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### 1nc – cir

**GOP will give into *political pressure* but it’ll be a fight**

**Sargent 10-30**-13 GREG SARGENT . Washington Post “Immigration reform is definitely undead” [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/10/30/immigration-reform-is-definitely-undead/] **[MG]**

We now have three House Republicans who have signed on to the House Dem comprehensive immigration reform bill, putting immigration reform officially back in the “undead” category. GOP Rep. David **Valada**o of California is officially on board with the bipartisan proposal, according to a statement from the Congressman sent my way: “I have been working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find common ground on the issue of immigration reform. Recently, I have focused my efforts on joining with likeminded Republicans in organizing and demonstrating to Republican Leadership broad support within the Party to address immigration reform in the House by the end of the year. “By supporting H.R. 15 I am strengthening my message: Addressing immigration reform in the House cannot wait. I am serious about making real progress and will remain committed to doing whatever it takes to repair our broken immigration system.” Valadao’s move is not wholly unexpected, given that he inhabits a moderate district with a lot of Latinos. But his insistence that addressing immigration reform “cannot wait” is helpful. It seems like an implicit message to the GOP leadership: We must act this year, and on this bill, if necessary. This comes after GOP Reps. leana Ros-Lehtinen and Jeff Denham did the same. Denham has said he expects “more” Republicans to ultimately sign on, and has also said that the House GOP leadership told him there will be a vote on something immigration-related by the end of the year. It’s unclear whether there will actually be a House vote on anything involving immigration before the year runs out, and it seems very unlikely that there will be a vote on the House Dem measure, which is essentially the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill, without the Corker-Hoeven border security amendment that House Dems dislike, and instead with another border security amendment House Dems like swapped in. However, the movement among Republicans towards the Dem bill — even if it is only a trickle for now — is interesting, as a reminder that immigration reform can happen if House GOP leaders actually want it to. To be sure, immigration reform faces a huge obstacle: The stark underlying structural realities of the House Republican caucus. Far too few Republican members have large enough Latino populations to impact the outcome in 2014. With primaries coming, there just may be no incentive for Republicans to act until after the 2014 elections. But there are other factors to consider. In some key respects, immigration reform poses its own unique set of political challenges and conditions — **it is not quite as polarizing an issue** as, say, Obamacare or even the question of whether to agree to new revenues as part of a budget deal. Major GOP aligned constituencies — the **U.S. Chamber of Commerce**, **evangelicals,** **high tech and agricultural interests** in the districts of House Republicans – want immigration reform. What’s more, there is a built-in incentive for Republicans to put this issue behind them, given the slow forward march of demographic realities. Also, as longtime immigration operative Simon Rosenberg explains, Congressional Republicans have a long history of working on this issue. And some polls show that even sizable chunks of Republican voters want comprehensive reform, particularly if it is packaged with border security (Republican pollster Whit Ayres’ research, in particular, has shown that even GOP primary voters want action when informed that the other option is the status quo or “de facto amnesty,” as some pro-reform Republicans put it. Indeed, if there is anything that can make something happen, it’s the possibility that inaction is far more difficult politically for Republicans than many of them (and many commentators) claim. The immigration problem — “de facto amnesty” is not going away. If more Republicans like these three urge action inside the GOP caucus, it’s not impossible that House GOP leaders will allow votes on border security, the Kids Act, or potentially the legalization proposal that Republicans are said to be working on. That could possibly get us to conference. Yes, **immigration reform remains decidedly undead.**

#### Plan sparks a firestorm- destroys capital

Fisher 6 (William, journalist who writes about foreign affairs, human and civil rights, the Middle East and US politics, Give Us Your Huddled Masses - Or Not, <http://www.commondreams.org/views06/0321-34.htm>, 3/21/6)

This was to be the year of comprehensive immigration reform legislation. President Bush spent a good deal of his once-hefty "political capital” to advocate for a “guest worker” program. But so polarized are the views of state officials, legislators and advocacy groups representing all points on the political spectrum that Congress-watchers are expressing serious doubt that 2006 will see any meaningful progress toward such reform. Tom Barry, Policy Director for the International Relations Center (IRC), predicted flatly, “There will be no comprehensive reform proposal approved by the U.S. Congress during this session or any session in the near future because the immigration restrictionists have seized control of the debate.” What is likely, experts agree, is a battle royal between two critical GOP constituencies: the “law-and-order conservatives” and business interests that rely on immigrant labor. One camp wants to tighten borders and deport people who are here illegally; the other seeks to bring illegal workers out of the shadows and acknowledge their growing economic importance. The issue is complicated by the competing -- and sometimes counter-intuitive � demands of a wide range of groups and coalitions. Usually conservative business interests, particularly in the fields of agriculture, construction, and hospitality, want to open American borders to avail themselves of cheaper labor. Groups representing states on the U.S.-Mexican border propose adopting draconian measures � including construction of a �security fence� -- to stem the tide of illegal immigrants. Others are advocating legislation that would tighten U.S. border security but give some legal status to newcomers. Still others are focusing on providing �a path to citizenship� for the more than 10 million undocumented immigrants already in the U.S.

**PC Is Key to Getting the *Essential Parts* of the Bill Through**

Anderson **Robichaud October 25**, 2013. n behalf of Robichaud, Anderson & Alcantara P.A. posted in US Immigration Law on “Beyond The Poisoned Well” http://www.robichaudlaw.com/blog/2013/10/beyond-the-poisoned-well-immigration-reform-tactics-changing.shtml

President Obama has not given up on enacting **c**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform. ¶ To be sure, there is concern in Washington, DC and around the country that the partisan wrangling over the partial federal government shutdown "poisoned the well" of good will that may be needed to get the president and both chambers of Congress to agree on a specific proposal.¶ That is one reason why it may be necessary to break up the proposal passed by the Senate earlier this year into several different smaller bills. The smaller bills could tackle specific issues such as work visas or family immigration.¶ This week, there were indications that President Obama may be coming around to that point of view.¶ After the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in June, the hope was that the U.S. House of Representatives would take up that bill. But the House did not do so. And now, after the passage of several months and the reality-check of the shutdown, the president appears to be shifting his tactics.¶ President Obama said this week that he is open to proposals from Republicans about possibly dividing up an immigration overhaul into several separate parts.¶ In political terms, it may be more practical to pass one or more of those parts than to keep holding out for a comprehensive reform that addresses all of the issues, all at once.¶ Of course, **in either form** -- either comprehensive or broken into separate parts -- **it will take considerable political capita**l and probably some (often elusive) compromise to actually pass immigration reform. But President **Obama is clearly** still **committed to making such reform one of the top priorities** of his second term.

**Immigration reform expands skilled labor—spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.**

**LA Times** 11/9/**12** [Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html>]

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries andenhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

**US-Indian relations avert South Asian nuclear war.**

**Schaffer 2** [Spring 2002, Teresita—Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, Lexis]

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1nc – t-visas

#### The aff is cultural engagement—economic engagement is only tangible trade and financial benefits—we have a caselist

Haass 00 – Richard Haass & Meghan O’Sullivan, Senior Fellows in the Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, p. 5-6

Architects of engagement strategies have a wide variety of incentives from which to choose. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology, loans, and economic aid.’2 Other equally useful economic incentives involve the removal of penalties, whether they be trade embargoes, investment bans, or high tariffs that have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. In addition, facilitated entry into the global economic arena and the institutions that govern it rank among the most potent incentives in today’s global market.’

Similarly, political engagement can involve the lure of diplomatic recognition, access to regional or international institutions, or the scheduling of summits between leaders—or the termination of these benefits. Military engagement could involve the extension of International Military Educational Training (IMET) both to strengthen respect for civilian authority and human rights among a country’s armed forces and, more feasibly, to establish relationships between Americans and young foreign mffitary officers.’4 These areas of engagement are likely to involve, working with state institutions, while cultural or civil society engagement is likely to entail building people-to-people contacts. Funding nongovernmental organizations, facilitating the flow of remittances, establishing postal and telephone links between the United States and the target country, and promoting the exchange of students, tourists, and other nongovernmental people between the countries are some of the incentives that might be offered under a policy of cultural engagement.

This brief overview of the various forms of engagement illuminates the choices open to policymakers. The plethora of options signals the flexibility of engagement as a foreign policy strategy and, in doing so, reveals one of the real strengths of engagement. At the same time, it also suggests the urgent need for considered analysis of this strategy. The purpose of this book is to address this need by deriving insights and lessons from past episodes of engagement and proposing guidelines for the future use of engagement strategies. Throughout the book, two critical questions are entertained. First, when should policymakers consider engagement? A strategy of engagement may serve certain foreign policy objectives better than others. Specific characteristics of a target country may make it more receptive to a strategy of engagement and the incentives offered under it; in other cases, a country's domestic politics may effectively exclude the use of engagement strategies. Second, how should engagement strategies be managed to maximize the chances of success? Shedding light on how policymakers achieved, or failed, in these efforts in the past is critical in an evaluation of engagement strategies. By focusing our analysis, these questions and concerns help produce a framework to guide the use of engagement strategies in the upcoming decades.

#### “Toward” means in the direction of—visas are a domestic policy

Taylor 6 – CJ Taylor, Supreme Court Justice on the Supreme Court of Michigan, “Supreme Court of Michigan. Grievance Administrator, Petitioner-Appellant, v. Geoffrey N. Fieger, Respondent-Appellee”, 7-31, http://faculty.law.wayne.edu/henning/ProfResp/Grievance%20Administrator%20v%20Fieger.pdf

MRPC 3.5(c) provides that a lawyer shall not "engage in undignified or discourteous conduct toward the tribunal." (Emphasis added.) We note that the rule does not provide a definition of the word "toward." It is well established that if a term in a court rule is not defined, we interpret the term in accordance with its everyday, plain meaning. Random House Webster's College Dictionary (1997) lists several definitions of the preposition "toward," including "in the direction of" and "with respect to; as regards."

#### Violation – they increases visas

**Prefer our interpretation**

**1 – Predictable limits – they can add anything to economic engagement, even if they have economic components they are still extra topical - kills clash and topic education**

**2 – Ground - we lose disads based on commodity trade —makes negation impossible**

### 1nc – offshoring da

#### Offshoring key to chinese econ

El-Shenawi 11

(Eman, “India and China are reaping the financial benefits produced by wealthy remitters” October 30, 2011, AlArabiya.net)

China, a holder of the world's largest foreign exchange reserves, at $3.2 trillion, has recently become a major player in the European debt crisis talks; the region's European Financial Stability Facility bailout fund has been trying to win help from Beijing. This is because China's GDP is set to grow to almost 9 percent in 2011. Compare that with the United States and the eurozone (growth forecasted at a joint 1.6 percent), and China's economic charm is clear. Indeed, the main reasons behind Chinese and Indian economic growth remain: their relatively cheap labor force and a thriving domestic market that has fed well into the global manufacturing supply chain. But their wealthy on- and offshore communities have cranked up their economic caliber and their global appeal for investors. India appears in the top five countries where the offshore affluent now have more than $1 million investable assets on average, according to the Global Affluent Investor study conducted by research company TNS. "India and China have already surpassed major European markets like Germany and France. It's interesting to see that the entrepreneurial spirit of people in these markets is already paying off in terms of personal wealth," Reg van Steen, director of business and finance, TNS, said, according to Reuters. Such emerging markets paint a cheery picture of wealth and how it can leverage economies in the wake of the 2008 global recession and amid the continuing fiscal crises.

