# Generic Neg Cards

## Theory / IL Cards

### Capital key to getting the plan

#### Presidential influence is key on foreign economic policies – use influence to convince legislators

**Milner & Tingley ’11** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “Who Supports Global Economic

Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy”, <http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)> (JN)

Fleisher, Krutz, and Hanna show that presidents’ rate of success in getting their legislation in foreign policy passed is extremely high, and higher than in domestic policy 35 These data suggest that presidents’ foreign policy concerns can often override the local constituency interests of legislators. According to this argument, domestic political economy or ideological factors reﬂected in their constituencies should have little predictable effect on legislators’ support for aid or trade policy; rather, legislators’ support should change as the president’s party and foreign policy interests change. 36 Interestingly, in all of the votes we study in which presidents take a position, presidents have endorsed bills that oppose protectionism and/or liberalize trade and promote economic aid. Hence getting legislators to vote with them means that presidents must convince those who oppose international engagement to support it. Unlike other political economy studies of preferences for trade or aid, we explore the potential inﬂuence of the president and his foreign policy concerns. Unlike existing studies of the inﬂuence of the president, we study political economy variables as well.

Additionally, previous work evaluating the inﬂuence of the president on foreign policy has assumed little differentiation across issue areas+ Some studies do acknowledge differences across issue areas in presidential power, but this research tends to distinguish only between foreign economic policy and military/security policy in general. 37 Our study is the ﬁrst to document differences in the inﬂuence of the president over Congress among types of foreign economic policy, while also assessing important political economy and ideological factors that inﬂuence legislators as well.

### President Gets Drawn In

#### President gets involved in matters of foreign policy – executive influence is necessary to overcome lawmakers focus on domestic earmarks

**Milner & Tingley ’11** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “Who Supports Global Economic

Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy”, <http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)> (JN)

Presidents answer to a national constituency and have a constitutional responsibility to promote security. This lends itself to a global outlook and the projection of U+S+ power and inﬂuence abroad. Congress, on the other hand, is comprised of electorally independent legislators who are selected by smaller geographic constituencies; therefore, legislators tend to have a more parochial outlook. They have more to gain by protecting domestic earmarks than they do by allocating foreign aid These studies often debate the relative importance of Congress and the president in foreign policy; an important contribution of this research has been to underline[s] the strong powers of the president in this area Certain studies of foreign economic policy, so called “statist” theories, have also argued for the dominance of the executive branch. In particular, national security concerns often generate support for the president’s position in Congress: “even if members’ personal preferences would lead them to disagree with the president, their operative preferences are likely to be shaped by public support for the White House during periods of international tension.” This approach suggests that rather than responding to domestic constituency pressures, legislators respond to the president. It also suggests that the president is most powerful when national security concerns can be credibly invoked.

#### President shapes opinions on trade and aid – gets involved because of knowledge and responsibility

**Milner & Tingley ’11** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “Who Supports Global Economic

Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy”, <http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)> (JN)

Studies of foreign policy often claim that the president is the dominant actor.

Legislators follow the president’s lead because presidents have more intense preferences and better knowledge about foreign policy. In this theory, presidents have

strong preferences over policies such as aid and trade because these are important

foreign policy tools, and presidents are responsible for responding to foreign policy challenges.

### PC real

#### PC key – rhetorical statements to appeal to partisan policies

Azari et al 13 - Julia Azari is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Marquette University. She holds Ph.D., M.A. and M.Phil. degrees in political science from Yale University, and a B.A. in political science from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Lara M. Brown, Ph.D., works as a political analyst and author in Washington, D.C. Zim G. Nwokora is Post-Doctoral Fellow in Politics at the Centre for Governance and Public Policy at Griffith University in Australia (Julia, Lara, and Zim, “The Presidential Leadership Dilemma: Between the Constitution and a Political Party “, SUNY Press, April 1 2013, <http://books.google.com/books?id=PI-BsfRcoxYC&dq=political+capital+%22obama%22&lr=&source=gbs_navlinks_s>)//CB

