from Iowa. George Miller, a Democrat, is U.S. representative for California's 11th congressional district and former chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, “Raise minimum wage; working people should not live in poverty,” October 10, <http://www.cnn.com/2014/10/10/opinion/perez-harkin-miller-minimum-wage/>]

Every day for low-wage workers is filled with struggle and anxiety. We have heard from and visited with people making heartbreaking decisions about which bill to pay, which meal to skip, which growing child will get a pair of shoes this season and whether to buy a gallon of milk or a gallon of gas. For many of us, an unexpected car repair is an inconvenience; for a minimum-wage worker, it is a catastrophe. **The national minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour is unconscionably low.** It is an affront to our values, and it has remained unchanged for more than five years. During that time, the cost of food, utilities, transportation and other essentials has gone up, but low-wage workers' paychecks have remained the same. In fact, the **purchasing power of the minimum wage has been eroding steadily** (PDF) **since its peak in the late 1960s.** Today's minimum wage would have to be well above \$10 per hour to equal the purchasing power of the minimum wage in 1968. Too many low-wage workers must rely on public assistance just to keep their heads above water. **Raising the minimum wage would allow up to 3.6 million people to come off the food stamp rolls.** These workers would have the dignity and satisfaction of buying food with their own paychecks while American **taxpayers would no longer have to pony up billions of dollars to subsidize the large companies that build wealth for shareholders on the backs of their workers.** Fortunately, many businesses are turning away from this low-road business model. Poll after poll shows that employers – especially small businesses – are rallying around \$10.10. We've seen it firsthand in visits to these businesses, where they know that higher wages strengthen their bottom line by increasing employee loyalty, retention and productivity. **Businesses also know that they need customers with money in their pockets. When working families get a raise, they don't stash it in offshore tax**

havens. They pump it right back into their local economies at the grocery store, hardware store or auto body shop.

Increasing the minimum wage boosts consumer demand, growing our economy and helping communities thrive.

Henry Ford understood this. A century ago, long before there was a federally mandated minimum wage, he doubled the pay of the workers on his assembly line because he thought they should be able to afford the very cars they were making. He said, "If we can distribute high wages, then that money is going to be spent and it will serve to make storekeepers and distributors and manufacturers and workers in other lines more prosperous. ... Countrywide high wages spell nationwide prosperity."

## T – Domestic



## 1nc

**Domestic is defined individuals within the United States or US persons elsewhere—non-citizens are excluded**

**Jackson, RAND Safety and Justice program director, 2009** (Brian A., “The Challenge of Domestic Intelligence in a Free Society,” RAND, Homeland Security Program and the Intelligence Policy Center, 2009, [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\\_MG804.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG804.pdf), p. 4-5, IC)

To guide the work reported in this volume, **we define domestic intelligence as efforts by government organizations to gather, assess, and act on information about individuals or organizations in the United States or U.S. persons elsewhere**<sup>3</sup>

**BEGIN FOOTNOTE 3**

**Federal law and executive order define a U.S. person as “a citizen of the United States, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, an unincorporated association with a substantial number of members who are citizens of the U.S. or are aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or a corporation that is incorporated in the U.S.” (NSA, undated). Although this definition would therefore allow information to be gathered on U.S. persons located abroad, our objective was to examine the creation of a domestic intelligence organization that would focus on—and whose activities would center around—individuals and organizations located inside the United States. Though such an agency might receive information about U.S. persons that was collected abroad by other intelligence agencies, it would not collect that information itself.**

**END FOOTNOTE 3**

that are not related to the investigation of a known past criminal act or specific planned criminal activity.<sup>4</sup>

**Violation: The affirmative curtails surveillance of non-US persons abroad**

**Voting issue for two reasons:**

**---LIMITS –loosening the ‘domestic’ restriction opens the floodgates to country-specific affirmatives**

**---PREDICTABLE GROUND – immigration is a completely distinct topic. Core topic links related to NSA and domestic law enforcement don’t apply**

## 2nc ev

**Domestic implies US persons as protected under the Fourth Amendment, which excludes non-permanent immigrants—this means the aff is foreign, not domestic, surveillance**

**Freiwald, University of San Francisco School of Law professor, 2009** (Susan, "ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE AT THE VIRTUAL BORDER," Mississippi Law Journal, Vol. 78, No. 2, 1/14/09, <http://www.olemiss.edu/depts/ncjrl/pdf/ljournal09Freiwald.pdf>, p. 331-332, IC) **The Fourth Amendment does not protect everyone**, however. **It mandates** the greatest **judicial oversight when government agents monitor**, for law enforcement purposes, **the communications of "U.S. Persons"**<sup>13</sup>

### **BEGIN FOOTNOTE 13**

Under Fourth Amendment doctrine, U.S. citizens and aliens with "sufficient connection with this country to be considered part of th[is] community" have the same rights. *United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259, 265 (1990). **Federal statutory law refers to American citizens and permanent resident aliens as "U.S. Person[s]."** 50 U.S.C. §§ 1801(i), 1821(1) (2005). Throughout this essay, the term **"U.S. Persons" will be used to represent the group of citizens and aliens who have Fourth Amendment rights.**

### **END FOOTNOTE 13**

in America.<sup>14</sup> **At the opposite end of the spectrum, the Fourth Amendment has nothing to say about government surveillance of** the communications of **foreign persons in foreign places** to gather foreign intelligence.<sup>15</sup> When they want to monitor entirely "foreign" communications, executive branch agents enjoy considerable discretion. That is in part because such surveillance falls within the executive's constitutional power to conduct foreign affairs,<sup>16</sup> and in part because foreigners surveilled abroad generally lack standing to bring cases in United States courts.<sup>17</sup> As the Fourth Circuit has noted, **"[j]ust as the separation of powers . . . forced the executive to recognize a judicial role when the President conducts domestic security surveillance, so the separation of powers requires us to acknowledge the principal responsibility of the President for** foreign affairs and concomitantly for **foreign intelligence surveillance.**"<sup>18</sup>

**Fourth Amendment rights are the key delineating factor**

**Freiwald, University of San Francisco School of Law professor, 2009** (Susan, "ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE AT THE VIRTUAL BORDER," Mississippi Law Journal, Vol. 78, No. 2, 1/14/09, <http://www.olemiss.edu/depts/ncjrl/pdf/ljournal09Freiwald.pdf>, p. 334-335, IC)

While the FISA scheme is a creature of Congress, it must conform to constitutional constraints.<sup>26</sup> As Part II discusses, **Fourth Amendment precedents require the judiciary to oversee executive branch surveillance of** purely **"domestic" surveillance.**<sup>27</sup> But **the Fourth Amendment has much less, if anything, to say about executive branch conduct of purely "foreign" surveillance.**<sup>28</sup> One could defensibly arrange the scenarios along a spectrum from most "domestic," and therefore protected by the Fourth Amendment, to most "foreign," and therefore least protected.

Rather than viewing the Fourth Amendment as providing decreasing judicial oversight as the character of the electronic surveillance becomes increasingly foreign, however, **one could** instead **view Fourth Amendment protection as** being **all or nothing.** In other words, **one could view the Fourth Amendment as providing strict regulation for purely domestic investigations**

and no regulation for purely foreign investigations because the latter are governed by executive branch discretion. Then one would view the rules for cases that fall in the middle as designed to determine whether to treat the investigation as domestic or foreign. Under this view, in cases that are neither clearly domestic nor clearly foreign, the judge's role would be to review the executive's decision to deprive the target of judicial oversight of the surveillance that the Fourth Amendment mandates. The executive makes such a determination when a target effectively acts in the interest of a foreign power; in such a case, the executive may be said to "exile" that target if she is a U.S. Person.<sup>29</sup>

### **Empirically, legislation only governs domestic surveillance as surveillance done within borders**

**Jordan, New York University School of Law LLM, 2006** (David Alan, "DECRYPTING THE FOURTH AMENDMENT: WARRANTLESS NSA SURVEILLANCE AND THE ENHANCED EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY PROVIDED BY ENCRYPTED VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL," Boston College Law Review, Vol. 47,

<http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2330&context=bclr>, p. 521, IC)

As part of this procedural framework, FISA established a special court known as the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (the "FISC"). This court hears most government requests to conduct "electronic surveillance" within the United States for foreign intelligence purposes.<sup>97</sup> The Act also mandated the adoption of minimization procedures to limit the effects of FISA-authorized surveillance on U.S. persons. FISA does not, however, extend protection to non-U.S. persons outside the United States.<sup>99</sup> Collecting signals information outside U.S. borders is not considered "electronic surveillance" under the Act's definition, even if a U.S. person is specifically targeted.<sup>100</sup>

#### **BEING FOOTNOTE 100**

See FISA, 50 U.S.C. § 1801(f). Section 1801(f) of FISA defines four types of conduct that are considered "electronic surveillance" under FISA. Signals collection operations that target U.S. persons outside the United States do not fit within any of these four definitions. The first three definitions require the targeted individual to be located inside of the United States to be considered "electronic surveillance." The fourth definition applies only to the use of surveillance devices within the United States. Therefore, the NSA's signals monitoring stations in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are not regulated by FISA. U.S. personnel located at these foreign stations presumably may monitor U.S. persons who are outside the United States, and that conduct technically would not be considered electronic surveillance under FISA's definitions. This highlights the fact that FISA was meant to govern only domestic surveillance taking place within U.S. borders. Although such efforts would not fall under FISA's definition of "electronic surveillance," USSID 18's minimization procedures still would apply and offer some protection to the rights of U.S. persons abroad. See generally USSID 18, *supra* note 13.

#### **END FOOTNOTE 100**

**Independently, the Fourth Amendment applies based on persons, not location—the question of the border is irrelevant, but they violate because the surveillance is not done on 'US persons'**

**Jordan, New York University School of Law LLM, 2006** (David Alan, "DECRYPTING THE FOURTH AMENDMENT: WARRANTLESS NSA SURVEILLANCE AND THE ENHANCED EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY PROVIDED BY ENCRYPTED VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL," Boston College Law

Review, Vol. 47,

<http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2330&context=bclr>, p. 542, IC) Professor Kerr states that "the Fourth Amendment is not a roving privacy machine," but in many ways, it is. 2" **The Supreme Court has long held that "the Fourth Amendment protects people, not places."** 221 This **protection travels with a person wherever he or she goes**, and it covers all situations where a legitimate expectation of privacy can be held.222 The Supreme Court has made it clear that it is **the reasonableness of a person's expectation of privacy, not the geographic location of the conversation in question**, that **determines whether or not a conversation is protected**. 2" American **citizens do not lose** their **Fourth Amendment rights** simply **because they set foot outside the United States**; likewise, their conversations do not become fair game once the electrons transmitting them pass beyond U.S. borders.224

### **People on the border/crossing are not given Fourth Amendment rights—they violate**

**Jordan, New York University School of Law LLM, 2006** (David Alan, "DECRYPTING THE FOURTH AMENDMENT: WARRANTLESS NSA SURVEILLANCE AND THE ENHANCED EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY PROVIDED BY ENCRYPTED VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL," Boston College Law Review, Vol. 47,

<http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2330&context=bclr>, p. 514, IC)

#### **BEGIN FOOTNOTE 55**

Courts have held that the government may use evidence collected by foreign governments against U.S. persons at trial in the United States even though such evidence was collected in a manner that would have violated their constitutional rights if conducted by U.S. agents. See Stefan Epstein, Annotation, Application of Fourth Amendment Exclusionary Rule to Evidence Obtained Through Search Conducted by Official of Foreign Government, 33 A.L.R. FED. 342, § 3(a) (1977) (explaining the general rule that the exclusionary rule does not apply to searches conducted by foreign governments). This is true even if U.S. agents are involved with the foreign government's efforts, provided that their participation is not substantial. See *id.*; see also *Gov't of Canal Zone v. Sierra*, 594 F.2d 60, 72 (1979) ("**Fourth Amendment rights are generally inapplicable to an action by a foreign sovereign in its own territory in enforcing its own laws**, even though American officials are present and cooperate in some degree."). Also, **traffic stops and questioning conducted by U.S. border officials** on U.S. citizens entering and leaving the country **have been upheld as constitutional despite the absence of probable cause or reasonable suspicion**. *United States v. Martinez-Fuerte*, 428 U.S. 543, 566 (1976) (holding that **the use of fixed border checkpoints and the questioning of travelers at U.S. borders do not require warrants or probable cause**). The Supreme Court has also held that the government may hand over an American soldier for trial by a foreign government although U.S. constitutional guarantees will not be provided. *Wilson v. Girard*, 354 U.S. 524, 530 (1957).

#### **END FOOTNOTE 55**





# **Enforcement CP**



## 1nc

**The United States federal government should establish complete surveillance, at least including the Vehicle and Dismount Exploitation Radar, over the US-Mexico border and deploy Customs and Border Patrol in response to discovered movements across the border.**

**The United States federal government should substantially increase internal immigration enforcement, including workplace verification, measures to curb misuse of social security and IRS ID numbers, partnership with state and local officials, increased removals and increased use of state and local laws to discourage illegal settlement.**

### **Increased drone surveillance solves cartel smuggling**

**Becker 13** – staff @ TDB

(Andrew, “New Drone Report: Our Border Is Not as Secure as We Thought,” The Daily Beast, [//BB">http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/04/04/new-drone-report-our-border-is-not-as-secure-as-we-thought.html">//BB](http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/04/04/new-drone-report-our-border-is-not-as-secure-as-we-thought.html)

Thanks to a previously unreported drone flying over the U.S.-Mexico border, we now know that **more people are crossing than previously thought—and getting away with it**, reports Andrew Becker of the Center for Investigative Reporting. **The U.S. Border Patrol has caught a fraction of the border crossers spotted by a sophisticated sensor mounted on unmanned spy aircraft** and flown over remote stretches of desert, casting doubts on claims that the area is more secure than ever, according to documents obtained by the Center for Investigative Reporting. **SIERRA VISTA, AZ - MARCH 07: Air Interdiction Agent Will Brazelton from U.S. Office of Air and Marine (OAM), pilots Predator drone surveillance flights from a flight operations center near the Mexican border on March 7, 2013 at Fort Huachuca in Sierra Vista, Arizona. The OAM flies the unmanned - and unarmed - MQ-9 Predator B aircraft an average of 12 hours per day at around 19,000 feet over southern Arizona. The drones, piloted from the ground, search for drug smugglers and immigrants crossing illegally from Mexico into the United States. Due to federal sequestration cuts, Customs and Border Protection is expected to lose \$500 million from its budget,** and OAM staff at Ft. Huachuca are now taking unpaid furlough days once every two weeks as part of the cuts. (Photo by John Moore/Getty Images) **Will Brazelton from the U.S. Office of Air and Marine (OAM) operates a Predator drone in March from a flight-operations center near the Mexican border at Fort Huachuca in Sierra Vista, Arizona. (John Moore/Getty)** **The border crossers were spotted with a new, all-seeing radar system developed for use in the Afghanistan War and patrolling above the U.S.-Mexico border in parts of Arizona since March 2012. The system can reveal every man, woman, and child under its gaze from a height of about 25,000 feet.** **Between October and December, records show, the remotely operated aircraft detected 7,333 border crossers during its Arizona missions. Border Patrol agents, however, reported 410 apprehensions during that time, according to an internal agency report. The sensor was credited with providing surveillance that led to 52 arrests and 15,135 pounds of seized marijuana.** **Dubbed VADER (Vehicle and Dismount Exploitation Radar) and conjuring images of the Star Wars villain, the sensor can cover a wide swath of land and follow movement as it happens. The system, which is on loan from the U.S. Army, is used to identify**

**roadside bombers in war zones.** Customs and Border Protection officials, who aim to buy two systems for the agency, have touted the system's effectiveness and testified before Congress that it is changing the Border Patrol's long-term strategy on securing the border. Yet its unique abilities could shine an uncomfortable light on the agency's ability to effectively patrol the border. The radar system is providing the Border Patrol with an important snapshot to judge what it calls "situational awareness"—what's actually happening at the border. But it has left the agency grappling to measure its own success and define "security." Using the system, **remote operators can track vehicles and people on foot in real time and distinguish humans from animals.** The technology allows the aircraft to fly above bad weather or dust storms that otherwise might ground it, while it sends signals to ground stations that display the human targets as moving dots or black-and-white images. The internal Customs and Border Protection intelligence report outlines several limitations of the system, including the obvious—it can't tell the difference between a U.S. citizen and noncitizen. On-the-ground video and other sensors are sometimes needed to confirm these so-called nefarious tracks. And simply identifying someone crossing the border is just the first step. **On the ground, Border Patrol agents often are not available** to respond because of rugged terrain or other assignments. **As a result, thousands of people have slipped through.** At the Border Patrol, they're known as "gotaways." **In one week in January**, for instance, **the sensor detected 355 "dismounts," or on-foot movement**, on the U.S. side of the border in Arizona. **Border Patrol agents caught 125 of those**, about 35 percent, while an additional 141 people evaded apprehension and 87 more turned back south to Mexico. Two were unaccounted for. **The sensor detections led to more than 1,100 pounds of seized drugs.** **VADER "has proven to be an extremely effective system in countering threats and supporting the ground commander's mission in theater,"** Boomer Rizzo, a Department of the Army civilian who helps run the radar program, said in an email. **"This sensor can track smaller and slower moving targets that traditional radar systems are not able to effectively operate against."** As for whether the system's effectiveness has highlighted failures with the nation's border security, Customs and Border Protection spokesman Michael Friel said the technology is still being tested and its accounting is being refined. The initial approach used to count who is caught and who evades arrest after VADER detections "was flawed and reflected an incomplete picture of border enforcement," he said. "There is no silver bullet in border technology." "The border is more secure than ever? Well, that's a pretty low bar." Specifically, the agency hadn't accounted for apprehensions once the unmanned spy plane was no longer patrolling the area or ones made out of its view, he said. As Congress once again takes up immigration reform, Obama administration officials and others have pointed to the lowest levels of unauthorized border crossers—as measured by Border Patrol apprehensions—and plummeting crime statistics on the U.S. side as proof that their methods are working. Conservatives have long said that immigration reform cannot come before the border is secure. Immigration-reform supporters, while acknowledging the political need for border security, say the flood of migrants is a symptom rather than a root cause of complex problems now being addressed by Congress. Amid this debate, unauthorized border traffic has picked up in recent months in some parts of the country. In the Rio Grande Valley sector in South Texas, apprehensions jumped to 97,762 last year, an increase of 65 percent from the previous year, according to internal records. Some border experts speculate that more immigrants, particularly from Central America, are crossing in recent months because of excitement about an expected immigration-law overhaul, federal budget cuts, and the recent release of detained immigrants by Immigration and Customs Enforcement. "The border is more secure than ever? Well, that's a pretty low bar," said Michael Nicley, who retired in 2007 as the Border Patrol's sector chief in Tucson, Arizona. "Border Patrol

agents would be the first to stick out their chests and say the border is under control. That's not what they're saying. Agents I talk to down here say we're getting hammered." Another recent Border Patrol report offers more insights into what VADER detects and how that information passes from one shift of on-duty agents to the next. The March report highlights various sensor detections—from groups of fewer than 10 to more than 100 south of the border. One group of nearly 20 wore booties to disguise its tracks. More than eight hours after VADER spotted them, they were labeled outstanding and passed to the next shift. Originally designed for war zone Defense contractor **Northrop Grumman**, based in the Washington, D.C., area, **developed VADER for the U.S. Army to counter roadside bombs and other improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in Afghanistan by detecting enemy combatants as they planted the weapons.** **The program was launched in 2006 with sponsorship from** the Pentagon's research arm, known as the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (**DARPA**), to create and test a new radar system within two years. In total, Northrop Grumman has won about \$188 million in related contracts, according to a review of contracting data by the Center for Investigative Reporting. The Army announced in February that it was awarding a sole-source contract to Northrop Grumman for continued support of two VADER systems in Afghanistan and a third in the continental United States through the end of the year. Northrop Grumman referred questions to the U.S. Army, which said information about the domestic use of the system should come from the Department of Homeland Security. **U.S. Customs and Border Protection**, meanwhile, **has been involved with the development and testing of the system for years.** **In 2009, the system was deployed along a 31-mile portion of the Arizona border with Mexico over five days** using a Customs and Border Protection unmanned aircraft, according to a 2011 National Research Council report. **The demonstration was "a great success"** as the system identified suspicious activities four out of five nights, the report states. Mark Borkowski, a Customs and Border Protection official, testified before a 2011 House panel of lawmakers that **the system demonstrated "significant potential" for helping the agency.** Legislators, in turn, have supported the technology with public statements and budget earmarks totaling millions of dollars. Rep. Candice Miller (R-Michigan), who leads a House subcommittee on border and maritime security, said in a June hearing that she was "very encouraged" by VADER. **"This tool is extremely valuable as CBP seeks to identify and detect changing smuggling patterns,"** she said.

## **Combining border security and internal enforcement solves illegal migration and eliminates the dual labor market**

**Vaughan 6** – Director of Policy Studies @ CIS

(Jessica, "Attrition Through Enforcement," CIS, [//BB">http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation">//BB](http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation)

**Proponents of mass legalization** of the illegal alien population, whether through amnesty or expanded guestworker programs, **often justify this radical step by suggesting that the only alternative** – a broad campaign to remove illegal aliens by force – **is unworkable.** One study put the cost of such a deportation strategy at \$206 billion over the next five years. But mass forced removal is not the only alternative to mass legalization. **This analysis shows that a strategy of attrition through enforcement, in combination with a stronger border security effort** such as the administration's Secure Border Initiative (SBI), **will significantly reduce the size of the illegal alien population at a reasonable cost. Reducing the size of the illegal population in turn will reduce** the fiscal and social **burdens that illegal immigration imposes on communities. In**

**contrast, a policy of mass legalization is likely to increase these costs and prompt more illegal immigration.** Studies of the size and growth of the illegal population show that **a borders-oriented strategy** like SBI, which aims to improve border security and focuses mainly on removing criminal aliens, will achieve only limited results. **If supplemented by attrition through enforcement**, which encourages voluntary compliance with immigration laws rather than relying on forced removal, **the illegal population could be nearly halved in five years.** According to the government's own cost estimates, such a strategy requires an additional investment of less than \$2 billion, or \$400 million per year – an increase of less than 1 percent of the President's 2007 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security (\$42.7 billion). **Elements of the attrition through enforcement strategy include: mandatory workplace verification of immigration status; measures to curb misuse of Social Security and IRS identification numbers; partnerships with state and local law enforcement officials; expanded entry-exit recording under US-VISIT; increased non-criminal removals; and state and local laws to discourage illegal settlement.** The purpose of this analysis is to identify both the likely cost to the federal government and the expected effect in terms reducing the size of the illegal alien population, of re-orienting the nation's immigration law enforcement strategy from one that relies primarily on border control and removing criminal aliens to one that also aims to increase the probability that illegal aliens will return home of their own accord. Among the findings: **A strategy of attrition through enforcement could reduce the illegal population by as many as 1.5 million illegal aliens each year.** Currently, only about 183,000 illegal aliens per year depart without the intervention of immigration officials, according to DHS statistics. Voluntary compliance works faster and is cheaper than a borders-only approach to immigration law enforcement. For example, under the controversial NSEERS program launched after 9/11, DHS removed roughly 1,500 illegally-resident Pakistanis; over the same time period, in response to the registration requirements, about 15,000 illegal Pakistani immigrants left the country on their own. **Requiring employers to verify the status of workers could deny jobs to about three million illegal workers in three years**, affecting at least one-third of the illegal population. This measure is a central feature of H.R. 4437, the enforcement measure passed by the House of Representatives in December, and is estimated to cost just over \$400 million over five years. **The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) knows the name, address, and place of employment of millions of illegal aliens, and issues hundreds of millions of dollars in tax refunds and tax credits to illegal aliens. Changing the laws to provide for information-sharing would help boost immigration law enforcement at minimal cost.** **US-VISIT is a critical tool in curbing illegal immigration.** Screening must be expanded to include Mexicans and Canadians, and DHS must move forward to deploy an exit-recording system. **These steps should be a pre-requisite to adding or expanding any visa program.** Less than 10 percent of ICE investigative resources are devoted to fraud, workplace violations, and overstayers. **DHS could double non-criminal removals** at a cost of roughly \$120 million per year, **balancing a "broken windows" approach with its current triage approach to interior enforcement.** Laws enacted by the state governments of Florida and New York to prevent illegal immigrants from obtaining driver's licenses have induced more illegal aliens to leave than have federal enforcement efforts against certain illegal populations in those states, and have come at virtually no cost to the federal government

## 2nc o/v

The counterplan solves the case by sealing the border and drastically increasing internal immigration enforcement. Prefer our ev---all of theirs are describing status quo failures, but ours is predictive about policy changes.

FIRST---cartels---increased enforcement disrupts all cartel smuggling operations. This is comparatively a larger internal link because it includes drugs and human smuggling.

SECOND---wages---enforcement deters prospective immigrants. Solves long-term wages because it hollows out the dual labor market.



## Solvency – drones

### **Empirically, drones solve revenue and provide key intelligence for ground disruption**

**Pena 14** - J.D. candidate at The George Washington University Law School and Senior Managing Editor of the Public Contract Law Journal

(Katharine, "ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PRIVATE SECURITY CONTRACTOR DRONE OPERATORS ON THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER: APPLYING LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE MIDDLE EAST," 44 Pub. Cont. L.J. 137)//BB

Those looking to expand the usage of drones cite several benefits. First, drones have the ability to eliminate targets and embark upon reconnaissance [139] missions without placing border patrol agents at risk. For example, **last year at the U.S.-Mexico border, "nine border drones helped find 7,600 pounds of marijuana, valued at \$ 19.3 million. The 14 manned P-3 Orions helped intercept 148,000 pounds of cocaine valued at \$ 2.8 billion" without the loss of any human life.** 10Link to the text of the note Second, the ability to maneuver around the world quickly and effectively allows drones seamless global reach and long-range capabilities. 11Link to the text of the note Third, **drones can provide necessary support to border patrol agents working on the ground.** 12Link to the text of the note Finally, **drones are adaptable and can remain in the air for extended periods of time,** while retaining the ability to strike rapidly. 13Link to the text of the note

### **Shift from fence to drones solves enforcement drawbacks**

**Licon 11** (Adriana, reporter for El Paso Times, "US drones help fight Mexico drug cartels" [http://www.elpasotimes.com/ci\\_17631672\\_3/17/11\\_JM](http://www.elpasotimes.com/ci_17631672_3/17/11_JM))

In this political season immigration is the issue that everyone's taking pains not to discuss. The presidential candidates are merely paying the same lip service to border security. Congress has all but abandoned comprehensive immigration reform, and the [George W.] Bush **administration continues to pile all their immigration-policy eggs in the border-security basket.** But that doesn't mean nothing is happening. Homeland Security [DHS] head Michael Chertoff, in an April [2008] trip to the U.S.-Mexico border, made clear his determination that 670 miles of border fence, already under construction in Arizona and California, be completed by the end of the year. **The border fence project has faced embarrassments**—illegal immigrants employed to build the wall, a "Virtual Fence" project that cannot distinguish humans and vehicles from livestock and bushes— but those setbacks pale in comparison to its fundamental flaws. Below [are] six simple reasons a fence spanning the U.S.-Mexico border is bad policy. The U.S. government has begun deploying drones into Mexico after **Mexican officials requested U.S. aircraft to help them fight drug-trafficking organizations.** Although U.S. agencies remained tight-lipped Wednesday on flying drones over Mexico, the chief of the Mexican National Security Council, Alejandro Poiré, admitted that his government **asked for this type of support to gather intelligence.** Poiré in a statement said the Mexican government defines **the operations,** most of which **take place in border areas.** "When these operations take place, **they are authorized and supervised by national agencies,** including the Mexican Air Force," Poiré said Wednesday. Furthermore, Poiré said, **the governments were not breaking any national sovereignty laws because they were simply assisting in gathering intelligence.** The **drones are for surveillance only** and are not armed. The announcement came the day The New York Times published a story revealing that U.S. agencies have been sending an undetermined number of Global Hawk drones to interior Mexico since last month. **Homeland Security drones flew along the U.S.-Mexico border in past years to gather intelligence on organized crime.** Global Hawks are **military drones that have been used for surveillance missions in Afghanistan as well as for relief efforts in natural disaster zones.** Global Hawks **can look over areas as large as 40,000 square miles.** The newspaper cited officials who spoke anonymously because the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense, who reportedly operate the drones, did not publicly comment. "All U.S. cooperation with Mexico is at the government of Mexico's invitation and is fully coordinated with the government of Mexico," said Matt Chandler, Homeland Security spokesman. Chandler declined to comment specifically on the use of unmanned aircraft in Mexico. Department of Defense officials did not return calls on Wednesday. U.S. Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Texas, is the chairman of a Homeland Security subcommittee. McCaul said he did not know that drones flew over Mexico before Wednesday. "They are probably trying to do it under the radar," he said. But McCaul said **it is a positive sign to increase the role of the United States in the Mexican drug war** Mexico, he said, has been reluctant to accept U.S.

intervention, but he said times are changing. **"It's a significant departure in the right direction," he said. "We are seeing the (Mexican President) Felipe Calderón administration welcoming our military presence"** McCaul said he learned from agencies on Wednesday that **a drone helped Mexican law enforcement capture gang members in connection to the murder of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Special Agent Jaime Zapata.** He was killed on a highway in San Luis Potosí on Feb. 15. The **drones may also set a precedent to devise a joint military operation with Mexico**, McCaul said. When President Calderón visited the White House on March 3, he said, **officials sought to be "very open-minded and search for more creative solutions."** "It seems to me that we are experiencing extraordinary circumstances that call for extraordinary actions by our governments," Calderón said. Mexican army and embassy officials declined to comment on the U.S. drones flying over Mexico, and instead referred inquiries to the National Security Council. Earlier this week, Juárez Mayor Héctor Murguía hosted Carlos Pascual, the U.S. ambassador in Mexico, to discuss national security matters. Murguía appeared welcoming to ideas such as placing ICE agents on the ground in Juárez. He also said he is pleased to receive any support the neighboring country could give to the city of 1.3 million that has been ravaged by drug-cartel violence. Murguía refused to comment on whether he and Pascual spoke about the drones, calling it a matter of "national security." The fact that U.S. drones are flying inland by the request of the Mexican government shows the two countries' relations are deepening, said Eric Olsen, senior associate at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars' Mexico Institute in Washington, D.C. "Of course these kinds of operations are shrouded in secrecy," he said. "There is enormous sensitivity, but **there is also a realization that the threat posed by drug cartels is severe.**" Olsen said **the U.S. presence is still limited.** There are no **law enforcement operations on the ground, and American agents are not armed.** While Mexican officials said on Wednesday that they will heighten their use of technology with the help of the United States, Olsen said a military intervention in Mexico is not likely. "I certainly believe that Mexico with the appropriate support and help from the United States has the ability to tackle its problems." **The question of how secure the U.S.-Mexico border is was raised** last week during a judiciary committee hearing with U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano. At the hearing, Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, cited a Government Accountability Office report for fiscal 2010 on the U.S. border with Mexico. **The Government Accountability Office points out that of the 2,000 miles along the southern border that 1,120 of those miles were not yet under operational control by the federal government**, Cornyn said. Cornyn also said that of 445,000 people detained on the Mexican border, 45,000 came from 140 countries, according to Border Patrol figures for fiscal 2009. At least four countries on this list of 140 have been designated by the U.S. Department of State as state sponsors of terrorism, Cornyn said. **With our porous border admitting people coming from 140 different countries other than Mexico, including four nations that are state sponsors of international terrorism -- this is a national security threat,** Cornyn said. Napolitano during the hearing said the federal government was working to secure the border. "You have to understand first of all that operational control is a term of art by the Border Patrol. It doesn't include all of the assets that are being deployed to the border -- the technology and so forth," she said.

## Solvency – internal enforcement

### **The comprehensive strategy of the counterplan effectively expedites removal of illegals from the US**

**Vaughan 6** – Director of Policy Studies @ CIS

(Jessica, "Attrition Through Enforcement," CIS, [//BB](http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation))

Conclusion

This analysis demonstrates that it is not only possible, but would be quite practical to undertake a strategy of attrition through enforcement in order to shrink the size of the illegal alien population and relieve the burden illegal immigration imposes on American communities. This strategy, when combined with conventional immigration law enforcement and tighter security at the borders, could reduce the number of illegal aliens by half over a period of five years. Contrary to some reports, and according to the government's own cost estimates, this strategy is a bargain, costing less than \$2 billion over five years. It is less expensive and less radical than either a massive amnesty/guestworker program, or a massive apprehension and removal operation. The strategy of attrition through enforcement relies on tried and true immigration law enforcement techniques that discourage illegal settlement and increase the probability that illegal aliens will return of their own accord. Lawmakers must not be intimidated by the sheer size of the illegal population. Both academic research and recent experience demonstrate that migrants respond to incentives and deterrents, and that a subtle increase in the "heat" on illegal aliens can be enough to dramatically reduce the scale of the problem within just a few years. The federal government already has within its grasp the ability and the tools to control the level of illegal immigration, and its success in doing so is a direct result of the effort it has made. A modest investment of resources to step up this effort will pay large dividends for the future.

Here's evidence supporting each particular plank:

#### **---Employer enforcement solves the primary incentive for migration**

**Vaughan 6** – Director of Policy Studies @ CIS

(Jessica, "Attrition Through Enforcement," CIS, [//BB](http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation))

Contrary to studies published by groups favoring amnesty, a significant reduction in the size of the illegal population can be accomplished at a cost far less than the "billions and billions of dollars" mentioned by Mr. Chertoff. At a cost of less than \$2 billion, a strategy of attrition through enforcement is as affordable as the SBI, and will deliver greater reductions in the illegal alien population. Policies Details and Costs. I. Preventing Employment: The Basic Pilot Program. Rationale. It is widely recognized that employment is the most common incentive for illegal immigration to the United States. With the passage of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), it became illegal for employers to knowingly hire illegal aliens. The law required employers to demand documents establishing an alien's eligibility for work, but provided no easy way for most employers to ascertain if the documents were legitimate, spawning a huge counterfeit document industry, enabling employers to look the other way at bogus papers, and holding out the specter of discrimination lawsuits against those employers who inspect documents too closely. The bipartisan Commission on Immigration Reform, or

Jordan Commission, in 1994 concluded: "Reducing the employment magnet is the linchpin of a comprehensive strategy to deter unlawful migration.... **Strategies to deter unlawful entries and visa overstays require both a reliable process for verifying authorization to work and an enforcement capacity to ensure that employers adhere to all immigration-related labor standards. The Commission supports** implementation of pilot programs to test what we believe is **the most promising option for verifying work authorization: a computerized registry based on the Social Security number.**"<sup>11</sup> Three pilot programs were introduced in 1997 and the most successful, known as the Basic Pilot program, was reauthorized and expanded by Congress in 2004. An independent evaluation carried out by Temple University's Institute for Survey Research and the private research firm Westat found that the Basic Pilot program did reduce unauthorized employment among participating employers (the program is currently voluntary).<sup>12</sup> The study said that the program did this in two ways: It identified illegal aliens who had submitted false Social Security numbers or immigration documents and it deterred illegal aliens from seeking jobs with employers who participated in the program. The evaluation team found that about 10 percent of the employees screened in the program were illegal aliens. A majority of the participating employers surveyed (64 percent) said that the number of illegal workers applying for work had been reduced under the Basic Pilot program and nearly all (95 percent) felt that the program had reduced the likelihood that they would hire illegal aliens. **The most important program weaknesses identified by the evaluators involved the accurate and timely entry of information into government databases, which they found had been addressed and improved by the agencies involved by the time of Basic Pilot's reauthorization in 2004.**<sup>13</sup> H.R. 4437, the **immigration enforcement** bill passed by the House of Representatives in December 2005, also known as the Sensenbrenner bill, **would build on the Basic Pilot program to make it mandatory for all employers to verify the work eligibility of all new hires upon enactment.** Verification of all employees would be mandatory for government and certain private employers by 2009, and apply to all employees at all employers by 2012.

### **---IRS action solves**

**Vaughan 6** – Director of Policy Studies @ CIS

(Jessica, "Attrition Through Enforcement," CIS, [//BB">http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation](http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation))//BB

In the context of analyzing a different IRS-DHS data-sharing proposal, **the GAO recommended that the IRS develop a taxpayer consent notice as part of the ITIN application, whereby applicants would consent to potential disclosure of some information to immigration authorities.**<sup>31</sup> Alternatively, the IRS could put a Privacy Act notification on the ITIN application, as was recommended by the Treasury Department auditors, informing the applicant that information may be provided to DHS. Either version of **disclosure** consent is apparently possible under existing Internal Revenue Code authority. Either step **would** likely **diminish the popularity of the ITIN among illegal aliens, and extricate the IRS from its current untenable position of shielding illegal aliens from federal enforcement authorities.** The data on tax payments by and refunds to illegal aliens suggest that any possible loss in tax revenue resulting from diminished compliance could be made up by fewer credits and refunds being paid out to these individuals. In 1999, the IRS management agreed with the idea of a Privacy Act notice, but has never made the change.<sup>32</sup> **In addition, the IRS should be required to notify DHS and the Attorney General of all cases where illegal aliens file tax returns using ITINs and wage reports using SSNs belonging to other people.** According to the Treasury Department's audit, there were 265,000 such cases in 2001.<sup>33</sup> Under the Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1998, it is a

crime to knowingly transfer or use, "without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person with the intent to commit, or to aid or abet, any unlawful activity... ."34 Prosecution of selected cases would help address this problem. It would also help compensate for the Basic Pilot Program's inability to detect fraudulent use of genuine Social Security numbers.ª Finally, **the IRS should end preferential tax treatment for illegal aliens.** In its audit report on ITINs, the Treasury Department noted a significant inconsistency in IRS policy – while illegal aliens are treated as "non-resident" aliens for the purposes of qualifying for an ITIN, they are taxed by the same rules as resident U.S. citizens and legally-resident aliens. They qualify for the standard deduction and the Additional Child Tax Credit, which non-resident aliens with taxable income may not take. According to the audit, in tax year 2001, "\$160.5 million was given to approximately 203,000 unauthorized resident aliens, with about 190,000 of these filers having no tax liability and receiving \$151 million."35 And, "unauthorized resident aliens claimed the standard deduction on 92.3 percent of the returns filed, reducing their AGI [adjusted gross income] by \$3.2 billion."36 **Although IRS management agreed with these recommendations, no changes have been made in the policy.**

### **---State and local enforcement is a force-multiplier---independently solves drug revenues**

**Vaughan 6** – Director of Policy Studies @ CIS

(Jessica, "Attrition Through Enforcement," CIS, [//BB](http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation))

#### III. Law Enforcement Partnerships: Many Hands Make Lighter Work

Rationale. Despite the recent growth in funding for the Department of Homeland Security and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (**ICE**), its enforcement arm, the agency **remains hopelessly out-manned**, with fewer than 10,000 immigration enforcement agents and investigators dedicated to locating and apprehending some of the more than 11 million illegal aliens residing throughout the country. **A large share of these agents perform support tasks such as processing and transporting detainees, and so are not actively involved in the identification and capture of illegal aliens.** It would take a huge infusion of funding and personnel for ICE to single-handedly manage this workload effectively so as to bring about a noticeable reduction in the size of the illegal alien population.ª **The law does not anticipate or require that the job be done single-handedly by ICE. Hundreds of thousands of police officers, sheriffs, and state troopers across the country regularly encounter illegal aliens in the course of their daily routine, and these officers also have the authority to arrest illegal aliens.** After taking illegal aliens into custody, police officers are to inform federal immigration authorities and turn over the alien for further processing, if appropriate.40 In some cases, DHS will respond and take custody of aliens. Yet many police departments complain that DHS often refuses, citing higher priorities. Typical is this reaction: "We're not driving hours inland to pick up illegal aliens when we're trying to stop terrorists and weapons of mass destruction," said Rich Nemitz, the agent in charge of the Port Huron (Mich.) Border Patrol Station, which was asked to take custody of several illegal aliens identified by the Saginaw police force.41ª Further complicating matters, some jurisdictions have so-called "sanctuary" policies in place, which forbid police officers from questioning individuals about their immigration status. Other jurisdictions cite concerns that any police involvement with federal immigration authorities will sow fear of authorities in immigrant communities.ª **At the national level, ICE has merely tolerated rather than encouraged involvement from state and local law enforcement, and the enforcement statistics reflect this ambivalence,** with only a very small fraction of the resident illegal

population apprehended and removed each year (fewer than 100,000 removals of longer-term illegal residents, or about 1 percent of the total illegal population in 2004).<sup>42</sup> **ICE could become far more productive in terms of apprehensions and removals if it more actively cultivated partnerships with those state and local law enforcement departments that wish to participate in immigration law enforcement. These partnerships have proved to be mutually beneficial;** in addition to helping ICE, **they also give local police another law enforcement tool to use in addressing local criminal problems, such as gangs and drugs.**

### **---Increased deportations solves**

**Vaughan 6** – Director of Policy Studies @ CIS

(Jessica, “Attrition Through Enforcement,” CIS, [//BB](http://cis.org/Enforcement-IllegalPopulation)

V. Broken Windows: Doubling Non-Criminal Removals

Rationale. Faced with an overwhelming workload and a perceptible ambivalence in its leadership about the problem of illegal immigration, **DHS has adopted a triage strategy of immigration law enforcement, with priority given to locating and removing criminal aliens,** such as sexual predators and people who have participated in genocide, along with those caught working illegally in sensitive locations such as airports and tall buildings. **Meanwhile, resources for other types of interior enforcement have dried up.** A recent GAO report found that only a very small share of ICE investigative hours are devoted to cases not involving criminal aliens, alien smuggling, or absconders. While 26 percent of the investigative time in 2004 went to drug cases and 17 percent to financial cases, only five percent of the investigative hours were devoted to identity and benefit fraud, which is acknowledged to be a pervasive problem. Workplace enforcement did not even make the chart, representing less than two percent of the investigative hours.<sup>55</sup> **To bring about a noticeable reduction in the size of the illegal population and deter future illegal immigration, DHS will have to move beyond the triage approach and embrace a parallel strategy of routine immigration law enforcement** that gives more attention to enforcement at the workplace, visa overstays, and especially fraud in the benefits application process. **The strategy of attrition through enforcement envisions a doubling of non-criminal removals, both to decrease the size of the illegal alien population directly and to create a climate of enforcement that encourages voluntary compliance as the likelihood of detection increases.**<sup>56</sup> A “broken windows”-style approach is consistent with, even essential to, the DHS primary mission of keeping the nation safe from terrorists. We now know that most terrorists have relied on immigration fraud and weak interior enforcement to remain in this country to carry out attacks.<sup>56</sup> **Consistent, everyday enforcement of routine immigration law infractions will nab criminals and terrorists, in addition to helping shrink the population of illegal aliens.**<sup>56</sup> To this end, DHS has taken steps to improve fraud detection, and equally important, ensure that applicants who resort to fraud are removed, rather than merely denied legal status only to slip back into the illegal population. In a remarkable instance of inter-bureau cooperation, in 2004 the Office of Fraud Detection and National Security was created within USCIS, the immigration benefits arm of DHS, in partnership with ICE, the enforcement arm. This office uses technology-enhanced methods to identify fraud and national security risks in the immigration benefits application stream before the applications are adjudicated. What makes this new approach truly innovative is that while some of the confirmed fraud cases are referred to ICE for criminal prosecution, now even more cases are handled administratively – that is, the applicant is denied the benefit and placed directly in removal proceedings – which is a much less cumbersome and less costly process than prosecution. Detailed statistics on the performance of this unit are not yet available, but DHS reported to Congress that over the time period spanning

October 1, 2004 to approximately August of 2005, the FDNS units, staffed with 154 employees, generated more than 1,500 cases, most of which were ultimately pursued administratively. The agency has been authorized to double the size of the staff in the next year.<sup>57</sup> Benefit. **Boosting resources to bring about a doubling of non-criminal removals would bring about a 40 percent increase in total interior apprehensions, for an additional 73,000 removals per year.**

## **Don't trust their ev---it's describing policies that aren't enforced**

**Krikorian 5** (Mark, executive director for Center for Immigration Studies, "Downsizing Illegal Immigration: A Strategy of Attrition Through Enforcement")

<http://www.cis.org/ReducingIllegalImmigration-Attrition-Enforcement> May 05 JM)

This **strategy of attrition is not a pipe dream**, or the idle imaginings of a policy wonk. The central **insight is that there is already**

**significant churn in the illegal population**, which can be used to speed the decline in overall numbers. **According to a 2003 report from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1 thousands of people are subtracted from the illegal population each year.** From 1995 to 1999, **an average of 165,000 a year went back home**

**on their own after residing here for at least a year; the same number got some kind of legal status, about 50,000 were deported, and 25,000 died, for a total of more than 400,000 people each year subtracted from the resident illegal population.** The problem is that the average annual inflow of new illegal aliens over that same

period was nearly 800,000, swamping the outflow and creating an average annual increase of close to 400,000. **A strategy of attrition** would seek to reverse this relationship, so that the

outflow from the illegal population is much larger than the number of new illegal settlers from abroad. This **would be a measured approach to the**

**problem, one that doesn't aspire to an immediate, magical solution to a long-brewing crisis,**

**but also does not simply declare surrender,** as the Bush and McCain/Kennedy amnesty proposals do. But why not mass deportations? If our goal is to reduce the size of the illegal population, why not stage a reprise of the ill-named "Operation Wetback," the 1954 effort that used neighborhood sweeps to arrest and deport a large portion of the illegal Mexican population, in an attempt to prevent the huge Bracero temporary worker program from resulting in permanent settlement. It's true that random raids at workplaces and elsewhere will always be needed as an enforcement tool

(like speed traps or random tax audits, in other contexts), because every illegal alien must understand that he may be detained at any time. But **mass roundups aren't going to happen** for three reasons: First, **we simply don't have the capacity to find, detain, and deport 10-12 million**

**people** in a short period of time. And this isn't simply a matter of needing more officers, buses, and detention beds; the invention of new rights for illegal aliens over the past 30 years, and the growth of a cadre of activist attorneys whose mission is to obstruct enforcement of the immigration law by any and all means, makes it much more difficult to remove illegals than in the past. Congress can do much to

improve our capacity to deport illegal aliens, **by increasing resources** and **radically streamlining the appeals process,** but

Washington has permitted the illegal population to grow so large that simply arresting them all really is not possible. Secondly, **even if we had the capacity to magically relocate the millions of illegals, the economic disruption from such an abrupt change would make the transition more painful than it needs to be for those businesses that have become addicted to illegal labor.** There are 6 or 7 million illegal aliens in the American workforce, concentrated in farm work, construction, hotels, and restaurants; their

presence was not, and is not, economically necessary. **Our** remarkably flexible and responsive market economy **can easily adjust to the absence of these**

**illegal workers,** but it won't happen overnight. Of course, any new commitment to enforcement is going to result in short-term difficulties for some employers, but phasing in the new enforcement regime, so long as the goal is still achieved, will likely be necessary. And finally, political support for a new commitment to enforcement might well be undermined if an exodus of biblical proportions were to be televised in every American living room. As it is, the media and anti-enforcement political figures would pounce on every misstep by the government, every heart-wrenching story, every inconvenienced employer; mass roundups would provide such a superabundance of these anecdotes (while media coverage of those benefiting from the new enforcement environment would be almost completely lacking), that it would almost certainly undermine whatever political consensus developed in favor of immigration law enforcement. None of this means that a new strategy of attrition wouldn't include a significant increase in deportations. But the numbers of deportations are quite low to begin with, so even a big increase couldn't address the whole problem. In Fiscal Year 2004, only 47,842 aliens were actually deported from the United States, a decrease of 5 percent from the previous year.<sup>2</sup> The number of "removals" reported in the media is much larger (197,792 in FY 04), but that is only because the immigration statistics aggregate actual deportations with findings of "inadmissibility," which is to say, aliens who are not let through immigration checkpoints at airports or land crossings, and so were never living in the United States to begin with. Thus, if there are 10 million illegal aliens and we actually deport only about 50,000 a year, deportations would have to be increased by a factor of 200 in order to solve the illegal-alien problem in this way

alone. A **more realistic goal of doubling or tripling the number of deportations, as important and as beneficial as that would be, would by itself have only a small numerical effect on the total illegal population. This means that self-deportation is essential.** Tough Laws, Unenforced But, one might reasonably ask, **aren't we already enforcing the law?** Aren't we already doing most of what would be needed to downsize the illegal population? And if not, as a Wall Street Journal editorial asked

last year, "Then what is it we've been doing for 20 years now?" The answer lies in the old Soviet joke: "We pretend to work and they pretend to pay us." **The immigration law is**

**designed to look tough but not be enforced.** This has been the case since at least 1986, when Congress enacted the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), which traded an illegal-alien amnesty for a first-ever ban on the employment of illegal aliens. The point was to turn off the magnet of jobs that is the main reason illegals come here in the first place.

**More than 2.7 million illegals got legalized up front, with promises of future enforcement** But the law itself was hobbled such that it became unworkable. Only if employers had a means of verifying the legal status of new hires against Social Security or INS databases could the new system succeed -- but Congress refused to require the INS to start developing such a verification system. Instead, employers were expected to do the verifying themselves, by examining a bewildering array of easily forged documents, and then they were threatened with discrimination lawsuits by the Justice Department if they looked too hard. It would be hard to imagine a system more obviously intended to fail. Eventually, even this flawed setup was sabotaged. **After being criticized for workplace raids,** the INS in 1998 decided to try a new approach to enforcing the hiring ban. Instead of raiding

individual employers, Operation Vanguard sought to identify illegal workers at all the meatpacking plants in Nebraska through audits of personnel records. **The INS then asked to interview those employees who appeared to be unauthorized -- and the illegals ran off. The procedure was remarkably successful, and was meant to be repeated every two or three months until the whole industry was weaned from dependence on illegal labor.** But employers and politicians vociferously criticized the very idea of enforcing the immigration law. Nebraska's governor at the time, Mike Johanns, organized a task force to oppose the operation; the meat packers and the ranchers hired his predecessor, Ben Nelson, to lobby on their behalf; and, in Washington, Sen. Chuck Hagel pressured the Justice Department to stop the operation. The INS took the hint, and all but gave up on enforcing the hiring ban nationwide.<sup>3</sup> **This practice has continued despite 9/11, with worksite enforcement now limited to "critical infrastructure" -- military bases, nuclear plants, refineries, etc. -- with all other employers continuing to receive the green light from Washington to employ illegals. Nor is this the only example of tough-looking laws that go unenforced**

In 1996, Congress passed a large immigration bill, which included a provision that sought to punish long-term illegal residence by barring illegals from future re-entry for three or ten years, depending on the length of the initial unlawful stay. Its scope was limited in any case, since it applied only to people who actually left the country and then tried to return, but it was denounced at the time by the usual suspects as "radical" and "draconian." But an examination of the law's results shows that, in its first four years, the bar prevented fewer than 12,000 people from re-entering the United States. Even the expansion of border enforcement follows this pattern. The Border Patrol has doubled in size over the past decade, accounting for the lion's share of increased resources for enforcement. Its 10,000 agents are better equipped and doing a better job than ever before. But because, as any agent will point out, the Border Patrol alone can't control illegal immigration, there's little danger that such increased capacity will actually curtail the flow (and in any case, one-third of the illegal population did not jump the border at all, instead entering legally and then never leaving). Again, a policy that appears tough, but isn't -- a velvet fist in an iron glove. This mismatch between the advertised policy and the real one is a result of the yawning gap between public and elite opinion on immigration. The laws need to look tough, with promises of robust enforcement, to satisfy public concerns. But immigration's relatively low political importance for most people ensures that the elite preference for loose enforcement will be satisfied in the end.

## Empirics prove enforcement strategies work

**NumbersUSA 8** (NumbersUSA, a company made to achieve lower immigration levels, reports on CNN, FOX, MSNBC and NPR "HOW 'ATTRITION THROUGH ENFORCEMENT' WORKS" <https://www.numbersusa.com/content/learn/issues/american-workers/how-attrition-through-enforcement-works.html> 6/20/08 JM)

The principle behind **Attrition Through Enforcement** is that **living illegally in the United States will become more difficult and less satisfying over time when the government -- at all levels -- enforces all of the laws already on the books.** It is also imperative that the government with the full cooperation of the private sector, implements certain workplace enforcement measures. **The goal is to make it extremely difficult for unauthorized persons to live and work in the United States.** There is **no need for taxpayers to watch the government spend billions of their dollars to round up and deport illegal aliens; they will buy their own bus or plane tickets back home if they can no longer earn a living here.** We know **Attrition Through Enforcement works** because, **in states that have passed tough new laws to penalize employers of and deny public benefits to illegal aliens, the illegal aliens began to move out of those states, often before the new laws are even implemented.** As it currently stands, **almost 200,000 illegal aliens self-deport** from the United States every year, but imagine how many **more would leave if our government refused to award illegal aliens another amnesty, mandated all employers to verify a person's eligibility to work here,** cracked down on identity fraud and enabled local police to easily transfer illegal aliens in their custody to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officials. Among many detailed border security provisions stressing more agents and better technology at minimal operating costs, the **SAVE Act would: increase border patrol agents by 8,000, utilize new technology and fencing to secure the border; expand specialized enforcement programs,** such as the "Tunnel Task Force"; and, address the "jobs magnet" by strengthening the Employment Verification Program (E-Verify) to close security gaps, address loopholes, and make it mandatory for employers. The E-Verify program provides employers with an inexpensive, quick, and accurate way to verify employee eligibility. E-Verify **has already achieved tremendous success,** but is currently voluntary and offers little incentive for employers to participate. This puts users at an economic disadvantage when it is only being used by a fraction of U.S. employers and competitors continue to hire illegal aliens. Last, but not least, the SAVE Act would **address interior enforcement by employing more ICE agents, training additional state and local law enforcement personnel, and expediting the removal of illegal aliens by expanding detention capacity and increasing the number of Federal District Court Judges.** Furthermore, this legislation would begin a targeted media campaign to inform illegal aliens of new laws and penalties, while also informing employers of penalties for hiring illegal immigrants.



## Solvency – border enforcement

### **Illegal immigration is partially motivated by lax security and loopholes- enforcement solves the root cause**

**Paul 6/27** [Catharine, Homeland Security Today, Goodlatte: Obama Administration 'Takes Steps in the Opposite Direction' with Anti-Detention Policy . [online] Available at: <http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/daily-news-analysis/single-article/goodlatte-obama-administration-takes-steps-in-the-opposite-direction-with-anti-detention-policy/453ef31f788b7a2651fa9375383a7ab8.html> [Accessed 27 Jun. 2015].]

Earlier this week, Department of Homeland Security (**DHS**) **officials announced a new immigration detention policy that will enable** hundreds of **women and children who have crossed the southern border illegally to be released from family detention centers if they can prove** they are **eligible for asylum, prompting** a storm of **criticism that the end** to long-term detention **will only exacerbate the border crisis.** House Committee on the Judiciary Chairman Bob **Goodlatte** (R.-Va.) **issued a statement** condemning the new policy, **calling the** ongoing **surge** of Central American families and children arriving at our border **“a crisis of President Obama’s own making” that will “only encourage more children and families** to make the dangerous journey to the United States.” Homeland Security Today reported in March that a new Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit found that the "rapid increase in the number of unaccompanied alien children (UAC) apprehended at the US-Mexican border" from Central America was triggered primarily by crime, violence and economic distress, contrasts substantively with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) El Paso Intelligence Center’s (EPIC) July 7, 2014 intelligence assessment, Misperceptions of US Policy Key Driver in Central American Migrant Surge. **The EPIC assessment stated the surge** of UACs and families into Texas’ Rio Grande Valley **that began in 2012 had much more to do with human traffickers** promoting false information that anyone who could get to the US would be allowed to stay. Homeland Security Today first reported in 2011 that the Rio Grande Valley was fast becoming the entry point for “Other Than Mexicans” (OTMS) and “Special Interest Aliens” -- persons from countries that harbor or support terrorists or where there is a significant terrorist presence. **“The best way to deter illegal immigration is to** enforce our laws in the interior of the United States and **detain those who illegally cross** our borders while their cases are pending,” Goodlatte said. “However, the Obama administration refuses to take the actions necessary to end the crisis at our southern border and instead continues to take steps in the opposite direction that only encourage more to come.”

### **Targeted enforcement measures are the most effective- 50% increase causes a 13.2% reduction in immigration- prefer this evidence since it’s predictive**

**Lessem, Assistant Professor at Carnegie Mellon, ‘12** [Rebecca, Tepper School of Business. Working paper no. 1454, Mexico-U.S. Immigration: Effects of Wages and Border Enforcement. Carnegie Mellon University, Pg. 24, 2 May 2012. Web. 29 June 2015. <[http://repository.cmu.edu/tepper/1454/?utm\\_source=repository.cmu.edu%2Ftepper%2F1454&utm\\_medium=PDF&utm\\_campaign=PDFCoverPages](http://repository.cmu.edu/tepper/1454/?utm_source=repository.cmu.edu%2Ftepper%2F1454&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)>.]

In comparison to past work on this topic, **my model can be used to optimally allocate border enforcement.** I again **assume a 50% total increase in enforcement**, where the extra resources are allocated to minimize illegal immigration rates, assuming that this is the government’s objective. The solution to the static problem in my model indicates that the cost of crossing at

each sector of the border should be equal. Due to the wide variation in the estimated fixed costs across border patrol sectors, it is not possible to reach this point with a 50% increase in enforcement. To get closest to this point, the **extra resources should be allocated to the sectors of the border with the lowest fixed costs of crossing**. These points also have the highest enforcement levels, but even after accounting for the effects of enforcement, the costs of crossing there are still lowest. The fourth row of Table 13 shows the effects of this policy on annual migration rates. The qualitative changes are the same as with the uniform increase in enforcement, but the magnitudes are substantially larger. The fourth row of Table 14 shows the overall effects of this policy change. As with the uniform increase in enforcement, fewer people move, and the duration of each move increases. **When the extra enforcement is allocated following this equal costs strategy, the average number of years spent in the U.S. decreases by 13.2%**, whereas it decreased by around 5% with the uniform increase in enforcement. This shows that the effect of increased enforcement depends on the allocation of the extra resources.

### **Prefer this evidence- most empirically rigorous- takes into account spouses and their decisions to migrate**

**Lessem, Assistant Professor at Carnegie Mellon, '12** [Rebecca, Tepper School of Business. Working paper no. 1454, Mexico-U.S. Immigration: Effects of Wages and Border Enforcement. Carnegie Mellon University, Pgs 1-2, 2 May 2012. Web. 29 June 2015. <[http://repository.cmu.edu/tepper/1454/?utm\\_source=repository.cmu.edu%2Ftepper%2F1454&utm\\_medium=PDF&utm\\_campaign=PDFCoverPages](http://repository.cmu.edu/tepper/1454/?utm_source=repository.cmu.edu%2Ftepper%2F1454&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)>.]

In this paper, **I study how wage differentials and U.S. border enforcement affect an individual's immigration decisions. I analyze these questions in a dynamic setting, which is important because the data shows that repeat and return migration are common. In addition, I allow for a person's location choices to depend on where their spouse is living. This is the first paper on this topic that allows for an interaction between the decisions of spouses in a dynamic setting.** To evaluate the effectiveness of border enforcement, **I use a new identification strategy**, which accounts for the variation in the allocation of enforcement resources along the border. Most of the migration literature uses a static framework; however, the **trends in the data imply that a dynamic setting is more appropriate**. Kennan and Walker (2011) develop a dynamic model where individuals move within the U.S. based on income differences across locations. I modify their framework to account for the differences caused by illegal immigration. Hong (2010) applies a similar framework to Mexico-U.S. immigration, focusing on the legalization process. Thom (2010) develops and estimates a model of circular migration for Mexican immigrants, incorporating savings decisions. These papers study only male migration, whereas **my model allows for interactions between the decisions of married couples**. The data shows that **this is important, in that 5.7% of women with a husband in the U.S. move each year**, compared to an overall female migration rate of 0.6%.<sup>3</sup> Gemici (2011) estimates a dynamic model of migration decisions with intra-household bargaining, using U.S. data. In her model, married couples make a joint decision on where to live, whereas the data from Mexico shows that couples often live in different locations.

### **Increase solves—squo not effective because of lack of presence**

**Vitiello 8** (Robert, chief patrol agent for the U.S. Border Patrol's Rio Grande Valley Sector., "A Border Fence Will Reduce Illegal Crossings of the U.S.-Mexico Border")

<http://faculty.polytechnic.org/gfeldmeth/71.borderfencesummary.pdf> 2008 JM--edited for sexist language)

The U.S. Border Patrol, part of the Department of Homeland Security, is responsible for monitoring U.S. borders and apprehending those that would seek to enter the United States illegally. Along the nation's southern border, Border Patrol agents seize thousands of illegal aliens every year and deter many more from making the crossing from Mexico into the United States. One of the most important tools the Border Patrol has in carrying out its mission is the miles of pedestrian and vehicle fencing that stretches across several major points of entry. To aid the Border Patrol and ensure that it can fulfill its mandate, **the government should expedite the extension of border fences to cut off other crossing sites.** Taking into account the environmental impact and the concerns of local residents, the construction of new fences can be accomplished to meet Border Patrol objectives without jeopardizing the resources and natural beauty of these border regions. U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is responsible for protecting more than 4,000 miles of border with Canada, 1,900 miles of border with Mexico, and 2,627 miles of coastal border to include the island of Puerto Rico. The U.S. Border Patrol is the sole entity responsible for securing our Nation's borders between the official ports of entry and bases its operation on the Border Patrol National Strategy. To that end, our **objectives are to apprehend terrorists and terrorist weapons illegally entering the United States;** to deter entries through improved enforcement; **detect, apprehend and deter smugglers of humans, drugs, and other contraband;** and to improve the quality of life in border communities. The Border Patrol uses a combination of efforts in achieving our goals. The Border Patrol depends on a 'defense in depth' posture, utilizing agents in the field, interior immigration checkpoints, and coordinated enforcement operations, as well as partnerships with other federal and state law enforcement agencies. During Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 alone, **Border Patrol agents apprehended 876,704 persons** (858,638 on the southwest border) **attempting to enter the United States illegally, including** human **smugglers**, drug traffickers, and illegal aliens, and seized 1,859,299 pounds of marijuana and 14,242 pounds of cocaine. As of April 20, 2008, in FY2008, the Border Patrol has arrested 422,433 illegal aliens (411,329 on the southwest border) and seized 952,847 pounds of marijuana and 6,625 pounds of cocaine. In my area of responsibility, the Rio Grande Valley Sector, in FY2008 alone we have apprehended 42,004 illegal aliens and seized 189,377 pounds of marijuana and 3,461 pounds of cocaine. Various Methods Are Needed to Secure the Borders Securing our Nation's diverse border terrain is **an important and complex task that cannot be resolved by a single solution alone.** To secure each unique mile of the border requires a balance of **personnel, technology, and tactical infrastructure** (such as roads, pedestrian and vehicle fencing, and lights) that is tailored to each specific environment. The installation of **fencing** has proven to be **an effective tool to slow, redirect, and deter illegal entries,** especially in certain areas **where personnel and technology alone cannot sufficiently secure the border.** For example, in an urban environment, an illegal entrant can be across the border and into the community in a matter of minutes, sometimes seconds. In this environment, fencing provides a critical barrier. In a rural environment agents have more time to bring an illegal incursion to the proper resolution, making it more likely that vehicles will be used as a conveyance for getting from the point of entry to staging areas and community infrastructure that supports them. In this environment, vehicle fence can be utilized to prevent vehicles from entering and limit the speed and carrying capability of illegal entrants, along with sensor and surveillance technology to detect and track illegal entrants on foot. Remote areas may be completely uninhabited with no roads at or near the border. It could take someone hours or even days to be able to cross the border and get to a road or community infrastructure. Vehicle fence could be applied to remote areas where a vehicle could travel cross-country. The effectiveness of **tactical infrastructure** can be seen in the 14-mile congressionally mandated

fence in San Diego, California, which, in combination with increased personnel and technology, **has proved effective in reducing the number of apprehensions made** in the San Diego Sector. Over a 12-year period between 1992 and 2004, **overall apprehensions made in the San Diego Sector declined by 76 percent**. The Imperial Beach and Chula Vista Stations, whose areas of responsibilities fall within the 14-mile project area, combined for 361,125 apprehensions in 1992. By 2004, total apprehensions in these two stations dropped to 19,038 as **a result of the increase in fencing, manpower, and technology**. In the Yuma [Arizona] Sector during the same 12-year period, apprehensions increased by 591 percent. More recently, however, no sector has seen a bigger decrease in apprehensions and vehicle drive-throughs. With the addition of tactical infrastructure and increased staffing over the past two years, **apprehensions** in the Yuma Sector in FY2007 **decreased by 68 percent and are down 76 percent to date** in FY2008. Vehicle drive-through traffic within the Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR) decreased from 694 in FY2006 to 251 in FY2007 and 150 in FY2008 (all statistics covering only the timeframe between October 1 and April 3 of the given fiscal year). Vehicle drive-through activity elsewhere within the Yuma Sector during the same time period decreased from 423 in FY2006 to 145 in FY2007 and 0 in FY2008. In Rio Grande Valley Sector, I identified approximately 70 miles of border on which pedestrian fencing is operationally necessary to gain effective control of the border. The Border Fence Has Congressional Support In fact, Congress recognized that tactical infrastructure is critical to securing the Nation's borders by mandating that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) "achieve and maintain" operational control of the border and requiring DHS to construct—in the most expeditious manner possible—the infrastructure necessary to deter and prevent illegal entry. DHS is responding to this mandate and **installing fencing, barriers, roads, lighting, cameras, and sensors on hundreds of miles of the southwest border**. DHS will have 670 miles of pedestrian and vehicle fencing completed by the end of December 2008. These priority miles of fencing are to be constructed in areas where fencing would be most practical and effective in deterring smugglers and aliens attempting to gain illegal entry into the United States. **Operational assessments** by the local Border Patrol agents and Chiefs—based on illegal crossborder activity and the Border Patrol's extensive field experience—**identified** multiple locations where fencing would most effectively enhance border security. These operational assessments identified approximately 370 miles of pedestrian fencing. In Rio Grande Valley Sector, I identified approximately 70 **miles of border on which pedestrian fencing is operationally necessary to gain effective control of the border**, and my fellow Sector Chiefs performed these same assessments in their areas of operation. In addition to the Border Patrol's operational assessments, several other factors contribute to decisions to construct tactical infrastructure in certain locations, including engineering assessments, which include the cost to construct; environmental assessments; and input from state and local stakeholders, including landowners. Each of these steps is a standard element of the planning process that enables us to make informed decisions in deploying the right mix of tactical infrastructure. The Department of Homeland Security's Commitment As noted earlier, to meet our operational goals, DHS is committed to building a total of 370 miles of pedestrian fence and 300 miles of vehicle fence along the southwest border by the end of December 2008. In a letter to [DHS] Secretary [Michael] Chertoff on March 20, 2008, Associate Deputy Secretary of the Interior James Cason informed him that while Department of the Interior (DOI) managers were attempting to facilitate the construction of border infrastructure on federal land, they had come to realize DOI could not accommodate approval of some tactical infrastructure projects based on legal obligations. Given these obstacles and the ambitious timeline for a project of this scope and scale, on April 1, 2008, Secretary Chertoff determined that it was necessary to utilize the

authority given to him by Congress to waive any legal requirements he determined necessary to ensure the expeditious construction of infrastructure needed to secure the border. Absent the Secretary's use of the waiver authority, it would not be possible to achieve the objectives set forth. The first waiver applies to certain environmental and land management laws for various project areas along the southwest border, encompassing roughly 470 total miles. The waiver will facilitate additional pedestrian and vehicle fence construction, towers, sensors, cameras, detection equipment, and roads in the vicinity of the border. The second waiver was signed for the levee-border barrier project in Hidalgo County, Texas. This roughly 22-mile project will strengthen flood protection in the area while providing the Border Patrol with important tactical infrastructure. In addition to environmental and land management laws, this waiver addresses other legal and administrative impediments to completing this project by the end of the calendar year. In planning for a project of this magnitude, DHS cannot anticipate every potential legal impediment that may arise during construction. Accordingly, each law listed in the waivers was either an immediate impediment to expeditious construction or was determined to be a potential source of administrative delay or litigation. As Secretary Chertoff stated in his April 1, 2008, press release concerning the waiver, "**criminal activity at the border does not stop for endless debate or protracted litigation.**" Minimizing Environmental Impact However, the Secretary's decision to invoke his waiver authority does not mean that CBP has turned its back on environmental stewardship or continued consultation with stakeholders who will be directly affected by the construction of new border infrastructure. We will continue to coordinate closely with the federal land managers to ensure impacts to the environment, wildlife, and cultural and historic artifacts are minimized to the fullest extent practicable. The flow of illegal pedestrian and vehicle traffic across the border not only jeopardizes our ability to secure our borders, but it has also caused severe and profound impacts to the environment. As an example of our commitment to the environment, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) representatives participated in the first comprehensive review of the proposed fence alignment in the Rio Grande Valley in September 2007. USFWS provided comments on each fence section and made suggestions, where necessary, relative to fence realignments that would substantially reduce potential impacts to threatened and endangered species, or would impact components of the Lower Rio Grande Valley National Wildlife Refuge and nature reserves in the region. **Throughout the planning process, the USFWS has continued to provide advice on the fence types and alignment of the fence project segments, including input regarding incorporating cat passages into the fence in specific areas that have the potential to serve as movement corridors for the ocelot and jaguarondi.** It is important to note that the flow of illegal pedestrian and vehicle traffic across the border not only jeopardizes our ability to secure our borders, but it has also caused severe and profound impacts to the environment. For example, illegal roads divert the normal flow of water and rob native plant cover of the moisture it depends on to survive. **Illegal entrants also leave trash and high concentrations of human waste, which impact wildlife, vegetation, and water quality.** Numerous **wildfires caused by campfires of illegal entrants have caused a significant threat to human safety and the lands along the border, as well as increased impacts to soil, vegetation, cultural sites, and other sensitive resources.** We believe that efforts to stem illegal cross border activity in certain areas of high traffic will result in an improvement to the environment and increase the public's ability to enjoy it as a resource.

Listening to Local Inhabitants In addition to our commitment to responsible environmental stewardship, CBP continues to solicit and respond to the needs of state, local, and tribal governments, other agencies of the federal government, and local residents. CBP has gone to great lengths to obtain public input throughout our planning efforts regarding the construction of fence along the southwest border. CBP has engaged in extensive discussions about the

placement of fencing with state and local stakeholders, including repeated consultations with landowners. CBP has contacted more than 600 different landowners, hosted 11 public open houses, held 15 publicly-advertised town hall meetings, and conducted 84 meetings with state and local officials and public groups. The Border Patrol's objective is nothing less than securing operational control of the border. As a result of these outreach efforts, there are many instances where we were able to make modifications to our original plans to accommodate landowner/community concerns while still meeting our operational needs. For example, we made numerous alignment changes to the Rio Grande Valley segments to limit impacts to the USFWS National Wildlife Refuge areas, a bird watching observation facility in the City of Roma, and negate the need to relocate approximately 30 residences. The fence alignment at the Roma Port of Entry (POE) was initially proposed to be on top of a 30-foot bluff. During our site visit in September, it was determined that placing the fence at the top of the bluff would impact historical buildings and bring about constructability issues. Based on these findings, Border Patrol, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and USFWS came to a compromise to construct the fence at the bottom of the bluff, where it would still provide operational utility. We will continue to consult with our state and local stakeholders, including landowners, to ensure that our investments effectively balance border security with the diverse needs of those that live in border communities. The Border Patrol's objective is nothing less than securing operational control of the border. We recognize the challenges of doing so, as we have dealt with them for many years. Challenges continue to lie ahead and the need for a comprehensive enforcement approach remains. Our national strategy gives us the means by which to achieve our ambitious goal. We face these challenges every day with vigilance, dedication to service, and integrity as we work to strengthen national security and protect America and its citizens.

### **Enforcement key to reducing smuggling**

**Reagan 6/26** [Kevin. "Human Smuggling in Pinal County: 22-year Sentence Could Have Been More." Casa Grande Dispatch. Tri Valley Central. Web.]

Voyles said **illegal immigrants are often targeted** by criminals **because it's presumed they won't report a crime for fear of being deported**. The number of human smuggling cases seen around Pinal County has decreased in the last few months, Voyles said. U.S. Customs and Border Protection spokesman George Trevino said it continues to be an issue statewide. The agency detains vehicles transporting multiple immigrants locked in trunks on a daily basis. **The extreme summer heat adds an additional safety hazard** for the immigrants. "It's those inherent dangers that they don't think about when they get in the vehicle," said Trevino. In his testimony to the state Legislature's Judiciary Committee earlier this year, Pinal County Sheriff Paul Babeu said **human trafficking is not going away anytime soon. "Almost daily, deputies of my office are involved in vehicle pursuits with cartel members smuggling drugs or humans,"** Babeu said. **"We must secure our border first, prior to any discussion of green cards and a path to citizenship."**

### **Increasing border enforcement solves**

**Dickson '14** [Caitlin, 7/9, The Daily Beast, How Mexico's Cartels Are Behind the Border Kid Crisis. [online] Available at: <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/06/23/how-mexico-s-cartels-are-behind-the-border-kid-crisis.html> [Accessed 28 Jun. 2015].

**"We have grave concerns that dangerous cartel activity, including narcotics smuggling and human trafficking, will go unchecked because Border Patrol resources are stretched too thin,"** Texas Attorney General Greg Abbott wrote in a letter to Department of Homeland Security

Secretary Jeh Johnson this month, requesting \$30 million for additional law enforcement. **Recent U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration statistics back this theory. Total marijuana, cocaine, heroin and methamphetamine seizures between January 1 and June 14 of this year have dropped across all states that line the U.S.-Mexico border, but the decrease in Texas—the center of the surge in unaccompanied minors—has been bigger than the average, at 34 percent.** The DEA and Border Patrol have said it's too soon to tell whether the decrease in drug seizures is at all connected to the increase in underage crossers.

## Avoids terror

Hezbollah is an evolving threat in the Middle East that will use Mexico to its advantage

Walser 10 (Ray, Senior Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation, "Hezbollah Terrorists On Our Southern Border," 7/19/2010, The Heritage Foundation, [//JL">http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2010/07/hezbollah-terrorists-on-our-southern-border\)//JL](http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2010/07/hezbollah-terrorists-on-our-southern-border)

\*edited for gendered language

Although U.S. officials cannot confirm reports of the arrest of **Jamel Nasr** recently in Tijuana, they should acknowledge that the reports are consistent with increasing concern that **Hezbollah is seeking an operational base in the Americas**. **Nasr** was no ordinary tourist or would-be immigrant. He is a member of the Lebanese-based terror group, **Hezbollah**. Mexican authorities have released few details about his arrest, but they appear to **have uncovered a network traceable back to the terrorist group's headquarters in the Middle East**. The possible arrest is not the first incident indicating Hezbollah's interest in establishing a beachhead in the Americas. Last month, Paraguayan police arrested **Moussa Ali Hamdan**, a naturalized U.S. citizen, who had been sought by the U.S. since last November, when he was indicted for involvement in bogus passports, counterfeiting, and selling fake merchandise to finance Hezbollah operations. South and Central America hold **definite attractions** for the terror crowd. For starters, there's money. Profits from the region's lucrative drug trade help fuel many international terrorists. Hezbollah craves a share of the action. The Tri-Border region—the weakly-governed space where Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay join—has been an area of ongoing concern for U.S. counter-terrorism experts since 9/11. It boasts a high density of inhabitants of Arab descent. That, coupled with a robust smuggling trade, makes the Tri-Border a lawless breeding ground ideal for fueling international terrorism. More recently, **Hezbollah seems to be finding convenient operating space in Venezuela**. **Hugo Chavez's**, Venezuela's fiery, anti-American president, recently hosted **Syrian President Hafez al-Assad**. Syria's deep involvement in Lebanon, its border disputes with Israel and its backing of Hezbollah are of long-standing. In Caracas, **Chavez and Assad reaffirmed a united front against common enemies: the U.S. and Israel**. Doubtless, **finding ways to advance Hezbollah's power and influence without being caught** was a topic of private conversation as well. **Caracas is a hub for international anti-American activity** and regular air flights link Venezuela with Syria and Iran. **Venezuela is also becoming a hub for international drug traffickers**, with shipments to Europe and West Africa rising dramatically. The latter market is especially worrisome, as the narcotics trade is destabilizing West Africa, helping make it a target of opportunity for Islamic extremists. Hezbollah also would have a natural interest in Mexico's drug cartels, **which account for 90% of the cocaine flowing to more than 240 U.S. cities**. The cartels are all-purpose, amoral criminal organizations quick to engage in all things nefarious—from drug dealings to assassinations, kidnapping, and migrant smuggling—provided they're profitable. If **Hezbollah bag men** can do business with Mexico's cartels, so can its trained terrorists. In the fluid, globalized struggle based on the principles of asymmetric warfare, **terrorists constantly seek out our vulnerabilities and soft targets**. Congresswoman **Sue Myrick** (R-N.C.) is right to sound an alarm about the Hezbollah threat. The **Obama administration must continue to work closely with Mexican authorities to track down any Hezbollah connections**. **The U.S. should also help stand up Mexico's professional law enforcement and intelligence collection capabilities**. While we may disagree with our southern neighbor on many points, security should not be one of them.

