
West Coast Publishing

Immigration 2018 Affirmative Sample

Edited by Jim Hanson

Researchers

Angie Tinker, Duncan Stewart, Eric Robinson, Jonathan Shane,
Kinny Torre, Matt Gomez, Matt Stannard, Shelby Pryor, William James Taylor

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone
outside of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.
We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.

Contact us at jim@wcdebate.com

www.wcdebate.com

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.

AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO

IMMIGRATION 2018-2019 WEST COAST AFFIRMATIVE

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.

Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible. You'll find scenario/impacts, affirmatives, disadvantages, counterplans, and kritiks listed alphabetically in their categories.

Using the Arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH. Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files--build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

Copying and Sharing West Coast Evidence?

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- **You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.**

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com and seek our consent.

Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at www.wcdebate.com
2. E-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2018. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

Visit our web page!
www.wcdebate.com

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States. 2

AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO..... 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 4

Topic Overview 14

Debating on the Affirmative 17

Aff DACA Dreamers..... 20

1AC..... 21

Advantage 1—Economy..... 22

Advantage 2—Military 28

Advantage 3—Disease 32

Mexican Economy Add-On..... 36

Dreamers will be deported 41

Answer to Trump administration says no deportations 43

Answer to Dreamers are protected by Congress..... 46

Answer to DACA extension is enough..... 51

Dreamers are good for the economy..... 55

US economy has a labor shortage now..... 59

Answer to US economic growth now 61

Answer to Dreamers lower wages 62

Answer to Dreamers cost taxpayers 63

Dreamers are key to recruitment 64

Military recruitment/readiness is weak..... 66

DREAM Act key to public health 68

Deportation causes disease spread 71

Answer to Chain migration 72

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Answer to Drug/Human trafficking..... 77

Answer to Politics DA..... 79

Answer to Borders/Identity K 83

Answer to Militarism/Imperialism K 84

Answer to States CP 86

Aff H1B Visas 87

1AC 88

1AC 89

1AC 91

1AC 93

1AC 94

Inherency / Harms 96

Inherency – Cap have been met 97

Solvency Extension..... 98

Solvency – General extension 99

Solvency – General extension 100

Solvency – A2: BAHA 101

Economy Advantage 102

Brinks / Productivity Key 103

Productivity / innovation internal links 104

Competitiveness internal links..... 106

Competitiveness internal links..... 108

Competitiveness / Canada internal links 109

Job growth internal links..... 111

Science & Technology Advantage Ext. 112

Internal link Ext. 113

Internal link Ext. 114

Start-up internal links 116

Higher Education internal links..... 117

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Higher Education internal links 119

Higher Education internal links 121

U.S. Science leadership 123

General Answers to case arguments 124

Anti-H1B arguments are racist..... 125

Answers to: Outsourcing (general) 126

Answers to: Outsourcing (won't hurt U.S. jobs / wages)..... 128

Answers to: Outsourcing (won't hurt U.S. jobs / wages)..... 129

Answers to "Brain Drain" (Indian Economy)..... 130

Answers to "Brain Drain" (Indian Economy)..... 132

A2: CPs 134

A2: Abolish H1B program CP..... 135

A2: Abolish H1B program CP..... 136

A2: Executive Order CP 137

Aff Open Borders 138

Legal Open Borders Affirmative..... 139

Legal Open Borders 1AC 1/8..... 140

Legal Open Borders 1AC 2/8..... 141

Legal Open Borders 1AC 3/8..... 142

Legal Open Borders 1AC 4/8..... 143

Legal Open Borders 1AC 5/8..... 144

Legal Open Borders 1AC 6/8..... 145

Legal Open Borders 1AC 7/8..... 146

Legal Open Borders 1AC 8/8..... 147

Solvency 148

Solvency 149

Ethics Impacts 150

Racism Extensions..... 151

Ethics/Racism Impacts 152

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Open Borders Increases Human Rights 153