Finally, the analysis offers a basic model assessing factors that explain why the president may choose rhetorical over constitutional signing statements. The results are consistent with some of our previous work. 51 Divided part control and low approval level place presidents at considerable disadvantage in building coalitions to pass policy. When presidents can’t count on the party for congressional majorities, building up political capital in order to persuade becomes paramount. Thus, we find that presidents rely significantly more upon rhetorical statements as opposed to the constitutional types under conditions of divided government. Likewise, the results suggest that a president’s incentive to use rhetorical statements rises significantly as his public standing decreases. Last, the results suggest another intriguing possibility for the rhetorical signing statement. The models demonstrate a significant correlation with a president’s legislative success. One plausible explanation that is consistent with some of the anecdotal evidence is that presidents use the rhetorical statements to appeal for other policies. If the rhetorical statement can be used to reach out to constituencies and build capital, then such appeals may appreciably affect subsequent policy success. This result certainly merits further inquiry that we leave for a later time.

#### PC real – used to appeal for policies and political pressure

Azari et al 13 - Julia Azari is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Marquette University. She holds Ph.D., M.A. and M.Phil. degrees in political science from Yale University, and a B.A. in political science from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Lara M. Brown, Ph.D., works as a political analyst and author in Washington, D.C. Zim G. Nwokora is Post-Doctoral Fellow in Politics at the Centre for Governance and Public Policy at Griffith University in Australia (Julia, Lara, and Zim, “The Presidential Leadership Dilemma: Between the Constitution and a Political Party “, SUNY Press, April 1 2013, <http://books.google.com/books?id=PI-BsfRcoxYC&dq=political+capital+%22obama%22&lr=&source=gbs_navlinks_s>)//CB

As we have suggested, the rhetorical type of signing statement may serve as a very potent political tool designed to enhance the president’s standing with the nation, with the Congress, with his or her political party, or other key political constituencies. The rhetorical statements can do this by reminding the public/media that the president can deliver successful policy, frame policy arguments and/or the perception of bipartisanship, reach out to the constituency groups, and sometimes even appeal for future policy change. In this way, rhetorical statements may be used to motivate, reward, and build political capital among various constituencies. Certainly, credit claiming represents one notable feature of the rhetorical statements. Work on such credit-claiming appeals suggest that presidents have incentives to highlight their legislative success and will therefore have incentives to highlight their legislative success and will therefore appeal on policies that are expected to pass. 42 However, we don’t think the rhetorical signing statement represents a simple costless credit claiming device, otherwise presidents would likely use them on all legislation that landed on their desks. Instead, as found with presidential appeals more generally, their effectiveness diminishes with greater use.

So, if rhetorical signing statements are used to enhance a president’s standing in the eyes of national or narrower partisan constituencies, what conditions would make such tools the most desirable? In other words, when does the president have the greatest need or incentive to claim credit form the broader public or build political capital? One plausible answer, it would seem, is related to when the president’s persuasive capacity is appreciably diminished or when presidents are competing with Congress, rather than leading Congress. We argue that such conditions are more likely during divided government and when presidential approval levels are relatively low. That is, presidents may need their persuasive powers the most when they don’t have the seats in Congress to build coalitions or high approval levels that can be used to pressure lawmakers to support presidential initiatives. This line of argument suggests a couple of testable expectations. First, the condition of divided government should provide presidents with greater incentives to use the rhetorical signing statement as compared to the condition of unified government. Second, we expect presidents should have a greater incentive to employ the rhetorical signing statement when their standing with the public is low as compared to when their approval is high.