Recent congressional documents prove the threat is at an all time high  
Mora 12 (Edwin, Staff Writer for CNS News, "Napolitano: Terrorists Enter U.S. from Mexico 'From Time to Time'," 7/30/2012, CNS News, [//JL">http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/napolitano-terrorists-enter-us-mexico-time-time\)//JL](http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/napolitano-terrorists-enter-us-mexico-time-time)

(CNSNews.com) – Homeland Security Secretary Janet **Napolitano** told Congress last week that **terrorists** intending to harm the American people **enter the U.S. from Mexico "from time to time."** At a July 25 hearing of the House Homeland Security Committee, Rep. Ron Barber (D-Ariz.) asked Napolitano: "As you know, Madam Secretary, there **have been anecdotal reports about material evidence of the presence of terrorists along our southern**



border. My question is, is there any credible evidence that these reports are accurate and that terrorists are, in fact, crossing our southern border with the intent to do

harm to the American people?" Napolitano answered: With respect, there have been--and the Ababziar matter would be one I

would refer to that's currently being adjudicated in the criminal courts, from time to time, and we are constantly working against different and evolving threats involving various terrorist groups and various ways they may seek to enter the country." "What I can tell you, however, is that that southern border--the U.S.-Mexico border--is heavily, heavily staffed at record amounts of manpower, materiel, infrastructure and the like, and we are constantly making sure we're doing all we can to make that border as safe as possible," she said. An August 2009 audit by the Government Accountability Office that focused on Customs and Border Protection (CBP) checkpoints

said that in fiscal 2008 CBP reported "there were three individuals encountered by the Border Patrol at southwest border checkpoints who were identified as persons linked to terrorism." In April 2010, CNSNews.com reported that FBI Director Robert Mueller told the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, "In Detroit, Mahmoud Yousef Kourani was

indicted in the Eastern District of Michigan on one count of conspiracy to provide material support to Hezbollah..

Kourani was already in custody for entering the country illegally through Mexico and was involved in fundraising activities on behalf of Hezbollah." Five years ago, in an August 2007 interview with the El Paso Times, then-Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell echoed what Napolitano told Congress last week about terrorist coming into the U.S. across the Mexican border.

So, are terrorists coming across the Southwest border?" McConnell said in that interview. "Not in great numbers." "There are some cases?" asked the El Paso Times.

There are some And would they use it as a path, given it was available to them? In time they will," said McConnell. "If they're successful at it, then they'll

probably repeat it," asked the reporter. "Sure," said McConnell. There were a significant number of Iraqis who came across last year, smuggled across

illegally. "Where was that?" asked the reporter. "Across the Southwest border," said McConnell.

## Terrorists are using the southwest border – specifically rural areas

### Theobald 15 (Bill, Staff Writer at USA Today, "Southwest border not secure, locals tell committee," 3/17/2015, ProQuest)//JL

WASHINGTON -- People living and working in Arizona and other border states told Senate lawmakers Tuesday the U.S.-Mexico boundary isn't secure. Witnesses at the

hearing before the the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee said that must change before Congress considers immigration reform. Mark Daniels, the sheriff in Cochise County, Ariz.,

told committee members violence along the border continues to escalate. **The rural parts of**

**the border are not secure,**" he said. He said previous federal efforts have focused on populated areas, pushing

more of the illegal activity -- border crossings and drug-smuggling -- to rural areas like his county. "We are a product of the federal government's plan," Daniels said.

Mexican traffickers have become more sophisticated and innovative in getting drugs across the border, Daniels said in written testimony. They

use ultra-light aircraft that aren't detected by radar, vehicles that look like they belong to law enforcement, and even catapults that launch bundles of marijuana across the

border. Citing the discovery of a tunnel underneath the border, Daniels said he fears terrorists could cross into the U.S. **If you can bring drugs**

**through, you can bring terrorists through**" he said. Daniels said he has implemented several local programs to improve border security, including buying additional communication equipment and creating a ranch patrol. Chris Cabrera, a Border Patrol agent testifying on behalf of the 16,500 agents represented by the National Border Patrol Council, said he estimates only 35-40 percent of illegal immigrants are caught crossing the border,

despite estimates of 75 percent from Customs and Border Protection officials. "I want to be crystal clear -- the border is not secure," he said. He said agents who report more than 20 illegal border-crossers at a given spot, based on counting footprints, are punished and learn to keep their counts artificially lower. "I raise this issue with you because before we can start to address our problems, we have to acknowledge the extent of them," Cabrera said. Committee Chairman Sen. Ron

Johnson, R-Wis., said lack of reliable information is a top problem in dealing with border security. There is no solid way to track illegal flow at our border," he said.

Cabrera recommended hiring 5,000 more border agents, thinning out the layers of management within the Border Patrol, and improving the training of agents. Also testifying was Howard Buffett, son of billionaire investor Warren Buffett, who owns 2,375 acres of

ranchland along the border in Cochise County. Congress should strengthen border security separately from reforming immigration, Buffett said. Our insecure

border creates a serious humanitarian crisis" by encouraging people to try illegal crossings and allowing drug cartels to operate, he told lawmakers. In a related development Tuesday, Arizona Republican Sen. John McCain and Arizona Republican Rep. Matt Salmon introduced companion bills that would give Customs and Border Protection agents full access to federal lands on Arizona's southwest border. Currently, agents must receive permission from federal agencies to conduct routine patrols. The Arizona Borderlands Protection and Preservation Act was co-sponsored in the Senate by GOP Sen. Jeff Flake and in the House by Arizona Republican Reps. Trent Franks, Paul Gosar, Martha McSally, and David Schweikert.

## Avoids politics

**Border surveillance has massive support in Congress – the plan ensures massive controversy**

**Preston 10 (Julia, Staff Writer at NYT, “Obama Signs Border Bill to Increase Surveillance,” 8/13/2010, New York Times,**

**[//JL](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/14/us/politics/14immig.html?_r=0)**

President Obama signed into law a \$600 million bill on Friday to pay for 1,500 new border agents additional **surveillance** unmanned drones and new Border Patrol stations along the southwest border. The measure **sailed through Congress** in little more than a week with **broad bipartisan support**, demonstrating the **pressure on politicians to look strong on border enforcement** introduced on Aug. 5, the bill was approved the same day by the Senate by unanimous consent, and passed again by the Senate on Thursday in a special session during the Congressional recess. The House had passed the bill in a special session on Tuesday. Mr. Obama requested the funds in June, after he announced he would send 1,200 National Guard troops to support agents along the border. The administration has been **under pressure** to strengthen border enforcement since Arizona adopted a tough law in April to crack down on illegal immigration, saying the federal government was failing to do its job. After the administration sued Arizona, a federal court stayed important parts of that law. The two senators from Arizona, John McCain and Jon Kyl, both Republicans who have criticized the administration's border measures as weak, surprised Democrats by signing on as sponsors of the spending bill.

**There's bipartisan support for increasing border surveillance**

**TeleSur 14 (“Republicans Expect to Pass Obama's Border Bill,” 7/27/2014,**

**[//JL](http://www.telesurtv.net/english/news/Republicans-Expect-to-Pass-Obamas-Border-Bill---20140727-0032.html)**

Texas Republican John Cornyn said Sunday that he expects the House of Representatives to pass a “skinnied-down” emergency funding bill this week that President Barack Obama had proposed to deal with the surge of migrants being detained at the U.S.-Mexico border. Earlier this month, U.S. President Barack Obama asked Congress for US\$3.7 billion to address the issue of mass migration of minors from Central America trying to enter the U.S., and the resulting humanitarian crisis along the Mexico-U.S. border. The money, he said, is needed to set up new detention facilities, **conduct more aerial surveillance** and hire more immigration judges **and Border Patrol agents**. The figure stirred controversy because it nearly doubled the initial US\$2 billion estimate the president said would be necessary. The House of Representatives, which is largely Republican-controlled, is now debating how much to cut down from Obama's request. However, the proposed amount is expected to **face opposition** in the Democratic-controlled Senate. Senate Democrats are prepared to vote on a bill to give Obama US\$2.7 billion. However, House Republicans are considering only US\$1 billion or less. Cornyn, the number two Republican in the U.S. Senate, said on ABC's “This Week”, “Fortunately it sounds like the House of Representatives is going to move legislation this week which would actually offer a solution.” “I think the House will come with a skinnied-down bill in terms of money,” he said. Republicans have repeatedly **criticized Obama's approach** to immigration reform saying it does not do enough to deter migrants from wanting to come to the U.S. They also **call for more security on the border** and faster deportations of migrants without proper papers.

**Electronic Surveillance popular with Dems**

**Barry, Senior Policy Analyst, '10** [Tom, 4/14, senior policy analyst at the Center for International Policy and director of its TransBorder Project, “Fallacies of High Tech Fixes for Border Security”, Center for International Policy: International Policy Report, pg. 2]

**Even the leading liberal immigration reformers have joined the border security bandwagon. They generally regard increased border controls as a necessary foundation to gain bipartisan support for comprehensive immigration reform. High-tech solutions for border security are the highly preferred border security solution. Unlike the border fence, electronic surveillance and drones aren't unsightly, don't have much of an environmental impact and are commonly regarded as the only way to monitor the vast stretches of northern and southern borderlands.**

**During their campaigns**, Democratic Party presidential candidates Barack **Obama and Hillary Clinton**—backing away from earlier support for the border fence (both voted for the Secure Border Fence Act of 2006)—**asserted that technological surveillance is the preferable** border security solution. As candidate Obama said during the February 21, 2009 presidential debate: “There may be areas where it makes sense to have some fencing. But for the most part, having Border Patrol, surveillance, [and] deploying effective technology—that’s going to be the better approach.”

### **Electronic security is bipartisan- sometimes even seen as left of center**

**Barry, Senior Policy Analyst, '10** [Tom, 4/14, senior policy analyst at the Center for International Policy and director of its TransBorder Project, “Fallacies of High Tech Fixes for Border Security”, Center for International Policy: International Policy Report, pg. 5] The **massive outlays of DHS dollars** for high-tech fixes, **like the** so-called virtual fence and the **deployment of UAVs (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles), have sparked little or no public opposition**—in marked contrast, for example, to the surge of opposition to the border fence from community groups, environmentalists, and immigrant-rights organizations.

**Environmental organizations like the Sierra Club have positioned themselves on the side of aerial and electronic surveillance** while opposing the border wall and the setting aside of environmental impact statements in the name of border security. The organization’s Borderlands Campaign, for example, urged those who opposed the border wall to support the “Border Security and Responsibility Act of 2009.”

The “Border Security and Responsibility Act of 2009,” a bill introduced by Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), “provides guidance to move toward a more sane and just border policy.” The bill calls for the end of the construction of the border fence (authorized by the Security Border Fence Act of 2006) while advocating “giving priority to the use of remote cameras, sensors... additional manpower, unmanned aerial vehicles, or other low impact border enforcement techniques.”

**The “Comprehensive Immigration Reform for America’s Security and Prosperity” (CIR ASAP), introduced by Rep. Luis Guitierrez (D-Ill.), is widely deemed, even by its advocates, as too left-of-center to be seriously considered by Congress. Yet even this progressive bill**, which counts on the strong support of the Hispanic Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, **attempts to** bolster the security credentials of CIR advocacy with its **backing of high-tech**, immensely expensive and unproven **border-security strategies**.

A summary of the bill provided by Gutierrez’s office states that CIR ASAP “minimizes wasteful spending by developing and studying comprehensive uses of advanced technologies, such as aerial and automated surveillance.” The Gutierrez CIR bill proposes that DHS should develop “a comprehensive plan for the systematic surveillance of the international land and maritime borders of the United States.”

**According to this CIR bill**, which is the only one that has been introduced, DHS should take acts “to gain operational control of the international land borders of the United States.” To do this, the **DHS secretary should “give first priority to the use** of remote cameras, sensors, removal of nonnative vegetation, incorporation of natural barriers, additional manpower, **unmanned aerial vehicles**, or other low impact border enforcement techniques.”

### **Massive lobby in congress pushing for drones- 33 members, working with multiple branches of gov’t**

**Barry, Senior Policy Analyst, '10** [Tom, 4/14, senior policy analyst at the Center for International Policy and director of its TransBorder Project, “Fallacies of High Tech Fixes for Border Security”, Center for International Policy: International Policy Report, pg. 8]

Since **the start of DHS’s drone program, it has counted on the strong support of the Congressional UAV Caucus, whose mission is to “educate members of Congress and the public on the** strategic, tactical, and scientific **value of UAVs, actively support further development** and acquisition of more capable UAVs, and to more effectively engage the civilian aviation community on UAV use and safety.” Congressional representatives **in this 33-member caucus** include Howard “Buck” McKeon, Duncan Hunter, Silvestre Reyes, Alan Mollohan, Jerry Lewis, and Brian Bilbray. Representative McKeon, the Republican congressman who represents the San Diego-area district that is home to Predator manufacturer General Atomics, is the leading voice

of the new congressional caucus and a regular beneficiary of company-sponsored international trips to promote UAVs.

Caucus **members say they are working with “the military, industry, NASA, DHS, and FAA to seek fair and equitable solutions to the challenges created by UAV operations in the U.S. national air space,”** as well as supporting “policies and budgets that **promote a larger, more robust national security UAV capability.”**

## History of bipartisan legislation passing on drones specifically

**Barry, Senior Policy Analyst, '10** [Tom, 4/14, senior policy analyst at the Center for International Policy and director of its TransBorder Project, “Fallacies of High Tech Fixes for Border Security”, Center for International Policy: International Policy Report, pg. 8]

**Congress has passed a flurry of laws and budget authorizations to foster UAVs. In 2003, Congress directed DHS to study the feasibility of using UAVs, and has repeated this directive in numerous instances** since then. The 2003 DoD Authorization Act (P.L. 108-136) required the president to issue a report “on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles for support of homeland security missions.” **As part of the 2007 appropriations bill, Congress urged DHS to work with the FAA to implement a pilot program that would use UAVs for surveillance on the northern border.**

**Along the southern border, politicians such as Texas Governor Rick Perry and congressional members such as Henry Cuellar (D-Tex.) and Silvestre Reyes (D-Tex.) are increasingly vocal about** the need for **UAV surveillance**, mirrored on the northern border by North Dakota’s Democratic senators Byron Dorgan and Kent Conrad.

## The drone caucus hates the plan and loves the cp

**Barry 11 (Tom, Director of the TransBorder Project of the Americas Program at the Center for Immigration Policy, “How the Drone Warfare Industry Took Over Our Congress,” 11/30/2011, Altnet, [//JL](http://www.altnet.org/story/153278/how_the_drone_warfare_industry_took_over_our_congress)**

At the Unmanned Systems Fair on September 21, the latest drone technology was on display. **The drone fair, which took place in the lobby of the Rayburn House Office Building, also displayed the easy**

**mix of government and business.** Also on exhibit was the kind of bipartisan unity often seen when Democrats and Republicans rally around security and federal pork. Howard “Buck”

**McKeon, R-Calif., and Henry Cuellar, D-Tex., co-chairs of the Unmanned Systems Caucus, welcomed the drone industry and its supporters to Capitol Hill. The drone caucus, which has more than 50 members, cosponsored the drone fete with the Association of Unmanned Vehicle Systems International, an**

industry group that brings together the leading drone manufacturers. **Drone orders from the federal government are rolling in to AUVSI corporate members, including such top military contractors as General Atomics, Lockheed Martin and Northrup Grumman. Buck McKeon, who also sits on the House Armed Services Committee, thanked the industry for its support**

of “our warfighters.” In his opening remarks, **Cuellar stressed the fundamental role of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in ensuring homeland security and border security. The Obama administration’s enthusiasm for drone attacks and surveillance in Afghanistan and elsewhere has helped consolidate the Pentagon’s commitment to drone warfare.** Paralleling the increased use of drones in foreign wars is the rising commitment of the Department of

Homeland Security to deploy drones for border security. **The drone business is projected to double over the next decade despite stagnant military**

budgets. The annual global market is expected to rise from \$5.9 billion to nearly \$11.3 billion by 2020 – with the United States accounting for about three-quarters of the total research, development and procurement markets. **U.S.**

**government drone purchases – not counting contracts for an array of related UAV services and “payloads” – rose from \$588 million to \$1.3 billion over the past five years.** In the search of a high-tech fix for its much-criticized border security operations, **DHS is becoming increasingly committed to drone deployment. The administration’s enthusiasm for drone surveillance mirrors its continuing**

**commitment to ground-based electronic surveillance projects** which have quietly proceeded despite the department’s repeated inability to

demonstrate the benefits of the “virtual fence.” **The Air and Maritime Office of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) currently has a fleet of eight UAVs, with another two drones expected by**

early next year. CBP's strategic plan calls for the eventual deployment of 24 drones. **CBP continues to add drones** even though agency officials acknowledge that they have neither the skilled teams nor the technical infrastructure necessary to deploy the drones it already has. The agency says that **drones function as a "force multiplier"** but it has never offered any evidence to document this claim that drones

increase the efficiency of the Border Patrol and are more effective than piloted aircraft or ground patrols. Nonetheless, **border security hawks**, especially in Texas, **continue to escalate**

**their demands for more drones to patrol the border and Mexican airspace.** Besides drone caucus co-chair Cuellar, who

represents the South Texas border district that includes Laredo, other Texan drone proponents include Governor Rick Perry, Cong. Michael **McCaul**, the Republican congressman who chairs the House Homeland Security Committee, and Silvestre **Reyes**, who represents the El Paso district and ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee. **As part of** the U.S. global drug war and as an extension of **border security, unarmed**

**drones are also crossing the border into Mexico.** The U.S. Northern Command has acknowledged that the U.S. military does fly Global Hawk drones into Mexico to assist President

Felipe Calderón's government drug war. **Drone caucus members McCaul and Reyes, among others, have called for**

**increased drone surveillance in Mexico** Caucus and Campaigns Formed in 2009 by McKeon, **the Unmanned Systems Caucus** (formerly

called the UAV Caucus) **aims to** "educate members of Congress and the public on the strategic, tactical, and scientific value of unmanned systems, **actively support further**

**development and acquisition of more systems** and to more effectively engage the civilian aviation community on unmanned system use and safety." The caucus states that it "works with the military, industry, the Department of Homeland Security, NASA, the Federal Aviation Administration, and other stakeholders to seek fair and equitable solutions to challenges created by UAV operations in the U.S. National Air Space."

Members include a collection of **border hawks, immigration hardliners and** **leading congressional voices**

for the military contracting industry. **These include** Brian **Bilbray** (R-Calif.), who heads the House Immigration Reform Caucus; Candice **Miller** (R-Minn.), who heads the Homeland Security subcommittee that reviews the air and marine operations of DHS; Joe **Wilson** (R-SC); Jerry **Lewis** (R-Calif.); Dana **Rohrabacher** (R-Calif.); Loretta **Sanchez** (D-Calif.); and Duncan **Hunter** (R-Calif.). The drone caucus works

closely with the industry association AUVSI, which, in addition to the drone fair, sponsored a UAV Action Day on Capitol Hill last year. **AUVSI has** **its own congressional advocacy**

**committee** that is closely linked to the caucus. The keynote speaker at the drone association's recent annual conference was McKeon, who is also slated to be the featured speaker at AUVSI's AIR Day 2011 – in recognition, says AUVSI's president that Congressman McKeon "has been one of the biggest supporters of the unmanned systems community." While the relationship between increasing drone contracts and the increasing campaign contributions received by drone caucus members can only be speculated, **caucus members are favored recipients of contributions by members of** the unmanned systems association **AUVSI**

In the 2010 election cycle, **political action committees associated with** companies that produce **drones donated more than \$1.7 million to the 42 congressional members** who were members of the congressional drone caucus. The leading recipient was McKeon, who currently chairs the powerful House Armed Services Committee, with Cong. Reyes coming in a close second.

## AT drones fail

### **Drones fail now because they just cover half of the border---the counterplan provides complete coverage**

**Spagat 14** – Staff @ AP

(Elliott, "US border security: Let the drones do it?," CSM,

<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Latest-News-Wires/2014/1113/US-border-security-Let-the-drones-do-it>)

**The U.S. government now patrols** nearly **half** **the Mexican border by drones alone** in a largely unheralded shift to control desolate stretches where there are no agents, camera towers, ground sensors or fences, and it plans to expand the strategy to the Canadian border. It represents a significant departure from a decades-old approach that emphasizes boots on the ground and fences. Since 2000, the number of Border Patrol agents on the 1,954-mile border more than doubled to surpass 18,000 and fencing multiplied nine times to 700 miles. Under the new approach, **Predator Bs sweep remote mountains, canyons and rivers with a high-resolution video camera and return within three days for another video in the same spot**, according to two officials with direct knowledge of the effort on condition of anonymity because details have not been made public. Recommended: INFOGRAPHIC The future of drones in the US. The two videos are then overlaid for analysts who use sophisticated software to identify tiny changes — perhaps the tracks of a farmer or cows, perhaps those of immigrants who entered the country illegally or a drug-laden Hummer, they said. About 92 percent of drone missions have shown no change in terrain, but the others raised enough questions to dispatch agents to determine if someone got away, sometimes by helicopter because the area is so remote. **The agents look for any sign of human activity — footprints, broken twigs, trash.** About 4 percent of missions have been false alarms, like tracks of livestock or farmers, and about 2 percent are inconclusive. The remaining 2 percent offer evidence of illegal crossings from Mexico, which typically results in ground sensors being planted for closer monitoring. **The government has operated about 10,000 drone flights under the strategy**, known internally as "change detection," since it began in March 2013. The flights currently cover about 900 miles, much of it in Texas, and are expected to expand to the Canadian border by the end of 2015. **The purpose is to assign agents where illegal activity is highest**, said R. Gil Kerlikowske, commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, the Border Patrol's parent agency, which operates nine unmanned aircraft across the country. **"You have finite resources,"** he said in an interview. **"If you can look at some very rugged terrain (and) you can see there's not traffic, whether it's tire tracks or clothing being abandoned or anything else, you want to deploy your resources to where you have a greater risk, a greater threat."** If the video shows the terrain unchanged, Border Patrol Chief Michael Fisher calls it "proving the negative" — showing there isn't anything illegal happening there and therefore no need for agents and fences. The strategy was launched without fanfare and expanded at a time when President Barack Obama prepares to issue an executive order by the end of this year to reduce deportations and enhance border security. Rep. Michael **McCaul**, a Texas Republican who chairs the House Homeland Security Committee, **applauded the approach while saying that surveillance gaps still remain.** "We can no longer focus only on static defenses such as fences and fixed (camera) towers," he said.

**This shapes how you should read all of their solvency deficits---the only problem with drones is commitment not capability**

**Dyer 15** - retired Naval Intelligence officer

(JE, "Drones that work great everywhere else are somehow 'ineffective' on U.S. border," <http://libertyunyielding.com/2015/01/07/drones-work-great-everywhere-else-somehow-ineffective-u-s-border/>)

Here you go. **A Sudden Meme has popped up: the drone surveillance program at the U.S. border has been "ineffective"** and isn't worth the money we're spending on it. **The meme has spread like wildfire.** Everyone's got the story. See here, here, here, here, here, here, here, here, and here. I'm tired of typing "here" so I'll move on. **Sudden Memes have become a frequent feature of news in the Obama era. This latest one has media outlets from all points of the political spectrum reporting in lockstep that drones on the border have been expensive and basically useless.** \$12,000 per hour! Way **fewer hours of coverage than planned!** Almost **no significant contribution to border apprehensions!** **Covering only 170 miles of the border anyway!** **It's like no one engages in any abstract, analytical thought before running with these stories.** (Although someone at Slate clearly paused for political thought. The Slate article decrying the ineffectiveness of the border-drone program is accompanied by an image of George W. Bush and then-Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff inspecting a border drone back in 2007. If drones are ineffective, then they have to be depicted as Bush's Drones.) **A pause for objective reflection would at least prompt some research. Drones have been extremely effective,** after all, **at surveillance in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Yemen, Syria, Somalia, and Libya.** **When Obama wanted to support African nations like Uganda, Ethiopia, and Nigeria in fighting terrorists and insurgencies, he sent drones (see here as well).** **The Obama administration has used drones to fight drug trafficking and bolster local security in the Caribbean (also here) and Mexico. Central American countries have increased their own use of drones significantly in recent years, presumably because drones have been effective for them.** **The U.S. Air Force's drone fleet is overextended to the "breaking point" due to the popularity of the drone surveillance product with military commanders.** **And in July 2014, the Obama administration requested a "drone surge" on the border with Mexico as part of its effort to interdict drug smuggling and human trafficking.** **The administration is clearly a fan of drones, having deployed them to so many places where it considers the U.S. to have a national interest. But suddenly, six months after Obama proposed a drone surge at the U.S. border, an IG report reveals that the drones that have set the world on fire in other venues have been so ineffective on the U.S. border that someone ought surely to lose his pension for gross mismanagement.** **It has to be a management problem, after all. Drones don't task or fly themselves. If flying them over a mere 170 miles of border is limiting their effectiveness,** well, **expand their operating area.** **The coverage area is not a limitation of drones; it's an artifact of tasking, logistics, and regulation, all of which the U.S. government has virtually absolute discretion over.** The same goes for the altitudes drones fly at (depending on their type), and how they are used in flight.

## AT US-Mexico relations DA

Relations are resilient – issues are insulated – this evidence is predictive

**Selee and Diaz-Cayeros 13** – PhD, Director of the Wilson Center’s Mexico Institute  
(Andrew and Alberto, “Mexico and the United States: the politics of partnership,” ISBN-13: 978-1588268938)

Yet positive factors favor prospects for more effective partnership and are likely to drive cooperation over time. First among these is the genuine interdependence of interests that underlies integration between the two countries. Everyday issues that need to be resolved – from the GM bailout to drug trafficking to natural disasters and water shortages at the border – create a dynamic of constant engagement around highly concrete topics that policymakers on the two sides of the border need to address. Moreover, the growing complexity of the relationship means that even when disputes arise among the two countries’ political leaders, progress continues along a number of other areas, driven by federal agencies, state, and local governments, and nongovernmental actors. Increasingly, interactions between the two countries take place simultaneously along a wide number of different points of engagement, which are largely independent of each other and have their own particular dynamics.

Progress on one does not necessarily augur progress on another; nor does failure in one area lead to failure in another. Nonetheless, progress in deepening engagement between the two countries will constantly be challenged by the persistent asymmetries that condition the relationship. The different in geopolitical realities of the two countries, the continuing inequality in average income between them and the dissimilar capacities of the two states are likely to continue to limit some efforts at greater cooperation. Recent tendencies have softened the impact of some of these asymmetries. Democratization in Mexico has made the political systems of the two countries more similar. Increased economic and social exchanges have built ties that mitigate some of the most visible asymmetries and forced the two countries to seek solutions to shared problems. Public opinion studies show how far the two countries have gone in recognizing their mutual interest in working together despite their differences, with ordinary citizens generally far ahead of political elites. Over the long term, interdependence will force the two countries closer and complexity will allow the relationship to lay down even deeper roots along multiple points of engagement. However, asymmetry will continue to create frictions and provide a brake on progress in cooperation. The relationship between the United States and Mexico will continuously deepen, but will be a process fraught with tension. The countries have ceased to be distant neighbors but as yet they remain far away from being strategic partners whose relationship is guided by a common vision of mutually beneficial shared outcomes.

**Momentum – it’s a decade-long rise**

**Shirk 13** - Associate professor of political science

(Jason, MAY, “US-Mexico Relations Complicated, Conditioned by Drug War,” a statement from Shirk in an interview with host Scott Simon, NPR,  
<http://www.npr.org/2013/05/04/181053775/u-s-mexico-relations-complicated-conditioned-by-drug-war>)



**In the last 12 years,** and especially the last six years, have really been a **high-water mark** in U.S.-Mexico collaboration, particularly on security issues. **Levels of trust are so high** that we **have had the opportunity to fly drones in Mexico, we have agents operating in direct collaboration with their Mexican counterparts, we've seen record levels of extradition.** So, **the collaboration is at a much higher level of intensity than we've ever seen before** - or has been, at least over the last six years or so.

**Prefer our evidence – theirs is media speculation that hyperbolizes bumps in the road**

**O'Neil 13** - senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization  
Shannon, "Mexico Makes It," <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138818/shannon-k-oneil/mexico-makes-it>)

**Hidden behind the troubling headlines,** however, is another, more hopeful Mexico -- **one undergoing rapid and widespread social, political, and economic transformation.** Yes, Mexico continues to struggle with grave security threats, but it is also fostering a globally competitive marketplace, a growing middle class, and an increasingly influential pro-democracy voter base. In addition, Mexico's ties with the United States are changing. **Common interests** in energy, manufacturing, and security, as well as an overlapping community formed by millions of binational families, have made Mexico's path forward increasingly important to its northern neighbor.<sup>¶</sup> For most of the past century, U.S.-Mexican relations were conducted at arm's length. That began to change, however, **in the 1980s and, even more, after the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) spurred** **greater bilateral economic engagement** and **cooperation.** Mexico's democratic transition has further eased the wariness of some skeptics in Washington. Still, the U.S.-Mexican relationship is far from perfect. New bilateral policies are required, especially to facilitate the movement of people and goods across the U.S.-Mexican border. More important, the United States needs to start seeing Mexico as a partner instead of a problem.

**Student exchanges guarantee generational resiliency**

**Guilamo-Ramos 13**

(Vincent, Director, Doctoral Program at the Silver School of Social Work. Co-authored by José Alfredo Miranda López) "The U.S. and Mexico Have Much to Learn from Each Other" HuffPost Blog. May 28, 2013. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/vincent-guilamoramamos/us-mexico-relations\\_b\\_3347068.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/vincent-guilamoramamos/us-mexico-relations_b_3347068.html)

Barack **Obama's recent visit to Mexico**, the fourth of his presidency, **represented an important, deliberate attempt to shift the focus of Mexico-U.S. relations from security to economic improvement.**<sup>¶</sup> **But it also represented much more -- a chance to allay the public's profoundly negative conceptions of Mexico by** **shifting the conversation** to **education, labor,** **environment, and other human-scale issues** that are truly **vital** to the future of both countries. <sup>¶</sup> **While much media coverage focuses on Mexican immigration battles, drug wars and narco-trafficking, the relationship between the U.S. and Mexico has been** **evolving** in complex and **positive ways.**<sup>¶</sup> That is really not so surprising when one considers that the Latino population in the U.S. surpassed 50 million not too long ago, and people of Mexican ancestry account for more than 60 percent of this total. Mexico's economy and middle class are growing.<sup>¶</sup>

And there is Obama's pivotal "100,000 Strong in the Americas" initiative, launched in 2011 to expand study-abroad exchange opportunities between the U.S. and Latin America. Increasing student exchange, and building understanding through higher education, offers at least the potential to help offset the tarnished public perception of bilateral relations. Not incidentally, this cross-border tradition contributes heavily to both countries' economies.



# High Skilled Immigrants DA



## 1nc

### **High-skilled immigration reform will pass now---strong commitment to border security is a pre-requisite for passage**

**Levy 6-3** – Capitol Hill analyst @ US News

(Gabrielle, “Signs of Life For Immigration Reform,” US News,

[//BB](http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2015/06/03/signs-of-life-for-immigration-reform)

**With comprehensive immigration reform essentially dead** on Capitol Hill for the foreseeable future, **Republicans appear poised to advance** a series of **incremental measures to address** the hot-button issue amid political pressure to tackle **the broken system**. **GOP lawmakers in recent weeks have proposed potential areas of compromise they hope can** help the party **handle the delicate balance** between **appeasing the demands of the base** in **beefing up border security while addressing the practical economic need for foreign labor**.<sup>a</sup> The moves come amid almost no progress on immigration legislation since the then-Democratically controlled Senate passed a comprehensive reform bill in 2013 that never came up for a vote in the GOP-led House. The impasse led President Barack Obama to issue executive orders protecting some groups of immigrants living illegally in the U.S. from deportation – infuriating Republicans in the process.<sup>a</sup> With the unilateral moves halted by a federal judge, congressional leadership has been content to sidestep the thorny issue after losing a faceoff in March in which they unsuccessfully tried to tie funding for the Department of Homeland Security to a rollback of the Obama actions. But **the looming presidential race has increased the sense of urgency among some of the rank and file eager to see the party raise its standing among Hispanic voters**.<sup>a</sup> “If you’re a Republican [running for president], you at minimum want the immigration issue neutralized, and maybe gain votes where Mitt Romney was unable to get them” in 2012, says Stuart Anderson, executive director of the nonpartisan, nonprofit National Foundation for American Policy.<sup>a</sup> While any of the the piecemeal proposals faces long odds to passage and even less chance of cooperation with the White House, **one area of focus appears to be** on guest worker programs that would increase the number and accessibility of visas for both **high- and low-skilled workers**. **The reform already has bipartisan support**.<sup>a</sup> “When it comes to illegal immigration, what’s the No. 1 reason people come to this country illegally? The same reason our ancestors came here: to work,” Sen. Ron Johnson, R-Wis., said Tuesday at a bipartisan event exploring pragmatic methods of reigniting the debate on reform. “From my standpoint, if you really want to secure our border, let’s eliminate or drastically reduce the incentives for illegal immigration, starting with a guest worker program.”<sup>a</sup> Some studies have suggested that, instead of taking away jobs from Americans, **those workers help spur economic growth**. It’s a position immigration advocates hope to use to sell the issue to a broader constituency.<sup>a</sup> “If you don’t have a restaurant worker working in the kitchen ... you’re not going to have good jobs, waiter jobs, management jobs in restaurants for Americans,” says Alfonso Aguilar, director of the Latino Partnership program at the conservative American Principles in Action group and the former chief of the U.S. Office of Citizenship under President George W. Bush. “So we need to connect with the middle class and show that immigration is good for the middle class.”<sup>a</sup>

NOGALES, AZ - JANUARY 21: The U.S.-Mexico border fence on January 21, 2014 in Nogales, Arizona. (Photograph by Charles Ommanney/Reportage by Getty Images)<sup>a</sup> RELATED<sup>a</sup> Tracing the 2016 Fault Lines<sup>a</sup> Aguilar’s organization has suggested setting up guest worker programs for low-skilled workers that would allow the number of visas to fluctuate based on the needs of

businesses. The system, particularly suited to the needs of the agricultural industry, would allow workers to come into the U.S. for a few months of the year, then return to their home countries. A more narrowly tailored bill from Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, has also gained some interest from advocates on both sides of the aisle. The measure, which has yet to move in committee, would increase the number of visas for high-skilled workers, particularly those in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM, fields, and make it easier for those workers to stay in the U.S." Just like in business, I don't want the smart people working in my competitor's business, I want them working in mine," Johnson said. "The same thing should be true for a national economy: If we use American resources to educate the brightest people from around the world ... we should provide every incentive for the brightest minds to be working here to grow our economy."

## **Reducing immigration enforcement collapses support for raising legal migration ceilings**

**Margin 7** - Warner-Booker Distinguished Professor of International Law and Class of 1963 Research Professor, University of Virginia. The author served as General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service from 1995 to 1998, and many of the opinions voiced here derive from that first-hand experience with immigration enforcement, as well as a quarter century of scholarly work in the field

(David, "EIGHT MYTHS ABOUT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT," Legislation and Public Policy, 10)//BB

MYTH 7: SERIOUS ENFORCEMENT IS AT ODDS WITH HUMANE IMMIGRATION POLICY. A common vignette in media coverage of immigration issues is the detention and deportation of a person, perhaps based on a years-old deportation order and in spite of relationships to citizen or lawful resident family members—relationships which may have come into existence only after the person's illegal migration, for example through the birth of a child on U.S. soil. The coverage is usually sympathetic to the individual, for understandable reasons, and it often conveys a message that enforcement—that is, assuring the person's deportation instead of allowing him or her to remain—is the antithesis of a humane immigration policy.<sup>110</sup> We cannot realistically build American immigration policy on the notion that long residence, even if illegal, must always generate an equitable claim to remain. As the recent backlash against amnesty demonstrates, such a notion flies against a strong popular headwind derived from a widely held (and publicly valuable) aversion to lawbreaking. It will be a sufficient achievement if this round of immigration reform can incorporate a one-time amnesty for a finite population already present. In my view, that can only happen if a wide enough segment of the public is convinced that such an amnesty would truly be a single event—primarily because of the simultaneous deployment of the resources and systems necessary to sustain resolute enforcement thereafter. Viewed in a wider compass, the only politically durable foundation for generous legal immigration policy in the future is the assurance that immigration is under control.

**Without** reliable **enforcement**, the political field is open to those who blow the negative effects of immigration out of all proportion and who seek to ride fears of widespread lawbreaking to political success. At times, such efforts even **threaten to cut back on legal migration**—the easiest part of our overall immigration patterns for a frustrated Congress to affect. After all, we only narrowly avoided a serious reduction in legal immigration ceilings in 1996 as part of that year's illegal migration control legislation.<sup>111</sup> **Without** reliable **enforcement** that dries up the job magnet, frustration with visible lawbreaking leads state

**and local governments** to experiment with harsh measures meant to discourage illegal migration. Frustration also sometimes leads Congress to lash out, as it did in 1996, to impose ever harsher measures on the unfortunate few who do fall within the toils of the enforcement system—visiting upon them new mandates for detention, exaggerated reactions to minor infractions, or new restrictions on forms of relief that once allowed immigration judges to take account of humanitarian reality and forgive deportation on a case-by-case basis.<sup>112</sup> **Reliable enforcement** would arm the opponents of such harsh measures with better arguments and bring into the fold wider constituencies for resisting such harshness—perhaps someday even for rolling back some of the severity of the 1996 amendments. **Reliable enforcement**, in short, empowers generous legal immigration policy in the long run. This insight suggests one final myth deserving examination here: MYTH 8: IMMIGRATION REFORM IS REALLY ONLY ABOUT ENFORCEMENT.

### High-skilled immigration reform is key to US economic leadership

**Ghadar 15** – founding director of The Center for Global Business Studies at Penn State's Smeal College of Business and a senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (Fariborz, “Here's one way to attract the best and brightest to the U.S. - and keep them here: Fariborz Ghadar,” Penn Live, [http://www.pennlive.com/opinion/2015/03/post\\_40.html](http://www.pennlive.com/opinion/2015/03/post_40.html))/BB Reflected in the development of the Immigration Innovation Act and the Startup Act, 2015 has already proven to be an important year for immigration policy. But until these bills are passed into law, they mean little to the future of the United States. Less than one month into the new year, **Senate introduced the Immigration Innovation Act with the intention of increasing** the presence of **highly skilled immigrants** in the U.S. Visas available for foreign graduates of U.S. universities in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields who hold employment in their areas of expertise after graduation will increase by over 75 percent to an attractive 115,000. The Innovation Act also discontinues any sort of cap on visas for masters and doctorate students with employment after graduation, regardless of the field. **In order for the U.S. to compete in the increasingly technical world, we must change our policies to accept contributions from the brightest minds regardless of birthplace.** The Immigration Innovation Act aims to adapt our country's workforce to the forecasted environment. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, “STEM occupations are projected to grow by 17.0 percent from 2008 to 2018, compared to 9.8 percent growth for non-STEM occupations.” While the Startup Act will create a world-class workforce to fill the jobs we already have, the Startup Act will facilitate foreign entrepreneurs in their creation of more enterprises. A 2012 study released by the Partnership For A New American Economy found that **immigrants file 76 percent of patents at top U.S. universities.** Upon graduation, these striving entrepreneurs seek to start businesses around their new discoveries. **Of the patents awarded to immigrants, over half are granted to the groups who face the most difficulty in acquiring visas:** students, postdoctoral fellows, and staff researchers. Without green cards, the mere prospect of raising capital is nearly impossible. Our current policies literally force intelligent professionals and their innovations out of the U.S. economy. The Kauffman Foundation, the largest American foundation to focus on the promotion of entrepreneurship, completed a study in 2013 highlighting the economic effects of the Startup Act. **If the Startup Act were to be put into law, the Kauffman Foundation predicts the creation of between 500,000 and 1.5 million jobs** in the technology and engineering fields over the next 10 years. The Foundation's predictions are based upon data from the U.S. Census Bureau Business Dynamics Statistics. One quarter of technology and



engineering companies developed between 1995 and 2012 were founded or co-founded by foreign-born immigrants. Those developed between 2006 and 2012 employed an average of 21.37 people each. **Foreign-born immigrants creating employment opportunities in the U.S. is not a novel concept.** **Between 1995 and 2006, the technology companies started by immigrants accounted for an impressive 10 percent of total job creation.** **This number is made even more remarkable by the fact that these immigrant-owned firms made up only 1 percent of all firms** developed between 1995 and 2006. One can only imagine how much these numbers would increase if the U.S. were to actually facilitate highly skilled immigrants' efforts to form businesses and create jobs. The Kauffman Foundation's predictions for the future are, of course, dependent upon the reformation of U.S. immigration policy. Relative to other countries, such as Canada, New Zealand, and the UK, our current policies are unreceptive to foreigners seeking to employ their valuable skills. Lack of foreign interest in working in the U.S. is not to blame; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services reached their cap on H-1B visas within five days of the application opening in 2014. **Our strict limit on H-1B visas is the reason why 46 percent of immigrants in Canada report a high level of education, while only 35 percent of immigrants in the U.S. can report the same.** And **the disparity will continue to grow** so long as we choose to **reject the Immigration Innovation and Startup Acts.** **At present, the United States is a leading world power.** **But in order to maintain this status,** we must supply our labor force with the best minds from around the world. **If our policies continue to reject the contributions of highly skilled immigrants, our economy will continue to lose potential.** **We must realize the vital role highly skilled immigrants play in keeping our country on the frontier of this technologically advanced and ever-evolving world and pass the Immigration Innovation Act and Startup Act immediately.**

## **US economic leadership solves nuclear war**

**Haass 13** - President of the Council on Foreign Relations

(Richard, "The World Without America," [http://www.project-](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass)

[syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass))

Let me posit a radical idea: **The most critical threat facing the United States now and for the foreseeable future is** not a rising China, a reckless North Korea, a nuclear Iran, modern

terrorism, or climate change. Although all of these constitute potential or actual threats, the biggest challenges facing the US are its burgeoning debt, crumbling infrastructure, second-rate primary and secondary schools, outdated immigration system, and **slow economic growth** – in

short, **the domestic foundations of American power**. Readers in other countries may be tempted to react to this judgment with a dose of schadenfreude, finding more than a little satisfaction in America's difficulties. Such a response should not be surprising. The US and those representing it have been guilty of hubris (the US may often be the indispensable nation, but it would be better if others pointed this out), and examples of inconsistency between America's practices and its principles understandably provoke charges of hypocrisy. When America does not adhere to the principles that it preaches to others, it breeds resentment. But, like most temptations, the urge to gloat at America's imperfections and struggles ought to be resisted. People around the globe should be careful what they wish for. America's failure to deal with its internal challenges would come at a steep price. Indeed, the rest of the world's stake in American success is nearly as large as that of the US itself. Part of the reason is economic. The US economy still accounts for about one-quarter of global output. If US growth accelerates, America's capacity to consume other countries' goods and services will increase, thereby

boosting growth around the world. At a time **when Europe is drifting and Asia is slowing, only the US** (or, more broadly, North America) **has the potential to drive global economic recovery**. The US remains a unique source of innovation. Most of the world's citizens communicate with mobile devices based on technology developed in Silicon Valley; likewise, the Internet was made in America. More recently, new technologies developed in the US greatly increase the ability to extract oil and natural gas from underground formations. This technology is now making its way around the globe, allowing other societies to increase their energy production and decrease both their reliance on costly imports and their carbon emissions. The US is also an invaluable source of ideas. Its world-class universities educate a significant percentage of future world leaders. More fundamentally, **the US has long been a leading example of what market economies and democratic politics can accomplish**. People and **governments around the world are far more likely to become more open if the American model is perceived to be succeeding**. Finally, **the world faces many serious challenges**, ranging **from** the need to halt **the spread of weapons of mass destruction**, fight **climate change**, and maintain **a functioning world economic order that promotes trade and investment to regulating practices in cyberspace, improving global health, and preventing armed conflicts**. **These problems will not simply go away or sort themselves out**. While Adam **Smith's "invisible hand"** may ensure the success of free markets, it is **powerless in the world of geopolitics**. **Order requires the visible hand of leadership** to formulate and realize **global responses** to global challenges. Don't get me wrong: None of this is meant to suggest that the US can deal effectively with the world's problems on its own. Unilateralism rarely works. It is not just that the US lacks the means; the very nature of contemporary global problems suggests that only collective responses stand a good chance of succeeding. But **multilateralism is much easier to advocate than** to design and implement. Right **now there is only one candidate for this role: the US**. **No other country has the necessary combination of capability and outlook**. This brings me back to the argument that **the US must put its house in order – economically**, physically, socially, and politically – **if it is to have the resources needed to promote order in the world**. Everyone should hope that it does: **The alternative to a world led by the US is not a world led by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, India, or any other country, but rather a world that is not led at all**. Such a world would almost certainly be **characterized by chronic crisis and conflict**. That would be bad not just for Americans, but **for the vast majority of the planet's** inhabitants.

## UQ – Will pass

### **High-skilled immigration reform will pass now**

**Lee 15** – analyst @ IB Times

(Brianna, “Immigration Reform 2015: High Hopes For High-Skilled Immigration Reform, Even As Congress Battles Obama,” IB Times, <http://www.ibtimes.com/immigration-reform-2015-high-hopes-high-skilled-immigration-reform-even-congress-1783946>)//BB

**Immigration reform is** one of the most **divisive** issues in Congress right now, **but for bills favoring high-skilled immigrants, there may be some hope. Senators introduced two bills this week to increase and streamline high-skilled immigration**, and the sponsors say **they’re optimistic about their prospects.** **Measures to expand immigration channels for high-skilled workers, particularly in the tech industry, have long enjoyed bipartisan support** but have fallen victim to the thornier politics of comprehensive reform. **Passing the bills separately could be a win for business interests** that want skilled labor and signal some progress on immigration from Congress. But detaching them from a comprehensive bill might dim the chances for legislation on more polarizing issues, like pathways to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. **The Immigration Innovation Act**, also known as I-Squared, was introduced Tuesday in the Senate by a bipartisan group of six including Sens. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah; Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn; and Marco Rubio, R-Fla. The bill **would drastically expand** the number of available **visas for temporary high-skilled workers, raising the existing cap** of 65,000 to 115,000, **with room to expand** up to 195,000 under certain circumstances. The **proposal also exempts some categories of immigrants from the quota for employment-based green cards, effectively doubling the number of those available visas.** **A separate bill called the Startup Act**, backed by six senators including Sens. Jerry Moran, R-Kan., and Mark Warner, D-Va., **would create a new type of visa for entrepreneurs** looking to start companies in the United States. **Neither bill is a new proposal; various versions of them have cropped up in Congress before. But reform of the high-skilled immigration process has usually been attached to broader legislation as a sweetener for lawmakers to pass it.** **Now the new Republican-dominated Congress seems more inclined to implement piecemeal reform**, rather than a sweeping comprehensive bill. “Just because we can’t do everything doesn’t mean we can’t do some things,” Moran told the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday. “In my view, Congress makes a mistake when it tries to do everything in one piece of legislation.” **Immigration is a particularly sore subject in Congress right now, as House Republicans voted Wednesday to defund President Barack Obama’s executive action granting deportation relief to some 4 million undocumented immigrants. The House also narrowly passed a bill to undo deportation relief for undocumented childhood arrivals under the president’s 2012 executive order. Passing measures for high-skilled immigrants would give the Republicans something to point to when accused of blocking any immigration reform.** **Not all Republicans are on board, however. Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., released an immigration handbook Tuesday that outlined arguments against increasing temporary high-skilled worker visas. “It is understandable why these corporations push for legislation that will flood the labor market and keep pay low; what is not understandable is why we would ever consider advancing legislation that provides jobs for the citizens of other countries at the expense of our own,” he wrote. Nevertheless, analysts say the bills have a strong chance of passing both houses. “Congress seems much more amenable to high-skilled reform than they were before,” said Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration policy analyst at the libertarian Cato Institute. “Republicans have been on board with expanding high-skilled**

immigration for a **very long time**. Now that they control the Senate, they can **control the discussion** on that, and they're going to push for more liberalization of the system than they would have gotten in a mixed Congress."

## High-skilled bills have momentum

### National Journal 6-2

("Pathways to Reform: A Discussion on High-Skilled Immigration Policy,"

[//BB">https://dc.linktank.com/event/pathways-to-reform-a-discussion-on-high-skilled-immigration-policy//BB](https://dc.linktank.com/event/pathways-to-reform-a-discussion-on-high-skilled-immigration-policy)

**While it appears unlikely that Congress will take up a comprehensive immigration reform bill** this year, **efforts are underway** in Congress by proponents of high-skilled immigration reform to **gather momentum** for reforms to legal immigration laws for high-skilled workers.<sup>a</sup>

**Supporters want to increase the availability of H-1B visas and create more access to green cards for high skilled foreign nationals.** While technology companies insist the demand for high-skilled workers far exceeds the country's supply of domestic labor in STEM fields, critics say the industry has created an artificial shortage to keep wages low.

## New GOP congress makes passage likely

**Wadhwa 15** – former professor @ Harvard, fellow at Rock Center for Corporate Governance at Stanford University, director of research at Center for Entrepreneurship and Research Commercialization at Duke, and distinguished fellow at Singularity University

(Vivek, "Sensible immigration reform may finally have a chance in Washington,"

<http://venturebeat.com/2015/01/16/sensible-immigration-reform-may-finally-have-a-chance-in-washington//BB>

**Congress' inability to move forward on immigration reform has taken a toll on the country's economic growth and global competitiveness.** Witness the rise of Chinese companies such as Alibaba and Xiaomi — which now have their eyes on U.S. markets — and of their counterparts in India. Entrepreneurs worldwide are building the same technologies as Silicon Valley is. America has lost its monopoly on innovation.<sup>a</sup> **But there may finally be hope to slow the skilled immigrant exodus that is in progress. New legislation,** called the Immigration Innovation ("I-Squared") Act of 2015, **prescribes some very sensible reforms.**<sup>a</sup> This bill increases the cap on H-1B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 and allows it to reach 195,000 in years of high demand; removes the limits on immigrants with advanced degrees; allows the spouses of H-1B visa holders to work, so that they are not confined to their homes; and eases restrictions on changing jobs so that workers aren't held hostage to abusive employers who pay lower-than-market wages.<sup>a</sup> Most importantly, the bill enables the recapture of unused green card numbers in order to reduce wait times for the more than a million skilled immigrants who are trapped in limbo, often waiting for more than a decade to get their visas. And it exempts advanced STEM-degree holders, persons with extraordinary ability, and dependents of skilled immigrants from the visa caps. To retrain American workers who have seen their skills become obsolete because of technology changes, the bill reforms the way in which the hefty fees for H-1B visas and employment-based green cards are used.<sup>a</sup> **The bill,** introduced Tuesday by Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Chris Coons (D-Del.), Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) and Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.), **promises to make some badly needed reforms** that should have happened long ago. **Both political parties have supported key elements of them. Yet no progress was made,** because Democrats feared that legislation they considered extremely

important — the legalization of undocumented workers — would become less of a priority if they agreed to resolve the problems of legal, skilled immigrants. Rep. Luis V. Gutierrez (D-Ill.), chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, said as much to me at a hearing of the House Judiciary Committee on immigration in February 2013. **The result of this impasse has been that highly educated and skilled immigrants have become frustrated and returned home**; startups in Silicon Valley have been unable to hire the workers they desperately need for building world-changing technologies; and entrepreneurs who want to come to the United States to start their companies and create American jobs have been unable to do so. **Why might there be progress now, when all efforts over the past few years have failed? Because after the electoral defeat of Democrats, both sides are eager to show that they can act responsibly and put the needs of the country ahead of partisan politics.** Grover Norquist, who is president of Americans for Tax Reform and a powerhouse in the Republican Party, says that **the bill will get the support of the vast majority of Republicans**: “They need this after six years of telling high tech they really support them but were being held back by the concerns of many Republicans who feared what the Senate might add to any originally targeted bill. Democrats in Congress and Obama need to support this after six years of holding skilled immigrants hostage to a mega deal and telling the business community to wait.” Norquist says that, because the **Republicans control both houses, they can ensure consensus and prevent skilled-immigration legislation from being stapled to a larger, more complicated bill.**

## UQ – Yes STEM shortage

### **STEM shortage exists now**

**Nager 15** – MA in political economy, economic research analyst at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation

(Adams w/ Roger Atkinson, “Debunking the Top Ten Arguments Against High-Skilled Immigration,” [//BB">http://www.itif.org/publications/2015/04/20/debunking-top-ten-arguments-against-high-skilled-immigration\)//BB](http://www.itif.org/publications/2015/04/20/debunking-top-ten-arguments-against-high-skilled-immigration)

**Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, a vocal group of advocates insists that the United States does not face a shortage of** science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workers. The advocates argue incorrectly that high-skilled immigration is not only unnecessary but is actually harmful to American workers. In this report, ITIF refutes 10 of the most common myths asserted to deny the existence of a STEM worker shortage and provides clear evidence that a STEM shortage hurts the American economy and workers.ª Myth 1: Data

disprove the STEM shortage.ª Fact: **Despite what advocates may claim, a rigorous examination of available data instead of anecdotal sampling supports the conclusion there is a STEM shortage.**ª Myth 2: American universities will supply enough computer science graduates to meet demand over the next 10 years.ª Fact: **By best estimates and current trends, there will be at least two new jobs in computer occupations for every U.S. computer science graduate over the next decade.**

### **US is falling behind in STEM—that’s the greatest threat to national security**

**Sund, Naval Postgraduate School master’s candidate, 2014** (Steven A., “U.S. DECLINING GLOBAL RANKINGS IN MATH AND SCIENCE AND THE IMPACT ON OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: POLICY OPTIONS TO ELLICIT ANOTHER SPUTNIK MOMENT,” Master’s thesis with advisors Christopher Bellavita, the director of programs for the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, and Richard Bergin, Harvard PhD in Business Administration and co-leader of KPMG’s US Economics and Regulation practice, Naval Postgraduate School, p. 1, IC)

**The inadequacies of our** systems of research and **education pose a greater threat to U.S. national security** over the next quarter century **than any potential conventional war that we might imagine.** –Hart-Rudman Commission Report.

Despite this warning, **the United States has not implemented a national education imperative** or developed a sense of social responsibility **capable of reversing our declining interest** science, technology, engineering and math **(STEM) education,** which had been at the forefront of national concerns following WWII, when the atomic bomb, and Sputnik fueled American society’s interest and drive in the sciences, to a point in 2007 where **fewer than two percent of high-school graduates receive engineering degrees** from U.S. universities (Augustine, 2007, p. 47). Now, 60 years later, **we are witnessing greater increase in spending by foreign governments on science and engineering** (S&E) initiatives **while the United States has reduced investment** in these areas. Although numerous schools, government agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGO) and private corporations, and community organizations have developed policies to help bolster STEM education, **U.S. schools are still declining in global rankings. The lack of interest in the sciences** by our domestic students **and low completions of advanced higher level science degrees** by American students **are compounding the problem.**

## **Rising challengers will displace US dominance in science and technology**

**Sund, Naval Postgraduate School master's candidate, 2014** (Steven A., "U.S. DECLINING GLOBAL RANKINGS IN MATH AND SCIENCE AND THE IMPACT ON OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: POLICY OPTIONS TO ELLICIT ANOTHER SPUTNIK MOMENT," Master's thesis with advisors Christopher Bellavita, the director of programs for the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, and Richard Bergin, Harvard PhD in Business Administration and co-leader of KPMG's US Economics and Regulation practice, Naval Postgraduate School, p. 10, IC)

In response to the emerging global education competition, **several countries have implemented programs and policies** in the 21st century **aimed directly at the United States' dominance of the science and research universities**. For example, **the European Union is** focusing governmental policy on **developing centers of excellence** and is posturing to make the European Institute of Technology a challenger to the top ranking U.S. universities (Marginson & Wende, 2007 p. 322). In addition, **Germany is implementing** a plan to develop **a group of universities** that will be capable of being **part of the top 10 research universities in the world**. Furthermore, **China, India, Singapore, and Korea are all taking major steps to ensure that they are at the forefront of science and technology research**. **China is also taking steps to develop world class universities** and is undergoing a state driven educational achievement initiative to increase the quantity and quality of education in China.

## **US brain drain now**

**Husick, Foreign Policy Research Institute's Program on Teaching Innovation co-director, 2012** (Lawrence, "From Brain Drain to Brain Flow: The New Economy of Innovation Turbulence," FPRI, August 2012, <http://www.fpri.org/articles/2012/08/brain-drain-brain-flow-new-economy-innovation-turbulence>, IC)

**At one time** in the recent past, leaders in developing countries and in international organizations decried the "brain drain" that led the best and brightest in what we used to call the "third world" to emigrate to the West to take advantage of superior educational and employment opportunities. **The United States was the destination of choice**, both for these reasons and because other societies were seen as less hospitable to immigrants. These **foreign-born students became successful professionals and entrepreneurs after graduation**, and their children, in turn, became some of the highest-performing students in American schools, changing the culture, which became aware of the "tiger mom" effect. Then, in an unexpected turn of affairs, partly **due to the politicization of the immigration issue, the United States started denying work visas to graduates, telling talented foreign students, "Go home, and take your degree with you."**

As any student of innovation knows, promoting innovative thinking is, at best, an inexact enterprise. One of the few certainties, however, is that **innovation happens at edges**, where turbulence promotes mixing, more often than at the stable center, where people and ideas have greater homogeneity. In genetics, this translates to environmental stress that makes it possible for a mutation that is favorable to changed conditions to confer a survival advantage. **In academia and industry, the concept is more akin to cross-pollination, as a newly minted Ph.D. leaves her institution to take up a teaching or research post at another university, government laboratory or company.**

In the early days of the scientific revolution when Gallileo, Kepler, and Brahe were changing our view of man's place in the universe, travel was difficult and dangerous, and correspondence and publishing (even if officially suppressed) had to suffice. By the time of Newton, however, scientists and scholars regularly traveled across Europe, and the great debates raged among

thinkers in Europe and, to a lesser extent, America. The Colonies had Franklin, and, after devoutly religious rioters (in Birmingham, England) burned his house to the ground, Joseph Priestley, too. It may not have been the Royal Society, but the study of natural philosophy enlightened debate in Philadelphia at Franklin's American Philosophical Society, at Mr. Jefferson's University in Charlottesville, where five of the original eight faculty members came from England, and in the Yard at Harvard as well.

In the 150 years that followed, however, few scholars and fewer innovators emigrated beyond the European-American axis. Vast stores of technical and scientific knowledge in China, India and the Islamic world remained out of sight and largely out of mind as the West advanced scientifically, technologically and economically. Even in the period leading up to and after World War II, when many academics and innovators left Europe and emigrated to the United States, almost no Japanese, Chinese, Korean, or Indian professors, inventors or students were seen on American campuses or in industry.

It may be argued that globalization is not best exemplified by the search for cheap labor, but rather, by the search for great brains. **Beginning in the 1970s, students from rising Asia— India, South Korea, China and Japan— appeared on American campuses in increasing numbers. Many of these students stayed in the United States** after graduation, teaching, working in corporate research laboratories, and starting new companies.

This educational trend has both continued and quickened... **today more than half of all foreign Ph.D. students in American universities come from** just three countries: **China, India and South Korea. The difference is that after graduation, the United States now largely refuses to allow them to remain.** For the most part, **these graduates return home.** For instance, **it has been reported that over 80 percent of the** science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) **professors at the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology hold Ph.D.s from American universities.**

**We are now seeing the emergence of a globalized innovation revolution,** but one **that is advancing at the expense of the United States.** In countries where our new doctorate degree holders are welcome, the mixing of ideas is generating, “innovative, high-impact scientific outcomes” according to The Scientist magazine.<sup>[1]</sup> Journal publisher Elsevier has followed the effects of migrating scientists by reviewing papers published over the past 15 years. Reporting its “Global Brain Migration” study at a recent meeting in Chicago, researcher Nick Fowler showed that movement of international students and faculty are reshaping the world of innovation.

### **STEM professionals lacking now**

**Papa, Indiana State Senate Chief of Staff and Chief Legal Counsel, and Whelan, former law clerk to then-Chief Justice of the Indiana Supreme Court Brent**

**Dickson, 2015** (Jeff and Jessica, “REGAINING THE ECONOMIC EDGE: POLICY PROPOSALS FOR HIGH-SKILL WORKER AND STUDENT AUTHORIZATIONS,” Indiana International And Comparative Law Review, Vol. 25, No. 1, 2015, p. 41, IC)

**One major issue** in the current immigration system **is the disparity between the number of U.S. students pursuing STEM degrees and the projected need for top talent in STEM careers.**<sup>38</sup> Between 2010 and 2020, **employment in STEM** occupations **is expected to expand faster than employment in non-STEM** occupations by seventeen versus fourteen percent.<sup>39</sup> Further, **both government officials and private industry cite “concerns regarding shortages of skilled workers . . . compounded by the pending retirements of many baby boomers.”**<sup>40</sup> Correspondingly, **the supply of STEM talent is not keeping up with demand.**



Although the number of students receiving degrees from four-year institutions has increased in the United States over the past several decades, **the share of students graduating with STEM degrees has declined.** The percentage of bachelor's degrees awarded in STEM fields declined from twenty-four percent in 1985 to eighteen percent in 2009.<sup>41</sup> During the same time period, the percentage of master's degrees awarded in STEM fields dropped from eighteen percent to fourteen percent.<sup>42</sup> Although the share of doctorate degrees in the STEM fields was relatively stable between 1985 and 2009, the share of those degrees going to domestic students dropped from seventy-four percent to fifty-four percent.<sup>43</sup> Overall, the number of full-time foreign graduate students in science, engineering, and health fields grew from 91,150 in 1990 to 148,923 in 2009.<sup>44</sup> In sum, **there is an increase in the demand for STEM professionals, a decrease in the share of students pursuing STEM degrees,** and of the students pursuing STEM degrees, a decrease in the share of domestic students pursuing such degrees. Policy changes must be made to address this growing issue.

### **H1-B Visas are lacking- runs out quickly and green card authorization is extremely slow**

**Roth '14** [Mark, 12/16, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, H-1B work visa full of uncertainties for immigrants. [online] Available at: <http://www.post-gazette.com/local/city/2014/12/16/H-1B-work-visa-full-of-uncertainties-for-immigrants/stories/201412160004> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].] Even then, it will be a tossup. **The 65,000 visa cap has not changed in 10 years, and demand from employers is high. This year, the government received 172,500 applications, and it took just nine days for the visas to run out. Even coming out of the recession in fiscal 2010 and 2011, the visa limit was reached after several months.** Those who favor expanding the **H-1B** program say higher **numbers are important not just to meet employers' needs, but because many immigrants now have to wait years to get permanent residency green cards** to stay and work in the U.S. When **America's immigration laws** were overhauled in 1965, it got rid of the quotas that limited migration from Asia and parts of Europe, but **substituted an "equality rule" that said no country could get more than 7 percent of the visas issued each year. For populous nations like India, China and the Philippines, that has created huge backlogs** in visa applications. Right now, the State Department said, **the wait for employment-based green cards is 11 years for people from India, four years for those from China and two years for those from the Philippines.** Because that entry point is so clogged, some say, employers need a program like the H-1B visa to meet their fast changing needs. "It's not realistic for most people to get sponsored for a green card, since the wait times can be six to 10 years or longer," said Stuart Anderson, a pro-immigration activist who runs the National Foundation for American Policy in Arlington, Va. "Nobody you know goes for an interview and the employer says, 'Oh great, show up at noon on Jan. 1, 2022, and Mary will show you around the office.'"

## UQ – Silicon valley down now

### **Silicon Valley failing now**

**The New Economy 2012** (“Silicon Valley: The new contenders,” The New Economy, a quarterly magazine and website looking at technology and innovation in its wider business context, 1/18/12, <http://www.theneweconomy.com/strategy/silicon-valley-the-new-contenders>, IC)

**Silicon Valley** – the world famous bastion for technological innovation – **might have passed its glory days**. Facing increasing competition from emerging markets such as China and India, **the tech haven is suffering a ‘brain drain’ at an extremely worrying rate**. Any ‘brain drain’ experienced, however, would simply rectify the large influx of immigrant entrepreneurs that have flooded the sun-drenched region for generations. Reports indicate that as much as 52 percent of Silicon Valley’s start-up companies were founded by immigrants, and that non-natives contribute almost 25 percent of WIPO PCT applications filed. The **immigrants** that have flooded Silicon Valley **form an inherent part of the** very essence of the world-famous **institution. However, a shift has occurred. Turning their back on the spot they once considered the world base for technological developments, these** brainy **individuals don’t necessarily rate Silicon Valley number one anymore.**» Many **entrepreneurs have decided to take their practises back to their native countries**, or relocate to other attractive tech havens – be it in China, India, Germany, France or elsewhere. According to a study carried out by researchers at Duke University, UC Berkeley and Harvard universities, **many immigrant students are now planning to return to domestic shores, rather than settle in Silicon Valley**, as per the norm until only a few years ago. Hence, **the brain drain that has hit Silicon Valley is only set to worsen.**

## UQ – AT disagreements concerning bills

### **Disagreements will get worked out**

**Owens 6-2** – UNC Chapel-Hill, health care reporter at National Journal. Her work has previously appeared in the Los Angeles Times, The News & Observer and The Charlotte Observer (Caitlin, “Still No Clear Path to Boost High-Skilled Immigration,”

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/still-no-clear-path-to-boost-high-skilled-immigration-20150602//BB>

**Democratic Rep. John Delaney and Republican Sen. Ron Johnson agree that highly-skilled immigrants are valuable to the U.S. economy—they just disagree on what to do about it.**<sup>a</sup> As Delaney put it: Democrats prioritize finding a path to legalization for undocumented immigrants while Republicans want to first focus on securing the border.<sup>a</sup> “We all want every American to have the opportunity to build a good life for themselves and their family,” Johnson said. “There’s wide disparity in terms of how to provide those types of opportunities, how to achieve that prosperity.”<sup>a</sup> Delaney, a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and Johnson, chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, on Tuesday keynoted a National Journal event, “Pathways to Reform: A Discussion on High-Skilled Immigration Policy,” underwritten by Qualcomm.<sup>a</sup> “I agree with so much I heard,” said Johnson, who spoke after Delaney, “but there’s a heavy disagreement in terms of what the federal government really ought to do.”<sup>a</sup> Echoing the positions of their respective parties, **Delaney talked about comprehensive reform and Johnson talked about piecemeal**, step-by-step change.<sup>a</sup> Delaney said he thinks **there will eventually be a House version of the 2013 immigration bill passed in the Senate**; Johnson said he would argue **the “comprehensive bill ... wasn’t going to work.”<sup>a</sup>** **But at the end of the day, both want to retain talent in the U.S.**

### **I-Squared is a bipartisan bill that would increase border security and visas for high-skilled workers**

**Rubin ’15** [Jennifer, 1/13, Can something on immigration pass?. [online] Washington Post. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2015/01/13/can-something-on-immigration-pass/> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].

The president would of course veto this, and in any event it would likely be filibustered in the Senate. But there is **another immigration measure** that **has bipartisan support**, which was set out in a press release: U.S. **Senators Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Chris Coons (D-Del.), Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), and Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.)** today **introduced legislation, the Immigration Innovation (“I-Squared”) Act of 2015, to bring long-overdue reforms to the nation’s immigration laws for high-skilled workers. The bill focuses on** areas vital to ensuring the United States can maintain its competitiveness in the global economy: **the quantity of** employment-based nonimmigrant visas (**H-1B visas**), allowing for their growth depending on the demands of the economy while making reforms to protect workers; **increased access to green cards for high-skilled workers by expanding the exemptions and eliminating the annual per country limits** for employment based green cards; **and reforming the fees on H-1B and green cards so those fees can be used to promote American worker retraining and education.** The bill was first introduced in the 113th Congress. There can’t be any argument this is a threat to low-wage earners. Sure, there are economic illiterates who think this would be bad for the economy (they should check with the Heritage

Foundation's chief economist Stephen Moore). **This** is hugely significant, however, since it puts liberal Democrats on record as supporting reform that does nothing about the 11 million here illegally. That **is terrain on which deals can be made.**

## **Republicans want greater support in 2016- immigration reform now has bipartisan support**

**Levy, Political Reporter, 6/3** [Signs of Life For Immigration Reform - US News. [online] US News & World Report. Available at: <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2015/06/03/signs-of-life-for-immigration-reform> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].]

With the unilateral moves halted by a federal judge, congressional leadership has been content to sidestep the thorny issue after losing a faceoff in March in which they unsuccessfully tried to tie funding for the Department of Homeland Security to a rollback of the Obama actions. But **the looming presidential race has increased the sense of urgency among some** of the rank and file eager **to see the party raise its standing among Hispanic voters. "If you're a Republican [running for president], you at minimum want the immigration issue neutralized,** and maybe gain votes where Mitt Romney was unable to get them" in 2012, says Stuart Anderson, executive director of the nonpartisan, nonprofit National Foundation for American Policy. While any of the the piecemeal proposals faces long odds to passage and even less chance of cooperation with the White House, one area of focus appears to be on guest worker **programs that would increase the number and accessibility of visas for both high- and low-skilled workers.** The reform **already has bipartisan support.** "When it comes to illegal immigration, what's the No. 1 reason people come to this country illegally? The same reason our ancestors came here: to work," Sen. Ron Johnson, R-Wis., said Tuesday at a bipartisan event exploring pragmatic methods of reigniting the debate on reform. "From my standpoint, if you really want to secure our border, let's eliminate or drastically reduce the incentives for illegal immigration, starting with a guest worker program." Some studies have suggested that, instead of taking away jobs from Americans, those workers help spur economic growth. It's a position immigration advocates hope to use to sell the issue to a broader constituency. "If you don't have a restaurant worker working in the kitchen ... you're not going to have good jobs, waiter jobs, management jobs in restaurants for Americans," says Alfonso Aguilar, director of the Latino Partnership program at the conservative American Principles in Action group and the former chief of the U.S. Office of Citizenship under President George W. Bush. "So we need to connect with the middle class and show that immigration is good for the middle class." Aguilar's organization has suggested setting up guest worker programs for low-skilled workers that would allow the number of visas to fluctuate based on the needs of businesses. The system, particularly suited to the needs of the agricultural industry, would allow workers to come into the U.S. for a few months of the year, then return to their home countries. **A more narrowly tailored bill** from Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, has also gained some interest from advocates on both sides of the aisle. The measure, which has yet to move in committee, **would increase the number of visas for high-skilled workers, particularly those in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM, fields, and make it easier for those workers to stay in the U.S.** "Just like in business, I don't want the smart people working in my competitor's business, I want them working in mine," Johnson said. "The same thing should be true for a national economy: If we use American resources to educate the brightest people from around the world ... we should provide every incentive for the brightest minds to be working here to grow our economy." **Political demands** from the Republican base **mean that any bill that would allow more foreign workers in would need to first improve border security,** whether that be through extending

and enhancing a fence or increasing the number of border agents. A border security bill nearly made it to the House floor in January, but was pulled back at the last minute over objections from more conservative members that it did not go far enough or block funding to implement the president's executive actions. Republican leaders say they plan to bring it up again.

### **Prefer our evidence---theirs conflates high-skilled reform with comprehensive attempts**

**Chaffetz 14** – U.S. Representative for Utah's 3rd congressional district, first elected in 2008 (Jason, "Hope for immigration reform in the 114th Congress," Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/nov/18/hope-for-immigration-reform-in-the-114th-congress/>)//BB

**Contrary to public perception, there is a great deal of agreement on many of the solutions needed to address our immigration problem. If you set aside the divisive amnesty issue, you find that there is broad agreement on everything from border security to visa reform. Most of us recognize the need to address the brain drain of high-skilled students leaving our country, the urgency of deporting fugitive aliens who have been convicted of crimes, the value of a visa entry and exit program and reforms to our agricultural worker programs. Unfortunately, those types of votes have been held hostage to the demands for a broad and immediate amnesty.** With Democratic leaders pledging to reject any bill that does not resolve the highest-stake issue — amnesty — in their favor, efforts to resolve even the smallest piece of the immigration quagmire have been stalled. **With new leadership in the Senate and a stronger Republican majority in the House, I am optimistic that we will now be able to move forward on important pieces of the immigration reform puzzle on which there is broad agreement.** Among these is a bill I sponsored that addresses the barriers facing high-skilled immigrants. Despite passing the House by a vote of 389-15, my bill to remove the per-country caps on employment- and family-based visas stalled in the unproductive Democrat-led Senate. This bill simply removes some of the penalties and delays that discriminately affect people from high-population countries such as Mexico, India and China. It didn't stall because we couldn't agree. Both Democrats and Republicans recognize that visas should be available on a first-come, first-served basis without regard to country of origin. The bill stalled because the Senate never took a vote. Last November, I introduced bipartisan legislation that would create a consistent and reliable pay system within the Border Patrol. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would save taxpayers upward of \$100 million annually. These pay reforms would also enhance border security by ensuring that a greater number of agents are in the field on a more consistent basis. With a new Senate majority leader and newly elected House and Senate members who are committed to finding solutions, I believe **the time is right to pass common-sense immigration reforms that fix our legal immigration system, creating incentives for would-be immigrants to come in through the front door again.**

## UQ – AT GOP would never

### **GOP support**

**Lind '15** [Dara, 1/22, The Senate GOP is naming its two most anti-immigrant members to run its immigration subcommittee. [online] Vox. Available at: <http://www.vox.com/2015/1/22/7867941/sessions-vitter-immigration> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].] Congressional Republicans in both chambers are relatively united in wanting to shut down President Obama's 2014 executive actions on immigration, which would allow millions of unauthorized immigrants to apply for temporary protection from deportation. But **many Republicans are eager to present an immigration agenda that doesn't just say what they're against, but what they're for: border security and expanded legal immigration for skilled workers.** And there's been chatter that **the GOP might try to hem Obama in by passing those bills — which reflect reforms Obama has also said he wants** — and forcing him to make a decision.

### **Republicans are pushing**

**Foley, 3/27** [Megan, 4 Things You Should Know About the New Congress. [online] The Cheat Sheet. Available at: <http://www.cheatsheet.com/politics/the-new-congress-has-a-contentious-agenda-but-wants-to-compromise.html/?a=viewall> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].] Immigration: Not only have House Republicans made the funding of the Department of Homeland Security contingent on language derailing Obama's executive action, but **the House may advance legislation aimed at reforming U.S. immigration laws. The bill proposed by** Republicans representatives will be very different from the Senate bill that failed to pass the House in 2013. That bill drew vast criticism for offering undocumented immigrants what conservatives call amnesty. By comparison, the legislation likely to be proposed **in this current session of Congress will seek to strengthen border security and immigration laws while making immigration easier for high-skilled workers and farm laborers.**

## UQ – AT no border security

### **New border surveillance bills will fill in current holes**

#### **Coren 15**

(Courtney, "Sen. Ron Johnson: Border Security Bill Is 'First Step' in Reform,"  
<http://www.newsmax.com/Newsmax-Tv/Ron-Johnson-borders-John-Cornyn-Jeff-Flake/2015/01/21/id/619858/>)//BB

Wisconsin Sen. Ron **Johnson** tells Newsmax TV that he **expects to have bipartisan support for the Secure the Border First Act of 2015 that he is co-sponsoring with** Texas Sen. John **Cornyn** and Arizona Sen. Jeff **Flake**. "We certainly should have bipartisan support for finally securing our border," Johnson, who is the new chairman of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, told J.D. Hayworth on "America's Forum" on Wednesday. "I know **the public supports it. They have been demanding it** for decades, and of course, the political process has never given that to the American public," he said. "We have to secure the border as opposed to comprehensive reform," the Wisconsin Republican said. Story continues below video. Note: Watch Newsmax TV now on DIRECTV Ch. 349 and DISH Ch. 223. Get Newsmax TV on your cable system – Click Here Now. "We have a problem with our immigration system and we do have to fix it, but the title is calling out the fact that **this is the first step in any kind of immigration reform and we have to do it first**," he said. Johnson, Cornyn and Flake announced their border security measure Wednesday, which is designed to be a companion bill to the border security legislation introduced by House Homeland Security Chairman Michael McCaul of Texas. Johnson said that because Cornyn, Flake and McCaul are all from border states, "they have been dealing with this issue" first hand, and he's planning "to look to their expertise." "Certainly, Chairman McCaul has been drafting and crafting bills for a while," he added. McCaul told The Texas Tribune that the House border security bill "is the toughest border security bill ever before Congress" and it includes "real penalties for the administration for not doing their job." As Johnson takes the reins of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, the Wisconsin Republican says that "the mission statement of our committee under my chairmanship is pretty simple. It's 'to enhance the economic and national security of America.'" "If you want to keep this nation safe, we need to defeat ISIS. We need to secure our border," he said. "It starts with recognizing reality — that's what we're going to be holding hearings on, and then we'll set achievable goals." "I'm really going to bring a fresh pair of eyes to this process, but I don't want to reinvent the wheel where there's some really good prescriptive items we can employ to secure the border," he said. "I want to utilize those things." Johnson admits that **the border security bill "is a starting point,"** and that he also plans to work with Iowa Sen. Chuck Grassley's Judiciary Committee "to make sure we combine a border security and immigration enforcement provision because you really need to combine both."

## UQ – AT not top of agenda

That's not relevant to our DA.