Open Borders Increases Human Rights 154

Human Rights Impacts 155

Warming Add-On 156

Closed Borders Block Climate Change Solvency 157

Closed Borders Worsen Climate Change Impacts..... 158

Warming Impacts..... 159

Open Borders Increases Economic Growth 160

Open Borders Increases Economic Growth 161

Free Movement Increases Economic Growth..... 162

Capitalism and Growth Save the Environment..... 163

Capitalism and Growth Promote Peace..... 164

Capitalism and Growth Promote Peace..... 165

Capitalism and Growth Promote Peace..... 166

Answers to Population Arguments 167

Answers to Brain Drain 168

Answers to Mass Migration 169

Answers to “Immigration Unpopular” and Nativism 170

Answers to “Immigration Increases Unemployment” 171

Answers to “Immigration Increases Unemployment” 172

Answers to “Immigration Increases Unemployment” 173

Answers to Mass Migration Scenarios..... 174

Answers to Increased Crime 175

Answers to Effects Topicality 176

General Kritik Answers..... 177

General Kritik Answers..... 178

General Kritik Answers..... 179

No Right to Exclude..... 180

Aff Refugees 181

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1AC..... | 182 |
| Plan | 183 |
| Inherency | 184 |
| Structural Violence Advantage | 185 |
| Human Rights Leadership Advantage | 188 |
| Inherency | 194 |
| Advantage – Structural Violence..... | 197 |
| Advantage – Human Rights Leadership | 201 |
| Human Rights Harms – Backups | 202 |
| Hegemony Harms – Backups | 206 |
| Solvency – Human Rights Cred | 211 |
| Solvency – Refugee Crisis..... | 212 |
| Advantage – Terrorism | 213 |
| AT: Terrorism Disad/Link Turns..... | 216 |
| AT: T-Immigration | 219 |
| AT: Economy Disad | 221 |
| AT: Aid CP..... | 227 |
| Solvency – Syria Blocks | 228 |
| Solvency – Resettlement Key..... | 230 |
| Solvency – No Follow-On | 232 |
| AT: Brain Drain Net Benefit..... | 233 |
| Aff Wet Foot Dry Foot..... | 235 |
| 1AC..... | 236 |
| Inherency | 237 |
| Hegemony..... | 238 |
| Human Rights..... | 243 |
| Responses to Alt Right Xenophobia DA | 247 |
| Uniqueness Answers..... | 248 |
| Electoral Candidates | 249 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Hate Groups High Now | 250 |
| Trump is the Norm | 251 |
| Technology..... | 252 |
| Xenophobia High Now | 255 |
| A2: Antifa | 257 |
| A2: Charlottesville..... | 258 |
| Link Answers | 259 |
| Refugee Link Turns..... | 260 |
| DACA Link Turns..... | 261 |
| Contact Theory Link Turn..... | 263 |
| Winners Win Link Turn..... | 265 |
| Impact Answers..... | 266 |
| A2: Overton Window | 267 |
| Pacifism Turn..... | 269 |
| PR Turn..... | 271 |
| Responses to Brain Drain DA | 272 |
| Brain drain inevitable..... | 273 |
| Immigration policy has no effect | 276 |
| Immigration improves global economies | 279 |
| Remittances offset loss..... | 280 |
| Return migration and expatriates boost home economies..... | 281 |
| No global emigration externality | 285 |
| Immigration key to gender equality | 287 |
| African immigration leads to domestic improvement..... | 294 |
| Remittances good | 295 |
| India | 297 |
| Russia | 300 |
| Responses to Economy DA..... | 303 |
| ***A/T UNIQUENESS*** | 304 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Non-Unique – Econ Low Now | 305 |
| Non-Unique – Econ Low Now | 306 |
| Non-Unique – Immigration on the rise | 307 |
| Non-Unique Consumer Confidence Low..... | 308 |
| Non-Unique Consumer Confidence Low..... | 309 |
| Non-Unique – Unemployment Numbers Rising | 310 |
| Non-Unique – Alt Causes | 311 |
| ***A/T LINKS*** | 312 |
| No Link—H-1B Visas..... | 313 |
| No Link—A/T Wage Depression..... | 314 |
| No Link—Alt Causes to Wage Depression..... | 315 |
| Link Turn—Helps Economy: Tax Base | 316 |
| Link Turn—Helps Economy: Young Workforce/Wage Increase | 317 |
| Link Turn—Helps Economy: Empirics | 318 |
| Link Turn—Helps Economy: Net Positive..... | 319 |
| Link Turn – Helps Economy: Unemployment Levels..... | 320 |
| A/T “Immigrants Don’t Pay Taxes” | 321 |
| A/T Borjas Link | 322 |
| ***A/T INTERNAL LINKS*** | 324 |
| No Int. Link – Alt Causes to Wage Growth..... | 325 |
| No Int. Link – Alt Causes to Wage Growth..... | 326 |
| No Int. Link – Alt Causes to Unemployment..... | 327 |
| No Int. Link—Assumes Illegal Immigrants | 328 |
| A/T Wages Key to the Economy..... | 329 |
| ***A/T IMPACTS*** | 330 |
| No Econ Collapse—Resiliency and Safeguards | 331 |
| No Impact – Econ Resilient | 332 |
| Impact Turn – Booming Market Hurts Recruitment | 333 |
| Impact Turn—Solves Nuclear War..... | 334 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Impact Inevitable – Collapse coming | 335 |
| Impact Inevitable – Collapse coming | 336 |
| A/T Hegemony – Credibility Low | 337 |
| A/T Hegemony – Causes Mass Causalties | 338 |
| Responses to Wages DA..... | 339 |
| Wages are low now..... | 340 |
| Alt causes to low wages | 343 |
| Immigration is good for wages | 345 |
| Answer to George Borjas | 350 |
| H1-Bs don't lower wages | 351 |
| Low-skilled workers don't lower wages..... | 358 |
| Farm workers don't lower wages | 360 |
| Amnesty doesn't lower wages..... | 361 |
| DACA/Dreamers don't lower wages | 362 |
| Labor shortage now | 363 |
| Stock Market Turn..... | 365 |
| Inflation Turn | 368 |
| Responses to Executive Order CP | 370 |
| No Solvency: Generic | 371 |
| No Solvency: Rollback | 373 |
| Perm: Generic | 374 |
| Perm: Increase Visa Acceptance | 376 |
| XO Links to Tix..... | 377 |
| Pres Powers High | 380 |
| Pres Powers Inevitable..... | 382 |
| XO BAD: Inter-Branch Conflict | 384 |
| XO Bad: Democracy and Civil Liberties | 388 |
| Responses to States CP | 391 |
| Immigration federalism doesn't solve integration | 392 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Immigration federalism links to politics..... | 394 |
| States can't effectively regulate immigration..... | 396 |
| Federalism restricts immigration..... | 398 |
| Immigration federalism is unconstitutional..... | 404 |
| Permutation..... | 410 |
| Immigration federalism provokes court backlash..... | 412 |
| Answer to 'Laboratories of democracy'..... | 413 |
| Answer to 'Steam valve'..... | 414 |
| State guest worker programs fail..... | 415 |
| Answer to Lopez court decision..... | 417 |
| US federalism not modeled..... | 419 |
| Responses to Capitalism K..... | 422 |
| Automation Turn..... | 423 |
| Big Business Turn..... | 427 |
| Freedom of migration is key to socialism..... | 428 |
| International socialism is best..... | 431 |
| Immigrants create jobs..... | 435 |
| Immigrants increase wages..... | 439 |
| Immigrants empower anti-capitalist movements..... | 443 |
| Permutation..... | 447 |
| Alternative fails..... | 450 |
| Responses to Immigration Hospitality K..... | 452 |
| No Link—Levinas..... | 453 |
| No Link—Selective Immigration..... | 454 |
| No Link—Selective Immigration..... | 455 |
| No Link—Selective Immigration..... | 456 |
| No Link—Selective Immigration..... | 457 |
| Link Turn—Worker conditions tied to Legal Status..... | 458 |
| Link Turn—Policies Increase Immigrants..... | 459 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Link Turn—Policies increase immigrants..... | 460 |
| Link Turn—Strict Policy causes Death | 461 |
| Link Turn—A/T Salter/Visa Restrictions..... | 462 |
| Perm—Ethics..... | 463 |
| Perm Solvency..... | 464 |
| Perm Solves—Biopower..... | 465 |
| Framework—Util Good | 466 |
| Framework—Util Good | 467 |
| Framework—Util/Ethics Perm | 468 |
| Framework—Extinction First | 469 |
| Framework—Law Good | 470 |
| Open Borders Disas to Alt—Link..... | 471 |
| Open Borders Disad to Alt—Internal Link..... | 472 |
| Open Borders Disad to Alt—Impact..... | 473 |
| Impact Turn— H1B Visas Good (Econ) | 474 |
| Impact Turn—H1B Visas Good (Econ) | 475 |
| Impact Turn – H1B Visas Good (Econ) | 476 |
| Impact Turn—Amnesty (Econ) | 477 |
| Impact Turn—Econ Collapse Causes War | 478 |
| Impact Turn—Border Security Good (Not Racist)..... | 479 |
| Impact Turn—Border security Good..... | 480 |
| Impact Defense—Biopower | 481 |
| Impact Defense—Biopower | 482 |
| Responses to Intersectionality K..... | 483 |
| Permutation Solvency | 484 |
| The Alternative is Vague | 485 |
| Solvency Answers..... | 486 |
| Solvency Answers..... | 488 |
| Black Female Centrality Turn (A2: Crenshaw)..... | 489 |