#### Chinese economic decline causes Asian instability and nuclear war

Tom **Plate**, East Asia Expert, Adjunct. Prof. Communications @ UCLA, 6/28/**’3**

(Neo-cons a bigger risk to Bush than China, Strait Times, l/n)

But imagine a China disintegrating- on its own, without neo-conservative or Central Intelligence Agency prompting, much less outright military invasion because the economy (against all predictions) suddenly collapses. That would knock Asia into chaos. A massive flood of refugees would head for Indonesia and other places with poor border controls, which don’t’ want them and cant handle them; some in Japan might lick their lips at the prospect of World War II revisited and look to annex a slice of China. That would send Singapore and Malaysia- once occupied by Japan- into nervous breakdowns. Meanwhile, India might make a grab for Tibet, and Pakistan for Kashmir. Then you can say hello to World War III, Asia style. That’s why wise policy encourages Chinese stability, security and economic growth – the very direction the White House now seems to prefer.

### 1nc – t-toward

**Interpretation – topical affs can only increase financial aid toward the topic countries – NOT the U.S. or other countries**

Haass, 2K – Brookings Foreign Policy Studies director

[Richard, and Meghan O'Sullivan, "Introduction" in Honey and Vinegar, ed. by Haass and O'Sullivan, google books]

Architects of engagement strategies have a **wide variety** of incentives from which to choose. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology, loans, and economic aid." Other equally useful economic incentives involve the removal of penalties, whether they be trade embargoes, investment bans, or high tariffs that have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. In addition, facilitated entry into the global economic arena and the institutions that govem it rank among the most potent incentives in today's global market."

#### Violation – they increase engagement toward countries other than Mexico through raising the visa cap

#### That’s a voting issue

#### They destroy limits by allowing affs to increase investment in the US or have the US work with the topic countries to invest in another country

#### At best, they’re extra-topical – that’s a voting issue because there’s an unlimited number of extra-topical things that the aff could do that the neg could never predict

### 1nc – neolib

#### The affirmative is confined to the dominant discourse of transnational capital. The affirmative buys into a system which produces unethical policy based on the short term logic of growth. This causes economic crisis and environmental destruction

Makwana 06 (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization¶ The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.¶ The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.¶ There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.¶ The neoliberal experiment has failed to combat extreme poverty, has exacerbated global inequality, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.¶ Introduction ¶ After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.¶ Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.¶ The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.¶ There is a consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.¶ There is a huge discrepancy between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)¶ Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).¶ The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.¶ The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.¶ According to Maria Páez Victor:¶ “Since 1846 the United States has carried out no fewer than 50 military invasions and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of perceived threats to its economic control and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”¶ As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.¶ So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.¶ However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.¶ The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.¶ Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.¶ Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.¶ Economic Growth¶ Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.¶ Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.¶ Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.¶ The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.¶ Free Trade¶ Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.¶ With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.¶ The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, increased inequality and caused environmental destruction.¶ In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.¶ The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.¶ These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly biased in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.¶ Liberalization¶ The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.¶ According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.¶ Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely destroys local industries. It creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and economic crisis in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.¶ A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.¶

#### The alternative is a process of critique that challenges the ideology of capital by prioritizing human development over production

Lebowitz 07 (Michael A. Lebowitz is author of Beyond Capital: Marx’s Political Economy of the Working Class (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), Build It Now: Socialism for the Twenty-First Century (Monthly Review Press, 2006), and The Socialist Alternative: Real Human Development (Monthly Review Press, forthcoming in 2008). Portions of this essay were presented as “Going Beyond Survival: Making the Social Economy a Real Alternative” at the Fourth International Meeting of the Solidarity Economy, July 21–23, 2006, at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, “Venezuela: A Good Example of the Bad Left of Latin America”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/07/01/venezuela-a-good-example-of-the-bad-left-of-latin-america>,)

What constitutes a real alternative to capitalism? I suggest that it is a society in which the explicit goal is not the growth of capital or of the material means of production but, rather, human development itself—the growth of human capacities. We can see this perspective embodied in the Bolivarian Constitution of Venezuela—in Article 299’s emphasis upon “ensuring overall human development,” in the declaration of Article 20 that “everyone has the right to the free development of his or her own personality,” and in the focus of Article 102 upon “developing the creative potential of every human being and the full exercise of his or her personality in a democratic society.”¶ In these passages (which are by no means the whole of that constitution), there is the conception of a real alternative—an economy whose logic is not the logic of capital. “The social economy,” President Hugo Chávez said in September 2003, “bases its logic on the human being, on work, that is to say, on the worker and the worker’s family, that is to say, in the human being.” That social economy, he continued, does not focus on economic gain, on exchange values; rather, “the social economy generates mainly use-value.” Its purpose is “the construction of the new man, of the new woman, of the new society.”¶ These are beautiful ideas and beautiful words, but they are, of course, only ideas and words. The first set comes from a constitution and the second comes from the regular national educational seminar known as Aló Presidente. How can such ideas and words be made real? Let me suggest four preconditions for the realization of this alternative to capitalism.¶ (1) Any discussion of structural change must begin from an understanding of the existing structure—in short, from an understanding of capitalism. We need to grasp that the logic of capital, the logic in which profit rather than satisfaction of the needs of human beings is the goal, dominates both where it fosters the comparative advantage of repression and also where it accepts an increase in slave rations. (2) It is essential to attack the logic of capital ideologically. In the absence of the development of a mass understanding of the nature of capital—that capital is the result of the social labor of the collective worker—the need to survive the ravages of neoliberal and repressive policies produces only the desire for a fairer society, the search for a better share for the exploited and excluded: in short, barbarism with a human face.¶ (3) A critical aspect in the battle to go beyond capitalism is the recognition that human capacity develops only through human activity, only through what Marx understood as “revolutionary practice,” the simultaneous changing of circumstances and self-change. Real human development does not drop from the sky in the form of money to support survival or the expenditures of popular governments upon education and health. In contrast to populism, which produces people who look to the state for all answers and to leaders who promise everything, the conception which truly challenges the logic of capital in the battle of ideas is one which explicitly recognizes the centrality of self-management in the workplace and self-government in the community as the means of unleashing human potential—i.e., the idea of socialism for the twenty-first century.¶ (4) But, the idea of this socialism cannot displace real capitalism. Nor can dwarfish islands of cooperation change the world by competing successfully against capitalist corporations. You need the power to foster the new productive relations while truncating the reproduction of capitalist productive relations. You need to take the power of the state away from capital, and you need to use that power when capital responds to encroachments—when capital goes on strike, you must be prepared to move in rather than give in. Winning the “battle of democracy” and using “political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie” remains as critical now as when Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. Consider these preconditions. Are they being met by the new Latin American governments on the left? On the contrary, for the most part, we can see the familiar characteristics of social democracy—which does not understand the nature of capital, does not attack the logic of capital ideologically, does not believe that there is a real alternative to capitalism, and, not surprisingly, gives in when capital threatens to go on strike.¶ “We can’t kill the goose that lays the golden eggs,” announced the social democratic premier of British Columbia in Canada (in the 1970s when I was party policy chairman). Here, crystallized, is the ultimate wisdom of social democracy—the manner in which social democracy enforces the logic of capital and ideologically disarms and demobilizes people.¶ Venezuela, however, is going in a different direction at this point. While the Bolivarian Revolution did not start out to build a socialist alternative (and its continuation along this path is contested every step of the way), it is both actively rejecting the logic of capital and also ideologically arming and mobilizing people to build that alternative.

### 1nc – uncapped pic

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase in renewable, market-based cap, portable, H-2A and H-2B visas through a guest-worker program with Mexico.

#### Uncapped visas tank CIR – breaks the delicate compromise between business and labor

Werner 3-30-13

Congressional reporter for AP specializing in immigration

“Immigration Reform: Business, Labor Get Deal On Worker Program, Source Says” By ERICA WERNER 03/30/13 08:41 PM ET EDT http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/30/immigration-reform\_n\_2985521.html

Big business and labor have struck a deal on a new low-skilled worker program, removing the biggest hurdle to completion of sweeping immigration legislation allowing 11 million illegal immigrants eventual U.S. citizenship, labor and Senate officials said Saturday. The agreement was reached in a phone call late Friday night with AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka, U.S. Chamber of Commerce head Tom Donohue, and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York, who's been mediating the dispute. The deal resolves disagreements over wages for the new workers and which industries would be included. Those disputes had led talks to break down a week ago, throwing into doubt whether Schumer and seven other senators crafting a comprehensive bipartisan immigration bill would be able to complete their work as planned. The deal must still be signed off on by the other senators working with Schumer, including Republicans John McCain of Arizona and Marco Rubio of Florida, but that's expected to happen, according to a person with knowledge of the talks who spoke on condition of anonymity. With the agreement in place, the senators are expected to unveil their legislation the week of April 8. Their measure would secure the border, crack down on employers, improve legal immigration and create a 13-year pathway to citizenship for the millions of illegal immigrants already here. It's a major second-term priority of President Barack Obama's and would usher in the most dramatic changes to the nation's faltering immigration system in more than two decades. "The strength of the consensus across America for just reform has afforded us the momentum needed to forge an agreement in principle to develop a new type of employer visa system," Trumka said in a statement late Saturday. "We expect that this new program, which benefits not just business, but everyone, will promote long overdue reforms by raising the bar for existing programs." Schumer said: "This issue has always been the dealbreaker on immigration reform, but not this time." The AFL-CIO and the Chamber of Commerce, longtime antagonists over temporary worker programs, had been fighting over wages for tens of thousands of low-skilled workers who would be brought in under the new program to fill jobs in construction, hotels and resorts, nursing homes and restaurants, and other industries. Under the agreement, a new "W" visa program would go into effect beginning April 1, 2015, according to an AFL-CIO fact sheet. In year one of the program, 20,000 workers would be allowed in; in year two, 35,000; in year three, 55,000; and in year four, 75,000. Ultimately the program would be capped at 200,000 workers a year, but the number of visas would fluctuate, depending on unemployment rates, job openings, employer demand and data collected by a new federal bureau pushed by the labor movement as an objective monitor of the market. One-third of all visas in any year would go to businesses with under 25 workers. A "safety valve" would allow employers to exceed the cap if they can show need and pay premium wages, but any additional workers brought in would be subtracted from the following year's cap. The workers could move from employer to employer and would be able to petition for permanent residency after a year, and ultimately seek U.S. citizenship. Neither is possible for temporary workers now. The new program would fill needs employers say they have that are not currently met by U.S. immigration programs. Most industries don't have a good way to hire a steady supply of foreign workers because there's one temporary visa program for low-wage nonagricultural workers but it's capped at 66,000 visas per year and is only supposed to be used for seasonal or temporary jobs. Business has sought temporary worker programs in a quest for a cheaper workforce, but labor has opposed the programs because of concerns over working conditions and the effect on jobs and wages for U.S. workers. The issue helped sink the last major attempt at immigration overhaul in 2007, which the AFL-CIO opposed partly because of temporary worker provisions, and the flare-up earlier this month sparked concerns that the same thing would happen this time around. Agreement between the two traditional foes is one of many indications that immigration reform has its best chance in years in Congress this year. After apparent miscommunications earlier this month between the AFL-CIO and the Chamber of Commerce on the wage issue, the deal resolves it in a way both sides are comfortable with, officials said. Workers would earn actual wages paid to American workers or the prevailing wages for the industry they're working in, whichever is higher. The Labor Department would determine prevailing wage based on customary rates in specific localities, so that it would vary from city to city. There also had been disagreement on how to handle the construction industry, which unions argue is different from other industries in the new program because it can be more seasonal in nature and includes a number of higher-skilled trades. The official said the resolution will cap at 15,000 a year the number of visas that can be sought by the construction industry. Schumer called White House chief of staff Denis McDonough on Saturday to inform him of the deal, the person with knowledge of the talks said. The three principals in the talks – Trumka, Donohue and Schumer – agreed they should meet for dinner soon to celebrate, the person said. However, in a sign of the delicate and uncertain negotiations still ahead, Rubio sent a letter Saturday to Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., calling for a deliberate hearing process on the new legislation and cautioning against a "rush to legislate." Rubio and a number of other Republicans are striking a tricky balance as they simultaneously court conservative and Hispanic voters on the immigration issue. Separately, the new immigration bill also is expected to offer many more visas for high-tech workers, new visas for agriculture workers, and provisions allowing some agriculture workers already in the U.S. a speedier path to citizenship than that provided to other illegal immigrants, in an effort to create a stable agricultural workforce.