**Immigration policy changes are coming---only a question of form**

**Economist 5-28**

("Barriers ahead," Economist,

<http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2015/05/politics-immigration>)

**A FEDERAL appeals court ruled on Tuesday against the Obama administration's executive**

**order to shield millions of immigrants from deportation.** This decision is most immediately a blow to migrants who must continue to live in the shadows. Pundits add that this is a big setback for Barack Obama, as the president now may not see his big immigration plans take effect while he is in office. Republicans may be celebrating, as many have come out against the president's policies for immigration reform. But for **the many GOP candidates who are jockeying for position in the 2016 presidential field, the appeals-court ruling is bad news.** **Immigration will**

**now be squarely on the agenda.**

Candidates running for the White House will now have to spell out just how many millions of long-established migrants they would seek to deport if elected (angering many non-white voters), or how many they would allow to stay (risking conservative cries of "amnesty"). Hillary Clinton is surely smiling, particularly as Hispanic voters could prove pivotal in some swing states in the 2016 elections, from Florida to Nevada. **The legal import** of this week's ruling **is** relatively **slight**. The Fifth Circuit of Appeals in New Orleans was not offering a formal opinion on the underlying legality of Mr Obama's actions. Rather, it merely dismissed a procedural challenge by government lawyers to a ruling in February by a federal judge in Texas, which has halted the president's immigration agenda like a cartoon spanner thrown into giant cogwheels. The same appeals court will be asked to take a view on the merits of the Texas judge's reasoning this summer, though in fact the whole question could easily end up in the Supreme Court. For now, though, by a split 2-1 decision, the Fifth Circuit signalled that its sympathies lie with Texas and 25 other largely Republican states, which sued Mr Obama for what they call a "lawless" attempt to bypass Congress and rewrite immigration law by presidential fiat. The lawsuit by the 26 states involves an executive decision unveiled in November 2014 that protects from deportation an estimated 4m parents of citizens and permanent residents (green-card holders), as well as some 300,000 people who arrived as children and meet specific criteria. The order expanded an earlier policy for granting residence—but not formal legal status—to immigrants who came as children, graduated from high school and have not been convicted of a serious crime. The government had planned to start taking applications this month. The whole row has a deeply partisan slant to it, which is depressing to anyone who has hopes of seeing America fix its broken immigration system. Comprehensive reform will advance only when broad, bipartisan majorities are on board. To simplify, but not by much, the 26 states seeking to block Mr Obama take the view that bringing immigrants in from the shadows imposes painful costs on the states where they live. Texas and the others say that they would be forced to spend money issuing driving licences and other services to newly legal residents, and so the president's scheme goes way beyond an exercise of his executive powers to decide who should and should not be deported. But 15 other, largely Democratic states side with the government, arguing that deportation priorities are an executive prerogative—and that more broadly it is a net boon to the country to let those already here work legally. **Expect all 2016 candidates to be asked where they stand on the president's executive decisions.** Some



Republicans may have planned to fudge the question, by thundering about his habit of ignoring the constitution, or by murmuring about pathways to legal status for migrants that meet lots of arduous criteria and wait a long time at the back of a line. But **now that many millions of otherwise hard-working law-abiding migrants face deportation in America, it may be the job of the country's next president to decide their fate.**

## UQ – AT Obama’s XOs solve

### **Obama’s executive actions are weak and vague- no solvency**

**Meyers ’14** [Jessie, 11/24, BostonGlobe.com, Tech companies see few big gains in Obama’s executive action - The Boston Globe. [online] Available at: <https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2014/11/24/tech-companies-see-few-big-gains-obama-executive-action/dauDjukOhe1qx5ZQTSc0M/story.html> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015]. The president’s action “kind of falls short,” said Thomas Ketchell, a 26-year-old entrepreneur who spoke from Belgium because he could not stay in the United States. He and the two other cofounders of Hstry, an education technology company based in Back Bay, must bounce between Europe and the United States because they cannot receive H-1B visas, he said. “It should be a lot easier, considering what we are offering US students,” he said. **Senior administration officials** defended the modest nature of the changes on legal grounds. They **said the administration does not have the authority to raise the cap for H-1B visas without congressional approval.** The limit sits at 65,000, with an additional 20,000 for those with advanced degrees from an American university. **Only half** of those **who applied** for a visa **this year received one;** the **permits disappeared in days.** New England has some of the highest demand for H-1B visas in relation to total employment, according to an October report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Last year, Citizenship and Immigration Services approved nearly 11,000 H-1B visas for Massachusetts. Obama acknowledged the problem in his speech on Thursday night. “I will make it easier and faster for high-skilled immigrants, graduates, and entrepreneurs to stay and contribute to our economy, as so many business leaders have proposed,” he said in an address to the nation. But **companies** had **hoped Obama would allow officials to reissue unused green cards to workers caught in a years-long backlog. That authorization is considered critical by many tech employers because it allows foreigners to live and work** in the country **on a permanent basis.** The administration said it will continue to work on the issue with industry. Obama’s action proposes several other tweaks, including changes that would make it easier for temporary high-skilled workers to switch jobs and allow spouses to work. Spouses do not currently have that option. Another would make it possible for high-skilled workers to obtain some green-card benefits as they wait in line for one. **The President’s Council of Economic Advisors estimated that his executive action,** including the high-skilled component, **will expand the country’s labor force by nearly 150,000 people over the next decade.** Many of these changes require the creation of **rules** that **could take more than a year.** “This is a step in the right direction,” said James Brett, chief executive officer of The New England Council, an alliance of universities, hospitals, and organizations. “But it’s only the beginning.” Other **firms expressed confusion over uncertain timelines and vague guidelines.** “There’s a whole lot more work to be done to put meat on the bones of what the president is talking about doing,” said Peter Muller, director of immigration policy for Intel, a California-based technology company with 1,400 workers in Hudson.

### **Number needs to double, Obama has no authority, bipartisan congressional reform required**

**Kudlow, Former Associate Director of Economics, ’14** [Larry, 11/22, Associate director for economics and planning, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President under Reagan, Kudlow: What about the brainiacs?. [online] CNBC. Available at: <http://www.cnbc.com/id/102210294> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].]

**Tight limits on high-skilled worker visas and the whole wacky system of green-card, permanent-resident status are not being fixed. This can only happen through legislative change.** In other words, **Congress has to act** (in this and a dozen other places). So the Silicon Valley crowd is not cheering Obama's executive actions. For example, **the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, a trade organization representing nearly 400 tech companies, says the brainiac H-1B visas that are capped at 65,000 a year should at least be doubled. They also want some kind of legal status for science and math students.** While Obama's action may let these students finish their studies without deportation, it's vague whether they can stay after that. As Michael Barone has noted, it's the high-tech brainiacs that we want to invite and protect. They are more important than the low-wage groups. Even **big-business advocates**, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Business Roundtable **are underwhelmed** by Obama's actions. Chamber president Tom Donohue told Fortune.com, "**Meaningful and lasting immigration reform can only be achieved through the enactment of bipartisan legislation.**" (Italics mine.) So here's Obama breaking all kinds of constitutional rules and losing important support. Another problem is that **Obama's plan is not going to have much economic impact. His Council of Economic Advisors is predicting a GDP increase of 0.4 percent after ten years, a 0.3 percent increase in average wages, and a reduction in the federal budget deficit of \$25 billion. Virtually no change.** In their report, the council also says the economy will do slightly better because of increased innovation from high-skilled workers. But as noted, **we're not going to get any more high-skilled workers because the president has no authority to issue them visas.**

## Link – backlash against legal immigration

### **Without enforcement, Congress will backlash against other areas of immigration**

**Margin 7** - Warner-Booker Distinguished Professor of International Law and Class of 1963 Research Professor, University of Virginia. The author served as General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service from 1995 to 1998, and many of the opinions voiced here derive from that first-hand experience with immigration enforcement, as well as a quarter century of scholarly work in the field

(David, "EIGHT MYTHS ABOUT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT," Legislation and Public Policy, 10)//BB

I have focused here on enforcement, and I definitely want to see the United States develop an effective, balanced, and well-designed enforcement system, over a five- to ten-year time frame, centered around workplace verification and follow-up, though bolstered by effective border policing. **Enforcement**, for the reasons I have indicated, **is a crucial component of reform. No combination of** guestworker provisions or legal migration expansion, short of virtual open borders, will obviate or even reduce the enforcement requirement. **Without effective enforcement, demagoguery and polarization on immigration will persist and eat away at generous legal immigration provisions.** But **enforcement** is not really the most important focus for our current immigration reform debate. Instead it **is merely a means—a crucial means that must be well-crafted and well-implemented—toward a greater objective.**

### **Illegal enforcement is key to political support for high-skilled migration---key to the economy**

**Margin 7** - Warner-Booker Distinguished Professor of International Law and Class of 1963 Research Professor, University of Virginia. The author served as General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service from 1995 to 1998, and many of the opinions voiced here derive from that first-hand experience with immigration enforcement, as well as a quarter century of scholarly work in the field

(David, "EIGHT MYTHS ABOUT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT," Legislation and Public Policy, 10)//BB

The greater objective is to reform our laws so that we as a nation can best take advantage of the benefits of immigration in the twenty-first century. After all, **we have at our disposal a huge and globally rare asset, because, by tradition and self-image, we are a nation reasonably comfortable with high levels of legal immigration. We readily admit one million persons a year for legal permanent migration,<sup>113</sup> and, in my opinion, the citizenry would tolerate a higher level if there were wider assurance that illegal migration has come under control.** Our nation struggles with ongoing problems of discrimination and excess, to be sure, but viewed on the world scene, **the United States is one of only a handful of countries that has been reasonably successful in welcoming immigrants, providing real opportunity, and making good use of the restless talent of those who come to take up a new life.** Immigration is important to this nation's economy, its scientific advancement, and its artistic and cultural richness.<sup>114</sup> **We need to get enforcement right so that we can preserve, nurture, and expand these national advantages.**

## High-skilled immigration is key to the economy---avoiding the amnesty debate is key to passage

**Marin 15** – formerly the 41st Treasurer of the United States and is co-chair of the American Competitiveness Alliance

(Rosario, “Rosario Marin: Immigration reform should focus on common ground, not partisan differences,” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/opinion/2015/01/21/rosario-marin-immigration-reform-should-focus-on-common-ground-not-partisan/>)/BB

While I have had tactical differences with the President, I believe that now the President has acted unilaterally to allow some 5 million undocumented individuals to stay in the U.S., **the new**

**GOP Congress has a political opening to sidestep the “amnesty” debate and focus on**

**bipartisan areas**

that unite the party. After all, as long as this President remains in office, attempts to roll back his executive actions will prove fruitless. Encouraging more workers to come to America, both in high-tech and STEM fields as well as agricultural, construction, hospitality and other sectors where there are shortages, is a win-win for Republicans and the U.S. economy. - Rosario Marin. I strongly believe that Republicans must defend their record as the party of opportunity for all those who work hard and play by the rules. They can do this while also helping to grow the economy by passing legislation aimed at loosening restrictions on our antiquated guest-worker programs, both for highly skilled workers including in the critical STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), and for lower skilled workers in key sectors such as agriculture, construction and hospitality. **Our economy has been moving**

**in the right direction, with a declining unemployment rate and faster GDP growth. But** as the Federal Reserve reports in its most recent “Beige Book” survey of current economic conditions, **a tight labor market still exists in many parts of the country that is holding back our business’ ability to expand**, in sectors including trucking, computer programming, manufacturing,

construction and energy. **Our businesses across the country clearly still face a “skills gap”**

**between the jobs they need to fill and the available pool of workers**, a gap that will only get larger in the coming years. According to the Conference Board, America faces a two-pronged problem of a skills gap combined with an aging population that will steadily erode the working-age population. **To help alleviate these shortfalls, Washington can take a huge step forward**

**by reforming our outdated visa programs for temporary workers, known as H1B visas for foreign skilled workers; H2As for agricultural workers; and H2Bs for non-agricultural temporary and seasonal workers.** The H1B program has an 85,000 annual cap, first set in 1990; to put that in perspective, the government received 172,500 applications last year, or more than double the available slots. The H2B program has a 66,000 annual cap, also set in 1990, which routinely is exceeded to the point where Congress regularly has to step in and provide temporary relief. There are bipartisan efforts on all of these fronts that can and should be dusted off in the 114th Congress. First, on skilled workers lawmakers should look to measures like the “**Immigration Innovation Act of 2015**,” already introduced this year by Senators Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Amy Klobuchar (D-MN) and others that **would immediately increase the H-1B cap** to 115,000 (with no cap for those with advanced degrees from U.S. institutions) with the potential to rise as high as 195,000 based on demand. A House bill introduced by Judiciary Chairman Robert Goodlatte would immediately set the cap at 195,000, though within that figure is a 40,000 set-aside for STEM graduates. Importantly, neither bill contains harmful restrictions on visa-dependent information technology companies such as those contained in the Senate-passed immigration bill that would severely limit which employers can hire the best available foreign skilled workers. For agricultural workers, the Senate-passed bill and another measure introduced by

Chairman Goodlatte are good places to start. Both bills would create new visa categories that would allow farmworkers to stay in the U.S. for longer periods, providing more certainty for businesses, while enabling some undocumented aliens to eventually qualify for legal status. For other temporary workers, the Senate-passed bill would exempt returning seasonal workers from the annual 66,000 H2B cap, while creating a new visa category for longer-term temporary workers that would fluctuate between 20,000 and 200,000 workers per year. With the exception of a 15,000 annual cap on construction workers, these are common sense changes to temporary worker visa policies that can and should be adopted. Our **Republican Party can avoid getting stuck in the quagmire of amnesty politics if we stick to economic themes that we all support and which can garner bipartisan support**; by doing so Republicans show we know how to govern and reject the politics of division that will play into our opponents' hands in 2016. **Encouraging more workers to come to America, both in high-tech and STEM fields as well as agricultural, construction, hospitality and other sectors where there are shortages, is a win-win for Republicans and the U.S. economy.**

### **The #1 priority for conservatives is border security- reducing it is a non-starter for any reform**

**Fahrenthold, Reporter, 4/23** [David, Why Rubio is running away from the most prominent item on his résumé. [online] Washington Post. Available at: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-marco-rubio-misjudged-himself-on-immigration-reform/2015/04/23/b81010ea-dca6-11e4-a500-1c5bb1d8ff6a\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-marco-rubio-misjudged-himself-on-immigration-reform/2015/04/23/b81010ea-dca6-11e4-a500-1c5bb1d8ff6a_story.html) [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].]

Now, with his presidential run underway, Rubio has changed his mind about the bill he helped to write. He says he would not support it today. Too big. Tried to do too much at once. Instead, **Rubio wants to break the reforms up into smaller bills, starting with increased enforcement on the border. "What I've learned is you can't even have a conversation about that until people believe and know — not just believe, but it's proven to them — that future illegal immigration will be controlled,"** Rubio said at the Conservative Political Action Conference this year. **After the border is secured, he said, Congress can start talking about what to do with those already here.**

### **Border security is a prerequisite to passing multiple compromise bills that would increase high-skilled immigration**

**Gingrich, Former House Speaker, '14** [Newt, 11/19 Speaker of the House 95-99, House Minority Whip 89-95, Washington Times, NEWT GINGRICH: Solving immigration, one step at a time. [online] The Washington Times. Available at: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/nov/19/newt-gingrich-solving-immigration-one-step-at-a-ti/?page=all> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].]

**If there is to be any hope of passing real reform on immigration, the right approach is not to jam every solution into one bill, but to work on seven or eight small bills, each with a discrete purpose and a broad coalition of supporters. Such a process will enable Congress and the American people to verify that the president is enforcing the laws in good faith before passing the more contentious components of a compromise. Securing the border has to be the first step and the prerequisite for additional reforms. Any proposal that does not begin with enforcing the law and re-establishing control over who does and does not enter the United States is a nonstarter.**

There's no excuse for the national security and humanitarian disaster that is our southern border. There are 240,000 employees at the Department of Homeland Security. There are 70,000 Homeland

Security agents and officers. That's enough to station 36 officers along every single mile of the U.S.-Mexico border. There are, in addition, about 450,000 Americans serving in the National Guard (about 230 for every mile) who could be sent to the border on a temporary basis. The president has all the authority he needs to secure the border today, so the first bill Congress should pass is a simple measure giving the president whatever resources he reasonably believes are required to accomplish it. At the same time, Congress should establish objective metrics for verifying when the border is secure. **Once these standards are met, Congress should advance other**

**important reforms in separate, easily understandable bills. We should fix our visa system to stop sending home highly skilled people who want to stay and contribute** to the United States. We should make it easier to deport people who have committed crimes or violated the terms of their visas. We should make English the official language of government so speaking the common language remains part of what it means to be American (since language is an essential part of what ties a nation together).

### **Strictest border reform bill in history still didn't pass because it didn't go far enough- you will make absolutely zero progress by loosening the border**

**Przybyla '15** [Heidi, 3/6, Bloomberg.com/politics, Boehner Shouldn't Expect Pelosi's Help on Immigration Policy. [online] Available at: <http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-03-06/boehner-shouldn-t-expect-pelosi-s-help-on-immigration-proposals> [Accessed 26 Jun. 2015].] **The first step** to a comprehensive immigration policy in the Republican Congress **is a border-security plan. Many Republicans insist on a practically airtight border before creating employment rules for low- and high-skilled workers. In January Boehner had to cancel a vote on a bill that would require securing heavily trafficked border areas within two years, construction of 27 miles of new fence, and creation of a biometric identity system for all points of entry** to the U.S. **Conservatives balked because the measure, H.R. 399, didn't include increased immigration enforcement within the U.S.** The conservatives' stance "made absolutely no sense," said Peter King, a New York Republican on the House Homeland Security Committee. **"It would have been the strictest border-security bill in the history of Congress,"** he said. **"It's going to be tough" to do anything this year,** King said. **Piecemeal Approach Passage of a border-security measure could create momentum among Republicans for other immigration legislation.** Yet what Republicans are calling piecemeal action is what Democrats consider "anti-immigrant," said Representative Zoe Lofgren of California, the top Democrat on the House Judiciary immigration and border subcommittee.

## Internal – visas key

**Hostile immigration policy is the lynchpin for keeping talent in the US— American universities already attract the best, we just can't keep them in because of other countries' immigration policies**

**Han, UC Santa Barbara Center for Nanotechnology in Society postdoctoral**

**scholar, et al. 2015** (Xueying, Galen Stocking, UC Santa Barbara doctoral candidate in political science, Matthew A. Gebbie, UC Santa Barbara CNS science and engineering graduate fellow, and Richard P. Appelbaum, UC Santa Barbara Global and International Studies Program chair and research professor, "Will They Stay or Will They Go? International Graduate Students and Their Decisions to Stay or Leave the U.S. upon Graduation," PLOS, 3/11/15, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0118183#sec008>, IC)

Overall, our survey and interviews suggest that **the American university system is still viewed as a world-class destination** for international students to train and gain experience in graduate level science and engineering. As a result, **the American university system continues to attract** some of **the world's top technical talent**, thus remaining a beneficiary of the high level of skills and unique perspective offered by the world's top international students. While our study was performed at a single institution, we received a clear impression that the international graduate student population is composed of a highly motivated and talented group of individuals that are adding substantial value to the university environment, both through providing the local academic community with valuable direct connections to international professional networks as well as bringing different viewpoints to bear on complex problems.

We conclude that **a major reason the U.S. academic system remains at the forefront of the world's scientific communities is because the U.S. system remains so inclusive** to the diverse, talented international students who are seeking to pursue educational opportunities outside of their home countries. The United States was home to 28% of all globally mobile students in 2001 and 19% of all globally mobile students in 2012 [48]. **The decline in percent share of globally mobile students coming to the U.S. is likely due to** multitude of reasons not limited to **increased effort put into recruiting foreign students by key competitive nations, immigration-friendly visa policies by other countries, and** hesitancy of applying to **U.S.** institutions due to changing **governmental regulations** [49, 50]. Despite the decrease in the global share of international students, the U.S. remains the number one destination for students [48]. We therefore find it important to conclude by noting that our interviews brought up two recurring themes that may have direct relevance to the continued excellence of the U.S. university system:

**Many students expressed concern about ways in which** the complex nature of **America's immigration policies hinders their ability to succeed**. In particular, **uncertainties about obtaining green cards** following graduation **were listed as a deterrent for choosing to study in the U.S.** and attempting to stay following graduation.

Many students also noted that the U.S. is no longer an automatic choice for obtaining the best PhD education in science and engineering. In particular, **Europe was listed as becoming increasingly competitive** choice for many students and their undergraduate colleagues. **One cause** of this **is the EU's relaxed immigration policies**, under which students from EU Member States have the opportunity to study at institutions in other EU countries. With cost and proximity so important to students from Asia, why go all the way the U.S.?



Both of these themes show that **policy makers can no longer safely assume that the U.S. university system will attract the world's top talent** simply by the virtue of being the world's most highly desired academic destination. If the U.S. wishes to continue to both attract and keep the world's best young scientific minds, **policy makers must make changes to the current immigration policies regarding advanced degree STEM holders**. Universities in other countries are seen as increasing in scientific competitiveness, and as a result **the U.S. may lose out to other regions in attracting scientists in the global talent pool. This, in turn, could compromise America's leading position in research and innovation.**

While the U.S. clearly pays a price when the best post-graduates repatriate to their home countries, the loss of talent is not necessarily total. Students who return home often become part of a global innovation network, continuing to work with their colleagues in the U.S. (and elsewhere), encouraging their own students to attend school in the U.S., and contributing to global innovation in which the U.S. plays the major role and reaps many benefits. As Luo and Wang (2002) demonstrate, the migration of talent can create networks of expatriates and returnees who work together to conduct research or build businesses in both countries.

Today, **with the rise of China, India, and other emerging economies, there is growing concern in policy circles that the U.S. may be losing its competitive edge [51–57].** Our research strongly suggests that **the U.S. is losing out in terms of retaining talented foreign students, in large part because U.S. immigration policies make it difficult for the best and the brightest to remain after graduating, even though the large majority would prefer to do so.** While some returnees may retain their ties with former U.S. professors and colleagues, it is a matter of debate whether this offsets the direct loss of talent through repatriation. We argue that **by reworking immigration policies** and thereby making the environment more appealing for the most talented international students to stay for the early portion of their careers, **the U.S. would benefit greatly.**

## **H-1B visas are key to economic growth**

**Colby, fellow at the Center for a New American Security, and Lettow, US**

**National Security Council senior director for strategic planning, 2014** (Elbridge and Paul, "Have We Hit Peak America?" Foreign Policy, 7/3/14, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/07/03/have-we-hit-peak-america/>, IC)

These **assets have made the United States the leading destination for high-skilled immigrants, who provide an essential engine for economic growth.** William Kerr of Harvard Business School, for instance, found that **American immigrants of Chinese and Indian extraction accounted for 15 percent of U.S. domestic patents** in 2004, up from just 2 percent in 1975. And **the Brookings Institution has estimated that a quarter of technology and engineering businesses started in the United States between 1995 and 2005 had a foreign-born founder.**

**Preserving the U.S. edge in human capital is essential.** But the United States is not exploiting this advantage as much as it should. **Its current approach to H-1B visas, for instance, is overly restrictive and ultimately harmful. The United States regularly educates and trains hyperskilled Ph.D. students in the sciences, for example, and then makes it difficult for them to stay in the country. America should welcome and try to keep skilled and talented workers and entrepreneurs.** The payoffs are clear: **Every H-1B visa granted for an employee to join a high-tech company adds another five jobs to the economy. Other countries, such as Canada and Australia, already understand this dynamic. They are attracting talent through incentives and**

criteria, such as educational attainment and work history, that suggest great economic potential. The United States ought to learn from their example.

### **Visas restrictions are a key deterrent for innovation—the US is losing its lead quickly**

**Mustos, Eötvös Loránd University Master of Laws, 2014** (Anita, “The Age of Migration: Open Borders Pros and Cons,” Thesis submitted to Eötvös Loránd University Law University, consulting Boldizsár Nagy, Eötvös Loránd University department of international relations associate professor, 9/12/14, [http://www.unleashingideas.org/global-entrepreneurship-library/sites/grl/files/anita\\_mustos\\_-\\_thesis\\_2014.pdf](http://www.unleashingideas.org/global-entrepreneurship-library/sites/grl/files/anita_mustos_-_thesis_2014.pdf), p. 44, IC)

Data provided by The Economist shows that creators are no more welcomed in America. The share of permanent visas granted for economic reasons (as opposed to kinship) fell from 18% to 13% between 1991 and 2011. In contrast, in Canada it rose from 18% to 67%. 97 The oversubscription and inflexibility of the current U.S. immigration system risk that employers will reduce their investments in job creation in the United States.

“The size and impact of this threat are uncertain, but high-profile examples such as Microsoft’s 2007 expansion in Canada, which the company explicitly described as a strategy to recruit and retain highly skilled people affected by immigration issues in the U.S., have given these fears some basis.”<sup>98</sup>

Thus if the United States wants to keep up with the race for global talent, it is crucial to break the political logjam and carry out a meaningful immigration reform that brings more job creators and innovation to the country and lets them stay.<sup>99</sup>

“Although a few other countries may rank more highly in the World Bank’s Doing Business reports that grade the regulatory costs of starting and running a business, none has the economic heft and market size of the United States.”<sup>100</sup>

In short, it means the U.S. still has the best overall entrepreneurial ecosystem of any other country in the world. But if it fails to loosen its restrictions on visas for highly skilled immigrants, it might be outcompeted by other countries. Whatever administrative steps U.S. policy makers do take, other nations are not sitting idly by. In fact they are also competing for talent.<sup>101</sup>

## Internal – I-squard specific

### **Failure to pass will kill competitiveness**

**Benner '15** [Katie, 1/22, Bloomberg View, Obama, Immigration and Silicon Valley. [online] Available at: <http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2015-01-22/obama-immigration-reform-h-b1-visas-and-silicon-valley> [Accessed 27 Jun. 2015].

The U.S. technology industry might finally get the immigration reform that it wants. Bipartisan Senate groups introduced two tech-focused bills this month. The **Immigration Innovation Act** - which increases the cap on H-1B Visas from 65,000 to 115,000, **eliminates per-country limits on visa petitioners and lets spouses of H-1B visa holders work** - came out of conversations with corporate tech leaders. The **Startup Act**, which already has been introduced on three earlier occasions, **creates a new visa category for foreign entrepreneurs. It also seeks to change the tax code to benefit startups.** It was co-sponsored by six Senators including Democrat Mark R. Warner, who himself was a venture investor before he turned to politics. **Should these tech-related measures die, companies like Facebook say they'll face a talent shortage. The situation could endanger U.S. competitiveness as Canada, Germany, South Africa and China attempt to woo engineers from abroad too. Chinese companies have recently made huge venture investments in entrepreneurs around the world and the Silicon Dragon is seen as a serious threat to Silicon Valley.**

### **Springboards more reforms**

**Schwartz '15** [Eric, 1/14, Why the New Tech-Focused Immigration Bill Could Actually Succeed. [online] DC Inno. Available at: <http://dcinno.streetwise.co/2015/01/14/immigration-bill-tech-companies-seeking-more-h-1b-visas/> [Accessed 27 Jun. 2015].]

**"This bill is a common sense approach to ensuring that those who have come here to be educated in high-tech fields have the ability to stay here with their families and contribute to the economy and our society,"** said Senator **Orrin Hatch** (R-Ut.) who **introduced the bill with a bipartisan group of co-sponsors** including Senators Amy Klobuchar (D-Mn.), Marco Rubio (R-Fl.), Chris Coons (D-De.), Jeff Flake (R-Az.) and Richard Blumenthal (D-Ct.). **"I'm calling on everyone – from the President and both sides of the aisle in Congress to the tech and business industries – to get behind this bill and use it as a launching for more progress on immigration reform."**

## MPX – leadership

**High-skilled immigration is key to US technological competitiveness, which is the largest internal link to US leadership**

**Alden, Council on Foreign Relations senior fellow, 2010** (Edward, "U.S. Losing Ground in Competitive Immigration," World Politics Review, 7/27/10, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/6142/u-s-losing-ground-in-competitive-immigration>, IC)

In the contemporary world, no country has done this better than the United States. **The U.S. remains more successful than any other nation in recruiting and retaining talented individuals** from around the world -- in sports, in entertainment, and most importantly **in the scientific and technological fields** that drive modern economies. **But that lead has shrunk significantly over the past decade, with potentially serious implications for U.S. global leadership. The best university students, who once flocked to the United States, are finding other attractive options** in the U.K., Australia and Canada -- and even in long-closed Japan. **Skilled workers, frustrated by the tight U.S. quotas on work visas and the long waits for permanent residency, are being lured by other countries that have overhauled their immigration laws** and promise a smoother transition to a new life. And **Chinese and Indians, the two largest groups of skilled migrants, have seen new job possibilities emerge in their own fast-growing economies, leading more to stay put or to come back home.** These trends have alarmed U.S. businesses, and some political leaders as well. Michael **Bloomberg**, the media magnate and outspoken mayor of New York, **has warned that restrictive laws and a stifling immigration bureaucracy that drive away immigrant entrepreneurs and other skilled migrants are a policy of "national suicide."** He added, **"I can't think of any ways to destroy this country quite as direct and impactful as our immigration policy.** We educate the best and the brightest, and then we don't give them a green card." But that urgency has yet to be shared in Washington. Rhetorically at least, President Barack Obama understands what is at stake. "To this day, America reaps incredible economic rewards because we remain a magnet for the best and brightest from across the globe," he said in his first big speech on immigration at American University in Washington in early July. "In an increasingly interconnected world, the diversity of our country is a powerful advantage in global competition." But that conviction has not been matched by action. Instead, **the question of what to do for high-skilled immigrants remains trapped in the larger debate over whether Congress should offer a legalization program for the roughly 11 million immigrants living illegally in the United States, most of whom work in lower-skilled occupations** like agricultural, construction, gardening, housekeeping and food services. Obama has repeatedly promised to move ahead on comprehensive immigration reform legislation. But it has not been his highest priority, and currently not a single Republican is ready to stand with the president on the issue. **Instead of finding new ways to welcome immigrants, both the U.S. federal and state governments have been focused on ever-tougher enforcement designed to keep out illegal immigrants** and deport those already inside the United States. The United States has been called the "accidental empire," and its emergence as the strongest magnet for talented and ambitious immigrants that the world has ever known was in many ways accidental as well. The great wave of European immigrants in the early 20th century was composed primarily of unskilled laborers filling a seemingly insatiable demand for manufacturing and agricultural workers. When the United States largely closed its doors to immigrants in the 1920s and 1930s, no exception was made for skilled immigrants, even many of those fleeing Nazi persecution. The

landmark 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act that reopened the doors was almost willfully dismissive of the economic role of immigration. The bill championed the principle of reunifying families as the primary basis for U.S. immigrant admissions, and sought to be even-handed by setting quotas that would give an equal opportunity to immigrants from all parts of the world. The legacy of that legislation is still felt today. Of the roughly one million legal immigrants admitted to the United States each year, about two-thirds are relatives of U.S. citizens or permanent residents, admitted without regard to their educational attainments, work history, language skills or any other predictors of labor market success. The comparatively smaller programs for recruiting skilled immigrants without family ties were not expanded until quite recently. The EB visa for permanent residence for so-called "priority workers" was introduced by Congress in 1990, and **the H-1B visa** that offers temporary residence for skilled foreign workers **was established** that same year **with a quota of 65,000 annually**. Notwithstanding the relatively low priority the United States government has given to attracting them, skilled immigrants have continued to come in large numbers. Among immigrants in OECD countries, more than half of those who have at least a high school diploma are living in the United States. Adjusting for population size, only Canada has a higher percentage of at least high-school educated immigrants. **The percentage of immigrants with a university education is lower in the U.S.** than in countries like Canada, the U.K. and Australia, **but even here the U.S. has done surprisingly well in the absence of a focused policy for attracting high-skilled immigrants. The main reason has been a job market that**, until the recent financial crisis, **was** far more **robust** than America's competitors, especially in Europe. Skilled immigrants came to the United States for the simple reason that it was easier to find a good, well-paying job or start up a new company there than anywhere else in the world. Immigrants have been especially important in high-technology fields, and the work of Vivek Wadhwa and others builds a convincing case that **Silicon Valley as we know it would not have emerged without immigrant entrepreneurs, particularly from India and China**. Immigrants, for instance, generate some 25 percent of all patents awarded to U.S. scientists, which is more than twice their representation in the population. The quality of America's universities is similarly an advantage that other countries have not been able to overcome. In the latest rankings from Times Higher Education in the U.K., 13 of the world's top 20 schools were in the United States. Foreign science and engineering students in particular have favored the U.S. Currently, some 40 percent of doctoral degrees in science and engineering are awarded to foreign students, as are 65 percent of those in computer science. Historically, the large majority of these graduates have stayed and built their careers in the U.S. The success of American higher education was symbolized by last year's Nobel Prizes in the sciences and medicine: All nine of the prizes went to individuals who had either been educated or were currently working at an American university. **Such an overwhelming advantage is hard to lose, but over the past decade the signs of slippage are rather ominous.** The **problems have arisen from** three main sources: **mistakes in U.S. policy** (including the reaction to the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks); the **growing efforts by other countries to recruit and retain skilled immigrants; and**, finally, **the increased economic opportunities in** the biggest immigrant-sending countries, particularly **China and India**. In the aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks, in which all of the attackers had managed to enter the United States on valid visas, the U.S. government set about tightening its border and immigration regime in an effort to prevent similar mistakes in the future. Some of the measures were implemented with minimal disruption to travelers and immigrants, and have been copied by some other countries, such as the new fingerprint requirements for most visitors to the United States. But other initiatives -- in particular the intensive background checks required for most students and other visitors from Muslim countries, and for most of those with scientific expertise -- have been far more disruptive. Long

delays for visa applications became chronic after Sept. 11, and despite some improvements, such delays have re-emerged periodically. As recently as early 2009, **many Indians and Chinese with engineering or scientific backgrounds were facing waits of several months** or more **for these security checks to be completed. The message sent to the highly skilled was that immigrating to the United States has become a very uncertain** proposition. The disruptive response to Sept. 11 came on top of longstanding problems in the U.S. immigration system that have only worsened over the past decade. In particular, the **national quotas set** for green cards in an effort to ensure that potential immigrants from different parts of the world would have an equal shot at U.S. residence **have had a particularly hard impact on China and India, which are by far the world's largest source-countries for skilled emigrants.** Depending on their education and skill levels, green card applicants from those countries face waits of four to eight years before their applications are considered. For those already living in the United States on temporary visas -- such as an H-1B -- that normally tie them to a single employer, that waiting period results in huge uncertainty, frustration, and the loss of opportunities for career advancement. **Other countries have seized on those delays to try to lure skilled workers away** from the United States. Canada, for instance, has an open door for applicants with advanced degrees and experience in fields such as healthcare, engineering and construction, and promises permanent residence in eight to 12 months. The Canadian province of Alberta, which faces critical labor shortages in the energy sector, has offered an even faster track for temporary visa holders with needed skills who are currently working in the United States. Canada's initiative is one of many under way in OECD countries to try to attract skilled migrants. All the advanced developed countries are facing serious demographic problems from a combination of aging workforces and low birth rates. For countries with less of an immigrant tradition than the United States, opening the door to educated immigrants is the least controversial politically, and promises the greatest short-term economic returns. Over the past decade, a number of countries have overhauled their immigration systems to offer preference to skilled migrants. The United Kingdom, for instance, recently established a new points system that gives strong preferences to highly skilled migrants, entrepreneurs, investors and foreign graduate students who want to remain and work in the country. There is no quota, and those who meet the criteria do not need a job offer or other sponsor. Others with more specialized skills can be admitted with a job offer. The European Union has adopted and will fully implement next year a new "blue card" scheme that will open the door for those with professional credentials and experience to work anywhere within the EU. Australia was the first country to introduce a points system in which the government gives preference to skilled migrants who meet certain criteria, such as language skills and educational attainment, and has seen a steady rise in both the educational levels and the labor market success of recent immigrants. Other countries, including Singapore, New Zealand, and even Japan and Korea have taken new steps to lure skilled immigrants. **The challenge to the traditional U.S. dominance in attracting skilled immigrants is most apparent in foreign student numbers.** While not all university students who study abroad remain in the countries where they are educated, university education is the best pipeline to permanent immigration of high-skilled workers. Numerous studies have shown that foreign students who are educated abroad and remain in those countries tend to do much better in the workforce than those emigrating with foreign credentials. **Many countries are now emulating the U.S. practice of allowing foreign students to remain and work in the country** for periods of a year or more **after graduation** without having to seek a new work visa. The United States had seen steady, nearly uninterrupted growth in the number of foreign students for most of the post-World War II period. After Sept. 11, however, enrollment of foreign students fell for several years and has only fully recovered to pre-Sept. 11 levels in the past year. More worrisome, **new**

**enrollment of foreign graduate students fell sharply and has still not fully recovered despite** stronger growth in the past few years. What is striking about these numbers is that the decline came during a decade when the international student population soared. The U.K. nearly doubled its inflows of foreign students in that period, and Australia, France and New Zealand saw similar gains. Overall, the U.S. share of foreign students fell from 28 percent in 2000 to 21 percent by 2008. In the longer run, however, **the toughest competition** for students **may be coming from** the **traditional source-countries. India**, for instance, **has increased its number of engineering graduates almost four-fold** in a decade, though the quality of their education remains much lower than in comparable U.S. schools. **China is soon expected to overtake the U.S. in the number of scientists and engineers graduating with doctoral degrees** from its universities. As importantly, **new economic opportunities** in those countries **are luring back more of their U.S.-trained nationals**. The rise of India's technology industry in **Bangalore was fueled** in part **by U.S.-educated Indians returning home. China** in 2007 **introduced a range of incentives to lure back overseas Chinese scientists, engineers and executives**, many of them educated and currently living in the U.S. The U.S. scientific establishment was shocked recently when Shi Yigong, a naturalized U.S. citizen and star molecular biologist at Princeton University, turned down a prestigious \$10 million research grant and returned to Beijing to become dean of life sciences at Tsinghua University. "There's no question in my mind that over the past decade **the U.S. has become a less attractive place for highly educated immigrants** to settle," AnnaLee Saxenian, dean of the School of Information at Berkeley and an expert on immigration into Silicon Valley, recently told the Fiscal Times. "My foreign graduate students used to assume that they would stay here after graduation. . . . Now they say, 'I can go home and live like a king in India.'" **The implications of such trends** for the United States **are worrisome**. As Jacob Funk Kirkegaard has highlighted, the United States faces a real decline in the number of highly educated workers -- those holding master's, professional and doctoral degrees -- as the baby boom generation moves into retirement, and the U.S. education system has failed to respond. Educated foreigners have helped to fill the gap, but the growing international competition for such immigrants will make it harder for the U.S. to plug that hole. **The worst-case scenario would be a debilitating loss of America's edge in scientific and technological innovation, with consequences not only for the economy but for U.S. military dominance** as well. Numerous reports generated by the country's scientific establishment have warned of that danger, and some in the military are paying serious attention. Gordon **England, the former deputy defense secretary** during the Bush administration, **warned, "The greatest long-term threat to U.S. national security is not terrorists** wielding a nuclear or biological weapon, **but the erosion of America's place as a world leader in science and technology.**" Certainly the United States retains many advantages that will continue to offset short-sighted policies, including its research universities, its dynamic venture capital system for encouraging entrepreneurs, and its long history as an immigrant society. But **it is hard to see the U.S. reversing the current erosion in its attractiveness to immigrants unless the government can finally respond with long-needed policy changes** to make it easier for the most talented immigrants to come and remain in the country. And that appears increasingly unlikely. Washington has been debating immigration reform since former President George W. Bush put the issue back on the table in 2004, and over that time, both political and public support for the idea has been eroding. With the deep recession and real unemployment stuck in the double digits, the political hurdles to reform have been raised even higher. **Immigration** is the sort of issue that **poses the biggest problems for America's divided political system: The costs of inaction** over the long run **are serious, but the political costs of action** in the short run **are high**. In that respect, it is much like energy and climate change policy, or the rising burden of retirement and old-age medical entitlements --

also issues on which it has so far proved impossible to make much progress despite the evident crises looming on the horizon. **On immigration, the consequences of such inaction are also certain to be severe** -- if not Michael Bloomberg's "national suicide," then at least a steady decline in American power and prestige. It will take an unusual burst of consensus and creativity on the part of America's political leadership to change course. That is not likely, but **it is sorely needed**.

### **Collapse of US primary leads to great power wars**

**Thayer**, Associate Professor in the Department of Defense and Strategic Studies at Missouri State University, **2006** (Bradley, "In Defense of Primacy," *The National Interest*, December, Lexis)

THROUGHOUT HISTORY, peace and stability have been great benefits of an era where there was a dominant power--Rome, Britain or the United States today. Scholars and statesmen have long recognized the irenic effect of power on the anarchic world of international politics.

Everything we think of when we consider the current international order--free trade, a robust monetary regime, increasing respect for human rights, growing democratization--is directly linked to U.S. power. Retrenchment proponents seem to think that the current system can be maintained without the current amount of U.S. power behind it. In that they are dead wrong and need to be reminded of one of history's most significant lessons: Appalling things happen when international orders collapse. The Dark Ages followed Rome's collapse. Hitler succeeded the order established at Versailles. Without U.S. power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. As country and western great Ral Donner sang: "You don't know what you've got (until you lose it)."

Consequently, it is important to note what those good things are. In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causes many positive outcomes for Washington and the world. The first has been a more peaceful world. During the Cold War, U.S. leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy helps keep a number of complicated relationships aligned--between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. This is not to say it fulfills Woodrow Wilson's vision of ending all war. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood, particularly war's worst form: great power wars.

Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and other elements of its ideology of liberalism. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because, as John Owen noted on these pages in the Spring 2006 issue, liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview.<sup>3</sup> So, spreading democracy helps maintain U.S. primacy. In addition, once states are governed democratically, the likelihood of any type of conflict is significantly reduced. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Indeed they do. Rather, it is because they are more open, more transparent and more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with U.S. leadership. And so, in general, democratic states are good for their citizens as well as for advancing the interests of the United States.



## MPX – Growth/Innovation

### **High skilled workers are key to innovation and the economy—absent reforms, US economic leadership declines**

**Johnson, American Immigration Council executive director, 2015** (Benjamin, “The Power and Potential of High Skilled Immigration,” American Immigration Council, 5/17/2015, <http://immigrationimpact.com/2015/03/17/the-power-and-potential-of-high-skilled-immigration/>, IC)

Today, **foreign workers fill a critical need**—particularly **in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math** fields. Now more than ever, we need an honest conversation about reforms that can improve and strengthen the admission of these immigrants into our labor force. But to do that, we must move the current immigration debate beyond the stereotypes, myths, and hyperbole that distract from that conversation, and which seek to pit native-born workers against their foreign-born colleagues. **The U.S. job market is not a “zero-sum game”** in which workers must fight each other for a fixed number of jobs. The United States has the most dynamic and powerful economy the world has ever known, and **immigrants of all types and skills**, from every corner of the globe, **have worked shoulder to shoulder with native-born workers to build it.** The overwhelming weight of research shows that in our dynamic labor market, **skilled immigrants complement their U.S.-born counterparts. Skilled immigrants’ help create new jobs and new opportunities for economic expansion.** Indeed, **foreign workers positively impact the wages and employment opportunities of native-born workers across our economy.** The important role that skilled immigrants play in our economy extends far beyond the world of computers and high tech, and **skilled immigrants** are helping to reshape communities far beyond Silicon Valley. They **are making enormous contributions in almost every aspect of our economy, including manufacturing, medical research, healthcare delivery, and agriculture.** Their contributions have helped rebuild economies in places like Des Moines, Iowa; Tuscaloosa, Alabama; and Raleigh, North Carolina. For me, the bottom line is this: In today’s global economy, where other countries are spending billions of dollars to compete with America’s ability to attract immigrants, we cannot take this issue for granted. **If we continue to ignore the need for immigration reform or adopt policies that discourage skilled immigrants from helping America to innovate, lead, and create more high-paying jobs we run the enormous risk that America will be left behind, without a robust innovation and entrepreneurial sector.** Innovation is the **key to growing the U.S. economy and creating jobs.** In turn, **the key to innovation is attracting, growing, and retaining a skilled workforce. Foreign-born workers, especially STEM workers, have been and will continue to be a critical part of this equation.**

### **Boosting high-skilled immigration is key to innovation**

**Nowrasteh 14** – MS @ London School of Economics

(Alex, “Boost Highly Skilled Immigration,” <http://www.cato.org/publications/cato-online-forum/boost-highly-skilled-immigration>)

A third **major benefit** from highly skilled immigrants is their high rate of entrepreneurship. The **founding of new firms is an important contributor to innovation and job growth in the United States.** In 2013, immigrants were nearly twice as likely to start a business as U.S.-born Americans. Between 1995 and 2005, 25.3 percent of all technology and engineering firms established in the United States had at least one immigrant founder. Immigrants from India, China, the United Kingdom, and Taiwan tended to be the most entrepreneurial. In Silicon Valley,

43.9 percent of technology and engineering startups had at least one immigrant co-founder between 2005 and 2012.<sup>9</sup> Several conclusions can be drawn from this research. The impact of immigrant workers on TFP are notoriously difficult to measure and papers attempting to do so are open to methodological challenges. However, much research finds that immigrant workers increase TFP and there is no major study or academic research that has found that immigrants reduce it. **Increased patents and innovation are likely the main way by which immigrants affect TFP** while task specialization is an additional factor. **Studies on immigrant innovation through patents are generally convincing as an increase in the supply of scientists and engineers has historically increased the supply of research and development in the United States.**<sup>10</sup> One influential paper by Jones estimated that as much as 50 percent of U.S. productivity growth between 1950 and 1993 could be attributed to growth in the share of scientists and engineers – two sectors likely to expand if skilled immigration was liberalized.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, **highly-skilled immigrants are very entrepreneurial, contributing to innovation and productivity growth through the creation of new firms in the high-tech sector. New firms are a major source of job growth and innovation as they often take risks that larger, established firms are unwilling to bear.** **The contributions of highly skilled immigrants to innovation, productivity growth, and entrepreneurship are likely great in proportion to their numbers. However, the restrictiveness of America’s immigration policy has severely limited the potential of our economy to benefit even further. There are several policy reforms that could increase high-skilled immigration and thus the overall economic gains.**

### **High-skilled immigration reform is key to competitiveness**

**Fitz 12** – JD @ UVA, Vice President of Immigration Policy at American Progress, where he directs the organization’s research and analysis of the economic, political, legal, and social impacts of immigration policy in America and develops policy recommendations designed to further America’s economic and security interests (Marshall, “How to Attract the World’s Best Talent While Ensuring America Remains the Land of Opportunity for All,” American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/technology/report/2012/01/19/10945/immigration-for-innovation/>)/BB

Yet **despite the critical importance of such immigrants to the nation’s economic success in the increasingly competitive global economy, our current high-skilled immigration system is a two-fold failure: Arbitrary restrictions prevent American companies from effectively tapping the full potential of this talent pool,** while inadequate safeguards fail to prevent against wage depression and worker mistreatment. The reforms outlined in this paper will help establish a 21st century immigration system that reaps the fruits of admitting the world’s best and brightest to promote economic competitiveness, while upholding our responsibilities in a global economy.<sup>12</sup> Of course, our current immigration policies have failed the country on many fronts beyond the high-skilled policy arena. And the urgent need for comprehensive, systemic reforms is beyond question. The national debate has understandably focused up to this point on the most visible and most highly charged issue—ending illegal immigration. And a holistic strategy that combines enforcement with a requirement that current undocumented immigrants register, pay a fine, learn English, and pay back taxes will spur economic growth to the tune of \$1.5 trillion in cumulative GDP over 10 years. Overhauling our immigration system and restoring the rule of law is indisputably a national economic and security imperative.<sup>13</sup> But **reforms to our high-skilled immigration system are not only important to enhance the coherence and integrity of our immigration policies, they are also an important component of any national**

strategy to foster innovation and competitiveness. Science, technology, and innovation have been—and will continue to be—keys to U.S. economic growth. The United States **must remain** on the cutting edge of technological innovation if we are to continue **driving the most dynamic economic engine in the world**, and U.S. companies **must be able** to recruit international talent to effectively compete in the international innovation arena.

## **High-skilled immigration is key to innovation, entrepreneurship and education--all drive growth**

**Nowrasteh 10** – MS @ London School of Economics

(Alex, “H-1B Visas: A Case for Open Immigration of Highly Skilled Foreign Workers,”

[//BB](https://cei.org/sites/default/files/Alex%20Nowrasteh%20-%20H1-B%20Visas.pdf)

**Highly skilled immigrants are an **enormous** net benefit to the American economy. Their achievements are astounding**, especially in relation to their numbers. But **the achievements do not just accrue to the immigrants themselves. The spillover effects of increased technological innovation, entrepreneurship, and high rates of education are enough to safely justify removing all caps and restrictions** on H-1B visas. **Restrictions** on the entry of highly skilled immigrants **hinder** the growth of certain **industries, reduce economic growth, and slow technological development**. The government cannot pick winners among highly skilled immigrants before they enter the country, so the number allowed entry should be as great as possible, the requirements for entry as low as possible, and the burdens eliminated to the greatest extent possible.

## **High skilled workers are key to technological and scientific innovation**

**Nowrasteh, Cato Institute Immigration Policy Analyst, 2010** (Alex, “H-1B Visas: A Case for Open Immigration of Highly Skilled Foreign Workers,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, October 2010, <https://cei.org/sites/default/files/Alex%20Nowrasteh%20-%20H1-B%20Visas.pdf>, p. 8-10, IC)

Immigrants contribute to America’s ongoing technological success. While far from perfect, **patents** can **serve as a rough measure of a country’s level of technological innovation**. A 2005 World Bank study found that **foreign graduate students working in the United States file an enormous number of patents**.<sup>23</sup> Additionally, **a quarter of international patents filed from the U.S. in 2006 named a non-U.S. citizen working in the U.S. as the inventor** or co-inventor.<sup>24</sup> Increased usage of computers and information technology services are responsible for virtually all of the growth in labor productivity and two-thirds of the growth in total factor productivity between 1995 and 2002.<sup>25</sup> H-1Bs are heavily concentrated in those sectors and have been instrumental in many recent technological advances.<sup>26</sup> Technological improvements, largely driven by the rate of innovation and invention, can be approximately measured by looking at the rate of patent issuance. In many sectors—particularly in those involving emerging technologies—the more patents that get filed, the quicker and broader the pace of technological advancement.<sup>27</sup>

An **increase in patents would help GDP growth**.<sup>28</sup> The elasticity of America’s GDP in the late 1990s was about 0.113, which means that **a relatively small increase in the number of highly skilled foreign workers** and their resulting patents **have a disproportionately large effect on GDP. The influx of immigrant college graduates in the 1990s increased U.S. per capita GDP by 1.4 percent to 2.4 percent**. GDP in the first quarter of 2000 was \$11 trillion.<sup>29</sup> In that year,

**patents filed by immigrant college graduates contributed between \$155 billion and \$265 billion** to GDP.<sup>30</sup>

**Foreign graduate students** studying **in the U.S.**—many of whom qualify for but are denied H-1B visas due to the cap—**are prolific inventors**. On average, **each** additional foreign graduate **student results in 0.63 patent applications**.<sup>31</sup> Additionally, 24.2 percent of international patents filed from the U.S. listed a foreign skilled worker as an inventor or co-inventor.<sup>32</sup> That figure is up from 7.2 percent in 1998.<sup>33</sup> This army of foreign graduate student innovators gives the U.S. a significant comparative advantage in the training and export of specialists in higher education, partly because of the numbers of skilled foreign workers and foreign students enrolled at U.S. universities.<sup>34</sup>

**Technological growth** and change **is highly dependent upon spillovers of knowledge**. Today's inventions and innovations are usually built upon those of yesteryear. Speeding up this process are the knowledge of those inventions and the concentration of inventors. **Contact between inventors, especially geographic proximity, is a prime ingredient for rapid and valuable technological advancement**.<sup>35</sup> **Highly skilled foreigners accelerate** and expand **this process**. **The contribution of foreign-born workers to scientific progress** outside of the intellectual property sphere **is** also **staggering**. **Forty percent of all science and engineering PhDs working in the U.S. are foreign-born**.<sup>36</sup> Since the year 2000, **one-third of the Americans who received the Nobel Prize** in physics<sup>37</sup> and one-third of Americans who received the Nobel Prize for medicine and physiology between 1901 and 2005 **were born abroad**.<sup>38</sup> Five of the eight Americans who received the Nobel Prize for sciences in 2009 were born abroad.<sup>39</sup> Given this, it is reasonable to assert that **excluding highly educated foreigners would harm groundbreaking, frontier research and development** in the United States.

### **Immigration is key to future STEM industries—we have studies**

**Kerr, Harvard Business School Professor, 2013** (William R., “U.S. HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRATION, INNOVATION, AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: EMPIRICAL APPROACHES AND EVIDENCE,” National Bureau of Economic Research, August 2013, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19377.pdf>, p. 8-9, IC)

Placing these first two themes together, it becomes clear that **immigration** acts in two different ways for the United States. First, it **provides the United States with a number of exceptional superstars for STEM work**. Second, **immigration acts through the sheer quantity of workers that it provides for STEM fields. These workers are** often **well trained for STEM roles**, but, conditional on that education, the immigrants are of a similar quality level to U.S. natives. The pieces are not at odds with each other, as amid a large STEM workforce of more than two million workers, the exceptional tail does not move the averages of the groups very much. While it is difficult to prove which of these channels is more important, we have the general feeling that the quantity aspect of high-skilled immigration is the stronger factor in terms of its potential impact for STEM work in the United States.

To close, we also note a parallel set of work that considers the quantity and quality of **immigrant student enrollments in STEM fields**. This dimension **is important as university and graduate school admissions shape**, in large part, **the United States' future STEM workforce**. Bound et al. (2009) and similar **studies document how immigrants account for an exceptional share of STEM students, especially among graduate students**, in levels that exceed those noted for the workforce above. Grogger and Hanson (2013) describe the selectivity of foreign-born STEM Ph.D. students in the United States. **Studies evaluating the production of innovation within**

**universities also** tend to **find a special role for immigrant students** (e.g., Chellaraj et al. 2008, Stephan 2010, Gurmu et al. 2010, Stuen et al. 2012, Gaule and Piacentini 2012). 6

### **Expert consensus votes negative—net positive effect on the economy**

**Kane, Stanford’s Hoover Institution research fellow, 2014** (Tim, “There’s a better way to do immigration reform,” LA Times, 10/20/14, <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-kane-immigration-work-visa-reform-20141021-story.html>, IC)

Such rules are politically appealing, but they are more likely to chill guest work opportunities and reduce economic dynamism than to protect jobs. Research shows that **the U.S. economy is stronger on balance with immigration**, just as it is with free trade, **which is why so many of the surveyed experts are bullish on the “likely effects of an expanded** and more efficient **U.S. guest worker program** for all skill levels five years after enactment.” **Ninety-four percent of the experts said it would increase GDP. All but one thought U.S. exports would increase** (51%) or at least stay the same. On balance, **our experts thought there would be no effect on unemployment among U.S. workers.**

## MPX – Cyber

**Easing restrictions for high-skilled workers is necessary to protect against cyberwarfare**

**Bucci, Heritage Foundation Center for Foreign and National Security Policy director, Rosenzweig, Heritage Foundation visiting fellow, and Inserra, Heritage Foundation research associate in homeland security and cybersecurity, 2013**

(Steven P., Paul, and David, “A Congressional Guide: Seven Steps to U.S. Security, Prosperity, and Freedom in Cyberspace,” The Heritage Foundation, Backgrounder #2785 in National Security and Defense, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/a-congressional-guide-seven-steps-to-us-security-prosperity-and-freedom-in-cyberspace>, IC)

While the above provision is aimed at the population in general, **this one is aimed at the development of a workforce to serve the technology industry and the key government organizations that use cyber means for** higher-order activities, such as cyberwarfare, **defense of** specific technical industry **intellectual property, and** critical **infrastructure defense**. The GAO surveyed 11 chief information officers (CIOs) of federal agencies and 12 outside cybersecurity experts and found that four of the CIOs and five of the outside experts “cited weaknesses in education, awareness, and workforce planning as a root cause hindering progress in improving the nation’s cybersecurity posture.”<sup>[33]</sup> The development of an adequate cyber workforce will begin with improvements in STEM education. These improvements need to span from kindergarten through high school, and into university and graduate school.

For this to happen, the process of acquiring and keeping good teachers needs to change. This can be done by eliminating the last-in-first-out policy that is currently applied to teachers, and moving toward merit-based compensation systems. Instead of evaluating teachers based on how long they have held their positions, their pay should directly reflect how well they teach their students.<sup>[34]</sup> As Heritage Foundation economic and education policy expert Jason Richwine notes:

Under a market-driven pay-for-performance system, teacher compensation will begin to move toward levels matching those of similarly skilled private-sector employees. Whether fundamental reforms of this kind can be implemented within the public-school system is questionable, which makes flexible school models—such as expanded charter school options or vouchers—attractive options that policymakers should consider. Any reform that allows schools to operate with a less onerous regulatory burden could potentially improve the teacher-compensation system.<sup>[35]</sup>

Another way to encourage greater STEM education is by encouraging the use of online educational options.<sup>[36]</sup> Online learning can provide students with access to highly qualified teachers no matter where they live. More STEM graduates will help to round out the United States workforce. Along these lines, **the U.S. government should modify its visa system so that foreign STEM graduates are no longer forced to leave the U.S. as soon as they complete their U.S. education.**<sup>[37]</sup>

**The U.S. can** also **improve its cyber workforce by** capitalizing on attributes the country already has in place. The U.S. should:

**Increase the number of IT professionals** with security certifications. Information-security certifications like the Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP) and the Certified Information Security Manager (CISM) represent the minimum level of training that a cybersecurity professional needs. For those who want to go beyond, intensive college and

university programs are the next step. Some institutions streamline the degree process by granting credit to certificate holders for the education they have already completed. Develop more IT leaders with cybersecurity expertise. After 9/11, many pointed out the need for more cybersecurity professionals. Since then, the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security have laid out stringent criteria for cybersecurity education programs—and recognized institutions that met these criteria as National Centers of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education (CAEIAE). Many of these centers are now following the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education (NICE) framework, guaranteeing even more alignment with the security standards needed by government and industry. Graduates of these Centers are working to help the NSA and DHS, as well as many corporations, with the cybersecurity issues they face today. But more graduates are needed.

Draw on current military personnel. With proven leadership abilities and valuable security clearances, military service members are in a unique position to support U.S. cybersecurity. By gaining high-level cybersecurity knowledge, these experienced professionals can provide valuable insights to a variety of government agencies. For these professionals in particular, online institutions are an excellent fit because they offer flexibility, including the ability to complete courses from far-flung locations, and quality, as some online schools have earned CAEIAE designations. [38]

**The U.S. needs more qualified personnel in the general STEM fields**, and specifically in the advanced cyber skill sets, such as code writing, defensive procedures, deep-packet inspection, and big data analysis techniques. **A major effort must be made to find the sort of people who can flourish in this field**, and give them the opportunity to pursue the higher STEM education they require. Additionally, Congress should change or remove barriers to pursuing these careers, such as outdated security clearance procedures and do more to retain these experts and keep them current. **If this effort is not adequately enabled, the U.S. will slowly fall further behind its competitors**. Every effort must be made to encourage the adjustment of hiring practices in order to allow the hiring of individuals who have proven cyber skills, even if they do not have the standard educational credentials. This would also mean that security clearance restrictions might need to be adjusted on a case-by-case basis. **To lose the services of a willing former hacker in the struggle against cyber foes due to bureaucratic regulations would be foolish.**

## **Defense against cyber hacking is key—China will use their advanced technological capabilities to undermine US deterrent capabilities and invade Taiwan**

**Murphy, eight year Army Special Operations veteran, 2015** (Jack, “Chinese Hackers Prepare Battlespace for War with America,” SOFREP, 6/8/15, <http://sofrep.com/41635/chinese-hackers-prepare-battlespace-war-america/>, IC)

News broke last week that **Chinese hackers** had **compromised computer databases belonging to the Office of Personnel Management**. On the surface, reports of the Obama administration scrambling to contain the damage done by having this information exposed may not make sense. Is it really that big a deal if the Chinese stole lists of government employees? It is when the list is of Americans with top-secret security clearances. According to SOFREP sources, it isn't just benign human-resources-type information that was stolen, but also lists of active CIA personnel and information pertaining to front companies used as commercial cover by the same agency.

**State-sponsored Chinese hackers have been breaking into American computer networks for decades now**, with the information stolen usually being attributed by the press as being

information gathered for identity theft, fraud, or in some cases, industrial espionage. No big deal if some Americans lose money from their bank accounts, after all it is insured by the federal government. The damage done by industrial espionage is not readily apparent either, since it will be years until we see [Chinese stealth fighters](#) developed with stolen American technology.

**By hacking into American computer systems** over and over again, the People's Republic of **China has probed our defenses to assess what the U.S. government will do in response to cyber-intrusions. The answer? Not a damn thing.** We will not respond to cyber attacks with cyber-retaliation, military force, economic sanctions, or even sternly worded diplomatic letters. We probably should have unrolled the red carpet for China's hackers and told them that we are just fine with them stealing our data. Our limp-wristed politicians are too afraid of upsetting our economic relations with China to do anything about it.

But the reality is that **China's hackers are** not **stealing** personal identification information from [police departments](#), large corporations, and the federal government **for purposes of** committing fraud. The real reason is far more insidious. This is actually the **information-gathering** process the Chinese are conducting **as a part of** what the U.S. military would call [operational preparation of the environment](#)(OPE) also known as **operational preparation of the battlespace** (OPB).

**OPE is setting the conditions for success prior to the initiation of open military hostilities between** two belligerent **nations who plan to go to war.** More specifically, OPE entails sending intelligence service personnel to recruit rings of spies, burying caches of weapons and equipment, and developing targeting information for people and critical infrastructure.

Operational preparation of the environment could even include assassinating key personalities in order to remove them prior to D-Day in a war that hasn't happened yet.

**China's hackers are,** in fact, conducting OPE—**preparing the battlefield for a war that has not happened yet.** To understand why, you have to first understand China's strategy.

China's strategy

The Chinese government has deceived the Western world into believing that they are a friend and ally, one that will eventually transition into a democratic state. The reality is that **China fully intends to surpass the United States economically, and** then **militarily.** They also have no interest in becoming a democracy. The PRC's long-term goal is to become a Ba, which translates as "tyrant." More accurately, **they wish to become a hegemon.** While China makes overtures of integrating into the existing global order, the truth is that China seeks to become a revisionist power. Revealing this strategy now would be devastating, as it could lead to an open military confrontation with the West, "unraveling years of patient assiduous efforts to build China into a economical and geopolitical hegemon" (Pillsbury, 136).

**Humiliations at the hands of the West still burn deep with China's hawks,** the ying pai. These **feelings of** humiliation and **nationalism have motivated them to develop an anti-Western doctrine,** humorously enough based around the writings of people like Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley (Pillsbury, 18). These Chinese elites are said to refer to the ancient proverb, tao guang yang hui, which means to bide your time and build your capabilities. However, another translation is, "overturning the old hegemon and exacting revenge" (Pillsbury, 33).

**In order to jump several generations ahead of America, the Chinese have developed crash weapons technology programs in secret, hacked into critical American infrastructure, and fooled the West into supporting their economy.** To this end, the Chinese seek to develop da tong or "an era of unipolar dominance" (Pillsbury, 39), which is a far cry from the [multi-polar world](#) we talk about here at SOFREP. These **Chinese elites see the geo-political chessboard as a zero-sum game, with cooperation being nothing more than a facade to get what they secretly want.**



Much of Chinese strategy is derived from the period of the Warring States, China's medieval era. While there is no direct comparison, the chronicles of the Warring States period have their best analog in Machiavelli's "The Prince." The Warring States period produces axioms and strategy for the Chinese military and elite class.

**China knows full well that they are in no state to challenge America in a direct military confrontation, so in order to gain an advantage, the People's Liberation Army is developing a series of secret weapons** referred to as shashoujian or "Assassin's Mace," a term derived from Chinese folklore. Known as program 863, China's secret weapons programs include anti-satellite weapons, [directed-energy platforms](#), electromagnetic pulse (EMP) weapons, anti-aircraft carrier missiles, and various forms of electronic and cyber warfare (Pillsbury, 139). Initiated in 1986 by Deng Xiaoping, it was reevaluated in 2001 "with the help of foreign experts and widened to support China's competitiveness in international markets" (Hannas, 12).

That's right, foreign experts. **China is developing the technologies to defeat us, and they are doing it with the nearly full complacency and acquiescence of the West.** Not only are they developing these weapons with stolen technology, but also with foreign consultants, in this case probably from the [World Bank](#).

**One means of gaining an asymmetrical advantage against the United States is by having computer hackers prepare the environment for war by stealing military, industrial, and economic secrets.** These hackers belong to over a dozen different bureaucracies within the Chinese government, such as Unit 61398. Hundreds of successful cyber attacks will help the Chinese acquire total information dominance over the battle space at, or just prior to, the commencement of hostilities. One intelligence analyst described the damage that could be done to America in the event of war by Chinese cyber-warfare as being like "removing the spark plugs from an engine" just as Uncle Sam gets behind the wheel and turns the key.

Where China intends to fight

It would be easy to interpret this analysis as meaning that China intends to attack and invade America, but that is not the case. There is no known evidence from intelligence assessments, defectors, interviews, or China's military and technology build-up itself to suggest that China wants to land troops on American shores. In fact, such a reckless action seems quite contrary to Chinese strategy. We then have to ask **what China is preparing the battle space for?** The answer: **Taiwan, the Senkaku islands, and other military aggressions we cannot yet foresee.**

**What the Chinese are planning for is a local war fought under high-technology conditions** in which, "PLA strategists expect such conflicts to be characterized by limited political objectives and the use of information technology and by being highly mobile, lethal, and resource intensive" (Cliff, xv). The People's Liberation Army divides the tactics used in this future war into soft-kill and hard-kill categories. Soft-kills include attacks against American [computer networks and jamming](#). Hard-kills include the employment of ballistic missiles, explosives, and directed energy weapons (Cliff, xvi). **American centers of power projection** such as logistical hubs, airfields, and refueling stations **may also be attacked by Chinese Special Operations Forces.**

**This is China's Anti-Access/Access-Denial (A2AD) strategy. To invade Taiwan or other targets in the South China Sea, they don't have to defeat American forces outright, they just have to delay us** long enough for their forces to achieve their limited military objectives in the region. In order to implement this [military stratagem](#), China will wait for when the time is right, when the shi or momentum of an event is already in their favor. This is when China will strike first with what they call da ji zeng shi, meaning, "strike with force to increase shi" (Pillsbury, 146).

**The PLA believes that a “preemptive surprise attack can mean the difference in determining the outcome of a military confrontation** and can set the terms for a broader political debate (such as a territorial dispute)” (Pillsbury, 146). In other words, **China will** use da ji zeng shi to **revise the current global order. Once they deny American access to the South China Sea** and conduct an amphibious landing in Taiwan, they will then have the leverage to force political outcomes in their favor. Make no mistake, after China has invaded Taiwan, there will be no great heroic American military action to re-take the island. The damage will have been done. **Part of achieving this first strike against America,** when China decides their shi is ready, **will be to wreak havoc with American computer infrastructure,** all done using information acquired through the hundreds of probing attacks and information thefts that the U.S. government has been desperately trying to ignore. If the PRC does in fact have access to the names of Americans holding security clearances and information pertaining to U.S. intelligence front companies, then the kind of damage they could do boggles the mind. Yes, this is exactly the type of information that the Chinese can use to implement an anti-access/access-denial strategy and gain [information dominance](#).

Again, China does not have to beat us in an outright shooting war, they just have to slow us down until they have achieved their narrow political and military objectives. “It is possible that the United States could actually be defeated by China-not in the sense that the U.S. military would be destroyed but in the sense that China would accomplish its military-political objectives while preventing the United States from accomplishing some or all of its own political and military objectives” (Cliff, 112) notes a Rand Corporation white paper on the topic.

Our politicians think in terms of four year election cycles. Chinese politicians think in terms of hundred-year plans. Most Americans have attention spans that can barely last through a three and a half minute music video, so who do you think has the advantage here?

But our enemies are not yet ready to emerge from the shadows. **We are now approaching a dangerous time in which China is preparing to overtake America economically, and Chinese policymakers may very well convince themselves that their anti-access/access-denial strategy would successfully prevent America from intervening** in the South China Sea. The strategic momentum, the shi, of events is beginning to pick up its pace.

By hacking information about the CIA and other government agencies, **the Chinese government is essentially compiling a massive database of any and all personnel employed by the U.S. government. What they plan to do with that information in the future is unknown, but whatever it is it should scare the hell out of you. The day China wants to** invade Taiwan or **take** other **aggressive military action, the Chinese government could empty the bank accounts of every U.S. government employee.** They wouldn’t even be able to get to work at the Pentagon, the FBI, the CIA, SOCOM, PACOM, or wherever else because they couldn’t buy a tank of gas. China could further prepare the battle space by tailoring their information warfare to key individuals, like shutting down Admiral McRaven’s entire electronic profile, emptying his bank accounts, shutting down his cell phone, and changing his user credentials on sensitive computer terminals which would remove this key personality from the chessboard on D-Day.

## **STEM key to solve cyber-security**

**Sund, Naval Postgraduate School master’s candidate, 2014** (Steven A., “U.S.

DECLINING GLOBAL RANKINGS IN MATH AND SCIENCE AND THE IMPACT ON OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: POLICY OPTIONS TO ELICIT ANOTHER SPUTNIK MOMENT,” Master’s thesis with advisors Christopher Bellavita, the director of programs for the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, and Richard Bergin, Harvard PhD in Business Administration and co-leader of KPMG’s US Economics and Regulation practice, Naval Postgraduate School, p. 71-72, IC)

Unbeknownst to most Americans, **we have entered an arms race** of intellectual capacity, a race **America is not well positioned for** future success. In speaking about the importance higher education and innovation, China's President Hu stated, "the worldwide competition of overall national strength is actually a competition for talents, especially innovative talents" (Augustine, 2007, p. 45). **China has implemented a massive educational and military modernization program, and it has developed a significant cyber offensive initiative. The Department of Defense has recognized that China has** developed a capacity of disruptive **military technology that can compete militarily with the United States and may** potentially **overtake America's military advantages** in time. **Although** President **Obama has** developed **a cyber-security initiative**, he has recognized that **America does not have enough appropriately educated domestic citizens to fill the critical position. This declining STEM capacity has also resulted in a number of critical hightechnology manufacturing needs to be moved overseas**, which further national security concerns for the United States. Other countries such as Russia and Germany have also undergone educational initiatives in an attempt to compete with the United States.

### **China-Taiwan war draws in major powers, leads to extinction**

**Hunkovic 9** – Professor at American Military University

(Lee, The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America", American Military University, p.54)

**A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war**, therefore, **many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain**, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, **the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat.** In any case, **if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be** economically and/or militarily **affected by it.** However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

## MPX – Global economy (brain gain)

### **High-skilled immigration is key to the global economy**

**Saxenian 2** – Dean and Professor in the School of Information and professor in the

Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of Cal Berkeley

(AnnaLee, “Brain Circulation: How High-Skill Immigration Makes Everyone Better Off,”

[//BB">http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2002/12/winter-immigration-saxenian\)//BB](http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2002/12/winter-immigration-saxenian)

Silicon Valley's workforce is among the world's most ethnically diverse. Not only do Asian and Hispanic workers dominate the low-paying, blue-collar workforce, but **foreign-born**

**scientists and engineers are increasingly visible as entrepreneurs and senior managers.**

More than a quarter of Silicon Valley's highly skilled workers are immigrants, including tens of thousands from lands as diverse as China, Taiwan, India, the United Kingdom, Iran, Vietnam, the Philippines, Canada, and Israel. Understandably, the rapid growth of the foreign-born workforce has evoked intense debates over U.S. immigration policy, both here and in the developing world. In the United States, discussions of the

immigration of scientists and engineers have focused primarily on the extent to which foreign-born professionals displace native workers. **The view from sending countries**

by contrast, **has been that the emigration of highly skilled personnel to the United States represents**

**a big economic loss, a "brain drain."** Neither view is adequate in today's global economy. Far from simply replacing native workers, foreign-born engineers are starting

new businesses and generating jobs and wealth at least as fast as their U.S. counterparts. And **the dynamism of emerging regions in Asia and**

**elsewhere now draws skilled immigrants homeward. Even when they choose not to return**

**home, they are serving as middlemen linking businesses in the United States with those in**

**distant regions.** In some parts of the world, the **old** dynamic of "brain drain" is giving way to one I call "**brain**

**circulation.** Most people instinctively assume that the movement of skill and talent must

**benefit one country at the expense of another. But thanks to brain circulation, high-skilled**

**immigration increasingly benefits both sides.** Economically speaking, it is blessed to give and

**to receive.** "New" Immigrant Entrepreneurs Unlike traditional ethnic entrepreneurs who remain isolated in marginal, low-wage industries, Silicon Valley's new foreign-born entrepreneurs are highly educated professionals in dynamic and technologically sophisticated industries. And they have been extremely successful. By the end of the 1990s, Chinese and Indian engineers were running 29 percent of Silicon Valley's technology businesses. By 2000, these companies collectively accounted for more than \$19.5 billion in sales and 72,839 jobs. And the pace of immigrant entrepreneurship has accelerated dramatically in

the past decade. Not that Silicon Valley's immigrants have abandoned their ethnic ties. Like their less-educated counterparts, Silicon Valley's **high-tech immigrants rely on**

**ethnic strategies to enhance entrepreneurial opportunities.** Seeing themselves as outsiders to the mainstream technology community,

foreign-born engineers and scientists in Silicon Valley have created social and professional networks to mobilize the information, know-how, skill, and capital to start technology firms. Local ethnic professional associations like the Silicon Valley Chinese Engineers Association, The Indus Entrepreneur, and the Korean IT Forum provide contacts and resources for recently arrived immigrants. Combining elements of traditional immigrant culture with distinctly high-tech practices, these organizations simultaneously create ethnic identities within the region and aid professional networking and information exchange. These are not traditional political or lobbying groups—rather their focus is the professional and technical advancement of their members. Membership in Indian and Chinese professional associations has virtually no overlap, although the overlap within the separate communities—particularly the Chinese, with its many specialized associations—appears considerable. Yet ethnic distinctions also exist within the Chinese community. To an outsider, the Chinese American Semiconductor Professionals Association and the North American Chinese Semiconductor Association are redundant organizations. One, however, represents Taiwanese, the other Mainland, Chinese. Whatever their ethnicity, all these associations tend to mix socializing—over Chinese banquets, Indian dinners, or family-centered social events—with support for professional and technical advancement. Each, either explicitly or informally, offers first-generation immigrants professional contacts and networks within the local technology community. They serve as recruitment channels and provide role models of successful immigrant entrepreneurs and managers. They sponsor regular speakers and conferences whose subjects range from specialized technical and market information to how to write a business plan or manage a business. Some Chinese associations give seminars on English communication, negotiation skills, and stress management. Many of these groups have become important cross-generational forums. Older engineers and entrepreneurs in both the Chinese and the Indian communities now help finance and mentor younger co-ethnic entrepreneurs. Within these networks, "angel" investors often invest individually or jointly in promising new ventures. The Indus Entrepreneur, for example, aims to "foster entrepreneurship by providing mentorship and resources" within the South Asian technology community. Both the Asian American Manufacturers Association and the Monte Jade Science and Technology Association sponsor annual investment conferences to match investors (often from Asia as well as Silicon Valley) with Chinese entrepreneurs. Although many Chinese and Indian immigrants socialize primarily within their ethnic networks, they routinely work with U.S. engineers and U.S.-run businesses. In fact, recognition is growing within these communities that although a start-up might be spawned with the support of the ethnic networks, it must become part of the mainstream to grow. The most successful immigrant entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley today appear to be those who have drawn on ethnic resources while simultaneously integrating into mainstream technology and business networks. Transnational

Entrepreneurship Far beyond their role in Silicon Valley, **the professional and social networks that link new immigrant**

**entrepreneurs with each other have become global institutions that connect new immigrants**

**with their counterparts at home. These new transnational communities provide the shared**

**information, contacts, and trust that allow local producers to participate in an increasingly**

**global economy.** Silicon Valley's Taiwanese engineers, for example, have built a vibrant two-way bridge connecting them with Taiwan's technology community. Their Indian counterparts have become key middlemen linking U.S. businesses to low-cost software expertise in India. These cross-Pacific networks give skilled immigrants a big edge over mainstream competitors who often lack the language

skills, cultural know-how, and contacts to build business relationships in Asia. **The long-distance networks are accelerating the**

**globalization of labor markets and enhancing opportunities for entrepreneurship, investment,**

**and trade both in the United States and in newly emerging regions in Asia.** Taiwanese immigrant Min Wu, for

example, arrived in the United States in the early 1970s to pursue graduate training in electrical engineering. After earning a doctorate from Stanford University in 1976, Wu saw little use for his new skills in economically backward Taiwan and chose to remain in the United States. He worked for more than a decade in senior positions at Silicon Valley-based semiconductor companies including Siliconix and Intel. He also gained entrepreneurial experience as one of the founding members of VLSI Technology. By the late 1980s, Taiwan's economy had improved dramatically, and Wu decided to return. In 1989 he started one of Taiwan's first semiconductor companies, Macronix Co., in the Hsinchu Science-based Industrial Park. Wu also became an active participant in Silicon Valley's Monte Jade Science and Technology Association, which was building business links between the technical communities in Silicon Valley and Taiwan. Macronix went public on the Taiwan stock exchange in 1995 and in 1996 became the first Taiwanese company to list on Nasdaq. It is now the sixth biggest semiconductor maker in Taiwan, with more than \$300 million in sales and some 2,800 employees. Although most of its employees and its manufacturing facilities are in Taiwan, Macronix has an advanced design and engineering center in Silicon Valley, where Wu regularly recruits senior managers. A Macronix venture capital fund invests in promising start-ups in both Silicon Valley and Taiwan—not to raise money but to develop technologies related to their core business. In short, Min Wu's activities bridge and benefit both the Taiwan and Silicon Valley economies. A New Model of Globalization As recently as the 1970s, only giant corporations had the resources and capabilities to grow internationally, and they did so primarily by establishing marketing offices or manufacturing plants overseas. Today, new transportation and communications technologies allow even the smallest firms to build partnerships with foreign producers to tap overseas expertise, cost-savings, and markets. Start-ups in

Silicon Valley are often global actors from the day they begin operations. Many raise capital from Asian sources, others subcontract manufacturing to Taiwan or rely on software development in India, and virtually all sell their products in Asian markets. The scarce resource in this new environment is the ability to locate foreign partners quickly and to manage complex business relationships across cultural and linguistic boundaries. The challenge is keenest in high-tech industries whose products, markets, and technologies are continually being redefined—and whose product cycles are exceptionally short. For them, first-generation immigrants like the Chinese and Indian engineers of Silicon Valley, who have the language, cultural, and technical skills to thrive in both the United States and foreign markets, are invaluable. Their social structures enable even the smallest producers to locate and maintain collaborations across long distances and gain access to Asian capital, manufacturing capabilities, skills, and markets. These ties have measurable economic benefits. For every 1 percent increase in the number of first-generation immigrants from a given country, for example, California's exports to that country go up nearly 0.5 percent. The effect

is especially pronounced in the Asia-Pacific where, all other things being equal, California exports nearly four times more than it exports to comparable countries elsewhere in the world. **Growing**

**links** between the high-tech communities of Silicon Valley and Taiwan, for example, **offer big benefits to both economies**. Silicon Valley remains the center of

new product definition and of design and development of leading-edge technologies, whereas Taiwan offers world-class manufacturing, flexible development and integration, and access to key customers and markets in China and Southeast Asia. But what appears a classic case of the economic benefits of comparative advantage would not be possible without the underlying social structures, provided by Taiwanese

engineers, which ensure continuous flows of information between the two regions. **The reciprocal and decentralized nature of these**

**relationships is distinctive.** The ties between Japan and the United States during the 1980s were typically arm's-length, and technology transfers between large firms were managed

from the top down. The Silicon Valley-Hsinchu relationship, by contrast, consists of formal and informal collaborations among individual investors and entrepreneurs, small and medium-sized firms, and divisions of larger companies on both sides of the Pacific. In this complex mix, the rich social and professional ties among Taiwanese engineers and their U.S. counterparts are as important as the more formal corporate alliances and partnerships. Silicon Valley-based firms are poised to exploit both India's software talent and Taiwan's manufacturing capabilities. Mahesh Veerina started Ramp Networks (initially Trancell Systems) in 1993 with several Indian friends, relatives, and colleagues. Their aim was to develop low-cost devices to speed Internet access for small businesses. By 1994, short on money, they decided to hire programmers in India for one-quarter of the Silicon Valley rate. One founder spent two years setting up and managing their software development center in the southern city of Hyderabad. By 1999 Ramp had 65 employees in Santa Clara and 25 in India. Having used his Indian background to link California with India, Veerina then met two principals of a Taiwanese investment fund, InveStar, that folded in Taiwan. In less than three months, Veerina set up partnerships for high-volume manufacture of Ramp's routers with three Taiwanese manufacturers (it took nine months to establish a similar partnership with a U.S. manufacturer). The Taiwanese price per unit was about half what Ramp was paying for manufacturing in the United States, and Ramp increased its output one-hundred-fold because of relationships subsequently built by Veerina with key customers in the Taiwanese personal computer industry. Ramp also opted to use the worldwide distribution channels of its Taiwanese partners. And when Ramp designed a new model, the Taiwanese manufacturer was prepared to ship product in two weeks—not the six months it would have taken in the United States. Veerina attributes much of his success to InveStar's partners and their network of contacts in Taiwan. In a business where product cycles are often shorter than nine months, the speed and cost savings provided by these relationships provide critical competitive advantages to a firm like Ramp. InveStar sees as one of its key assets its intimate knowledge of the ins and outs of the business infrastructure in Taiwan's decentralized industrial system. By helping outsiders (both Chinese and non-Chinese) negotiate these complicated networks to tap into Taiwan's cost-effective and high-quality infrastructure and capability for speedy and flexible integration, such firms provide their clients far more than access to capital.