Black Feminism Turns 490

Black Feminism Turns 491

Theory of Difference Turn (A2: single issue focus links) 492

Exclusion / Difference Turns 493

Identity Politics Turn – 1NC..... 495

Identity Politics Turn – Link Ext. 496

Identity Politics Turn – Link Ext. 498

Identity Politics Turn – Impact Ext. 499

Identity Politics Turn – Impact Ext. 500

Anti-semitism Turns 501

Methodology Turns (white supremacy/antiblackness) 502

Methodology Turns (white supremacy/antiblackness) 503

Topic Overview

The Resolution

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.

This year's resolution is a fairly straightforward one. There are no lists or made up terms of art. Instead, it challenges affirmative teams to identify methods of reducing restrictions to immigration to the United States. However, there are some key terms that will be important when debating this topic. Reduce quite obviously is asking the affirmative team to lower restrictions. "Substantially" modifies the word "reduce" and should require affirmative teams to make a large change the status quo. "Restrictions" and "legal immigration" will be the most hotly contested words/phrases on this topic and have competing definitions depending on both domestic and international law. There is also a requirement that the immigration practices being targeted must be ones that are "to" the United States, as opposed to the traditional "in" the United States that we normally see. Some of these are straightforward and should not result in too much deviation but others, like the debate over what a substantial reduction in restrictions is or what exactly falls under legal immigration, offer opportunities to both expand and constrain the scope of the resolution.

United States Federal Government

The United States federal government, or USFG for short, simply means the federal government operating in Washington, D.C. It is comprised of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches and merely serves to prevent the affirmative from utilizing state or international actors. There may be affirmatives that focus on subsets of the USFG, such as having the Department of Homeland Security operate as the actor, or the Department of Justice, or even the Supreme Court. These affirmatives serve the purpose of making politics links more difficult to generate while also opening up potential advantage ground such as judicial precedent.

Substantially

At first glance, "substantially" seems to be one of the most difficult words in the resolution to find a context-specific definition of. At its most basic definition, "substantially" can be both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative definitions serve almost no purpose for setting a limit on the topic as they are entirely subjective. Meanwhile, quantitative definitions would be more useful except that most of the literature is describing levels of immigration in terms of numbers

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

of actual immigrants being substantial, not the amount of “restrictions”, which is the word that “substantially” modifies.

The most difficult part of trying to define the word in context of a particular resolution is that substantial has particular legal meanings *depending on context*. That means that court decisions or legislation defining “substantial” are almost always using it for the sake of that particular law, making it a mischaracterization or inaccurate definition when applied to this topic. As a result, teams may choose to search for more generic definitions of the word, devoid of legal context, and hope to universalize it. The problem is that these broad definitions are vacuous or incomprehensible when applied to the phrase “restrictions on legal immigration.” What exactly is a “great or significant extent” reduction in “restrictions on legal immigration.” Does the definition that “substantially” means “at least 50%” require affirmative teams to remove at least half of all existing restrictions on legal immigration?

One of the most important aspects of defining “substantial” will depend on the definition of “restrictions” and “legal immigration.” It seems a safe bet to assume that negative team’s will find some grounds to argue quantitative definitions of “substantial” apply to the population size of immigrants that the affirmative plan deals with.

According to the Migration Policy Institute:

More than 43.7 million immigrants resided in the United States in 2016, accounting for 13.5 percent of the total U.S. population of 323.1 million, according to American Community Survey (ACS) data. Between 2015 and 2016, the foreign-born population increased by about 449,000, or 1 percent, a rate slower than the 2.1 percent growth experienced between 2014 and 2015. (Jie Zong, Migration Policy Institute, "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States," February 8th, 2018. migrationpolicy.org, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states>)

Accordingly, while affirmative teams may try to exploit the lack of a clear definition of “substantial” to allow for small affs, negative teams should have a fighting chance in arguing that they must affect a large population of the legal immigration pool.

Restrictions

Restriction is a sufficiently broad term to allow for numerous affirmatives on the topic. United States immigration law is vast and complex, containing many legal challenges for migrants seeking to become U.S. citizens. Any number of these laws, or even hard population caps such as those President Trump has been proposing, could be topical restrictions to be reduced.

Immigration law is different based on the type of legal immigration it is addressing. Family immigration eligibility requirements differ from asylee/refugee eligibility requirements. Similarly, employment-based immigration, such as visa programs, have different population caps and rules/regulations that other areas of legal immigration.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

An area of potential debate could be whether restriction does indeed encompass those eligibility requirements and regulations, or whether it only applies to population caps and quotas. Should the latter be the definition, the topic would certainly be quite small. That being said, because the immigration law is so vast, any potential lifting/easing of eligibility requirements could quickly unlimit the topic and make life difficult for the negative.

Legal Immigration

The largest debate in immigration is about legality. For years, the more conservative politicians have argued that they have no problem with legal immigration, it is illegal migrants they take issue with. This resolution will focus on those “legal” avenues of immigration. The federal government, in particular the Department of Homeland Security, has a fairly clear definition of what “legal immigration” includes.

Legal immigration refers to those activities whereupon a person who is “legally” immigrating to the United States are admitted and recognized as entering the country by the government. Individuals who are considered legal immigrants and awaiting citizenship are legally categorized as “legally permanent residents” or LPRs.

There are several different categories of legal immigration:

Family-Based Immigration: This is a category of immigration where U.S. Citizens or LPRs attempt to bring their foreign family members into the United States.

Employment-Based Immigration: This is a category of immigration where foreigners with valuable skills enter the country on either a permanent or temporary basis

Refugees, Asylees, and other Vulnerable Populations: these are categories of individuals who have been forced to flee their country of origin due to life-threatening or extraordinary conditions

Temporary Protected Status: this is a legal status granted to individuals who are in the United States but may not return to their country of origin due to natural disasters, armed conflict, or other circumstances. TPS status is granted on a six, 12, or 18 month basis and can be extended indefinitely

Deferred Enforced Departure: a legal status that provides protection for an individual from deportation whose home country is unstable. The unique part of DED is that it is entirely under executive authority.