Moreover, if the rhetorical statements are used as opportunities to claim credit and appreciably boost political capital, there should be some connection between rhetorical statements and a president’s subsequent policy success. We only speak to this tangentially in our empirical analysis, but there is at least anecdotal evidence supporting such a contention. That is, presidents do use rhetorical signing statements to appeal for a subsequent policy or call on Congress to pass a specific policy in the future within the same rhetorical signing statement. The rhetorical signing statement George W. Bush attached to HR 7222 (the Andean Trade Preference Act) does a number of the things we have discussed such as reminds the public that the president can successfully deliver policy; shares credit with Congress and key political actors; and frames arguments of free trade in a positive light. But, importantly, this signing statement also explicitly appeals to Congress for future trade agreements. President Bush makes his case on this point:

Seems to me, it’d make a lot of sense to simply – asking the Congress to sign a trade deal that allows us to be treated just like we’ve treated other people. Unfortunately, nearly 2 years have passed since the United States and Colombia signed our free trade agreement, Colombia – Congress can directly benefit American workers and ranchers and farmers and give them greater confidence about our economic future. Congress is coming back to Washington next month. One of their top priorities should be to approve this vital agreement with Colombia, as well as with Panama and South Korea. 43

### A2 ideology trumps

#### Presidential influence overcomes ideological differences

**Milner & Tingley ’10** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF U.S. FOREIGN AID:

AMERICAN LEGISLATORS AND THE DOMESTIC POLITICS

OF AID”, [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/dtingley/files/enp.pdf)](http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)) (JN)

Inﬂuence of President. The executive branch employs aid as a part of its foreign policy and so issues the initial foreign aid budget to Congress. For some scholars, presidents have much more inﬂuence over foreign policy than they do on domestic policy, and more inﬂuence than the public or Congress (Canes-Wrone et al., 2008; Howell and Pevehouse, 2007). The preferences of the executive may inﬂuence aid policy as the president invokes national security or his greater knowledge of foreign aﬀairs to elicit support from legislators. Party dynamics may also aﬀect legislative voting as presidents strongly lobby members of their own party to support their foreign policy goals.

### A2 Intrinsicness

#### Intrinsicness ignores the real world – debating the political consequences of actions is necessary

Volokh 03 Gary T. Schwartz Professor of Law at the UCLA School of Law [Eugene Volokh, The Mechanisms of the Slippery Slope, 116 Harv. L. Rev. 1026, 1136-37 (2003)]

Let me return to the question with which this article began: When should you oppose one decision A, which you don't much mind on its own, because of a concern that it might later lead others to enact another decision B, which you strongly oppose?

One possible answer is “never.” You should focus, the argument would go, on one decision at a time. If you like it on its own terms, vote for it; if you don't, oppose it; but don't worry about the slippery slope. And in the standard first-order approximation of human behavior, where people are perfectly informed, have firm, well-developed opinions, and have single-peaked preferences, slippery slopes are indeed unlikely. People decide whether they prefer 0, A, or B, and the majority's preferences become law without much risk that one decision will somehow trigger another.

Likewise, in such a world, law has no expressive effect on people's attitudes, people's decisions are context-independent, no one is ignorant, rationally or not, and people make decisions based on thorough analysis rather than on heuristics. Policy decisions in that world end up being easier to make and to analyze.

But as behavioral economists, norms theorists, and others have pointed out, that is not the world we live in, even if it is sometimes a useful first-order approximation. The real world is more complex, and this complexity makes possible slippery slopes and their close relative, path dependence. We can't just dismiss slippery slope arguments as illogical or paranoid,330 though we can't uncritically accept them, either.

1137 The slippery slope is in some ways a helpful metaphor, but as with many metaphors, it starts by enriching our vision and ends by clouding it. 331 We need to go beyond the metaphor and examine the specific mechanisms that cause the phenomenon that the metaphor describes--mechanisms that connect to the nature of our political institutions, our judicial process, and possibly even human reasoning. These mechanisms and their effects deserve further study, even if paying attention to them will make policy analysis more complex. So long as our support of one political or legal decision today can lead to other results tomorrow, wise judges, legislators, opinion leaders, interest group organizers, and citizens have to take these mechanisms into account.