**As Silicon Valley's skilled Chinese and Indian immigrants create social and economic links to their home countries, they simultaneously open foreign markets and identify manufacturing options and technical skills in Asia for the broader U.S. business community.** Traditional Fortune 500 corporations as well as newer technology companies, for example, now increasingly turn to India for software programming and development talent. Meanwhile, information technology-related sectors in the United States rely heavily on Taiwan (and more recently China) for their fast and flexible infrastructure for manufacturing semiconductors and PCs, as well as their growing markets for advanced technology components. And these

distant resources are now just as accessible to new start-ups like Ramp as to more established corporations. **These new international linkages are**

**strengthening the economic infrastructure of the United States while providing **new****

**opportunities for once peripheral regions** of the world economy. Foreign-born engineers have started thousands of technology businesses in the United States, generating jobs, exports, and wealth at home and also accelerating the integration of these businesses into the **global economy**.

Δ A New Policy Environment Δ The Silicon Valley experience underscores far-reaching transformations of the relationship between immigration, trade, and economic

development in the 21st century. Where once the main economic ties between immigrants and their home countries were remittances sent to families left behind, **today more and more skilled U.S. immigrants eventually return home. Those who remain in America often become part of transnational communities that link the United States to the economies of distant regions. These new immigrant entrepreneurs thus foster economic development directly, by creating new jobs and wealth, as well as indirectly, by coordinating the**

**information flows and providing the linguistic and cultural know-how that **promote trade and****

**investment with their home countries**.

Δ Analysts and policymakers must recognize this new reality. In the recent U.S. debate over making **more H1-B**

**visas** available for highly skilled immigrants, discussion began—and ended—with the extent to which immigrants displace native workers. But these high-tech immigrants affect more than labor supply and wages. They also **create new jobs here and new ties abroad**. Some of **their economic contributions**, such as enhanced trade

and investment flows, are difficult to quantify, but they **must figure into our debates**. Economic openness has its costs, to be sure, but the strength of the U.S. economy has

historically derived from its openness and diversity—and this will be increasingly true as the economy becomes more global. As Silicon Valley's new immigrant entrepreneurs suggest, **Americans**

**should resist viewing immigration and trade as zero-sum processes**. We need to encourage the immigration of skilled workers—while simultaneously improving the education of workers here at home.

## MPX – Chinese military modernization

### **Immigration is key to future STEM industries—we have studies**

**Kerr, Harvard Business School Professor, 2013** (William R., “U.S. HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRATION, INNOVATION, AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: EMPIRICAL APPROACHES AND EVIDENCE,” National Bureau of Economic Research, August 2013, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19377.pdf>, p. 8-9, IC)

Placing these first two themes together, it becomes clear that immigration acts in two different ways for the United States. First, it provides the United States with a number of exceptional superstars for STEM work. Second, immigration acts through the sheer quantity of workers that it provides for STEM fields. These workers are often well trained for STEM roles, but, conditional on that education, the immigrants are of a similar quality level to U.S. natives. The pieces are not at odds with each other, as amid a large STEM workforce of more than two million workers, the exceptional tail does not move the averages of the groups very much. While it is difficult to prove which of these channels is more important, we have the general feeling that the quantity aspect of high-skilled immigration is the stronger factor in terms of its potential impact for STEM work in the United States.

To close, we also note a parallel set of work that considers the quantity and quality of immigrant student enrollments in STEM fields. This dimension is important as university and graduate school admissions shape, in large part, the United States' future STEM workforce. Bound et al. (2009) and similar studies document how immigrants account for an exceptional share of STEM students, especially among graduate students, in levels that exceed those noted for the workforce above. Grogger and Hanson (2013) describe the selectivity of foreign-born STEM Ph.D. students in the United States. Studies evaluating the production of innovation within universities also tend to find a special role for immigrant students (e.g., Chellaraj et al. 2008, Stephan 2010, Gurmu et al. 2010, Stuen et al. 2012, Gaule and Piacentini 2012). 6

### **An educated workforce is the crucial component to national defense—that's key to balance Chinese military modernization**

**Sund, Naval Postgraduate School master's candidate, 2014** (Steven A., “U.S. DECLINING GLOBAL RANKINGS IN MATH AND SCIENCE AND THE IMPACT ON OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: POLICY OPTIONS TO ELICIT ANOTHER SPUTNIK MOMENT,” Master's thesis with advisors Christopher Bellavita, the director of programs for the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, and Richard Bergin, Harvard PhD in Business Administration and co-leader of KPMG's US Economics and Regulation practice, Naval Postgraduate School, p. 14-15, IC) Maintaining a highly educated and innovative workforce is also critical to our national security and defense capabilities. Defense related innovation has provided a number of critical technologies, such as the Internet, communications and weather satellites, global positioning systems, and nuclear power. However, the defense science and engineering workforce has declined from 45,000 to 28,000 scientists during the 1990s (Augustine, 2007, p. 59). With the increasing number of foreign born students obtaining advanced science degrees and engineering degrees in the U.S., and the decreased interest of U.S. students in the sciences, the problem of the shrinking skilled labor force is exacerbated further by the reduction in numbers of U.S. citizens in these fields who can obtain the requisite security clearances (Augustine, 2007, p. 59). With the development of such cutting edge military technology such as the digital computers, stealth capabilities, precision guided missiles, nuclear propulsion, and space

**surveillance**, it is easy to see why President Bush stated, **“science and technology have never been more important to the defense of a nation and the health of the economy”** (Augustine, 2007, p. 59).

Realizing the difficulties of facing the U.S. military, **countries like China are using new technologies to develop a new army** for the twenty-first century **based on** the use of information technology to wage **information warfare** (IW) and electronic warfare (EW). **China is currently looking for alternative methods, such as IW, to attack the United States.** This “Net Force” would be made up of highly skilled soldiers who make up a shock brigade of network warriors, information protection troops, an information corps, electronic police, and a united network (Tsai, 2006, p. 69). **Because of the use of emerging technologies** as warfare agents, our knowledge of these technologies and **our technological advantage over competing countries** around the world **will be even more crucial to our national security** in the future.

In January 2011, open source information began reporting that the Chinese J-20 stealth fighter would be operational much sooner than previously expected. What is most important about the new **Chinese stealth aircraft is** that more of it **is being manufactured from** composites of **Chinese made technologies, as opposed to imported technologies. This** change **is showing greater capabilities of Chinese military technology,** which is being driven by its expanding technology. According to the Chinese Defense Minister Liang Guanglie, this **industrial capability is expected to speed up** during this next five year plan, which runs from 2011 through 2015, **when China is expected to implement military modernization** (Grevatt, 2011, p. 2). In speaking about the importance higher education and innovation, China’s President Hu stated, **“the worldwide competition of overall national strength is actually a competition for talents, especially innovative talents”** (Augustine, 2007, p. 45).

## MPX – Chinese STEM

### **Lack of H1-B visas results in high-skilled immigrants moving back to China**

**Zavodny, Agnes Scott College economics professor, 2011** (Madeline, "Immigration and American Jobs," American Enterprise Institute, 12/15/11, [http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/-immigration-and-american-jobs\\_144002688962.pdf](http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/-immigration-and-american-jobs_144002688962.pdf), p. 13, IC)

Despite this, current policy allocates only about 7 percent of green cards based on employment, while **the number of H-1B visas** for skilled temporary foreign workers **is capped at 85,000 annually. Other rules impose further limitations** on highly skilled immigration. For example, **per-country caps limit each country to no more than 7 percent of green cards issued annually, which creates daunting backlogs for China and India**, countries that quickly fill their annual quota. Facing the prospect of working on temporary visas for up to ten years and unable to change employers or even job titles without jeopardizing their initial application, many **highly skilled, highly motivated workers from China and India choose to leave for greater opportunities back home** or in another, more welcoming country. Given what this study shows about the opportunity to boost American employment and contribute to government coffers, **policymakers should increase the number of permanent visas for highly skilled workers** and rewrite the rules to lift the artificial limits on country caps for green cards.

### **That's key to Chinese technological innovation—new technology gets militarized for cyberwarfare and allow for Chinese aggression against Taiwan**

**Mulvenon, UCLA PhD in political science and Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis Director, 2013** (James C., "Chinese Cyber Espionage," testimony before the Congressional-Executive Commission on China hearing entitled "Hearing on Chinese Hacking: Impact on Human Rights and Commercial Rule of Law," 6/25/13, <http://www.cecc.gov/sites/chinacommission.house.gov/files/CECC%20Hearing%20-%20Chinese%20Hacking%20-%20James%20Mulvenon%20Written%20Statement.pdf>, IC)

After more than thirty years of serving as the world's assembly point and export processing zone, the **Beijing** government **has** clearly **made the decision to transform Chinese economic development by encouraging "indigenous innovation."**<sup>xvi</sup> Since 2006, James **McGregor and others have highlighted "Chinese policies** and initiatives **aimed at building 'national champion' companies through subsidies and preferential policies while using China's market power to appropriate foreign technology**, tweak it **and create Chinese 'indigenous innovations'** that will come back at us globally."<sup>xvii</sup> In the information technology sector, **McGregor notes "Chinese government mandate to replace core foreign technology in critical infrastructure -- such as chips, software and communications hardware -- with Chinese technology within a decade."**

Among the tools being actively used to achieve these goals are:

a foreign-focused anti-monopoly law, mandatory technology transfers, compulsory technology licensing, rigged Chinese standards and testing rules, local content requirements, mandates to reveal encryption codes, excessive disclosure for scientific permits and technology patents, discriminatory government procurement policies, and the continued failure to adequately protect intellectual property rights.<sup>xviii</sup>

Missing from this excellent list, however, are traditional technical espionage and technical cyber espionage, which many companies believe are already eroding their technical advantage. The logic for these latter approaches is clearly outlined by David Szady, former head of the FBI's counterintelligence unit: **"If they can steal it** and do it in five years, **why [take longer] to**



**develop it?"<sup>xix</sup> Rather than destroying US competitiveness through "cyberwar,"** former DNI McConnell argues that **Chinese entities "are exploiting our systems for information advantage** – looking for the characteristics of a weapons system by a defense contractor or academic research on plasma physics, for example – not in order to destroy data and do damage."<sup>xx</sup> Examples of Chinese cyber espionage to obtain science and technology can be divided into two broad categories: external and insider. The 2011 NCIX report offers three illustrative examples of insider cyber threats:

- David Yen Lee, a chemist with Valspar Corporation, used his access to internal computer networks between 2008 and 2009 to download approximately 160 secret formulas for paints and coatings to removable storage media. He intended to parlay this proprietary information to obtain a new job with Nippon Paint in Shanghai, China. Lee was arrested in March 2009, pleaded guilty to one count of theft of trade secrets, and was sentenced in December 2010 to 15 months in prison.
- Meng Hong, a DuPont research chemist, downloaded proprietary information on organic light-emitting diodes (OLED) in mid-2009 to his personal email account and thumb drive. He intended to transfer this information to Peking University, where he had accepted a faculty position, and sought Chinese government funding to commercialize OLED research. Hong was arrested in October 2009, pleaded guilty to one count of theft of trade secrets, and was sentenced in October 2010 to 14 months in prison.
- Xiangdong Yu (aka Mike Yu), a product engineer with Ford Motor Company, copied approximately 4,000 Ford documents onto an external hard drive to help obtain a job with a Chinese automotive company. He was arrested in October 2009, pleaded guilty to two counts of theft of trade secrets, and sentenced in April 2011 to 70 months in prison.<sup>xxi</sup>

External cyber threats to scientific and industrial data, believed to originate in China, have been well-documented in reports by outside vendors. Some examples include:

- In its Night Dragon report, McAfee documented "coordinated covert and targeted cyberattacks have been conducted against global oil, energy, and petrochemical companies," "targeting and harvesting sensitive competitive proprietary operations and project-financing information with regard to oil and gas field bids and operations."<sup>xxii</sup>
- In his Shady Rat report, McAfee's Dmitry Alperovitch identified 71 compromised organizations in one set of intrusions, including 13 defense contractors, 13 information technology companies, and 6 manufacturing companies.<sup>xxiii</sup>
- In January 2010, Google reported a "highly sophisticated and targeted attack on our corporate infrastructure originating from China that resulted in the theft of intellectual property," including source code.<sup>xxiv</sup> Google claimed that the intrusion also targeted "at least twenty other large companies from a wide range of businesses--including the Internet, finance, technology, media and chemical sectors," and was corroborated in separate admissions by Adobe,<sup>xxv</sup>
- In its GhostNet report, researchers at Information Warfare Monitor found 1,295 infected computers in 103 countries, including a range of political, diplomatic and economic target organizations such as Deloitte and Touche's New York office.<sup>xxvi</sup> The follow-on report, Shadows in the Cloud, identified additional targets, including Honeywell.<sup>xxvii</sup> Each of these reported intrusions were traced to IP addresses in China, and almost certainly represent only a fraction of the known hacks, given the reluctance of companies to report data breaches.

Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB)

**It is also important to contextualize China's interest in cyber espionage within Beijing's threat perceptions of potential scenarios for military conflict.** In the minds of the Chinese leadership, the **available evidence suggests that the most important political-military challenges and the**

**most likely flashpoints** for Sino-US conflict **involve Taiwan or the South China Sea**. Should the late 1990s, the PLA has been hard at work bolstering the hedging options of the leadership, developing advanced campaign doctrines, testing the concepts in increasingly complex training and exercises, and integrating new indigenous and imported weapons systems.

Yet **cyber operations are also expected to play an important role in these scenarios, necessitating intelligence preparation of the cyber battlefield**. At the strategic level, the **writings of Chinese military authors suggest that there are two main centers of gravity in a Taiwan scenario, both of which can be attacked with computer network operations** in concert with other kinetic and non-kinetic capabilities. The first of these is the will of the Taiwanese people, which they hope to undermine through exercises, cyber attacks against critical infrastructure, missile attacks, SOF operations, and other operations that have a psyop focus. Based on assessments from the 1995-1996 exercises, as well as public opinion polling in Taiwan, China appears to have concluded that the Taiwanese people do not have the stomach for conflict and will therefore sue for peace after suffering only a small amount of pain. The second center of gravity is the will and capability of the United States to intervene decisively in a cross-strait conflict. In a strategic sense, China has traditionally believed that its ICBM inventory, which is capable of striking CONUS, will serve as a deterrent to US intervention or at least a brake on escalation.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Closer to its borders, **the PLA has been engaged in an active program of equipment modernization**, purchasing niche "counter-intervention" capabilities such as anti-ship ballistic missiles, long-range cruise missiles and submarines to shape the operational calculus of the American carrier strike group commander on station.<sup>xxix</sup> According to the predictable cadre of "true believers," **both of the centers of gravity identified above can be attacked using computer network operations**. In the first case, the Chinese IO community believes that CNO will play a useful psychological role in undermining the will of the Taiwanese people by attacking infrastructure and economic vitality. In the second case, **the Chinese IO community envisions computer network attacks against unclassified NIPRNET** and its automated logistics systems **as an effective way to deter or delay US intervention into a military contingency** and thereby permit Beijing to achieve its political objectives with a minimum of fighting. In both cases, **China must conduct substantial computer network exploitation** (the military term for cyber espionage) **for intelligence preparation of this battlefield**, and the alleged intrusion set into NIPRNET computer systems would appear to fulfill this military requirement.

Why does the Chinese military believe that the deployment phase of US military operations, particularly the use of the unclassified NIPRNET for logistics deployments, is the primary focus of vulnerability? **Since DESERT STORM** in the early 1990s, **the PLA has expended significant resources analyzing** the operations of what it often and euphemistically terms "**the high-tech enemy**."<sup>xxx</sup> **When Chinese strategists contemplate how to affect US deployments, they confront the limitations of their current conventional force**, which does not have range sufficient to interdict US facilities or assets beyond the Japanese home islands.<sup>xxxi</sup> Nuclear options, while theoretically available, are nonetheless far too escalatory to be used so early in the conflict.<sup>xxxii</sup> Theater missile systems, which are possibly moving to a mixture of conventional and nuclear warheads, could be used against Japan or Guam, but uncertainties about the nature of a given warhead would likely generate responses similar to the nuclear scenario.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Instead, **PLA analysts of US military operations presciently concluded that the key vulnerability was the mechanics of deployment** itself. Specifically, **Chinese authors highlight DoD's need to use civilian backbone and unclassified computer networks** (known as the NIPRNET), which is a function of the requirements of global power projection, **as an "Achilles Heel."** **There is also recognition** of the fact **that operations in the Pacific are** especially

**reliant on precisely coordinated transportation, communications, and logistics networks**, given what PACOM calls the “tyranny of distance”<sup>xxxiv</sup> in the theater. **PLA strategists believe that a disruptive computer network attack** against these systems or affiliated civilian systems **could** potentially delay or **degrade US force deployment to the region** while allowing the PRC to maintain a degree of plausible deniability.

**The Chinese are right to highlight the NIPRNET as an attractive and accessible target**, unlike its classified counterparts. It is attractive because it contains and transmits critical deployment information in the all-important time-phased force deployment list (known as the “tip-fiddle”), which is valuable for both intelligence-gathering about US military operations but also a lucrative target for disruptive attacks. In terms of accessibility, it was relatively easy to gather data about the NIPRNET from open sources, at least before 9/11. Moreover, **the very nature of the system is the source of its vulnerabilities, since the needs of global power project mandate that it has to be unclassified and connected to the greater global network**, albeit through protected gateways.<sup>xxxv</sup>

DoD’s classified networks, on the other hand, are an attractive but less accessible target for the Chinese. On the one hand, these networks would be an intelligence gold mine, and is likely a priority computer network exploit target. On the other hand, they are less attractive as a computer network attack target, thanks to the difficulty of penetrating its high defenses. Any overall Chinese military strategy predicated on a high degree of success in penetrating these networks during crisis or war is a high-risk venture, and increases the chances of failure of the overall effort to an unacceptable level.

**Chinese CNE or CNA operations** against logistics networks **could have a detrimental impact on US logistics support to operations. PRC computer network exploit activities** directed against US military logistics networks **could reveal force deployment information**, such as the names of ships deployed, readiness status of various units, timing and destination of deployments, and rendezvous schedules. **This is especially important for the Chinese in times of crisis**, since the PRC in peacetime utilizes US military web sites and newspapers as a principal source for deployment information. An article in October 2001 in People's Daily, for example, explicitly cited US Navy web sites for information about the origins, destination and purpose of two carrier battle groups exercising in the South China Sea.<sup>xxxvi</sup> Since the quantity and quality of deployment information on open websites has been dramatically reduced after 9/11, the intelligence benefits (necessity?) of exploiting the NIPRNET have become even more paramount.<sup>xxxvii</sup> Computer network attack could also delay re-supply to the theater by misdirecting stores, fuel, and munitions, corrupting or deleting inventory files, and thereby hindering mission capability.

## **China-Taiwan war draws in major powers, leads to extinction**

**Hunkovic 9** – Professor at American Military University

(Lee, *The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America*”, American Military University, p.54)

**A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war**, therefore, **many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain**, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, **the possibility exists**

**that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat.** In any case, **if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be** economically and/or militarily **affected by it.** However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

## MPX – Chinese dedev

**Chinese-born, high-skilled workers are returning to China—only a more inclusive immigration system can solve**

**Yuwei, journalist, 2011** (Zhang, “Talent hunters mean business,” The 4th Media, 7/27/11, <http://www.4thmedia.org/2011/07/talent-hunters-mean-business/>, IC)

**Li Yang**, a PhD marketing student at Columbia Business School in New York, **faces a tough choice** when he graduates next year – **whether to stay in the United States or return to China** to look for a job.

**“Several years ago, the answer would have been simple.** Of course, I’d prefer **to stay in the US** maybe long enough to enjoy some immigration benefits. **But now China offers equally competitive opportunities for overseas returnees, which many will consider and accept,”** said Li, 28, who has been studying in the US for more than six years.

In 2008, **the government launched the Thousand Talents Program to improve China’s capacity for innovation** in the next five to 10 years. It hopes to boost the recruitment of talented people who are willing to return to China for top salaries.

A follow-up initiative, **the Thousand Young Talents Program, was set up last year to recruit about 2,000 jobseekers from abroad** over the next five years **to work in the natural sciences and engineering.**

Under the National Medium- and Long-term Talent Development Plan (2010-20) released in June, **the government will adopt favorable policies in taxation, insurance, housing, children and spouse settlement, career development, research projects, and government awards for high-caliber overseas Chinese who are willing to work in China.**

Li is encouraged by the programs. **“More Chinese students and young professionals around me are considering returning to China. The program is a good start and it shows the government has recognized the role these overseas returnees can play.**

“There is not much difference between China and the US in terms of employment opportunities now,” he said. “That’s where it makes the choice difficult.”

**More Chinese students have returned home in recent years** – 134,800 from the US last year, a 25 percent increase from 2009, according to the Chinese Ministry of Education. While **many returned because of the difficulty in obtaining a non-immigrant work visa**, it is thought that the better employment prospects in China also played a role.

Shaun Rein, managing director at China Market Research in Shanghai, said **most of the people his firm hired in the past two years had gone abroad for business school and returned to China.**

**Some are benefiting from favorable policies set up by the government,** Rein said. “This is a very positive development for China. We need these top-flight students to return home.”

Keeping the foreigners

The United States, meanwhile, is trying to keep the foreigners. Speaking in El Paso, Texas, in May, President Barack Obama said an overhaul of US immigration laws is needed to secure highly skilled and high-tech foreign talent.

“So we don’t want the next Intel or the next Google to be created in China or India,” he said. “We want those companies and jobs to take root here.”

In May, the Obama administration extended the Optional Practical Training program to allow students graduating from programs in several dozen additional disciplines, including soil microbiology, pharmaceuticals and medical informatics, to be able to find a job or work up to 29

months (instead of 12) after graduation. The move was intended to address the shortages of scientists and technology experts in some high-tech sectors.

New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg said recently, at a Council on Foreign Relations event in Washington, that **“the one thing” that can spur job growth is to encourage more legal immigration to the US.**

He said the **changes should include** allowing foreign graduates from US universities to obtain green cards (permanent residency), **ending caps on visas for highly skilled workers**, and setting green card limits based on the country’s economic needs, not an immigrant’s family ties. About 15 percent of all green cards go to employees and their dependents, while the rest go largely to immigrants, families and relatives, Bloomberg said.

Last year more **than 70,000 Chinese applicants obtained permanent residency in the US**, placing second behind Mexican applicants, according to the US Department of Homeland Security.

**“That American dream cannot survive if we keep telling the dreamers to go elsewhere,”** Bloomberg said. **“It’s what I call national suicide – and that’s not hyperbole.”**

Immigration limits

Groups that favor tighter immigration restrictions think the US already has a system that allows 8 million foreign workers to hold jobs when nearly 14 million Americans are unemployed in a slow-growing economy. Republicans, in general, support a tighter immigration policy to preserve more jobs for Americans.

A recent Gallup survey showed that Americans continue to show a slight preference for lower immigration levels over maintaining current levels, while a much smaller percentage favors increased immigration.

Li does not agree, saying immigrants have contributed so much to the United States, historically an immigration country. **“It makes sense to make the immigration policies more friendly to foreign workers. The thing is, how can (the US) attract more Chinese students to stay when more opportunities are rising at home?”**

Li changed his major from biomedical engineering to marketing, a field he said is much more open in China because of a large number of domestic companies’ branding needs. Meanwhile, many US companies are cutting back on marketing and advertising budgets and on personnel to save costs.

What companies want

The reality in China now is that **talented people**, especially those who have a foreign education, **are in high demand at both Chinese and foreign multinational companies.**

New Corporate Executive Board research indicates that **many Chinese are increasingly interested in working for domestic rather than Western companies because of China’s economic growth** and compelling career opportunities.

“Our Western multinational clients are increasingly concerned about their ability to attract and retain highly skilled Chinese talent,” said Conrad Schmidt, executive director of the board’s Corporate Leadership Council.

Rein, from China Market Research, said **the majority of the Fortune 500 companies** his firm interviewed **said their biggest obstacle to growth in China was recruiting and retaining talent.** Rein, who is bullish on China’s economy for the next decade, is concerned about the weak talent pool in the country.

“The university system here does not train people to think analytically enough for a global business world,” he said. “Many students realize this so they travel to the US, UK and Australia to study.

**“Fifteen years ago, many Chinese who studied abroad stayed abroad** because the opportunities in China were limited. However, **many are now starting to return to China** because this is where the great growth is and job opportunities abound.”

### **Attracting overseas Chinese scholars back to China is key to their economy**

**Wang, Brookings Institute visiting fellow, 2010** (Huiyao, “China’s National Talent Plan: Key Measures and Objectives,” Brookings, 11/23/10, [http://robohub.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Brookings\\_China\\_1000\\_talent\\_Plan.pdf](http://robohub.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Brookings_China_1000_talent_Plan.pdf), IC)

**China** has also **enjoyed a huge trade surplus** for a number of years. **However, in terms of the exchange of rencai, it has suffered a major deficit. China has sent out 1.62 million students and scholars** since 1978, **but** as of today, **only 497,000 have returned** to China. The fact that the total number of returnees is now close to half a million was helped by the financial crisis in some developed countries: over 100,000 students returned to China in 2009 alone. Although the total return rate is now around 30 percent, the U.S. Energy Department’s Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education for the National Science Foundation reports that **the percentage of highly qualified Chinese rencai —such as U.S.-educated PhD graduates** in the sciences and engineering—**that remained in the United States stands at 92 percent**, the highest in the world (in comparison, for these highly qualified rencai, India’s stay rate is 81 percent, Taiwan’s is 43 percent, South Korea’s is 41 percent, Japan’s is 33 percent, Mexico’s is 32 percent and Thailand’s is 7 percent).as can be see from the table below.xiii

China has begun to recognize that **having financial resources is not enough: human resources must be prioritized** in today’s knowledge economy. Therefore, **methods for attracting human capital to China can have a profound impact on the country’s economic, political and social transformation.**

### **Chinese growth makes war US-China war inevitable within five years**

**Keck 14** – citing John Mearsheimer, professor of IR

(Zachary, US-China Rivalry More Dangerous Than Cold War?,

<http://thediplomat.com/2014/01/us-china-rivalry-more-dangerous-than-cold-war/>)

The prominent realist international relations scholar John Mearsheimer says **there is a greater possibility of the U.S. and China going to war in the future than there was of a Soviet-NATO general war** during the Cold War.¶ Mearsheimer made the comments at a lunch hosted by the Center for the National Interest in Washington, DC on Monday. The lunch was held to discuss Mearsheimer’s recent article in The National Interest on U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East. However, much of the conversation during the Q&A session focused on U.S. policy towards Asia amid China’s rise, a topic that Mearsheimer addresses in greater length in the updated edition of his classic treatise, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, which is due out this April.¶ In contrast to the

Middle East, which he characterizes as posing little threat to the United States, Mearsheimer said that **the U.S. will face a tremendous challenge** in Asia should China continue to rise economically. The University of Chicago professor said that **in such a scenario it is inevitable that the U.S. and China will engage in an intense strategic competition, much like the Soviet-American rivalry** during the Cold War.¶ While stressing that he didn’t believe a shooting war between the U.S. and China is inevitable,

Mearsheimer said that he believes **a U.S.-China Cold War will be much less stable than the previous American-Soviet one. His reasoning was based on geography and its interaction with nuclear weapons.**¶ Specifically, the center of gravity of the U.S.-Soviet competition was the central European landmass. This created a rather stable situation as, according to Mearsheimer, anyone that war gamed a NATO-Warsaw conflict over Central Europe understood that it would quickly turn nuclear. This gave both sides a powerful incentive to avoid a general conflict in Central

Europe as a nuclear war would make it very likely that both the U.S. and Soviet Union would be “vaporized.”¶ **The U.S.-China strategic rivalry lacks this singular center of gravity.** Instead, **Mearsheimer identified four potential hotspots** over which

he believes the U.S. and China might find themselves at war: **the Korean Peninsula, the Taiwan Strait and the South and East China Seas**. Besides featuring more hotspots than the U.S.-Soviet conflict, Mearsheimer implied that he felt that **decision-makers in**

**Beijing and Washington might be more confident that they could engage in a shooting war** over one of these areas without it escalating to the nuclear threshold.¶ For instance, he singled out the Sino-Japanese dispute over the **Senkaku** /Diaoyu Islands, of which he said there **was a very real possibility that Japan and China could find themselves in a shooting war in the next five years**. Should a shooting war break out between China and Japan in the East China Sea, Mearsheimer said he believes **the U.S. will** have two options: first, to act as an umpire in trying to separate the two sides and return to the status quo ante; second, to **enter the conflict on the side of Japan**.¶ Mearsheimer said that he thinks it's more likely the U.S. would opt for the second option because a failure to do so would weaken U.S. credibility in the eyes of its Asian allies. In particular, he believes that America trying to act as a mediator would badly undermine Japanese and South Korean policymakers' faith in America's extended deterrence. Since the U.S. does not want Japan or South Korea to build their own nuclear weapons, Washington would be hesitant to not come out decisively on the side of the Japanese in any war between Tokyo and Beijing.¶ Mearsheimer did add that the U.S. is in the early stages of dealing with a rising China, and the full threat would not materialize for at least another ten years. He also stressed that his arguments assumed that China will be able to maintain rapid economic growth. Were China's growth rates to streamline or even turn negative, then the U.S. would remain the preponderant power in the world and actually see its relative power grow through 2050.¶ In characteristically blunt fashion, **Mearsheimer** said that he **hopes that China's economy falters or collapses**, as **this would eliminate** a potentially **immense security threat for the United States and its allies**. Indeed, Mearsheimer said he was flabbergasted by Americans and people in allied states who profess wanting to see China continue to grow economically. He reminded the audience that at the peak of its power the Soviet Union possessed a much smaller GDP than the United States. **Given that China has a population size over four times larger than America's, should it reach a GDP per capita that is comparable to Taiwan or Hong Kong today, it will be a greater potential threat to the United States than anything America has previously dealt with.**

## **Leads to nuclear winter**

**Wittner 11** - Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, Wittner is the author of eight books, the editor or co-editor of another four, and the author of over 250 published articles and book reviews. From 1984 to 1987, he edited Peace & Change, a journal of peace research.,

(Lawrence S, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?," [www.huntingtonnews.net/14446](http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446))

**While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China's growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China's claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region.** According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was "asserting our own position as a Pacific power." But **need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China's offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu.** In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would "be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else." Of course, China didn't have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. **Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations;** and, admittedly, there haven't been very many—at least not yet. **But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur.** Indeed, **in that case, the conflict**



**almost slipped into a nuclear war.** Pakistan's foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use "any weapon" in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, **don't nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack?** Do they? **Obviously, NATO leaders didn't feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO's strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union.** Furthermore, **if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing "Star Wars"** and its modern variant, national missile defense. **Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might?** Of course, **the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart.** Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would "win" any nuclear war with China. But what would that "victory" entail? **A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands.** Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a "nuclear winter" around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

### **Cross-strait war leads to extinction**

**Ching 2k** - senior journalist at The Straits Times and author of two books on Taiwan (Ching Cheong, "No One Gains in War Over Taiwan", June 25, Lexis Nexis)

**THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China.** If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. **Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war.** Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, **east Asia will be set on fire.** And the **conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset** by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, **hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase.** Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book *The Korean War*, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is

little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that **China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing** also **seems prepared to go for the nuclear option.** A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that **should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.** There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armageddon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for **China puts sovereignty above everything else.**

## China scenario – yes return now

**Chinese strategies for returning emigrants to the homeland are key to their technological innovation and national power**

**Kennedy, Harvard PhD in political science and ANU Crawford school of public policy senior lecturer, 2015** (Andrew B., “Powerhouses or pretenders? Debating China’s and India’s emergence as technological powers,” *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 28, Issue 2, 2015, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09512748.2014.995126>, IC)

**Technological creativity represents a key source of national power**, a point long recognized by international relations scholars. **New technologies** not only spur economic growth and national prosperity, but can also **provide states with leverage** in international trade. New **technologies** from railroads to nuclear energy have also **generated new sources of military power**, at least for states that can surmount the financial and organizational hurdles to military innovation (Horowitz 2010). Moreover, nations vary widely in their innovative capacities. Long-cycle theorists, who have probed the connections between technology and national power with particular care, note that technological development at a given point in history tends to cluster in a single national economy, from which it diffuses throughout the international system (Thompson 1990; Modelski and Thompson 1996).

In this context, it is not surprising that **technological innovation should be a pressing preoccupation for rising powers**. To be sure, a rising state may simply be a ‘fast follower’, rapidly adopting new technologies invented elsewhere rather than creating them on its own. When the hurdles to imitation are high, however, **the advantages of possessing a new technology first** – both in the economic and military spheres – **can be considerable** (Milner and Yoffie 1989; Mueller 1997; Horowitz 2010). Indeed, the historical record makes clear that **technological innovation often helps fuel the rise of new powers**. Germany rose to economic prominence in the late-nineteenth century as it ‘institutionalized innovation’ in what David Landes called ‘the second wind’ of the industrial revolution (Landes 2003, 352). The rise of the United States in the early- and mid-twentieth century was not simply a function of its increasingly vast economy, but also technological leadership in areas ranging from electric light to mass production to air transport (Gordon 2004, 23–34). Following World War II, Japan’s remarkable rise in automotive and information technology led to predictions that it would eclipse the United States as the world’s leading economy, expectations that have faded as Japan has struggled to keep up in the age of the Internet (Drezner 2001).

Today’s rising powers – **China and India** in particular – **are certainly not content to rely on the outside world for new technologies**. In 2006, **China’s** National Medium- and Long-Term Program for Science and Technology Development (2006–2020), or **MLP, was launched to rapidly advance ‘indigenous innovation’** and to promote 16 ‘megaprojects’ in particular (State Council 2006). **The MLP was spurred** in part **by dissatisfaction with China’s role in the world economy**, as well as a conviction that foreign companies would no longer transfer technologies, particularly advanced technologies, to Chinese firms (Cao et al. 2006, 41). **The document itself argued that ‘in areas critical to the national economy and security, core technologies cannot be purchased’ and that China should ‘take the initiative in the fierce international competition’**. Yet the MLP hardly endorsed autarky: the document listed a range of shortcomings in China’s own science and technology (S&T) system and concluded that international cooperation would be essential for China going forward. In 2010, China added a follow-on plan to speed the development of seven ‘Strategic Emerging Industries’ (SEI) – an

effort to place Chinese companies at the forefront of technological innovation. While more targeted than the MLP, **this initiative** also **represents a striking mix of technological ambition, nationalist anxiety,** and international outreach.

**Chinese attempts to build 'indigenous innovation' through returning emigrants to the homeland are key to its technological innovation—that gets militarized for cyberwarfare and allow for Chinese aggression against Taiwan**

**Mulvenon, UCLA PhD in political science and Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis Director, 2013** (James C., "Chinese Cyber Espionage," testimony before the

Congressional-Executive Commission on China hearing entitled "Hearing on Chinese Hacking: Impact on Human Rights and Commercial Rule of Law," 6/25/13,

<http://www.cecc.gov/sites/chinacommission.house.gov/files/CECC%20Hearing%20-%20Chinese%20Hacking%20-%20James%20Mulvenon%20Written%20Statement.pdf>, IC)

After more than thirty years of serving as the world's assembly point and export processing zone, the **Beijing** government **has** clearly **made the decision to transform Chinese economic development by encouraging "indigenous innovation."**<sup>xvi</sup> Since 2006, James **McGregor and others have highlighted "Chinese policies** and initiatives **aimed at building 'national champion' companies through subsidies and preferential policies while using China's market power to appropriate foreign technology**, tweak it **and create Chinese 'indigenous innovations'** that will come back at us globally."<sup>xvii</sup> In the information technology sector, **McGregor notes "Chinese government mandate to replace core foreign technology in critical infrastructure -- such as chips, software and communications hardware -- with Chinese technology within a decade."**

Among the tools being actively used to achieve these goals are:

a foreign-focused anti-monopoly law, mandatory technology transfers, compulsory technology licensing, rigged Chinese standards and testing rules, local content requirements, mandates to reveal encryption codes, excessive disclosure for scientific permits and technology patents, discriminatory government procurement policies, and the continued failure to adequately protect intellectual property rights.<sup>xviii</sup>

Missing from this excellent list, however, are traditional technical espionage and technical cyber espionage, which many companies believe are already eroding their technical advantage. The logic for these latter approaches is clearly outlined by David Szady, former head of the FBI's counterintelligence unit: "**if they can steal it** and do it in five years, **why [take longer] to develop it?"**<sup>xix</sup> **Rather than destroying US competitiveness through "cyberwar,"** former DNI

McConnell argues that **Chinese entities "are exploiting our systems for information advantage** – looking for the characteristics of a weapons system by a defense contractor or academic research on plasma physics, for example – not in order to destroy data and do damage."<sup>xx</sup>

Examples of Chinese cyber espionage to obtain science and technology can be divided into two broad categories: external and insider. The 2011 NCIX report offers three illustrative examples of insider cyber threats:

- David Yen Lee, a chemist with Valspar Corporation, used his access to internal computer networks between 2008 and 2009 to download approximately 160 secret formulas for paints and coatings to removable storage media. He intended to parlay this proprietary information to obtain a new job with Nippon Paint in Shanghai, China. Lee was arrested in March 2009, pleaded guilty to one count of theft of trade secrets, and was sentenced in December 2010 to 15 months in prison.

- Meng Hong, a DuPont research chemist, downloaded proprietary information on organic light-emitting diodes (OLED) in mid-2009 to his personal email account and thumb drive. He intended to transfer this information to Peking University, where he had accepted a faculty position, and sought Chinese government funding to commercialize OLED research. Hong was arrested in October 2009, pleaded guilty to one count of theft of trade secrets, and was sentenced in October 2010 to 14 months in prison.

- Xiangdong Yu (aka Mike Yu), a product engineer with Ford Motor Company, copied approximately 4,000 Ford documents onto an external hard drive to help obtain a job with a Chinese automotive company. He was arrested in October 2009, pleaded guilty to two counts of theft of trade secrets, and sentenced in April 2011 to 70 months in prison.<sup>xxi</sup>

External cyber threats to scientific and industrial data, believed to originate in China, have been well-documented in reports by outside vendors. Some examples include:

- In its Night Dragon report, McAfee documented "coordinated covert and targeted cyberattacks have been conducted against global oil, energy, and petrochemical companies," "targeting and harvesting sensitive competitive proprietary operations and project-financing information with regard to oil and gas field bids and operations."<sup>xxii</sup>

- In his Shady Rat report, McAfee's Dmitry Alperovitch identified 71 compromised organizations in one set of intrusions, including 13 defense contractors, 13 information technology companies, and 6 manufacturing companies.<sup>xxiii</sup>

- In January 2010, Google reported a "highly sophisticated and targeted attack on our corporate infrastructure originating from China that resulted in the theft of intellectual property," including source code.<sup>xxiv</sup> Google claimed that the intrusion also targeted "at least twenty other large companies from a wide range of businesses—including the Internet, finance, technology, media and chemical sectors," and was corroborated in separate admissions by Adobe,<sup>xxv</sup>

- In its GhostNet report, researchers at Information Warfare Monitor found 1,295 infected computers in 103 countries, including a range of political, diplomatic and economic target organizations such as Deloitte and Touche's New York office.<sup>xxvi</sup> The follow-on report, Shadows in the Cloud, identified additional targets, including Honeywell.<sup>xxvii</sup> Each of these reported intrusions were traced to IP addresses in China, and almost certainly represent only a fraction of the known hacks, given the reluctance of companies to report data breaches.

Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB)

**It is also important to contextualize China's interest in cyber espionage within Beijing's threat perceptions of potential scenarios for military conflict.** In the minds of the Chinese leadership, the **available evidence suggests that the most important political-military challenges and the most likely flashpoints** for Sino-US conflict **involve Taiwan or the South China Sea.** Should the late 1990s, the PLA has been hard at work bolstering the hedging options of the leadership, developing advanced campaign doctrines, testing the concepts in increasingly complex training and exercises, and integrating new indigenous and imported weapons systems.

Yet **cyber operations are also expected to play an important role in these scenarios, necessitating intelligence preparation of the cyber battlefield.** At the strategic level, the **writings of Chinese military authors suggest that there are two main centers of gravity in a Taiwan scenario, both of which can be attacked with computer network operations** in concert with other kinetic and non-kinetic capabilities. The first of these is the will of the Taiwanese people, which they hope to undermine through exercises, cyber attacks against critical infrastructure, missile attacks, SOF operations, and other operations that have a psyop focus. Based on assessments from the 1995-1996 exercises, as well as public opinion polling in Taiwan, China appears to have concluded that the Taiwanese people do not have the stomach for

conflict and will therefore sue for peace after suffering only a small amount of pain. The second center of gravity is the will and capability of the United States to intervene decisively in a cross-strait conflict. In a strategic sense, China has traditionally believed that its ICBM inventory, which is capable of striking CONUS, will serve as a deterrent to US intervention or at least a brake on escalation.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Closer to its borders, **the PLA has been engaged in an active program of equipment modernization**, purchasing niche "counter-intervention" capabilities such as anti-ship ballistic missiles, long-range cruise missiles and submarines to shape the operational calculus of the American carrier strike group commander on station.<sup>xxix</sup> According to the predictable cadre of "true believers," **both of the centers of gravity** identified above **can be attacked using computer network operations**. In the first case, the Chinese IO community believes that CNO will play a useful psychological role in undermining the will of the Taiwanese people by attacking infrastructure and economic vitality. In the second case, **the Chinese IO community envisions computer network attacks against unclassified NIPRNET** and its automated logistics systems **as an effective way to deter or delay US intervention into a military contingency** and thereby permit Beijing to achieve its political objectives with a minimum of fighting. In both cases, **China must conduct substantial computer network exploitation** (the military term for cyber espionage) **for intelligence preparation of this battlefield**, and the alleged intrusion set into NIPRNET computer systems would appear to fulfill this military requirement.

Why does the Chinese military believe that the deployment phase of US military operations, particularly the use of the unclassified NIPRNET for logistics deployments, is the primary focus of vulnerability? **Since DESERT STORM** in the early 1990s, **the PLA has expended significant resources analyzing** the operations of what it often and euphemistically terms "**the high-tech enemy**."<sup>xxx</sup> **When Chinese strategists contemplate how to affect US deployments, they confront the limitations of their current conventional force**, which does not have range sufficient to interdict US facilities or assets beyond the Japanese home islands.<sup>xxxi</sup> Nuclear options, while theoretically available, are nonetheless far too escalatory to be used so early in the conflict.<sup>xxxii</sup> Theater missile systems, which are possibly moving to a mixture of conventional and nuclear warheads, could be used against Japan or Guam, but uncertainties about the nature of a given warhead would likely generate responses similar to the nuclear scenario.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Instead, **PLA analysts of US military operations presciently concluded that the key vulnerability was the mechanics of deployment** itself. Specifically, **Chinese authors highlight DoD's need to use civilian backbone and unclassified computer networks** (known as the NIPRNET), which is a function of the requirements of global power projection, **as an "Achilles Heel."** **There is also recognition** of the fact **that operations in the Pacific are especially reliant on precisely coordinated transportation, communications, and logistics networks**, given what PACOM calls the "tyranny of distance"<sup>xxxiv</sup> in the theater. **PLA strategists believe that a disruptive computer network attack** against these systems or affiliated civilian systems **could potentially delay or degrade US force deployment to the region** while allowing the PRC to maintain a degree of plausible deniability.

**The Chinese are right to highlight** the **NIPRNET as an attractive and accessible target**, unlike its classified counterparts. It is attractive because it contains and transmits critical deployment information in the all-important time-phased force deployment list (known as the "tip-fiddle"), which is valuable for both intelligence-gathering about US military operations but also a lucrative target for disruptive attacks. In terms of accessibility, it was relatively easy to gather data about the NIPRNET from open sources, at least before 9/11. Moreover, **the very nature of the system is the source of its vulnerabilities, since the needs of global power project mandate**

that it has to be unclassified and connected to the greater global network, albeit through protected gateways.xxxv

DoD's classified networks, on the other hand, are an attractive but less accessible target for the Chinese. On the one hand, these networks would be an intelligence gold mine, and is likely a priority computer network exploit target. On the other hand, they are less attractive as a computer network attack target, thanks to the difficulty of penetrating its high defenses. Any overall Chinese military strategy predicated on a high degree of success in penetrating these networks during crisis or war is a high-risk venture, and increases the chances of failure of the overall effort to an unacceptable level.

**Chinese CNE or CNA operations** against logistics networks **could have a detrimental impact on US logistics support to operations. PRC computer network exploit activities** directed against US military logistics networks **could reveal force deployment information**, such as the names of ships deployed, readiness status of various units, timing and destination of deployments, and rendezvous schedules. **This is especially important for the Chinese in times of crisis**, since the PRC in peacetime utilizes US military web sites and newspapers as a principal source for deployment information. An article in October 2001 in People's Daily, for example, explicitly cited US Navy web sites for information about the origins, destination and purpose of two carrier battle groups exercising in the South China Sea.xxxvi Since the quantity and quality of deployment information on open websites has been dramatically reduced after 9/11, the intelligence benefits (necessity?) of exploiting the NIPRNET have become even more paramount.xxxvii Computer network attack could also delay re-supply to the theater by misdirecting stores, fuel, and munitions, corrupting or deleting inventory files, and thereby hindering mission capability.

## **China tech rise now—challenging Silicon Valley**

**The New Economy 2012** ("Silicon Valley: The new contenders," The New Economy, a quarterly magazine and website looking at technology and innovation in its wider business context, 1/18/12, <http://www.theneweconomy.com/strategy/silicon-valley-the-new-contenders>, IC)

In a bid to flaunt an innovation-based economy by 2020, **China is advancing swiftly into the realm of technology, and is now considered one of the strongest contenders to seriously challenge Silicon Valley**. Recognising the potential, foreign and native investors alike have raced to inject funds into the tech sector.

Although the Chinese tech environment is very much under development, its progress has passed the mere budding stage. Recognising the potential of the region, **an increasing number of top-notch entrepreneurs and major technology companies descend on the country** from across the globe, **turning their back on the sun-drenched destination that previously held their attention**. Indeed, **if there is a country in the world revelling in brain gain, it's China**.

Generous funding is not the only element that tempts the best in foreign minds to settle in China; **the country's culture of tech innovations is becoming a draw in its own right**. China might be known as the copy cat above all others ≥ be it in the field of hand bag design, technology or otherwise – but there's no doubt that the country has started to impress its surroundings with an environment that supports original ideas.

Already some **native companies are rising to position themselves as world leaders in innovation**. The Chinese internet conglomerate **Tencent boasts a stock market value that hovers just below** the names of leading lights such as **Google and Amazon**. Two other strong contenders are the leading e-commerce portal, Alibaba, and Huawei Technology, which has made its name pioneering next-generation mobile communication infrastructure. In the field of

computer engineering as well, **one of the fastest computers ever to be produced is the brainchild of Chinese engineers.** Collectively, these forward-thinking companies and products have helped to boost China's status to become viable forces in the tech sector.

As a way to flex its tech muscles to the world, **China plays host to one of the world's most important conferences on tech innovation and entrepreneurship.** CHINICT is an annual event that has now been running for eight years and next set to take place in Beijing in May 2012. The conference **attracts delegates from all over the world and the interest it generates is highly indicative of China's growing status** in the tech universe. As a result, the event has grown increasingly grandiose as the years have gone on.



## China scenario – return key to economy

### **Attracting overseas Chinese scholars back to China is key to their economy**

**Wang, Brookings Institute visiting fellow, 2010** (Huiyao, “China’s National Talent Plan: Key Measures and Objectives,” Brookings, 11/23/10, [http://robohub.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Brookings\\_China\\_1000\\_talent\\_Plan.pdf](http://robohub.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Brookings_China_1000_talent_Plan.pdf), IC)

**China** has also **enjoyed a huge trade surplus** for a number of years. **However, in terms of the exchange of rencai, it has suffered a major deficit. China has sent out 1.62 million students and scholars** since 1978, **but** as of today, **only 497,000 have returned** to China. The fact that the total number of returnees is now close to half a million was helped by the financial crisis in some developed countries: over 100,000 students returned to China in 2009 alone. Although the total return rate is now around 30 percent, the U.S. Energy Department’s Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education for the National Science Foundation reports that **the percentage of highly qualified Chinese rencai —such as U.S.-educated PhD graduates** in the sciences and engineering—**that remained in the United States stands at 92 percent**, the highest in the world (in comparison, for these highly qualified rencai, India’s stay rate is 81 percent, Taiwan’s is 43 percent, South Korea’s is 41 percent, Japan’s is 33 percent, Mexico’s is 32 percent and Thailand’s is 7 percent).as can be see from the table below.xiii

China has begun to recognize that **having financial resources is not enough: human resources must be prioritized** in today’s knowledge economy. Therefore, **methods for attracting human capital to China can have a profound impact on the country’s economic, political and social transformation.**

### **Increasing national talent is key to transitioning the Chinese economy from manufacturing to information technology**

**Wang, Brookings Institute visiting fellow, 2010** (Huiyao, “China’s National Talent Plan: Key Measures and Objectives,” Brookings, 11/23/10, [http://robohub.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Brookings\\_China\\_1000\\_talent\\_Plan.pdf](http://robohub.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Brookings_China_1000_talent_Plan.pdf), IC)

**The national talent development plan can be viewed as a new national strategy to transform China from a labor-intensive country into a talent-rich one.** Although this plan was established by the central government for implementation at the top levels of government, **the example set by the central government’s talent plan has already led** many Chinese **provincial and municipal governments to establish local talent development plans.** Through this, **there has been a new emphasis placed on talent development in many regions, which are in need of talented individuals now more than ever before. Guangdong** Province is a good example of this phenomenon, particularly since it **has been hit hard by the global financial crisis** and the subsequent closure of many labor-intensive manufacturing facilities in the province. There, CCP Politburo Member and provincial Party Chief Wang Yang chaired a study meeting for all top provincial leaders on this author’s book National Strategy—Talents Change World on May 22 of this year.xxxiii The aforementioned **Foxconn serial labor suicides and the strikes at Toyota and Honda all happened in Guangdong** this year. Thus, **Guangdong needs** to find **a new strategy to upgrade its industries and maintain its growth.** In 2007, Guangdong’s GDP, after overtaking those of Singapore and Hong Kong, surpassed that of Taiwan.xxxiv However, while the financial crisis was still impacting Guangdong in 2010 and it continued to face various new challenges to

its economy, the daunting tasks facing Guangdong are not unique to the province; they are in fact challenges faced by the whole country.

Cheap labor has fueled China's development miracle over the past three decades, but that model, focused mainly on manufacturing, requiring high resources and energy consumption and resulting in a heavy toll on the environment, has led China to a crossroads. China needs to find a new growth engine and a new effective stimulus, which will require changing the mindset regarding investment that has dominated the past 30 years. While China's past success was built on its population dividend, its future growth will rely on the new strategy set forth by this newly adopted national talent development plan.

## AT Mexican immigration solves

**Mexican immigration can't solve – structural barriers means they wouldn't be able to fill the IT industry**

**Alarcon, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte [College of the Northern Border] faculty member, 2000**

(Rafael, "Migrants of the Information Age: Indian and Mexican Engineers and Regional Development in Silicon Valley," Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, Working Paper No. 16, May 2000, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2811q36q>, p. 14-15, IC)

This comparative view of industrial policy in India and Mexico yields interesting insights. The Indian and Mexican governments went from an import substitution strategy of industrialization to economic liberalization at about the same time. In the case of Mexico this process has been more radical. The two governments faced a consistent policy on the part of IBM and responded differently. **The departure of IBM from India** and the absence of a strong domestic computer industry **forced** India to rely on imports from many sources. As a result of this, **Indian programmers** were forced **to acquire a very eclectic training that is crucial in today's global labor market for software production** (Parthasarathy, 2000). During the 1980s, the city of Bangalore, "India's Silicon Valley" supplied in addition to software products, large numbers of highly skilled, low-wage software engineers and programmers who took jobs in the United States and other countries. Currently, it is estimated that there are nearly 140,000 Indian scientists working abroad (Stremlau, 1996). In contrast, **the relative success of Mexico in creating a national industry** to locally produce computers, is one factor that **helps explain the relative small number of Mexican engineers and scientists who seek employment in the United States**. Conclusion This article has shown that immigration policy has been a powerful instrument in the creation of immigrant "niches" in the labor markets. **While Indians have clustered in the information technology industry, Mexicans have formed "niches" in low-skilled industries such as agriculture**. The review of the relationship between immigration policy and the requirements of the information technology industry reveals two important conclusions. First, the **changes on immigration policy** of the mid-1960s **instituted a selection process that facilitated the immigration of Indians with high levels of education**. This is the main factor that explains why these immigrants are so highly educated and why they concentrate in the high technology industry. Portes and Rumbaut (1996) contend that **unlike Europeans and some Latin Americans** (such as the Mexicans), **Asians and Africans could not use family reunification to enter** the United States. **There were few immigrants from those countries living in the United States;** hence, **the only path open** to them **was** the use of **occupational skills**. For this reason, at least in the immediate period after the implementation of the act, **most of the Indians who entered the United States** using employment-based visas **were highly educated. This** initial movement **created a strong network of highly educated Indian immigrants**. That situation began to change as family reunification and refugee policy allowed the immigration of less skilled persons. On the other hand, the **Mexican immigrants constitute the largest group of unskilled workers because geographical propinquity has lessened the selection process by lowering the** economic and social **costs of immigration**. In addition, specific immigration U.S. policies, direct recruitment, and the development of social networks have encouraged the immigration of unskilled workers.

In regards to the effect of industrial policies in India and Mexico, Parthasarathy (2000) contends that **the ability of Indians to become "global software engineers" is the result of industrial policies implemented by the Indian government supporting the development of the software**

**industry**. The departure of IBM from India in 1978, and the failure of the country to develop a domestic viable computer industry forced most Indian users to rely on imports that came from many sources. Thus, during the 1970s and 1980s Indian programmers learned how to work on a variety of platforms without being tied to any single one Parthasarathy (2000). In contrast, **Mexico has solidified its role as the preferred location for** inbound **manufacturing in the electronics industry**, and now expanding under NAFTA.

## AT no labor shortage

**Even if there's no labor shortage, high-skilled laborers massively boost the economy by increasing productivity**

**Nowrasteh, Cato Institute Immigration Policy Analyst, 2015** (Alex, "Allow Highly Skilled Immigration and Boost the Economy," The Cato Institute, 1/21/15, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/allow-highly-skilled-immigration-boost-economy>, IC)

As virtually all the research shows, **attracting more high-skilled immigrants will stimulate economic growth and job creation by boosting innovation and productivity.**

Hatch touted I-Squared by writing that even "[t]he president recognizes we face a high-skilled worker shortage that has become a national crisis." **Although there are tight labor markets for some high-tech occupations, the information sector is not one of them,** and it's by no means a national crisis. Wages for computer scientists, many engineers, and scientists are growing more quickly than for other occupations, but wage increases and a tight labor market are not the same as a shortage.

**The real benefits of I-Squared wouldn't come from filling jobs in "shortage" occupations,** which don't exist for most technology occupations, **but from increasing the productivity of the American economy.**

"The **productivity gains from immigrant inventions** and innovations **are tremendous.**"

Economists at Rutgers and Princeton found that **a 1-percentage-point increase in college-educated immigrants** as a share of the population **increased patents per capita by 9 percent to 18 percent.** Economists from Harvard and the University of Michigan also found **a 10 percent increase in the number of workers with H-1B visas** in a city **boosts the entire city's patent output by almost 1 percent,** a huge increase given the small numbers of H-1Bs relative to the workforce. They concluded that **H-1B workers boost patents and innovation so much that they have a significant effect on long-term economic growth while also creating more jobs** for Americans with similar skills.

The productivity gains from immigrant inventions and innovations are tremendous. **From 1990 to 2010, 10 percent to 25 percent of the total combined productivity growth across 219 American cities was caused by H-1B workers in** the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (**STEM**) **professions.** Those **large gains occurred not just because of patenting but because skilled immigrants have different skills than Americans** with similar educations. **A larger, more diversely skilled immigrant workforce** in the STEM occupations **boosts wages and jobs** for American workers.

Influential research by University of California, Berkeley, economist Charles Jones found that **50 percent of U.S. productivity growth from 1950 to 1993 could be attributed to growth in** the share of **scientists and engineers in the workforce.** I-Squared's reforms to the H-1B system could more than triple the annual flow of engineers and scientists into the United States. If history is any guide, **I-Squared's increase in those occupations could jump-start the U.S. economy for decades** to come.

The bill, of course, does more than liberalize the H-1B visa. It also boosts the number of employment-based green cards for highly skilled immigrants, more than doubling them by creating numerous exemptions. **Skilled immigrants** with green cards **are very entrepreneurial,** as are immigrants at every skill level.

**Between 1995 and 2005, 25.3 percent of all technology and engineering firms** established in the United States **had** at least **one immigrant founder**. **In Silicon Valley, 43.9 percent of** technology and engineering **startups had at least one immigrant co-founder** between 2005 and 2012. **Company creation is a big driver of employment growth** and innovation, **and immigrants do a lot of it.**

## AT low-skill solves

### **High-skilled immigration is uniquely key for entrepreneurship**

**Mustos, Eötvös Loránd University Master of Laws, 2014** (Anita, “The Age of Migration: Open Borders Pros and Cons,” Thesis submitted to Eötvös Loránd University Law University, consulting Boldizsár Nagy, Eötvös Loránd University department of international relations associate professor, 9/12/14, [http://www.unleashingideas.org/global-entrepreneurship-library/sites/grl/files/anita\\_mustos\\_-\\_thesis\\_2014.pdf](http://www.unleashingideas.org/global-entrepreneurship-library/sites/grl/files/anita_mustos_-_thesis_2014.pdf), p. 26, IC)

The contribution of **highly skilled immigrants** can be various: they **fuel knowledge creation at the universities, offer technical skills combined with international cultural knowledge and diverse perspectives** to the research and development teams of U.S. businesses. Also, **they build up their own businesses and create jobs for inhabitants and for other immigrants**. On the other hand, **they enable employers to fill vacancies at the different levels of skills and experience continuum**.

The case of **low-skilled immigration** is more complex. In one hand, they **fulfil the demand for nontradable**, -with other words- in-person **services but also their overrepresentation in these jobs** (child care, cleaning and maintenance, gardening, hairdressing or manicuring, health care etc.) **may exacerbate the barriers that the lowest skilled individuals already face in the labour market, especially when the lessskilled nationals have to compete with cheap unathorized immigrant workforce**.

### **H-1B key to innovation**

**Mustos, Eötvös Loránd University Master of Laws, 2014** (Anita, “The Age of Migration: Open Borders Pros and Cons,” Thesis submitted to Eötvös Loránd University Law University, consulting Boldizsár Nagy, Eötvös Loránd University department of international relations associate professor, 9/12/14, [http://www.unleashingideas.org/global-entrepreneurship-library/sites/grl/files/anita\\_mustos\\_-\\_thesis\\_2014.pdf](http://www.unleashingideas.org/global-entrepreneurship-library/sites/grl/files/anita_mustos_-_thesis_2014.pdf), p. 32-33, IC)

The rapidly growing and shifting high-tech industry requires a large pool of specific skills. **The overwhelming majority of H-1B visas are issued to foreign professionals in STEM fields**, such as information technology, life sciences, and materials sciences. These are typically engineers, scientists, doctors, nurses, professors, and researchers.<sup>62</sup>

The available supply for this specific demand cannot be measured by the sheer number of U.S. STEM degree holders. Foreign workers may outcompete but do not crowd out their native rivals. Wadhwa suggests also that the H-1B opponents do not take into account the lack of labor mobility or the number of STEM holders who decide to leave this competitive field of industry for other pursuits.

Finally, the most simplistic argument against H-1B opponents lies in numbers. **Research has found that a higher concentration of H-1B holders in STEM fields actually boost invention**. The two-thirds of H-1B visas are issued for positions in the STEM fields and **more than two-thirds of those STEM-based visas go to applicants from India and China where apparently more than fifty percent of the world’s undergraduate engineering degrees are earned**.<sup>63</sup>

As Brookings’ data shows, H-1B holders are concentrated in metropolitan areas and in innovative research centers such as New York or the Silicon Valley where unemployment rates for bachelor degree holders are relatively marginal. This means that **“where there is innovation and economic growth, there is a great demand for U.S. and foreign workers.”**<sup>64</sup>

In conclusion, Vivek Wadhwa notes:

**“In a global competition for talent, U.S. companies and institutions say they must seek the best talent, whatever the nationality of the candidate.”<sup>65</sup>**



## AT wages DA

### **H1-B visa immigration doesn't depress wages**

**Melugin, CEI Adjunct Fellow, 2001** (Jessica P., "High-Tech Immigration," Competitive Enterprise Institute, Tech Briefing 2001, p. 37, IC)

**The H1-B program is sometimes accused of exerting downward pressure on wages for US-born technology workers. But according to a Commerce Department study, "It seems clear from both government and non-government data, that the compensation level for IT professionals is both high and rising." The study cites salary growth estimates ranging from 3 to 4 percent up to double-digit growth.<sup>7</sup> So while it may be true that H1-B workers are preventing US salaries from skyrocketing (which would be to the detriment of consumers and the US economy in general), visa holders are certainly not depressing wages in the tech sector.**

### **H1-B visas don't result in unethically low wages for foreign-born workers**

**Melugin, CEI Adjunct Fellow, 2001** (Jessica P., "High-Tech Immigration," Competitive Enterprise Institute, Tech Briefing 2001, p. 37, IC)

**Because employers are obligated to pay H1-B workers at least the wage paid to their native-born counterparts, foreign-born workers are protected from inappropriately low wages. Very few instances of noncompliance with this requirement have been found. Close to 525,000 non-immigrant petitions were granted between 1991 and 1999; during that time, 134 violations were found, and only seven were determined "willful" violations of the law.<sup>8</sup> Contrary to some critics' accusations, an average of one intentional violation per year does not a slave-labor scheme make.**

## AT we go over cap

### Still has an economic impact

**Kirkegaard, Peterson Institute for International Economics senior fellow with a PhD from Johns Hopkins, 2015** (Jacob Funk, “The Economic Scope and Future of US-India Labor Migration Issues,” Peterson Institute for International Economics, February 2015, <http://www.piie.com/publications/wp/wp15-1.pdf>, p. 9, IC)

Lines 10 and 11 in table 5 show the annual congressional H-1B cap and the date on which it was reached<sup>17</sup> (and/or the number of petitions filed on the first of day of visa availability). It is clear that **the cap is of limited importance to the actual number of H-1B petitions approved** each year: the numbers reported in line 1 show the approval of 3–4 times as many H-1B visas as stipulated by the cap. This is by legislative intent, as the law exempts all H-1B visas for continuing employment (grey-shaded areas in table 5), as well as H-1Bs for initial employment, if the petitioner is an institution of higher education (or its affiliated or related nonprofit entities), a nonprofit research organization, or a government research organization.<sup>18</sup> In other words, the H-1B cap is applied almost exclusively to private businesses hiring new foreign employees on H-1B visas. And as table 5 shows, even those for initial employment can exceed the congressional cap substantially; indeed, the only time this was not the case was in FY2010. These data further highlight the importance of the H-1B program to nonprofit, research, and higher education organizations in the United States.

Since the mid-2000s, H-1B visas have become available on April 1 for the following fiscal year. The data (line 11) show that **the congressional cap is frequently met within months—and in 2008 and 2009, during the Great Recession, the allocated number was exhausted on the very first day of availability**.<sup>19</sup> Thus **in recent years US-located firms have**, often for a number of months, **not had access to new foreign high-skilled employees on H-1B visas**. So **although the actual number of H-1B visas exceeds the cap, it is a mistake to assume that** the effects of the cap are uniform or that **its economic impact is negligible**.

## AT domestic crowd-out

**Turn—high-skilled immigrants increase jobs for US natives—we have statistics**  
**Zavodny, Agnes Scott College economics professor, 2011** (Madeline, “Immigration and American Jobs,” American Enterprise Institute, 12/15/11, [http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/-immigration-and-american-jobs\\_144002688962.pdf](http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/-immigration-and-american-jobs_144002688962.pdf), p. 10, IC)

**Immigrants with advanced degrees** from US universities **who work in STEM fields dramatically boost employment for US natives**. During 2000–2007, **a 10 percent increase in the share of such workers boosted the US-born employment rate by 0.04 percent**. Evaluating this at the average numbers of foreign- and US-born workers during that period, this implies that **every additional 100 foreign-born workers** who earned an advanced degree in the United States and then worked in STEM fields **led to an additional 262 jobs for US natives**. (See Table 2)

In addition, immigrants with advanced degrees in general boost employment for US natives. The overall share of workers who are immigrants with an advanced degree (from foreign and US universities) working in a STEM occupation is also positively associated with the native employment rate. During 2000–2007, **a 10 percent increase in the share of workers who are immigrants with advanced degrees working in STEM boosted the US-born employment rate by 0.03 percent**. **This translates into every additional 100 foreign-born workers with an advanced degree working in a STEM occupation creating about eighty-six additional jobs for US-born workers**. The estimates also indicate that **simply increasing the number of immigrants with advanced degrees** working in all fields, not just STEM, **would increase American employment**. A 10 percent increase in the share of all workers who are immigrants with advanced degrees boosted the native employment rate by 0.08 percent during 2000–2007. In other words, each additional 100 foreign-born workers with an advanced degree created about forty-four additional jobs for US natives.<sup>20</sup> (See Table 1)

### **Immigration increases employment for native workers**

**Melugin, CEI Adjunct Fellow, 2001** (Jessica P., “High-Tech Immigration,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, Tech Briefing 2001, p. 37, IC)

**Substantial economic evidence refutes the proposition that increased immigration decreases employment for native workers**. Indeed, some **studies, and** considerable **practical experience, show that the opposite** is true. **In California’s Silicon Valley, immigrants founded one out of every five firms and are currently running one-quarter of the high-tech companies**. In 1998, **these companies** collectively **provided** more than **50,000 jobs and accounted for almost \$20 billion in sales**.<sup>5</sup> One recent study shows that **admitting an extra 50,000 H1-B workers would mean \$5.5 billion in wealth transferred from other nations to the United States**.<sup>6</sup>

### **No crowd-out—no reason to prefer immigrants**

**Melugin, CEI Adjunct Fellow, 2001** (Jessica P., “High-Tech Immigration,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, Tech Briefing 2001, p. 37-38, IC)

**Another criticism** often leveled against the H1-B program **is that foreign workers displace native-born tech professionals**. **Given the number of high-tech jobs that are now unfilled, this claim makes no sense**. It also **assumes** that **US companies would rather hire H1-B visa holders than US workers**. But **why would they?** As noted, **a company cannot** expect to **save any money**

in wages because of the legal obligation to pay foreign-born workers and native workers equivalent salaries. Also, the time, trouble, and cost involved in obtaining an H1-B visa and in securing an H1-B candidate make native hiring far preferable to most employers. If qualified US workers can begin work immediately and with no hassles, why would anyone choose to navigate through a sea of fees, attorneys, specialized consultants, complicated forms, and long delays?

## **High skilled workers make up for any education subsidies and don't crowd out domestic jobs**

**Nowrasteh, Cato Institute Immigration Policy Analyst, 2010** (Alex, "H-1B Visas: A Case for Open Immigration of Highly Skilled Foreign Workers," Competitive Enterprise Institute, October 2010, <https://cei.org/sites/default/files/Alex%20Nowrasteh%20-%20H1-B%20Visas.pdf>, p. 13-14, IC)

It is often said that America is falling behind in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (known as the STEM fields). That is debatable, yet even if it were true that America is falling behind in these fields, the country's number of scientists and engineers can be increased relatively quickly and easily by allowing the educated foreigners of the world to migrate to the U.S.

As mentioned previously, less than 1 percent of H-1B applicants had less than a bachelor's degree, 43 percent had a bachelor's degree, 41 percent had a master's degree, 11 percent had a doctorate, and 5 percent had professional degrees.<sup>64</sup> They are a highly educated group and many of them pursue educational opportunities in the United States prior, during, or after becoming H-1B workers. The number of STEM degrees awarded to foreign students studying in America is substantial. Between 2003 and 2007, nonresident aliens earned 143,391 bachelor's degrees, 255,267 master's degrees, and 49,532 doctorates in STEM.<sup>65</sup> According to estimates based on survey data and an assumed annual emigration rate of 3.2 percent, 50,187 bachelor's, 117,634 master's, and 14,960 doctorates from the group above would have remained in the U.S. had visa rules allowed them.<sup>66</sup>

Foreign-born graduate students do not crowd out American students from advanced programs.<sup>67</sup> They tend to fill new spots rather than displace qualified Americans.<sup>68</sup> The number of PhDs awarded to Americans has not changed in recent decades, but the departments have expanded tremendously to accommodate increasing numbers of foreign students.

Additionally, highly skilled, foreign-born workers do not use public education funds. Education is the single largest component of state and local government spending, absorbing roughly a third of all state and local expenditures.<sup>69</sup> The average per pupil cost of public primary and secondary education is approximately \$9,600 per year.<sup>70</sup> Highly skilled foreign workers on H-1B visas are, by and large, already educated once they receive their work documents. They do not receive state funding for primary and secondary education.

Students already working in the U.S. on H-1B visas can typically receive in-state tuition for state universities if they become residents of the state in which they are working. This may qualify as an example of taxpayers subsidizing the education of foreign-born workers—though the workers still pay. This is a relatively minor problem that would be best addressed by states reforming their in-state tuition policies. Moreover, if highly skilled foreign workers were allowed to live and work in the U.S. indefinitely after completing their education, the increased

**tax revenue would more than offset the modest public education subsidy.** The amount of annual federal tax revenue foregone by forcing STEM graduates to leave the country is approximately \$3.6 billion.<sup>71</sup> That makes up for state university subsidies.



## **Politics DA Links**





# Solvency Answers



## 1nc circumvention – executive

### **Executive ignores the plan**

**Kretsedemas 11** - PhD. Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts Director, Undergraduate Studies in Sociology @ U Mass Boston  
(Philip, "Immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, Nation, and the Limits of the Law," Ebrary)//BB

The political process I describe extends to immigration policy. It also bears noting that **there has always been a special relationship between immigration policy and the discretionary authority of the executive office. Because the immigration system falls under the direct oversight of the executive office it is amenable to the prerogatives of executive authority.** Although the immigration system is accountable to the immigration laws enacted by Congress, the interpretation of these laws is often carried out by judges and administrators directly appointed by the executive office. As a result, **important policy decisions can be routinely shaped by negotiations that take place outside of the legislative process.**<sup>a</sup> Consider U.S. policy on refugee resettlement, which has been shaped as much by the diplomacy of the U.S. executive office as by the legislative acts of Congress. Examples include the arrangements that the Clinton administration made with the Jamaican government to process Haitian asylum seekers in Jamaican waters (Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees 1994), the Bush administration's subsequent executive orders aimed specifically at deterring a mass exodus of Haitian refugees to the shores of South Florida (Wasem 2005), and the multifarious reasons that have led the U.S. government to award temporal\*' protected status to foreign nationals fleeing political persecution and natural disasters (Wasem and Ester 2008).<sup>a</sup> In all of these cases, **the executive office is not merely defining the rights that particular categories of noncitizens have under the law, it is also making decisions about whether particular categories of noncitizens have the right to have rights.** At what point—or to what extent—can these persons be said to fall under the jurisdiction of U.S. law? **Post-9/11 anti-terrorist investigations show just how indeterminate this process can be.** Suspects can be removed from the normal protections of law and held for secret **reasons in secret locations, and these same individuals can be returned to the law, sometimes without being charged with a single criminal or civil violation** (Cole 2000a; Ifitikhar 2008).