There is some debate as to whether some of these statuses qualify as “immigration.” Part of the debate over whether an affirmative is about legal immigration, and not just some other type of policy, is whether immigration must require individuals to be seeking to reside in the host country permanently. Therefore, affirmatives to focus solely on temporary work visas, or TPS status, might have a difficult time winning a topicality debate.

Debating on the Affirmative

This section will aim to provide a wide range, but not an exhaustive list of, potential affirmative areas that could be read this year. The primary choice affirmative teams will need to make is what area of legal immigration they will reduce restrictions on. Immigration is a timely debate, with President Trump frequently imposing restrictions or attempting to make deals regarding both legal and illegal immigration. Those policies will require teams to keep up to date with their research and could lead to new affirmatives becoming inherent throughout the school year. That being said, here is just a small list of potential affirmative mechanisms you can pursue, possible advantage ground, critical literature, and things to look out for from the negative.

Plans

Executive Order 13780 (Travel Ban): The most high profile of Trump's immigration policies, the executive order that instated a travel ban on Muslim countries has drawn fire from many different activists and court cases. EO 13780 is the corrected version of the ban following previous legal challenges and went into effect on December 4th, 2017. The ban restricts travel to the United States, including for potential immigrants, from Chad, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Somalia, Syria, Venezuela, and Yemen. Affirmatives can aim to remove countries from the ban, repeal the ban altogether, or have the court rule against it and claim precedent based advantages from its discriminatory intent. Many affirmatives that want to address the Syrian refugee crisis will likely want to focus on this mechanism.

Family-Based Immigration: Family-based immigration is a category of immigration where U.S. Citizens or LPRs attempt to bring their foreign family members into the United States. It is governed by strict eligibility criteria that only allows for immediate relatives to apply and has a strict preference based system. Affirmatives could expand eligibility requirements to be more lenient or raise the amount of visas granted for this purpose. This offers soft-left advantage ground based on the impact of separating families from each other and also more traditional advantage ground such as soft-power and human rights credibility claims.

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Act (DACA): DACA is an immigration policy that is under legal fire from several states and the federal government. It allowed for children who were brought to the country illegal to apply for work permits. DACA established these individuals as legal residents with legal protection from deportation. In 2017, President Trump repealed DACA and gave a 6 month period for Congress to come up with a solution for the

some 800,000 individuals affected by the decision. Nothing was forthcoming and DACA recipients exist in a space of uncertainty. Affirmative teams can provide a path to citizenship or repeal challenges to DACA and claim that mass deportation would harm the economy and affect US international credibility and hegemony.

Refugees: Aside from the travel ban, President Trump also imposed a harsh restriction on the U.S. Refugee Resettlement program, slowing down the rate of refugees the United States accepts annual to a historic low in 2018. Affirmative teams could repeal this restriction or raise the cap on refugees and claim a number of stability and relations advantages based on the areas where refugees come from. Syria, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen, Myanmar, and many other war torn areas around the world are experience humanitarian crises and could fall under the umbrella of refugee affs. In addition, much literature exists on how the refugee crisis in the Middle East is destabilizing front-line countries who are accepting the bulk of refugees like Turkey and Lebanon, and how it is fueling populism throughout Europe as part of an anti-refugee backlash.

Visa affs: Employment-based immigration has a rich history in highschool and college debate. The most famous and likely affirmative to make a reappearance on this topic will be H1B Visas, which allow foreign workers to be employed by domestic US companies in specialty occupations. Affirmative teams can ease restrictions or increase the amount of visas distributed and claim a number of big-stick advantages like hegemony, competitiveness, specific sectors like aerospace and technology, and economy based advantages as well. In addition to employment based-visas, teams can reach into the backfiles and find ways to innovate and update education-based visa affs from last years topic like F1 visas.

Additional Advantage Areas

These are only some of the potential mechanisms affirmative teams can pursue. Amnesty, Path-to-Citizenship, or specific Visa programs are all areas that are ripe for innovation. But in addition to these mechanisms, there are important advantage areas that affirmatives can be built around.

Hegemony: Immigration policy can drastically affect United States relation with allies or stability around the world. Its impact on military capabilities cannot be understated and this year will likely see a large number of advantages discussing its impact on United States hegemony. Not just restricted to hard power, expect to see affirmatives arguing that soft power can be built by more immigrant-friendly policy.

Economy: The economic effects of immigration are one of the areas with the most amount of debate in the topic literature. Many prominent experts have published studies identifying

potential economic advantages like entrepreneurship, taxes, consumer spending, and other positive economic indicators to countries accepting more immigrants.

Democracy/Populism: From European Populism as a result of refugees being forced into Europe as a result of American restrictions to the credibility of the US democratic model being tarnished by such a cultural 180 in our nation's approach to immigration, the credibility of democracy as a model of governance and the effectiveness of democracy promotion abroad is heavily impacted by immigration policy.

Stability/Relations: The effect of US immigration policy and in particular the restrictions recently enacted on countries experiencing a refugee crisis have drastic implications for our relations with allies in nearby regions and the stability of those regions. Middle East instability, Myanmar and Southeast Asia, or African nations like Somalia and Sudan are all potential advantage areas.

International Law: Many legal scholars argue that anti-immigration policies or a failure to accept or treat refugees and immigrants humanely is a violation of different areas of international law and could offer a large pool of advantage ground

Xenophobia/Racism: There is undeniably a xenophobic and racist element to the nativist backlash to immigration. Affirmative teams can couch their justification for a more open immigration policy in a criticism of hostile immigration policy on its overtly racist justifications.

Gender: There is a large amount of literature that discusses the burdens placed particularly on women by restrictive immigration policy and eligibility criteria. Affirmatives can identify issues with sexual violence faced by immigrants or by the gender discrimination that occurs in Visa and other selection processes.

Borders/Biopower: Traditional borders kritiks are strong affirmative arguments on this topic, as teams will be able to argue that closed borders and strict immigration policies fuel a biopolitical political system and feeds a violent governance structure.

Aff DACA Dreamers

1AC

Plan—The United States Federal Government should pass the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act.