#### Only the counterplan solves displacement of American jobs while the plan causes it

Werner 3-30-13

Congressional reporter for AP specializing in immigration

“Immigration Reform: Business, Labor Get Deal On Worker Program, Source Says” By ERICA WERNER 03/30/13 08:41 PM ET EDT http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/30/immigration-reform\_n\_2985521.html

Under the agreement, a new "W" visa program would go into effect beginning April 1, 2015, according to an AFL-CIO fact sheet. In year one of the program, 20,000 workers would be allowed in; in year two, 35,000; in year three, 55,000; and in year four, 75,000. Ultimately the program would be capped at 200,000 workers a year, but the number of visas would fluctuate, depending on unemployment rates, job openings, employer demand and data collected by a new federal bureau pushed by the labor movement as an objective monitor of the market. One-third of all visas in any year would go to businesses with under 25 workers. A "safety valve" would allow employers to exceed the cap if they can show need and pay premium wages, but any additional workers brought in would be subtracted from the following year's cap. The workers could move from employer to employer and would be able to petition for permanent residency after a year, and ultimately seek U.S. citizenship. Neither is possible for temporary workers now. The new program would fill needs employers say they have that are not currently met by U.S. immigration programs. Most industries don't have a good way to hire a steady supply of foreign workers because there's one temporary visa program for low-wage nonagricultural workers but it's capped at 66,000 visas per year and is only supposed to be used for seasonal or temporary jobs.

### 1nc – manufacturing

#### **1 there is no shortage now**

Capps and Fortuny, 1ac authors, 7

(Randy, demographer and Senior Policy Analyst with MPI's National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, Karina, author of “Children of Immigrants: 2008 State Trends Update,”, “Trends in the Low-Wage Immigrant Labor Force, 2000–2005” pg online at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411426\_Low-Wafge\_immigrant\_Labor.pdf)//Holmes

While unauthorized immigrants are still only a small share of the total population and labor force, they are even more overrepresented than immigrants generally in the low-wage and lower-skilled labor force. In 2005, about 30 percent of all immigrants were unauthorized (Passel 2006), and they composed just 4 percent of the U.S. population and 5 percent of the workforce (figure 2). But unauthorized immigrants were nearly a tenth (9 percent) of low-wage workers and almost a quarter (23 percent) of lower-skilled workers. Their share of lower-skilled workers rose by 5 percentage points between 2000 and 2005. In 2005, there were a total of 6.4 million unauthorized immigrant workers, and half of all lower- skilled immigrant workers (3.1 million) were unauthorized.

**2 No deterrence impact**

**Kober 10**, research fellow, foreign policy studies – Cato, 6/13/**’10**

(Stanley, “The deterrence illusion,” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/jun/10/deterrence-war-peace>)

The world at the beginning of the 21st century bears an eerie – and disquieting – resemblance to Europe at the beginning of the last century. That was also an era of globalisation. New technologies for transportation and communication were transforming the world. Europeans had lived so long in peace that war seemed irrational. And they were right, up to a point. The first world war was the product of a mode of rational thinking that went badly off course. **The peace of Europe was based on security assurances.** Germany was the protector of Austria-Hungary, and Russia was the protector of Serbia. The prospect of escalation was supposed to prevent war, and it did– until, finally, it didn't. The Russians, who should have been deterred – they had suffered a terrible defeat at the hands of Japan just a few years before – decided they had to come to the support of their fellow Slavs. **As countries honoured their commitments, a system that was designed to prevent war instead widened it.** We have also been living in an age of globalisation, especially since the end of the cold war, but it too is increasingly being challenged. And just like the situation at the beginning of the last century, deterrence is not working. Much is made, for example, of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (Nato) invoking Article V – the famous "three musketeers" pledge that an attack on one member is to be considered as an attack on all – following the terrorist attacks of September 11. But the United States is the most powerful member of Nato by far. Indeed, in 2001, it was widely considered to be a hegemon, a hyperpower. Other countries wanted to be in Nato because they felt an American guarantee would provide security. And yet it was the US that was attacked. This failure of deterrence has not received the attention it deserves. It is, after all, not unique. The North Vietnamese were not deterred by the American guarantee to South Vietnam. Similarly, Hezbollah was not deterred in Lebanon in the 1980s, and American forces were assaulted in Somalia. What has been going wrong? The successful deterrence of the superpowers during the cold war led to the belief that if such powerful countries could be deterred, then lesser powers should fall into line when confronted with an overwhelmingly powerful adversary. It is plausible, but it may be too rational. For all their ideological differences, the US and the Soviet Union observed red lines during the cold war. There were crises – Berlin, Cuba, to name a couple – but these did not touch on emotional issues or vital interests, so that compromise and retreat were possible. Indeed, what we may have missed in the west is the importance of retreat in Soviet ideology. "Victory is impossible unless [the revolutionary parties] have learned both how to attack and how to retreat properly," Lenin wrote in "Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder. When the Soviets retreated, the US took the credit. Deterrence worked. But what if retreat was part of the plan all along? What if, in other words, **the Soviet Union was the exception rather than the rule**? That question is more urgent because, in the post-cold war world, the US has expanded its security guarantees, even as its enemies show they are not impressed. The Iraqi insurgents were not intimidated by President Bush's challenge to "bring 'em on". The Taliban have made an extraordinary comeback from oblivion and show no respect for American power. North Korea is demonstrating increasing belligerence. And yet the US keeps emphasising security through alliances. "We believe that there are certain commitments, as we saw in a bipartisan basis to Nato, that need to be embedded in the DNA of American foreign policy," secretary of state Hillary Clinton affirmed in introducing the new National Security Strategy. But that was the reason the US was in Vietnam. It had a bipartisan commitment to South Vietnam under the Southeast Asia Treaty Organisation, reaffirmed through the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which passed Congress with only two dissenting votes. It didn't work, and found its commitments were not embedded in its DNA. Americans turned against the war, Secretary Clinton among them. The great powers could not guarantee peace in Europe a century ago, and the US could not guarantee it in Asia a half-century ago.

3 Internal link is from AmericanManufacturing.org—obvious incentive to exaggerate risk of decline by making up threats

#### 4 Manufacturing’s resilient

WSJ 11(Wall Street Journal. 2/25/11. "The Truth About U.S. Manufacturing."online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703652104576122353274221570.html.html#articleTabs%3Darticle)

Is American manufacturing dead? You might think so reading most of the nation's editorial pages or watching the endless laments in the news that "nothing is made in America anymore," and that our manufacturing jobs have vanished to China, Mexico and South Korea. Yet the empirical evidence tells a different story–of a thriving and growing U.S. manufacturing sector, and a country that remains **by far** the world's largest manufacturer. This is a particularly sensitive topic in my hometown of Flint, Mich., where auto-plant closings have meant lost jobs and difficult transitions for the displaced. But while it's true that the U.S. has lost more than seven million manufacturing jobs since the late 1970s, our manufacturing output has **continued to expand.** International data compiled by the United Nations on global output from 1970-2009 show this success story. Excluding recession-related decreases in 2001 and 2008-09, America's manufacturing output has continued to increase since 1970. In every year since 2004, manufacturing output has exceeded $2 trillion (in constant 2005 dollars), twice the output produced in America's factories in the early 1970s. Taken on its own, U.S. manufacturing would rank today as the sixth largest economy in the world, just behind France and ahead of the United Kingdom, Italy and Brazil. In 2009, the most recent full year for which international data are available, our manufacturing output was $2.155 trillion (including mining and utilities). That's more than 45% higher than China's, the country we're supposedly losing ground to. Despite recent gains in China and elsewhere, the U.S. still produced more than 20% of global manufacturing output in 2009. The truth is that America still makes a lot of stuff, and we're making more of it than ever before. We're merely able to do it with a fraction of the workers needed in the past. Consider the incredible, increasing productivity of America's manufacturing workers: The average U.S. factory worker is responsible today for more than $180,000 of annual manufacturing output, triple the $60,000 in 1972. Increases in productivity are a direct result of capital investments in productivity-enhancing technology, such as GM's next generation Ecotec engine. These increases are a direct result of capital investments in productivity-enhancing technology, which last year helped boost output to record levels in industries like computers and semiconductors, medical equipment and supplies, pharmaceuticals and medicine, and oil and natural-gas equipment.

### 1nc – ag

#### 1 No Russian instability

COUNTRY FORECAST SELECT 10 (3-8-2010, Economist Intelligence Unit, Lexis)

However, although Russians are dissatisfied with the economic situation, this does not yet appear to have affected significantly the popular standing of either Mr Medvedev or Mr Putin. Although the impact of economic crises on social stability usually occurs with a lag, it is nevertheless doubtful that a rise in social discontent could threaten the leadership--Boris Yeltsin managed to survive politically through the crisis in 1998, despite being in a much weaker position. Although some independent labour groups have emerged, most trade union organisations are close to the government. The authorities face little threat from a weak opposition. The liberals in Russia are in disarray and are not represented in parliament. The Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF)--the only true opposition party in parliament--is a declining force.