### **Circumvention is even true under Obama**

**Kretsedemas 11** - PhD. Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts Director, Undergraduate Studies in Sociology @ U Mass Boston  
(Philip, "Immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, Nation, and the Limits of the Law," Ebrary)//BB

**Despite the fact that Democratic administrations are often viewed as being more proimmigrant than Republican administrations, recent Democrat administrations have actually been tougher on border control and immigration enforcement. The peak years for border patrol apprehensions (in all of U.S. history) occurred between 1996 and 2000, during the last term of the Clinton presidency.**<sup>28</sup> The 1996 immigration and antiterrorism laws, which laid the foundations for the recent expansion of immigration enforcement, were also enacted

under the Clinton administration.<sup>30</sup> By contrast, border enforcement under the Bush administration fell by an average of five hundred thousand apprehensions per year, compared to the peak years that occurred under the second term of the Clinton administration. Ironically, the Bush administration continued to enact laws and approve budgetary proposals that expanded the size of the border patrol (Deborah Meyers 2005). The peak years in the annual growth and absolute size of the unauthorized migrant population also occurred under the tenure of the Bush administration<sup>30</sup>—so these low enforcement levels cannot be explained by a decline in the number of unauthorized border crossings (even though this does begin to occur in 2007 with the onset of the global recession). The Bush administration's initial proposal for a new guest worker program also contained no new enforcement provisions, making it the "least militarized" of all of the proposals that were initially put forward by Republicans and Democrats in the Senate.<sup>31</sup> From all appearances, the Bush administration's stance on unauthorized migration and border control was a faithful replication of the wink-and-nod attitude that the U.S. government has historically adopted toward<sup>32</sup> unauthorized Mexican migrant labor in the Southwest.<sup>32</sup> Meanwhile, **over the last several decades the political climate surrounding immigration has forced the government to adopt a much tougher stance on all kinds of immigration violations.** As a result, the position of the U.S. government on unauthorized migration has become much more complex. For example, the Bush administration criticized the vigilante enforcement efforts of the Minutemen movement and became bitter enemies with immigration restrictionists in the House of Representatives, increased spending on border patrol, and touted its efforts to control unauthorized migration (efforts that were not very effective), advocated for the legalization of unauthorized migrants and the expansion of the guest worker program, affirmed the U.S. government's commitment to protecting immigrant rights, and affirmed the inherent right of local authorities to enforce federal immigration laws (Kretsedemas 2008a).<sup>33</sup> One of the most remarkable things about this assortment of policy positions is not its incoherency, but the fact that it is not markedly different from that of other contemporary administrations (from the Reagan-Bush era to the Obama presidency). There have been some notable differences in the way different administrations have weighted these priorities, but the general tendency has been to move forward on all these fronts—strengthening enforcement, facilitating the expansion of migration flows, fending off the more hard-line proposals of the immigration control movement, and advancing laws that generally weaken immigrant rights (while attempting to protect immigrant rights in some narrow areas). This orientation toward immigration policy is largely responsible for the enforcement trends and the changing relationship between immigrant and nonimmigrant flows (see chapter 2).<sup>34</sup> **The priorities that underlie these decisions are similar to the logic of executive discretion, and many of these policy decisions have been facilitated by the use of this discretion. Nothing is set in stone. The goal is to be able to adapt existing policy to an array of unexpected contingencies.** Hence, support for immigrant rights—including the rights of unauthorized migrants—does not translate into support for the uniform reinstatement of social, civil, and labor rights that have been eroded by the past several decades of neoliberal restructuring. **Even when the executive office uses its authority to selectively strengthen immigrant rights, this does not necessarily result in the creation of a formal, legal precedent** (that could be referenced by immigrant rights advocates in the legal arguments they are using in local and federal courts). **Instead these decisions tend to function as an affirmation of executive discretion over the expansion or protection of immigrant rights.**<sup>33</sup> In a similar vein, executive support for immigration enforcement tends to translate into support for the discretionary use of

these expanded enforcement powers (which fall under the authority of the executive office). In contrast to immigration restrictionists, recent administrations have shown no signs that they are interested in effecting a long-term decline in immigration levels. Nevertheless, **there are situations in which an intensification of immigration enforcement**—including strategies that resemble the mass deportation proposals of immigration restrictionists—**could be deemed "necessary" for a variety of political and economic reasons**. A good example is 1954's Operation Wetback, which was used to terminate the Bracero program initiated almost a decade earlier. Under Operation Wetback, the U.S. immigration system deported almost 1 million Mexican nationals (Ngai 2005,127-166).

### **CBP will continue to surveil, even if it's illegal**

**Magalí and Chávez 11.**(Murià Magalí is a lecturer at the University of California in San Diego and focuses on US-Mexico Border studies, Chávez Sergio is an assistant professor of sociology at Rice University. He received his B.A. in sociology from the University of California Davis and his Ph.D. from Cornell University. Dr. Chávez has conducted field research in Tijuana and Guanajuato, Mexico and North Carolina on internal and international migration, labor markets, social networks and border studies) "Shopping and Working in the Borderlands, Enforcement, Surveillance, and Marketing in Tijuana, Mexico" Surveillance and Society, p. 365, 2011  
<http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/viewFile/4169/4171//droneofark>

People crossing the border then share a constant fear of arbitrariness, because **it is hard to predict when an inspector decides who poses a risk**. In fact, **the lack of transparency of their standards, criteria and procedures, turns surveillance technologies into the tip of an iceberg, the visible fragment of an invisible system of control, a virtual infrastructure that occasionally becomes evident, when it is used against particular individuals**. We interviewed, for instance, people who have seen their visas revoked for reasons as strange as carrying a Starbucks receipt, because the agent saw it as evidence that the crosser may be holding an illegal job. **At this point, the vast array of high end technological devises, biometric cards, sensors and databases, seem to be combined with the visual discrimination agents conduct in their daily routines**: Whether trying to keep people out or helping them come in, **border officials must rely heavily on strategies like race and class profiling, and individualized conceptions of risk and harm when doing their jobs. While these policies are not officially sanctioned, the impetus for such profiling remains strong**" (Wonders 2006, 80).

## 1nc circumvention – states

### **Decreasing federal border security causes states, localities and individuals to fill-in**

**Barry 11** – Senior Policy Analyst @ CIP, authored or co-authored more than twenty books on Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, food aid, the United Nations, free trade and U.S. foreign policy

(Tom, “Policy on the Edge: Failures of Border Security and New Directions for Border Control,” Center for Int’l Policy, <http://www.ciponline.org/research/html/failures-of-border-security-and-new-directions-for-border-control>)//BB

Yet **the federal government’s continued expressions of its commitment to border security only serve to** highlight the shortcomings of this commitment and to **spark opposition to** long overdue **immigration reform**. **“Secure the border”—a political demand echoed by immigration restrictionists, grassroots anti-immigrant activists and a chorus of politicians—now resounds as a battle cry against the federal government** and liberal immigration reformers. These **border security hawks charge that the federal government is failing to** meet its responsibility to **secure the border**, pointing to continued illegal crossings by immigrants and drug traffickers. **Border**

**sheriffs**, **militant activists** and **state legislatures** have even **started taking border security into their own hands**.<sup>4</sup> **The post-9/11 imperative of securing the homeland set off a widely played game of one-upmanship that has had Washington, border politicians and sheriffs, political activists and vigilantes competing to be regarded as the most serious and hawkish**

**on border security**. The emotions and concerns unleashed by the 9/11 attacks exacerbated the long-running practice of using the border security issue to further an array of political agendas—immigration crackdowns, border pork-barrel projects, drug wars, states’ rights and even liberal immigration reform. Yet these new commitments to control the border have been largely expressions of public diplomacy rather than manifestations of new thinking about the border. In his ground-breaking 2001 study of border enforcement, *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide*, border scholar Peter Andreas rightly observed that **border policing has “some of the features of a ritualized spectator sport,”** noting that the game metaphor reflects the “performance and audience-driven nature” of the politics of border control.<sup>5</sup> As the politics of border security in Texas and Arizona so well illustrate, **“secure the border” is a rallying cry that energizes constituencies**, catapults politicians to office and produces a steady stream of Fox News appearances for prominent border security hawks. It also diverts the debate over border policies far away from any reflective discussion of the structural causative factors producing the border crisis.

### **Restrictionists are waiting in the wings---they’ll use the plan to ramp up state immigration authority**

**Kretsedemas 11** - PhD. Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts Director, Undergraduate Studies in Sociology @ U Mass Boston

(Philip, “Immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, Nation, and the Limits of the Law,” Ebrary)//BB

In this case, the extralegal powers of the state would appear to be aligned with a free flow position on immigration. But **the U.S. government** also **has a long history of cultivating zones of discretionary authority** that predate the latest phase of globalization and **that are** more closely

related to governing strategies used to control racial minority populations. In this case, the deployment of discretionary authority' drifts in the direction of "states' rights" arguments, which give local authorities freedom to craft laws and enforcement practices that are not strictly beholden to federal laws and constitutional standards. These sorts of arguments are currently being revived by immigration restrictionists who want to expand the authority of state and local governments on immigration matters so that they can more aggressively pursue unauthorized migrants.

### **This recreates Jim Crow-era exclusions**

**Kretsedemas 11** - PhD. Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts Director, Undergraduate Studies in Sociology @ U Mass Boston  
(Philip, "Immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, Nation, and the Limits of the Law," Ebrary)//BB

The last chapter examined immigration policy from the vantage point of the executive office. This chapter engages a very different political terrain, but one that is no less complex: immigration laws that have been enacted by state and local governments. On one hand, local immigration laws seem to be an apt example of the expansion of executive authority under neoliberalism (see chapter 3). Similar to recent experiments with deregulation and federal devolution, local immigration laws have allowed the authority of the federal government to be parceled out to a variety of state and nonstate actors. This has produced a situation in which police officers, landlords, election booth workers, and health care workers have been given more freedom to participate in enforcement practices that used to be regarded as the exclusive preserve of the federal immigration system. But this expanded discretionary authority is not always used in ways that are consistent with the federal government's priorities for immigration. Furthermore, this kind of discretionary authority is connected to a legal history, and to ideas about popular sovereignty, that predate neoliberalism. The push to get more local governments involved in immigration enforcement has also been a major objective of the immigration control movement, and many of these laws are informed by an economic nationalist agenda that is directly opposed to the idea that employers should have access to a free flow of migrant labor. So even though some of these laws may have further extended the "long arm" of the federal government into the realm of state and local affairs, they have also become a heated battleground that has the potential to undermine the federal government's policy priorities and enforcement objectives. Irrespective of how this struggle is resolved, these laws are clearly a matter of concern for immigrant populations. Although local immigration laws deploy race-neutral language, it is hard to deny that there is a racial undertone to the popular discourse on illegal immigration, which is one reason local enforcement practices have been criticized for encouraging a new kind of Latino profiling (Appleseed 2008; Muchetti 2005; Shahani and Greene 2009). These concerns are pertinent to the issues I explore in this chapter, but the scope of my analysis is much broader than this. The primary aim of this chapter is to explain how local immigration laws connect to a history of legal rationales and political dynamics that have been used to justify the discriminatory treatment of minority populations in the United States. In making these connections, my discussion draws parallels with the Jim Crow laws enacted by hundreds of state and municipal governments in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

## 2nc states/localities

**Illegal immigration causes states and localities to take enforcement into their own hands---the plan can't solve because they only fiat the removal of federal enforcement efforts---that's Barry**

**States will use interior enforcement to nullify the effect of the plan**

**Mayer 9** – former professor @ THE OSU

(Matt, "Controlling Illegal Immigration: State and Local Governments Must Do More," <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/08/controlling-illegal-immigration-state-and-local-governments-must-do-more>)//BB

Starting in 2004, state legislatures began to assert themselves in the area of illegal immigration as the numbers problem equated to busted budgets and increasing societal burdens. Although the activity level in 2004 seems low today, at the time, the increase in bills passed that dealt with one of six aspects of illegal immigration caused a stir. By 2008, the increase in activity at the state level had jumped to 1,305 bills introduced and **209 bills passed**. The primary areas of action were (1) driver's licenses and identification, (2) public benefits, (3) higher education benefits, (4) voting security, (5) criminal sanctions, and (6) employment. As states began to reclaim their historical roles and authorities under the Constitution, interest groups supportive of illegal immigration began their assaults in the courtrooms.

Constitutionally, other than in the areas of border security and visa policy, the Tenth Amendment ensures that states **retain their traditional police powers** to control their jurisdictions. Despite the enormous growth of the federal government from 1935 to today, states remain the "laboratories of democracy," exhibiting the flexibility to develop innovative solutions to America's toughest challenges. On interior illegal-immigration enforcement issues, states and localities are doing what they can to solve their problems.

**State fill-in is historically proven**

**Armacost 15** – Professor @ University of Virginia School of Law

(Barbara, "The Enforcement Pathologies of Immigration Policing," Public Law and Legal Theory 2015-19)//BB

It is conventional wisdom that "the power to regulate immigration is unquestionably . . . a federal power."<sup>32</sup> While federal exclusivity does not prohibit every state enactment that "in any way deals with aliens," only the federal government can "regulate immigration, which is essentially a determination of who should or who should not be admitted into the country, and the conditions under which a legal entrant may remain."<sup>33</sup> The assertion that immigration is the unique preserve of the national, political branches has been elaborated by legal scholars and repeated by countless federal courts. **In reality, however, states have historically been and continue to be** involved in immigration enforcement, both by Congressional design and through the increasing popularity of state immigration legislation.

**Arizona v US leaves ample room for state immigration enforcement**

**Armacost 15** – Professor @ University of Virginia School of Law

(Barbara, "The Enforcement Pathologies of Immigration Policing," Public Law and Legal Theory 2015-19)//BB



So **what is left of state immigration policing after Arizona v. United States?** **Much indeed!** On the one hand, the Court affirmed that the federal government “remains in firm control of the final immigration treatment of anyone stopped and identified by [state] officers.”<sup>94</sup> On the other hand, **the Court explicitly acknowledged that the states have a significant interest in immigration policy because they bear many of the consequences related to illegal immigrant populations.**<sup>95</sup> **The Supreme Court affirmed the states’ power to protect these interests through immigration enforcement** that is conducted as an adjunct to (but does not prolong) stops and arrests for other crimes. Given that police have myriads of interactions with citizens in the process of enforcing traffic laws and investigating ordinary crime, **this holding creates significant space for state immigration policing.**<sup>96</sup> **Five other states in addition to Arizona – Utah, Indiana, Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina – have enacted omnibus legislation containing provisions that authorize or require state and local police to verify the immigration status of individuals detained pursuant to ordinary law enforcement actions.**<sup>96</sup> The Alabama<sup>97</sup> and South Carolina<sup>98</sup> statutes mirror Arizona in requiring<sup>96</sup> (the Georgia statute merely “authorizes”<sup>99</sup>) police to determine the immigration status of persons who have been stopped, detained, investigated,<sup>100</sup> or arrested and as to whom police have “reasonable suspicion” that the detainee is an illegal alien. Utah’s provision is similar requiring police to verify the status of any individual they stop, detain or arrest if the detainee is unable to provide verification of legal status.<sup>101</sup> Like Arizona SB 1070, Utah, Alabama, and Indiana<sup>102</sup> also include provisions that create sanctions against state and local officials who fail to fully enforce state and federal law.<sup>103</sup> Finally, Utah authorizes state and local police to make warrantless arrests if they have “reasonable cause to believe” the individual is subject to a civil removal order issued<sup>96</sup> by an immigration judge.<sup>104</sup> In addition to state enforcement initiatives, the federal government continues to pursue immigration policing partnerships through 287(g) jail model agreements, the Secure Communities (now PEP) initiative, and a whole menu of other state/federal partnerships under its ACCESS program.<sup>96</sup> **It is fair to say that state and local immigration policing is alive, well, and growing.**

### **The feds won’t block**

**Kretsedemas 11** - PhD. Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts Director, Undergraduate Studies in Sociology @ U Mass Boston  
(Philip, “Immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, Nation, and the Limits of the Law,” Ebrary)//BB

In a nutshell, **local enforcement laws allow** one segment of the local population (which includes all **legal residents** but is largely composed of the native-born citizenry) **to make decisions about policies and practices that will be applied to the noncitizen population.** As a result, **the enactment of these laws**, even when they are beneficial for immigrants, also **reinforces distinctions within the local body politic between those who are deciders of the law and those who are subjects of the law.** Most important, **these laws foster a field of discourse and institutional practice in which legal status becomes the primary terrain through which these distinctions are realized.** Meanwhile, **the localization of immigration policy decentralizes the interpretation and implementation of immigration law, which creates more room for slippage between federal law and local practices.**<sup>96</sup> **The federal government has a long history of turning a blind eye to this slippage,** allowing it to lay the groundwork for patterns in **institutional discrimination.** In this case, **the most pervasive forms of racial inequality are not justified by the letter of the law but by the exceptions and (indiscretions that allow these**

disparities to be concealed within the margins of the law. Once again, the history of Jim Crow provides an important point of comparison.

## 1nc border not key

**Border surveillance is irrelevant---interior enforcement ensures the plan's effect is minimal**

**Kretsedemas 11** - PhD. Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts Director, Undergraduate Studies in Sociology @ U Mass Boston  
(Philip, "Immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, Nation, and the Limits of the Law," Ebrary)//BB

**There are other surveillance strategies that have not explicitly targeted noncitizens by national origin but that focus on visa categories that contain large concentrations of non-European nationals. A notable example is the monitoring practices used by the immigration system to assess the prevalence of fraud in the H1B visa program, which contains a large concentration of Indian nationals (USCIS 2008).<sup>28</sup> These kinds of enforcement programs are part of a much broader array of surveillance, enforcement, and data gathering strategies that the federal government has used to police the nonimmigrant flow. This includes, among other things, the development of new methodologies for assessing the number of visa overstayers who enter the United States via commercial airlines and the development of enforcement strategies that are better attuned to the changing composition of the nonimmigrant worker population and the conditions under which these workers may lose their status (GAO 2008,1995,1992).<sup>29</sup> These strategies can all be regarded as practical attempts to catch up with the complex array of legal channels through which noncitizens enter and exit the United States. Once again, this illustrates how the expansion of the nonimmigrant flow has set the stage for the emergence of a more expansive and intensive kind of immigration enforcement. The aim of these practices is to create a seamless web of interior surveillance and policing mechanisms that can track the nonimmigrant through the entirety of their stay in the United States (so that enforcement can more easily trace these people if or when their legal status expires). As a result, immigration enforcement has become increasingly focused on policing the movements of noncitizen bodies—and not just on policing the borders of a geographic territory. In this context, legal constructs of alienness cannot be easily disentangled from the national origin and racial profiles that are often associated with the idea of the foreigner.**



# **AT CARTELS ADVANTAGE**



## Funding CP

**The United States federal government should investigate and eliminate Mexican cartel financing.**

**Cutting off cartel funding streams solves violence- counter terror proves**

**Morris** 12/4/13, Ph.D. history of US foreign relations from Georgetown University (Krache Morris, "Think Again: Mexican Drug Cartels", Foreign Policy, [http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/12/04/think-again-mexican-drug-cartels/?wp\\_login\\_redirect=0](http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/12/04/think-again-mexican-drug-cartels/?wp_login_redirect=0))AM

To that end, investigative techniques and legal precedents for going after global criminal networks are increasingly robust, and the political payoffs could be substantial. One of the more successful campaigns in the war on terrorism has been the financial one; experience gained in tracking the funds of al Qaeda could make it easier to similarly unravel Los Zetas' financing. Malfeasance in the financial industry is nothing new, but public sensitivity to banks' wrongdoing is arguably higher than it has been in decades. An enterprising prosecutor could make quite a reputation for herself by tracking DTO money through the financial system. The cartels, along with the violence and corruption they perpetrate, are threats to both Mexico and the United States. The problem is a complicated one and taps areas of profound policy disagreement. The way to make progress in combating the DTOs is to ignore issues like gun control and illegal immigration and follow the money. Stanching the cartels' profits will do more to end the bloodshed than any new fence or law.

## UQ – Violence low

### **Mexico will remain stable—collapse not imminent or inevitable**

**Bremmer 1/7/15**

Ian Bremmer is a foreign affairs columnist and editor-at-large at TIME. He is the president of Eurasia Group, a political-risk consultancy, and a Global Research Professor at New York University. 1/7/15, Time Magazine, "These Are the Geopolitical Risks You Won't Have to Fear in 2015" <http://time.com/3656679/these-are-the-geopolitical-risks-you-wont-have-to-fear-in-2015/>, jj

4. Mexico, Mexican President Enrique Pena **Nieto has his hands full**. He's fighting off accusations of financial impropriety involving his wife and his finance minister. Economic growth has been anemic. **Many Mexicans**, outraged by the murder of 43 college students who were handed over to drug lords by a local mayor, **feel that the government hasn't lived up to its commitments to improve security.** **Despite the storm clouds**, though, **it should be a reasonably positive year for Mexico**. Pena **Nieto still has the popularity and the determination to push forward with economic reforms in the telecom and energy sectors. The President's weakness has mainly benefited the right-of-center National Action Party (PAN), which generally supports his agenda. If he can make progress on his reforms, it will have a huge impact on Mexico's productivity and competitiveness, which will help attract large-scale investment from abroad. Combine that with an economic rebound in the U.S. as well as improving cross-border trade, inbound investment and tourism numbers, and Mexico could be a bright spot for 2015.**

### **Violence is declining -**

**Goforth 12/8/14** (Sean, Nearshore Americas, Special Analysis: The Rise and Fall of Violent Crime in Latin America")

After Brazil, Mexico has the highest number of murders in Latin America, **though in per capita terms its homicide rate is well below that of Honduras, Venezuela, and many other countries in the region. English-language news coverage of Mexico has tended to paint the violence as nationwide, creating a sense north of the border that the country is lawless;** the government in Mexico City an observer to the mayhem all around. **This was never the case.**

As The Economist's Mexico correspondent advised business travelers to the country back in 2010: **"Once you avoid the hotspots, it's downright safe."** For sure, the states of Sinaloa and Guerrero remain dangerous to travelers and Mexicans alike, **but "hot spots" like those are shrinking, and throughout most of Mexico things are calm.** Ciudad Juarez, the world's murder capital three years ago, **is undergoing something of an urban renaissance**, its bars and nightclubs now crowded on the weekends.

### **Headlines are misleading – violence in Mexico is on the decline**

**Pinker and Mack 12/22/14** (Steven and Andrew, Slate Magazine, "The World Is Not Falling Apart")

**The global average**, to be sure, **conceals many regions with horrific rates of killing**, particularly in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa. **But even in those hot zones, it's easy for the headlines to mislead. The gory drug-fueled killings in parts of Mexico, for example, can create**



an impression that the country has spiraled into **Hobbesian lawlessness**. But **the trend line belies the impression in two ways**. One is that **the 21<sup>st</sup>-century spike has not undone a massive reduction in homicide that Mexico has enjoyed** since 1940, comparable to the reductions that Europe and the United States underwent in earlier centuries. **The other is that what goes up often comes down**. **The rate of Mexican homicide has declined in each of the past two years** a reduction of global violence by 50 percent in the next three decades is a feasible target for the next round of Millennium Development Goals.

## **Border violence is on the decline**

**Seelke 12/16/14**

(Clare Ribando, Congressional Research Service, "Mexico: Background and US Relations")  
**Organized crime-related homicides continued to decline in 2013** as they had during the last year of the Calderón government, yet serious security challenges remain in many parts of Mexico. President Peña **Nieto has said that organized-crime violence declined by 30%** in 2013.<sup>23</sup> Since the government is no longer publicly releasing information on trends in organized crime-related killings as opposed to all homicides, it is difficult to analyze the security situation with precision. **According to Mexican government figures, all homicides fell by 16.5%** as compared to 2012.<sup>24</sup> **Independent estimates appear to verify that figure.**<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, kidnappings increased in 2013, with police among those accused of carrying them out.<sup>26</sup> **Violence has declined in some parts of northern Mexico** (except for Tamaulipas), but has spiked in the interior of the country and along the Pacific Coast, particularly in Michoacán. The failures of past federal efforts to quell violence and reestablish state presence there have led to the development of armed civilian "self-defense groups" there that have clashed with crime groups. Recent events, including discoveries of mass graves, have laid bare the dire security situation in Guerrero.

## UQ – no immigration

### **The advantage is wrong – illegal immigration isn't happening now**

**Markon 15** (Jerry, Staff Writer at the Washington Post, "Fewer immigrants are entering the U.S. illegally, and that's changed the border security debate," 5/27/2015, Washington Post, [//JL](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/flow-of-illegal-immigration-slows-as-us-mexico-border-dynamics-evolve/2015/05/27/c5caf02c-006b-11e5-833c-a2de05b6b2a4_story.html)

Monica Camacho-Perez came to the United States from Mexico as a child, crossing into Arizona with her mother in the same spot where her father made the trip before them. Nobody stopped us,<sup>1</sup> Camacho-Perez, now 20, said of her 2002 journey. Three years ago, her uncle tried to cross the border and join the family in Baltimore, where they remain illegal immigrants. He was stopped three times by the U.S. Border Patrol and jailed for 50 days.<sup>2</sup> "He doesn't want to try anymore," said Camacho-Perez. Now, it's really hard. As the Department of Homeland Security continues to pour money into border security, evidence is emerging that illegal immigration flows have fallen to their lowest level in at least two

decades. The nation's population of illegal immigrants which more than tripled, to 12.2 million, between 1990 and 2007 has dropped by about 1 million, according to demographers at the Pew Research Center. A key – but largely overlooked – sign of these ebbing flows is the changing makeup of the undocumented population. Until recent years, illegal immigrants tended to be young men streaming across the Southern border in pursuit of work, but demographic data show that the typical illegal immigrant now is much more likely someone who is 35 or older and has lived in the United States for a decade or more. Homeland security officials in the Obama and George W. Bush administrations – who have more than doubled the Border Patrol's size and spent billions on drones, sensors and other technology at the border – say enhanced security is driving the new trends. We have seen tremendous progress,<sup>3</sup> said R. Gil Kerlikowske, commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, which is part of the Department of Homeland Security. The border is much more secure than in times past.<sup>4</sup> The issue of border security is central to the broader debate over immigration reform that has roiled Washington in recent years and is emerging as a flash point in the 2016 presidential campaign. Congressional **Republicans have**

**insisted on greater border security before they consider legalizing any immigrants who came to this country without proper documents**.<sup>5</sup> President Obama says the border has never been more

secure and is urging a series of legislative steps to legalize millions of undocumented immigrants, streamline the visa system and further fortify the border. He has already moved to protect certain undocumented immigrants from deportation through executive actions.<sup>6</sup> But these actions have faced resistance in the courts, including the

decision Tuesday by a federal appeals court to keep one of the president's signature immigration efforts from moving ahead. What's increasingly clear is that the shifting fortunes of the U.S. economy account for less of the ebb and flow of illegal immigration. Even as the economy bounces back from recession, illegal immigration flows, especially from Mexico, have kept declining,<sup>7</sup> according to researchers and government data. Since the

1990s, the opposite was true: The better the economy, the more people tried to come. Every month or quarter that the economy continues to improve and unauthorized immigration doesn't pick up supports the theory that border security is a bigger factor, and it's less about the economy and we have moved into a new era," said Marc Rosenblum, deputy director of the U.S. immigration program at the Migration Policy Institute. Some researchers say factors other than security are playing a role and might even account for much of the reduced flow of illegal immigrants. These researchers point, for instance, to changes in Latin America that could be pushing fewer people to seek a better life in the United States.<sup>8</sup> At odds with the government's claims of success, a series of academic studies in recent years have found little linkage between

border security and illegal migration. Douglas S. Massey, a Princeton University sociologist, said the falling numbers of immigrants have "nothing to do with border enforcement". Massey, who helps run a project that has interviewed thousands of illegal Mexican migrants over the past three decades, attributed the trend to demographic changes in Mexico, such as women having fewer children.<sup>9</sup> But even some researchers who are skeptical about the overall effectiveness of enhanced border security acknowledge indirect effects of these measures. For potential migrants who are calculating the pros and cons of trying to cross the border, stiffer U.S. security measures are making the trip much more expensive, in particular the exploding cost of hiring a guide. The journey has also become more

arduous and dangerous, in part because the DHS has plugged traditional crossing points and driven migrants deeper into the desert.<sup>10</sup> "More difficult and expensive" Since the Bush administration, the DHS has dramatically increased its efforts to lock down the southwest border. The budget for Customs and Border Protection has grown to \$10.7 billion in the past decade, a 75 percent increase. The number of Border Patrol agents at the border has nearly doubled over the past decade, to more than 18,000 today. Much of the ramp-up occurred during the

## Bush administration

but the Obama administration has marshaled more forces as well. Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson has recently set up three task forces to increase coordination within the DHS. Current and former DHS officials acknowledge that a confluence of factors explains the decline in illegal migration, including demographic changes in Mexico, improvements in its economy and Mexico's crackdown on Central American migrants headed to the United States. But these officials insist that the massive investment to secure the border has been the key factor. "It used to be that you could

literally sit at a bar in Tijuana, Mexico, look across the border into San Diego, wait for the Border Patrol to drive in the other direction and make a run for it," said Steve Atkiss, a former CBP chief of staff and now a partner at Command Consulting Group. "It's much more difficult and expensive now." Madai Ledezma crossed the Mexican border into Texas a decade ago at age 23 and remains in the United States as an illegal immigrant. She said her uncle and brother had recently wanted to join her. But, she said, they're staying put after her uncle was caught by the Border Patrol a year ago and locked up for a month before being sent back to Mexico. "The risk of crossing again is that he will be locked up again," Ledezma said. She added, "I just heard recently that the Border Patrol now has the ability to fire their weapons." "Aging in place" Ledezma's uncle was one of a shrinking number of undocumented immigrants stopped by the Border Patrol. Government officials widely cite that trend as evidence that the overall flow is also down. In 2000, considered the peak of the flood of illegal Mexican migration, more than 1.6 million people were apprehended, according to DHS data. Those numbers have plunged to around 400,000 per year since 2012 and are down 28 percent in the first part of fiscal 2015 compared with last year. Even last year's

spike in unaccompanied minors crossing the border from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras has receded dramatically, the data show. While the declining number of apprehensions is not conclusive proof that illegal immigration is down, other less publicized research strongly suggests this is the case. Wayne Cornelius, director of the Mexican migration field research program at the University of California at San Diego, interviews hundreds of people each year in the Mexican state of Yucatan and asks them whether they are planning to come to the United States in the next 12 months. In 2006, 24 percent said yes. By 2009, as the U.S. economy was cratering, 8 percent said yes. This year, 2.5 percent answered in the affirmative. A recent study by the Pew Research Center, meanwhile, found that the median length of stay for illegal immigrants in the United States jumped from less than eight years in 2003 to nearly 13 years by 2013. Their median age has increased from 28 during the 1990s to nearly 36 today. Those figures wouldn't be possible if young men were still coming across the border in huge numbers, and it was those young men who accounted for most of the illegal traffic. But Massey,

the Princeton researcher, highlighted an unintended consequence of the security crackdown on the border. He said immigrants who are already in the United States are afraid to go back and forth to Mexico as they traditionally did, and are "aging in place" in the United States. Ledezma's tale is a common one. Over the past decade, she and her husband, Jose Pina, a landscaper, have become involved in their community in New Carrollton. Their daughter, Heather, 6, is a U.S. citizen. Ledezma volunteers at Heather's school, reads with her at the public library and attends a local church. "After so many years of living here, I of course consider this my home," she said. According to estimates by the Migration Policy Institute, about a third of illegal immigrants own a home and have children who are U.S. citizens. "We have this population here and they haven't left and they don't appear to be going back and forth to Mexico anymore," said George Escobar, senior director of human services for CASA, a Maryland-based immigrant advocacy group. "These trends have reshaped the immigration debate right before our eyes."

## **Their premise of the advantage is wrong – net-illegal immigration is at 0**

**Klein 13** (Ezra, Staff Writer for the Washington Post, "Everything you know about immigration is wrong," 8/10/2013, Washington Post,

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/08/10/everything-you-know-about-immigration-is-wrong/>)/JL

Everything you know about immigration, particularly unauthorized immigration, is wrong. So says Princeton University's Doug Massey, anyway. Massey is one of the nation's preeminent immigration scholars. And he thinks we've wasted a whole lot of money on immigration policy and are about to waste a whole lot more. Massey slices the history of Mexico-to-U.S.

migration in five periods. Early in the 20th century, there was the era of "the hook," when Japan stopped sending workers to the U.S. and the mining, agriculture and railroad industries begged Mexican laborers to replace them. It's called "the hook" because laborers were recruited with promises of high wages, signing bonuses, transportation and lodging, most of which either never materialized or were deducted from their paychecks. Then, during the Roaring Twenties, came "flood tide" -- almost 650,000 Mexican workers came legally, causing the number of Mexicans in the U.S. to rocket to almost 750,000 in 1929 from 100,000 in 1900. The Great Depression ended all that. Jobless Americans took out their anger on jobless Mexicans, and thus began the "era of deportations." From 1929 to 1939, 469,000 Mexicans were expelled from the U.S.; by 1940, the Mexican-born population had fallen to 377,000. Enter World War II. With so many American men fighting overseas, Mexican labor was once again in high demand. The U.S. and Mexico negotiated the Bracero Program, which gave Mexican workers access to temporary U.S. visas. That kicked off the "Bracero era." In 1945, the program brought in 50,000 Mexican guest workers. By 1956, it was up to 445,000. Mexico was also freed from quota

limitations on legal immigration, so by 1963, more than 50,000 Mexicans were immigrating each year. With so many legal ways to enter the country, illegal immigration was virtually unknown. In 1965, the U.S. ended the Bracero program and began to limit Mexican immigration. The number of guest-worker permits dropped to 1,725 in 1979 from more than 400,000 in 1959. The number of residence visas declined to 20,000 after previously being unlimited. But the demand for Mexican labor remained strong. And so the "era of undocumented migration" began. Border apprehensions rose to

1.7 million in 1986 from 55,000 in 1965. But even as millions of Mexicans entered the U.S. illegally, millions also returned. About 85 percent of new entries were offset by departures. Consequently, the growth of the undocumented population was slow. After passage of a comprehensive immigration law in

1986, the U.S. began militarizing the border with Mexico even as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and, later, the North American Free Trade Agreement strengthened economic ties with Mexico. From 1986 to 2000, trade with Mexico increased eightfold. Until this point, there isn't much to dispute in Massey's narrative. But here his immigration story takes a turn that confounds Washington's conventional wisdom and makes a

mockery of the current political debate. According to Massey, **the rise of America's large undocumented population is a direct result of the militarization of the border** While undocumented workers once traveled back and forth from Mexico with relative ease, after the border was garrisoned, immigrants from Mexico crossed the border and stayed. Migrants quite rationally responded to the increased costs and risks by minimizing the number of times they crossed the border," Massey wrote in his 2007 paper "Understanding America's

Immigration Crisis." "But they achieved this goal not by remaining in Mexico and abandoning their intention to migrate to the U.S., but by hunkering down and staying once they had run the gauntlet at the border, and made it to their final destination." The data support Massey's thesis: In 1980, 46 percent of undocumented Mexican migrants returned to Mexico within 12 months. By 2007, that was down to 7 percent. As a result, the permanent undocumented population exploded. The militarization also had another unintended consequence: it dispersed the undocumented population. Prior to 1986, about 85 percent of Mexicans who entered the U.S. settled in California, Texas or Illinois, and more than two-thirds entered through either the San Diego-Tijuana entry point or the El Paso-Juarez entry point. As the U.S. blockaded those areas, undocumented migrants found new ways in -- and new places to settle. By 2002, two-thirds of undocumented migrants were entering at a non-San Diego/El Paso entry point and settling in a "nontraditional" state. In recent years, the net inflow of new undocumented immigrants arriving from Mexico has fallen to zero. Some of the decline is due to the U.S.

recession and a falloff in construction, which employed a lot of migrant workers. But some is due to an improving economy in Mexico, where unemployment is 5 percent and wages have been rising. "I personally think **the huge boom in Mexican immigration is over,**" Massey said. Yet the political debate over immigration is stuck in 1985. Congress is focused above all on how to further militarize an already militarized border -- despite the fact that doubling the size of the border patrol since 2004 and installing hundreds of miles of barriers and surveillance equipment appears to have been counterproductive. At any rate, the flow of unauthorized immigration has slowed dramatically. Listening to the Republicans, you'd think waves of people are crossing the border," Massey said. "But **illegal migration stopped four years ago and has been zero since**." In light of these facts, the debate is backward. Republicans in the House of Representatives are focused on further militarizing the border against the people who are no longer crossing it; at the same time they are loath to do anything about the millions of real undocumented immigrants who are the legacy of the last buildup. At best, we can hope to waste tens of billions of dollars on further enforcement in return for a lengthy and complicated path to citizenship. At worst, we'll do nothing -- in which case this will be known as the era of wasted opportunity.

## No solvency

### **US policy can't influence cartel action – Mexican policy change is key**

**Rottas 11** Andrew Rottas, Graduate Student, University of Texas at Austin, Department of Government, April 22, 2011 “Reconceptualizing the U.S.-Mexico Border: Drug Cartels as Responsible Stakeholders”, SSRN

This understanding of cartel behavior would logically alter the motivations of the United States, both in the way it handles the cartels and the Mexican government. **One thing must be made clear: a basic assumption of the U.S. position is that the Mexican government is not capable of expecting the same amount of force or control over the border region as the criminal syndicate.** This, however, is more than a rational assumption, it is an inevitable one. **The existence of cartels outside of government control undermines the Mexican government, and cartel agents have openly attacked government officials over the last few years. One can reasonably assume that if the Mexican government were capable of eliminating, or significantly weakening, these groups, it would do so. As already discussed, these criminal groups depend on access to the border for a great deal of their revenue, not to mention for obtaining the weapons they have used to combat government forces. Therefore, to dismantle these criminal organizations, one of the most important steps the Mexican government must take is dislodging criminal control of the border.** However, even when engaged in what has rapidly become a life or death struggle for its own survival, the Mexican government has been unable to accomplish this task. **This stands as evidence, then, that the Mexican government, even were the cartels to disappear tomorrow, would not be able to muster equivalent force (and equivalently motivated forces) to the border, at least not in the short term.** The balance of these relationships is further complicated by the complex set of players in the U.S. government system that shapes the relationship between the U.S. and Mexico. Obviously, any country's relationship to the United States depends on the interplay of many actors, but Mexico features a relatively unique balance of power between the Departments of State, Defense, and Homeland Security. The unusual influence of the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security in forming and implementing U.S.-Mexico policy highlights a central goal for the United States in its dealings with Mexico – protecting the safety of American citizens. And because the cartels, as discussed above, have been so relentlessly tied to security concerns, it is not surprising that these security actors, almost to the exception of traditional diplomatic actors, have been critical to developing the American strategy for dealing with the Mexican government and cartels. **With this emphasis on security in mind, we look at two distinct American options: a meaningful commitment to removing the crime syndicates and restoring control to the Mexican government, or relative acceptance of the status quo.** The key variable in whether or not the relevant actors in the American government will choose to make a dedicated effort to eliminate the cartels is whether or not the Americans believe that leaving the cartels in place would significantly increase risk to American citizens. In the conventional telling of this story, the American government is expected to view the cartels as a likely source of threat for violence to Americans, whether because the cartels choose not to control cross border crime, or because they choose to ally with terrorist threats. It seems clear that cartels create substantial social and security costs for both America and Mexico, through for example, fueling criminal enterprises in America with weapon purchases, bringing narcotics into America, undermining rule of law in Mexico, and endangering Mexican citizens. As a result, it is a reasonable assumption that if

America believed the “threat factor” were even roughly equivalent with the government and the cartels in place, they would make the play to remove the cartels.

## Link turn – drugs

### **Drug prevention strategies solve now**

#### **Billeaud 11**

(Jacques, “U.S. Border Plan Puts Emphasis on Drug Prevention,”

<http://www.abqjournal.com/41929/abqnewsseeker/border-plan-puts-emphasis-on-drug-prevention.html>)

**The government’s updated security plan for the U.S.-Mexico border keeps its focus on trying to stop drug and gun smuggling** but contains an added emphasis on preventing and treating drug use in communities along the border. Drug czar Gil Kerlikowske said Thursday that efforts over the past two years have rightly focused on border security, but he believes there has to be a holistic approach that confronts America’s demand for illegal drugs. “I spent 37 years in law enforcement, and my colleagues say you can’t arrest your way out of this drug problem,” said Kerlikowske, who along with Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano unveiled the update in the Arizona border city of Nogales, using the local Border Patrol station as their backdrop. Arizona is one of the country’s busiest hubs for marijuana smuggling. The areas in and around the city of Nogales have been popular crossing points for smugglers. Dozens of border tunnels have been discovered in Nogales since the mid-1990s. The government has increased its number of agents there and added border fences. **The updated border security plan includes federal grants for efforts to prevent and treat drug use in border communities that bear the brunt of America’s drug smuggling woes.** Asked whether the plan will be effective after 30 years of failed drugs strategies, Kerlikowske said the country has made strides, such as lower drug use, particularly cocaine use. “There is no one enterprise that owns this problem,” Kerlikowske said. Sounding a theme repeated by federal officials over the last 18 months or so, Napolitano said **violent crime in American communities along the border is flat, seizures of drugs and drug money are up and illegal immigration is down.** **“The numbers that need to go up are going up, and the numbers that need to go down are really going down,”** Napolitano said, **noting that the Border Patrol’s ranks and technology along the border have grown significantly in the past few years.**

### **Surveillance is key---it solves drug trafficking and human smuggling**

**Sternstein 14** – reports on cybersecurity and homeland security systems. She’s covered technology for more than a decade at such publications as National Journal's Technology Daily, Federal Computer Week and Forbes

(Aliya, “Obama Requests Drone Surge for U.S.-Mexico Border,”

<http://www.defenseone.com/threats/2014/07/obama-requests-drone-surge-us-mexico-border/88303//BB>

President Barack Obama today requested \$39 million for aerial **surveillance, including unmanned aircraft operations**, as part of an effort to **systemically take care of** what he called **an urgent humanitarian situation.**

The emergency funding would go toward 16,526 additional **drone** and manned aircraft **flight hours for border surveillance**, and 16 additional drone **crews** to better **detect and stop illegal activity**, according to administration officials. There currently is a flood of unaccompanied children, and adults with children, illegally crossing the border to escape violence and poverty in Central American communities. **The remotely-piloted jets would not be deployed to look for**

these **migrants**, who are out in the open and turning themselves in. **Rather, the drones would try to detect drug smugglers, human traffickers and others attempting to evade the law.**<sup>a</sup> The agency's "**unmanned and manned aircraft can continue to support ongoing border security operations, specifically regarding the tracking of illegal cross-border smuggling operations,**" a CBP official told Nextgov on Tuesday.

## **Open border boosts cartel revenue**

**Rottas 11** Andrew Rottas, Graduate Student, University of Texas at Austin, Department of Government, April 22, 2011 "Reconceptualizing the U.S.-Mexico Border: Drug Cartels as Responsible Stakeholders", SSRN Database

The first step in explaining the likely actions of the cartels is to narrow down their end goal: continuing to make money. At heart, these groups are a business enterprise – failure to turn a profit dries up resources and leaves all involved unable to fend off attacks from either the Mexican government or rival syndicates. **The second essential realization is that, for all cartel organizations, whether focusing primarily on narcotics or human trafficking, keeping the U.S.-Mexico border relatively open is the essential precondition of keeping future revenues flowing. In order to continue to bring in money, the cartels and their goods must continue to cross the U.S.-Mexico border safely. Increased security at the border, therefore, directly influences the ability of the cartels to maintain necessary profit levels.** Even removing the possibility that the American government could effectively seal its borders to these cartels, increased security would require increased expenditures in the forms of equipment to avoid detection, bribes to avoid capture, construction in building and maintaining routes, and more. **Even more importantly; the time horizon of these profits is, at least for the time being, essentially infinite. So long as cartels are able to maintain control of their organizations and stay ahead of the efforts of the Mexican government to stamp them out, they can continue to draw enormous profits from illicit border trade for the foreseeable future. Neither of these conditions is under serious threat of change. As such, it is not merely the profit of the current day, month, or even year that the cartels are working to defend. The cartels are working to maintain conditions so that these profits will be readily available far into the future.** Realizing that, in reality, cartels have tremendous interest in defending the status quo is the first essential step in moving beyond the predominant vision of cartels as senselessly violent anarchists.

## **Cartels care more about drugs than migrants – immigrants use drug coyotes because of cartels' monopoly on control**

**Slack 15** Slack, Jeremy M. Jeremy Slack is a PhD candidate at the University of Arizona in their School of Geography and Development. "Drugs and Deportation on the Border: Post-Deportation Geographies of Enforcement and Conflict." (2015). Pages 98-100 [https://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/556876/1/azu\\_etd\\_13923\\_sip1\\_m.pdf](https://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/556876/1/azu_etd_13923_sip1_m.pdf)

Perhaps this experience is more in line with Spener's false coyotaje, whereupon individuals never intend to actually smuggle migrants into the United States, another aberrant form (Spener 2009, 155). However, our data suggest that these experiences may be much more common in the Arizona-Sonora area than the Texas border. More research is needed in other areas along the border to determine both the differences in the experience of being smuggled into the United States as well as how the processes of clandestine migration function border-wide. A complicated interplay exists between enforcement and the efforts to circumvent 96 these measures (Andreas 2000). As enforcement shifts and changes, so too do the ways people try to counteract the new measures aimed at stopping their activities. The only constant in this ever-changing dynamic is an increase in profitability as the enforcement increases. **However, as drug smuggling and people smuggling have increased in profitability concurrently, they have also come into competition with each other in a number**

**of ways.** First and foremost, these large and increasingly organized cartels are forced to operate in the limited amount of space on the border. **They share trails and pickup points along the highways and compete for the best routes.**<sup>Second,</sup>



the strategy of undocumented migration can help or hinder drug trafficking, and vice versa. **Since it is much less costly (for the moment) for a group of migrants to get apprehended than for a shipment of drugs to get intercepted, there is greater incentive to prioritize the shipment of drugs.** Conversely, the increased presence of migrants on these trails makes them more obvious to Border Patrol agents, and therefore they attract more surveillance. For instance, in the past, migrants were not walking high into the mountains, but this has changed in an attempt to avoid the increased Border Patrol presence. Payan (2006) notes that the vast majority of drugs are smuggled into the United States mixed in with cargo through legal ports of entry (POEs), and that smuggling through the desert is most likely unorganized individuals engaging in small-time drug trafficking. Spener (2009) also notes that the method for smuggling a commodity is much different for a human being, and that only a small amount of drugs actually comes into the United States on the backs of people. However, the fact that the United States Border Patrol seized 1.05 million pounds of drugs between the POEs (largely in Arizona), and 97 based on our firsthand accounts, suggests that this may have changed (Department of Homeland Security 2010; Esquivel 2010). **The most common manifestation of this is coordinating groups of border crossers, by dividing them into groups of fifteen to twenty people, and sending them in staggered formation, one leaving thirty to sixty minutes before the next. This is usually done without the knowledge of the would-be migrants, and only when things fall apart, as with the case of Ramón, does the situation become clear. After five or six of these groups have been sent out, a group of ten individuals carrying backpacks filled with marijuana is sent behind them. Those with more valuable drug cargo are now able to keep tabs on the movement of the Border Patrol in response to the undocumented migrants and therefore increase their rate of success. Extremely large groups of people apprehended in the desert have become a common sign of this manipulation.** On April 30, 2010, a group of 105 migrants was arrested outside the Baboquivari Mountains in southern Arizona (McCombs 2010). We have been told about groups of up to one hundred people crossing. Groups of this size are easily detected. The chances for a successful crossing are slim, however, a lot of attention is required from the authorities to apprehend, transport, and process all of these individuals. Since the one thing that clandestine organizations have on their U.S. adversaries is a nearly unlimited supply of people, it makes sense that organizing a group of this size is a way of limiting the capacity of the Border Patrol and increasing success rates for more valuable cargo. **Because more and more people fear the consequences of not using an established guide, this strategy has become more effective.** The use of a nonaffiliated guide sheds some light on this situation as well. 98 Juanito was originally from Guerrero but had lived in California for over ten years. **He explained how he got his own group of people together to cross after being deported for a DUI (driving under the influence). He may or may not have been their guide, but he said that he knew the way well and had never been caught by the Migra, only by the police. During the trip he did not see any other migrants but two groups of twenty-five burreros, all with backpacks filled with marijuana, and some carrying guns. He complained that a vehicle picked them up earlier than the migrant pickup points, and consequently his group had to walk farther (personal communication, April 13, 2009). The fact that he saw more drug smugglers than migrants is indicative of not using an established guide. This is similar to Ramón's story, whereupon leaving the group he was confronted with drug trafficking operating alongside clandestine migration. He might not have witnessed this phenomenon if he had crossed with a local guide.**

**Drugs are key:**

**Drugs drive cartel violence---artificially high prices sustain violence**

**Armentano 9** – Deputy Director of the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, an expert in the field of marijuana policy, health, and pharmacology, has served as a consultant for Health Canada and the Canadian Public Health Association (Paul, “How to End Mexico's Deadly Drug War”, 1/18/09, The Foundation for Economic Education, [http://www.fee.org/the\\_freeman/detail/how-to-end-mexicos-deadly-drug-war](http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/how-to-end-mexicos-deadly-drug-war)) The U.S. Office of Drug Control Policy (more commonly known as the drug czar's office) says more than 60 percent of the profits reaped by Mexican drug lords are derived from the exportation and sale of cannabis to the American market. To anyone who has studied the marijuana issue, this figure should come as no surprise. An estimated 100 million Americans age 12 or older—or about 43 percent of the country—admit to having tried pot, a higher

percentage, according to the World Health Organization, than any other country on the planet. **Twenty-five million Americans admit** (on government surveys, no less) **to smoking marijuana during the past year, and 15 million say that they indulge regularly.** **This high demand, combined with the drug's artificially inflated black-market value** (pot possession has been illegal under federal law since 1937), **now makes cannabis America's top cash crop.**¶ In fact, according to a 2007 analysis by George Mason University professor Jon Gettman, **the annual retail value of the U.S. marijuana market is some \$113 billion.**¶ How much of this goes directly to Mexican cartels is difficult to quantify, but no doubt the percentage is significant. Government officials estimate that approximately half the marijuana consumed in the United States originates from outside its borders, and they have identified Mexico as far and away America's largest pot provider. **Because Mexican-grown marijuana tends to fetch lower prices on the black market than domestically grown weed** (a result attributed largely to lower production costs—the Mexican variety tends to be grown outdoors, while an increasing percentage of American-grown pot is produced hydroponically indoors), **it remains consistently popular among U.S. consumers,** particularly in a down economy. As a result, U.S. law officials now report that **some Mexican cartels are moving to the United States to set up shop permanently.** A Congressional Research Service report says low-level cartel members are now establishing clandestine growing operations inside the United States (thus eliminating the need to cross the border), as well as partnering with domestic gangs and other criminal enterprises. A March 23 New York Times story speculated that Mexican drug gangs or their affiliates are now active in some 230 U.S. cities, extending from Tucson, Arizona, to Anchorage, Alaska.¶ In short, **America's multibillion-dollar demand for pot is fueling the Mexican drug trade and much of the turf battles and carnage** associated with it. ¶ Same Old "Solutions" ¶ So what are the administration's plans to quell the cartels' growing influence and surging violence? Troublingly, **the White House appears intent on recycling the very strategies that gave rise to Mexico's infamous drug lords in the first place.**¶ In March the administration requested \$700 million from Congress to "bolster existing efforts by Washington and Mexican President Felipe Calderón's administration to fight violent trafficking in drugs . . . into the United States." These efforts, as described by the Los Angeles Times, include: "vowing to send U.S. money, manpower, and technology to the southwestern border" and "reducing illegal flows (of drugs) in both directions across the border." The administration also announced that it intends to clamp down on the U.S. demand for illicit drugs by increasing funding for drug treatment and drug courts.¶ There are three primary problems with this strategy.¶ First, **marijuana production is a lucrative business that attracts criminal entrepreneurs precisely because it is a black-market** (and highly sought after) **commodity. As long as pot remains federally prohibited its retail price to the consumer will remain artificially high, and its production and distribution will attract criminal enterprises willing to turn to violence** (rather than the judicial system) **to maintain their slice of the multi-billion-dollar pie.**¶ Second, the United States is already spending more money on illicit-drug law enforcement, drug treatment, and drug courts than at any time in our history. FBI data show that domestic marijuana arrests have increased from under 300,000 annually in 1991 to over 800,000 today. Police seizures of marijuana have also risen dramatically in recent years, as has the amount of taxpayer dollars federal officials have spent on so-called "educational efforts" to discourage the drug's use. (For example, since the late 1990s Congress has appropriated well over a billion dollars in anti-pot public service announcements alone.) Yet despite these combined efforts to discourage demand, Americans use more pot than anyone else in the world.¶ Third, **law enforcement's recent attempts to crack down on the cartels' marijuana distribution rings,** particularly new efforts launched by the Calderón administration

in Mexico, **are driving the unprecedented wave in Mexican violence—not abating it.** The New York Times states: “A crackdown begun more than two years ago by President Felipe Calderón, coupled with feuds over turf and control of the organizations, has set off an unprecedented wave of killings in Mexico. . . . Many of the victims were tortured. Beheadings have become common.” Because of this escalating violence, Mexico now ranks behind only Pakistan and Iran as the administration’s top international security concern.¶ Despite the rising death toll, drug war hawks at the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) remain adamant that the United States’ and Mexico’s “supply side” strategies are in fact successful. “Our view is that the violence we have been seeing is a signpost of the success our very courageous Mexican counterparts are having,” acting DEA administrator Michele Lionhart said recently. “The cartels are acting out like caged animals, because they are caged animals.” President Obama also appears to share this view. After visiting with the Calderón government in April, he told CNN he intended to “beef up” security on the border. When asked whether the administration would consider alternative strategies, such as potentially liberalizing pot’s criminal classification, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano replied that such an option “is not on the table.”¶ A New Remedy,¶ By contrast the Calderón administration appears open to the idea of legalizing marijuana—or at least reducing criminal sanctions on the possession of small quantities of drugs—as a way to stem the tide of violence. Last spring Mexican lawmakers made the possession of personal-use quantities of cannabis and other illicit substances a noncriminal offense. And in April Mexico’s ambassador to the United States, Arturo **Sarukhan, told CBS’s Face the Nation that legalizing the marijuana trade was a legitimate option for both the Mexican and U.S. governments.** “[T]hose who would suggest that some of these measures [legalization] be looked at understand the dynamics of the drug trade,” Sarukhan said.¶ Former Mexican President Vicente Fox recently echoed Sarukhan’s remarks, as did a commission of former Latin American presidents. “I believe **it’s time to open the debate over legalizing drugs,**” Fox told CNN in May. “It can’t be that the only way [to try to control illicit drug use] is for the state to use force.”¶ Writing recently on CNN.com, Harvard economist and Freeman contributor Jeffrey Miron said that ending drug prohibition—on both sides of the border—is the only realistic and viable way to put a permanent stop to the rising power and violence associated with Mexico’s drug traffickers. **“Prohibition creates violence because it drives the drug market underground,”** he wrote. **“This means buyers and sellers cannot resolve their disputes with lawsuits, arbitration or advertising, so they resort to violence instead. . . . The only way to reduce violence, therefore, is to legalize drugs.”**

## **Marijuana’s outweighs other factors**

Ioan **Grillo 12**, author, journalist, writer and TV producer based in Mexico City, has reported on Mexico and Latin America since 2001, “Hit Mexico’s Cartels With Legalization”, 11/1/12, NYT, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/02/opinion/hit-mexicos-cartels-with-legalization.html> Marijuana is just one of the drugs that the cartels traffic. Chemicals such as crystal meth may be too venomous to ever be legalized. But **cannabis is a cash crop that provides huge profits to criminal armies**, paying for assassins and guns south of the Rio Grande. The scale of the Mexican marijuana business was illustrated by a mammoth 120-hectare plantation busted last year in Baja California. It had a sophisticated irrigation system, sleeping quarters for 60 workers and could produce 120 metric tons of cannabis per harvest.¶ Again, **nobody knows exactly how much the whole Mexico-U.S. marijuana trade is worth**, with estimates ranging from \$2 billion to \$20 billion annually. But **even if you believe the lowest numbers, legal marijuana would take**

**billions of dollars a year away from organized crime. This would inflict more financial damage than soldiers or drug agents have managed in years and substantially weaken cartels.** It is also argued that Mexican gangsters have expanded to a portfolio of crimes that includes kidnapping, extortion, human smuggling and theft from oil pipelines. This is a terrifying truth. But **this does not take away from the fact that the marijuana trade provides the crime groups with major resources. That they are committing crimes such as kidnapping, which have a horrific effect on innocent people, makes cutting off their financing all the more urgent.** The cartels will not disappear overnight. **U.S. agents and the Mexican police need to continue battling hit squads** that wield rocket-propelled grenades and belt-driven machine guns. Killers who hack off heads still have to be locked away. Mexico needs to clean up corruption among the police and build a valid justice system. And young men in the barrios have to be given a better option than signing up as killers. All **these tasks will be easier if the flow of money to the cartels is dramatically slowed down**. Do we really want to hand them another trillion dollars over the next three decades?

### **Pot is key to Sinaloa and Tijuana cartels, the most powerful and influential cartels**

Chad Murray 11, M.A. student in the Latin American and Hemispheric Studies Program @ George Washington, supervised and sponsored by the OAS and Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission, "Mexican Drug Trafficking Organizations and Marijuana: The Potential Effects of U.S. Legalization", 4/26/11, <https://elliott.gwu.edu/sites/elliott.gwu.edu/files/downloads/acad/lahs/mexico-marijuana-071111.pdf>

While **Los Zetas and La Familia** have recently dominated the media coverage of the drug war in Mexico, they **might not be objectively termed the strongest cartels in the country**. They are the most active in attacking government forces and setting up narco bloqueos in major cities.<sup>59</sup> However, they do not have the financial strength, military prowess, territorial reach, or tactical discipline of Mexico's largest DTO, the **Sinaloa** cartel. <sup>60</sup> This DTO **and the Tijuana cartel are major traffickers of marijuana**, and their territories are the major marijuana production areas in Mexico. **They have near exclusive control of the so called "Golden Triangle" region of Mexico** where the mountainous areas of Sinaloa, Durango and Chihuahua states meet. This makes sense, because according to sources in the Drug Enforcement Agency **these two DTOs likely make a majority their revenue from marijuana.** <sup>61</sup> **The amount of marijuana trafficked by the Sinaloa cartel is evident by the scale of recent drug busts.** In October of 2010 Mexican police and military forces seized more than 134 metric tons of marijuana in one Sinaloa facility. This was equal to almost \$200 million according to Mexican authorities.<sup>63</sup> The very next month 30 tons of marijuana was retrieved by law enforcement on both sides of the border after a Tijuana drug smuggling tunnel was discovered.<sup>64</sup> The DTO behind this operation has not been determined, but based on the location it is likely to be either the Sinaloa cartel or Arellano Felix Organization. These seizures represent only a proportion of the amount marijuana trafficked into the United States from Mexico through the San Diego-Tijuana corridor in 2 months. There are other drug transport corridors that likely receive more marijuana traffic. <sup>65</sup> Although the **Sinaloa** cartel does not often target civilians, it **is the most violent DTO in terms of overall casualties**. **It has targeted hundreds of police officers and** its leader, "**El Chapo**" Guzmán, **is widely thought to have caused a recent upsurge in violence** after breaking a truce with the other major criminal groups in the country.<sup>66</sup> The feud between the Sinaloa and Juarez

organizations is the reason that Juarez is the most violent city in Mexico, and according to some accounts, the entire world. 67 **The Sinaloa cartel's huge financial resources make it a major threat to the government**, because they are able to corrupt large numbers of local, state, and federal government officials. This was revealed in several high profile cases in recent years.68The **Sinaloa** cartel **is constantly trying to expand its territory into that traditionally held by other cartels**, particularly in Juarez, **and this is a major cause of much of the violence.**¶ The **Sinaloa** cartel **has the greatest capacity to wage „all-out war“ because they have far more money than the other DTOs.** **Guzmán** is also more focused on winning the favor and tacit protection of the populace, and thus **is more involved in the drugs trade than kidnapping**, and prefers to bribe rather than confront authorities.69 However, in many ways this makes the **Sinaloa** cartel more dangerous to the Government in Mexico. **Its use of bribes can make local state and even federal law enforcement unreliable.** Furthermore, the Sinaloa organization's outreach to the civilian population makes it even harder for the government to gain information about Guzmán. In addition, **the massive strength of the Sinaloa cartel makes an eventual peace all the more allusive.** In the event that the government would try to reduce the violence through talks with cartels, the Sinaloa organization would be unlikely to take them seriously. The government has little to offer big organizations like Sinaloa, which already enjoy near uncontested control over the areas in which they operate.¶ The Tijuana cartel is also a powerful, though often underrated organization. This group was infamous in 2008 and 2009, when it destabilized much of Tijuana with its attacks on the police and rival cartels. 71As with the Sinaloa cartel, the **Tijuana** cartel **is a very important organization with networks mainly in the Tijuana and the San Diego area. This DTO is famous for both its violence and the brutality.** Most notoriously, Teodoro García Simental's war for control of Tijuana led to hundreds being tortured and killed until his arrest in 2010. ¶ The main areas where the **Sinaloa and Tijuana** cartels tend to cultivate marijuana include Sonora, Michoacán, and Sinaloa states. They **focus on** trafficking in **marijuana because it is easy to grow, profitable for wholesale, and cheap to pay laborers**. In 2010 farmers received only 15 to 20 dollars for a pound of marijuana. 73 This price is just barely above the amount farmers could get for corn and other produce. Therefore, **if the price farmers were to be paid for marijuana were to fall much further, it is not unlikely that many would turn to more legitimate crops.**¶ **These cartels represent a huge part of the Mexican organized criminal structure.** **Dealing a major blow to these groups could give the Mexican government a leg up.** The Sinaloa cartel currently has the ability, due to its huge monetary reserves, to project its influence and carry out violence acts across vast swathes of Mexico. The Tijuana cartel holds large parts of its namesake city through violence and coercion. The following chapter will explore what effect, if any, the legalization of marijuana would have on the revenue, operational capacities, overall strength, and ability to wage violence for these two cartels.

## Link turn – AT no examples of surveillance success

### **Deterrence makes gains incalculable**

**Peter 14** – analyst

(Tom, “Drones on the US border: Are they worth the price,” CSM, [//BB">http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2014/0205/Drones-on-the-US-border-Are-they-worth-the-price\)//BB](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2014/0205/Drones-on-the-US-border-Are-they-worth-the-price)

CBP now says it's meeting all its internal flight-hour goals. **During the last fiscal year, the organization's 10 drones flew approximately 5,102 hours** (up from 3,909 in 2011). **Considering the increase** in drones, the improvement may seem marginal, but a senior CBP official says **the program is on track. It now operates under flight-hour guidelines that have evolved and changed** since the DHS report, says the official, who could speak to the media only on condition of anonymity. “I don't want to fly hours just to burn hours. I want to fly hours to meet a mission requirement.” Moreover, **measuring the drone program by apprehensions and drug interdictions produces a misleading metric** for success, say CBP officials. **If a drone's SAR radar helps reposition the border patrol to better respond to traffic along a previously unknown smuggling route, such a gain would be difficult to quantify.**

## MPX D – Violence low [best w/ K]

### **Mexican violence is declining and exaggerated**

**Weissman 14** - Distinguished Professor of Law University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Law

(Deborah, “The Politics of Narrative: Law and the Representation of Mexican Criminality,” SSRN)//BB

**The transnational narrative breathes new life into the national immigration panic discourse that has long plagued Latin Americans and generally Mexicans.**<sup>132</sup> The U.S. militarized response to drug cartel violence in Mexico cannot but help to foment public anxiety at home.<sup>133</sup> Indeed, **the narrative of drug-cartel violence has assumed a life of its own and has found a receptive milieu in an environment of fear and economic insecurity.** At the same time **the media and government officials invoke the threat of terrorist invaders from south of the border and plan military initiatives in Mexico,** “interior” terminology such as “surge operations” have entered the lexicon to signal the need to catch the ever-present Mexican criminal at-large within the territory of the United States.<sup>134</sup> The language of U.S. Border Patrol operating within the United States itself now includes “such military terms as ‘deconfliction,’ ‘situational awareness,’ ‘operational control,’ ‘surges,’ ‘forward operating bases,’ ‘common operating picture,’ and ‘defense-in-depth’” all in reference to domestic activity.<sup>135</sup> Politicians invoke similar war metaphors to address the threat of immigrants in the United States as those they use to describe the military efforts in Mexico and have made reference to the domestic “battlefield” of crime and illegal immigration.<sup>136</sup> And more than illegal drug activity—some have put the full blame for the sex-slave industry and other violent enterprises within the United States on Mexicans.<sup>137</sup> **Congressional hearings on immigration-related matters have resorted to the use of “tabloid-style titles” and function as a “largely fact-free performance” that seize upon dramatic stories that distort the truth and offer anecdotes that have been refuted by FBI data regarding crime on the border.**<sup>138</sup> Congressional witnesses reported that the “civil authorities, law enforcement agencies as well as [U.S.] citizens are under attack around the clock” notwithstanding **national, state, and local criminal justice data that confirm the decreasing rates of violent crime rates on the border and that border cities of all sizes demonstrate lower crime rates than the national average.**<sup>139</sup> Indeed, **much of the discourse around violent drug cartels functions to produce a “moral panic” about Mexicans in the United States.**<sup>140</sup> **The specter of the “Mexican as criminal”** crossing the border is said to “gladden[ ] the hearts of politicians on the right.”<sup>141</sup> **It is fodder for political demagoguery** for those politicians who seek to project a tough-on-crime image; Mexicans provides them with readily identifiable scapegoats.<sup>142</sup> Political fear-mongering about Mexicans offers a proven method to gain leverage in electoral contests.<sup>143</sup> Senator John McCain accused Mexican immigrants of setting the devastating wild fires in Arizona and New Mexico notwithstanding the lack of any proof to support such a charge.<sup>144</sup> Then Republican Presidential candidate Fred Thompson and members of the conservative media attributed the recent U.S. financial crisis to fraud in lending practices involving Mexican immigrants.<sup>145</sup> Others have invoked fear of massive voter fraud, claiming that unauthorized immigrants, most of whom are Mexicans, would be attempting to vote en masse illegally, and thereby affect the outcome of U.S. elections.<sup>146</sup> The U.S. State Department often discourages college students from traveling to Mexico for their spring break, warning of crime and danger.<sup>147</sup> For good measure they also

issued travel warnings for fear of contracting “swine flu,” a disease that some scholars have observed, “reinforced the ‘dirty,’ ‘unkempt,’ and ‘uncivilized’ representations of Mexicans, notwithstanding that the disease, later renamed H1N1, first originated in a town where a U.S. hog-operation corporation improperly handled waste.<sup>148</sup> The judiciary too is implicated in the invocation of this narrative: indeed, U.S. Supreme Court has suggested that Mexican immigrants may have greater proclivity toward criminal activity than native-born citizens.<sup>149</sup> **These discursive strategies help to define national membership in ways that suggest that most Mexicans ought to remain outside of U.S.** society. <sup>150</sup> **They ignore** the now **well-established studies** **statistics** about crime and immigrants, some of which focus on Mexican immigrants, that demonstrate that immigrants have a lower rate of criminal activity than their U.S. citizen counterpart.<sup>151</sup>



## MPX D – Not a failed state

### Mexico is not a failed state

**Dear 13** – PhD, professor in the College of Environmental Design at UC Berkeley

(Michael, "Why walls won't work," p. 136-139)//BB

**WHAT EVIDENCE IS there to support the claim that Mexico is a failed state?** Since 2005, the US-based Fund for Peace and the magazine Foreign Policy have published an annual Failed States Index (FSI) based on twelve indicators measuring weaknesses in a country's social, economic, and political institutions.<sup>11</sup> The FSI does not purport to predict when a state will fail, but to provide a measure of its vulnerability to collapse; even a failing score need not imply that every one of the states institutions is vulnerable. According to the 2010 FSI ranking of 177 countries worldwide, **the most unstable nation in the world was Somalia, with a score of 114** out of a

possible 110; the least unstable was Norway, with a score of 19. **Mexico ranked 96th**, placing it in a warning category (above the

**alert category—the worst—which included half the nations under review**). **The US ranked**

**158th**, which put it in the moderate category, one step below the best category, sustainable. Mexico's FSI rating was hurt by its uneven economic development and levels of socioeconomic inequality and by the existence of internal militias, guerrilla forces or private armies in armed struggle against state security forces, e.g., drug cartels or the Chiapas rebels. "Mexico is not a poor country, but it is not as rich as the US,

and neither country spreads its wealth around very evenly.<sup>16</sup> **Other global indicators add nuance and perspective to Mexico's**

**failings, but most of them point to the nation's consistently average performance**. Thus, Transparency

International's 2011 world Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) ranked Mexico number two (out of 183 countries), and the US number 14. (In the CPI, the lower number is better.)<sup>16</sup> However, there are two exceptions to these generally average indicators, one unfavorable, the other more-positive. When the international Reporters Without Borders brought out its first Press Freedom Index (PFI) in 2002, Mexico was roughly at midpoint in the rankings; a few years later, it had tumbled almost to bottom place where it has been stuck ever since. The PFI judged Mexico (along with Afghanistan, Somalia, and Pakistan) to be in a situation of "permanent chaos," where a culture of impunity had taken hold and where journalists who voiced critical opinions became targets. In a related 2010 Impunity Index compiled by the Committee to Protect Journalists, Mexico ranked ninth-worst nation the world. Noting that "more than 100 journalists and media workers were murdered or have vanished since 2006 when Calderon took office," the Committee claimed that a chilling veil of self-censorship had descended over reporters and editors who, in the face of threats, had chosen to put personal survival above reporting the news.<sup>66</sup> Other international observers

evinced greater optimism about the state of Mexico's democracy. **The Economist's Intelligence Unit regularly examines 167 nations**

**worldwide in a Democracy Index (DI). In 2010, the US ranked number 18 and was categorized**

**as a "full democracy;" Mexico ranked 55th and was characterized as a "flawed democracy."**<sup>67</sup>

Aspects of Mexico's political culture and electoral practices negatively influenced its ranking, but the **functionality of the Mexican government was**

**not brought into question**.<sup>68</sup> **Seasoned observers in Mexico bring much-needed perspective to**

**over-heated invocations of state failure**. Alma Guillermoprieto, for instance, **rejected the notion of Mexico as a failed state. Failed states, she protested, do not constantly build new roads and schools, collect taxes, and generate legitimate industrial and commercial activity sufficient to rank Mexico in the Top 20 largest economies in the world**.<sup>69</sup> Mexican citizens may be less than surprised when government neglects to

execute certain of its functions, but they worry more when cartels take over the functions of government and local policing and move into the business of building schools.<sup>70</sup> **Enrique Krauze**

**countered the charge of failure by cataloguing the recent achievements of the Mexican state. It was a tolerant and secular state**, he wrote, **an inclusive society with no serious threat or regional**

**secession or territorial dispute. It had overcome one-party political rule. Power had been**

**decentralized, allowing much greater autonomy in the executive, legislative, and judicial**

**branches. A transparency law had been passed to combat electoral corruption. The nations**

**institutions demonstrated resilience to crises** such as currency devaluation, economic downturn, the murder of a presidential candidate, and

post-election civil unrest. Still, Krauze conceded, Mexico's young multiparty democracy confronted many challenges, some old and some new. Poverty and inequality were stickily persistent. Alluding to the country's newest problem—the most serious crisis since the 1910 Revolution, in his opinion—Krauze warned of the increasing power and viciousness of organized crime in drug trafficking, kidnapping, and

extortion.<sup>71</sup> **On the evidence of the rankings, expert opinion, and the informal responses of**

**virtually every Mexican I asked, Mexico is not a failed state.**<sup>71</sup> However, there is a widespread consensus that the Mexican

government is losing its capacity to govern. A 2011 Latinobarometro poll placed Mexico last out of 18 Latin American countries in terms of satisfaction with the way democracy works in the country and close to last in terms of whether or not the country is 'making progress.'

## MPX D – US won't invade

### **No US invasion of Mexico**

**Andreas 9** – PhD, Professor of Political Science and Int'l Studies @ Brown

(Peter, "Border Games," p. 150-151)//BB

Some prominent security analysts have even advised that the United States should prepare for full-scale military action not only along but across the border in the not too distant future. **In The Next War, former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger describes** key potential future conflicts that U.S. national security strategists should be ready for. In the war scenario closest to home, 60,000 U.S. troops are deployed to the southwestern border after a radical nationalist leader has taken power in Mexico with the help of powerful drug-trafficking interests, and the re-sulting chaotic situation in Mexico has turned the northward flow of people and drugs into a flood. Unable to plug the border holes, Washington launches **a full-scale military invasion**. Some six months later, law and order have been restored south of the border. The State Department's postwar strategic: assessment of the conflict criticizes the failure of U.S. intelligence to foresee the crisis but praises the military's readiness to inter-vene.<sup>28</sup> **Fortunately, U.S. and Mexican political leaders—as well as Mexico's drug-traffic king organizations—share an interest in keeping this sce-nario in the realm of fiction.**

**Full militarization of the border is inhibited by official opinion in several quarters.** Importantly, **a much more expansive U.S. military role is strongly opposed by the law enforcement community.** While certainly welcoming various forms of military assistance in a support role, **enforcement bureau-cracies such as the Border Patrol jealously guard their turf. A significantly greater border role for the military is also widely opposed by mainstream political elites and by much of the military establishment itself.** Indeed, after a teenage goatherder was fatally shot by U.S. soldiers on a patrol mission along the Texas border in May 1997, the Pentagon indefinitely suspended such operations and indicated an interest in scaling back some of its border duties.