Advantage 1—Economy

The US economy is facing a critical labor shortage now

Rick Newman. Writer at Yahoo Finance. February 23, 2018. SA hidden threat to Trump’s economic agenda. <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/hidden-threat-trumps-economic-agenda-160013364.html> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

With the U.S. economy in its ninth year of expansion, employers are fretting about a problem that seemed unimaginable just a few years ago, in the aftermath of mass layoffs and the Great Recession: a shortage of workers, from unskilled laborers needed to hammer nails to programmers and developers able to build complex software. The unemployment rate is a low 4.1% and probably headed below 4% at some point this year. The Labor Department says there are nearly 6 million unfilled jobs in the U.S. economy, close to a record high. For the first time ever, small-business owners said in a monthly survey dating to 1974 that the poor quality of labor is their biggest problem, rather than perennial gripes such as taxes, weak sales, costly health insurance or excessive regulation. In a recent survey of business owners by J.P. Morgan Chase, 54% said finding qualified workers would be a “top challenge” in 2018—10 points higher than the portion who felt that way last year. Yahoo Finance surveyed more than 1,100 people who own or manage a business, and interviewed a variety of them in depth, to determine why there’s a shortage of workers, and what might be done about it. (Here are highlights from the survey.) Among our findings: More than half of employers say they can’t find enough qualified workers. To lure workers, employers are raising pay and sweetening benefits—and they still can’t find people, in many cases. Businesses struggle to find workers able to show up on time, finish a shift and pass a drug test. Many businesses, like Carlos Soto’s floral service, are giving up work—and revenue—because they’re chronically understaffed. In some industries, employers fault lousy immigration policies—and feel President Trump is making the problem worse. Workers, for their part, blame companies for offshoring jobs, skimping on training and setting standards unrealistically high. Economists emphasize that key data doesn’t yet show workers are scarce throughout the economy. Job growth remains strong, for instance, with employers creating more than 180,000 new jobs per month, on average, since the start of 2017. If workers were scarce everywhere, that monthly average would be lower, perhaps below 100,000. And pay hasn’t risen broadly throughout the economy, which is what normally happens when companies run short on staffing. “Businesses are grumbling about the inability to find qualified workers,” says Ryan Sweet, director of real-time economics at Moody’s Analytics. “But it’s isolated and concentrated regionally. I think what’s happening is, it was easy to find qualified workers a few years ago. HR offices could wallpaper their offices with resumes. Now, it’s harder. The pool of available workers is diminishing.” A widespread labor crunch could be coming in a few years, however, threatening Trump’s goal of achieving annual growth rates of 3% or higher. And anecdotal reports today might be the first real sign of trouble. Today’s hiring difficulties also highlight fissures in the economy and in society more broadly, including a failing education system in parts of the country, poor policymaking in Washington and even cultural and generational divisions. Such festering problems might finally be causing tangible economic damage.

3.6 million dreamers are facing deportation—they're key to stabilizing the labor market—DACA extension isn't enough

Alan Gomez. Writer at USA Today. January 18, 2018. There are 3.6M 'DREAMers' — a number far greater than commonly known. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2018/01/18/there-3-5-m-dreamers-and-most-may-face-nightmare/1042134001/>

The political debate over the fate of "DREAMers" — undocumented immigrants brought to the U.S. as children — has overlooked just how many there are in the country today: about 3.6 million. That number of people whose lives risk being uprooted is not widely known, in large part because so much public attention has been focused recently on 800,000 mostly young DREAMers accepted into the Obama-era Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. This smaller group of DREAMers is in the spotlight because President Trump terminated DACA in September, saying it was an illegal overreach of executive authority that can only come from Congress, which is negotiating with Trump on a compromise immigration plan. While many politicians use DREAMer and DACA interchangeably, the terms are "not a distinction without a difference," said House Minority Whip Rep. Steny Hoyer, D-Md. DREAMers got their name from the DREAM Act, a bill that has been proposed in Congress since 2001, but never passed, that would protect that group of immigrants. The 3.6 million estimate of undocumented immigrants brought to U.S. before their 18th birthday comes from the Migration Policy Institute, a non-partisan, non-profit think tank that studies global immigration patterns. That is roughly a third of all undocumented immigrants in the country and does not include millions of their immediate family members who are U.S. citizens. A number so large raises the stakes for both sides in the dispute over whether to deport DREAMers, allow them to stay under prescribed conditions or provide them with a path to citizenship. Ali Noorani, executive director of the pro-immigrant National Immigration Forum, said exposing millions of DREAMers to deportations would be a moral and economic calamity. "At a time when our economy is growing and our labor market is extremely tight, these are all folks of working age who have skills to immediately contribute," Noorani said. "We would be spending billions of dollars to remove folks who have the potential to help the country grow." On the other side is Mark Krikorian, executive director for the Center for Immigration Status, which favors lower levels of immigration. He argues for only extending protections for the 800,000 in DACA. "It's not like they're entitled to anything, but prudence suggests an extraordinary act of mercy," he said. "Amnesty is warranted for them alone, at least this time." In exchange for DREAMer protections, Republicans want enhanced border security, the end of a diversity visa program for people from under-represented countries, including several from Africa, and a reduction in relatives that U.S. citizens can sponsor for visas. The impact of what may happen to DREAMers was highlighted this week when Jorge Garcia, 39, a Detroit landscaper who has lived in the U.S. for 30 years, was deported back to his native Mexico even though he arrived in the country when he was 10 years. Garcia, whose wife and two children are all U.S. citizens, did not qualify for DACA because he was just over the age limit. To qualify for DACA, created in 2012, DREAMers had to undergo a thorough background check, prove they arrived in the U.S. before their 16th birthday, were 30 or younger, were attending school or in the military, and had not committed a felony or serious misdemeanor. The program provided work permits and two-year reprieves from deportation that could be renewed. Cecilia Muñoz, Obama's domestic policy director, said he chose to protect a limited number of DREAMers because he could go only so far through executive action. Now that Congress is involved, Muñoz said, far more DREAMers should be protected. "The right policy is to be as generous as possible," Muñoz said. "We know the success of DACA. It's good for the country, and this has overwhelming support around the country from people on both sides of the aisle. There's no reason to limit who is eligible."