#### 2 Wages and profits prove no labor shortage

CNBC 12

(“What the Invisible Farm Labor Shortage Is Really About” 11/29, pg online at http://www.cnbc.com/id/50016592//sd)

Despite the absolute lack of evidence of anything approaching a farm-labor shortage, complaints about this invisible menace continue to make headlines. Here's how a recent piece from the Washington bureau of Gannett begins: Farmers from Arizona to New York are struggling to find enough people to harvest their crops this season, a shortage they blame on state and federal laws designed to crack down on the migrant labor that makes up the bulk of the nation's seasonal farmworkers. "We see shortages in all parts of the country," said Kristi Boswell, director of congressional relations for the American Farm Bureau. "Farmers are struggling with fewer bodies out there to harvest the crop. They're definitely stressed." Farmers with labor-intensive crops or livestock, including fruit, vegetables, nuts, Christmas trees and dairy cows say they are being hit especially hard. "We've got neighbors literally competing against each other just to have enough of a workforce to harvest their crops," Boswell said. Heaven forefend! Neighbors "literally competing against each other." It's practically a civil war. The fact is that there is no data whatsoever to support the alleged farm labor crisis. The latest data, issued from the Department of Agriculture on November 27, shows that labor expenses on farms have increased just 0.7 percent over the past year. Costs for hired labor, those who work on the farm long-term, are up just 0.5 percent. Costs for contract labor, the harvest-time pickers, are up just 1.5 percent. In other words, labor costs are well-below the level of general price inflation. In fact, farm labor costs are still below where they were in 2008 on a nominal basis. In real terms, labor costs are falling for farmers. This doesn't mean all is well for the farmer. There are genuine challenges and for the first time in years, farm profits seem set to fall this year. The Department of Agriculture is projecting farm revenue to come in at a record $448.5 billion, which is a 4.6 percent gain over last year. But expenses are rising for farms. The big increases in expenses are the cost of feed (up $12.2 billion, or 13 percent), seed (up $2.1 billion, or 11.9 percent), fertilizer (up $1.6 billion, or 6.3 percent), and pesticides (up $1.1 billion, or 9 percent). These increases dwarf the $200 million increase in labor costs spread across the nation. If there were a labor shortage, we'd see the price of farm labor rising rapidly. We just don't see that—indicating that there is no shortage at all. There is, instead, a consist cry from the farm lobby for policy makers to adopt policies aimed at lowering labor costs. Gannet reports, for example, that "the American Farm Bureau and other farm groups are working on a plan to present to the new Congress that would allow more migrant laborers to work legally on U.S. farms." That's what all this noise is really about: enacting policies to crush already low farm wages by allowing farmers to import more foreign workers.

#### 3 US ag can’t resolve global food security – regional investments are key

OGFS, 9. Office of Global Food Security, US Department of State, September 28, 2009. “Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative: Consultation Document.” http://www.state.gov/s/globalfoodsecurity/129952.htm – clawan

The United States alone cannot meet the global need to reduce hunger and promote food security. And foreign assistance alone will not end hunger or eliminate under-nutrition. We must draw on significant investments from other donors, the private sector, partner countries, and citizens themselves. Foreign assistance must play a key role in strengthening public institutions that catalyze private investment rather than hold it back. It must also invest in the experience of the small-scale farmers and business that can succeed by providing them with loans to jumpstart operations. The most effective food security strategies come from those closest to the problems—not governments or institutions thousands of miles away. In the past, our efforts have been undermined by a lack of coordination, limited transparency, uneven monitoring and evaluation, and relationships with recipient countries based more on patronage than partnership. Going forward, we will emphasize consultation and careful analysis of impact and make corrections as we go. While we will increase our own efforts, success will ultimately rest on the shoulders of the farmers and entrepreneurs who wake up each day committed to grow their future. It also will rest on the national and local leaders in their countries who must foster environments where investments in agricultural development can thrive, with zero tolerance for the petty corruption and polices that restrict agriculture-led growth.

#### 4 Empirics prove – no resource wars

Salehyan, 07(Idean, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas, August 14, 2007, “The New Myth About Climate Change,” Foreign Policy, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2007/08/13/the_new_myth_about_climate_change>)

These claims generally boil down to an argument about resource scarcity. Desertification, sea-level rise, more-frequent severe weather events, an increased geographical range of tropical disease, and shortages of freshwater will lead to violence over scarce necessities. Friction between haves and have-nots will increase, and governments will be hard-pressed to provide even the most basic services. In some scenarios, mass migration will ensue, whether due to desertification, natural disasters, and rising sea levels, or as a consequence of resource wars. Environmental refugees will in turn spark political violence in receiving areas, and countries in the global North will erect ever higher barriers to keep culturally unwelcome and hungry foreigners out. The number of failed states, meanwhile, will increase as governments collapse in the face of resource wars and weakened state capabilities, and transnational terrorists and criminal networks will move in. International wars over depleted water and energy supplies will also intensify. The basic need for survival will supplant nationalism, religion, or ideology as the fundamental root of conflict. Dire scenarios like these may sound convincing, but they are misleading. Even worse, they are irresponsible, for they shift liability for wars and human rights abuses away from oppressive, corrupt governments. Additionally, focusing on climate change as a security threat that requires a military response diverts attention away from prudent adaptation mechanisms and new technologies that can prevent the worst catastrophes. 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.

#### 5 High food prices get checked by farmers and governments

Wang 12 (Weijing; Are High Food Prices Good or Bad? [http://asia.ifad.org/web/china/blogs/-/blogs/are-high-food-prices-good-or bad?p\_p\_auth=mnKY6vAo&p\_r\_p\_564233524\_catego ryId=0&\_33\_redirect=http%3A%2F%2Fasia.ifad.org%2Fweb%2Fchina%2Fblogs%3Fp \_p\_auth%3DmnKY6vAo%26p\_p\_id%3D33%26p\_p\_lifecycle%3D0%26p\_p\_col\_id%3Dcolumn-2%26p\_p\_col\_count%3D4%26p\_r\_ p\_564233524\_categoryId%3D0&](http://asia.ifad.org/web/china/blogs/-/blogs/are-high-food-prices-good-or%20bad?p_p_auth=mnKY6vAo&p_r_p_564233524_catego%20ryId=0&_33_redirect=http%3A%2F%2Fasia.ifad.org%2Fweb%2Fchina%2Fblogs%3Fp%20_p_auth%3DmnKY6vAo%26p_p_id%3D33%26p_p_lifecycle%3D0%26p_p_col_id%3Dcolumn-2%26p_p_col_count%3D4%26p_r_%20p_564233524_categoryId%3D0&)) HS

People normally think high food prices are bad, or at least bad to net consumers, although good to net producers. As many small holders and the poor are the net consumers, they are vulnerable to high food prices. The memory of 2008 food crisis is still fresh to many people: the high food prices exaggerated poverty and pushed more than 100 million people into hunger in 2008 (WFP, 2008). In the recent south-south cooperation workshop in Beijing however, it was argued that high food prices were not always bad. When the prices go up, it hurts farmers, but farmers will quickly have coping strategy and produce more. They become producers and benefit from the high prices. This opinion is likely to be consistent with Chinese government’s food prices policy. The objective of food price policy is to keep the food prices growing moderately. The rationale is to provide enough incentives for farming, and gradually increase farmers’ income, but not too radical to cause food crisis. I think it seems a good blueprint but the question is how well for government to create an environment to allow the prices grow moderately? And if there is a pressure of volatility of food prices , how well could the government, the community, the producers and the consumers prevent and prepare for it?

#### 6 Global food prices down – demand and supplies

**Reuters, 13** (3/27/13, "Global food prices fall on lower demand, improved supplies -World Bank", http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/global-food-prices-fall-on-lower-demand-improved-supplies-world-bank)

WASHINGTON, March 27 (Reuters) - Global food prices have declined in recent months as lower demand for cereals and improved supplies pushed prices down, the World Bank said on Wednesday, warning that prices were still near record peaks and volatile.¶ The World Bank's Food Price Index showed international prices of wheat fell by 11 percent, sugar by 10 percent and maize, or corn, by 6 percent during the four-month period between October 2012 and February 2013.

### 1nc – solvency

#### 1. H2A Hires Wont Be as Rampant as You Assume – Multiple Barriers to New Hires

John **Dolan** May 11, **2010** “Even in tough economic times, Vermont dairy jobs are a tough sell”

<http://www.vermonttoday.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100511/VBJ/305119997/-1/VBJ02>

The farms supplying Thomas Dairy are mostly small operations, with family members doing the work, in some cases with the help of one or two reliable hands who have been working with them for years. “If they had to go beyond that [into the local labor market], I don’t know how they’d get by,” Thomas said. Thomas Dairy, like others in Vermont large enough to keep more than the immediate family busy, found migrant workers through an agency. But the family decided five years ago it wasn’t feasible for the long haul. “We did a lot of looking at the economics and it just wasn’t working for us,” Richard Thomas said. He noted that he had to pay a fee to acquire and transport the workers, as well as provide hourly wages and housing. He added that while most Mexican laborers are hard workers, they can be difficult to supervise in a state as undiversified as Vermont. No one in the Thomas operation could speak Spanish. “It’s very hard to communicate with these people if you can’t really talk with them,” Thomas said. The phenomenon is not seen only in Vermont; it’s a nationwide issue. To help address the problem, the U.S. Labor Department has a program, known as H-2A, under which farmers can legally hire foreign workers for seasonal agriculture jobs. But H-2A limits these work visas to one year in duration, to ensure that the jobs are truly seasonal or temporary, and thus push farmers to hire Americans for permanent positions. But dairy farms, unlike apple orchards or other crop-harvesting operations, are not seasonal in nature and need ongoing, year-round labor. Modified H-2A rules went into effect March 15. They now require farmers to prove – not merely claim – that they tried to hire U.S. workers before they sought visas for seasonal foreign labor. The new rules also implement additional protections for such workers. But contrary to the hopes of Vermont dairy farm advocates, the one-year work limit remained in place with no provision for the longer-term labor needs of dairy farms. Since farmers must pay for transportation both ways for foreign workers under the H-2A program, it is financially impractical and unreasonably cumbersome for them to replace their work forces every year, advocates say.

#### 2. H2A visas fail

Vazzano, associate editor, ’10 (Ann-Marie, May, “Dissecting AgJOBS, http://www.growingproduce.com/americanfruitgrower/?storyid=3725&style=1)

While on the surface AgJOBS appears to offer great benefits to growers, Mallory points out that it doesn’t permanently tie those workers to agriculture. One of the provisions of AgJOBS says that these laborers would be required to work in agriculture only for a period of a few years, after which time they would be free to work in whatever field they choose. “So it’s not a real permanent solution to the problem,” Mallory says. “Since it doesn’t permanently tie our current workforce to agriculture, in a few years, to some extent, I believe we could be back to where we are if it were not for the H-2A provision of AgJOBS.” That’s where the H-2A guestworker program comes into play. “So if some years down the road, if the workers get older or transition to other fields of work, what we have left is the guestworker program that would allow us to bring in workers under a special visa to fill those jobs,” Mallory explains. But, dealing with the regulatory enforcement issues of H-2A can be a headache for growers. The regulations recently have been rewritten under the Obama administration, meaning agriculture is now on its fourth set of rules over the last couple of years. The new regulations became law on March 15, and according to Mallory, they’re going to make using the program more costly and complicated for producers.