### **No Spillover – cartels fear US law enforcement**

**Rottas 11** Andrew Rottas, Graduate Student, University of Texas at Austin, Department of Government, April 22, 2011 "Reconceptualizing the U.S.-Mexico Border: Drug Cartels as Responsible Stakeholders", SSRN database

**Anyone listening to the recent domestic political debate in the United States would be forgiven for coming away with an impression that violent spillover from the Mexican drug wars is, in fact, a serious problem.** In early 2010, a group of congressional members sent a letter to the president asking for National Guard troops to be sent to the border because "violence in the vicinity of the U.S.-Mexico border continues to increase at an alarming rate."<sup>5</sup> Arizona Governor Jan Brewer described the main impetus behind her state's controversial immigration legislation, passed in April 2010, as "border-related violence and crime due to illegal immigration."<sup>6</sup> **Opponents of immigration, proponents of aid to Mexico, advocates for increased spending on border security, and other groups have all repeated the story that violent crime originating in Mexico is spilling over to the United States. American border towns have been painted as under siege from Mexican criminal groups, living in constant fear of the violence spreading out from the border. However, the facts on the ground simply do not support this picture. Assistant Police Chief Roy Bermudez, of the border city of Nogales, is on record as saying: "We have not, thank God, witnessed any spillover violence from**

**Mexico.”<sup>7</sup> And the statistics back him up. FBI statistics show that crime rates in Nogales, Douglas, Yuma, and other Arizona border towns have remained essentially flat.** In 2000, Nogales suffered 23 rapes, robberies, or murders. In 2009, despite nearly a decade of population growth and a significant increase in cross-border cartel presence, the number of such crimes dropped to 19. There were no murders in the previous two years. Statewide, the crime rate dropped 12% in 2009. Between 2004 and 2008 it fell 23%.<sup>8</sup> Also according to the FBI, the four large (500,000 or higher population) cities with the lowest crime rates were in states bordering Mexico: San Diego, California, Phoenix, Arizona, and El Paso and Austin, Texas.<sup>9</sup> **El Paso, in fact, provides the most fascinating case of all. Ciudad Juarez sits immediately across the border, and the Rio Grande, from El Paso. They are connected by vehicle and pedestrian bridges. In 2009, Ciudad Juarez suffered almost 2,700 murders - by some estimates it was the most violent city on the planet. El Paso had just one murder. El Paso County Sheriff Richard Wiles offers a simple explanation: “the Mexican cartels know that if they try to commit that sort of violence here, they’ll get shut down.”** <sup>10</sup> And El Paso is not alone: in 2008, for example San Diego, with a population of 1,271,655, experienced 55 murders<sup>11</sup>, while its cross-border sister city Tijuana, with a population of approximately 1,286,187 had 843.<sup>12</sup> This pattern repeats throughout the region and time period: **heavy periods of cartel violence across the border have failed to lead to any concurrent spike in the United States. This tremendous disparity in violence lends clear support to the hypothesis that cartels will work to restrain cross-border violence. Even if projecting violence onto the American side of the border were merely extremely inconvenient for these cartels, one would expect to see more spillover than this. The lack of corresponding violence in the US indicates an intentional effort by the cartels to keep violence off of American soil.**

### **Turn – cartel control offers a more secure border than the Mexican government control would**

**Rottas <sup>11</sup>** Andrew Rottas, Graduate Student, University of Texas at Austin, Department of Government, April 22, 2011 “Reconceptualizing the U.S.-Mexico Border: Drug Cartels as Responsible Stakeholders”, SSRN

However, as demonstrated in the discussion above, we see **that the United States government actually has reason to be confident that the cartels will play the option of providing tight security against violence on the border. This changes the equation significantly: the United States is now in a position to receive a strong partner in border security at only the costs of the negative effects of cartel control, the vast majority of which are borne by Mexico. Attacking the cartels under this condition would mean that the United States would pay to dislodge the cartels, and then either pay the cost of a less motivated and capable defender of the southern border, or shoulder the costs of propping up the Mexican government’s capabilities to defend the border. Even in the long term, once the Mexican government was back on its feet in the region, it is entirely possible that protecting the border would not be the critical priority that this argument demonstrates it to be for cartel actors. Thus, as long as the United States can be confident that the syndicates are able and motivated to provide capable defense at the border, the dominant strategy is to allow the status quo to remain in place.**

## MPX D – No terror

### **No cartel cooperation with terrorists - security oriented action hurts US – Mexico relations**

**Correa-Cabrera, Garrett, and Keck 14** Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera, Terence Garrett and Michelle Keck, Dr. Guadalupe is the Chair/Associate Professor of the School of Government at the University of Texas Brownsville, Dr. Terence Garrett is a Professor of the School of Government at the University of Texas Brownsville, Dr. Michelle Keck is an Assistant Professor at the School of Government at the University of Texas Brownsville, “Administrative Surveillance and Fear: Implications for U.S.-Mexico Border Relations and Governance”, *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, No. 96 (April 2014), pp. 35-53

Many have suggested that troops be sent to the U.S. border to fight the alleged narco-insurgency and keep Mexico's mayhem from spilling over the border. **U.S. intelligence and security officials have suggested the existence of ties between the major drug cartels operating in Mexico** (such as the Zetas) **and Hezbollah, Al Qaeda, or Al Qaeda affiliates**. For example, Department of Homeland Security Secretary, Janet Napolitano, mentioned this possibility in testimony before a congressional committee in February of 2011. In particular, she expressed Washington's concern because of an 'eventual alliance between Al-Qaeda and the Zetas' (Wilkinson 2011). **But the spectacular form in which media has presented the risks of escalating spillover violence and alleged narco-insurgency - and even narco-terrorism - seems to depict an inaccurate and unrealistic panorama** (Correa-Cabrera 2012, 208). **An alliance between the terrorists of Al Qaeda and the Mexican Zetas is unrealistic if one takes a close look at the goals and characteristics of these two organizations. Mexican TCOs 'are not ideologically motivated** and the Mexican government is trying to make a strong distinction between those things', according to Eric Olson, a senior associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Aguilar 2010, para. 11). **Carlos Pascual, former U.S. ambassador to Mexico, has also argued that there is no evidence the cartels have 'a political ideology or a religious ideology, and we need to make that distinction'**. Pascual insists that 'the lines should not be blurred to link the cartels with terrorist activities with an ideology' (Aguilar 2010, para. 8). **But the idea that Mexican TCOs could ally themselves with terrorists has become a part of public discourse because of groups whose aim might be 'to promote fear among the U.S. public in order to further their political and economic agendas'** (Correa-Cabrera 2012, 209). **This fear has been used to justify draconian immigration laws and the deployment, in some cases, of troops to the border. Unfortunately, these types of actions are misguided and could seriously damage the relationship between Mexico and the U.S. In many cases, the politics of fear appear to respond to specific political, ideological and economic interests while closing off channels of cooperation and communication between the U.S. and its southern neighbour.**

## MPX D – No Hezbollah

**Hezbollah is getting evicted from Latin America—no crime/terror connection anymore**

### **Algemeiner 1-6**

“Hezbollah’s ‘Golden Days’ in Latin America Coming to an End, Expert Says”

<http://www.algemeiner.com/2015/01/06/hezbollahs-golden-days-in-latin-america-coming-to-an-end-expert-says/>

**The rapidly changing diplomatic and political circumstances in Latin America mean that “Hezbollah’s golden days” in the region are coming to an end, an expert on the Lebanese Islamist terrorist organization has asserted.** Writing on the NOW-Lebanon website, journalist Ana Maria Luca observed that **“things are changing drastically in the region.** The late President Hugo **Chavez**, America’s most ostentatious enemy in the region, **is gone.** **The times when Hezbollah members got Venezuelan papers to travel to the United States and Canada are probably over.** **Cuba** — another country warmly disposed towards Iran, **has recently seen an unprecedented thawing of relations with the US.** Luca noted that **Hezbollah was perturbed by the thawing of US-Cuba relations announced last month** by President Obama. “This is how Hezbollah’s international relations official, Ammar Mousawi, congratulated Cuba,” she wrote. “The achievements of Cuba, which was firm in its principles, are a lesson for all peoples of the world who suffer from American hegemony,’ calling on the regime in Havana to ‘thwart the political, economic and military siege of Washington against Cuba for over half a century.’” Luca’s observations were provoked by a report in the leading Brazilian daily, O Globo, which linked Hezbollah with Primer Comando de la Capital (PCC,) a criminal gang that operates across Brazil. “Intelligence services in Brazil believed that there were Hezbollah members in the country who were connected to Brazilian criminal gangs, providing weapons and explosives for the Brazilian criminals. In exchange, the Lebanese got protection for Lebanese inmates in PCC-controlled Brazilian prisons,” she said. The revelation of Hezbollah’s Brazilian connection came on top of earlier investigations, reports and allegations of cooperation with the Mexican Los Zetas cartel, Luca said. “The documents, leaked by the Brazilian police to the press, show an interesting political shift in national and regional politics,” she asserted. **Hezbollah’s murky network in Latin America,** which depends on friendly governments such as the leftist regimes in Venezuela and Bolivia, **has been under scrutiny since 2006,** when the US Treasury Department raised the matter with several Latin American governments. **Almost ten years later,** according to Luca, **Hezbollah can no longer rely on intelligence agencies and police forces “turning a blind eye.”**

**Status quo solves Hezbollah—the conflict in Syria has overstretched them and will force military restraint**

### **Byman & Saab, 1-21**

Daniel Byman, Research Director, Center for Middle East Policy, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center for Middle East Policy, Bilal Y. Saab, Resident Senior Fellow for Middle East Security, Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security, January 21, 2015, Brookings Institution, “Hezbollah Hesitates? The Group’s Uncertain Transformation”

<http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2015/01/21-hezbollah-threat-byman-saab>

Israel's killing this week of six Hezbollah fighters and a top Iranian general in a helicopter raid in Syria is the latest and boldest attack by the Jewish state against the Shia party in recent years. Hezbollah has vowed to retaliate, and many of its supporters, urging the party to respond swiftly and forcefully, have advised Israel to "prepare its shelters." If the three-decade history of confrontation between Israel and Hezbollah is any guide, the latter is likely to strike back to protect its credibility. But that is not inevitable. **The Syrian conflict has transformed Hezbollah, arguably turning it into a more cautious foe** of the Jewish state. Hezbollah is a survivor. Since its formation in the early 1980s, the Shia party has made it through three high-intensity military conflicts with Israel, the assassination of several of its top leaders, the departure of its Syrian patron from Lebanon in 2005, and significant political crises in Beirut. Power, money, and performance, chiefly enabled by Iran and Syria, have allowed Hezbollah to become the dominant group in Lebanon and a key player in the high politics of the Middle East. But **the Syrian civil war is challenging Hezbollah's domestic and regional position. If Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime falls, Hezbollah would lose a key supporter from a country that historically has played a dominant role in Lebanese politics.** Even more important, Syria is Iran's closest ally, and Tehran was calling in its chits by asking Hezbollah to close ranks around the Assad regime. **Should Syria fall, Hezbollah could lose a storage facility and transit route** for weapons from Iran and Syria to Lebanon. **But should Assad leave, or his jihadist opponents grow stronger, the gravest threat Hezbollah** (and Lebanon as a whole) **would have to imminently deal with is Sunni extremism** as represented by groups such as the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS). **Sunni radicals** would not settle for controlling Syria. They **would also seek to expand into Lebanon to go after their number one bogeyman, Hezbollah.** **Already, Sunni jihadists have struck Hezbollah targets** and the Iranian embassy in Lebanon, among other places. By intervening in Syria to come to Assad's aid, **Hezbollah's chief Hassan Nasrallah has put his party on a collision course with Syria's** (and many of the region's) **Sunnis**—moderate and extremist alike. Indeed, despite Hezbollah's military advances in Syria, Sunni militants have been able to penetrate deep into the Shia party's sphere of influence and wreak havoc. More important, the same extremists that Nasrallah was hoping to fight outside Lebanon could turn Lebanon into another Iraq, a country defined by Sunni-Shia sectarian violence. **Another Lebanese civil war would be a major distraction** from the military struggle against Israel. **Hezbollah also risks military setbacks.** Hezbollah has beaten back Israel's military from Lebanon, earning it healthy respect from Israeli military leaders, something conspicuously lacking for other Arab military forces. At any given moment, there are perhaps 5,000 Hezbollah soldiers in Syria, but Hezbollah regularly rotates its forces to limit the impact. Even so, **the strain is showing.** **Because of its heavy role in Syria, Hezbollah is more militarily invested in Iran than ever before.** In Syria, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps' Quds Force assisted Hezbollah with command-and-control and training. Entering the war was in part payback for past favors, but the move tied Hezbollah even more tightly to its Iranian master. Finally, Hezbollah believes that it has a military role in Lebanon because of Syria. Along the border, its forces cooperate quietly with the Lebanese Armed Forces, patrolling and even laying mines to prevent infiltration. Hezbollah is both battle weary and battle hardened. The Syria experience has bloodied its forces, making them more skilled and allowing Hezbollah to test its commanders. At the same time, **the heavy death toll and the constant strain are overwhelming, and Hezbollah could not easily take on a new foe.** The fighting in Syria is also different from fighting Israel: Hezbollah is, in essence, a counterinsurgency force, taking on less-organized, poorly trained, and lightly-armed rebels. The Israel Defense Forces are a different, and far more dangerous, kettle of fish. As a result, **Hezbollah's military threat to Israel is uncertain.** The growing range of Hezbollah's rockets puts all of Israel in danger, although the success of the "Iron Dome" missile defense system offers Israelis some comfort. Nevertheless, Hezbollah is in no mood for an all-out war with Israel. The memories of the disastrous 2006 conflict are still fresh, and the drain of the Syrian conflict makes Hezbollah even more cautious. Although Israel likewise has no interest in a broad fight, conflict might break out depending on how Hezbollah chooses to respond to Israel's latest deadly assault. **Despite Hezbollah's role in terrorism, the United States and Hezbollah currently share many interests**—a reality both sides hate and would deny. Yet **both are at war with ISIS, and both want to prop up** Iraqi Prime Minister Haider **Abadi's government in Baghdad.** Even within Lebanon, although Washington supports Hezbollah's weak political rivals, it recognizes that Hezbollah is helping hold the country together and that an ISIS expansion or a descent into chaos would be a nightmare. A slight shift could turn suspicion into conflict. U.S. military actions in Syria are focused on ISIS and thus are indirectly helping the Assad regime, Hezbollah's ally. Yet if Washington decides to live up to its anti-Assad rhetoric and take on the Syrian regime as well as ISIS, it will also be taking on Hezbollah. Similarly, Hezbollah is more in bed with Iran now than ever before, and any military action against Tehran over its nuclear program must factor in the Hezbollah response. Hezbollah remains a potent regional actor: a stalking horse for Iran, and a prop to the Syrian regime. Nevertheless, **the organization is also overtaxed militarily and on the defensive politically.** Therefore, as painful as the loss it has just suffered is, **it wouldn't be shocking if Hezbollah decided to hold fire** or at least limit its response.



# **AT WAGES ADVANTAGE**





## UQ – Econ high

### **Economy is thriving---jobs and wages**

#### **AP 6-10**

("US jobs, wages hit 15-year high," <http://www.herald-dispatch.com/business/x1641594689/US-jobs-wages-hit-15-year-high>)//BB

**U.S. employers advertised the most open jobs in April than at any time in the 15 years that the government has tracked the data,** a sign that **this year's steady hiring will likely continue.**

The Labor Department said Tuesday that the number of open jobs at the end of April jumped 5.2 percent to 5.4 million. The figure suggests that employers anticipate stronger customer demand in the months ahead. **The job market has remained healthy** even as the economy faltered at the start of 2015. The steady hiring shows that businesses see the economic slump as having resulted mainly from temporary factors such as a harsh winter. On Friday, **the government said employers added a robust 280,000 jobs in May after a healthy gain in April.**

Average hourly **wages also ticked up.** Tuesday's figures show "**the bigger than expected gain in employment in May was no fluke.**" said Paul Ashworth, chief U.S. economist for Capital Economics. "**Labor market conditions are strengthening and wage growth will accelerate further.**" The unemployment rate rose to 5.5 percent last month, from 5.4 percent. But even that was partly good news: the improving job market and wage gains encouraged more people to start searching for work, reducing the number who had given up the hunt.

## UQ – Wages high

### **Wages high now**

**Davidson 15** – analyst @ WSJ

(Kate, “Jobs and Wages Grew in Nearly Every Large U.S. County in 2014,” Wall Street Journal, 6/17, <http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2015/06/17/jobs-and-wages-grew-in-nearly-every-large-u-s-county-in-2014/>)//BB

**Employment and wages grew in the vast majority of large U.S. counties last year**, underscoring the job market’s momentum through much of 2014.

**More than 94% of large U.S. counties reported employment gains through December**

**compared with a year earlier, and 98% saw average weekly wages increase**, the Labor

Department said Wednesday. The 339 largest U.S. counties have 75,000 workers or more.

**Last year’s gains are consistent with an economy that was adding jobs at a robust pace.** The

U.S. added an average 260,000 jobs a month in 2014—a pace that has since slowed—and the national unemployment rate dropping by a full percentage point during the year, to 5.6% in

December. **The average weekly wage in the U.S. increased 3.5% last year**, growing to \$1,035 by the end of 2014.

### **Momentum---many economic measures prove**

**Sparshott 15** – analyst @ WSJ

(Jeffrey, “Are Wages and Benefits Growing Faster Than We Think?,” 6/10,

<http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2015/06/10/are-wages-and-benefits-growing-faster-than-we-think/>)//BB

**U.S. workers’ wages and benefits may be picking up faster** than previously thought. Employer

costs for employee compensation jumped 4.9% from a year earlier in March, the Labor

Department said Wednesday, the second consecutive increase at that relatively robust level.

Average cost per hour worked rose to \$33.49 in March, versus \$31.93 a year earlier. Wages and

salaries climbed 4.2% to \$22.88 while benefits rose 6.4% to \$10.61. Health insurance, one

component of benefits, was up 2.5%. That’s well above a 1.2% gain as recently as the third

quarter of 2013 and a sign the labor market is getting tighter as employers add jobs at a healthy

pace. **“The growth reported over the most recent four quarters is one of the firmest over-**

**year-ago changes in the ECEC on record back to 1991,”** Daniel Silver, an economist at J.P.

Morgan Chase, said in a note to clients. “The ECEC is not one of our preferred measures of wage

inflation, but **its recent firming echoes the message from many other related measures** that

**have also been strengthening lately.”**

## No link – immigrants don't influence wages

### **Even if they win the aff solves wages it's not key to the economy**

**Camarota 1** (Steven, Director of Research at the Center for Immigration Studies, "Impact of Mexican Immigration on Wages and Prices in the United States," July 2001, Center for Immigration Studies, <http://cis.org/articles/2001/mexico/wages.html>)/JL

Mexican Immigrants Account for a Small Share of Economic Output. It may be surprising that the millions of Mexicans holding jobs in the United States have such a small impact on the overall U.S. economy. To understand why the effect of Mexicans must be very small, it may be helpful to examine what share of total economic output Mexican immigrants

account for. Based on the March 2000 CPS, which asked about employment in the previous calendar year, there were a total of 4.9 million Mexican immigrants working in the U. States for at least part of 1999 — of a total U.S. workforce of 149 million. This means that Mexican immigrants

accounted for 3.3 percent of the total workforce. Of these, 4.4 million worked full time out of a total full-time workforce of 119.2 million, and 500,000 worked part time out of a total part-time workforce of 29.8 million. Mexican immigrants therefore accounted for 3.7 percent of all full-time workers

and 0.4 percent of all part-time workers. Despite the fact that they account for 3.3 percent of the U.S. workforce, Mexican immigrants' total earnings account for only 1.91 percent of all labor income (including, salary, wages, commissions, tips, etc.) paid to workers in the United States because of their

lower skill levels and resulting lower average incomes. This breaks down to 1.32 percent of labor incomes going to legal Mexican immigrants and 0.58 percent to illegal Mexican immigrants. Making the standard assumption that capital comprises 30 percent of economic output, this means

that Mexican-immigrant labor accounts for 1.34 percent of GDP, with 0.93 percent from legal Mexican immigrants and 0.41 percent from illegal Mexican

immigrant labor: **Thus Mexican immigrants have only a very small effect on the total U.S. economy.**

## Link turn – NAFTA

### **The plan causes NAFTA backlash**

**Andreas 9** – PhD, Professor of Political Science and Int'l Studies @ Brown  
(Peter, "Border Games," p. 84)//BB

Each agency is concerned only about showing the success of its discrete mission, rather than with the viability of the policy as a whole. Each has its own way of measuring and justifying its performance: for example, the Customs Service highlights seizures and arrests at the border ports of entry; the DEA prioritizes the capture of major traffickers; the State Department stresses the level of cooperation with Mexico. Poor results tend to be blamed on mismanagement and insufficient resources. Improved results are assumed to come from more and better law enforcement and cross-border cooperation. The question-and-answer period that follows the prepared official testimonies can often be heated, but given the political and bureaucratic interests involved, there is rarely any challenge to the basic underlying supply-side logic of the drug control strategy.

**Projecting an impression of cross-border commitment** and progress in the antidrug campaign **has ultimately proved to be more politically consequential for U.S. and Mexican leaders than whether or not the drug supply has actually been reduced. Regardless of its deterrent effect, the escalation of enforcement efforts has helped to fend off political attacks and kept the drug issue from derailing the broader process of economic integration.** In other words, **a policy that has largely failed in its stated goal has nevertheless helped to realize other key political objectives**—most notably **the** creation and **maintenance of NAFTA**. The intensified antidrug campaign, however, has brought with it significant collateral damage: more corruption, more militarized law enforcement, more linkages between the drug trade and legitimate cross-border trade, and a generally more "nar-coticized" U.S.-Mexico relationship.

### **NAFTA is key to the economy**

**Canadian- American Business Council 8**- The Premier Voice of the Canadian American Business Community ("The economic benefits of NAFTA", April 2008,  
<http://canabusco.org/resources/TheEconomicBenefitsofNAFTA.pdf//RT>

From the current U.S. government's perspective, **the U.S. economy has been a big winner under NAFTA. U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab says U.S. merchandise exports to Canadian and Mexico grew more rapidly – 157% – than U.S. exports to the rest of the world, which was 108%. About US\$2.4 billion worth of goods crosses the northern and southern borders each day.** As a result, **Canada and Mexico are the U.S.'s first and second largest export markets**, although China is soon expected to be the U.S.'s largest trading partner. Initial worries about NAFTA, from the U.S. perspective, had little to do with trade with Canada. Instead, former presidential candidate Ross Perot, characterized then widespread concerns about America job losses to Mexico as "that giant sucking sound. That does not appear to have happened. Instead, Schwab says that **U.S. economic growth during the past 14 years of NAFTA has been strong: U.S. employment rose 22% to 137.2 million in December 2006 from 112.2 million in December 1993. The average unemployment rate was 5.1% between 1994 and 2006, compared with 7.1% between 1981 and 1993. U.S. manufacturing output rose by 63% between 1993 and 2006, nearly double the 37% seen between 1980 and 1993.** Wages in the same sector increased 1.6% between 1993 and 2006 compared with 0.9% between 1980 and 1993. Excluding housing, U.S. business investment has risen by 107% since 1993, compared

with 45% between 1980 and 1993**The U.S. Trade Representative also insists that NAFTA's investment provisions such as Chapter 11 do not prevent the U.S. – or any NAFTA country – from adopting or maintaining non-discriminatory laws or regulations that protect the environment, worker rights, health and safety or other public interest.** Schwab notes that to date the U.S. has not lost a challenge in cases decided under NAFTA, nor has it paid a penny in damages to resolve any investment dispute. Even if the U.S. were to lose a case, **it could be directed to pay compensation but it could not be required to change the laws or regulations at issue.**

## Link turn – wages

### Low-skilled immigration collapses wages

**Ruark and Graham 11** (Eric a. Ruark, Director of Research at Federation for American Immigration Reform and Professor at University of Maryland, and Matthew Graham, co-researcher for the Federation for American Immigration, “Immigration, Poverty and Low-Wage Earners the Harmful effect of Unskilled immigrants on American Workers”

[http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty\\_rev.pdf](http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty_rev.pdf) May 2011 JM)

**Today’s immigration system is dysfunctional because it is not responsive to the socioeconomic conditions of the country. Only**

**immigration contributes to an already existing surplus of low-skilled workers, increasing job competition and driving down wages and conditions to the detriment of American workers.** The presence of a large illegal workforce perpetuates a vicious cycle as degraded work conditions discourage Americans from seeking these jobs and make employers more dependent on an illegal foreign workforce. America’s massive low-skill labor force and illegal alien population allow employers to offer low pay and deplorable conditions.

These harmful effects of the immigration system were recognized in the reports of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform in the mid 1990s. The Commission’s immigration reform recommendations were welcomed by President Clinton and submitted to Congress, but have largely been ignored since then. **Conditions for America’s poorest workers have continued to deteriorate because of both illegal and legal immigration.** Reform of the immigration system to assure that it does not harm Americans and

instead contributes to a stronger more equitable society is long overdue. The reforms that are needed include ending family-based chain migration and unskilled immigration, ending the job competition for America’s most vulnerable citizens by curtailing illegal immigration and unskilled legal immigration, and holding employers accountable for hiring illegal workers. The U.S. has a responsibility to protect the economic interests of all of its citizens. **yet the immigration**

**system, which adds hundreds of thousands to the labor force each year, is bringing in workers faster than jobs are being created.** Moreover, only a small portion of admissions are based on skills or educational criteria, creating an enormous glut of low-skilled workers who struggle to rise above poverty.

In 1995, the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform recommended curtailing family-based immigration and replacing the “failed and expensive regulatory system [for skill-based immigration] with one that is market-driven.” Along these lines, the Commission recommended that, “it is not in the national interest to admit unskilled workers” because **“the U.S. economy is showing difficulty in absorbing disadvantaged workers.”**<sup>1</sup> Fifteen years later, **U.S. politicians continue to ignore these recommendations, bowing to corporate demands for unskilled labor rather than taking a realistic look at immigration’s effect on poverty and the American worker.**

### Illegal immigrants deflate wages—statistical data

**Ruark and Graham 11** (Eric a. Ruark, Director of Research at Federation for American Immigration Reform and Professor at University of Maryland, and Matthew Graham, co-researcher for the Federation for American Immigration, “Immigration, Poverty and Low-Wage Earners the Harmful effect of Unskilled immigrants on American Workers”

[http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty\\_rev.pdf](http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty_rev.pdf) May 2011 JM)

**Illegal aliens are** the least skilled subset of the immigrant population, and therefore **the most likely to undercut the wages and working conditions of low-skilled natives.** Among seventeen industry categories named by the Pew Research Center as having the highest proportions of illegal aliens, **data from the Current Population Survey reveal that noncitizens earned lower wages than natives in all but one of them.**<sup>28</sup> **Data for noncitizens,** which includes legal and illegal immigrants as well as temporary laborers, **differ from data on illegal aliens because the latter tend to have lower wages and fewer skills.** However, **data on noncitizens are a much better fit for illegal aliens than using the foreign born population as a whole.** In construction, **noncitizens earned less than two-thirds of natives’ wage salaries, and in the two agricultural categories, they earned less than half.**<sup>29</sup> **Wage and salary differences demonstrate how illegal and unskilled immigrants place downward**

**pressure on wages by providing an incentive for employers to choose them over natives. The opportunity to exploit workers is the reason big business clamors for more immigrant labor. Most wage-effect studies do not analyze illegal immigrants as a separate group because most demographic data is not differentiated on that basis**

drag on unskilled wages. In 2010, Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda of **the Center for American Progress estimated that unskilled workers would on average make about \$400 more per year if the illegal immigrant population were reduced by 4 million, or approximately one-third.**<sup>30</sup> In Georgia, where the illegal immigrant share of the labor force went from about 4 percent to 7 percent from 2000 to 2007, a study by the Federal Reserve found that the illegal labor caused a 2.5 percent wage drop overall and an 11 percent drop in construction wages over the period.<sup>31</sup> This analysis used a confidential state employer database that helped identify Social Security mismatches, making it one of the most sophisticated estimates available. Other estimates focus on the entire immigrant population, whose education is comparable to natives at the high end but overwhelmingly unskilled at the other end of the distribution. **The National Research Council's landmark 1997 study estimated that high school dropouts earn 5 percent less per year due to immigration, which totaled \$13 billion in wage losses at a time when the illegal alien population stood at less than half its present number.**<sup>32</sup> Harvard University's George Borjas concluded that **immigration reduced wages for the poorest 10 percent of Americans by about 7.4 percent** between 1980 and 2000 with even larger effects for workers with less than 20 years of experience.<sup>33</sup> **Other economists who have found that immigration depresses low-skilled wages** include the Cato Institute's Daniel Griswold.<sup>34</sup> If legal and illegal immigration continue to add to the overabundance of unskilled workers, the consequences for poor natives will continue to grow.

## **Immigration has a significant average negative effect on wages**

**Borjas, Professor of Economics at Harvard, '13** [George, described Business Week and the Wall Street Journal as "America's leading immigration economist", Robert W. Scrivner Professor of Economics and Social Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School, recipient of the 2011 IZA Prize in Labor Economics, Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, "Immigration and the American Worker." Center for Immigration Studies. N.p., Apr. 2013. Web. 29 June 2015. <<http://cis.org/immigration-and-the-american-worker-review-academic-literature>>.

Classifying workers by education level and age and comparing differences across groups over time shows that **a 10 percent increase in the size of an education/age group due to the entry of immigrants** (both legal and illegal) **reduces the wage of native-born men in that group by 3.7 percent and the wage of all native-born workers by 2.5 percent. The results** from the education/age comparisons **align well with** what is predicted by **economic theory**. Further support for the results from the education/age comparisons can be found in studies using the same method in other countries. **A theory-based framework predicts** that the **immigrants** who entered the country **from 1990 to 2010 reduced the average annual earnings of American workers by \$1,396** in the short run. Because immigration (legal and illegal) increased the supply of workers unevenly, the impact varies across skill groups, with high school dropouts being the most negatively affected group.

## **Illegal immigration specifically has a massive wage redistribution effect**

**Borjas, Professor of Economics at Harvard, '13** [George, described Business Week and the Wall Street Journal as "America's leading immigration economist", Robert W. Scrivner Professor of Economics and Social Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School, recipient of the 2011 IZA Prize in Labor Economics, Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, "Immigration and the American Worker." Center for Immigration Studies. N.p., Apr. 2013. Web.



29 June 2015. <<http://cis.org/immigration-and-the-american-worker-review-academic-literature>>.]

The immigration surplus or benefit to natives created by illegal immigrants is estimated at around \$9 billion a year or 0.06 percent of GDP — six one-hundredths of 1 percent. Although the net benefits to natives from illegal immigrants are small, there is a sizable redistribution effect. **Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated \$99 to \$118 billion a year**, and generates a gain for businesses and other users of immigrants of \$107 to \$128 billion.

**Immigrants outcompete Americans for jobs causing a drastic decline in wages**  
**Borjas 13 (George, Economics Professor at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, “Immigration and the American Worker,” April 2013, Center for Immigration Studies, [//JL](http://cis.org/immigration-and-the-american-worker-review-academic-literature))**

Economists have long known that immigration redistributes income in the receiving society. Although immigration makes the aggregate economy larger, the actual net benefit accruing to natives is small, equal to an estimated two-tenths of 1 percent of GDP. There is **little evidence** indicating that immigration (legal and/or illegal) creates large net gains for native-born Americans. Even though the overall net impact on natives is small, this does not mean that the wage losses suffered by some natives or the income gains accruing to other natives are not substantial. Some groups of **workers face a great deal of competition from immigrants**. These workers are primarily, but by no means exclusively, at the bottom end of the skill distribution, doing low-wage jobs that require modest levels of education. Such workers make up a significant share of the nation’s working poor. The biggest winners from immigration are owners of businesses that employ a lot of immigrant labor and other users of immigrant labor. The other big winners are the immigrants themselves.

## Link turn – Social Security

### Illegal immigration makes social security ineffective

Johnson 11 (Mary, Social Security and Medicare Policy Analyst, “The Growing Cost Of Illegal Immigration To Social Security,” 10/5/2011, The Senior Citizens League, <http://seniorsleague.org/2011/the-growing-cost-of-illegal-immigration-to-social-security/>)/JL

A huge inconsistency between U.S. immigration law and Social Security threatens to undermine the income security of millions of U.S. senior citizens and the disabled. In 2004 Congress passed legislation requiring immigrants to have work authorization at the time a Social Security number is assigned **or at some**

**later time** in order to become entitled under Social Security.<sup>(1)</sup> Therefore, immigrants who obtain authorization to work in this country may eventually claim benefits based on all earnings. Despite tightening the law, Congress did not fix a policy loophole that would be inadvertently triggered with the passage of comprehensive immigration reform legislation. When determining entitlement for insured status, and when calculating the initial retirement benefit, the Social Security Administration (SSA) uses all reported earnings from covered

employment in the United States, even if the earnings were from illegal or “unauthorized” work.<sup>(2)</sup> This policy benefits immigrants who have broken U.S. immigration and employment laws and have worked using a stolen or fraudulent Social Security number. In addition, this policy flaw raises questions as to whether Social Security eligibility

acts as an **incentive for more illegal immigration** in the future. Although immigration law forbids work without authorization, immigrants do find jobs, and the majority of employers report their earnings to SSA. Each year SSA receives hundreds of millions of W-2s. When the name and Social Security number (SSN) do not match SSA’s records, the W-2 is held in the Earnings Suspense File (ESF). Recent data indicates that in recent years the ESF is growing at an unprecedented pace and the cumulative wages represented is now \$585 billion. These wages can later be reinstated to valid Social Security numbers when immigrants gain work authorization. Because earnings are used to determine both the number of quarters of coverage worked for insured status, and the initial retirement benefit, this poses a substantial liability to the Social Security Trust Fund and would worsen its solvency. It’s widely anticipated that benefits will be cut,

**perhaps significantly**, for retirees at some point in the relatively near future, and that significantly higher taxes will be needed. In addition, this inconsistency between Social Security and immigration law suggests that newly work-authorized immigrants may benefit in the future, at least to some extent, at the expense of native-born U.S. workers and retirees who paid into the system legally over their entire working careers.

## MPX D – US not key

### **US is not key to the global economy**

**Brainard 8** – vice president and director of the Global Economy and Development program at the Brookings Institution, where she holds the Bernard L. Schwartz Chair in International Economics

(Lael, “CAN AMERICA STILL LEAD IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY?,” Scholar)//BB

1. Dispersion of Economic Power: **The rest of the world no longer depends on the United States as the engine of global growth as in the past. The emerging market countries are booming, integrating into the global economy, and learning to assert their interests more forcefully. Europe, with \$17 trillion in 2007 GDP (before the recent rise of the Euro) is a formidable economic bloc and a complex political unit** with which to interact. The U.S. economy, while fundamentally sound, is now about one-fourth of the global economy, a fraction that is falling. Although in reality most major economies are deeply coupled rather than decoupled through multiple transmission channels, **the sheer size and vibrancy of demand from emerging market economies are large enough to propel the global economy even when the U.S., European, or Japanese economies falter**—though not if they fail.

## MPX D – Economic decline doesn't lead to war

### **No impact to economic decline – prefer new data**

Daniel **Drezner 14**, Professor of IR at Tufts, “The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession”, World Politics, Volume 66. Number 1, January 2014, pp. 123-164

The final significant outcome addresses a dog that hasn't barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.<sup>42</sup> They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder. **The aggregate data suggest otherwise**, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has concluded that “the average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”<sup>43</sup> Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis, as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict, as Lotta Themner and Peter Wallensteen conclude: “[T]he pattern is one of relative stability when we consider the trend for the past five years.”<sup>44</sup> The secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed. Rogers Brubaker observes that “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”<sup>45</sup>

### **Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war**

Robert **Jervis 11**, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? <sup>45</sup> A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone

**suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.**

### **\*\*No conflicts resulted from the recession – disproves the impact**

**Barnett 9**—senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC (Thomas, The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis, 25 August 2009, <http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx>)

**When the global financial crisis struck** roughly a year ago, **the blogosphere was ablaze with** all sorts of scary **predictions of**, and commentary regarding, **ensuing** conflict and **wars** -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how **globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had** virtually **no impact** whatsoever **on** the **international security** landscape. **None of the** more than **three-dozen ongoing conflicts** listed by GlobalSecurity.org **can be clearly attributed to the global recession**. Indeed, the last new entry (civil **conflict between Hamas and Fatah** in the Palestine) **predates the economic crisis** by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. **Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts** listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, **we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements**. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, **the only two potential state-on-state wars** (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) **are** both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly **unrelated to** global **economic trends**. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), **our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been** quite **modest**, both leading up to and **following the** onset of the economic **crisis**: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: •No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); •The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); •Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); •**No great** improvement or **disruption in great-power cooperation** regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); •A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and •**No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan** or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) **Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending**. If anything, the **friendly cooperation on** such **stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis**. **Can we say that**

**the world** has **suffered a** distinct **shift to** political **radicalism** as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's **major economies remain governed by center**-left or center-right political **factions that remain** decidedly **friendly to** both **markets** and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial **crisis has proven the** great **resilience of America's** post-World War II international **liberal** trade **order**.

## **History proves**

**Ferguson 6**— Laurence A. Tisch prof of History at Harvard. William Ziegler of Business Administration at Harvard. MA and D.Phil from Glasgow and Oxford (Niall, "The Next War of the World," September/October 2006, [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\\_next\\_war\\_of\\_the\\_world.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the_next_war_of_the_world.html))

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. **What** may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography **links the** Great **Depression to** the rise of **fascism and** the outbreak of **World War II**. But that simple story **leaves too much out**. Nazi **Germany started the war** in Europe only **after its economy** had **recovered**. **Not all the countries** affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes **start wars** of aggression. In fact, **no** general **relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century** as a whole. Some **wars came after** periods of **growth**, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, **and** some severe economic **crises were not followed by wars**.

## **Robust studies prove**

**Miller 2k**— Professor of Management, Ottawa (Morris, Poverty As A Cause Of Wars?, <http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256/WG4draft1.htm>)

Thus, these armed conflicts can hardly be said to be caused by poverty as a principal factor when the greed and envy of leaders and their hegemonic ambitions provide sufficient cause. The poor would appear to be more the victims than the perpetrators of armed conflict. It might be alleged that some dramatic event or rapid sequence of those types of events that lead to the exacerbation of poverty might be the catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who might be tempted to seek a diversion by finding/fabricating an enemy and going to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of **the Carnegie Endowment** for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. **After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries**

in Latin America and Asia in the years since World War II they **concluded that** Much of **the conventional** wisdom about the political **impact of economic crises may be wrong...** The **severity of economic crisis** - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - **bore no relationship to** the **collapse** of regimes. A more direct role was played by political variables such as ideological polarization, labor radicalism, guerilla insurgencies and an anti-Communist military... **(In democratic states) such changes seldom lead to** an outbreak of **violence (while)** in the cases of **dictatorships** and semi-democracies, the ruling elites **responded** to crises **by** increasing repression (thereby **using one form of violence to abort another.**

## No geopolitical effects

**Blackwill 2009** – former US ambassador to India and US National Security Council Deputy for Iraq, former dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard (Robert D., RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, [http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\\_papers/2009/RAND\\_OP275.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2009/RAND_OP275.pdf))

Did the economic slump lead to strategic amendments in the way Japan sees the world? No. Did it slow the pace of India's emergence as a rising great power? No. To the contrary, the new Congress-led government in New Delhi will accelerate that process. Did it alter Iran's apparent determination to acquire a nuclear capability or something close to it? No. Was it a prime cause of the recent domestic crisis and instability in Iran after its 2009 presidential election? No. Did it slow or accelerate the moderate Arab states intent to move along the nuclear path? No. Did it affect North Korea's destabilizing nuclear calculations? No. Did it importantly weaken political reconciliation in Iraq? No, because there is almost none in any case. Did it slow the Middle East peace process? No, not least because prospects for progress on issues between Israel and the Palestinians are the most unpromising in 25 years. Did it substantially affect the enormous internal and international challenges associated with the growth of Jihadism in Pakistan? No. But at the same time, it is important to stress that Pakistan, quite apart from the global recession, is the epicenter of global terrorism and now represents potentially the most dangerous international situation since the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Did the global economic downturn systemically affect the future of Afghanistan? No. The fact that the United States is doing badly in the war in Afghanistan has nothing to do with the economic deterioration. As Henry Kissinger observes, “The conventional army loses if it does not win. The guerrilla wins if he does not lose.” And NATO is not winning in Afghanistan. Did it change in a major way the future of the Mexican state? No. Did the downturn make Europe, because of its domestic politics, less willing and able over time to join the U.S. in effective alliance policies? **No**, there will likely be no basic variations in Europe's external policies and no serious evolution in transatlantic relations. As President Obama is experiencing regarding Europe, the problems with European publics in this regard are civilizational in character, not especially tied to this recession—in general, European publics do not wish their nations to take on foreign missions that entail the use of force and possible loss of life. Did the downturn slow further EU integration? Perhaps, at the margin, but in any case one has to watch closely to see if EU integration moves like a turtle or like a rock. And so forth. To be clear, there will inevitably be major challenges in the international situation in the next five years. In fact, this will be the most dangerous and chaotic global period since before the 1973 Middle East war. But it is not obvious that these disturbing developments will be primarily a result of the global economic problems. It is, of course, important to be alert to primary and enduring international discontinuities. **If such a convulsive geopolitical event is out there, what is it?** One that comes to mind is another catastrophic attack on the American homeland. Another is the collapse of Pakistan and the loss of government control of its nuclear arsenal to Islamic extremists. But again, neither of these two geopolitical calamities would be connected to the current economic decline. Some argue that, even though **geopolitical** changes resulting from the current global economic tribulations are not yet apparent, they are occurring beneath the surface of the international system and will become manifest in the years to come. In short, causality not perceptible now will become so. This subterranean argument is difficult to rebut. To test that hypothesis, the obvious analytical method is to seek tangible data that demonstrates that it is so. In short, show A, B, and/or C (in this case, geopolitical transformations caused by the world slump) to have occurred, thus substantiating the contention. One could then examine said postulated evidence and come to a judgment regarding its validity. To instead contend that, even though no such data can be adduced, the assertion, nevertheless, is true because of presently invisible occurrences seems more in the realm of religious conviction than rigorous analysis. But it is worth asking, as the magisterial American soldier-statesman George Marshall often did, “Why might I be wrong?” If the global economic numbers continue to decline next year and the year after, one must wonder whether any region would remain stable—whether China would maintain internal stability, whether the United States would continue as the pillar of international order, and whether the European Union would hold together. In that same vein, it is unclear today what effect, if any, the reckless financial lending and huge public debt that the United States is accumulating, as well as current massive governmental fiscal and monetary intervention in the American economy, will have on U.S. economic dynamism, entrepreneurial creativity, and, consequently, power projection over the very long term. One can only speculate on that issue at present, but it is certainly worth worrying about, and it is the most important “known unknown”<sup>27</sup> regarding this subject.<sup>28</sup> In addition, perhaps the Chinese Communist Party's grip on China is more fragile than posited here, and possibly Pakistan and Mexico are much more vulnerable to failed-state outcomes primarily because of the economic downturn than anticipated in this essay. While it seems unlikely that these worst-case scenarios will eventuate as a result of the world recession, they do illustrate again that crucial uncertainties in this analysis are the global downturn's length and severity and the long-term effects of the Obama Administration's policies on the U.S. economy. Finally, if not, why not? If the world is in the most severe international economic crisis since the 1930s, why is it not producing structural changes in the global order? A brief answer is that the transcendent geopolitical elements have not altered in substantial ways with regard to individual nations in the two years since the economic crisis began. What are those enduring geopolitical elements? For

any given country, they include the following: • **Geographic location**, topography, and climate. As Robert Kaplan puts it, “to embrace geography is not to accept it as an implacable force against which humankind is powerless. Rather, it serves to qualify human freedom and choice with a modest acceptance of fate.”<sup>29</sup> In this connection, see in particular the works of Sir Halford John Mackinder and

his *The Geographical Pivot of History* (1904)<sup>30</sup>, and Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783* (1890).<sup>31</sup> • Demography—the size, birth rate, growth, density, ethnicity, literacy, religions, migration/emigration/ assimilation/absorption, and industriousness of the population. • The histories, foreign and defense policy tendencies, cultural determinants, and domestic politics of individual countries. • The size and strength of the domestic economy. • The quality and pace of technology. • The presence of natural resources. • The character, capabilities, and policies of neighboring states. For the countries that matter most in the global order, perhaps unsurprisingly, none of these decisive variables have changed very much since the global downturn began, except for nations' weaker economic performances. That single factor is not likely to trump all these other abiding geopolitical determinants and therefore produce international structural change. Moreover, the fundamental power relationships between and among the world's foremost countries have also not altered, nor have those nations' perceptions of their vital national interests and how best to promote and defend them. To sum up this pivotal concept, in the absence of war, revolution, or other extreme international or domestic disruptions, for nation-states, the powerful abiding conditions just listed do not evolve much except over the very long term, and thus neither do countries' strategic intent and core external policies— even, as today, in the face of world economic trials. This point was made earlier about Russia's enduring national security goals, which go back hundreds of years. Similarly, a Gulf monarch recently advised—with respect to Iran—not to fasten on the views of President Ahmadinejad or Supreme Leader Khamenei. Rather, he counseled that, to best understand contemporary Iranian policy, one should more usefully read the histories, objectives, and strategies of the Persian kings Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, who successively ruled a vast empire around 500 BC.<sup>32</sup> The American filmmaker Orson Welles once opined that “To give an accurate description of what never happened is the proper occupation of the historian.”<sup>33</sup> Perhaps the same is occasionally true of pundits. ■



## MPX turn – higher wages bad

### Rising average wage hurts low-skilled workers

**Lammam 14** (Charles, Director of Fiscal Studies at the Fraser Institute. He holds an M.A. in public policy and a B.A. in economics with a minor in business administration from Simon Fraser University, “The Economic Effects of Living Wage Laws” <http://www.fraserinstitute.org/uploadedFiles/fraser-ca/Content/research-news/research/publications/economic-effects-of-living-wage-laws.pdf> January 2014 JM)

Although **activists** claim living wage laws can **increase wages with minimal costs**, **the reality is quite different**

Both **economic theory** and evidence suggest that living wage ordinances, like minimum **wage** legislation, **create distortions in the labour market that have a negative impact on employment**. When governments mandate a wage above the prevailing

market rate, a typical result is that **fewer jobs and hours become available and it is usually the people who**

**are less skilled who are most adversely affected**. Indeed, there is a trade-off between the workers who benefit from a higher wage

and those who endure the costs due to fewer employment opportunities. iv The research looking into the economic effects of living wage laws is not as developed as the minimum wage literature, which spans several decades and over a hundred academic studies. But the conclusion from the best and most rigorously analyzed evidence is that

living wage laws have similar unintended consequences. Specifically, **evidence shows that employers respond to living wages by cutting back on jobs, hours, and on-the-job training**. Those who advocate living wage laws tend to overlook these consequences

and instead focus only on the benefits of such policies. The reality is that, **while some workers may benefit from a higher wage,**

**their gain comes at the expense of others**. According to research by leading scholars in the field, **a 100% increase in the**

living **wage** (say going from a minimum wage of \$10 per hour to a living wage of \$20 per hour) **reduces employment among low-wage**

**workers by between 12% and 17%**. **Affected workers therefore lose valuable employment**

**income and the ability to gain new skills and experience that foster upward income mobility.**

Research also finds that **employers respond** to living wages **by hiring more qualified workers at the expense of**

**those with fewer skills in order to offset some of the higher wage costs**. **Living wages**

**therefore reduce the opportunity for less-skilled workers to participate in the labour market.**

**This is a highly perverse outcome since less-skilled workers are presumably among the very**

**people the policy is intended help. And, if employers end up hiring more productive workers**

**who would have been paid a higher wage anyways, it defeats the purpose of adopting living**

**wage laws in the first place.**

### Internal link turn—rising wages hurts the economy through small businesses

**ALEC 14** (American Legislative Exchange Council, America’s largest nonpartisan, voluntary membership organization of state legislators. Comprised of nearly one-quarter of the country’s state legislators, business and thought leaders, “Raising the Minimum Wage: The Effects on Employment, Businesses and Consumers” [http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising\\_Minimum\\_wage.pdf](http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising_Minimum_wage.pdf) March 2014 JM)

When the government imposes **a higher** minimum **wage**, employers **face higher labor costs and are forced to respond by decreasing other production expenses.**<sup>3</sup> **Some employers make labor-saving capital**

**investments that reduce reliance on employees, decrease pay raises to employees that earn**

**more than the minimum wage, or replace the lowest-skilled individuals with more highly**

**skilled employees.**<sup>4</sup> **Other firms may make adjustments such as reducing employees’ hours,**

**non-wage benefits or training.**<sup>5</sup> **Businesses cannot afford to pay employees more than those**

**employees produce on the aggregate. Employees** who are **paid the minimum wage earn that wage**

**rate because they lack the productivity to command higher pay.**<sup>6</sup> Advocates of increasing the minimum wage rely on the

idea that businesses are able but unwilling to pay higher wages to their employees. The hope is that these businesses will simply take a hit in their profits while employment and prices are negligibly affected. Unfortunately, most minimum wage earners work for small businesses, rather than large corporations.<sup>7</sup> According to an analysis by the Employment Policies Institute, roughly half of the minimum wage workforce is employed at businesses with fewer than 100 employees, and 40 percent work at businesses with

fewer than 50 employees.<sup>8</sup> Small businesses face a very competitive market and often push profits as low as they can go to stay open. Minimum wage earners employed by large corporations would also be affected, because these corporations are under tremendous pressure from shareholders to keep costs low. Last year, **the California chapter of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) projected the potential negative effects of the state's 2013 legislation that raises California's minimum wage rate to \$9 per hour in 2014 and again to \$10 by 2016.**<sup>9</sup> **It estimated the increase to the wage rate would shrink the California economy by \$5.7 billion** in **Raising the minimum wage favors those who already have jobs at the expense of the unemployed.** **The next 10 years and result in approximately 68,000 jobs being cut from the state. It further projected that 63 percent of the estimated 68,000 jobs lost would be from small businesses that could no longer afford to pay their employees**<sup>10</sup> The bottom line is that someone must pay for the costs associated with an increased minimum wage. Often, because a business cannot pay these costs, they are paid for by the individuals the minimum wage is intended to help—low-skilled, undereducated individuals—as they lose out on job opportunities.

## Internal link turn—rising wages hurt the economy through increasing unemployment

**ALEC 14** (American Legislative Exchange Council, America's largest nonpartisan, voluntary membership organization of state legislators. Comprised of nearly one-quarter of the country's state legislators, business and thought leaders, "Raising the Minimum Wage: The Effects on Employment, Businesses and Consumers" [http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising\\_Minimum\\_wage.pdf](http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising_Minimum_wage.pdf) March 2014 JM)

**Under the basic neoclassical competitive market model—used most frequently to study the effects of the minimum wage—increasing the price of a good or service decreases demand for that good or service.**<sup>11</sup> In the case of wage rates, **if the government increases the price of labor by raising the minimum wage, employers will demand less of it.** Although most economic research since the advent of the minimum wage has found that increases to the minimum wage reduce employment, the effect of minimum wage laws on employment levels continues to be one of the most studied questions in economics.<sup>12</sup> Earlier research examining the minimum wage's effects on employment used time-series data and variation in the national minimum wage. The results of this research show **increases to the minimum wage tend to reduce employment levels**.<sup>13</sup> In the 1990s, however,

economists began to use the variation in state minimum wage levels to determine the effect of minimum wage increases on employment. The **results** of the 1990s research **were more controversial; some studies** had similar results to earlier research, others found no effect or even significant positive effects on employment, and **others showed even stronger negative effects of increasing the minimum wage**.<sup>13</sup> However, the main conclusion of more than seven decades of research is that minimum wage increases tend to reduce employment.<sup>14</sup> One review by economists David Neumark and William Wascher shows **that 63 percent of studies found relatively consistent evidence of negative employment effects on minimum wages**.<sup>15</sup> Further, 85 percent of what they deem the most reliable studies point to

negative employment effects.<sup>16</sup> **A recent study by the Heritage Foundation concluded that the current proposal before Congress to raise the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10.10 per hour would likely eliminate an estimated 300,000 jobs per year and lower the national gross domestic product by an average of \$40 billion per year.**<sup>17</sup> **The negative effects on employment are likely to be more profound in the long run, as employers shift to labor-saving methods of production when labor costs rise**.<sup>18</sup> ATMs have replaced many bank tellers, cashiers have been swapped for self-serve checkouts at grocery and convenience stores, and gas jockeys have been eliminated in most areas where they are not legally mandated. **In occupations where most work is repetitive, it is cost-effective for an employer to respond to higher labor costs by substituting technology for employees.** This means occupations consisting of routine tasks—**the jobs most likely to be held by less experienced and less educated individuals—are also the most likely to be replaced by technology as employers make investments to adapt to higher labor costs associated with an increased minimum wage.** Even if **employers** do not decrease hiring, they **will respond to higher labor costs by replacing the lowest-skilled individuals with more highly-skilled employees**, which prices inexperienced workers out of the market. Further, **the higher pay attracts more affluent individuals to enter the low-wage labor market, such as teenagers from well-off families or adults looking to provide a**

**secondary income to their households. The increased labor supply makes it even more difficult to secure minimum wage jobs for those who most need them.** According to testimony provided by James Sherk of the Heritage Foundation, after minimum wage levels increase, businesses employ more teenagers living in affluent zip codes and fewer teenagers from lower-income zip codes.<sup>19</sup> Although increases to the minimum wage encourage more teenagers to attempt to join the workforce, mandated wage increases limit the number of job opportunities available to them at a time when teenage unemployment rates are already at a staggering 20 percent.<sup>20</sup> For many young people looking for a job, the primary value that employment provides is on-the-job training, rather than the initial low pay. More than 60 percent of young employed earners are enrolled in school during non-summer months, and for 79 percent of them, it is a part-time job.<sup>21</sup> Minimum wage jobs can often serve as a stepping stone to later career goals, so young earners are often more likely to need experience in basic job skills than a small wage increase. Increasing the minimum wage and removing job opportunities from teenagers and young adults could suppress their wage-earning abilities later in life when they are more likely to need their wages to support a family.<sup>22</sup> **The effects on employment are even more pronounced for minority youth. A 10 percent increase in the minimum wage decreases minority employment by 3.9 percent, with the majority of the burden falling on minority youth whose employment levels will decrease by 6.6 percent.**

Internal link turn—higher wages decrease consumer spending

**ALEC 14** (American Legislative Exchange Council, America's largest nonpartisan, voluntary membership organization of state legislators. Comprised of nearly one-quarter of the country's state legislators, business and thought leaders, "Raising the Minimum Wage: The Effects on Employment, Businesses and Consumers" [http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising\\_Minimum\\_wage.pdf](http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising_Minimum_wage.pdf) March 2014 JM)

However, negative employment effects are not the only consequence of raising the minimum wage. **Employers often cannot fully absorb the costs of an increased mandated wage rate by cutting their workforce because they need that labor to successfully run their businesses. Employers are forced to turn to other methods to protect their bottom line and stay in business. The costs** of a minimum wage hike are often passed on to consumers in what economist Daniel Aaronson calls "price pass-through."<sup>23</sup> In a study of prices in the restaurant and fast food industry—an industry that heavily employs and serves low-wage earners—Aaronson, French and

MacDonald found **an increase in the minimum wage also increases the prices of food items.**<sup>24</sup> Using data from **the Consumer Price Index (CPI) from 1995 to 1997, the economists examined 7,500 food items (usually a complete meal) from 1,000 different establishments in 88 different geographic areas. They found the increase in menu prices affected limited service restaurants the hardest.** These are restaurants where most diners pay at the counter and take their food home with them. These restaurants are also more likely to employ low-wage workers and thus more likely to have their business

costs rise as a result of a minimum wage increase. **The study found that in these instances, almost 100 percent of the increase in labor costs is passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices.**<sup>25</sup> **These results are consistent with most of the economic literature on the subject.** Sara Lemos of the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) looked

at more than 20 papers on the subject and found that **most studies predicted a 10 percent increase in the minimum wage would result in a 4 percent increase in food prices and a 0.4 percent increase in prices overall.**<sup>26</sup> Unfortunately, the businesses hit hardest by an increase to the minimum wage are not only the types of places where low-income people are employed, but also businesses frequented by low-income consumers.

**Food prices are of particular importance to people living near or below the poverty line as they tend to spend a greater percentage of their family budget on food.** The low-wage employees who experience an increase to their wages due to a minimum wage increase will have the benefit of higher wages largely offset by higher prices. Additionally, **non-minimum wage earners will face higher prices without the corresponding increase in wages. Thus, they will likely cut back spending to compensate. These cutbacks in spending may also result in substitutions toward cheaper, lower quality goods.** Daniel Aaronson and Eric French predicted **a \$25 billion drop in spending from those earning above minimum wage if the minimum wage was increased from \$7.25 to \$9.00** per hour.<sup>27</sup> It is worth noting that overall they expect spending to rise in the short run (due to increased spending from minimum wage earners), but they also expect GDP to remain constant in the long run.

## AT dual labor market theory

### Immigrant enclaves disprove dual labor market theory

**Lin and Mele 5** (Jan, Professor at the London New School for Economics and Christopher, PhD and professor at the New School for Research; "The Urban Sociology Reader", Introduction, [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Zk7IOenSKjsC&oi=fnd&pg=PA152&dq=immigrant+enclave+theory&ots=hpcd73a1ua&sig=I503\\_i0gXbJsBS9FNC38prgj4cM#v=onepage&q=immigrant%20enclave%20theory&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Zk7IOenSKjsC&oi=fnd&pg=PA152&dq=immigrant+enclave+theory&ots=hpcd73a1ua&sig=I503_i0gXbJsBS9FNC38prgj4cM#v=onepage&q=immigrant%20enclave%20theory&f=false) 2005 JM)

Portes and Manning first make the point that the proliferation of **immigrant enclaves challenges traditional precepts of assimilation theory**, as the persistence of ethnic identity and ethnic communities is more permissible and commonplace since the 1980s. Whereas **social mobility in American society was in the early twentieth century more predicated on the suppression of ethnic ancestry** and the acquisition of American cultural values, **we have seen that socioeconomic prosperity in contemporary America can be promoted along with a continuing commitment to ethnicity** and ethnic enclaves. **Immigrant enclaves are growing** as often as they are disappearing, and furthermore, they arise sometimes in the suburbs. **Immigrant enclaves are further more an alternative for economic incorporation beyond the existing dichotomy of a segmented labor market in which there is an upper tier of jobs that offers good mobility ladders, and a lower tier of dead-end jobs in which minorities predominate.** The contradiction is that immigrant enclaves offer opportunity for some ethnic people through the exploitation of co-ethnic others. **Ethnic enclaves offer a kind of protection by hiring immigrants who may be undocumented** or lack good English language skills. They commonly offer on-the-job training rather than requiring higher education. While being in this protective sector, they may also be subject to severe exploitation, working with low wages, poor benefits, no labor rights, and sweatshop conditions that may violate labor law. On the other hand, some co-ethnics benefit, notably bosses and immigrant business owners. **Forward, backward, and consumption linkages within immigrant enclaves commonly result in the re-circulating of dollars in the ethnic economy** via the phenomenon of the **economic multiplier.**

## AT immigrants lower costs

The "illegal-worker discount" isn't a thing

Desilver 6 (Drew, Staff Writer at The Seattle Times, "immigration," 9/18/2006, ProQuest)//JL

**\*Also can be used for the CP**

More than 7 million illegal immigrants work in the U<sub>nited</sub> S<sub>tates</sub>. They build houses, pick crops, slaughter cattle, stitch clothes, mow lawns, clean hotel rooms, cook restaurant meals and wash

the dishes that come back. You might assume that the plentiful supply of low-wage illegal workers would translate into significantly lower prices for the goods and services they produce. In fact, their impact on consumer prices -- call it the "illegal-worker discount" -- is surprisingly small. The bag of Washington state apples you bought last weekend? Probably a few cents cheaper than it otherwise would have been, economists estimate. That steak dinner at a downtown restaurant? Maybe a

buck off. Your new house in Subdivision Estates? Hard to say, but perhaps a few thousand dollars less expensive. The underlying reason, economists say, is that for most goods the labor -- whether legal or illegal, native- or foreign-born -- represents only a sliver of the retail price. Consider those apples --

Washington's signature contribution to the American food basket. At a local grocery store, red delicious apples go for about 99 cents a pound. Of that, only about 7 cents represents the cost of labor, said Tom Schotzko, a recently retired extension economist at Washington State University. The rest represents the grower's other expenses, warehousing and shipping fees, and the retailer's markup. And that's for one of the most labor-intensive crops in the state: it takes 150 to 190 hours of labor to grow and harvest an acre of apples, Schotzko said, compared to four hours for an acre of potatoes and 11-2 hours for an acre of wheat. The labor-intensive nature of many crops is a key reason agriculture continues to rely on illegal workers. A report by Jeffrey Passel, a demographer at the Pew Hispanic Center who has long studied immigration trends, estimates that 247,000 illegal immigrants were employed as "miscellaneous agricultural workers" last year -- only 3.4 percent of the nation's 7.2 million illegal workers, according to Pew statistics, but 29

percent of all workers in that job category. Eliminating illegal farm workers, by shrinking the pool of available labor, likely would raise wages for

those who remain Philip Martin, a professor of agricultural economics at the University of California, Davis, noted that two years after the old bracero program ended in 1964, the United Farm Workers union won a 40 percent increase for grape harvesters. A decade ago, two

Iowa State University agricultural economists estimated that removing all illegal farm workers would raise wages for seasonal farm

workers by 30 percent in the first couple of years, and 15 percent in the medium term. But supermarket prices of summer-fall fruits and vegetables, they concluded, would rise by just 6 percent in the short run -- dropping to 3 percent over time, as imports took up some of the slack and some farmers mechanized their operations or shifted out of labor-intensive crops. (Winter-spring produce would be even less affected, they found, because so much already is imported.)

## **Neg vs. K Versions**

**k immigration neg**

# Toolbox



## T Version – Illegal Immigrants

**Immigration surveillance affs solve your discussion**

**Aranda, University of South Florida sociology department chair, and Vaquera, USF sociology associate professor, 2015** (Elizabeth and Elizabeth, “Racism, the

Immigration Enforcement Regime, and the Implications for Racial Inequality in the Lives of Undocumented Young Adults,” *Sociology of Race & Ethnicity*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 2015, <http://sre.sagepub.com/content/1/1/88.full>, IC)

The current immigration enforcement regime embodies a colorblind racial project of the state rooted in the racial structure of society and resulting in racism toward immigrants.

Approaching racism from structural and social process perspectives, we seek to understand the social consequences of enforcement practices in the lives of undocumented immigrant young adults who moved to the United States as minors. Findings indicate that although legal discourse regarding immigration enforcement theoretically purports colorblindness, racial practices such as profiling subject immigrants to arrest, detention, and deportation and, in effect, criminalize them. Further, enforcement practices produce distress, vulnerability, and anxiety in the lives of young immigrants and their families, often resulting in legitimate fears of detention and deportation since enforcement measures disproportionately affect Latinos and other racialized immigrant groups in U.S. society. We conclude that policies and programs that exclude, segregate, detain, and physically remove immigrants from the country reproduce racial inequalities in other areas of social life through spillover effects that result in dire consequences for these immigrants and their kin. We argue that immigrant enforcement practices reflect the nation’s racial policy of our times.

## Agamben K—Link

**The abjectivity of illegal immigrants in the status quo emerged out of the biopolitics of the surveillance state. The aff's piecemeal legislation normalizes the surveillance state at large. In order to achieve solvency these systems of monitoring and oppression must first be dissolved.**

**Gonzales and Chavez 12** (Roberto G. Gonzales - Assistant Professor, Harvard University [Immigration](#), [race and ethnicity](#), [migration](#), [unauthorized migration](#), [Latina/o Studies](#) and Leo R. Chavez - Professor

Ph.D., Stanford University. "Awakening to a Nightmare" Abjectivity and Illegality in the Lives of Undocumented 1.5-Generation Latino Immigrants in the United States" - June 2012. Current Anthropology Volume 53, Number 3, P. 256. Accessed 7/13/15.

<http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~lchavez/Chavez1.pdf>) dortiz

We are interested in the experiences of living in abjection. Abjectivity speaks to how the "casting away" of individuals and populations shapes (or perhaps delimits) their social, economic, and biological life. We believe that abjectivity draws attention to the forces creating the condition of abjectivity. Abjectivity is the effect of social forces, but we must also ask about the causes of that condition.

We argue that the practices of the biopolitics of citizenship and governmentality—surveillance, immigration documents, employment forms, birth certificates, tax forms, drivers' licenses, credit card applications, bank accounts, medical insurance, and mandatory car insurance—may frustrate anyone, citizen and noncitizen alike, because they enclose, penetrate, define, and limit one's life and actions. But for undocumented 1.5-generation Latino immigrants (and others in a similar status), these practices of governmental contact and surveillance can create enormous distress, detention, and even deportation (Inda 2006). These "rites of institution," as Pierre Bourdieu (1992) called them, are central to the power of nation-states to construct identities and produce, in a perverse way, the "sweet sorrow" of a sense of belonging (to borrow from Shakespeare). Thus, abjectivity underscores the link between the mechanics of biopower and the lived experiences of those most vulnerable to the exercise of power. Our construction of abjectivity clearly draws on Michel Foucault's biopolitics, the development of techniques that work on the body to produce docile bodies (Foucault 1977, 1990 [1976], 3. See Uli Linke's (2006) argument that the state also has a corporeal grounding. Gonzales and Chavez Undocumented 1.5-Generation Latino Immigrants 257 1997; Gordon 1991).<sup>4</sup> This led Foucault, as Giorgio Agamben (1998) points out, to two research directives. The first focuses on the way power "penetrates subjects' very bodies and forms of life."The state, with its "political techniques (such as the science of the police) . . . assumes and integrates the care of the natural life of individuals into its very center" (Agamben 1998:5). Second, Foucault examines "the technologies of the self by which processes of subjectivization bring the individual to bind himself to his own identity and consciousness and, at the same time, to an external power" (Agamben 1998:5). Judith Butler (1997b) also argued that power and subject are interlocked in a paradox of subjectivization, or the formation of a self-conscious identity and thus agency.

## **Immigration policies are tools of capitalism used to determine wages and increase classism**

**Berlinschi and Squicciarini 11**(Ruxanda and Mara, LICOS Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance, “On the Political Economy of Illegal Immigration”

[http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ruxanda\\_Berlinschi/publication/241763586\\_On\\_the\\_Political\\_Economy\\_of\\_Illegal\\_Immigration/links/0c96053bbbb9695b7b000000.pdf](http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ruxanda_Berlinschi/publication/241763586_On_the_Political_Economy_of_Illegal_Immigration/links/0c96053bbbb9695b7b000000.pdf) 2011 JM)

This paper is related to the literature on the impact of migration on the host country and on the political economy of immigration policies. The seminal paper by Borjas (1995), shows that if **migrants bring no capital with them, immigration increases total income** in the host country, but also **generates a redistribution of wealth from labour to capital revenues**. If migrants bring some capital with them, **the impact of immigration on total income of natives and on its redistribution between labour and capital owners is lower**. A number of papers have developed political economy models explaining the formation of immigration policies. Benhabib (1996) analyses how **immigration policies that impose capital requirements to migrants would be determined under majority voting**, when natives differ in their capital holdings. Facchini and Willman (2005) model policies restricting international factor mobility when domestic groups bid for protection and the government maximizes a welfare function that depends both on voters' welfare and on contributions from the interest groups. Epstein and Nitzan (2006) analyze the determination of migration quotas in a contest between workers and capital owners, whose preferences towards immigration are exogenously given and where the government's objective function is a weighted sum between total welfare and lobbying transfers received. In their model, **lobbying enhances compromise when the government does not intervene in the policy proposal, but may lead to extreme policies when the government intervenes in the policy proposal**. **An increase in the weight given by the government to social welfare may either increase or decrease the migration quota, depending on its impact on lobbying efforts by each group**. All these papers only **considered legal migration**. Another strand of the literature has focused on illegal immigration and has studied optimal policies when the government wants to limit the flow of illegal immigrants. The pioneering paper of Ethier (1986) analyses the effectiveness of border versus internal enforcement in combating illegal immigration. In that model, **skilled and unskilled workers are used to produce a final good via a neoclassical production function**. Illegal immigrants increase the supply of unskilled workers. **Firms employ unskilled labour up to the point in which the wage equals the marginal labour productivity**. In absence of wage rigidities, illegal immigration reduces the unskilled wage and increases the skilled wage. In presence of wage rigidities, it increases unskilled unemployment rate without affecting the skilled workers. **Border enforcement**, modelled as the probability for an illegal entry attempt to fail, **determines the supply of illegal migrants**. Internal enforcement, modelled as the probability for a firm employing an illegal worker to be caught and pay a fine, **determines the wage gap between 5 illegal migrants and unskilled legal workers**. The model shows that using a mix of **border and internal enforcement is less costly than using only one of type of enforcement**. Woodland and Yoshida (2006) extend Ethier's setting to a two-country context, **distinguishing between the cases of capital mobility and capital immobility and relaxing the assumption of immigrants' risk neutrality**. They show that non-neutral attitudes to risk may lead to multiple and unstable equilibria. Illegal immigration is reduced by tighter border control and greater internal enforcement. **The effect of these policies on the origin country's**

wage rates depends on the degree of capital mobility and the effect of internal enforcement on the host country's illegal wage rate depends on immigrants' attitude to risk. Chau (2001) analyses the role of amnesty policies. The paper argues that amnesty programs may allow the authorities to increase welfare by binding their own hands when border and internal enforcement policies are time-inconsistent. All these early papers on illegal immigration rest on the assumption that illegal immigration is always undesired and governments are willing to fight it.

## **Immigration makes it possible for capitalists to be fascist and dehumanize the immigrant workers**

**Martiniello and Roth 10** (Marco and Jan, National Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS), Brussels / Center for Ethnic and Migration Studies (CEDEM), University of Liège, Belgium, "Selected Studies in International Migration and Immigrant Incorporation" <http://dare.uva.nl/cgi/arno/show.cgi?fid=182582#page=22> pub. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2010 JM)

The solution to these problems adopted by West European capitalism has been the employment of immigrant workers from underdeveloped areas of Southern Europe or from the Third World.<sup>10</sup> Today, the unemployed masses of these areas form a 'latent surplus population'<sup>11</sup> or reserve army, which can be imported into the developed countries as the interests of the capitalist class dictate. In economic crises employment of immigrant workers. In addition to this economic function, the employment of immigrant workers has an important socio-political function for capitalism: by creating a split between immigrant and indigenous workers along national and racial lines and offering better conditions and status to indigenous workers, it is possible to give large sections of the working class **the consciousness**

**of a labour aristocracy.** The employment of immigrant workers in the capitalist production process is not a new phenomenon. The Irish played a vital part in British industrialization. Not only did they provide a special form of labour for heavy work of a temporary nature on railways, canals and roads;<sup>12</sup> their competition also forced down wages and conditions for other workers. Engels described Irish immigration as a 'cause of abasement to which the English worker is exposed, a cause permanently active in forcing the whole class downwards'.<sup>13</sup> Marx described the antagonism between British and Irish workers, artificially created by the mass media of the ruling class, as 'the secret of the impotence of the English working class, despite their organization'.<sup>14</sup> As industrialization got under way in France, Germany and Switzerland in the latter half of the 19th century, these countries too brought in foreign labour: from Poland, Italy and Spain. **There were 800,000 foreign workers in the German Reich in 1907.** More than

a third of the Ruhr miners were Poles. Switzerland had half a million foreigners in 1910 – 15 per cent of her total population. French heavy industry was highly dependent on immigrant labour right up to the Second World War. According to Lenin, one of the special features of imperialism was 'the decline in emigration from imperialist countries and the increase in immigration into these countries from the more backward countries where lower wages are paid'.<sup>15</sup> **This was**

**a main cause of the division of the working class.** **The fascist form of capitalism also developed its own specific form of exploiting immigrant workers: the use of forced labour.**

No less than 71 /2 million deportees from occupied countries and prisoners of war were working in Germany by 1944, replacing the men recruited for the army. About a quarter of German munitions production was carried out by foreign labour.<sup>16</sup> Compared with early patterns, immigration of workers to contemporary West Europe has two new features. The first is its character as a permanent part of the economic structure. Previously, immigrant labour was

used more or less temporarily when the domestic industrial reserve army was inadequate for some special reason, like war or unusually fast expansion; since 1945, however, **large numbers of immigrant workers have taken up key positions in the productive process, so that even in the case of recession their labour cannot be dispensed with**. The second is its **importance as the basis of the modern industrial reserve army**. Other groups which might conceivably fulfil the same function, non-working women, the disabled and the chronic sick, members of the lumpen **proletariat** whose conditions prevent them from working,<sup>17</sup> **have already been integrated into the production process to the extent to which this is profitable for the capitalist system**. The use of further reserves of this type would require costly social measures (e.g. adequate kindergartens). The main traditional form of the industrial reserve army – men thrown out of work by rationalization and cyclical crises – is hardly available today, for reasons already mentioned. **Thus immigration is of key importance for the capitalist system**.

## **Capitalism is sustained by immigration—contributes to classism, capitalist business cycles and manipulation of the proletariat**

**Martiniello and Roth 10** (Marco and Jan, National Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS), Brussels / Center for Ethnic and Migration Studies (CEDEM), University of Liège, Belgium, “Selected Studies in International Migration and Immigrant Incorporation” <http://dare.uva.nl/cgi/arno/show.cgi?fid=182582#page=22> pub. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2010 JM)

**The domination of the working masses by a small capitalist ruling class has never been based on violence alone**. Capitalist rule is based on a range of mechanisms, some objective products of the economic process, others subjective phenomena arising through manipulation of attitudes. Two such mechanisms, which received considerable attention from the founders of scientific socialism, are **the industrial reserve army, which belongs to the first category, and the labour aristocracy**, which belongs to the second. These two mechanisms are closely related, as are the objective and subjective factors which give rise to them. mechanisms of domination Engels pointed out that **‘English manufacture must have, at all times save the brief periods of highest prosperity, an unemployed reserve army of workers, in order to produce the masses of goods required by the market in the liveliest months**’.<sup>1</sup> Marx showed that **the industrial reserve army or surplus working population is not only the necessary product of capital accumulation and the associated increase in labour productivity**, but at the same time ‘the lever of capitalist accumulation’, **‘a condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production’**.<sup>2</sup> **Only by bringing ever more workers into the production process can the capitalist accumulate capital**, which is the precondition for extending production and applying new techniques. **These new techniques throw out of work the very men whose labour allowed their application. They are set free to provide a labour reserve which is available to be thrown into other sectors as the interests of the capitalist require. ‘The whole form of the movement of modern industry depends, therefore, upon the constant transformation of a part of the labouring population into unemployed or half-employed hands.’**<sup>3</sup> The pressure of the industrial reserve army forces those workers who are employed to accept long hours and poor conditions. Above all: ‘Taking them as a whole, **the general movements of wages are exclusively regulated by the expansion and contraction of the industrial reserve army**’.<sup>4</sup> If employment grows and the reserve army contracts, workers are in a better position to demand higher wages. When this

happens, **profits and capital accumulation diminish, investment falls and men are thrown out of work, leading to a growth of the reserve army and a fall in wages. This is the basis of the capitalist economic cycle.** Marx mentions the possibility of the workers seeing through the seemingly natural law of relative over-population, and undermining its effectiveness through trade-union activity directed towards cooperation between the employed and the unemployed.<sup>5</sup> The labour aristocracy is also described by Engels and Marx. **By conceding privileges to certain well-organized sectors of labour,** above all to craftsmen (who by virtue of their training could not be readily replaced by members of the industrial reserve army), **the capitalists were able to undermine class consciousness and secure an opportunist non-revolutionary leadership for these sectors.**<sup>6</sup> Special advantages, sometimes taking the form of symbols of higher status (different clothing, salary instead of wages, etc.) rather than higher material rewards, were also conferred upon foremen and nonmanual workers, with the aim of distinguishing them from other workers and causing them to identify their interests with those of the capitalists. Engels pointed out that the **privileges given to some British workers were possible because of the vast profits made by the industrial capitalists through domination of the world market and imperialist exploitation of labour in other countries.**<sup>7</sup> Lenin emphasized the effects of imperialism on class consciousness: **'Imperialism... makes it economically possible to bribe the upper strata of the proletariat, and thereby fosters, gives shape to, and strengthens opportunism.'**<sup>8</sup> **'... A section of the proletariat allows itself to be led by men bought by, or at least paid by, the bourgeoisie', and the result is a split among the workers and 'temporary decay in the working-class movement'.**<sup>9</sup>

## Cap K—Root Cause

**Capitalism is the root cause—low-skilled immigration leads to unions, capital widening, and threatens the class struggle and racialization that capitalism is dependent on**

**Samers 10** (Michael Samers, School of Geography, University Park, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, “Invisible capitalism: political economy and the regulation of undocumented immigration in France” *Economy and Society* Volume 32 Number 4 November 2003: 555–583 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0308514032000141701> 2010 JM)

**Immigration is seen further to reduce inflation and the cost of social reproduction in national economies, and thus boost capital accumulation in a system founded upon exploitation, class inequality, class struggle and racialization.** In this sense, many claimed that during the period of so-called Fordism, **the presence of such a surplus population led to ‘capital deepening’** (that is, employing older technologies with an abundance of low-skilled workers) **and retarded ‘capital widening’** (investment into more productive technologies). Others held that the savings accrued to European capital actually allowed for greater investments in technological change (Castles 1984; Samers 1998). In either case, **both liberal and Marxist analyses focused on the importance of an abundant ‘labour supply’** and the latter argued that immigration became a structural necessity of post-World War II capital accumulation. **In Marxist analyses of post-war capital accumulation, ‘economistic’ arguments may have dominated**, but the nature of the state drew some attention as well. **Theorists viewed the national state as the ‘executive committee of the bourgeoisie’ that sanctioned immigration in order to expand the advanced economies for the sake of the capitalist classes** (Castells 1975; Castles and Kosack 1973; Castles 1984). After 1975 and the end of the post-war economic expansion, Cohen (1987) **identified** a number of related **reasons why European states tended towards zero immigration**. First, **‘the export of capital became more profitable than the import of labour’** or, put somewhat differently, **‘an internal racial division of labour could be replaced by an international division of labour’** (Cohen 1987: 140–1). Second, **migrants began to struggle for greater social, political and economic** (especially trade union) **rights** in the 1970s. As they did, the **advantages initially gained for European states from the immigrants’ lower costs of reproduction** were slowly being eroded. And, third, ‘post-Fordist’ **organizational and technical change reduced the demand for low-skilled/low-income (migrant) labour** (Samers 1997, 1998). Yet, if the state remained the ‘executive committee’ according to many Marxist analyses, it now saw migrant labour less as an advantageous industrial reserve army and more as the source of potential disorder and unrest.