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Failing to protect dreamers will impose massive costs and hasten the labor crisis

David Bier. Writer at Newsweek. September 5, 2017. RESCINDING DACA, THE DREAM ACT, WOULD IMPOSE MASSIVE COSTS ON EMPLOYERS. <http://www.newsweek.com/rescinding-dreamers-act-would-impose-massive-costs-employers-659813> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

DACA rescission will cost employers \$6.3 billion in employee turnover costs, including recruiting, hiring, and training 720,000 new employees. Every week for the next two years, U.S. employers will have to terminate 6,914 employees who currently participate in DACA at a weekly cost of \$61 million. Ending DACA would be the equivalent of 31 “major” regulations. DACA recipients receive employment authorization documents (EADs). It is not illegal to work without authorization, but it is illegal for employers to hire someone who lacks authorization. Thus, DACA EADs essentially grant permission to employers to hire DACA beneficiaries for a given period—in this case, two years—without fear of employer sanctions for hiring an unauthorized worker. Note that the law prohibits employers from discriminating against foreign-born applicants purely because they have temporary authorization. Thus, if President Trump rescinds DACA, employers are the ones who will have to actually implement the policy by policing their workforce and firing DACA recipients. DACA repeal’s regulatory compliance burden will fall directly on American employers. To estimate these costs, I reviewed 11 studies of the cost of turnover to employers. These studies included a wide variety of occupations with radically different wage levels. The most important component of turnover cost is the leaving employee’s wage, which is the marginal value of the worker’s production. (See table here.) The estimated turnover cost ranges from 12 percent to 37 percent of annual wages with a median of 25 percent (the average is 26 percent). This estimate is slightly lower than a U.S. Department of Labor estimate that concluded that turnover costs an employer 30 percent of the leaving employee’s salary. It is slightly higher than a 2012 literature survey by Boushey and Glynn (2012) that found a median turnover cost of 21 percent of an employee’s annual salary. An August 2017 Center for American Progress survey of DACA recipients found that their wages had risen to \$17.46 hourly (or \$34,920 annually). It also found that 91 percent of DACA recipients have jobs. According to my projections based on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services data, 790,148 people have DACA or will have DACA by September 1, 2017. Thus, 719,035 immigrants are earning \$25.1 billion per year. If the federal government forces employers to fire all of DACA recipients, it will cost employers \$6.3 billion. The fact that some employers will receive advanced notice of the expiration of their employees’ work authorization could mitigate these costs, but according to these studies, the primary cost associated with turnover is the lower productivity of new hires. Additionally, because DACA recipients’ wages have grown 69 percent over the last five years, it is likely that those DACA participants whose cancellations occur in 2018 and 2019 will have higher wages than those today. Finally, DACA participants’ employment rate has also risen year after year—four percentage points since 2016 —and older participants have a higher employment rate. This again indicates that the number of firings could be higher than this projection estimates. The costs will likely not be imposed all at once as the program will slowly unwind over a two-year period. I previously estimated the quarterly rate of expirations, based on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services data, which can give us an estimate of how a DACA cancellation would distribute the costs over time. Every week U.S. employers will have to terminate 6,914 DACA employees at a weekly cost of \$61 million.

The DREAM Act would supply enough labor and significantly boost the economy
Francesc Ortega, Ryan Edwards, and Philip E. Wolgin. Writers at Center for American
Progress. September 18, 2017. The Economic Benefits of Passing the Dream Act.

<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/reports/2017/09/18/439134/economic-benefits-passing-dream-act/> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

To better understand the potential economic impact of passing the Dream Act, this issue brief calculates the economic gains that would stem from legalizing potentially eligible individuals already in the workforce. This analysis builds on the groundbreaking work of the Center for American Progress' earlier study, "The Economic Impacts of Removing Unauthorized Immigrant Workers," which calculated the economic contributions of unauthorized workers to each individual industry, each state, and the nation as a whole, and updates and applies that economic model to the population of workers eligible for the Dream Act.⁴ This study finds, based on the methodology outlined below, that: Passing the Dream Act, and placing all of the potentially immediately eligible workers on a path to legal status, would add a total of \$22.7 billion annually to the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP). Because the gains from legalization grow each year, the cumulative increase in GDP over 10 years would be \$281 billion. If even half of all workers who are immediately eligible for the Dream Act complete the educational requirements to move from conditional status to lawful permanent residency—as distinct from the military service or employment paths—the annual gains could be even higher, creating what we term an "education bump" and reaching as high as \$728.4 billion cumulatively over a decade. Extrapolating from the immediately eligible and employed population to the entire population who may one day be eligible for the Dream Act—either when they age into eligibility or complete the educational requirements—the economic gains could be roughly 42 percent higher.⁵ Over a decade, this means the GDP gains from the Dream Act could be as high as a cumulative \$400 billion. With the education bump, the gains could be as high as a cumulative \$1 trillion. On a per capita basis, passing the Dream Act would ultimately raise the average incomes of all Americans by between approximately \$82 and \$273, annually. Overall, the data from this study are clear: Passing the Dream Act would significantly improve the American economy.

The US economy is key to global economic stability

Ayhan Kose. Development of Director at World Bank. February 27, 2017. Understanding the global role of the US economy. <http://voxeu.org/article/understanding-global-role-us-economy> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

Shocks to the US economy transmit to the rest of the world through three main channels. An acceleration in US activity can lift growth in trading partners directly through an increase in import demand, and indirectly by strengthening productivity spillovers embedded in trade. Financial market developments in the US may have even wider global implications. US bond and equity markets are the largest and most liquid in the world and the US dollar is the currency mostly widely used in trade and financial transactions. This makes US monetary policy and investor confidence important drivers of global financial conditions (Arteta et al. 2015, IMF2015). Given its role in global commodity markets (the US is both the world's largest gas and oil consumer and producer), changes in US growth prospects can affect global commodity prices. This affects activity, fiscal and balance of payment developments in commodity exporters. Estimates indicate that a percentage-point increase in US growth could boost growth in advanced economies by 0.8 of a percentage point, and in emerging market and developing economies by 0.6 of a percentage point after one year (Figure 2.A). Investment could respond even more strongly. A boost to investment could come for instance from fiscal stimulus measures – but the effect would largely depend on the circumstances of the implementation of these measures, including the amount of remaining economic slack, the response of monetary policy, and the adjustment of household and business expectations to the prospect of higher deficit and debt levels. A faster tightening of US monetary policy than previously expected could, for instance, lead to sudden increases in borrowing costs, currency pressures, financial market volatility, and capital outflows for more vulnerable emerging market and developing economies. Even in the absence of actual policy changes, heightened uncertainty driven by financial market volatility or ambiguity about the direction and scope of US policies could discourage investment both in the US and in the rest of the world. Empirical estimates suggest that a sustained 10% increase in US stock market volatility (specifically, the VIX) could, after one year, reduce investment growth in the US by about 0.6 of a percentage point, in other advanced economies by around 0.5 of a percentage point, and in emerging market and developing economies by 0.6 of a percentage point (Figure 2.B).