#### 3. Guestworker program is an inefficient use of farm labor which decreases productivity

Krikorian, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, ‘1

[Mark, Guestworker Programs: A Threat to American Agriculture, June, Backgrounders and Reports http://www.cis.org/GuestworkerPrograms-AmericanAgriculture]

The importation of foreign farmworkers also leads to very inefficient use of labor, further hampering productivity growth. The same March 2000 Labor Department report found widespread under-employment — the average number of weeks a farmworker works in agriculture has dropped from 26 weeks in 1990-92 to 24 weeks in 1996-98. The average farmworker spent only about 47 percent of his [time in U.S. farm work, compared with 19 percent of his time unemployed in the U.S., 8 percent of his time in U.S. non-farm employment, and 24 percent of his time living abroad. This inefficient utilization of farm labor is also reflected in the fact that the unemployment rate for farmworkers between 1994 and 1998 was routinely more than double the rate for all occupations, according to a December 1999 report from the Congressional Research Service. Ironically, the artificial expansion of the agricultural labor market not only dissuades our farmers from exploiting America's comparative advantage in technology and capital, but using cheap foreign labor to produce fruit and vegetables for export actually subsidizes foreign consumers, since about one-fifth of our country's fruit, vegetable, and horticultural production is exported. Subsidies for Americans are problematic enough, but subsidies for foreigners are difficult to justify in any conception of the national interest.

## 2nc

### 2nc – t

**Melding cultural engagement with economic engagement allows random visa affs of the week—there was an entire college topic devoted to this for a reason**

**Reuters, 12** Reuters, 6/20, Chicago Tribune, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-20/business/sns-rt-usa-immigrationmeatpacking-factboxl1e8hfhr9-20120619_1_h2-b-visas-diversity-visas-low-immigration>, “FACTBOX-U.S. visa types for immigrants: Papers in farmland,” ADM

CHICAGO, June 20 (Reuters) - There are some **185 different types of visas** offered by the U.S. State Department. The government approved 7.5 million visas in 2011, with 94 percent for those who enter the U.S. on a temporary basis for travel or short-term work. The remaining 6 percent were awarded to immigrants seeking permanent residency.

**Contextual uses of “engagement” are virtually infinite and kill predictability**

**Traub 10** – James Traub, Fellow of the Center for International Cooperation and Contributing Writer for the New York Times Magazine, “Terms of Engagement”, Foreign Policy, 2-19, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/19/terms\_of\_engagement?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full

**Virtually all** conversations with Obama administration foreign-policy officials, no matter where they begin, come to rest at "engagement" -- that **vexing, mutable, all-purpose word**. The U.S. president has "engaged" with rogue states, civil society, the United Nations, and citizens around the globe. Iran vindicates the policy of engagement -- or discredits it. China is a failure of engagement, Russia a success. Inside the Obama realm, engagement has come to mean "good diplomacy."

To critics on both the left and right, however, it has come to mean "bad diplomacy" -- cynical or naive, depending on which side you come from.

These days -- these shaky days -- the critics seem to be gaining the upper hand, making those Obama officials increasingly defensive about their policy toward autocratic states, whether in the Middle East or Eurasia, Iran or Sudan. Having spent years thinking hard thoughts in universities and think tanks, magazines and books, they cannot believe that they are losing the definitional war over their own policy. They are eager, and maybe a little desperate, to set things aright. And so it was, earlier this week, that when I asked to talk to one official about democracy promotion, I wound up having a 75-minute phone conversation with four White House figures, much of it about "engagement."

"A lot of the baggage we carry," said an officeholder I might as well designate as Senior Official #1 -- the conversation was on background and the White House that offered up these folks to defend the policy was insistent they not do so on the record -- "is the word 'engagement.' People hear the word and they think 'constructive engagement.'" I'm not sure this is true outside certain New England common rooms, but it's definitely not an association the Obama White House would like to encourage. After all, Ronald Reagan's administration used that expression to justify the United States's ongoing relationship with South Africa's apartheid government, a policy widely derided as a cynical pretext to preserve ties with a Cold War ally. And it failed.

If "constructive engagement" is one definition the Obamans are eager to avoid, another is straightforward, old-fashioned Kissingerian "realism" -- if by realism one means dealing with the interests of states, including brutal states, to the exclusion of those of ordinary citizens. As another interlocutor -- call him Senior Official #2 -- growing rather hot under the telephonic collar, put it, "A lot of my friends said, 'You guys are a bunch of engagement realists. They'll never talk about democracy and human rights.'" Barack Obama himself arguably encouraged this view during his 2008 presidential campaign by criticizing George W. Bush's moralistic bluster, by regularly expressing his high regard for archrealists like James Baker and Brent Scowcroft, and by stipulating his willingness to meet "without preconditions" with even the worst tyrants. And since becoming president he has muted criticism of the regimes in Sudan and Burma, and referred respectfully to "the Islamic Republic of Iran."

The allegation of realpolitik is still intolerable -- even baffling -- to these officials, who pledged themselves to Obama out of a deep faith in his redemptive promise. But if engagement rests upon the expectation that treating autocrats and theocrats with respect will significantly alter their behavior, then it suffers less from cynicism than from credulity -- which is the other article of baggage under which engagement now staggers. How can anyone believe that? Administration officials have been at pains to deny that they ever did, especially since Iran has trampled Obama's entreaties underfoot. The goal of engaging Iran, they now say, was not to change Iran's behavior but to change the behavior of more tractable states, like Russia and China, by showing that the United States was willing to go the last mile even with the Axis of Evil.

Of course, there is abundant evidence that Obama and some of his chief advisors really did hope that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad would moderate nuclear policy if they showed due regard for his country's national interests, as Helene Cooper recently noted in the New York Times. But it's also true that from the outset, officials have made the secondary argument for the virtues of engagement. The SOs insisted to me, as other SOs have in the past, that Obama's Iran policy in fact constitutes a triumph of engagement because Russia has increasingly come around to the American view on the imperative for sanctions. They argue that the Russian change of heart owes not only to the country's growing alarm over Iranian ambitions, but also to the White House's persistent effort to put relations with Russia on a less adversarial footing than they were at the end of the Bush years. We have engaged with Russia and reaped the benefits. Of course, Russia hasn't yet signed on to a tough sanctions measure against Iran; and China, which so far has pocketed Obama's shows of deference without much display of gratitude, may scotch the whole affair.

Let us stipulate, then, that engagement is not quite so naive as it appears. But is it not, still, a realist bargain, trading away those universal values that the president so often evokes in the hopes of geostrategic wins, whether on Iran or climate change or the global economy?

"We're trying to say 'no,'" says SO #2. "We're not going to accept that tradeoff. We're going to do this in parallel."

Trying, of course, isn't doing. But in Russia, this official argues, Obama successfully lowered the temperature with President Dmitry Medvedev while still meeting with dissidents and civil society groups, and he criticized the country's undemocratic elections last fall. And it was "parallel," not a "tradeoff": Obama didn't offer to go easy on human rights, or for that matter missile defense, to get an arms deal, nor did he insist that progress on arms control would depend on democratization.

There is a term for such a nuanced policy: "double-track engagement," an expression used by George Shultz, secretary of state during Reagan's second term, who pursued national interests while at the same time helping to pry open such autocratic Cold War allies as Chile and the Philippines. And since Obama, unlike Reagan, puts real store by the United Nations and other multilateral institutions, he is in fact practicing a yet more nuanced "triple-track engagement" -- with states, with peoples, and with international bodies. The United States has rejoined the Human Rights Council, paid up its U.N. dues, and promoted the G-20 over the G-8.

It became clear enough, after 75 minutes, that engagement is not one thing, or two things. It's three or four things. It's "multifaceted and complex." It's complicated because the world is complicated. Maybe that's why the Obama administration clings to its favorite word -- because complicated is hard to explain. Simple policies, like Bush's Freedom Agenda, afford immediate gratification -- and then deep disappointment down the road. Nuanced, many-things-at-once policies require patience and a tolerance for ambiguous victories. We now have abundant evidence that this is not a patient or tolerant moment. You have to wonder how long complicated can survive in the absence of big wins.

All of which leaves our senior officials increasingly defensive. "Does it take time to get a bureaucracy oriented around the idea of multitrack diplomacy?" asked SO #1. "All the habits of interaction are binary. So it does."

Sometimes, as in China or Egypt, engagement with the state seems to preclude engagement with the aspirations of citizens and you get, well, realism. Other times, folks like us just don't get it. Of course, we might feel less confused if the Obamans used some term other than "engagement" to **cover virtually everything they do**.

**Reasonability is arbitrary – it’s impossible to determine what is “reasonable” because it differs from judge to judge forcing judge intervention – we have evidentiary support**

**Stone 1923** — Justice in the Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit [Sussex Land & Live Stock Co. v. Midwest Refining Co., 294 F. 597; 1923 U.S. App. LEXIS 2531; 34 A.L.R. 249, No. 6192; No. 6193, Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, December 5, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis]

Where the use of land affects others, the use must be "reasonable" to escape liability for resultant damage to others. What is "reasonable" depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances. It is an elastic term which is of uncertain value in a definition. It has been well said that "reasonable," means with regard to all the interest affected, his own and his neighbor's and also having in view public policy. But, elastic as this rule is, both reason and authority have declared certain limitations beyond which it cannot extend. One of these limitations is that it is "unreasonable" and unlawful for one owner to physically invade the land of another owner. There can be no damnum absque injuria where there is such a trespass.

**Reasonability is arbitrary and undermines research and preparation**

**Resnick 01**, assistant professor of political science – Yeshiva University,

(Evan, “Defining Engagement,” Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 54, Iss. 2)

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

### 2nc – pic

**Their own evidence proves counterplan solves, and there aren’t any solvency deficits**

**Stanely-Becker 13**

(Tom, Government Research Assistant at University of Chicago, Yale Daily News, Peer-reviewed by Peter Swenson, Yale’s C.M. Saden Professor of Political Science. “Strange Bedfellows: Business, Labor, Guest Workers, and Immigration Reform in the United States, 1986-2013” April 19th, pg online at [http://www.library.yale.edu/prizes/applebaum/papers/stanley-becker.pdf//sd](http://www.library.yale.edu/prizes/applebaum/papers/stanley-becker.pdf/sd))

During the hearings that proceeded floor consideration of the CIRA, however, it was no longer agricultural business that led the campaign for an expanded guest worker program. Nor was the central concern rotting crops but rather the release of the market in guest workers from government authority. In 2006, the primary employer spokesperson at a House subcommittee hearing concerning “Guest Worker Programs: Impact on the American Workforce and U.S. Immigration Policy,” was not a farmer but Elizabeth Dickson, the Corporate Immigration Service Manager for Ingersoll-Rand Co., a diversified manufacturing and technology company. Dickson was also the chairperson of the Chamber of Commerce Subcommittee on Immigration, and her company belonged to a new employer advocacy group called the Essential Worker Immigration Coalition. In her testimony, the examples of guest workers needed by her company were not fruit pickers, but rather welders, service technicians, and tool and die makers. She also stressed labor needs in construction, health care, and hospitality. She criticized the H-2B program’s restriction “to short-term seasonal types of work,” and called on Congress to revise the administrative procedures and complex application process, and “structure expanded temporary worker programs that employers could use, in a reasonably efficient manner without numerous bureaucratic hoops and hurdles to fill jobs with immigrant workers when U.S. workers are not available.” Rather, than impose an artificial, governmental limit on the number of guest workers in an expanded program, like the total of 200,000 in the measure then pending in Congress, Dickson explained that the Chamber favored “a market-based cap” that “could increase and decrease based on the need for these visas.