**The perceived threat of immigration is caused by globalization—threatens state sovereignty and leads to aff impacts**

**Schinkel 9** (William, Professor of Sociology at Rotterdam University, “‘Illegal Aliens’ and the State, or: Bare Bodies vs the Zombie” [http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Willem\\_Schinkel/publication/240711536\\_Illegal\\_Aliens\\_and\\_the\\_State\\_or\\_Bare\\_Bodies\\_vs\\_the\\_Zombie/links/0deec534f86b127e8d000000.pdf](http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Willem_Schinkel/publication/240711536_Illegal_Aliens_and_the_State_or_Bare_Bodies_vs_the_Zombie/links/0deec534f86b127e8d000000.pdf) 2009 JM)

The **appearance of post-Cold War (irregular) migration is** in a sense a **prime example of the lifting of spatial constraints in an age of globalization**. The state is thought to be at least threatened or challenged and at most is turned into a chimera (Schinkel, 2009). It is argued that **welfare states**, given this current situation, **will have to close their borders to ‘economic immigrants’, since they cannot afford to take them in** (Engbersen, 2003). While, traditionally,

state membership has been one of the most effective tools of inclusion and exclusion, international irregular migration threatens to undermine this mechanism, since **the very presence (without 'membership') of irregular immigrants is a challenge to nationstate sovereignty** (Brubaker, 1989). **Irregular migration** thus **becomes** what 782 Bauman has called **'the revenge of the nomads'** (Bauman, 2001: 35). Next to regular migration (e.g. Falk, 2003) – which is by some thought to compromise the 'community of reference' of the nation-state – and next to other factors such as global neoliberal capitalism (e.g. Mann, 1997) – which **economically threatens the reach and relevance of the nationstate** – specifically irregular migration constitutes a challenge to western nation-states. Several sociologists and political theorists have argued that, as a consequence of phenomena such as global capitalism and migration, the very notion of the 'nation-state' may have become obsolete. In Ulrich Beck's words, **it has become a 'zombie-category'** (Beck, 2002a: 47; cf. Beck, 2002b). Likewise, Zygmunt Bauman has argued that nowadays 'tribal flowers sprout and flourish on the nation-state grave' (Bauman, 2002a: 9). Other authors observe that neoliberal capitalism has made the modern notion of the state obsolete (Robinson, 1998), or has at least diminished its relevance in providing 'the legal encasements for economic activity' (Sassen, 2003a, 2003b; cf. Beck, 2002b; Falk, 1999; Mann, 1997). For yet others, the mere scale of global transactions threatens to render traditional notions of the state obsolete (Albrow, 1996). Migration is an important factor in the supposed demise of nation-state autonomy: **'there is a diminished state-autonomy of host countries as a consequence of immigration of extended families'** (Heisler, 1997). In addition to being a threat to nation-state identity and to welfare state expenditures, **migration leads to questions concerning citizenship** (Brubaker, 1989). Citizenship beyond 'membership of a state' is sometimes regarded as favourable (Bauböck, 1991). **All these threats to the nation-state can be summarized under the heading of 'globalization'**, which in this respect is taken to be a process of increasing irrelevance of space threatening the existence of the nationstate (Mann, 1997). The **response** of nation-states to one such perceived threat **comes down to: a 'green light for the tourists, red light for the vagabonds'** (Bauman, 1998: 93). **The central question is whether or not this kind of immigration really threatens the state or rather poses one illustration of a chance for that state to reassert itself by reorienting itself** and by reallocating resources in shifting from a welfare state towards a penal state. I argue that the state is not a sitting duck waiting to be replaced by an institution for the organization of collective wants more effectively adjusted to an age of 'liquidness' (Bauman, 2000) or 'mobilities' (Urry, 2000). While globalization is said to lead to a diminishing relevance of both 'space' and of the nation-state, **the case of the illegal immigrant illustrates** that states are able to redefine themselves and turn challenges into chances. **The way in which they redefine themselves furthermore illustrates the persisting relevance of space, and of space as a political category.**



## Congress CP—1nc S

**Congress is key**

**Chow 5 (Gary, JD Candidate at the University of California Berkeley School of Law, "Exiled Once Again: Consequences of the Congressional Expansion of Deportable Offenses on the Southeast Asian Refugee Community," 2005, Regents of the University of California Asian Law Journal, Lexis)//JL**

Litigation remains vital to securing humane treatment for the deportees, to pushing through the rare case where relief is possible and to reminding a deferential judiciary of the deep injustice posed by these deportations. But **given the broad nature of**

**Congressional and Executive plenary power, litigation** alone **will not suffice.** **Any**

**comprehensive solution for the current state of immigration law lies with Congress**

However, in order to make any legislative remedy politically viable, **the popular perception of the deportees** as an undifferentiated foreign mass intent on exploiting this nation and victimizing its people, **must change.** It is precisely **this perception**, which **has rendered non-citizens easy scapegoats for** contemporary **anxiety over terrorism**, crime and the economy. As Joren Lyons, a staff attorney at the Asian Law Caucus states, "until we break through the image in the public mind of who is getting deported and why, things are not going to change." 297

## PIC—“Illegal” Immigrants

### **The use of the phrase “illegal immigrants” creates the foundation for forms of abjectivity**

**Gonzales and Chavez 12** (Roberto G. Gonzales - Assistant Professor, Harvard University [Immigration](#), [race and ethnicity](#), [migration](#), [unauthorized migration](#), [Latina/o Studies](#) and Leo R. Chavez - Professor

Ph.D., Stanford University. “Awakening to a Nightmare” Abjectivity and Illegality in the Lives of Undocumented 1.5-Generation Latino Immigrants in the United States” - June 2012. *Current Anthropology* Volume 53, Number 3, P. 258. Accessed 7/13/15.

<http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~lchavez/Chavez1.pdf>) dortiz

The biopolitics associated with governmentality produce illegality.<sup>10</sup> “Illegal” refers to unauthorized residents who entered the county without permission from government authorities, or they may have entered with permission—tourist or student visas—but then overstayed visa end dates. Illegality, as Susan B. Coutin (2007:9) observed, has meant that “individuals can be physically present but legally absent, existing in a space outside of society, a space of ‘nonexistence,’ a space that is not actually ‘elsewhere’ or beyond borders but that is rather a hidden dimension of social reality.” We would offer as a slight variation on Coutin’s representation: to be illegally present is not to be “outside of society” but to be allowed to participate in some aspects of society (e.g., schooling) but not others (e.g., work) (Gonzales 2011). All children, regardless of immigration status, have access to primary and secondary education as a result of the US Supreme Court’s decision in Plyer v. Doe. Access to higher education has focused on immigration status and in-state versus nonresident tuition. In California, Assembly Bill 540, signed into law in 2001, allowed undocumented students to attend publicly funded colleges and universities and pay in-state tuition, but they were ineligible for financial aid, which the California DREAM Act of 2011 now allows.<sup>11</sup> As a condition, being “illegal” contributes to subjective understandings of the world and to identity (Coutin 2000a, 2000b; De Genova 2002; Menjivar 2006; Suares-Navaz 2004; Willen 2007). As Sarah Willen (2007:11) has put it, “migrant ‘illegality’ [is] the catalyst for particular forms of ‘abjectivity.’” Abjectivity, by drawing us back to biopolitics, suggests that adding to the despair of abjectivity is not just the condition of illegality but the state’s holding out of the possibility of an end to that condition.

## Politics DA—Link

**ATD is super popular – the plan ensures backlash**

**Koulish 15 (Robert, Joel J. Feller Research Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland, “Spiderman’s Web and the Governmentality of Electronic Immigrant Detention,” 2/1/2015, Law, Culture and the Humanities, ProQuest)//JL**

**Because electronic monitoring allows authorities to gather information about**

**individuals** who are **neither under arrest nor in custody**,<sup>1</sup> and because it is not considered punishment in immigration

law, **electronic monitoring is not perceived as infringing upon an immigrant’s liberty**

**which adds to its popularity** with law enforcement. **Electronic monitoring is also politically**

**popular**. **It has become a preferred sanction by conservatives and liberals** alike: **it is**

**well documented** **that electronic monitoring and other alternatives to detention are**

**less costly** (fiscally conservative) **and intrusive** (more humane, a liberal alternative) than incarceration.<sup>13</sup> Whereas immigration detention is

estimated to cost a minimum of \$122 per day per person, ATD is estimated at about \$22 per day.<sup>14</sup> Thus a consensus has emerged that favors ATD scenarios where immigrants experience greater freedom even though they get less space legally speaking to assert fundamental rights in potentially abusive situations.

## A2 Fed policy S

**Any policy taken by the federal government is restricted by language of illegality and empirically proven serial policy failure, taking out federal solvency**

**Jones-Correa and de Graauw in 13** (Michael Jones-Correa, Cornell prof; Els de Graauw, Baruch College prof; “The Illegality Trap: The Politics of Immigration & the Lens of Illegality,” *Daedalus* Volume 142, No. 3, published summer 2013, accessed 7-14-15)//JRom

Legislative changes during the second half of the twentieth century hardened the boundaries of illegality and reduced the pathways to legalization. The Bracero Program, which since 1942 had allowed Mexico and Caribbean countries to send millions of temporary migrants to fill U.S. labor shortages, was terminated in 1964, thereby ending official recognition of circular migration.<sup>9</sup> The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act again rewrote the rules of the game. Overall, the act liberalized immigration to the United States by removing the restrictive national-origins quotas that for four decades had benefited immigrants from Western Europe and by shifting to a system of family-based migration. However, the act also introduced, for the first time, overall limits and caps on immigration from the Western Hemisphere, which proved particularly problematic for migration from Mexico. In a few short years, visa availability for migrants from Mexico plummeted from 450,000 annual guest worker visas and an unlimited number of residence visas to just 20,000 visas for permanent residence, with no legal guest worker program. Because incentives to migrate to the United States remained, these policy changes did little to reduce net migration from Mexico: they simply meant that most migrants were now considered “illegal.”<sup>10</sup> By the early 1980s, the number of undocumented residents in the United States, most of them from Mexico, had grown substantially, making illegal immigration a top political issue. A prolonged debate in Congress about how to curb illegal immigration and what to do with undocumented immigrants already in the country led to the passage of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). This law was expected to provide a comprehensive solution to the growing problem of undocumented immigration by providing for increased border control and employer sanctions to curb illegal immigration, as well as a onetime amnesty for undocumented immigrants who could prove their U.S. residence for eight or more years. Although more than 2.7 million undocumented immigrants, including 2.3 million from Mexico, legalized their status under IRCA, the legislation did not address the underlying causes of illegal immigration, and its ineffective enforcement mechanisms failed to curb undocumented immigration.<sup>11</sup> Consequently, the undocumented population continued to grow over the next three decades, further hardening the political discourse around illegality.<sup>12</sup> Laws enacted since the 1990s—which have restricted immigrant admissions, facilitated immigrant deportations, and restricted immigrants’ access to employment, housing, education, and social welfare programs—**further distinguished “illegal” from legal immigrants.**<sup>13</sup> In recent years, there has also been an increased blurring of criminal and immigration law, a phenomenon that some legal scholars have referred to as “cimmigration.”<sup>14</sup> While immigration laws are civil and their violation has historically been a civil offense, the federal government has increasingly pursued criminal prosecution for individuals who enter and reenter the United States without documentation. In doing so, the federal government has contributed to the public misperception that residing in the country without legal documentation constitutes a crime, thereby making “illegal” immigrants an accepted target of all discussions about immigration. **It also casts** **undocumented immigration as a valence issue**, disliked by politicians of both parties, the

media, and the electorate. **This has made it increasingly difficult to address the underlying structural reasons for why undocumented immigration occurs, or to address illegal immigration in conjunction with legal immigration.** **The immigration debate has become trapped by the language of illegality.** The gradual hardening of the political discourse around illegality and the growing public dislike of illegal immigrants have given rise to a set of federal initiatives that disproportionately focus on enforcement as the path to curb illegal immigration.<sup>15</sup> Legislatively, Congress enacted the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) in 1996. These laws have expanded the categories of immigrants subject to deportation, restricted the ability of immigrants to appeal deportation, and increased the crimes for which immigrants could be deported.<sup>16</sup> Five years later, following the terrorist attacks of 2001, Congress enacted the USA PATRIOT Act, which further restricted immigrants' civil liberties by creating new grounds for deportation and making it easier for federal officials to detain foreign-born individuals suspected of terrorist activities. **The criminalization of immigration and the portrayal of undocumented immigrants as dangerous criminals and threats to national security have made it difficult for politicians to speak out against immigration enforcement initiatives or offer any alternatives.**

States and localities circumvent – past serial policy failure proves – this card is more dank than Bhavish's memes

**Jones-Correa and de Graauw in 13** (Michael Jones-Correa, Cornell prof; Els de Graauw, Baruch College prof; "The Illegality Trap: The Politics of Immigration & the Lens of Illegality," *Daedalus* Volume 142, No. 3, published summer 2013, accessed 7-14-15)//JRom

**Congress' failure through the 2000s to enact a legislative fix to the illegal immigration problem has compelled state and local governments to fill the federal policy void with their own immigration laws and ordinances.** State legislative activity increased more than fivefold between 2005, when legislatures in 25 states considered approximately 300 immigration-related bills and enacted 39 of them, and 2011, when state legislators introduced 1,607 immigration-related bills and resolutions and passed 306 of them in 42 states and Puerto Rico.<sup>22</sup> Attention to immigration issues has also spiked in municipalities, and by the end of 2007, 180 cities, towns, and counties across the country had considered immigration-related proposals, enacting close to 120 ordinances.<sup>23</sup> These state and local laws tackle immigration issues across a broad range of policy areas, but most address immigrants' eligibility for state-issued identification documents (such as a driver's license), their access to employment, housing, education, and other public benefits, and the relationship between local law enforcement agencies and federal immigration authorities. **Some of these laws help immigrants integrate** by granting them in-state college tuition, local voting rights, municipal ID cards, and local sanctuary from federal immigration laws.<sup>24</sup> **Many other laws, however, seek to make life as difficult as possible for undocumented immigrants by excluding them from employment and housing opportunities as well as from a variety of government benefits.**<sup>25</sup> Increasingly, **state and local government officials**, in addition to federal authorities, have come to view immigration primarily through the lens of illegality. The explosion in state and local

immigration laws is, on the one hand, a consequence of the immigration quandary in the federal legislative sphere. On the other, it has added yet another layer of political conflict, though now in the judicial sphere. State and local laws addressing illegal immigration have produced constitutional conundrums and consequently have triggered legal challenges invoking the preemption and supremacy clauses of the Constitution under which immigration policy has traditionally been understood as a federal prerogative.<sup>26</sup>

Their reference to undocumented immigrants as “illegals” promotes the perception of undocumented immigrants as the *homo sacer*, conflates each status of naturalization as one shade of illegality, and perpetuates the stereotype of Latin@-Americans as criminals and fence-jumpers

**Jones-Correa and de Graauw in 13** (Michael Jones-Correa, Cornell prof; Els de Graauw, Baruch College prof; “The Illegality Trap: The Politics of Immigration & the Lens of Illegality,” *Daedalus* Volume 142, No. 3, published summer 2013, accessed 7-14-15)//JRom  
Framing the immigration debate around illegality clearly has had a series of very negative consequences: enforcement becomes the only conceivable and acceptable response; it shuts off the possibility of more comprehensive immigration reform; this failure, in turn, leads to the devolution of immigration policy-making to states and localities; and it shifts attention away from the real needs and requirements of immigrant integration. Breaking this impasse around immigration policy requires a reframing of the immigration debate. Since illegality is a valence issue, with no upside, it is difficult to shift away from this frame. **We require a fundamental rethinking of the meaning of the term illegal**. The first step in rethinking illegality is to stop using it so categorically; there is no single kind of illegality. “Illegality” can include legal and illegal entry, legal and illegal residence, legal and illegal employment, and civil and criminal illegality. Together, they combine to produce different forms and degrees of irregularity.<sup>38</sup> For example, despite the popular image of undocumented immigrants jumping or swimming across the border clandestinely, as much as 45 percent of undocumented immigrants in the United States entered the country legally and then overstayed their visas.<sup>39</sup> **Only a small minority of undocumented immigrants are engaged in criminal activity in the United States.**<sup>40</sup> And finally, many undocumented immigrants—especially those brought to the United States as young children—do not know they are undocumented until they apply for college or try to find a job.<sup>41</sup> In contemporary debates, immigrants are either illegal or they are not. In reality, **illegality is often contingent, with people adjusting their status over time.**<sup>42</sup> Recent studies indicate that significant numbers of immigrants obtain legal status despite previous experience as an “illegal.” For instance, one study tracking legal immigrants who arrived in 1996 found that approximately 19 percent had entered without inspection, another 12 percent had overstayed visas, and 11 percent had worked without authorization. Among those with experiences of being “illegal,” 61 percent were entries without inspection while 38 percent had entered legally but overstayed their visas. A decade later, almost a third of the now “legal” immigrants in this cohort had succeeded in regularizing their status and overcoming the stigma of illegality.<sup>43</sup>

Sequencing DA – federal policy cannot happen without reframing illegality

**Jones-Correa and de Graauw in 13** (Michael Jones-Correa, Cornell prof; Els de Graauw, Baruch College prof; “The Illegality Trap: The Politics of Immigration & the Lens of Illegality,” *Daedalus* Volume 142, No. 3, published summer 2013, accessed 7-15-15)//JRom

Reframing illegality would shift the terms of the debate and allow the deadlocked policy process to move forward. We list three plausible strategies that could be pursued once we accept a more nuanced definition of illegality. A great deal of energy has been expended on the legalization or amnesty option, as a number of other countries have done and as the United States did in 1986. This is a political dead end; and as we noted above, a one-time legalization largely preserves the categorical legal/illegal dichotomy.<sup>52</sup> A better alternative would be to pursue the idea of “earned legalization,” whereby migrants acquire points toward residency by meeting certain criteria, such as number of years in the country, having a stable job, paying taxes, and not having a criminal record.<sup>53</sup> Earned legalization acknowledges the nuances of illegality and could be constructed as a continuous process rather than as a one-shot deal, avoiding the buildup of a large population of undocumented migrants. Second, Congress could institute a statute of limitations on deportations. Through 1917, the United States very rarely deported illegal immigrants, and there was a statute of limitations on deportation. After 1891, undocumented migrants were deported only if they became a public charge within one year of their entry, and in 1917 this statute of limitations was extended to five years.<sup>54</sup> It was only in 1924 that Congress eliminated the statute of limitations on undocumented entry. Reinstating a statute of limitations would place undocumented residence more in line with other kinds of illegal activity for which statutes of limitations already exist. Illegality would subsequently and more appropriately define the behavior of a person, not the person in his or her entirety. Finally, the United States could expand administrative discretion. Discretionary relief from removal takes into account the time immigrants have been in the country and the ties they have to U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents.<sup>55</sup> U.S. law has historically allowed case-by-case administrative determinations of attachments to the United States—through family or time spent in the country—and allowances for “meritorious cases” or for those facing hardship if deported.<sup>56</sup> Administrative rules applying to deportation were tightened in 1996, when Congress added the requirement that undocumented migrants challenging removal must prove that deportation would result in “exceptional and extremely unusual hardship” to a close family member who was a U.S. citizen or a legal permanent resident.<sup>57</sup> The Obama administration’s recent decision, through its Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, to expand the role of administrative discretion in the deportation of certain unauthorized immigrants who entered the United States as children is one example of this strategy in action.<sup>58</sup> **Any or all of these policy steps would be possible if the U.S. immigration debate were to break free from the illegality trap. Jettisoning the idea that illegality is categorical rather than contingent would break the logjam in immigration policy, but more important, it would allow for greater opportunities for the many immigrants now in the United States, regardless of how they arrived.**

## A2 Narrative S

### **Narratives are not enough – only a method including historical analysis solves**

**Giroux, Miami University professor, in 91** (Henry A. Giroux, "Border Pedagogy as Postmodern Resistance," *Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics: Redrawing Educational Boundaries*, published by State University of New York Press, 1-1-1991, accessed 7-17-15)//JRom

Second, a border pedagogy of postmodern resistance needs to do more than educate students to perform ideological surgery on master-narratives based on white, patriarchal, and class-specific interests. If the master-narratives of domination are to be effectively deterritorialized, it is important for educators to understand how such narratives are taken up as part of an investment of feeling, pleasure, and desire. There is a need to rethink the syntax of learning and behavior outside the geography of rationality and reason. For example, this means that racism cannot be dealt with in a purely limited, analytical way. An anti-racist pedagogy must engage how and why students make particular ideological and affective investments and occupy particular subject positions in regard to issues concerning race and racism. This means attempting to understand the historical context and substance of the social and cultural forms that produce in diverse and multiple ways the often contradictory subject positions that gave students a sense of meaning, purpose, and delight. As Stuart Hall argues, this means uncovering both for ourselves as teachers as well as for the students we are teaching "the deep structural factors which have a tendency persistently not only to generate racial practices and structures but to reproduce them through time and which therefore account for their extraordinarily immovable character." In addition to engaging racism, within a politics of representation, ideology, and pleasure, it is also important to stress that any serious analyses of racism also has to be historical and structural. It has to chart how racist practices develop, where they come from, how they are sustained, how they affect dominant and subordinate groups, and how they can be challenged. This is not a discourse about personal preferences or dominant tastes but discourse about economics, culture, politics, and power.



# **Biometrics CP**

## 1nc

**The United States Congress should end the Security Communities program.**

**The CP solves the aff and avoids the link to the court DAs (and terror/politics?)**

### **Secure Communities results in the wrongful detainment, deprivation, and deportation of immigrants**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

While current plans for greater automation might help cope with these pressures, further automation itself introduces other risks, as discussed above.<sup>140</sup> Several of these hazards are illustrated by the case of James Makowski, who naturalized through his adoptive U.S. citizen parents after his adoption from India as an infant in 1987.<sup>141</sup> Following Makowski's arrest and guilty plea to a felony drug offense in 2010, the judge recommended an alternative sentence in a drug treatment "boot camp," instead of the seven-year prison sentence the charge ordinarily carries. However, when Makowski appeared for that program, he was deemed ineligible because ICE had issued a detainer--without notice to Makowski and allegedly without any investigation beyond its review of government databases--after he was flagged under Secure Communities upon his initial arrest. While Makowski possessed a U.S. passport and Social Security number since childhood, lived continuously in the United States since his adoption, and had served in the U.S. Marine Corps after undergoing an FBI background check, ICE did not rescind the detainer for two months--during which Makowski was incarcerated in a maximum security prison. Once Makowski's lawyer persuaded ICE to withdraw the detainer, Makowski entered and completed the treatment program.<sup>142</sup> Makowski's case illustrates how technology can increase the costs that are imposed on U.S. citizens and lawfully present noncitizens by mass immigration enforcement practices.<sup>143</sup> Evidence suggests that **significant numbers of U.S. citizens are placed at risk of being wrongfully detained and even deported each year, including many individuals flagged under Secure Communities**.<sup>144</sup> In other instances, noncitizens apprehended under the program might not be deportable at all or might have strong equities in favor of discretion or claims for relief that are not evident from ICE's database review.<sup>145</sup> **Even if such issues might subsequently be resolved, in the meantime these individuals may face severe deprivations, including detention, simply by virtue of having been investigated or charged**. While wrongful deprivations in the removal process are not by any means new, just **as Secure Communities expands and accelerates ICE's ability to identify and apprehend potentially deportable noncitizens, it simultaneously amplifies the consequences of mistakes along the way**. Given the program's enormous scale, **even small error rates can lead to large numbers of improper deprivations. In short, the combination of database errors, automation bias, complex but time-pressured decisionmaking, massive volumes of inquiries, and fragmented responsibilities among different immigration agencies can easily yield circumstances in which immigration agencies rush to issue detainers first, and ask questions either later or never**.<sup>146</sup> Closer empirical research on immigration agency enforcement processes certainly would help illuminate whether that is, in fact, a fair characterization of the outcomes that Secure Communities produces, and while the program has contributed to a tenfold increase in the number of ICE detainers, recently issued guidelines for issuing detainers may shift these outcomes.<sup>147</sup> Nevertheless, at least under recent practices, **the limited exercise of discretion by immigration**

**officials at the prosecution and adjudication stages of the removal process makes the moment of arrest critical**—the “discretion that matters,” as Hiroshi Motomura explains—in affecting whether an individual ultimately is removed.<sup>148</sup> Especially **given the limited procedural protections and access to counsel afforded to noncitizens facing removal proceedings**, particularly for individuals in detention, the consequences of database errors and other fallibilities of automation at the initial stages of the removal process can be difficult to correct and remedy once the agency has acted upon them.<sup>149</sup>

## **Automated biometric immigration surveillance programs like ‘Secure Communities’ are responsible for the deportation of immigrants and creation of a surveillance state**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>) While Arizona has been widely interpreted as putting the brakes on state and local immigration regulation, it hardly brings state and local involvement in immigration law and policy to an end.<sup>7</sup> With respect to immigration policing, in particular, **while the Court brushed back the state’s unilateral attempts to regulate and enforce immigration law, it simultaneously gave a boost to state and local immigration policing under the aegis of federal initiatives that enlist state and local cooperation**.<sup>8</sup> Running counter to a conventional narrative of federal inaction on immigration control, the steady **expansion of these federal arrangements in recent decades has contributed to an enduring convergence of immigration control and criminal law enforcement and the removal of unprecedented numbers of individuals**.<sup>9</sup> **The long shadow cast by mass immigration enforcement has integrated** the principles, priorities, and procedures of **immigration control into the day-to-day practices of** many state and local **police and criminal justice institutions** to a considerable extent.<sup>10</sup> Those federal programs are now undergoing a sea change with the deployment of technology. For example, even as it forcefully has urged invalidation of S.B. 1070 and similar laws, **the Obama Administration has presided over the largest expansion of state and local immigration policing in U.S. history** with its implementation of **the “Secure Communities” program**. Secure Communities **integrates the criminal records databases maintained by states and the FBI**, which are routinely queried by police conducting background checks on individuals they arrest, **with the immigration databases maintained by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)**—thereby **automating DHS’s ability to identify potentially deportable noncitizens in** state or local **custody**.<sup>11</sup> The program has transformative aspirations: **to automatically determine the immigration status of every person nationwide who is arrested and booked** by state and local police in order to identify potential immigration law violators.<sup>12</sup> **Secure Communities illustrates a broader, technology-based shift toward** what I refer to as **automated immigration policing**. Automated immigration **policing initiatives deploy interoperable database systems and other technologies to automate and routinize the identification and apprehension of potentially deportable noncitizens in the course of ordinary law enforcement** encounters and other moments of day-to-day life.<sup>13</sup> While scholars and advocates have devoted critical attention to these programs, **the full significance of this shift remains underappreciated**. Observers primarily have analyzed these initiatives as extensions, in degree, of previous federal efforts to enlist state and local police assistance, emphasizing analogous questions, costs, and benefits.<sup>14</sup> These **costs arise from the inherent fallibilities of automation, the tendency of surveillance mechanisms to be used for purposes beyond those for which they were initially implemented, the displacement of** state and local **control over information** that states and localities collect and share with federal authorities, **and the everyday effects of** these **initiatives on** both **law enforcement agencies and** the **communities**

**being monitored.** Finally, in Part V, I identify and advance principles to constrain, inform, and guide the **implementation of automated immigration policing initiatives and other programs** that similarly **are reshaping immigration enforcement practices with the use of new technologies.** As with other forms of technology-based surveillance, **the expanded use of automated immigration policing demands greater attention to the interests at stake when personal information is collected for immigration enforcement purposes.** I argue that the existing potential for conflicts over control of information between federal and subfederal governments may help to protect those interests, and that **the importance of those interests demands improved transparency, oversight, and accountability in the implementation of automated immigration policing mechanisms and other technology-based initiatives that are contributing to the development of the immigration surveillance state.**

### **Unchecked expansion of biometric surveillance creates ‘panopticism that results in the marginalization of immigrant populations and ‘self deportation’**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

As the National Immigration Law Center has noted, **it remains unclear “how far-reaching the fingerprint-sharing between DHS and DOJ will be”:** **Will the fingerprints of teachers applying for jobs be checked against DHS databases?** **Will the fingerprints of immigrant attorneys who wish to take the bar examination be stored in case they later have contact with the police?** **Will mobile fingerprint scanners be used to match fingerprints against DHS databases, so that taking a person into custody will not even be required?**<sup>162</sup> The potential **expansion of these database systems** in these or other directions **not only echoes past experiences with the proliferating noncriminal uses of criminal history records, but also would be entirely consistent with the trajectory in recent decades of immigration control more generally.** While varying in their approaches, the interior **immigration enforcement initiatives** that have emerged in recent years all **seek to establish,** crudely speaking, **a kind of immigration panopticism, which eliminates zones in society where immigration status is invisible and irrelevant and puts large numbers of public and private actors**—including law enforcement and criminal justice officials, but also welfare agencies, public hospitals and health agencies, motor vehicle licensing agencies, private employers, private landlords, and potentially others—**in the position of monitoring and determining immigration status, identifying potential immigration law violators, collecting personal information from those individuals, and informing federal authorities.** While hoping that these initiatives might increase the number of individuals who are deported, proponents of **these initiatives** have long **place-d** greater **emphasis on** what they characterize, in a term now made famous by Mitt Romney, as a process of **“selfdeportation,”** by which **deportable noncitizens are essentially disciplined into internalizing the perception that their immigration status is constantly being monitored** and, ultimately, into both revealing their status in a range of day-today settings **and conforming to social expectations** that **they depart the country.**<sup>163</sup> With database systems becoming increasingly interoperable—giving rise to broader assemblages that can “integrate and coordinate otherwise discrete surveillance regimes, either in temporary configurations or in more stable structures”—**the expanded use of the information and systems accessed through initiatives like Secure Communities would create far-reaching possibilities to extend the reach of that disciplinary process of “self-deportation.”**<sup>164</sup> The use of FBI-maintained identification and criminal history records for immigration control purposes also raises questions about whether immigration

authorities might similarly seek access to other databases maintained and held by federal, state, local, and even private entities—using, for example, the NGI initiative— and related questions will soon arise with other technology-based immigration enforcement initiatives, such as E-Verify. However, even as the prospect of ever-widening uses of these systems highlights the importance of addressing those possibilities before particular surveillance mechanisms are widely implemented, the ability to do so can be elusive—particularly when, as with automated immigration policing, those mechanisms have been deployed rapidly, with minimal transparency, under vague legal authority, and subject to limited external constraints.<sup>165</sup>

## **The Secure Communities program justifies racist dehumanization and deportation of immigrants**

**Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelob, 13** (Tanya, Ph.D. in sociology from UNC, professor at UC Merced & Pierrette, Ph.D. in sociology from UC Berkeley, professor at USC, Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program, *Latino Studies*, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, pp. 271-292, <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/lst/journal/v11/n3/pdf/lst201314a.pdf>)

A DHS program called, without irony, **“Secure Communities,” also expands ICE’s reach**. This technological tool allows participating jails to submit arrestees’ fingerprints not only to criminal databases, like those maintained by the FBI, but also to immigration databases maintained by ICE. **Secure Communities enables ICE to have a technological presence in jails and prisons. ICE launched this program in 2008, and as of September 2011, over 11 million fingerprint submissions allowed ICE to remove more than 142,000 people**. Although Homeland Security claims Secure Communities will find deportees with criminal records, **26 per cent of people deported** in FY 2011 through Secure Communities **had no criminal convictions** (only immigration violations) **and 29 per cent were individuals convicted of level three crimes, which carry sentences of less than 1 year** (Immigration Policy Center, 2011). The case of Emerson, a Guatemalan teenager, illustrates how deportation works through Secure Communities. As a child, he came with his mother to the United States on a tourist visa and he never legalized his status. After finishing high school, Emerson married a legal permanent resident of the United States and lived with her in Los Angeles. One day, Emerson’s friend asked him for a ride across town. When his friend got out of the car, he allegedly tried to steal a car. Emerson left the scene, but police arrested him and charged him as an accomplice. The charges were dropped, but his arrest led to a police check on his immigration status. When they discovered he had overstayed his visa, he was deported. Emerson was never convicted of a crime, and he qualified to apply for legal permanent residency through his spouse, but he was deported before he could finish the legalization process. **Secure Communities** and the 287(g) programs **merge immigration law enforcement with criminal law enforcement, creating a situation where law enforcement may check the immigration status of any non-citizen for eligibility to remain in the country. These programs allow police** and sheriff officers **to do routine immigration checks while writing a speeding ticket. If the driver has a deportation order, a routine traffic stop will result in the deportation of a “fugitive alien.”** If the driver has a prior conviction for possession of marijuana, then this stop may result in the deportation of a “criminal alien.” If the driver overstayed his tourist visa, he faces deportation as an “illegal alien.” **ICE reports and budgetary requests rely on these dehumanizing labels** (for example, **criminal, fugitive and illegal aliens**) **to argue that the removal of these non-citizens makes America safer. But over 80 per cent of all criminal deportees are deported for non-violent crimes** (Immigration Policy Center, 2011). **The term “fugitive aliens” sounds ominous, conjuring images of armed bank robbers, but it refers to people who were released from ICE custody and failed to report for their immigration hearings,** and people who have been ordered deported yet have not left the country. **The United States often hails itself as a**

**nation of immigrants – indicating the positive association with the label “immigrant.” In contrast, the labels “fugitive alien” and “criminal alien” point to a population the country would do well to expel. And “criminal” and “fugitive” alien are labels that are gendered** male, in contrast to “illegal alien,” which at times has referred to women, and at other times to men.

## 2nc S—Solvency Advocate

### **Secure Communities must go- it perpetuates flawed logic based on racist societal discourse while inflicting terrible human harms**

**Kubrin '14** [2014, Charis E. Kubrin is Professor of Criminology, Law and Society. Professor Kubrin's research focuses on neighborhoods, race, and violence as central to social disorganization theory. "7 Reasons to Abandon the Secure Communities Program" Criminology & Public Policy □Volume 13 □Issue 2]

The study "Immigration Enforcement, Policing, and Crime: Evidence from the Secure Communities Program" by Treyger, Chalfin, and Loeffler (2014, this issue) is a welcome addition to the literature, and one that is timely. Importantly, the study investigates the effects of the Secure Communities program on local crime rates and on the arrest behavior of municipal police agencies across the United States. As described by Treyger et al., Secure Communities is a program launched by the federal government to improve the efficiency of interior immigration enforcement and to enhance the capacity for targeting deportable individuals with criminal convictions, referred to as "criminal aliens." In particular, Secure Communities provides a system that automatically transmits and checks fingerprints against the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Automated Biometric Identification System (IDENT), which contains information on known immigration violators, known and suspected terrorists, and "criminal aliens," among others. A fingerprint match prompts Law Enforcement Support Center (LESC) officers from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to investigate, determine the individual's immigration status, and forward their conclusion to the relevant ICE field office. If ICE decides to take action, a detainer is issued to the law enforcement agency requesting that the individual be detained for up to 48 hours so that ICE can assume custody. Secure Communities is unprecedented in scope. Since its inception in 2008 with just 14 jurisdictions, Secure Communities has expanded to all 3,181 jurisdictions within 50 states, the District of Columbia, and five U.S. territories. Full implementation was achieved on January 22, 2013. From the beginning, proponents have maintained that Secure Communities enables a more efficient system for identifying "criminal aliens," and they have predicted that the program will reduce the risk that law enforcement agencies will release dangerous and deportable "criminal aliens" into the community, thereby enhancing public safety. Have their predictions borne out?

According to the findings of Treyger et al. (2014), they have not. As the authors empirically demonstrate, "There are no statistically discernible effects of activation on any category of crime under analysis . . . the program is associated with reductions in murder, rape, larceny, and motor vehicle theft that are well less than 1%. Effects on burglary and aggravated assault are somewhat larger but not significant at conventional levels." Treyger et al. further show that the size of the immigrant population in the jurisdiction does not alter this finding, as jurisdictions with relatively higher shares of foreign-born residents did not experience statistically discernible reductions in their crime rates after activation and neither did jurisdictions with medium and low shares of foreign-born residents. They conclude that "[t]he absence of any detectable influence on these common index crimes bears on the controversy surrounding Secure Communities because it is these crimes, rather than other more minor violations, that truly threaten public safety." Notably, these findings are consistent with another recent empirical investigation of Secure Communities (Cox and Miles, 2013) and related studies on the effects of local involvement in immigration law enforcement more generally (Kirk, Papachristos, Fagan, and Tyler, 2012; Koper, Guterbock, Woods, Taylor, and Carter, 2013). Collectively, these findings

raise serious doubt about whether Secure Communities can deliver on its promises. Given a lack of effectiveness, should Secure Communities be abandoned? My answer is unequivocally “yes.” Yet the findings of this study alone do not justify my answer to this question. There are several additional reasons—seven to be precise— that inform my response. These are as follows: (1) The assumptions upon which Secure Communities was founded are flawed; (2) Secure Communities is unnecessary; (3) Secure Communities does not target the right offenders; (4) Local law enforcement officials have not embraced Secure Communities; (5) Secure Communities creates insecure communities; (6) Secure Communities may increase instances of racial profiling and pretextual arrests; and (7) Secure Communities is associated with significant human costs. In the remainder of this essay, I discuss these reasons but not before first describing the broader context in which Secure Communities operates—the devolution of immigration enforcement. #1: The Assumptions upon which Secure Communities Was Founded Are Flawed On ICE’s official website, which describes the purpose and rationale for Secure Communities, is written the following: “ICE is focused on smart, effective immigration enforcement that prioritizes efforts to identify and remove criminal aliens and others who pose a threat to public safety.” Furthermore, “[o]ne important tool that ICE relies upon to advance this priority is Secure Communities, which uses an already-existing federal information-sharing partnership to identify and remove aliens who pose a threat to public safety” ([ice.gov/secure\\_communities/get-the-facts.htm](http://ice.gov/secure_communities/get-the-facts.htm)). Two assumptions underlying Secure Communities (and the related programs and partnerships discussed earlier) are that immigrants, and especially undocumented immigrants, are more crime-prone than the native born and that immigration to an area is likely to cause crime rates to rise. These assumptions also pervade public discourse on crime and immigration, and they have for decades (Hagan, Levi, and Dinovitzer, 2008: 96; Rumbaut and Ewing, 2007: 3). Yet the empirical evidence on the crime–immigration link shows otherwise. First, research consistently has documented that immigrants are less crime-prone than their nativeborn counterparts (Hagan and Palloni, 1999). In their extensive review of the literature, Martinez and Lee (2000: 496) concluded, “The major finding of a century of research on immigration and crime is that . . . immigrants nearly always exhibit lower crime rates than native groups.” Studies also have shown that immigrants are arrested and incarcerated at lower rates than the native-born (Butcher and Piehl, 1998; Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush, 2005). Rumbaut and Ewing (2007), for example, reported that among U.S. males 18–39 years of age, the incarceration rate for the native-born (3.5%) is five times higher than the rate for immigrants (0.7%) and further suggested that “data from the census and other sources show that for every ethnic group without exception, incarceration rates among young men are lowest for immigrants, even those who are the least educated” (p. 1; see also Portes and Rumbaut, 2006: 194–197). Second, a robust body of research at the aggregate level has found that neighborhoods and cities with higher concentrations of immigrants have lower rates of crime, all else equal (Akins, Rumbaut, and Stansfield, 2009; Chavez and Griffiths, 2009; Desmond and Kubrin, 2009; Feldmeyer and Steffensmeier, 2009; Graif and Sampson, 2009; Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld, 2001; MacDonald, Hipp, and Gill, 2013; Martinez, Lee, and Nielsen, 2004; Martinez, Stowell, and Cancino, 2008; Martinez, Stowell, and Lee, 2010; Nielsen, Lee, and Martinez, 2005; Nielsen and Martinez, 2009; Sampson et al., 2005; Stowell and Martinez, 2007, 2009). As indicated by the extensive list of studies just cited, the consistency with which this finding emerges in the literature is stunning. Finally, a growing body of research has documented that increases in immigration may have been responsible, in part, for the crime decline that began in the early 1990s (MacDonald et al., 2013; Martinez et al., 2010; Ousey and Kubrin, 2009; Stowell and Martinez, 2009; Wadsworth, 2010). As a result of data limitations—specifically, because information on legal status is not collected by law



enforcement agencies—one cannot determine with absolute certainty the extent to which these findings apply to undocumented immigrants in particular. Yet there are sound reasons to believe that crime and undocumented immigration do not go hand and hand as many people believe. First, the finding that immigrants are less criminally involved than their native-born counterparts has been documented in studies using different sources of data, including official data, victimization surveys, and self-report surveys, which suggests a triangulation of sorts. And second, because of migratory flows, documented and undocumented immigrants tend to co-locate such that low-crime areas are likely to contain both documented and undocumented residents. Although for many it is inconceivable that immigrants commit less crime and that immigrant communities are some of the safest places around, criminologists have several explanations to account for such findings. These include immigrant selection effects, immigration revitalization, ethnic enclaves, employment and ethnic entrepreneurship, and family structure (see Kubrin and Ishizawa, 2012: 150–154, for a review of these explanations). In sum, assumptions that immigrants in general, and immigrant “criminal aliens” in particular, pose a distinct threat to public safety fly in the face of empirical evidence that strongly suggests otherwise.

#2: Secure Communities Is Unnecessary According to ICE, “record numbers of criminal aliens have been removed, with Secure Communities playing a key role in ICE’s ability to fulfill this public safety priority. Between October 2008 and October 2011, the number of convicted criminals that ICE removed from the United States increased 89 percent, while the number of aliens removed without criminal convictions dropped by 29 percent. These trends are due in significant part to the implementation and expansion of Secure Communities” ([ice.gov/secure\\_communities/](http://ice.gov/secure_communities/)). In fact, Secure Communities is only responsible for a very limited percentage of ICE’s total removals and returns, a point ICE concedes later on its webpage. In contrast to ICE’s claim regarding the central importance of Secure Communities in carrying out their mission, I argue Secure Communities is unnecessary. As Treyger et al. (2014) note in their study, there is little compelling evidence that serious threats to public safety would have remained at large but for Secure Communities. They suggest prior programs aimed at identifying and deporting “criminal aliens” before they are released into the community may have been imperfect but had been effective and were improving for at least a decade prior to the launch of Secure Communities. As such, Treyger et al. argue that a sizable subset of individuals removed as a result of Secure Communities would have been identified regardless. This argument is certainly persuasive if one considers the wide-ranging policies and practices associated with devolution that go beyond Secure Communities, including those noted earlier as well as others introduced to prevent undocumented immigrants from coming to the United States in the first place. There has been dramatic growth in government spending on immigration enforcement generally. Spending for the federal government’s two main immigration enforcement agencies—U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE, formerly INS)—surpassed \$17.9 billion in fiscal year 2012, a figure that exceeds by 24% the government’s total spending for all its other principal criminal federal law enforcement agencies combined (e.g., FBI, DEA, Secret Service, U.S. Marshals Service, and ATF, which stood at \$14.4 billion) (Meissner, Kerwin, Chisthi, and Bergeron, 2013: 16). This funding has created a variety of initiatives that, in one way or another, seek to identify and deport undocumented immigrants generally and “criminal aliens” specifically—consistent with the aims of Secure Communities. This includes visa controls and travel screening, new and linked data systems such as IDENT (fingerprints), workplace enforcement (E-verify), criminal prosecutions for immigration-related violations, and of course, detention and deportation. My point is that long before Secure Communities came into existence, the United States created programs and policies aimed at both identifying and deporting “criminal aliens” before they

were released into the community and preventing undocumented immigrants from entering the United States. It is not at all surprising, then, that the current level of immigrant deportation is the highest it has ever been in U.S. history, creating what some have referred to as a “deportation nation” (Kanstrom, 2007). Figures from DHS reveal that annual removals of immigrants doubled between 2001 and 2010 to almost 400,000 (Office of Immigration Statistics, 2011). Perhaps more telling, this record deportation level comes at a time when the rate of immigrants coming to the United States illegally has dropped to a 40-year low, resulting in part from the sluggish economy. Secure Communities is unnecessary. #3: Secure Communities Does Not Target the Right Offenders As noted, proponents of Secure Communities predict the program will generate a substantial increase in the number of dangerous “criminal aliens” identified and reduce the risk that law enforcement agencies will release these individuals into the community. Note the emphasis on “dangerous” criminal aliens. The implication is that Secure Communities will target serious offenders who would pose a threat to public safety if left unidentified. Who, in fact, is being targeted by Secure Communities? Are those identified by the program serious offenders posing a significant threat to public safety? According to the study, the program has not removed “criminal aliens” who have committed serious crimes such as assault and robbery. Rather, Treyger et al. (2014) discover that Secure Communities has removed the pettiest of violators. Figure 1 in their article is instructive. Comparing the share of all “criminal aliens” convicted for specific crime categories from 2004 through 2012, the figure reveals that the most marked expansion in removals has been occurring among the less serious crimes. Treyger et al. state, “The most radical expansion from the pre- to post-Secure Communities is in removals of those convicted of criminal traffic offenses, which made up 23.1% of all criminal removals in 2013, up from 15.8% in 2009.” Patterns such as these have drawn criticism on the overly liberal application of the “criminal alien” label to people with traffic or other minor convictions (Stepick, 2013: 7). In short, then, although Secure Communities enables the identification of undocumented immigrants arrested for a minor crime but with prior serious convictions, the program also sweeps in individuals committing only minor violations, first-time arrestees without a criminal record, and even those wrongfully arrested (Treyger et al., 2014). The expansion of the criminal-alien net to catch these offenders does not promise a boost to public safety. #4: Local Law Enforcement Officials Have Not Embraced Secure Communities Unlike other policies and programs associated with devolution of immigration enforcement, Secure Communities requires mandatory participation and prohibits law enforcement agencies from “opting out” of the program—even as many jurisdictions have sought to do so (Aguilasocho, Rodwin, and Ashar, 2012: 5; Denerstein, 2011; Quinn, 2011). This is quite telling. Since the start of devolution, law enforcement agencies across the country have expressed concerns about being drawn into immigration enforcement, and for very good reasons (see point #5). To understand better how local police executives have responded to devolution, researchers distributed questionnaires to police chiefs in large- and medium-sized U.S. cities (Provine et al., 2012). Findings from their study reveal a high degree of variation in local responses to federal devolution of immigration-enforcement responsibilities; although most (roughly 75%) answered that they have no formal agreement with the agency but do contact ICE when holding suspected unauthorized immigrants for criminal violations, very few (less than 5%) had a Memorandum of Understanding with ICE (a 287[g] agreement) to help manage incarcerated inmates and work with ICE on investigations and arrests for (civil) immigration violations. Thirteen percent responded that they “do not participate or assist in ICE immigration enforcement activities” in any way. What emerges from this snapshot of police chiefs’ perceptions is that municipalities have not, in general, acted forcefully to direct their police departments toward greater engagement with immigration enforcement. For many law

enforcement officials, devolution is less than desirable. The increasing involvement in policing immigration runs at cross-purposes with community policing and other strategies to engage more closely with the community (Kubrin and Trager, 2014: 535). Police require the trust and cooperation of residents, including immigrants, to do their job effectively (Fagan and Meares, 2008; Kirk et al., 2012; Skogan and Frydl, 2004). For example, police rely on the willingness of victims and bystanders to cooperate with investigations. To gain this cooperation, the police must remain in close and trusted contact with community members. Developing trust and cooperation was a hallmark of policing prior to devolution, as community policing was adopted in communities throughout the United States. For decades, this approach helped make law enforcement officials more responsive to particular issues facing local communities, including immigrant communities, through regular channels for civic engagement and special arrangements for reaching out to immigrant groups (see Skogan, 2009, for an example of this in Chicago). Many, including law enforcement officials themselves, worry that devolution is eroding decades of progress that police officers worked hard to achieve under community policing. As officers increasingly occupy the role of “immigrant enforcers,” a breakdown in trust is likely to occur and produce a “chilling effect” in the local immigrant community (Khashu, 2009). Residents are left wondering, “Who is the police?” and “Who is la migra?” And if local police visibly join the ranks of immigration enforcement officials, residents may just stop talking to them all together (Kubrin and Trager, 2014: 536). Immigrants’ greatest fear is that contact with local authorities will somehow threaten their status in the United States. In sum, then, shifting the responsibility for enforcing immigration laws to local police puts at risk the decades-long investment they have made in community policing and trust building. For this reason alone, many law enforcement agencies rebuff the Secure Communities program even as they are required to comply.

2 # 5: Secure Communities Creates Insecure Communities But more is at risk with devolution. As Treyger et al. (2014) argue, if drawing local law enforcement agencies into immigration alienates residents, it may undermine the effectiveness of criminal law enforcement generally and harm public safety in the end. The irony is that in response to Secure Communities and related practices and policies, immigrants may adjust their crime-reporting behavior rather than their criminal behavior. If immigrants fear police contact, they may choose not to report any crime or victimization to law enforcement authorities (Hennessey, 2011; Theodore, 2013), something that police officers themselves acknowledge. Decker, Lewis, Provine, and Varsanyi (2009), for example, found that most U.S. police chiefs they interviewed believed that immigrants were less likely to contact police as victims of, or witnesses to, a crime if they understood that local officers were authorized to enforce federal immigration law. And the Task Force on Secure Communities (2011) conceded that one of the unintended consequences of local officers holding immigrants on federal detainers is a reduction of immigrants’ trust in the local police and the disruption of police-community relationships (see also Romney and Chang, 2012). It has long been documented that immigrants, compared with the native-born, are less likely to contact the police for assistance and report victimization to local law enforcement officers even when the victimization is serious (Davis and Hendricks, 2007; Horowitz, 2001; Menjivar and Salcido, 2002). Findings from a National Institute of Justice-sponsored survey and from selected site visits in immigrant communities across the United States show that compared with other crime victims, immigrants face unique pressures in deciding to cooperate with local law enforcement authorities after victimization (Davis and Erez, 1998). Reasons for underreporting include possible embarrassment to families, language difficulties, cultural differences in conceptions of justice, and a lack of knowledge of the criminal justice system (Davis and Erez 1998: 3–4). Yet fear of becoming involved with authorities tops the list of reasons why victimized immigrants are reluctant to turn to the police for help. With

immigrants already hesitant to seek help after victimization, underreporting is likely to become especially problematic in communities where local law enforcement officials actively police immigration. The Secure Communities program may thus exacerbate victims' vulnerability and alienation, increase crime and violence, and create insecure rather than secure communities.

**#6: Secure Communities May Increase Instances of Racial Profiling and Pretextual Arrests** One of the most oft-repeated criticisms associated with Secure Communities and other devolution policies and practices centers on the potential abuses that may result from increased discretion among local law enforcement officers (American Civil Liberties Union, 2012; Cox and Miles, 2013; Gonzales, 2011; Heffernan, 2011; Kohli, 2011). Topping the list is unconstitutional discriminatory policing. As Treyger et al. (2014) mention, law enforcement agencies and individual officers who prefer a more aggressive immigration enforcement regime might be motivated to make arrests for offenses that otherwise would be deemed too petty, or unsubstantiated by probable cause, with the intention that the arrestee be screened through IDENT To be fair, Treyger et al. (2014) did not find evidence of discriminatory policing. The authors note, "As for the concerns that Secure Communities will lead to discriminatory policing, as far as we can tell, activation of the data sharing system did not lead to widespread increases in arrests for any crimes or crime categories, or to increases of arrests of White suspects relative to Black suspects." Yet as they also admit, the absence of ethnicity-specific arrest data across a large set of law enforcement agencies presents an important limitation to the study. In particular, Treyger et al. could not detect any reallocation of arrests from non-Hispanic Whites to Hispanic Whites, which would be suggestive of discriminatory policing. Thus, firmer conclusions about the fears of racial profiling must await analysis of jurisdictions that record and make available such data. In the meantime, we cannot rule out the possibility that Secure Communities may increase instances of racial profiling and pretextual arrests.

**#7: Secure Communities Is Associated with Significant Human Costs** Besides the fact that Secure Communities does not target the right offenders (see point #3), we often forget that the individual being deported is not the only one affected by his or her removal. The innocent victims of deportation are the remaining family members and especially the deportee's children. The Urban Institute conducted a study that assessed the impact of immigration workplace raids (a major source of deportation) on children and families. The results were striking. For every two immigrants apprehended in the raid, one child was left behind (Capps, Castaneda, Chaundry, and Santos, 2007). Significant human costs are associated with this reality. First, some of these children are placed in foster care. The Applied Research Center (2011) estimated that as of 2011, at least 5,100 children currently living in foster care were there because parents had been detained or deported. This number is expected to triple by 2015. Once placed in foster care, the children of immigrants must make the adjustment to adulthood without the guidance of their families or (often) other members of the immigrant community to which they had previously belonged (Kubrin and Trager, 2014: 534). This places them at greater risk for delinquency (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001, 2006). Second, many of these children are raised in single-parent households. Not surprisingly, there is increased economic struggle as deportees are typically male and the breadwinners in their families. Moreover, research old and new has found that the children of immigrants often have difficulty adjusting to life in their country of residence and are at risk for antisocial and delinquent behaviors even when both parents are present (Morenoff and Astor, 2006; Taft, 1933; Tonry, 1997). Yet children who grow up with strong familial support tend to adjust better to life in their new country, whereas children who lack this support, in some cases because a parent is deported, are more likely to deemphasize their cultural heritage and adopt new lifestyle patterns. Such "assimilated" youth are at an increased risk for delinquency (Lee, 1998; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006; Rumbaut and Ewing, 2007; Zhou and

Bankston, 2006). This cultural dissonance only increases if a child views the detained or deported parent as a failed immigrant or as a criminal (Dreby, 2012). A third human cost is the psychological trauma children experience as a result of having a parent or both parents deported. The Urban Institute report referenced earlier (Capps et al., 2007: 4) identified a range of emotional problems children suffer including anxiety, depression, and stress: “After the arrest or disappearance of their parents, children experienced feelings of abandonment and showed symptoms of emotional trauma, psychological duress, and mental health problems. . . . The combination of fear, isolation, and economic hardship induced mental health problems such as depression, separation anxiety disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, and suicidal thoughts.” Unfortunately, often as a result of the fear of possible consequences in asking for assistance and barriers to accessing services, the report stated that few children sought or received any mental health care. These are among the many significant costs associated with Secure Communities.

Conclusion In June 2011, Representative David Price of North Carolina, a ranking member of the U.S. House of Representatives’ Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, had this to say about Secure Communities: “[Secure Communities] does draw that bright line between the federal role and the local role in immigration enforcement, . . . I believe it can accomplish the task more efficiently to identify and remove dangerous criminals from our communities, which I think we very widely agree should be the main priority of immigration enforcement” (157 Cong. Rec. H3947–48 [daily ed. June 2, 2011, statement of Rep. David Price]). Although I agree with Rep. Price that removing dangerous criminals from our communities should be a main priority of immigration enforcement, I disagree that Secure Communities offers an effective route to achieve this. As Treyger et al. (2014) convincingly show in their study, “Secure Communities has had no unambiguous beneficial effects” in enhancing public safety in jurisdictions across the United States. In fact, as I have argued here, the program may be doing more harm than good. It is time to abandon Secure Communities/

## 2nc S—Biopolitics

### **Biometric border surveillance creates a 'biopolitical border' that creates racist intrusion against immigrants and manifests fake terror threats to help exhibit control and divide communities**

**Amoore, 6**, Ph.D. in geography, professor at University of Durham, (Louise, 'Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror,' *Political Geography*, Vol. 25, Iss. 3, pp. 336-351, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629806000217>)

In this paper I develop the concept of the biometric border in order to signal a dual-faced phenomenon in the contemporary war on terror: the turn to digital technologies, data integration and managerial expertise in the politics of border management; and the exercise of biopower such that the body itself is inscribed with, and demarcates, a continual crossing of multiple encoded borders – social, legal, gendered, racialized and so on. **The term biometric border**, now part of the lingua franca of the risk consultants and the government departments charged with fighting the war on terror, **has yet to be analysed critically in terms of how it is being deployed. As a manifestation of** what Walters (2002, p. 571) calls **the 'biopolitical border', biometric borders extend the governing of mobility into domains that regulate multiple aspects of daily life. Subject to biopower, the crossing of a physical territorial border is only one border crossing in a limitless series of journeys that traverse and inscribe the boundaries of safe/dangerous, civil/uncivil, legitimate traveller/illegal migrant.** In part, then, **the biometric border signals a new and important geographical imagining of the border, interpreted in the literature as symptomatic of both decentred and outsourced forms of state and the contradictions of contemporary global capital** (see Hyndman, 1997 and Newman, 2001). Yet, **it is not simply the emergence of new border regimes but the performing of the idea of the biometric border that is becoming so central to the technologies of the war on terror.** Rather as Dear and Lucero (2005, p. 317) suggest in their discussion of the Baja California borderlands, 'la frontera portátil is everywhere'. In effect, **the biometric border is the portable border par excellence, carried by mobile bodies at the very same time as it is deployed to divide bodies at international boundaries, airports, railway stations, on subways or city streets, in the office or the neighbourhood. The work of the biometric border is** thus the work of redefining what Bigo (2001, p. 112) calls **the 'Möbius ribbon' of internal and external security, such that 'internal and external security become embedded in the figure of the "enemy within", of the outsider inside, increasingly labeled with the catchphrase "immigrant"'**. Read through Bigo's (2001, p. 100) lens of **a governmentality that combines 'technological sophistication with the old disciplines of the body', immigration and the terrorist threat become combined as a problem 'not because there is a threat to the survival of society' but because 'scenes from everyday life are politicized, because day-to-day living is securitized'**. Thus, **the governing of mobility through US VISIT's biometric borders is categorically not about new border threats in a post-9/11 world, but rather a means of identifying and designating the safe from the dangerous at multiple borders of daily life.** US VISIT, then, is but one element of a liberal mode of governmentality that sees risk profiling in the war on terror pervade and claim every aspect of species life itself, or something akin to a shift from geopolitics to biopolitics ( Dillon, 2002, Dillon, 2004, Dillon and Reid, 2001 and Larner and Walters, 2004). Certainly such **biopolitical and governmental techniques and technologies capture a crucial aspect of what is at stake politically in the extension of the biometric border into multiple realms of social life**, and this will form a key part of my argument. Yet, here I am also seeking to sound a note of caution lest, when we advance a critique of biopolitical systems in the war on terror, we inadvertently reproduce the certainties and assurances of the technical matrix that has become the mainstay of the homeland security

programmes. **The authority of risk profiling in the war on terror precisely relies upon the representation of a world that would be safer if only ambiguity, ambivalence and uncertainty could be controlled.**

## 2nc S—Racial Profiling

**That results in racial profiling and exploitation of vulnerable groups—methods of resistance against the biopolitical border are necessary to create politicizing movements**

**Amoore, 6**, Ph.D. in geography, professor at University of Durham, (Louise, 'Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror,' *Political Geography*, Vol. 25, Iss. 3, pp. 336-351, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629806000217>)

Announcing his plans for the US VISIT programme to European political leaders, former US Secretary of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, depicted a globalizing society of simultaneous opportunities and threats. 'As the world community has become more connected through the globalization of technology, transportation, commerce and communication', he argued, 'the benefits of globalization available to peace loving, freedom loving people are available to the terrorists as well' (Department of Homeland Security, 2005, p. 1). Framed in this way, the problem becomes one of isolating the legitimate 'inside' transborder activities of the global economy, and securing them from the illegitimate 'outside' of those who would exploit the possibilities of open borders. I have argued elsewhere, following Pat O'Malley and others, that the discursive deployment of risk, particularly by management consultants, is closely allied to the representation of the risks and rewards of globalization (Amoore, 2004, De Goede, 2004 and O'Malley, 2000). Far from seeking to minimize or limit the risks of a globalizing society, the **new techniques of 'targeted governance' in the war on terror rest upon an 'embracing of risk' made possible by the global integration of information technologies** (Baker, 2002 and Valverde and Mopas, 2004, p. 239). It is precisely such a vision of embracing the risks of globalization via information technology that frames **the Department of Homeland Security's US VISIT programme**. Put simply, US VISIT **appears to hold out the possibility of reconciling the necessary fiction of porous international borders that are open for business, with the need for security at the border**. It does this **by enacting a series of dividing practices in which the subject is broken up into calculable risk factors**, both within herself (such as, for example, 'student' and 'muslim' and 'woman'), and necessarily also in relation to others (as, for example, 'alien', 'immigrant' or 'illegal'). **It is through such dividing practices that, for Foucault (1983, p. 208), the subject becomes objectivised**. Though it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the implications of what has been called 'dataveillance' in the war on terror (see Amoore & de Goede, 2005), suffice to say that **these techniques involve processes of objectivisation in which new technologies of surveillance identify 'what effectively become suspect populations or "risky groups"'** (Levi & Wall, 2004, p. 200; see also Clarke, 1994). Accenture's 'smart border solution' to the governing of mobilities rests upon just such a system of dataveillance that categorises populations into degrees of riskiness. It does this by interfacing and integrating, at the time of writing, over 20 existing databases, from police authorities, to health, financial and travel records. Among the most significant are IDENT, a biometric database that stores and identifies electronic fingerprints on all foreign visitors, immigrants and asylum seekers; ADIS, storing travellers entry and exit data; APIS, containing passenger manifest information; SEVIS, containing data on all foreign and exchange students in the United States; IBIS, a 'lookout' watch list interfaced with Interpol and national crime data; CLAIMS3, holding information on foreign nationals claiming benefits; and an array of links to finance and banking, education, and health databases. US VISIT uses these databases to profile and encode people according to degrees of riskiness, checking 'hits' against passenger manifests and visa applications. As one Accenture consultant put it: '...the old systems could really only check the single person who is walking out to the plane. Accenture's system will check your associates. It will ask if you have made international phone calls to Afghanistan, taken flying lessons, or purchased 1000 pounds of fertilizer' (cited in "The Price of Protecting the Airways", 2001, p. 1). **The guiding assumption, then, is that encoded risk profiles can be used as a basis to predict and prevent future acts**. What Van



Munster (2004, p. 142) has called a **'discourse on eventualities' has allowed the war on terror to be fought preemptively through risk profiling. The risk-based identity of the person who attempts to cross an international border is in this way encoded and fixed far in advance of reaching the physical border** – when, for example, he leaves the electronic traces of buying an air ticket, applying for a visa, using a credit card, and so on. Indeed, the Smart Borders authorities hail US VISIT precisely because 'it makes US border guards the last line of defense, not the first, in identifying potential threats' ( Accenture digital forum, 2004, p. 4). **It is this preemptive fixing of identities that is emerging as a key point of contradiction and tension within the logic of the biometric border, and is of central concern to advocacy groups, civil liberties and privacy organizations, and immigrant rights groups.** In April 2004, a coalition, including the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee, National Immigration Law Center, Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC), and American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), wrote to the DHS expressing their concern at the 'enormous potential for error and violation of international human rights standards' in the US VISIT system.<sup>3</sup> Of particular concern to the group is the question of what happens to people who come up as 'hits' on the various databases, and how a 'false hit' that leads to detention or deportation can be challenged.<sup>4</sup> As one EPIC lawyer put the problem: **'these technologies are assumed to provide a complete picture of who someone is, leaving people having to dispute their own identity'**.<sup>5</sup> In these terms **the US VISIT system far exceeds a technologized 'recording' of entry and exit of non-US citizens and 'matching of people to their travel documents and visas'** (Accenture digital forum, 2004, p. 2). Rather, by encoding people with a pre-determined risk profile, US VISIT engages in what has been called 'the legitimation work of globalization', the everyday work of 'issuing and denying documents, sealing and opening records, regulating and criminalizing transactions, and repudiating and claiming countries and persons' (Coutin, Maurer, & Yngvesson, 2002, p. 804). **The mastery of border risks** by governments and their business partners, then, **is undertaken on the back of** risk displacement – the **reallocation and intensification of uncertainty for the most vulnerable groups.** The **direct and organized efforts to resist the governing of mobility** in the war on terror, exhibited by the ACLU, EPIC and others, **are playing an undeniably important role in politicising a programme that has been so effectively depoliticised.**

### **Surveillance privileges normative identities and essentializes struggles of certain groups**

**Amoore, 6**, Ph.D. in geography, professor at University of Durham, (Louise, 'Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror,' Political Geography, Vol. 25, Iss. 3, pp. 336-351, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629806000217>)

The deployment of electronic personal data in order to classify and govern the movement of people across borders has become a key feature of the contemporary war on terror. The US VISIT programme, though, extends **the use of integrated personal data into biometrics**, a move that **signals** what Levi and Wall (2004, p. 194) have termed **a 'new politics of surveillance'**. To clarify this point, this is not to say that biometric identifiers have not historically been central to the governing of mobility – after all, signatures are a form of biometric (see Salter, 2003), nor that 'older' forms of surveillance are not still prevalent in the war on terror. Indeed, **the historical emergence of body counts to enumerate and account for colonial subjects**, as Appadurai (1996, p. 133) suggests in his discussion of systems of classification in colonial India, **disciplines the 'unruly body', bringing it back into a zone of calculation and manageability**, recuperating it and **accounting for it within 'normal' ranges of acceptability.** **Contemporary biometric body counts bare out** much of what Appadurai signals for the creation of **'boundaries around homogeneous bodies' that 'performatively limits their extent', flattening differences and idiosyncrasies into calculable categories.** New forms of biometric technology extend this categorization and enumeration of the body via processes of risk profiling, such that they have themselves come to perform and represent a border that approves or

denies access. The US Patriot Act defined a set of practices for biometric applications that afforded their almost unlimited use in the investigation and identification of terrorism. In effect, the US VISIT system converges the data from integrated databases with biometric identifiers such as electronic fingerprints, facial and gait recognition, and iris scans. **Though the implementation of biometric gateways has been beset by difficulties, the seductive allure of biometrics has taken a strong hold in the governmentality of mobility.**<sup>6</sup> Mike **Davis, director of criminal justice for the FBI**, for example, **assured** a conference of European technology companies that **'the war on terror has come to rely on biometric technology' in a world where 'the only way to trace a terrorist is through biometrics'** (cited in "Biometrics: Great", 2004, p. 17). The allure of biometrics derives from the human body being seen as an indisputable anchor to which data can be safely secured. What van der Ploeg (2003, p. 58) has observed as a gradually extending intertwinement of individual physical characteristics with information systems' has served to deepen faith in data as a means of risk management and the body as a source of absolute identification. **Biometric technologies are perhaps best understood as techniques that govern both the mobility and enclosure of bodies,** or what David Lyon has termed surveillance **as 'social sorting'** (Lyon, 2003a and Lyon, 2003b; see also Cunningham & Heyman, 2004). In January 2005, for example, the then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, completed a number of agreements with the Dutch government to deploy biometric systems to accelerate the movement of 'trusted travellers' whilst restricting the movement of higher risk groups. Opening the new registered traveller programmes at Schipol airport, Secretary Ridge emphasized the possibilities for the categorization of air passengers via biometrics: 'we can design border security initiatives to both enhance homeland security and facilitate global commerce and travel'.<sup>7</sup> Within these programmes, we see not only the intertwinement of physical identifiers with information systems, but the annexing of patterns of behaviour, and their associated identities, that can be afforded smooth movement across borders. The use of air miles databases, for example, is coupled to the biometric submission of an iris scan to produce the identity of a 'trusted traveller'. Of course, Secretary Ridge himself qualifies for the programme: A fingerprint or iris scan is all that is needed for quick passenger identification and expedited processing through security. I've enrolled in the program myself, and I can tell you that it is a great tool that helps move low risk travellers more efficiently so that resources can be focused elsewhere, where the need is greater. (Department of Homeland Security, 2005, p. 1). In a sense, the US Air Transportation Association's registered traveller projects, together with the Netherlands' Privium Plus, have much in common with the historical practices of what is called 'risk pooling' in studies of the insurance industry (cf. Ewald, 1991 and Heimer, 2002). **By categorizing patterns of behaviour as 'low risk'** (whether in the profiling of claims history in insurance, or via frequent flier history in airline security), **authorities group together for common treatment individuals who are classified and encoded with a similar category of risk** – in this case expedited passage through security checks. Indeed, the trusted traveller is called into being through an array of self-governing techniques. The US VISIT in-flight video has an animated Tom Ridge warning that the traveller has the responsibility to record their own electronic fingerprint at exit kiosks in the departure lounges. Rather as a credit rating is derived from past patterns of responsible financial borrowing, the trusted traveller is the individual who governs his own mobility and establishes a low risk mobility rating. **In populations targeted for higher risk pools,** of course, **the electronic enmeshment of data with bodies is more invasive, and the degree of surveillance intensified.** Whereas the trusted traveller biometrics tend to emphasize membership of (or inclusion in) a group based on pre-screening checks such as citizenship and past travel patterns, what I will call immigrant biometrics are based on ongoing surveillance and checks on patterns of behaviour. While for the trusted traveller the biometric submission is usually the end of the matter, the passport to 'borders lite' (if not to a borderless world), **the risky traveller's biometric submission is only the beginning of a world of perennial dataveillance where the border looms large.** Regular travellers across the US–Mexico and US–Canada border, for example, can submit biometric data in order to fast-track the security checkpoint. Unlike Mr. Ridge's frequent flier experience, though, on trial at the US–Mexico border are radio frequency identification (RFID) enabled smart cards, enabling the tracking of the holder's whereabouts within the US. In terms of what is at stake politically, the emerging contests

around biometric borders centre on the question of the verification of identity. Biometric technologies are represented as infallible and unchallengeable verifiers of the truth about a person – the ultimate guarantors of identity. As such, they are increasingly being seen as the smart scientific solution to the problem of fighting the war on terror without impeding globalization – the means of managing risk by embracing risk (Baker & Simon, 2002) or, in Dillon and Reid's (2001) terms, of fighting liberal war whilst securing the liberal peace. Accenture, for example, views the biometric aspects of US VISIT as 'a key win in a climate where other countries on the front line of terrorism are interested in similar programmes' (Accenture press release, 2004, p. 1). In the UK, US VISIT-compliant biometric passports, for example, have become the Trojan horse for the much-contested ID card, with all passport applications post-2008 compulsorily linked to an ID card (Lyon, 2004). The 2005 US 'REAL ID' Act is perhaps the strongest example of the move to positioning identification and credibility determination, particularly of immigrants and asylum seekers, at the heart of the war on terror. The Act will compel authorities such as drivers' license bodies to verify identity and immigration status in the applications process. The linking of biometrics to integrated databases, as in all of these cases, not only appears to make the identification of a person beyond question, but also apparently lends authenticity and credibility to all of the data that are connected to that identity. Treated as a scientific, neutral and 'smart' solution to the problem of establishing identity (Valverde & Mopas, 2004), biometrics are parceled up, contracted out, networked and made available to multiple agencies with an anti-terror remit. Yet, **far from constituting a secure anchor for individual identity within the human body, biometric technologies are part of a process in which they 'are themselves incorporated into the bodily experience'** (van der Ploeg, 2003; see also Thrift, 2004). **It is important, then, to challenge and destabilise the apparent security of the biometrics-body-identity nexus, and to politicize the site of identity as a target for the war on terror.** As Butler, Laclau, and Žižek (2000, p. 17) remind us, "'identity" itself is never fully constituted; identification is not reducible to identity'. Read in these terms, **a project that works on fixing or securing an identity can never be complete, will always be contingent and uncertain.** The ever-present gap between identity and identification, or what is unrealizable in the discursive making of the subject, has been a preoccupation of social and cultural theory for some time. Despite radical differences of approach, there is some sense of valuing the 'gap' politically as a potential space for contestation and dissent. **Since the identity of the subject can never be entirely secured, the practices that rely upon the calling into being of specific subjectivities – terrorist, immigrant, asylum seeker – can never consider their work complete.** For Bhabha (1994, p. 269), **what is 'politically crucial' is the necessity of thinking beyond 'initiatory subjects and focusing on those interstitial movements or processes that are produced in the articulation of difference'**.

## 2nc S—Governmentality

Status quo immigration enforcement has created a ‘racial removal program’ that disproportionately targets Mexican and Latin American populations, specifically men

**Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelob, 13** (Tanya, Ph.D. in sociology from UNC, professor at UC Merced & Pierrette, Ph.D. in sociology from UC Berkeley, professor at USC, Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program, *Latino Studies*, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, pp. 271-292, <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/lst/journal/v11/n3/pdf/lst201314a.pdf>)

Despite its enormous budget, **the DHS lacks the resources to find and deport the estimated 11 million undocumented migrants** in the United States. **Thus, immigration law enforcement** must be selective. Overwhelming and conclusively, selective law enforcement **has selected Latino and Black Caribbean working class men**. Table 1 shows **the top 10 receiving countries of deportees in 2010** – these 10 countries **accounted for 96 per cent of deportees** in 2010. Of course, undocumented immigrants from China, the United Kingdom, Canada and other nations live and work in the United States. In the 1990s, demographers Fix and Passel (1994) estimated that Asians and people of European background make up 24 per cent of undocumented immigrants in the United States. Yet popular opinion in **the United States associates “Mexicanness” with illegality** (Golash-Boza, 2012). **Consequently, racial profiling targets Mexicans (or Latin Americans appearing to be Mexican) instead of immigrants of European or Asian backgrounds. The Border Patrol’s focus on Mexicans has a long historical legacy** (Ngai, 2004; Hernandez, 2010). **During the Great Depression, the United States repatriated as many as half a million people of Mexican origin – some of them US-born, US citizens – to Mexico.** This massive project of coercion required the participation of not only US federal agents, but also local sheriffs, schools, social workers and the Mexican consulates (Hoffman, 1974; Balderrama, 1982). **By 1940, the Mexican population in the United States had declined to about half of its size** in 1930 (Gonzalez, 1983), **resulting from** what historian Mae Ngai (2004) has called **a “racial removal program.” Racism against Latinos persists today;** Figure 4 illustrates the enduring emphasis, as well as the emphasis on Caribbean nationals. As you can see in the placement of the darker shades, **immigrants from Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean are disproportionately more likely than immigrants from the rest of the world to face deportation.** Although others have drawn attention to the racialized deportation crisis and the concentration of Latinos targeted (Lacayo, 2010; Coleman, 2012; GolashBoza, 2012), we underscore that **immigrant detainees and deportees are overwhelmingly male.** In the Jamaican case, 96 per cent of criminal deportees are men (Headley et al, 2005). A study of Dominican deportees by Brotherton and Barrios (2011) relied on a purposive sample that was 84 per cent male. The DHS does not make publicly available much of the data it collects on deportees. Thus, we do not have reliable universal data on the gender, age or familial status of deportees. We have been able to piece together data from a variety of sources and can conclude that as many as 90 per cent, and **at least 85 per cent, of deportees are men.** For example, we know that, of the 32,000 immigrants in ICE custody on 25 January 2009, 91 per cent were male and 9 per cent were female (Kerwin and Lin, 2009). Several studies of deportees based in receiving countries also permit us to make estimates of the overall deportee population.<sup>10</sup> Mexico receives by far the largest number of deportees. According to data provided by the DHS Office of Immigration Statistics, in FY 2010, the United States formally deported 282,003 Mexicans and returned 354,982 Mexicans. The Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF), the premier research institute on migration and borderlands in Mexico, has been collecting data on Mexicans who are sent back to Mexico since 2004 – the EMIF Norte Study.<sup>11</sup> **EMIF data collected during 2010 reflected that fully 89 per cent of Mexicans who were repatriated were men.**<sup>12</sup> Their data include Mexicans deported via airplane from the interior of the United States as well as those returned via land at the border. The EMIF data seem to include more returnees than deportees – only 27 per cent of those repatriated had been in the United States for more than a year

before being returned to Mexico, and the vast majority reported that Mexico was their place of residence – but their statistics line up with other signals of deportation as a gendered practice. **The EMIF study also includes interviews at the airport in Guatemala City where deportees arrive from the United States.** The data from 2006 indicate that 15 per cent of deportees arriving in Guatemala City were women. The first author had the opportunity to observe over 1000 deportees arriving into Guatemala City on airplanes, and can confirm that the vast majority were men. In addition, those planes that arrive from the interior of the United States, from Georgia, for example, tend to have even higher numbers of men than those airplanes arriving from border cities. In 2010, 75,645 Guatemalans, Hondurans, Salvadorans and Nicaraguans were deported. Together with Mexico, these countries accounted for 92.3 per cent of all people deported in FY 2010. On the basis of these facts, we conclude that at least 85 per cent of all people deported from the United States in recent years have been men. Of the 387,242 deportees in FY 2010, only 2.2 per cent were from Africa, Asia, Europe and Oceania. **The evidence is overwhelming that Latin American and Caribbean men are the targets of the current US deportation regime.**

That deportation, coupled with economic recession, destroys markets for low-skilled workers **Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelob, 13** (Tanya, Ph.D. in sociology from UNC, professor at UC Merced & Pierrette, Ph.D. in sociology from UC Berkeley, professor at USC, Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program, *Latino Studies*, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, pp. 271-292, <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/lst/journal/v11/n3/pdf/lst201314a.pdf>)

A gendered division of labor still prevails in the US economy, and **beginning in 2007, the United States entered the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, a crisis** particularly **marked by high rates of joblessness** among men without college degrees, and **among Black and Latino working class men.** **Globalization has now brought the United States three decades of deindustrialization, the erosion of union jobs and the manufacturing sector, and the normalization of off-shore production and consumer purchases** of imports. In recent decades, Latino **immigrant male labor has clustered in** industries such as the construction and building trades, **sectors that experienced extreme contraction due to the real estate bust** during the recession. Signs of economic and employment recovery surfaced in 2012, but the **big picture** of predicted **trends in employment growth suggest these** traditionally male job **sectors will not recover to pre-2007 levels.** While no one can precisely predict long-term structural changes in the economy, indicators suggest concentrated job growth will continue in services. According to the US Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, service-providing industries will add approximately 14.5 million new jobs and projections for 2008–2018 list “healthcare and social assistance” as the dominant sector of projected service job growth (Bureau of Labor Statistics). While predictions for job growth in construction lag, there is anticipated growth in the near future in healthcare, childcare and eldercare, cleaning jobs of all sorts, educational services, and hotel and food services. Women dominate these lowwage occupational sectors, including many Latina and Caribbean immigrant women. **The confluence of high unemployment and deportation among Latino immigrant men prompts us to ask: have Latino men and their jobs been declared disposable? We urge scholars,** particularly labor economists and sociologists, **to conduct sectoral and regional research to explore possible linkages between the current wave of deportations and local labor markets** for Latino immigrant men. **There are plenty of historical precedents of mass deportations following on the heels of major economic downturns** (for example, the “Repatriation” programs of the 1930s, and Operation Wetback during the post-Korean War economic slump). The **legal mechanisms for deportation have changed, but the outcomes seem eerily similar,** with a key difference. Now, immigrant women’s employment has expanded and they have been under-represented in deportation. In an earlier era, women’s bodies were coded as reproductive and

men's bodies as productive and this scheme served as justification for the recruitment of Asian and Mexican immigrant male workers and the exclusion of Asian and Mexican women. Now, that equation has been reversed. **In the current post-industrial economic context of globalization and high-tech, there is shrinking labor demand for men who lack higher education and advanced technology skill sets.** Meanwhile, in the United States and in all post-industrial nations around the globe, demand for immigrant women in caregiving, cleaning and nursing sectors has increased. All indicators suggest that this labor demand will only continue to increase in relation to aging baby boomer populations.