Economic decline causes war

Namsuk Kim and Pedro Conceição. Economists at UN Development Project's Regional Bureau for Africa. 2010. THE ECONOMIC CRISIS, VIOLENT CONFLICT, AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. https://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol15_1/KimConceicao15n1.pdf (Accessed 4/28/2018)

While there are a number of factors that could cause conflict, empirical studies find that poor economic performance is associated with higher incidence of conflict. Being a poor country is correlated with most forms of violence (UNDP, 2008a). Growth rates are also strongly associated with risks of conflict in developing countries. If the growth rate in developing countries is increased by 1 percentage point from the mean, the risk of conflict decreases by 0.6 percentage points to 4.0 percent (Collier et al., 2009). Kang and Meernik (2005) show that the growth rate in conflict countries in the five years prior to conflict, including cases of conflict recurrence, was on average 0.5 percent compared to 2 percent in the countries that remained peaceful. Figure 2 shows that economic development and conflicts are observed to be clearly related. The level of GDP is negatively correlated with observing a new conflict. Collier et al. (2009) finds that the predicted risk for a hypothetical country with characteristics set at the study's sample mean was 4.6 percent. If the level of per capita income were to be halved from this level, the risk would be increased to 5.3 percent. Conflict Loss of life Destruction of assets Forced migration Low investment in health and education Low Human Development Low institutional capacity Low productivity Low potential growth Slow growth Namsuk Kim and Pedro Conceição 33 Growth rates are also strongly associated with risks of conflict in developing countries. If the growth rate in developing countries is increased by 1 percentage point from the mean, the risk of conflict decreases by 0.6 percentage points to 4.0 percent (Collier et al., 2009). Kang and Meernik (2005) show that the growth rate in conflict countries in the five years prior to conflict, including cases of conflict recurrence, was on average 0.5 percent compared to 2 percent in countries that remained peaceful. Figure 2: GDP per capita and the probability of observing a new conflict Source: Humphreys (2003, p.2), as reported d in UNDP (2008a). Empirical analysis of growth and conflict has inherent data limitations, but some recent studies using more careful methodology shows a strong causal link running from poor economic performance to conflict.

Advantage 2—Military

The military wants to expand but can't find adequate recruits—that risks readiness and hegemony

Bryan Bender. Writer at Politico. February 19, 2018. Fat, unhealthy Americans threaten Trump's defense surge. <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/02/19/pentagon-buildup-troop-recruiting-shortage-351365> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

"Obesity and the percentage of people overweight in the country has just skyrocketed in the last 10 to 15 years," he added in an interview. "Asthma is going up. High school graduation rates are still just barely acceptable and in some big cities they are miserable. Criminality is also not going away. We have to face the reality that these things in some cases are getting worse, not better." That's on top of a more immediate obstacle that military leaders warned about last week: A relatively low unemployment rate is already making it harder to fill the ranks, particularly for the Army, which has historically benefited when full-time jobs are harder to find in the civilian economy. "It's difficult to recruit," Ryan McCarthy, the undersecretary of the Army, told reporters. "There's 4 percent unemployment." But increased recruitment is a key part of the administration's plan to spend billions more dollars to resharpen the United States' battlefield edge against Russia, China and other aspiring military powers. For example, the department's new defense strategy, which was published last month and provided the framework for its new budget proposal, declared that "the U.S. must reverse recent decisions to reduce the size of the joint force and grow the force while modernizing and ensuring readiness." The new budget calls for increasing the size of the military by 25,900 people through October 2019 and by a total of 56,600 by 2023 — all mostly active-duty troops. "In 2016, our military was the smallest it had been since before World War II," David Norquist, the top Pentagon budget official, told reporters last week in making the case for a bigger military. For starters, he said the Army plans to add 4,000 troops to reach a total of 487,500; the Navy will add 7,500 sailors for a total of 335,400; and the Air Force is seeking an additional 4,000 volunteers to reach 329,100 active-duty personnel. "This allows us to fill in units and provide key skills related to recruiting pilots, maintainers and cybersecurity experts," Norquist explained. But the military is struggling to reach its current recruiting goals. "The U.S. military is already having a hard time attracting enough qualified volunteers," according to the Heritage paper. "Of the four services, the Army has the greatest annual need. The Army anticipates problems with meeting its 2018 goal to enlist 80,000 qualified volunteers, even with increased bonuses and incentives." The booming civilian jobs market — which ebbs and flows — is seen as the least of the military's recruiting challenges over the longer term. The bleak demographic trends among the military-age population could make filling the ranks with qualified recruits exceedingly difficult for years to come. The government estimates that 24 million out of the 34 million people in the 17-through-24 age group are not qualified to serve. One major area of concern is education. All branches of the military require a high school diploma or General Equivalency Diploma. But while federal statistics show that about 80 percent of students achieve a degree, concerns are growing that those numbers are vastly incomplete. "Young Americans' inability to meet education qualifications highlights underlying issues in America's educational foundations, with national consequences," the Heritage paper concluded. Crime and drugs are also a major impediment. Studies have shown that criminal histories prevent one of every 10 young adults from being able to join the military. But health problems are the clearest impediment to military service — especially the alarming number of youngsters who are overweight.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Dreamers are key to successful recruiting and readiness

Eric Fanning. Writer at the Hill. January 8, 2018. Immigration reform: An Army recruitment opportunity. <http://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/367839-immigration-reform-an-army-recruitment-opportunity> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