**CP solves shortages – portability and wages sufficient**

**Buchanan 7-17**-13

Reporter for Highlands Today

**John, “Ag labor program traverses Congress” http://highlandstoday.com/list/highlands-agri-leader-news/ag-labor-program-traverses-congress-20130717/**

The ag worker program created by the Senate bill effectively replaces the old and much maligned H2A program. The new program includes both contractual and at-will provisions for farm labor. The contract visa program will be preferable for many growers and workers, Carlton said, because it ensures the stability of labor availability and employment. The at-will visa program will be preferable to some growers and workers because it allows workers to move from operator to operator and farmers to bring workers in to meet specific short-term needs. The Senate program also includes new wage rates that are above minimum wage, but significantly below old "adverse effect wage rates" specified by U.S. Department of Labor in H2A. There are six categories of wage rates: $9.64 per hour for farm workers and laborers, $9.84 per hour for graders and sorters, $11.37 per hour for dairy and livestock, and $11.87 for equipment operators. Rates for first-line supervisors and animal breeders are yet to be finalized. There also are significant changes to the transportation cost provisions of H2A. Under the Senate plan, contract via workers must still be provided inbound transportation and return transportation must be paid by employers if they complete at least three-quarters of their contract. For at-will visa workers, however, there is no transportation cost requirement. That's because it was deemed unfair for a worker's initial employer to absorb transportation costs if he would likely be working for multiple employers during his stay.

### 2nc – solvency

**And, Growers will ignore the law**

**Santa Maria Times, ’10 ( “Why ag jobs bill won’t work”)**

Ken McCalip’s recent guest commentary urges everyone to support **the new ag jobs bill coming before Congress in 2010 because**, in his opinion, **the current H-2A guest worker program has proven to be useless.** He says we need this bill for farmers who harvest labor-intensive crops, and the new bill would provide a legal, reliable and timely path to hire foreign workers. **The reason H-2A does not work is because employers ignore their responsibilities under the law.** The H-2A program requires that employers meet specific conditions: The employer must certify that there are not sufficient U.S. workers for these jobs; the employer must establish that the alien work force will not adversely affect U.S. wages and working conditions; and the employer must provide free housing for the workers unable to return home each day, provide transportation from and back to the country of origin, provide low-cost meals, and guarantee a period of employment. **Growers ignore the law and refuse to use the e-verify system. Instead, they use cheap illegal alien laborers who are not housed or fed at employer’s expense, or provided transportation from and back to the country of origin.**

**Doesn’t Solve- High wages**

McNeill, Policy Analyst for Home- land Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, ‘9 ( Jenna Baker, “Ag JOBs Amnesty: The Wrong Way to Help American Agriculture” , Heritage)

Currently, however, **only an estimated 75,000 workers are in the H-2A program.** The reason: **It is simply too bureaucratic and expensive for employ- ers to use it effectively. The current method by which the Department of Labor calculates wages is flawed, resulting in inflated wages that are higher for H-2A workers than for American employees.** Furthermore, employers must file paperwork with multiple departments, identify specific workers when filing a petition with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and then wait for months. **This long process often means that workers are no longer available when the visas are granted. The H-2A program’s problems reduce employers’ incentives to hire employees legally. Often employers wind up hiring illegal immigrants as employees instead—making illegal border crossings all the more attractive, because illegal immigrants know there will be work whey they get to the United States.**

### 2nc – ag

**Wages are the most accurate indicators of shortages**

**Levine 9**

(Linda, specialist in labor economics for the Congressional Research Service, “Farm Labor Shortages and Immigration Policy” 11/9 pg online at http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RL30395.pdf//sd)

As previously stated, economic theory suggests that if the demand for labor is nearing or has outstripped the supply of labor, firms will in the short-run bid up wages to compete for workers. Consequently, earnings in the short-supply field would be expected to increase more rapidly than earnings across all industries or occupations. The ratio of, in this instance, **farm to nonfarm wages would accordingly be expected to rise if the farm labor supply were tight.**

**No extinction from ag collapse**

**Allouche 11**, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT, ‘11

(Jeremy, “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 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

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.** Technological 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. Boutrous 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 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 scarcity**

**Jalsevac 04** (Paul, Life site news a division of Interim Publishing, “The Inherent Racism of Population Control”, <http://www.lifesite.net/waronfamily/Population_Control/Inherentracism.pdf>)

The pattern continues today. Economist Dennis Avery explained in 1995 that, food production was more than keeping pace with population growth since the world had, “more than doubled world food output in the past 30 years. We have raised food supplies per person by 25 percent in the populous Third World.”4 The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO) also dispelled fears of shortages in the food supply when, in preparation for the World Food Summit in Rome in November of 1995 it reported that, “Globally food supplies have more than doubled in the last 40 years…at a global level, there is probably no obstacle to food production rising to meet demand.”5 The UNFAO also later estimated that, simply with the present available technologies fully employed, the world could feed 30 to 35 billion people, i.e. roughly six times the present world population.6 It also reported that the number of people considered malnourished has declined from 36 percent in 1961-1970 to 20 percent in 1988-90 and later proclaimed that “earlier fears of chronic food shortages over much of the world proved unfounded.”7 The World Bank joined in to predict in 1993 that the improvement in the world food supply would continue, while pointing out that in developing countries grain production has grown at a faster rate than population since 1985. Grain production has slowed in the United States, but that is because stocks have grown so large that additional production could not be stored.8 A further wealth of evidence is available to remove any concerns about resource shortage in the modern world

**Every indicator proves**

**Sofia Globe, 13** - Daily News from Bulgaria (3/28/13, "Global food prices decline, but remain high, World Bank says", http://sofiaglobe.com/2013/03/28/global-food-prices-decline-but-remain-high-world-bank-says/)

The prices of internationally traded food commodities continued to fall between October 2012 and February 2013, according to the World Bank’s Food Price Index.¶ Food prices have been falling for six consecutive months, but the World Bank’s Food Price Index in February 2013 was only nine per cent below the recent all-time peak in August 2012. This means that despite sustained declines, international food prices remain very high and still close to their historical peaks.¶ Prices of all the three main food categories declined during the months between October 2012 and February 2013. Prices of grains dropped by five per cent, fats and oils by four per cent, and other foods by three per cent. In the same period, the price of internationally traded wheat declined by 11 per cent, sugar by 10 per cent, and maize by six per cent. The price of soybean oil did not change, while Thai five per cent rice prices increased by one per cent.International fertiliser prices declined by five per cent during this period, while crude oil prices rose by four per cent.¶ The international prices of grains in February 2013 remained well above those of a year ago. Wheat prices in February 2013 were 15 per cent higher than in February 2012. Maize prices were eight per cent higher than a year ago, and rice prices five per cent higher than in February 2012. Because of declines in the prices of internationally traded sugar (24 per cent) and soybean oil (six per cent), other components of the World Bank’s Food Price Index, the year-on-year international food price change increased by only one per cent.¶ Lower demand in tight international cereal markets and improved conditions of current winter crops explain falling international food prices. Trade flows of wheat, maize, and rice declined in 2012 due to a combination of high prices, lower production, and lower imports of cereals from key importers.¶ A sharp fall in the global use of wheat feed and reduced maize use for ethanol in the United States have both prevented a large increase in world cereal use.¶ Favourable weather conditions have been recently reported in the European Union, the Black Sea countries (except for southern parts of the Russian Federation), China, and India. These conditions contrast with less favorable circumstances in the United States, with a protracted severe drought extended across the southern Plains.¶ Looking ahead, favourable conditions for large exporters of maize in South America – and South Africa – should also lead to abundant supplies for the rest of 2013, the World Bank report said.¶ As for rice, conditions are favourable for the main producers in East and South Asia, and among other southern hemisphere producers. Consequently, the world production of cereals for 2012-13 has recently been revised upward by both the Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] and the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA], although production remains about three per cent below 2011-12 levels.

**No impact to Russian economy**

**Blackwill, 09** – former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning (Robert, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

**No economy impact**

**Goodrich and Zeihan 09** [Lauren Goodrich, Stratfor's Director of Analysis and Senior Eurasia analyst, and Peter Zeihan, Vice President of Analysis at Stratfor, “The Financial Crisis and the Six Pillars of Russian Strength,” March 3 2009, <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20090302_financial_crisis_and_six_pillars_russian_strength>]

Thus, while Russia's financial sector may be getting torn apart, the state does **not** really **count on that sector for domestic cohesion or stability,** or for projecting power abroad. Russia knows it lacks a good track record financially, so it depends on -- and has shored up where it can -- six other pillars to maintain its (self-proclaimed) place as a major international player. The current financial crisis would crush the last five pillars for any other state, but in Russia, it has only served to strengthen these bases. Over the past few years, there was a certain window of opportunity for Russia to resurge while Washington was preoccupied with wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. This window has been kept open longer by the West's lack of worry over the Russian resurgence given the financial crisis. But others closer to the Russian border understand that Moscow has many tools more potent than finance with which to continue reasserting itself.

### 2nc – manufacturing

**Manufacturing’s not key to heg anyways**

**Reich 09** (Robert B., former U.S. Secretary of Labor, is professor of public policy at the University of California at Berkeley. His latest book is Supercapitalism, “Manufacturing Jobs Are Never Coming Back,” May 28th, 2009, Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/2009/05/28/robert-reich-manufacturing-business-economy.html> //EH)

Others argue we need more manufacturing assembly operations in the U.S. because our national security depends on it. That seems doubtful. U.S. military contractors subcontract all over the world. As long as they diversify their sources so as not to be dependent on one location or country, we’re safe. In the unlikely event that much of the rest of the world where manufacturing is now done suddenly turns on us, we can create the factories and equipment we need. We’ve mobilized for war before, quite successfully. It’s always possible that the U.S. dollar eventually drops so low that global companies find it cheaper to locate more of their assembly operations in the U.S.–but don’t hold your breath. If and when that happens, American consumers will become far poorer than we are today because everything we buy from the rest of the world will be that much costlier. I don’t want to sound like one of those rabid free-market fundamentalists who believes the market always knows best. The market is fallible, as we’ve recently and painfully experienced. And sometimes we need to consider what’s good for our economy and society as a whole regardless of where the market may lead us. But that’s exactly where I depart from those who believe we need a larger manufacturing sector in America. Creating and sustaining it would be very costly to American consumers and taxpayers. I just don’t get how those costs could possibly be justified.