## 2nc S—Structural Violence

### **Disproportionate deportation of Latino men causes poverty and institutional fears in communities**

**Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo, 13** (Tanya, Ph.D. in sociology from UNC, professor at UC Merced & Pierrette, Ph.D. in sociology from UC Berkeley, professor at USC, Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program, *Latino Studies*, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, pp. 271-292, <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/lst/journal/v11/n3/pdf/lst201314a.pdf>)

**The deportation crisis affects the families of Latino immigrant men. Left behind** in the United States, these **families** include US citizens and legal residents with many years in the United States **who experience adverse economic, social and psychological effects** (Hagan et al, 2011; Dreby, 2012). **Detention and deportation often remove critical sources of** already meager male breadwinner **income** from Latino working families. **Family members try to scrape together thousands of dollars** in legal and immigration **fees to avoid detention and deportation, and** they may subsequently be unable to **cover rent and other living expenses**. Economic **hardship pushes women** who once relied on their partner's income into working two or three jobs, or generating informal sector income, **and this results in a greater care squeeze for the very young and the infirm**. Wide networks of relatives may be called upon for financial help. In some instances, family members living in Mexico are now asked to send financial support, reversing a long-term historical trend of US migrants sending remittances back to their country. In the United States, **many of the remaining families seek inadequate government-provided support**. Many of the deportees interviewed by the first author reported that their partners had sought food stamps, subsidized housing and state-funded childcare following deportation. **Deportation also causes emotional and psychological trauma and family dissolution. It affects not only the deportees and their family members, but others in the community who, because they fear a similar fate, deter their health or protective services-seeking behavior**. Adults and children share in psychological stress. Joanna Dreby's (2012) research based on interviews with 91 parents and 110 children in 80 households reveals that **regardless of legal status, children in Mexican immigrant families now express fear and anxiety about potential family separations**, leading her to suggest that children disproportionately shoulder the burden of deportation. The consequences of today's deportation crisis continue to unfold, and raise a number of urgent research questions: **What are the consequences for Latina women and other family members affected by deportations? How does this affect not only employment, but also caregiving, stress, health and well-being, mobility, and gender relations in families? What are the outcomes for Latino families and communities deprived of not only male breadwinners, but also caregiving fathers, partners and male mentors?** In many instances, the deportation crisis deprives Latino families of face-to-face fatherhood. **This return to institutionalized transnational fatherhood harkens back to the Bracero Program – a guest-worker program** put into place after World War II – **which separated families and caused despair and hardship for Mexican women, children and entire communities** (Rosas, 2011). Now, the United States removes fathers back to their countries of origin while their spouses and children remain here, but the effects are similar. **The deportation crisis sometimes prompts the de facto deportation of US citizen children**. More often the children stay in the United States, but their daily care may change: they might stay with one parent, or with relatives. **Some of the children end up in foster care, and the “Shattered Families” report** by the Applied Research Center conservatively **estimates that “there are at least 5100 children currently living in foster care whose parents have been either detained<sup>13</sup> or deported”** (Applied Research Center, 2011, 3). This raises a number of questions regarding family civil rights, and mental health trauma

suffered by children and parents alike. **The situation requires urgent attention** from not only advocates, legal defenders and clinical psychologists, but also legal scholars, psychologists and social welfare analysts. What are the short- and long-term consequences for Latino children and youth? And how do those effects reverberate in the deportation crisis' regional hotspots? How does the deportation regime era stunt the kind of optimism and outstanding second-generation achievements reported in studies such as the highly acclaimed book *Inheriting the City* (Kasinitz et al, 2008)? **Even the children of legal permanent residents now witness the removal and deportations of their fathers and male relatives. The optimistic outlooks for immigrant integration, immigrant incorporation and second-generation mobility are difficult to sustain in the absence of major immigration legislative reform.**



## 2nc S—Xenophobia

**The Obama administration, with the implementation of new enforcement method, has orchestrated another wave of mass deportation that creates violent discrimination against immigrants**

**Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelob, 13** (Tanya, Ph.D. in sociology from UNC, professor at UC Merced & Pierrette, Ph.D. in sociology from UC Berkeley, professor at USC, Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program, *Latino Studies*, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, pp. 271-292, <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/lst/journal/v11/n3/pdf/lst201314a.pdf>)

The **criminalization of immigrants constitutes a new form of legal violence in Latino communities, legally sanctioned social suffering resulting from the convergence of immigration law and criminal law** (Menjivar and Abrego, 2012). While entire families and communities suffer this violence, the removals and deportations have targeted Latino men. **Mass deportation began with President Bush, but under the Obama administration, deportations have continued to rise**, and the focus now centers on criminal aliens – non-US citizens who have been convicted of crimes.<sup>5</sup> During this same period, **emphasis has shifted from border enforcement to interior enforcement. The ratio of returns to removals reflects this shift** – as returns are primarily a border enforcement mechanism.<sup>6</sup> **“Returns” occur when a Border Patrol agent denies entry, whereas a “removal” involves a non-citizen attending an immigration hearing** or waiving the right to a hearing – as in an expedited removal. In 1996, there were 22 times as many returns as removals. This ratio has dropped continuously, and in 2011, **for the first time since 1941, the United States removed more people than it returned**. We can only crudely measure the weight of interior versus border enforcement by this shift, as some people apprehended at the border can be processed through a removal procedure. Nevertheless, **the trend is striking** (Figure 2). The **distribution of apprehensions of non-citizens among law enforcement agencies also indicates a shift towards interior enforcement**. Immigration law enforcement officers who work in two branches of the DHS carry out deportations: CBP and ICE. CBP is only authorized to work up to 100 air miles from the border; **most interior enforcement falls to ICE. Over the past decade, we have witnessed a shift towards ICE apprehensions. In 2002, interior apprehensions accounted for 10 per cent of all DHS apprehensions. By 2011, that figure was nearly 50 per cent**. Figure 3 displays these trends. This shift towards interior enforcement has gendered implications – **deported men leave behind women and children. Long-term residents of the United States are much more likely to have children and families in the United States than migrants who have been in the United States for shorter periods of time**. According to a 2012 ICE report, ICE removed 46,486 non-citizens who reported having at least one U.S. citizen child between 1 January and 30 June 2011 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2012). A previous report found that DHS deported about 100,000 legal permanent residents who had US citizen children in the 10 years spanning 1997 and 2007.<sup>7</sup> Since nearly all of these deportees are men, we can surmise that women left behind provide children with primary support and caregiving. **Deportations also leave children orphaned and relegated to the foster care system**.

## 2nc Biometrics Fail

Biometric surveillance fails at preventing crime or terrorism—curtailment allows more focused preventive measures to be introduced

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

Just as there is nothing inherently harmful about surveillance as such, the implementation of technology-based mechanisms to facilitate immigration policing is also not inherently or necessarily harmful as a categorical matter.<sup>122</sup> Without question, automation and semi-automation can make government processes more efficient and effective.<sup>123</sup> For example, as proponents of Secure Communities argue, by seeking to eliminate discretionary law enforcement determinations concerning whose immigration status should be investigated and verified, automated immigration policing initiatives could, at least theoretically, reduce the incidence of errors based on the lack of knowledge of immigration law among state and local police or invidious exercises of that discretion on the basis of race or ethnicity—both of which are common objections to both unilateral state and local immigration policing initiatives and cooperative federal enforcement programs such as Section 287(g) that automated policing immigration initiatives seek to replace.<sup>124</sup> At the same time, **automation and semi-automation also present significant risks** of their own. Studies indicate that **decision-making when using computerized systems can be distorted by automation complacency and automation bias**, related phenomena **in which individuals place too much trust in the proper functioning of automated systems** even when they suspect error or malfunction. When these phenomena are at work, **individuals may** regard these systems as resistant to error, **fail to sufficiently monitor their operation, or overtrust the answers, recommendations, and cues they provide**.<sup>125</sup> The resulting harms can be particularly great with complex, interoperable database systems, which often contain inaccurate information and whose proper utilization and maintenance can be challenging. FBI policy, for example, emphasizes that a positive NCIC response does not give an officer probable cause, and that the officer must verify its accuracy and reliability with the agency that originally entered the record before taking action.<sup>126</sup> But despite these admonitions, **deprivations of liberty due to inaccurate records** accessed through the NCIC, as well as through other law enforcement databases, **remain common**.<sup>127</sup> Immigration agencies' poor track record with data quality and management gives ample basis for these concerns in the context of automated immigration policing. Fair information principles emphasize that personal data in government databases should be accurate, complete, and current.<sup>128</sup> However, for decades, **immigration authorities have been criticized for maintaining unreliable and inaccurate records and inadequately managing their information systems**.<sup>129</sup> A 2005 study, for example, found that as many as forty-two percent of all matches in the NCIC Immigration Violators File in response to police inquiries were false positives, in which DHS could not confirm that the individuals were immigration law violators. More recently, a GAO study found that ICE had no record of the criminal arrest charges for more than half of all individuals removed under Secure Communities during 2011 and the first half of 2012.<sup>130</sup> Such **fallibilities are compounded by increased accessibility of databases across agencies, which can quickly propagate erroneous information far and wide and create greater opportunities for data insecurity and misuse**.<sup>131</sup> When ICE investigates individuals flagged under Secure Communities, for example, it relies not only upon its own records but also other databases, including crime-related databases accessible through the NCIC. These systems all have limitations of their own. For example, despite recent improvements, **criminal history records often remain inaccurate, inconsistent across states, and incomplete**—for example, by lacking final disposition information or failing to record when warrants have been vacated.<sup>132</sup> With other NCIC databases, such as the violent gang offenders and registered sex offenders files, vague and overbroad criteria for inclusion can elide

relevant variations among individuals whose records are included.<sup>133</sup> **Nor are the fingerprint identification technologies upon which Secure Communities relies entirely foolproof. Although automated fingerprint identification systems can be extremely accurate in determining identity, they nevertheless can yield inaccurate results, owing to technological limitations, the quality of fingerprint recording processes, and even the particular demographic groups in which the fingerprint subjects are members.**<sup>134</sup> According to one estimate, at least ten percent of the population have fingerprints that cannot be read; indeed, it is in part precisely because of the perceived limitations of fingerprints that authorities have sought to use advanced multimodal biometric technologies.<sup>135</sup> Moreover, as discussed above, IDENT is both underinclusive and grossly overinclusive as a database against which to match records of individuals who might be deportable.<sup>136</sup> **These risks might be more tolerable if database screening were merely one early step in a fuller investigative process.**<sup>137</sup> Indeed, even if it were hypothetically possible for database systems and biometric technologies to be perfectly accurate, consistent, and complete, well-functioning interoperability **processes** would still **depend on competent and effective “human and institutional layers.”**<sup>138</sup> With Secure Communities, for example, flagging an individual’s record is only step one in determining whether to issue a detainer. Officials must also ascertain the individual’s criminal history and whether the individual is potentially subject to a deportability ground. Even when an individual is deemed potentially deportable, officials must also determine whether the individual falls within the agency’s enforcement priorities and how to exercise its prosecutorial discretion. Given the intricacies of the deportability grounds and their surrounding jurisprudence, these determinations can be remarkably complex, requiring information from multiple sources, knowledge of applicable law, and difficult judgment calls.<sup>139</sup> However, the very design of **Secure Communities leaves limited space for these human and institutional layers to function carefully and effectively—and the potential harms that can result are greatly exacerbated by the heightened vulnerabilities and limited protections afforded to noncitizens facing the immigration enforcement and removal process.** Given ICE’s goal of lodging detainees while individuals are still in post-arrest police custody, the **pressure to make determinations rapidly can reinforce automation**-related biases in favor of making those decisions based largely or exclusively upon review of criminal history and other database systems—**which may preclude**, among other things, **factoring in equities that warrant the exercise of prosecutorial discretion.** **These pressures** are exacerbated by the massive scale of the program, which strains agency resources and—as seen in other aspects of the removal process taxed by mass enforcement practices—**can undermine the quality of decisionmaking.**

## 2nc WOT NB

**The CP avoids a link to terror—it results in reprioritization of security interests and increased cooperation between communities and police while decreasing racist deportation quotas**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165,

<http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

Second, **these programs can influence how immigration officials prioritize their own enforcement decisions.** At least conceivably, by consolidating decisions about which cases to prioritize with ICE officials, rather than state and local officials acting unilaterally or under 287(g) programs, Secure Communities could enable ICE to make better enforcement decisions that more closely reflect its stated priorities than when state and local officials make those determinations. To date, however, **evidence** instead **indicates that as with those earlier initiatives, ICE has continued under Secure Communities to charge and deport large numbers of individuals with minor criminal histories or no criminal histories at all** other than the arrests prompting their screening, which in many cases involve traffic violations or misdemeanors.<sup>199</sup> **This pattern of outcomes might reflect countervailing pressures on the agency to deport as many individuals as possible,** without regard to its stated enforcement priorities, as members of Congress and other interest groups frequently urge. Indeed, **internal documents suggest that senior ICE officials at times have established informal deportation quotas that have created pressures to disregard the agency's articulated enforcement priorities.**<sup>200</sup> By identifying an overwhelmingly large pool of potentially deportable individuals who fall outside of those priorities, **Secure Communities may influence how officials choose to navigate that tension, pressuring them to act upon that information by pursuing enforcement actions even when individuals fall outside of the agency's priorities.** Finally, especially in light of these effects, automated immigration policing can prompt everyday community responses comparable to other forms of surveillance. For example, **community groups have maintained that the New York Police Department's widespread surveillance** since 2001 of day-to-day life **in Muslim communities has undermined trust of the police within those communities.**<sup>201</sup> As discussed above, **earlier generations of immigration policing initiatives have prompted comparable responses in immigrant communities, and evidence to date suggests that Secure Communities has induced similar effects** as well—for example, by making immigrant community members reluctant to report criminal activity as victims or witnesses. **Police themselves have also expressed concern that Secure Communities may be undermining the relationships necessary for effective community policing,** owing to the perception that contact with the police functions as a gateway to immigration authorities.<sup>202</sup>

## A2 Aff = Root Cause

### **Secure Communities lays the foundation for the “illegal immigration” surveillance regime**

**Ray '11** [Fall/Winter 2011, Rachel R. Ray J.D., University of California, Davis School of Law, “IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT: VOICES FOR CHANGE: Insecure Communities: Examining Local Government Participation in US Immigration and Customs Enforcement's "Secure Communities" Program” Seattle Journal for Social Justice] 10 Seattle J. Soc. Just. 327

II. THE SECURE COMMUNITIES INFORMATION-SHARING PROCESS ICE introduced S-Comm [n9](#) in March 2008, referring to it as a "comprehensive strategy to improve and modernize the identification and removal of criminal aliens from the United States." [n10](#) Since its activation in October 2008, S-Comm has helped ICE identify and deport more than [\*332] 86,616 undocumented immigrants convicted of crimes. [n11](#) This number includes more than 12,200 "criminal aliens" convicted of serious crimes and over 29,500 "criminal aliens" [n12](#) convicted of less serious crimes. [n13](#) According to ICE, "criminal aliens" are undocumented immigrants convicted of a crime. [n14](#) Undocumented immigrants who are charged with crimes, but not yet convicted, are not considered to be "criminal aliens." [n15](#) ICE classifies undocumented immigrants convicted of a criminal offense into three categories. Level 1 crimes present the greatest threat and include murder, manslaughter, rape, kidnapping, major drug offenses, and national security crimes. [n16](#) Level 2 crimes present the second greatest threat and include minor property and drug offenses, such as larceny, fraud, burglary, and money laundering. Level 3 crimes include all "other offenses." [n17](#) Level 2 and 3 crimes "account for the majority of crimes committed by aliens." [n18](#) Though ICE hopes to implement S-Comm nationwide by 2013, the agency is focusing first on "criminal aliens in locations where analysis determines they are most likely to reside." [n19](#) As of June 30, 2011, S-Comm [\*333] was in place in 1,508 of 3,181 jurisdictions in forty-four states and territories. [n20](#) For example, only 1 percent of jurisdictions in Kentucky, 4 percent of jurisdictions in both Pennsylvania and Wyoming, and 5 percent of jurisdictions in Montana had been activated as of June 30, 2011. [n21](#) No jurisdictions in Alaska, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, District of Columbia, or Vermont had been activated as of that same date. By contrast, 100 percent of jurisdictions in Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had been activated as of June 30, 2011. [n22](#) S-Comm was intended to increase public safety by prioritizing the identification and removal of undocumented immigrants with criminal convictions. S-Comm seeks to achieve this goal by enlisting LLEAs to submit arrestees' fingerprints to the State Identification Bureau (SIB) at the time of each booking. [n23](#) ICE requests that LLEAs submit fingerprints electronically to the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) as soon as possible during the booking process. [n24](#) [\*334] The SIB then transmits the fingerprints electronically to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS). [n25](#) State participants in the National Fingerprint File Program send fingerprints to CJIS at the time of the individual's initial arrest. [n26](#) CJIS's receipt of the ten fingerprints initiates both IAFIS and United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) Automated Biometric Identification System (IDENT) searches. [n27](#) If an IDENT search matches a fingerprint, CJIS automatically sends an Immigration Alien Query to the ICE Law Enforcement Support Center (LESC) in order to verify the individual's criminal history and immigration status. [n28](#) LESC then creates and sends an Immigration Alien Response (IAR) to CJIS and the local ICE Detention and

Removal Operations Office (DRO) within four hours of fingerprint submission to IAFIS and IDENT. [n29](#) This entire process takes place before charges have been filed against the immigrant. After receiving the IAR from the LESC, ICE determines whether to issue a detainer. ICE will file an immigration detainer if the noncitizen in question is charged with a Level 1 offense or if he or she has a Level 1 conviction that could result in removal. ICE files these detainers with the LLEA with custody of the individual at the time of booking. [n30](#) Although ICE claims that S-Comm "prioritizes enforcement action toward the greatest threats to public safety" through the removal of "criminal aliens" convicted of crimes such as homicide, kidnapping, rape, and threatening [\*335] national security (Level 1 offenders), the program permits ICE discretion regarding processing of Level 2 and 3 offenders. [n31](#) Under S-Comm, only ICE determines the individual's "alienage" and removability after a detainer is issued. ICE makes that determination based on an interview it conducts in person or via telephone or video teleconference; [n32](#) however, an ICE field office will issue detainers, as deemed "appropriate," with the LLEA. [n33](#) If an LLEA releases an undocumented immigrant before ICE issues a detainer, ICE may request information about the individual's location and identification from the LLEA. [n34](#) Pursuant to the immigration detainer, ICE should assume custody of the undocumented immigrant within forty-eight hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, or federal holidays) of notification of an immigrant's release. After taking undocumented immigrants convicted of serious criminal offenses into custody, ICE will take "immediate action" to remove them. [n35](#) According to ICE, "[t]he biometric information sharing capability [involved in S-Comm] takes place at a federal level and happens automatically when a subject's fingerprints are submitted upon booking. This automatic process requires no change to law enforcement's daily [\*336] operations." [n36](#) Further, ICE's former [n37](#) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/ICE and SIBs states: This MOA does not affect a state's existing relationship with the FBI CJIS Division. Rather, the MOA builds on and enhances that relationship. Neither the SIB nor any state or local LEA that is subject to this MOA will be responsible for determining an individual's immigration status or whether a particular conviction renders an individual removable pursuant to the INA. [n38](#) Despite the MOA and a recent directive issued by ICE Director John Morton, ICE requests that LLEAs abide by conditions stated in the immigration detainer. [n39](#) LLEAs must not detain an undocumented immigrant for a period exceeding forty-eight hours. They must inform ICE if the subject is transferred or released, file the detainer in the subject's record or file, allow ICE officers and agents access to detainees, assist ICE in acquiring booking and/or detention information about detainees, comply with CJIS and US-VISIT rules, and include S-Comm in community policing and other outreach activities. [n40](#) In fact, in order to take part in S-Comm and provide DHS with fingerprint data, LLEAs must make changes to their current technology or install new fingerprinting equipment. [n41](#) [\*337]

**Secure communities web of surveillance underwrites the deportation of thousands of immigrants now marked as "illegal"**

**Ray '11** [Fall/Winter 2011, Rachel R. Ray J.D., University of California, Davis School of Law, "IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT: VOICES FOR CHANGE: Insecure Communities: Examining Local Government Participation in US Immigration and Customs Enforcement's "Secure Communities" Program" Seattle Journal for Social Justice] 10 Seattle J. Soc. Just. 327  
[\*337] III. A NATION OF "SECURE" COMMUNITIES: S-COMM'S EFFECTS When S-Comm began in 2008, ICE implemented the program in just fourteen LLEA jurisdictions. As of June 30, 2011, forty-seven percent of jurisdictions had applied the program, and DHS is on track to expand the program to all LLEAs across the country by 2013. [n42](#) Fiscal year (FY) 2010 statistics show a 70 percent increase in removal of "criminal aliens" compared to FY 2008. [n43](#) In 2010, S-Comm's

implementation resulted in the arrest of 21,000 Level 1 offenders and more than 59,000 "convicted criminal aliens" total. n44 However, ICE's own data suggests that many detainees issued through S-Comm were placed against noncriminal individuals or those convicted of Level 2 or 3 crimes. n45 This action is not only in opposition to the program's purpose, but it is also unfair. S-Comm has been widely criticized across the country by politicians, attorneys, law enforcement officials, and by advocates of immigrant rights, human rights, and domestic violence victims. n46 Some immigrant rights advocates analogize S-Comm to a nationwide version of Arizona's SB 1070; n47 S-Comm puts benign offenders--for example, those who miss a [\*338] stop sign--at risk for deportation. Additionally, it implicitly encourages racial profiling while breaking down trust between immigrant communities and LLEAs. To determine if S-Comm in its current iteration carries out its stated goal, it is necessary to examine the program's implementation. In February 2010, the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR), the National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON), and the Benjamin Cardozo Immigration Justice Clinic filed a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for ICE documents concerning S-Comm. n48 In April 2010, the three groups filed a lawsuit in the Southern District of New York "due to the urgent public need for the requested records." n49 ICE responded by releasing important records, including cumulative data about S-Comm. Information released in response to CCR, NDLON, and Cardozo's FOIA request revealed that 79 percent of those deported under S-Comm had no criminal record or had been arrested or detained for low-level offenses. n50 As of June 30, 2010, 32 percent of individuals given over to ICE custody via S-Comm were noncriminals--up from 22 percent in FY 2009 n51 --and 26 percent of S-Comm deportees also had no criminal records. n52 However, this number varied greatly by county and by state. For example, 82 percent of individuals in Travis County, Texas, and 54 percent of individuals deported through S-Comm in [\*339] Maricopa County, Arizona, had no criminal records. n53 ICE's own data indicates that ICE and LLEAs are not implementing S-Comm uniformly, nor as it was intended. Detention and deportation of noncriminal, undocumented immigrants are just two of the risks posed by S-Comm. On June 17, 2011, ICE attempted to address concerns raised by immigrant and domestic violence victim activists. n54 ICE now encourages ICE officers, attorneys, and special agents to exercise their prosecutorial discretion and refrain from asserting the "full scope" of their authority to enforce immigration policy when appropriate. n55 In particular, ICE encourages favorably exercising prosecutorial discretion toward survivors of domestic violence or other serious crimes, as well as witnesses and plaintiffs in litigation regarding violations of civil rights or liberties. n56 However, these changes to S-Comm's implementation may prove to be inadequate. According to Thomas A. Saenz, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund president and general counsel, ICE's reforms "amount to little more than lipstick on a pig, except that this is a snarling, vicious, and rabid pig that will continue to run rampant and inflict serious damage on families and communities across the nation." n57 Further, [\*340] the reform is likely premature because it was announced before ICE and the inspector general adequately reviewed the program. California Assemblymember Tom Ammiano proposes that ICE should suspend S-Comm and wait for the inspector general report so that they may develop better policies. n58 Described below are a number of other concerns, as well as comments on ICE's efforts to address such concerns. A. Reduction in the Reporting of Crimes S-Comm is a "source of anxiety" n59 for LLEAs, cities, and counties wanting to maintain a clear distinction between federal immigration enforcement and local law enforcement. Because S-Comm has only recently been deployed on a large scale, it remains unclear what the impact on local law enforcement practices will be. Negative impact in communities with large immigrant populations is of particular concern. If immigrant communities view local law enforcement officers as enforcers of immigration law, LLEAs may lose the confidence of immigrants. n60 Law enforcement

agencies rely on this confidence in order to receive compliance with the law and during criminal proceedings. n61 According to Charlie Beck, Los Angeles chief of police, "[S-Comm causes] a divide where there's a lack of trust, a lack of reporting, a lack of [\*341] cooperation with police." n62 If LLEAs expand their duties to include immigration matters, undocumented immigrants will likely feel uncomfortable reporting crime, "thus encouraging criminals to further victimize [immigrant] communities and spread into the community at large." n63 Criminals may target undocumented immigrants if they know that as victims, those immigrants and their communities are unlikely to cooperate with police who are known to be involved in reporting undocumented immigrants to immigration officials. n64 Further, immigrant communities are closely knit. Once information circulates that arrest, even without conviction, can lead to deportation, there may be a rise in resistance to or evasion of arrest and an imposition of "new layers of fear and isolation" on immigrants. n65 Unfortunately, ICE's June 2011 changes do not specifically address this concern, possibly because DHS and ICE take the position that "it remains the responsibility of each jurisdiction to abide by its constitutional obligation to avoid discriminatory policing." n66 [\*342] B. Explicit or Implicit Racism According to ICE, S-Comm reduces ethnic and racial profiling. n67 However, data obtained via the CCR/NDLON/Cardozo FOIA request suggests that S-Comm actually contributes to and conceals racial profiling. n68 S-Comm enables willing state and local law enforcement officials to stop and arrest individuals based upon their appearance. Those suspected to be undocumented can be arrested and deported. n69 Because S-Comm sends fingerprints to ICE at the booking stage, rather than at the charging or conviction stage, ICE is notified almost instantaneously after a law enforcement official arrests an undocumented immigrant. This facet of the program may encourage LLEAs to arrest individuals they deem "foreign-looking" in order to send their fingerprints to ICE. n70 Aware of this possibility, ICE uploaded a briefing to YouTube on June 20, 2011 that includes a warning to LLEAs that decisions to arrest or book should not be [\*343] based on perceptions of race, ethnicity, or ability to speak English. n71 Any decline in the amount of racial profiling related to S-Comm has not yet been documented. Though law enforcement officers' motivations may not be entirely clear, the following story illustrates the possibility that officers may stop individuals based on appearance. Felipe, a twenty-nine-year-old Mexican national who has lived in the United States since he was four years old, has no ability to become a US citizen unless he marries a US citizen. n72 One afternoon in early 2010, two police officers pulled him over while he was driving home from work in Santa Barbara, California. Felipe was not speeding. When he asked the officers why he had been stopped, they did not answer his question. After asking for Felipe's license and registration, the officers learned that the car was insured and that Felipe did not have a state-issued driver's license, which is not a statutorily deportable offense. He had with him a Mexican driver's license and a passport. Stating that both the license and passport were clearly fakes, the officers arrested Felipe for felony possession of fraudulent documents. Felipe asked the officers if he could call someone to get another form of identification, but they refused to let him. The officers also said that they had received a report of a car like Felipe's in a nearby city and suspected him of transporting drugs in his car. Felipe consented to a search, and the officers found nothing. Felipe was taken to the county jail where, during the booking process, officers asked [\*344] him about his immigration status. When he refused to answer, the officers said they had already fingerprinted him and there was no record of his immigration, so they "knew" he was undocumented. The officers told Felipe that they were going to detain him until the next day, when ICE would pick him up. They said they had placed an ICE hold on him, so it would be best if he simply disclosed his status to the police because ICE was going to deport him regardless. Fortunately for Felipe, he had attended community education seminars for immigrants and understood some of what the police were



telling him. Felipe is also a fluent English speaker, whereas many immigrants who are detained by police do not speak English and are not assisted by a translator. While he was interrogated and detained, Felipe felt like the officers were making fun of him. It was not clear what they planned to do with Felipe; they said things to each other like, "make it the maximum; he's not getting out anyway." When Felipe's mother called the jail and asked for his charges, the officer said he could not disclose them because of Felipe's ICE hold. As a result, Felipe's mother could not post bail. Felipe's cousin learned of his arrest and immediately drove to the jail, where a different officer told her she could post a \$ 20,000 bail. Felipe's cousin was able to get him out on bail thirty minutes before ICE arrived the following day. Felipe retained an immigration attorney--in addition to a public defender--and the prosecutor dropped the fraudulent document charges at his arraignment. The only remaining charge was for driving without a license. Felipe's account of his arrest and detention illustrates what may have been a racially--or ethnically--motivated stop. Had Felipe not had the help of his cousin or been unable to post bail, he would have been torn away [\*345] from his family and deported for a nonviolent crime. Unfortunately. Felipe's story is not unique. n73 Though LLEAs should be responsible for discriminatory policing, DHS's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (CRCL) and ICE offer a complaint procedure for state and LLEA enforcement of S-Comm. n74 Through the complaint process after an investigation, CRCL will provide recommendations, including the referral of matters to authorities such as police oversight bodies or state attorneys general, identification of LLEA officers who may require disciplinary investigation, and increased training for officers on civil rights issues. n75 However, unlike 287(g), through which state and local law enforcement agencies can partner with ICE through an MOA, "ICE need not have a formal partnership with the local law enforcement agencies whose arrests trigger an information flow to ICE through [S-Comm]." n76 Consequently, CRCL may not have a "compulsory process" for complainants, and may not have the ability to require state and local law enforcement agencies to comply with CRCL/ICE investigations. According to ICE and CRCL, [the complaint investigation] process is useful to ensure that DHS's activities do not function as a conduit or incentive for discriminatory policing, but it is important to note (and ICE will state, if asked) that DHS/ICE oversight of Secure Communities does not put DHS or ICE in a position to superintend all law [\*346] enforcement conduct in jurisdictions where Secure Communities has been activated. n77 ICE further states that civil rights and/or community policing mechanisms that may aide in fulfilling LLEAs' responsibility to abide by the constitutional obligation to avoid discriminatory policing have "nothing to do with Secure Communities or immigration enforcement. Accordingly. DHS will not discourage development or use of such mechanisms." n78 The position ICE and CRCL seemingly take regarding discriminatory practices suggests that government entities may either turn a blind eye to such practices or may choose not to regulate states or LLEAs with discriminatory practices. Additionally, CRCL consists of just six full-time employees and has a FY 2011 budget of \$ 1.2 million, which is less than one ten-thousandth of DHS's budget for 2011. With minimal capacity and limited resources, CRCL lacks the ability to oversee the roughly 1,508 jurisdictions in which S-Comm is activated. The Office would be stretched thin by handling complaints from the 3,181 jurisdictions nationwide in which ICE plans to implement the program. n79 C. Deportation of Individuals Convicted of Nonviolent Crimes As stated above, S-Comm leaves the fates of Level 2 and Level 3 offenders up to the discretion of ICE officials, and ICE statistics show that the majority of individuals deported under S-Comm were arrested for allegedly committing nonviolent crimes. n80 For example, in Travis, Texas, [\*347] 82 percent of S-Comm deportations are of noncriminals, while in San Diego, California, the figure is 63 percent. n81 These deportations may cause more harm than good because undocumented immigrants play an integral role in the US economy. n82 Many undocumented people live their lives for years as

law-abiding workers, occupying jobs many US citizens would not. n83 If S-Comm's stated goal is deporting "criminal aliens," these numbers suggest that ICE is not implementing the program in ways that meet that goal. ICE has made efforts to provide guidance for its officials making deportation decisions, but these officials are still allowed full discretion. In June 2011, ICE's director, John Morton, issued a memorandum to ICE personnel to provide direction as to the use of prosecutorial discretion to ensure that immigration enforcement is focused on ICE's priorities. n84 Among the factors to be considered when exercising prosecutorial discretion are a person's criminal history, whether an individual poses a clear risk to national security, and whether an individual has an "egregious record" of immigration violations. n85 However, Morton's memo concludes by stating that a favorable exercise of discretion by ICE personnel is not a right, and that nothing in the memo "should be construed to prohibit the [\*348] apprehension, detention, or removal of any alien unlawfully in the United States or to limit the legal authority of ICE or any of its personnel to enforce federal immigration law." n86 Because ICE personnel possess such broad discretion, they may still choose to exercise it in favor of deporting more individuals, rather than to focus solely on the most serious offenders. n87 D. Wrongful Deportation ICE files tens of thousands of cases in immigration courts each year and many are either thrown out or declared futile, creating a backlog in the courts and further highlighting ineffective government immigration reforms. n88 Over the past five years, immigration court judges (Us) terminated almost ninety-five thousand cases because there were no grounds for removal. n89 Us granted relief in more than one hundred fifty thousand cases during that same period of time. In total, nearly two hundred fifty thousand individuals were affected by futile ICE filings in the FY 2006-10 period, n90 and nearly 31 percent of ICE requests for deportation were rejected during the last quarter of FY 2010, up from roughly 25 percent the previous year. n91 In FY 2010, immigration courts in Los Angeles, Miami, New York City, and Philadelphia turned down more than half of ICE removal requests. n92 [\*349] These statistics demonstrate that governmental efforts to remove undocumented immigrants can be shockingly ineffective. Some failures result from poorly designed immigration reform programs like S-Comm. In fact, such programs may undermine public faith in the government's ability to implement effective changes, n93 and may be costly and ineffective at both the law enforcement and court levels. As such, this is another area where both ICE and immigrants would benefit from the use of prosecutorial discretion. Such discretion would help unclog the overburdened immigration court system, lighten caseloads for ICE attorneys and immigrant advocates alike, and prevent unnecessary removal proceedings and deportations. E. Impact on Domestic Violence Survivors and Their Families Past repercussions of local immigration enforcement on noncitizen domestic violence survivors suggest that S-Comm will also have a severely detrimental effect on this vulnerable population. n94 The negative impacts of local immigration enforcement on survivors of domestic violence may manifest in several ways. Most significantly, survivors of domestic violence are occasionally arrested wrongfully as the "primary aggressor" in a relationship, or through dual arrests. n95 These survivors, already traumatized, [\*350] may then be detained by ICE. Secondly, domestic violence offenders often report or threaten to report their victims to ICE or the police as a method of further victimization. n96 Offenders may separate or threaten to separate survivors from their children through deportation or arrest, leaving children in the abusers' custody, which may be physically or emotionally harmful to diem. n97 S-Comm provides an easy method for offenders to engage in such behavior. Survivors of domestic violence are already an at-risk group with considerable inhibitions about calling law enforcement, and S-Comm may further deter them from attempting to take protective measures. n98 If their communities equate police with ICE agents, immigrant survivors of abuse will hesitate to call the police to notify them. n99 This will also

inhibit domestic violence survivors from taking advantage of protective forms of immigration relief like the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) n100 that might help them gain independence from their abusers. n101 Additionally, immigrant domestic violence survivors may not wish to report abuse if they [\*351] believe that someone will turn their abusers in to ICE. n102 S-Comm currently has no protections in place for domestic violence survivors at the arrest stage, thus providing no safety net for survivors who police arrest simultaneously with their abusers. n103 Without such protections, law enforcement cannot adequately respond to all domestic violence crimes. n104 As evidenced by proposed changes in Morton's memos, ICE took note of S-Comm's potential to harm survivors of domestic violence. Both the memo addressing prosecutorial discretion generally and the memo addressing prosecutorial discretion in cases involving certain survivors, witnesses, and plaintiffs address the need for particular care and consideration in the cases of domestic violence survivors. In these cases, ICE personnel should "exercise all appropriate prosecutorial discretion to minimize any effect that immigration enforcement may have on the willingness and ability of victims, witnesses, and plaintiffs to call police and pursue justice." n105 Absent special circumstances, it is against ICE policy to initiate removal proceedings against individuals known to be immediate crime survivors or witnesses. n106 ICE further reiterates that there are provisions of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) n107 and VAWA that provide protections for victims of domestic violence and other crimes. Despite these reminders, immigrant rights advocacy groups remain [\*352] skeptical that ICE and LLEAs will exercise proper discretion and enforcement. n108 F. Detention for More than Forty-Eight Hours An ICE detainer allows an LLEA to maintain custody of an individual after local jurisdiction ends. n109 After ICE issues a detainer, transfer of custody from LLEAs to ICE is not instantaneous. In theory, once ICE issues a detainer, a locality should not hold an individual for more than forty-eight hours before he or she is transferred to ICE. n110 In practice, however, LLEAs often unlawfully detain individuals until after the detainer expires. n111 Unfortunately, unlike in criminal cases, indigent individuals in civil matters do not have a recognized right to government-funded counsel. n112 Many individuals who are held on detainers are not aware that they have recourse for wrongful detention, or even that LLEAs are detaining them unlawfully. n113 ICE detainers also place administrative burdens on LLEAs [\*353] and expose them to potential civil liability for illegal arrests or for detaining individuals for unlawful periods. In June 2011, ICE attempted to address the issue of prolonged detention by crafting a revised detainer form, which ICE now sends to LLEAs to emphasize that state and local authorities must not detain an individual for more than forty-eight hours. n114 The new form requires that LLEAs provide arrestees with a copy, which notifies the arrestee that he or she should not be detained beyond forty-eight hours. n115 The form provides the phone number for the ICE Joint Intake Center, which arrestees may call if they have a complaint relating to the detainer or civil rights or civil liberties violations. n116 ICE also plans to release a YouTube video briefing on ICE detainers, which may elaborate on proper compliance with detainers. n117 If ICE is able to ensure that LLEAs comply with the forty-eight hour maximum detention, and if ICE follows through with investigations of arrestees' complaints, the agency may see some improvement in this area. However, in localities with strained budgets and overcrowded detention centers, LLEA vigilance in complying with custody limitations will likely not be satisfactory. [\*354] G. Improper Implementation Dealing with immigration "crime" is a matter distinct from detecting traffic violations or handling serious crimes such as robbery or murder. Most regulations governing traditional law enforcement are significantly less complex than immigration laws. n118 State law enforcement officials are not likely to receive special training in immigration enforcement, which puts legal immigrants at risk for being mistaken as undocumented. n119 Further, ICE iterates time and again that S-Comm places no new burden on LLEAs. In fact, when LLEAs take

on the burden of immigration enforcement, resources traditionally available for normal crime prevention are no longer at LLEAs' disposal. n120 Neither DHS nor Congress oversees S-Comm's implementation satisfactorily, n121 though greater oversight may arise after ICE's June 2011 changes to the program. In 2010, the ACLU requested that the DHS Office of Inspector General audit the program for racial profiling and other abuses, as well as compliance with ICE's priorities. n122 Beginning in June 2011, ICE and CRCL started examining S-Comm data to identify LLEAs that may engage in "improper police practices," in an effort to improve S-Comm's implementation. n123 Also in June 2011, DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano [\*355] created the Task Force on Secure Communities, n124 a subcommittee of the Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC). n125 The task force released its findings and recommendations in September 2011, including criticism of S-Comm's failure to adequately target serious offenders and reduce confusion in the program's implementation. n126 While greater federal government oversight might address some of the detrimental effects of S-Comm, the federal government may not have the authority to enforce the program. The following section considers the appropriate roles of federal and local governments in immigration regulation and enforcement--and whether the federal government has that authority. government oversight might address some of the detrimental effects of S-Comm, the federal government may not have the authority to enforce the program. The following section considers the appropriate roles of federal and local governments in immigration regulation and enforcement--and whether the federal government has that authority.

## A2 Alt Causes

### **Secure Communities and the IDENT database present the largest biometric database in the country and a further automation of immigration surveillance**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

While efforts to make DHS and FBI databases interoperable are longstanding, **Secure Communities aggressively goes further by seeking to establish what ICE terms a “virtual presence in every jail” at the moment that every arrestee nationwide is booked.**<sup>95</sup> Although practices vary widely among jurisdictions, particularly for minor offenses, during the typical post-arrest booking process police record an arrestee’s fingerprints, and transmit them to their state’s criminal records repository.<sup>96</sup> In turn, although not required by federal law, all states voluntarily submit these fingerprints to the FBI’s IAFIS system for individuals arrested of felonies and serious misdemeanors—usually with a request for a response providing identification and criminal history information, but in many instances simply to update the FBI’s records.<sup>97</sup> Upon receipt, the FBI processes the fingerprints and, as applicable, generates a response—a process which, according to the FBI, on average now takes only thirty minutes for criminal fingerprint submissions, compared to much longer periods even a few years ago.<sup>98</sup> Under Secure Communities, as illustrated in Figure 1, the FBI simultaneously transmits these fingerprints—which necessarily include prints of U.S. citizens and lawfully present noncitizens who have been arrested and booked—for comparison against records in DHS’s Automated Biometric Identification System, which INS originally developed to help the Border Patrol identify and track individuals unlawfully crossing the U.S.–Mexico border.<sup>99</sup> Today, **this database system, generally referred to as IDENT, is used for a range of other immigration control functions and constitutes the main DHS-wide biometric and biographic information system.** Growing at a rate of ten million new entries per year, **IDENT holds records on over 148 million subjects who have had any contact with DHS, other agencies, and even other governments**— including visa applicants at U.S. embassies and consulates, noncitizens traveling to and from the United States, noncitizens applying for immigration benefits (including asylum), unauthorized migrants apprehended at the border or at sea, suspected immigration law violators encountered or arrested within “trusted traveler” programs or who have adopted children from abroad. Given its data collection and retention practices, IDENT contains fingerprint records for many naturalized U.S. citizens who were fingerprinted before naturalizing and lawfully present noncitizens, and by the same token does not include records of noncitizens who have never had any contact with DHS, such as those who have entered the United States without inspection.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, internal government documents indicate that DHS may now also be retaining in IDENT the fingerprints of all U.S. citizens whose fingerprints have been shared by the FBI through Secure Communities.<sup>101</sup> **If fingerprints transmitted from IAFIS under Secure Communities match a record in IDENT—and even if there is no match, but the individual has an unknown or non-U.S. place of birth—the system automatically flags the record and notifies LESC, which reviews a series of databases in an attempt to ascertain the individual’s immigration status and criminal history. With rapidly growing volumes of status determination requests, ICE is further automating this process**—for example, by automatically retrieving records and categorizing individuals’ criminal histories.<sup>102</sup> If this review yields a match, LESC notifies the originating law enforcement agency and the relevant ICE field office, which decides, based on enforcement priorities and other factors, whether to interview the individual or issue a detainer requesting that the agency hold the individual.<sup>103</sup>

## A2 Destroys Enforcement

### **Limiting biometric surveillance is key to preservation of anonymity and efficient immigration enforcement**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

To begin with, automated immigration policing invites reassessment of the interests at stake when personal information is collected, maintained, processed, and disseminated for immigration enforcement purposes and the mechanisms to protect those interests.<sup>207</sup> As I have explored elsewhere, the **proliferation of zones in society in which immigration enforcement takes place, and where immigration status has become visible**, salient, **and subject to** pervasive **monitoring, carries a range of social costs**.<sup>208</sup> While it is entirely appropriate to collect, maintain, and disseminate personal information for immigration enforcement purposes in some contexts and subject to certain constraints, both **individuals and society as a whole have legitimate interests in preserving zones in society in which immigration surveillance activities do not take place, and in making sure that when they do take place they are appropriately limited and constrained**. To some extent, **those interests stem from the value of preserving individual anonymity or quasi-anonymity more generally and the individual harms that can result when immigration status is routinely monitored**.<sup>209</sup> But **they also arise from a broader set of social concerns that surveillance and information privacy scholars have increasingly recognized** as important. **These social interests**—for example, **preventing coercive or excessive aggregations of unrestrained government power—often have less to do with the particular information being collected in any given instance than with the harms that can arise from the means of surveillance and information management**.<sup>210</sup> **In the immigration enforcement context, the importance of constraining those aggregations of power is heightened by the particular vulnerabilities of noncitizens facing removal proceedings and the limited extent to which their interests are afforded meaningful protections** in the immigration enforcement and removal process.<sup>211</sup> **Vindicating these interests** in the immigration enforcement context therefore **requires** context-appropriate **constraints on the collection, use, storage, and dissemination of personal information** for immigration enforcement purposes, **including limits on secondary uses of information** that were not originally contemplated. While courts may seem unlikely to readily recognize and impose such limits, in fact **the value of these kinds of limits has nevertheless long been recognized by numerous government actors**—including courts and even federal immigration officials themselves.<sup>212</sup> **However, exuberance over the potential benefits of interoperable databases and other new technologies may be clouding attention to the continued importance of these limits** when implementing those systems. In an era in which more data is almost always assumed to be better, more information sharing and interconnectivity between database systems is also often assumed to be better as well.<sup>213</sup> **But** as John Palfrey and Urs Gasser have emphasized, **“complete interoperability at all times and in all places . . . can introduce new vulnerabilities” and “exacerbate existing problems.”** Accordingly, they argue, **placing constraints upon information sharing and interoperability** and retaining “friction in [the] system” **may often be more optimal**.

## A2 Biometrics Declining

**Biometric surveillance is expanding in the status quo and is increasingly used for purposes unrelated to law enforcement**

**Kalhan, 13**, J.D. from Yale, associate professor at Drexel University School of Law, (Anil, Immigration Policing and Federalism Through the Lens of Technology, Surveillance, and Privacy, Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 7, Iss. 6, p. 1107-1165, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2013/12/14-Kalhan.pdf//RF>)

**Surveillance and privacy scholars have long been preoccupied with** surveillance or function creep: **the gradual and** sometimes **imperceptible expansion of surveillance mechanisms**, once in place, **for uses beyond those originally intended** or contemplated.<sup>150</sup> **A lengthy list of examples illustrates the phenomenon**—the **proliferation of surveillance camera systems** to police a widening array of low level criminal and noncriminal offenses,<sup>151</sup> the **expanding use of online tracking**,<sup>152</sup> the **use of census data and voter lists to facilitate targeting of disfavored individuals or groups**,<sup>153</sup> the **expansion of DNA databases** maintained by law enforcement to encompass rapidly widening categories of individuals and purposes,<sup>154</sup> **and the repurposing of identity documents and identification systems** of every stripe,<sup>155</sup> to take just a handful.

**Surveillance practices undertaken in the aftermath of the 2001** terrorist **attacks have routinely morphed beyond the scope of their original** antiterrorism **purposes**. For example, the “fusion centers” established during the past decade to collect, analyze, and exchange terrorism-related intelligence information among law enforcement agencies almost immediately, and unapologetically, expanded the scope of their activities to encompass ordinary crimes.<sup>156</sup> Database systems can be particularly susceptible to function creep. While fair information principles urge limits on the secondary use of information for purposes not specified when collected, in practice these constraints are limited—especially given the lengthy data retention periods in many of these systems, which are often themselves extended as a result of function creep.<sup>157</sup> For example, especially as the politics of crime control has spilled into institutions such as the workplace, and as “collateral” consequences of criminal proceedings have steadily increased, **criminal records database systems have increasingly been made accessible for a widening array of noncriminal purposes—including background checks for employment, licensing and permitting, housing, public assistance,** and gun purchases.<sup>158</sup> In the wake of the 2001 terrorist attacks, **the categories of noncriminal background checks authorized by law have grown further. Fingerprint submissions to the FBI for noncriminal background checks now exceed submissions** by law enforcement agencies **for criminal justice purposes.**<sup>159</sup> **The expanded use of these same database systems for automated immigration policing—and the possibility of still further expansion—can be understood in similar terms.** As discussed above, the widening of the NCIC’s scope to include civil immigration records came not only in the wake of the 2001 terrorist attacks, but also on the heels of several other categories of noncriminal records being added to the NCIC—including limited categories of immigration records—which extended the system’s use beyond its original criminal justice and law enforcement purposes. Moreover, **the addition to the NCIC of some categories of immigration records has opened the door to proposals that would add others—not for the antiterrorism purposes used to justify the most recent two categories, but more broadly for garden-variety immigration policing.** A bill that recently passed the House Judiciary Committee, for example, proposes to add large numbers of records to the NCIC on additional categories of suspected immigration law violators.<sup>160</sup> **If enacted, the proposal would make many more immigration records widely accessible to police officers nationwide, thereby placing even greater pressures upon the conception of immigration federalism that has emerged in recent years.** Similarly, **Secure Communities takes the processes and systems developed for the**

**collection and exchange of fingerprints and criminal history records for criminal justice purposes and shares those same records with DHS officials for wholly distinct civil immigration enforcement purposes.** Not only has **Secure Communities repurposed the biometric records already maintained by the FBI, but in addition,** as with programs ranging from DNA collection to public health surveillance, **the program has contributed to the dramatic expansion of DHS's own biometric collection practices,** which now include the collection of fingerprints and other biometric data from almost all noncitizens who have contact with the agency—largely for potential future uses of that data, rather than for any immediate purposes.<sup>161</sup> In this context, **questions about secondary uses for the data and infrastructure of automated immigration policing—and the constraints to be placed on such expansions—warrant greater consideration**



# RNTM K

\*Right not to Migrate

## RNTM—1nc

### **The solution to failed immigration policies center not on the right to migrate but the “right not to migrate”—shout out to the pope**

**Zenit**—citing Pope John Paul II 12/23/03, Roman News wire citing the most vocal political leader on human rights in Europe (“There Is a Right to Migrate and a Right Not to, Pope Says”, Zenit The world seen from Rome, <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/there-is-a-right-to-migrate-and-a-right-not-to-pope-says>)AM

The World Day is observed on dates established by respective bishops' conferences. On this occasion, the theme is "Migrations from the Viewpoint of Peace." In his message, **the Pope explains that "to create concrete conditions of peace, in regard to migrants and refugees, means to commit oneself seriously to safeguarding above all the right not to migrate. ... That is, to live in peace and dignity in one's own homeland."** He adds: "**Thanks to careful local and national administration, to more equitable trade, and to solidaristic international cooperation, every country must be given the possibility to ensure for its inhabitants, in addition to freedom of expression and movement, the possibility to satisfy their fundamental needs.**" In particular, the Pope mentions "**food, health, work, home, education, without which many people find themselves forced to migrate.**"

### **US Neoliberal policies are the root cause of cartel violence—granting the “right not to migrate” solves**

**SMITH** 09/17/2013, Staff Reporter at the National Catholic Register (Peter J, “Creating the Right ‘Not to Migrate’”, National Catholic Register, <http://www.ncregister.com/daily-news/creating-the-right-not-to-migrate/>)AM

**Do immigrants deserve the right “not to migrate?” For a migrant from Central America, that right would mean a chance for a job and a living wage at home.** For one young migrant, **having that right would have meant never boarding the train that cost him his two legs.** “This is a huge problem,” Bishop Gerald Kicanas of Tucson, Ariz., told the Register, as he relayed the story of **the now-disabled young man** he met, who **will spend the rest of his life unable to support his mother and her seven other children. The young man lost his legs trying to jump on board a train into the U.S. because he could find no work at home.** Others face worse fates. **“This year, 129 migrants have died” crossing the desert, Bishop Kicanas, board chairman of Catholic Relief Services, said.** “Since the year 2000, about 2,600 have died.” **Much of the U.S. debate rages over granting a path to citizenship for 11.1 million immigrants living in the U.S. without legal papers. Bishop Kicanas and the rest of the U.S. Catholic bishops have tried to draw attention to the little-known factors that are pushing immigrants to leave their home countries in the first place — and to demand positive solutions as part of comprehensive immigration reform. Few U.S. citizens realize the damage U.S. trade agreements and agro-subsidies have inflicted on Mexico, Central and Latin America. They play a major role creating the unemployment there that drives illegal immigration here.** Nor are many aware how **the rampant unemployment in Central America is fueling gang and drug violence that forces people, especially unaccompanied minors, to risk life and limb on the dangerous journey to the United States to find work and seek a better life.**

**Removing policies Like Nafta are a prerec to aff solvency—the discourse we have created is critical to bringing it onto discussions in order to affect policy changes**

**Peña** 9/20/12, PhD, Professor of American Ethnic Studies, Anthropology, and Environmental Studies at the University of Washington in Seattle (Devon, “The Right Not to Migrate”, Mexmigration: History and Politics of Mexican Immigration, <http://mexmigration.blogspot.com/2012/09/the-right-not-to-migrate.html>)AM

**NAFTA, the international economic policy that has displaced millions of rural Mexicans, has had more impact on the ongoing development of the migration of Mexicans to the United States than any other contemporary event. And it is here precisely that the Indigenous Bi-national Front of Oaxaca (FIOB) proposes that there is a need to expand and emphasize transnational analysis in the immigration debate. We must bring to the table of discussion, the simple fact that in the absence of real economic opportunities and a range of public policies channeled positively to impact the opportunities and rights of indigenous peoples and peasant communities in México Profundo, there will be no realistic possibility to contend with the issues of the short and long term flow of undocumented workers. Until we establish the Right Not To Migrate, the right to be fully realized with self determination in our home communities as the fundamental centerpiece of immigration policy we cannot expect to escape the tide of injustices sweeping our communities today on both sides of the border.**

## RNTM—2nc S

### **Horrible conditions of home countries drive Migration—only promoting the right not to migrate solves**

**Early 6/27/14**, writer and coordinator for US-El Salvador sister Cities (Alexandra, “The Desperate Choices Behind Child Migration”, Counter Punch, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/06/27/the-desperate-choices-behind-child-migration/>)AM **As someone who just returned from living and working in El Salvador, I’m still having a hard time adjusting to our mainstream media’s never-ending wave of know-nothing commentary on the subject of immigration. A case in point is the column penned by New York Times columnist Ross Douthat on Sunday, June 22nd. Douthat expresses alarm about the “current surge” of “unaccompanied minors from Central America” who are dangerously crossing the U.S.-Mexico border in such unprecedented numbers that the Border Patrol and the courts are now “struggling to care for the children and process their cases.” What has caused this “children’s migration?” According to Douthat it is “immigration reform’s open invitation”—“the mere promise of amnesty” that has now worsened “some of the humanitarian problems that reformers say they want to solve.” Douthat is a conservative but his solution is a familiar, bi-partisan one: “let’s prove that a more effective enforcement system can be built and only then codify an offer of legal status.” That immigration policy proposal, per usual, totally ignores what’s really driving the big increase in border crossings by impoverished young Central Americans and what the U.S. government could be doing to make staying in Central America a viable choice. The “Push Factors” To see things differently, it helps to put yourself in the shoes of others. Let’s imagine that you are poor single mother living in Apopa, a dangerous city next door to the capital, San Salvador. You work cleaning houses for \$15 a day. Your neighborhood is completely gang dominated. When you take the bus to the house where you work you are often late because the police check the bus and make all the men disembark for body searches. There are some mornings when you wake up and send your daughter to the corner store for eggs and she sees dead bodies in the street. They could be the bodies of a neighbor or a storeowner who refused to pay the extortionate demands of the local gang. Just a few days ago, walking with your son you were caught in a shoot out between two rival gangs. You could do nothing but duck and cover and try to comfort your wailing child. Your son is 12 and one of the gangs—let’s say la Mara Salvatrucha (MS), the country’s most violent—is starting to recruit him. They want to use him as courier to send messages and deliver drugs. Perhaps more frighteningly, your older daughter, 14 now, is attracting the attention of an MS leader in the neighborhood. You tell her to reject his overtures, but you know how hard it is for any young woman to spurn such a relationship—or end it, once it has begun. No Rural Refuge You think about just packing up and moving to the countryside, but you have heard stories. Your next-door neighbor, an office worker, faced gang pressure to pay a fifty-dollar a month extortion fee. So she decided to move back to her hometown, a tiny village in rural San Vicente. But even small towns in El Salvador aren’t safe these days. After your neighbor moved back home, her nephew, a 16 year-old scholarship student was killed in the middle of the afternoon in his own front yard, right across the dirt road. He wasn’t the slightest bit involved in any gang activity. All he did was date the ex-girlfriend of a gang member. In Apopa, you try to keep your kids inside as much as possible. And you worry. You worry about how you will pay the rent and find the money to send them to high school, let alone college. And you think about sending them to la Usa. Your brother lives in Maryland. Maybe he could cover part of the cost of their**

journey? You know the journey is dangerous but what other choices are there? **How many American parents have ever had to weigh such terrible options—the danger of daily life for their children versus the dangers of illegal immigration? How many have experienced the emotional pain of resulting family separation**—first from parents leaving for work in Los Angeles or Maryland, with their children staying behind, and now from the stream of children and teens following the same route north in search of a safer and better life? **Forced to Leave In February, with my U.S. passport in hand, I left El Salvador and hopped on a plane headed for the U.S. – adios gangs, adios fear, adios poverty. I left behind many Salvadoran friends who will never be able to do the same thing. Just a few months later, a bright young man from one rural community I often visited left to join his father in Washington State. To me, with a steady job and money in the bank, his beautiful mountainside community seemed like paradise. But the young man couldn't gain admittance to the one affordable, public university in El Salvador and couldn't find a job. While Douthat bemoans the fact that Border Patrol agents are "neglecting other law enforcement duties" to deal with the influx of child migrants,** I am hoping they will be too busy to catch my young friend and that he will reach his destination safely. **The vast majority of Salvadorans, like other Central Americans, don't want to migrate to the U.S. They love their families and communities and would much prefer to stay and work or go to school in their own countries. Creating stricter immigration rules and deporting more children will not stop this wave of forced migrants; only giving them the chance to survive and prosper at home will.**

**The Plan returns to simple border crossings of the 80's and 90's but ignores the fact that NAFTA and other US economic policies are to blame for a surge in migration—removing the border only facilitates further capitalist exploitation**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy ("Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream", Project Muse, Book)AM  
Just as Roberto's words of loyalty and friendship for his boss obscure his status as a low-wage worker, **people's words about early border crossings obscure the fact that they were entering a country that welcomed their labor while denying their full status as human beings. Those who crossed during the 1980s and early 1990s state that the journey was relatively easy. Evaristo went to the United States for the first time the 1980s** at the age of twenty-nine. **Traveling through Nogales, he was guided by a young boy who charged nothing. They simply walked by when the INS agents were not looking.** Evaristo's new boss met him at a McDonald's as soon as he made it across the border. Evaristo recalls eating two large orders of french-fries. He laughs as he remembers how he fumbled to work the ice dispenser on the soda machine. They arrived in Chandler, Arizona, at ten o'clock that night. **"It was so easy," Evaristo recalls. "And now—no, man, the reality is totally different. Now, you really do suffer!"** **Marta's first trip to the United States was fairly simple as well. She and her husband passed through Nogales in the early 1990s. The journey took them scarcely ten minutes.** They arrived at a Burger King, where a taxi was waiting for them. **Evaristo and Marta's experiences are typical of undocumented Mexican travel to the United States during that time. The immigration restrictions of the post-1965 era were not accompanied by increased border enforcement. Crossing the border remained relatively easy and inexpensive, with border apprehension efforts serving more as a symbolic gesture of control than as a genuinely effective deterrence policy.**<sup>10</sup> **As Douglas Massey, Jorge Durand, and Nolan Malone argue, the period of Mexican**

**immigration to the United States from 1965 to 1985 was comparable to major waves of European immigration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.**<sup>11</sup> That is, **Mexico sent large numbers of immigrants to the United States as it underwent intensive industrialization. Left alone, migration levels would eventually peak and then start to decline,** much as European-U.S. migration had done in the early twentieth century. **Beginning with the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, however, the U.S. government put a “wrench” into the “wellordered machinery” of Mexico-U.S. migration by implementing a series of restrictive border policies that blatantly contradicted the increasing economic integration of the continent.**<sup>12</sup> Until the mid-1990s, however, cross-border travel for residents of El Alberto remained fairly fluid. **Many found ready employment in the housing boom of the Southwest. Some of the town’s men worked for a year or two at a time while their wives and children remained in Mexico.** Others started families in the United States. **Many of those who arrived in the United States by the 1980s were able to secure papers for themselves and their families under the general amnesty extended by the Reagan administration.**

## A2 Border Key

### **Focusing on border security ignores underlying US policies that Strip migrants of the right not to migrate**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (“Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream”, Project Muse, Book)AM

**By the time residents of El Alberto finally ventured into the United States, a “clandestine form of cross-border interdependence” had been developing between the two countries for decades.**<sup>5</sup> **The rise of so-called “illegal” Mexican immigration must be understood as the by-product of recurring efforts by the U.S. government both to attract and to restrict Mexican labor in response to economic change. While the United States deported Mexicans en masse during the Great Depression, the tide turned following labor shortages during World War II. Through the Bracero program, initiated in 1942, the United States invited millions of Mexican contract laborers north. These documented laborers were accompanied by millions of undocumented immigrants who encountered little restriction at the border and found abundant employment in the Southwest. No sooner had U.S. agribusinesses become dependent on Mexican labor than the United States initiated Operation Wetback, which deported hundreds of thousands of undocumented immigrants back to Mexico. Later, as the Bracero program was officially ended and the 1965 Immigration Act placed new restrictions on the number of visas for people from the Western Hemisphere,** these measures were countered by a corresponding surge in undocumented immigration from Mexico.<sup>6</sup> To the best of my knowledge, **the first people from El Alberto to travel to the United States in search of work did so in the 1980s, and it was not until the mid-1990s that U.S. migration would become commonplace.** El Alberto was not alone in this pattern. During this time, **several factors converged to send members of Mexico’s rural, indigenous populations north.** With the exception of Mixtecs, Zapotecs, and P’urépechas, **few indigenous groups were systematically engaged in migration to the United States until the 1980s.**<sup>7</sup> **As growing economic liberalization caused the Mexican government to cut crucial subsidies to peasant farmers, more and more indigenous people had to go on the move. The situation for rural populations became even more precarious as the peso collapsed and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect in 1994.** By some accounts, **the peso collapse was part of a strategic move by the government to pave the way for foreign investment.**<sup>8</sup> **Indigenous farmers found themselves unable to compete with the plummeting prices of coffee, corn, and other agricultural products. During the years following the passage of NAFTA, Mexican government officials neglected small-scale agriculture, leaving members of rural populations with little choice but to seek their livelihood in agribusiness, urban wage labor, and U.S. migration.**<sup>9</sup> **It was in the midst of this increasingly hostile climate that migrants from El Alberto first caught wind of opportunities across the border.**

## A2 Circular Migration

**The circular migration claims of the 1AC are a farce due to the high cost of living in the US and the propagation of Consumerism—Only rejecting these economic systems and granting the right not to migrate solves**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (“Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream”, Project Muse, Book)AM

Heriberto explains that **many people go to the United States expecting to earn in a few hours what they would earn in a whole day in Mexico.** The trouble is that **they underestimate how long it will take them to save money, given the higher cost of living in the United States.** Often **people plan to return after one year, once they have earned enough to build a house in Mexico.** **The year comes and goes, and they find that they have not met their goal.** **As they continue working, their needs and desires continue to grow.** **Even after they return to Mexico, they are soon itching to make the journey back.** **The attraction of dollars in El Norte is foreshadowed by a folkloric belief about mountains in the Valle del Mezquital. In hñāhñu cosmology, mountains are held to be the source of rain and other benevolent forces. They contain circulating breezes and bodies of water that connect to the ocean.**<sup>15</sup> **They also occasionally open up to let forth animals and nahuales, or human-animal doubles, which travel to human settlements to lure young people back inside. Time passes differently inside the mountains than it does in the outside world. While a young person may feel that she has spent several hours within the mountain, a year may have passed within the life of the town.**<sup>16</sup> **Like the mountain of the legend, the United States is a marvelous place that offers opportunity but also danger.** Like the elusive entrance to the mountains, **passage to the North is available only to certain people, at certain times. When young people emerge from the United States, as from the fabled mountain, they find that their sense of time is out of sync with those they left behind.** A visiting pastor to a Pentecostal church in Phoenix captured the magical appeal of the North in a sermon in the spring of 2010. While preaching to a congregation that included at least a dozen immigrants from El Alberto, he made a play on Psalm 121. **“Many people in Mexico say, ‘I lift up my eyes to el Norte, from whence cometh my help,’”** he cried. **“From the North comes my support! From the North comes my check! But then, when we’ve made it to the North, to where do we turn our eyes?”** **Economic need initially drove El Alberto’s residents beyond their town** and, eventually, to the United States in search of work. Their early journeys within Mexico were not easy. They encountered discrimination, loneliness, and hunger. Gradually, their opportunities increased and their horizons expanded. **U.S. migration arose out of the same quest for survival that drove early internal migration. At first, the benefits of working in the United States were so great that the pull of dollars rivaled the pull of faith. The promise of the American Dream appeared to be close within reach—at least for the time being. Yet it would not be long before transnational life produced challenges of its own. U.S. migration brought not only money and consumer goods, but also new worries, needs, and desires. It brought the pang of family separation and the ever-present threat of apprehension and deportation. As the pursuit of dollars produced new forms of physical and psychological strain,** evangelicals in El Alberto would turn more strongly to their faith. The next chapter explores how Pentecostals draw upon religion today to negotiate the day-to-day challenges of transnational life.





## A2 NAFTA Good

**Migrants dependent on small scale farming are stuck with the choice of degrading their own environment or traveling to the US and degrade their own well-being—NAFTA=Satan**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (“Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream”, Project Muse, Book)AM

As Ramón’s words indicate, **it has become increasingly difficult as a result of NAFTA to produce one’s livelihood through small-scale farming. The choice to migrate, like the choice to use chemical fertilizers, is heavily structured by the state and by capitalism.** Ramón was not the only person in El Alberto who drew a connection between agricultural practices and human health. **On one occasion, I spoke with a man in his eighties who stated that life in the past was easier—and healthier. “No, the plants we planted, we didn’t have to put medicine on them,”** he explained, **as he coaxed an unruly herd of sheep and goats into their pen. “Like tomatoes. They just grew. And now, everything we plant, it needs medicina. And the same with people: we didn’t used to hardly ever get sick!** Now, you have to go to the doctor, you have to pay. No, it’s a bit difficult now.” **The connection that these men draw between farming and health is not simply metaphoric. They recognize that working and eating are part of a single organic process. Just as chemical fertilizers produce rapid growth that robs the soil of its vitality, migrant labor produces shortterm gains at the expense of long-term individual and collective wellbeing. In both cases, the mistake lies in having an accelerated expectation of productivity. Their observations express yet another level of alienation produced by wage labor, separation from nature. As Marx reminds us, “man lives on nature . . . nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous intercourse if he is not to die.”<sup>3</sup> The more people approach nature instrumentally, viewing it merely as a source of raw materials, the more they lose sight of the fact that nature itself is the source of their survival.**

## A2 Other Countries S

### **Grass roots movements in “home” countries fail to foster “The right not to migrate” due to overarching Neoliberal policies**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (“Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream”, Project Muse, Book)AM

**Through their ecotourism projects and through their religious devotion, residents of El Alberto are claiming both the right to migrate and the right to stay home. If their actions seem contradictory, it is because the economic regime in which the residents of the town are immersed is itself fraught with contradiction. It is a system that propels people to cross borders at the same time that it criminalizes undocumented travel. It is a system fraught with global forces that seek to control the mobility of indigenous people’s bodies, while also restricting their ability to live in and manage their ancestral lands.** In a recent International Tribunal of Conscience in Mexico City, **delegates of the Global Alternative Forum of Peoples in Movement urged the international community to recognize migration as a universal human right. Yet participants also urged members of the international community to protect people’s right not to migrate, as well as their right not to be forcibly displaced.** As these delegates made clear, **we cannot adequately support people in their efforts to cross borders in search of work if we do not also work to transform the political and economic conditions that cause them to leave home in the first place.** By celebrating the dynamic, boundary-crossing dimensions of religion, scholars of religion and migration have emphasized the first half of this equation, yet they have given insufficient attention to the latter. It is necessary to understand the role of religion in mobility, yet **we must also recognize**, as Arturo Escobar reminds us, that **“there is an embodiment and emplacement to human life that cannot be denied.”**<sup>10</sup> Throughout this book, I have sought to draw attention to both dimensions of migrants’ struggle. Religions facilitate movement and territoriality alike, and they do so in ways that do not always coincide with the spatial schemes of nation-states.

## A2 Reforms

**US policies restrict Countries like El Salvador and Honduras from granting their populations with the right not to migrate**

**Early 6/27/14**, writer and coordinator for US-El Salvador sister Cities (Alexandra, “The Desperate Choices Behind Child Migration”, Counter Punch, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/06/27/the-desperate-choices-behind-child-migration/>)AM

**The U.S. Government could do a lot to make life better in El Salvador and Honduras. But right now they are doing just the opposite. In El Salvador, the Obama administration is currently undercutting efforts by the Salvadoran government to support sustainable, small-scale farming. The U.S. Ambassador has threatened to deny a multimillion-dollar aid package if the FMLN government continues to buy seeds from local farmers, instead of from foreign companies like Monsanto, as part of their highly successful Family Agriculture program.**

Meanwhile **in Honduras, since the military take-over of June 2009 the U.S. has been supporting a corrupt, illegitimate regime responsible for increased economic inequality and violence.** I have participated in a number of **human rights and electoral observation delegations to Honduras and heard from community leaders about the hundreds of murders of women, gay people, activists and union leaders that have occurred under the watch of the post-coup regime. If I were Honduran, watching right wing hard liner Juan Orlando Hernandez “win” the presidential election through blatant fraud and intimidation would have been the last straw for me. I would have left too. I am no Harvard trained political analyst like Ross Douthat, but I know that only a dramatic shift in U.S. foreign policy will help change conditions in Central America and ease the humanitarian crisis at our border. The U.S. government must stop pushing free trade and privatization and start funding social programs. But most of all it must stand up for human rights. And these include the right not to migrate but to stay, study, work, speak out and live happily in your own home country.**

## A2 Standpoint Epistemology

**We must embrace the idea of the “Mexican Dream” and focus on the right not to migrate**

**Sarat 1/22/15**, PhD in Religion in the Americas who’s writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (Leah M, “Fighting for the “Mexican Dream”: Behind the scenes of border-crossing tourism”, NYU press, <http://www.fromthesquare.org/?p=7057#.Vav5GPIVikp>) AM

About every six months or so, a news story emerges about an unlikely ecotourism event in Mexico: a border-crossing simulation that invites visitors to step into the shoes of undocumented migrants as they flee “Border Patrol” agents, hide in ditches, and dodge bullets while crossing through a reimagined U.S.-Mexico border. Are you baffled yet? Perhaps offended by the thought of tourists making light of the migration journey? That was my reaction when I first heard of the Caminata Nocturna, or “Night Hike,” in early 2007. I traveled to El Alberto, the indigenous town in the Central Mexican state of Hidalgo that stages the simulation, to learn more. The true story behind the event is one of creativity and resilience. It is the story of the “Mexican Dream”—that is, of a community’s pursuit of a sustainable future in the face of overwhelming pressure to travel north. Residents of El Alberto dream not of reaching America, but rather of being able to earn a living right where they are. So committed are they to that vision that they have dedicated countless hours of unpaid work in order to make their town’s ecotourism park a success. At the close of the border simulation, tourists “arrive,” but not to an imaginary United States. Instead, they arrive at the base of a canyon whose sides are lit with hundreds of torches representing those who have perished during migration. The message of the border simulation is this: the American Dream is not the only dream worth fighting for. Instead, members of the national community must join forces with members of the international community to fight for a world in which the fundamental right not to migrate will be available to all. The bitter irony is that behind the scenes of the border reenactment, many of El Alberto’s residents find themselves with little option but to continue to undertake the perilous journey north. As they do so, many draw upon their evangelical Christian faith to confront the very real possibility of death at the U.S.-Mexico border. Immigration solutions that militarize the U.S.-Mexico border without addressing the root causes of migration are not enough. Let us listen to El Alberto’s call for the “Mexican Dream”—and let us ask what sort of binational solutions can help make that dream a reality.

## A2 Wages

**Even if you believe the wages advantage it fundamentally ignores the hard work that migrants do, the money they obtain only feeds broader American consumerism and they become forced to stay within the US longer as their bodies and minds deteriorate from difficult labor and social alienation**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (“Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream”, Project Muse, Book)AM

While Pentecostals draw upon divine power to buffer themselves against the many dangers encountered during migration, **Ramón draws upon his cultural heritage to make a sharp critique of U.S. consumerism and of the systematic exploitation of migrant labor in the United States.** He states that **migration has altered people’s notions of what it means to live a good life. Years of U.S. labor have transformed people’s expectations and desires, trapping them in a cycle of alienated labor and consumerism that is gradually eroding both their bodies and their spirits.** He also speaks of **the pervasive loss of dignity experienced by undocumented migrants who, despite years of working in the United States, feel that they are never fully accepted in American society.** In his thirties at the time of the interview, **Ramón explained that he initially did not want to travel to the United States**, but his brother continually urged him to join him there. **Ramón finally complied, mostly out of curiosity. “But I tell you, when I got there, I wasn’t happy with it. Because I earned less,”** he laughed, **“by doing harder work.”** **In Mexico, Ramón had worked** as a “steel guy,” **assembling steel girders at construction sites. The job was tough**, he admitted, **“but for periods of time only. And the work that I did [in the United States] was more difficult, because I was working with a pick and shovel. And I didn’t know how to speak English.”** Ramón claims that although the experience was difficult, he learned from it. “It wasn’t an offense for me. It was a way to learn how to be in a place, to say ‘I’ve gotten here.’” **Ramón counters enchanted conceptions about the power of U.S. dollars.** The problem, he says, is that **“many people hear that . . . money [in the United States] doubles itself, so they automatically think that they can obtain it very easily. But no, they also have to start from the bottom up.”** He states that if the community does not continue to stage the Caminata, the youth will always want to travel to the United States in search of a better standard of living. “And like I tell you, they’re not going to have it if they don’t work. They have to work to have it. The same over there, as here.” **The problem with migrant labor is not simply that saving money takes longer than expected.** The problem is that **one becomes locked into a cycle of work and consumption that gradually eats away at one’s vitality. Although migration has helped lift El Alberto out of poverty, Ramón insists that working in the United States has also subjected people to a new type of impoverishment.** He states: **A Mexican who emigrates from here to there, at the age of fifty, physically he already looks very worn out. He looks worn out because he spends his whole life at work. Working, working, in the morning at work until the afternoon, and yes, he has everything that he wanted to have, a nice sofa, a nice house, a nice bed, some nice shoes, but he doesn’t notice that physically, he wears himself out.**

## **The Capitalist economy of the US strips immigrants of their vitality and undercuts their ability to migrate circularly due to unabated consumerism**

**Sarat 13**, PhD in Religion in the Americas whose writing explores the intersection of religion and migration in Mexico and the Southwest Borderlands, with particular attention to the religious and social implications of U.S.-Mexico border policy (“Leah M, Fire in the Canyon: Religion, Migration, and the Mexican Dream”, Project Muse, Book)AM

Ramón’s **observations on work and consumerism illustrate the multiple levels of alienation that workers experience in a capitalist economy. In the double bind of alienation and commodity fetishism, products grow in value only to the extent that workers’ humanity is diminished. As a worker spends time and energy creating objects of consumption, “the less,” as Marx puts it, “belongs to him as his own.”**<sup>1</sup> **Rather than the outward manifestations of time and energy well spent, products confront the worker from the outside as autonomous and alien powers. Ramón’s hypothetical immigrant buys “everything he wanted to have” without realizing that his body is slowly deteriorating. He builds houses for others so that one day he will have enough money to buy a house of his own.** Yet the value his labor instills in those houses saps him of his own life force and leaves its mark on his physique. **Those who work in the United States without documents experience an additional level of alienation, for they live under a stigma of illegality that serves to obscure their humanity and discredit the material contributions they make to their host country. “Many of the people who have already been away from their place of origin for maybe ten, twenty years,” Ramón explains, “they’ve worked a lot, and yes they’ve achieved things, but they don’t feel satisfaction, to be able to say, ‘No, damn it, I did it, I succeeded, I feel proud.’” Instead, “they feel as though they never had the freedom to live in a place where their people understand them, their people accept them.”** On the contrary, **they always live under “a scornful gaze, to call it that. Because people don’t look favorably upon you.”** Although **they work so that the U.S. economy “grows, strengthens, and represents a great country,” even so, people in the host country “no te mira con buenos ojos”—they do not look upon you with “good eyes.”** At the time of the interview, Ramón had worked for more than a decade in the United States, in a wide variety of construction jobs. His words suggest that **immigrants experience the contradictions of the U.S. immigration system at a bodily level. Undocumented immigrants carry both a deep physical awareness of the material contributions their labor makes to the United States, and the nagging sense of a “scornful gaze” upon their backs.** Ramón explains that **U.S. citizens do not want to reflect upon the value of immigrant labor. “They don’t recognize it, in other words.” Although migrants manage to obtain material things, “they don’t have a great satisfaction. . . . They’re never going to have it. Why? Because they know that they were never looked favorably upon.” Just as U.S. citizens do not recognize the value of immigrant labor, the country’s leaders turn a blind eye to the true history of the process through which their own country became strong.** Ramón recognizes that **the United States has, undoubtedly, “achieved a lot. But one could say that it has never achieved it alone, by its own people.”** Rather, **“the leaders have brought many people, of the best people that the world has. . . . Whether they were American or not, all have participated so that [the country] can have the magnificence that it has.” Ramón’s observations resonate with emerging scholarship on the dynamics of power within the current global “mobility regime,” in which the selective control of mobility is done through social profiling that benefits some populations while facilitating the exploitation of others.**<sup>2</sup> Ramón highlights **the connection between migration and changing agricultural practices resulting from NAFTA. The goal of food production, he states, ought to be “so that human beings subsist. To live.” Yet the desire for profit often leads**

**to practices that run counter to that goal. In the United States, “the things they produce, they no longer give them the [proper] time. . . . It’s done by means of chemicals, fertilizers, to produce like this, quicker,” he said, snapping his fingers. “So obviously it’s an abnormal process, abnormal. That’s not good.” Virtually in the same breath, he states that international migration is “a mistake.” It is a mistake because emigrants are living “in the wrong place.” They leave their places of origin, “in order to live better, let’s say, to have a nice sofa, a nice bed, a nice house. And yes, they get it. But what is it that they’re eating? Is it good or bad?” he laughed. The heavily processed foods consumed into the United States lead to poor health and premature death.**