If passed, this legislation would not only provide temporary work permits and protection from deportation for millions of young people, it would also be a tremendous opportunity for the U.S. Army to expand its pool of high-quality recruits — tapping into exactly the kind of people that make our military the greatest in the world. Over the past two decades, the Army has maintained a high operational tempo. The missions in Iraq and Afghanistan continue, and the current threat landscape has created an urgent demand for personnel in Europe, Asia, and Africa. As a result, Congress directed the Army to increase the number of active-duty soldiers from 476,000 to 550,000 by the end of fiscal 2018. Quickly adding additional high-quality recruits is no easy task. The U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) is struggling to find candidates who meet the Army's requirements. Last year, USAREC Commander Maj. Gen. Jeffrey Snow acknowledged as much, stating that "the biggest challenge right now is the fact that only 3 in 10 can actually meet the requirements to actually join the military," because they fail due to health, educational background, or other issues. As a result, USAREC has been forced to lower its recruiting standards in hopes of reaching its goal of 80,000 new soldiers. In fiscal 2016, 1.6 percent of Army recruits were Category Four candidates, who scored in the bottom third of standard military exams. The following fiscal year, the Army increased the acceptance rate to 1.9 percent. While these percentages remain below the 4 percent cap, they are moving in the wrong direction. The reduction in recruiting standards comes at the same time the Pentagon has decided to suspend the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest, or MAVNI, program, which offered an expedited pathway to citizenship for immigrants with highly sought after medical and language skills. The MAVNI program had been a success for the Army: Sergeant Saral Shreshta, the 2012 Soldier of the Year, and Specialist Paul Chelimo, an Olympic Silver Medalist at the 2016 Rio games, earned their citizenship through the program. Given the wide breadth of challenges facing our nation, the U.S. needs a skilled, diverse military force with high levels of integrity that can adapt to today's emerging threats. The MAVNI program was an important element of creating that force and the Army has reaped the benefit of hundreds of Dreamers currently serving in its ranks. The Dream Act is an opportunity for the Army to expand access to this recruiting pool. According to a recent report, over the next few years, "the net growth in the U.S. population of 18- to 29-year-olds — the segment of the population most likely to enlist — will come entirely from immigrants and the children of immigrants." If the U.S. Army is going to be successful in recruiting qualified 18- to 29-year-olds, it must tap into this pool of potential recruits. And on the retention front, the facts are even more compelling: another study found that non-citizen "recruits are far more likely to remain in the military through their first terms of enlistment than recruits who are U.S. citizens." Resourcing our Armed Forces takes many forms. Of course we need to make sure that our military is adequately funded and has a stable budget that supports all missions. Dreamers also represent an important resource to ensure our military has access to mission critical skills. Pitting these goals against each other is unnecessary and shortsighted. Our nation's military is stronger when it reflects the diversity it aims to defend. Our nation's Armed Forces should not be forced to pass over those who are qualified and willing to serve. The Dream Act is an opportunity for Congress to advance this nation's national security by expanding recruitment pools, maintaining a high-quality force, and creating opportunities for thousands of young people for whom the United States of America has always been home. It should be passed as soon as possible.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Dreamers would help preserve hegemony

Kabir Sehgal. Writer at Market Watch. November 10, 2017. Opinion: U.S. Navy veteran: Let Dreamers serve their country. <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/us-navy-veteran-pass-the-dream-act-to-boost-military-recruitment-2017-11-09> (Accessed 4/28/2018)

Immigrants fill the U.S. military's ranks. Some 40,000 immigrants currently serve in America's active and reserve forces, and about 5,000 noncitizens join every year, according to new report by the National Immigration Forum. More than 500,000 veterans weren't born in the U.S. — a tradition that dates back to America's earliest years. For example, Irish immigrants fought in the U.S. Army during the War of 1812. In World War I, close to 500,000 military personnel were immigrants, comprising 18% of the total fighting force. Indeed, immigrants have demonstrated courage: 20% of Medal of Honor recipients are foreign born. They've also reached the highest levels of the armed forces: Chairman of the Joint Chiefs General John Shalikashvili was born in Poland. When I was deployed in the Middle East, I served alongside immigrants and their children, and I know first-hand that they put America first. Yet the military faces a challenge: it needs more recruits. Only 13% of 17- to 24- year-olds meet the criteria of joining. They're ineligible because of obesity, education, criminal records, and medical restrictions, among other reasons. Remarkably, just 1% of this population is both eligible and interested in joining the armed services. "The quality of people willing to serve has been declining rapidly," said Major General Allen Batschelet, who ran the Army Recruiting Command. This talent shortfall costs taxpayers. The army spent \$300 million in bonuses and advertisements to recruit more soldiers to meet its overall quota. The military needs more and better talent. Immigrants and noncitizens have skills that can bolster our defense forces, and they also have a lower attrition rate than citizens, according to the Center for Naval Analyses. "For love of their new country, generations of immigrants have served in America's armed forces. These days, in order to keep our nation safe, our military needs the talents and skills of the foreign born more than ever," Ali Noorani, author of *There Goes the Neighborhood*, has noted. In 2009, the military introduced the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest (MAVNI) program, which allowed immigrants and some noncitizens to join if they possess special medical or language skills. Almost 11,000 soldiers have participated in this program, which may be stopped altogether due to security concerns. "It's terrible. You trusted the Army, who delayed the process, and now they're going to cancel your contract and have you deported," said Margaret Stock, a retired Army officer who helped implement MAVNI. America's military should not be subject to these conditions. The MAVNI program should be fully restored. In addition, Congress must pass the Dream Act, which will significantly increase the eligible pool of new recruits. "As long as I had the opportunity to put on the uniform and serve my country, that's all I cared about. To me it was a no-brainer. This country is my home. It's all I've known for the past 20 years. It's where my wife and daughter are...I hope this legislation moves forward and people see the benefits immigrants bring to the military," said Erick Ruiz, a DACA recipient who also participated in MAVNI. More than 70,000 Dreamers might join the military as a way of gaining permanent legal status, per one report. Which means they would voluntarily put their lives on the line for U.S. citizenship. When the Dream Act was under consideration in 2010, General Colin Powell and Bob Gates, former Secretary of Defense, were among several high-ranking officials voicing support. The Dream Act already mandates strict criteria, such as checking an applicant's criminal background and making sure they demonstrate upstanding character. The 2017 version of the Dream Act would allow Dreamers to become citizens after serving in the military for a minimum of two years. Passing the Dream Act also would send a powerful message to both our allies and enemies: America's armed services are filled with young, talented, motivated, and skilled recruits. I would be proud to serve alongside the Dreamers.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

US hegemony prevents great power wars and economic collapse

Bradley Thayer. Professor at Harvard University. 2013. Humans, Not Angels: Reasons to Doubt the Decline of War Thesis. International Studies Review Volume 15, Issue 3, pages 396–419. (Accessed 4/28/2018)

During the Cold War, US leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy and the security blanket it provides reduce nuclear proliferation incentives and help keep a number of complicated relationships stable such as between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. 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 the worst form—great power wars. Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and many of the other positive forces Pinker identifies. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview. 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. Rather, it is because they are more transparent, more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with US leadership. Third, along with the growth of the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, mobility of capital, and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good. Fourth, and finally, the United States has been willing to use its power not only to advance its interests but to also promote the welfare of people all over the globe. The United States is the earth's leading source of positive externalities for the world. The US military has participated in over 50 operations since the end of the Cold War—and most of those missions have been humanitarian in nature. Indeed, the US military is the earth's “911 force”—it serves, de facto, as the world's police, the global paramedic, and the planet's fire department. There is no other state, group of states, or international organizations that can provide these global benefits. Without US power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. But, the waning of US power, at least in relative terms, introduces additional problems for Pinker concerning the decline of violence in the international realm. Given the importance of the distribution of power in international politics, and specifically US power for stability, there is reason to be concerned about the future as the distribution of relative power changes and not to the benefit of the United States.