**US not key—regional actors can deter escalation**

**Bandow 11** – senior fellow at the Cato Institute. A former special assistant to Ronald Reagan, he is the author of Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire (Xulon) [1-31-2011, Doug Bandow, “Solving the Debt Crisis: A Military Budget for a Republic”, January 31st, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=12746>]

¶More than two decades after the Cold War dramatically ended, the U.S. maintains a Cold War military. America has a couple score allies, dozens of security commitments, hundreds of overseas bases, and hundreds of thousands of troops overseas. Yet international hegemonic communism has disappeared, the Soviet Union has collapsed, Maoist China has been transformed, and pro-communist Third World dictatorships have been discarded in history's dustbin.¶ The European Union has a larger economy and population than America does. Japan spent decades with the world's second largest economy. South Korea has 40 times the GDP and twice the population of North Korea. As Colin Powell exclaimed in 1991, "I'm running out of demons. I'm running out of enemies. I'm down to Castro and Kim Il-sung."¶ Yet America accounts for roughly half of the globe's military outlays. In real terms the U.S. government spends more on the military today than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War. It is difficult for even a paranoid to concoct a traditional threat to the American homeland.¶ Terrorism is no replacement for the threat of nuclear holocaust. Commentator Philip Klein worries about "gutting" the military and argued that military cuts at the end of the Cold War "came back to haunt us when Sept. 11 happened." Yet the reductions, which still left America by far the world's most dominant power, neither allowed the attacks nor prevented Washington from responding with two wars.¶ And responding with two wars turned out to be a catastrophic mistake. Evil terrorism is a threat, but existential threat it is not. Moreover, the best response is not invasions and occupations — as the U.S. has learned at high cost in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Rather, the most effective tools are improved intelligence, Special Forces, international cooperation, and restrained intervention.¶ Attempts at nation-building are perhaps even more misguided than subsidizing wealthy industrialized states. America's record isn't pretty. The U.S. wasn't able to anoint its preferred Somali warlord as leader of that fractured nation. Washington's allies in the still unofficial and unstable nation of Kosovo committed grievous crimes against Serb, Roma, and other minorities. Haiti remains a failed state after constant U.S. intervention. The invasion of Iraq unleashed mass violence, destroyed the indigenous Christian community, and empowered Iran; despite elections, a liberal society remains unlikely. After nine years most Afghans dislike and distrust the corrupt government created by the U.S. and sustained only by allied arms.¶ The last resort of those who want America to do everything everywhere is to claim that the world will collapse into various circles of fiery hell without a ubiquitous and vast U.S. military presence. Yet there is no reason to believe that scores of wars are waiting to break out. And America's prosperous and populous allies are capable of promoting peace and stability in their own regions.

## 1nr

### 1nr – cir

**LA Times also says we solve the Chinese economy – solves nuclear war**

**Kaminski 07** (Antoni Z., Professor – Institute of Political Studies, “World Order: The Mechanics of Threats (Central European Perspective)”, Polish Quarterly of International Affairs, 1, p. 58)

As already argued, the economic advance of China has taken place with relatively few corresponding changes in the political system, although the operation of political and economic institutions has seen some major changes. Still, tools are missing that would allow the establishment of political and legal foundations for the modem economy, or they are too weak. The tools are efficient public administration, the rule of law, clearly defined ownership rights, efficient banking system, etc. For these reasons, many experts fear an economic crisis in China. Considering the importance of the state for the development of the global economy, the crisis would have serious global repercussions. Its political ramifications could be no less dramatic owing to the special position the military occupies in the Chinese political system, and the existence of many potential vexed issues in East Asia (disputes over islands in the China Sea and the Pacific). A potential hotbed of conflict is also Taiwan's status. Economic recession and the related destabilization of internal policies could lead to a political, or even military crisis. The likelihood of the global escalation of the conflict is high, as the interests of Russia, China, Japan, Australia and, first and foremost, the US clash in the region.

#### Link alone turns case – collapses signal and credible support -- Material engagement alone insufficient –

Cardenas and Noriega, 12

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, Mexico and the United States agreed on a $1 billion counter-narcotics assistance package. Yet, despite the enormous opportunity this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer and mutually beneficial security cooperation, the aid was so slowly delivered that Mexicans have been left to wonder if their raging drug war is a priority for the United States. Conservative lawmakers who were the driving force behind Plan Colombia a decade ago have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security as a means to fight illegal immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with bloodthirsty cartels on their own. It is time for the United States to more fully recognize that “Mexico’s drug war” is more accurately “America’s drug war” that Mexico is fighting. The US Department of Justice says that Mexico’s drug-trafficking organizations are the greatest organized crime threat in the United States. The US must suppress demand for illicit drugs through education, treatment, and law enforcement, but helping Mexico sustain this fight is an indispensable responsibility as well. Moreover, increased US bipartisan political support may encourage the Mexican people and their new president, Enrique Peña Nieto, to sustain their antidrug efforts to advance the two countries’ common security, stability, and prosperity. The United States should also provide robust and innovative material support for these efforts and institutionalize law-enforcement cooperation and information sharing that are essential to the common fight against transnational criminal groups. In Central America, the institutions of government and the rule of law have been overwhelmed by the onslaught of criminal gangs that have been displaced by Mexico’s stepped-up law enforcement. Guatemala’s state apparatus has been underfunded for decades, and the institutions of Honduras have been weakened by a succession of populist caudillo presidents, systematic corruption, and the expanding presence of organized crime. El Salvador confronts the unique challenge of hardened gang members deported from the United States maintaining their ties to criminal networks in US urban centers. A public-security crisis in these countries has undermined popular confidence in elected officials and overwhelmed poorly trained and equipped security forces. Unless the United States and neighboring countries organize an international response, several of these countries may soon become ungovernable territories, producing economic failure, civil strife, and refugee crises. This challenge requires a regional rescue plan (led by the United States, Mexico, Colombia, Europe, and the multilateral development banks). The United States should encourage interested nations to organize a summit of governments and institutions to develop such a plan and agree on how it should be implemented and funded. But by far the greatest threat to security and stability in the Americas is the narco-state that has taken root in Venezuela under the unaccountable regime of Hugo Chávez. This hostile regime is managed by Cuba’s security apparatus, funded by China, armed by Russia, and partnered with Iran, Hezbollah, and Colombian and Mexican narco-traffickers. US law enforcement and federal prosecutors have gathered fresh, compelling evidence implicating senior Venezuelan officials and Chávez himself in narcotics trafficking in collusion with Colombian terrorist groups. Chávez has also forged an important strategic alliance with Iran to allow it to evade international sanctions and carry its asymmetrical threat against the United States to the country’s doorstep. Even as the international community implements new financial sanctions to deny Teheran the means to sustain a uranium enrichment program, the regime has established dozens of shadowy commercial enterprises and banks in Venezuela to launder as much as $30 billion through its petro-economy. Certainly the drug kingpins managing Venezuela today have everything to lose when Chávez succumbs to cancer. Several ruthless, anti-United States governments have a stake in trying to engineer a chavista succession, even as the government struggles with an unsustainable fiscal situation, a collapsing economy, social polarization, and a public-security crisis. In short, within the next several years, Venezuela will become a manmade disaster that will impact regional security and energy supply. America’s current policy of evading responsibility for the implosion in Venezuela is untenable and dangerous. Every serious government in the Americas has a stake in addressing these issues before they become unmanageable. The crises in Central America and Venezuela will require US leadership, intelligent diplomacy, and resources to organize an effective multilateral response. The following are recommendations for addressing these issues, listed by country or region. The Americas: Renew emphasis on intelligence capabilities and mission to confront extraregional threats and cross-border criminality; Increase dialogue with regional and European military, intelligence, and security agencies on common threats; Direct US Northern and Southern Commands, the US Coast Guard, and the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to provide “surge” engagement plans for additional funding and other support; Ensure better cooperation from the US State Department with law enforcement and intelligence efforts. Mexico: Develop strong bipartisan support in the US Congress for Mexican counternarcotics efforts and for treating Mexico as not just an “enforcer” but an ally against drug trafficking cartels, and emphasize common “North American” strategies; Set up an interagency US-Mexico financial crimes unit based at the US Treasury to improve targeting of organized-crime money-laundering operations to cripple the financial solvency of the cartels.

#### Guest worker will pass with CIR—wage minimum, labor shortages, and weakened opposition from unions

Elias 13

(Thomas, masters in journalism from Stanford, “Farm labor shortages may drive immigration changes” Sandiego Source, newspaper, May 10, pg online at http://www.sddt.com/Commentary/article.cfm?SourceCode=20130510tza&Commentary\_ID=109&\_t=Farm+labor+shortages+may+drive+immigration+changes#.Ucypofkphsk//sd)

The proposed visa would not specify a single employer for each worker, so that employers could no longer discipline migrant workers by threatening to have them deported if they’re not docile. It would also include wages above the federal minimum and require decent working conditions. The Chamber also agreed to the unions’ idea of setting up a new government bureau to curtail work visas when unemployment rises to as-yet unspecified levels. Two things are clear from all this: It’s highly likely that any major immigration change legislation passing Congress this year will have a guest-worker component. And that this is happening mainly because of the labor shortages here and in other big farm states.

#### CIR solves us ag- keeps jobs in the us

Witchata Business Journal 6/24/13 (cites Thomas Vilsack, US secretary of Agriculture, Ag secretary: Immigration reform vital for industry growth, http://www.bizjournals.com/wichita/morning\_call/2013/06/ag-secretary-immigration-reform-vital.html)

A "broken" immigration policy is harmful to agribusiness, says U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Thomas Vilsack. The Kansas City Business Journal reports Vilsack spoke in Kansas City last week in support of a bipartisan immigration reform bill now in the U.S. Senate. The KCBJ story has full details on his talk. One key point Vilsack made was that the agriculture industry needs a stable work force, and he said migrant workers have been crucial to that work force, but that many of them are undocumented. If the United States doesn't figure out a way to make these workers legally and consistently available to farmers, crops, jobs and money will go elsewhere, he said.

#### And we’re key to hegemony – prevents military shortages

Mian 5 (Zia, Ph.D. and Physicist with the Program on Science and Global Security – Princeton University, “The Unraveling of the US Military”, AntiWar, 9-14, http://www.antiwar.com/orig/mian.php?articleid=7258)

Newspapers describe the U.S. Army as "facing one of the greatest recruiting challenges in its history." The U.S. military is deeply worried. General Barry McCaffrey, now a professor at the West Point, [wrote in the Wall Street Journal](http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110006902) that the U.S. is in a "race against time" in Iraq because of the strains on the military – the military is "starting to unravel." He argues that, "The U.S. Army and the Marines are too under-manned and under-resourced to sustain this security policy beyond next fall." The consequences are great. For McCaffrey, the U.S. military in Iraq is "the crown jewel of our national security guarantee to the American people in the war on terror." This threatens the future of the American wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and as McCaffrey puts it, "Failure would be a disaster for U.S. foreign policy and economic interests for the next 20 years." Sending in more troops, the American solution year after year in the Vietnam War, does not seem to be an option. President Bush has said that he would send more troops to Iraq if the military commanders in the field asked for them. He claims that they have not done so. But others suggest a more serious obstacle. Senator Harry Reid (D-Nev.), the Senate minority leader, has said that U.S. military commanders in Iraq have told him that they need more troops but they know none are available. Reed has said, "The conclusion I reach is that they know the soldiers aren't there, so why ask for something you know doesn't exist?" A recent study by the RAND Corporation, a military think-tank, "[Stretched Thin: Army Forces for Sustained Operations](http://www.rand.org/publications/MG/MG362/)" found that the troop shortage in the Army is so severe that it calls into question the Pentagon's policy of being able to fight two major regional wars at the same time while also having sufficient soldiers for the war on terrorism and providing security in America. A recent meeting of the National Governors' Association, which brings together the governors of the states, registered the governors' concern that deployment of National Guard soldiers in Iraq was leaving their states unable to deal with possible natural disasters and other emergencies, with one governor exclaiming that "we don't have personnel – whether it is full time or part time – to take care of all the needs and concerns of Americans." Recruitment Problems Little of this seems to resonate with the public. So far this year, the U.S. Army is reported to be 40 percent short of its recruitment target. The Army has failed to meet its monthly recruiting goals in each of the preceding four months. In mid-July, the U.S. military reported that the Army National Guard, which makes up more than one-third of the U.S. soldiers in Iraq, had missed its recruiting goal for the ninth straight month. This was an understatement of the larger trend. The Army National Guard has apparently missed its recruiting targets for at least 17 of the last 18 months. U.S. Army Chief of Staff General Peter Schoomaker told the Senate "We've got enormous challenges" when it comes to recruitment of new soldiers. The Army's goal of 80,000 new recruits for this year "is at serious risk," and next year "may be the toughest recruiting environment ever." These recruiting problems, he believes, are likely to stretch "well into the future." These problems are despite the enormous incentives now being offered to join the military. There is a joining bonus of $90,000 paid over three years, of which $20,000 is in cash and $70,000 in benefits, along with a canceling of the loans many a young American must take to afford to go to college. There are reports also that people almost 40 years old are now eligible to join the military, and that the physical and intellectual standards for recruits have been lowered. The fall in recruitment is strongest in the African-American community (12 percent of the U.S. population) and among women. African-Americans made up almost a quarter of Army recruits in 2000, now their numbers have fallen to less than 14 percent. The number of women Army recruits has dropped from 22 percent in 2000 to about 17 percent. Women make up about 15 percent of the military in total. The Military Path to Citizenship About 7 percent of the U.S. military are not citizens. There are about 30,000 foreign soldiers in the U.S. military from more than 100 countries; more than a third are Hispanic. To encourage recruitment, in 2002 the Bush administration made it easier for foreign-born U.S. troops to become naturalized citizens. Now, any legal resident who joins the military can immediately petition for citizenship rather than wait the five years required for civilians to start this process. They do not even have to pay the several hundred dollar fee for this process. As an added incentive, if a foreign-born soldier who is a U.S. citizen dies in the line of duty, the foreign-born members of his or her family can now seek citizenship, even if they are not legal residents. It is also possible for soldiers to be made citizens after they have died in service and for their families to then become eligible for citizenship. Despite all this, the numbers of non-citizens joining the military is falling fast. The number has fallen by 20 percent since 2001. It is not slowing down, as much of the decline came last year. It is not just those would be foot soldiers who are staying away. Those with the most to defend are less willing to do so. Army's Reserve Officers' Training Corps, which trains and commissions more than 60 percent of the new Army officers each year, has been facing similar problems. It now has the fewest participants in nearly a decade, with recruitment having fallen by more than 16 percent over the past two years. In a recent article in Harpers, Lewis Lapham pointed out that there is a longer-term process at work here, noting that almost half of the 1956 graduating class from Princeton University went into the military (400 out of a total of 900 students), but from the class of 2004, there were only nine students who joined out of a class of 1,100. The children of America's elite see no future for themselves in the military. And there are some soldiers who see this. The story is told of a U.S. Marine who returned to California after a tour of duty in Iraq and was invited to speak at a "gated community" in Malibu as a war hero. He told his audience "I am not a hero. … Guys like me are just a necessary part of things. To maintain this way of life in a fine community like this, you need psychos like us to go and drop a bomb on somebody's house." In its efforts to find out why there are now such problems with recruitment, the Army called in the research company Millward Brown to do a study. It found that the resistance was due to popular objection to the war in Iraq, the casualties, and media coverage of the torture at Abu Ghraib. The study reportedly concluded that, "Reasons for not considering military service are increasingly based on objections to the Iraq situation and aversion to the military." In short, the Bush administration has failed to make its case for the war in Iraq. Now, people see and read about what really happens in war, and towns and cities are facing the reality of the 1,900 or so [American military deaths](http://antiwar.com/casualties/) and well over 14,000 wounded so far in Iraq. A June 2005 Gallup poll found that in the past five years the proportion of Americans who said they would support their child's entering the military has fallen from two-thirds to about half. This has not all happened spontaneously. Across the U.S., there is a growing campaign against military recruitment that is bringing parents, teachers, and peace activists to protect students from military recruiters. Retention Also a Problem It is not just recruitment. The military has been having problems keeping its soldiers. Almost 30 percent of new recruits leave within six months. Some of this is at least due to the vast gap between the day-to-day experiences of young people before they join up and the life of a recruit during training. Stories talk of recruits who "can't eat, they literally vomit every time they put a spoon in their mouths, they're having nightmares." Bonuses are being offered to encourage soldiers to re-enlist once their service is over. It is reported that re-enlistment bonuses can be as high as $150,000, depending on the specialty and length of re-enlistment. Some reports suggest the Army has started to lower its standards for soldier performance, and so reduce losses. The Wall Street Journal has reported a military memo directing commanders not to dismiss soldiers for poor fitness, unsatisfactory performance, or even for pregnancy, alcoholism, and drug abuse. There are problems with desertion. The Pentagon has admitted that more than 5,500 soldiers have deserted since the start of the Iraq war. In comparison, 1,509 deserted in 1995. The cases that have become public have said that they did so because they are opposed to the war. A telephone hotline to help soldiers who want to leave the military has reported that the number of calls it is receiving is now double of what it was in 2001 – the hotline answered 33,000 calls last year. A New Army of Mercenaries? Max Boot, a prominent military commentator, named among "the 500 most influential people in the United States in the field of foreign policy," has offered his solution for the problem of finding people to fight America's wars. In a recent article, Boot proposed that the path to a bigger American Army lay in offering a new deal, "[Defend America, Become American](http://www.cfr.org/publication.html?id=8186)." Boot has proposed that the U.S. should look beyond just U.S. citizens and permanent, legal residents for soldiers to fight in its military. He has proposed a "Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act," a DREAM Act, as he puts it, that would offer legal status to the children of illegal immigrants residing in the U.S. and eligibility for citizenship if they can meet a number of conditions, including graduating from high school, and if they go to college or choose to serve in the military. A bill to this effect was introduced in the U.S. Senate but has not been voted on yet.

#### Labor supports CIR

Blau 7-10-13

Reporter for the Herald-Times

Jon Blau Wednesday, July 10, 2013 5:15 pm “Local Democrats, union leaders line up to support immigration reform” http://www.heraldtimesonline.com/news/local/local-democrats-union-leaders-line-up-to-support-immigration-reform/article\_e2357a54-e9a5-11e2-a4f8-0019bb30f31a.html

With the Senate’s immigration reform bill heading to the U.S. House of Representatives, local politicians and union leaders gathered Wednesday at the Monroe County Courthouse to advocate for the legislation’s passage. Monroe County Commissioner Iris Kiesling, once an immigrant from the Netherlands herself, was flanked by fellow Democrats and supporters of comprehensive immigration reform, including Mayor Mark Kruzan, Bloomington City Council President Darryl Neher, Monroe County Council members Shelli Yoder and Lee Jones, Indiana AFL-CIO President Nancy Guyott and White River Central Labor Council President Jackie Yenna.

#### Changes to guest worker cap cause union backlash

Gannett 7-3-13

Reporter for the Gannett Washington Bureau

Erin Kelly, “Immigration bill faces tough path in full Senate” Gannett Washington Bureau 4:21 a.m. EDT June 3, 2013 http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/06/03/immigration-reform-bill/2376243/

Jacoby said she doesn't think the bill will drastically change on the Senate floor, even though she and other business advocates would like to see an increase in the number of visas made available to lower-skilled workers. She cited the influence of the labor giant AFL-CIO, which seeks to protect American workers. "There will be some drama, but I think a lot of it is locked in by the Gang of Eight," said Jacoby, whose organization is a national coalition of small- and medium-size-business owners that pushes for immigration reforms to benefit employers. "They have a pretty protective approach, the Gang of Eight does, and they feel that if they change any of the labor stuff, the AFL will bolt, and that basically gives the AFL a trump card."

#### Unions key to Dems

Mooney 2-6-13

CNN White House producer

“Unions could again be key to immigration reform” February 6, 2013 Alex Mooney http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/05/politics/immigration-reform-unions

It should come as no surprise that prominent union leaders are among the first group President Barack Obama courts as he seeks support for overhauling immigration policy. It was organized labor that helped ensure defeat of a bipartisan effort to reform the nation's immigration laws five years ago. At that time, the AFL-CIO and other prominent union groups came out against the initiative, fearing a proposal for a temporary guest worker program for seasonal workers would weaken union membership and bargaining clout. That led to a handful of liberal-leaning Democrats to vote against the bill, including Sens. Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin and Debbie Stabenow. Mindful that a potential split in the Democratic coalition this time around could again prove fatal to the passage of an immigration bill, Obama met on Tuesday with more than a dozen labor leaders. They included AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka, Eliseo Medina of the Service Employees International Union, and Arturo Rodriguez of United Farm Workers.

**Dems need to compromise**

**Wagstaff 6/12**

[Keith, syndicated senior political columnist, “4 Key Factors that Will Decide Immigration Reform's Fate,” The Week, 6/12/13, http://theweek.com/article/index/245486/4-key-factors-that-will-decide-immigration-reforms-fate]

4. **The bill's fate** also **depends on how much Democrats are willing to compromise**¶ **While Democrats certainly have a list of changes** they would like added to the bill — including Sen. Patrick Leahy's amendment to allow immigrants to sponsor their same-sex partners for green cards — **their main focus will be on how far they're willing to bend to get 60 or even 70** votes in the Senate.¶ "**I want to get as many votes as we can, but not at the expense of the basic agreement,**" Sen. Dick **Durbin** (D-Ill.) **told Politico**. "When some of my friends announce 70 votes, they create an incentive for Republicans to dream up things that they either needed in this bill or outside of it. And we need to temper that."¶ **Even if Democrats can get the votes they need in the Senate, they still have to consider whether the bill will pass the more conservative House, where partisan arguments have stalled progress** on its own immigration bill.

**Budget Victory Gives Obama PC**

By Steve **Holland and** Mark **Felsenthal 10/17** 2013 Crisis averted, Obama says Americans 'completely fed up' with Washington http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/17/us-usa-fiscal-obama-idUSBRE99G0R720131017

Hours after he signed into law a bill hastily cobbled together to end the crisis, Obama said events over the past two weeks had inflicted "completely unnecessary" damage on the U.S. economy.¶ An increase in borrowing costs caused by the near-debt default was harmful and consumers cut back on spending with hundreds of thousands of government workers suddenly idled, he said.¶ "There was no economic rationale for all of this," he said.¶ Though bruised by the battle, **Obama emerged as the clear winner**. He immediately sought to use the political capital gained to advance a domestic policy agenda centered around a fresh round of budget talks and an effort to win approval of two stalled items, immigration reform and a farm bill.¶ He did not mention an urgent challenge facing him now: Repairing the flaws in his signature healthcare law that have prevented many Americans from even signing up for it.¶ Obama issued an aggressive challenge to Congress, particularly the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, to stop focusing on who wins and loses political battles and get to work with him on issues critical to improving the economy.