## Engagement

### Force Trade-offs

#### Trade and aid policies require trade-offs due to constituency pressures

**Milner & Tingley ’11** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “Who Supports Global Economic

Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy”, <http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)> (JN)

Foreign aid and trade policy are logically substitutable according to this theory. Most and Starr argue that trade and aid can be conceptualized as policy tools serving the goal of “adaptation for coordination or collaboration” As such, according to substitutability theory, these foreign policies could be “alternative routes by which decision makers attain their goals; decision makers who are confronted with some problem or subjected to some stimulus could, under at least certain conditions, substitute one such means for another” Leaders should be able to choose between them to best address pressure emanating from the international environment.  
However, these two policies may have different domestic consequences and thus require different domestic support coalitions+ Presidents may have a hard time switching between different policies if their domestic consequences—and hence their domestic support groups—are distinct+ Legislators whose votes are necessary for such policy substitutions are often caught between the president’s foreign policy priorities and their own domestic constituency pressures+

In other words, while the president may view aid and trade policies as essentially the same because they achieve the same foreign policy goal, they are not viewed as substitutable by certain domestic groups, and therefore some members of Congress who support one policy will not support the other, and vice-versa. As one scholar of foreign policy notes, Many issues in international negotiations can only be resolved by trade-offs involving packaged linkages between unrelated items. Such tradeoffs can often produce net results that are strongly beneﬁcial to the collective national interest of the US but may disadvantage the interests of some US domestic subgroups+ In such situations, and they occur daily, an organized special interest group that fears prospective disadvantage will seek to summon the aid of members of Congress or key ofﬁcials in executive branch departments. Where the political balance in a congressman’s district is close, and such an interest group is locally strong, he must listen to the group attentively or decide that political life no longer interests him.

### Trade Policies require Presidential Influence

#### Statistical support proves presidential influence overcomes ideology on trade

**Milner & Tingley ’11** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “Who Supports Global Economic

Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy”, <http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)> (JN)

For trade, the inﬂuence of the president is much more sizeable, a 26 percent increase in the probability of voting for trade. To assess the magnitude of this variable, we determine how much the skill or ideology variables in the trade votes would need to change to produce an effect equivalent to the inﬂuence of the president. The skill variable would need to move from the 10th to the 90th percentiles of its distribution and the ideology variable from the 25th to the 75th percentiles, both relatively large changes. Presidential inﬂuence matters for trade policy in ways that prior research has neglected, and this inﬂuence matters more than in economic aid policy.

## Cuba

### Costs PC

#### Obama doesn’t want to spend Political Capital on Cuba.

Padgett 8/23/10 (Tim, Author at TIME magazine, “Will the White House Fight to End the Cuba Travel Ban?”, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html)

But another reason to be confident, says Colvin, is that "this is the best diplomatic environment we've seen in a long time" for dismantling the embargo. That's because last month, Cuban President Raúl Castro, after a dissident hunger striker died earlier this year, released 52 political prisoners who were locked up in 2003 by his elder brother, then President Fidel Castro (who ceded power to Raúl in 2006 due to ill health). Obama last year had left the ball in Havana's court when he reversed his predecessor's policy and let Cuban Americans travel and send remittances more freely to Cuba. Raúl's prisoner release, say diplomats, now makes the next move Obama's, and many see his new travel regulations as part of that. But it's doubtful the Castros will feel international pressure to reciprocate, with further democratic or economic openings in Cuba, unless the travel ban that's been in place since 1963 is eradicated.

Proponents of doing just that insist there's more consensus than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. Opening Cuba to Americans, they believe, will do more to stimulate democratization there than isolating it has. Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree.

Still, for all the good vibes the bill's backers feel from the White House right now, some note warily that Obama has been loath to spend political capital in Cuba, or the rest of Latin America for that matter. Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against coup leaders in Honduras, who'd ousted a leftist President, when conservative Republicans in Congress objected.

Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, a Democrat, are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel. "This is not the time to ease the pressure on the Castro regime," Menendez said this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." As a result, says one congressional aide who asked not to be identified, when it comes time for the White House to give the bill more full-throated support, "there's a fear they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."

But Democratic Congressman Howard Berman of California, a co-sponsor of the bill, says tearing down the travel ban is about more than Cuban rights — it's also about the constitutional rights of U.S. citizens to travel freely abroad. "Letting U.S. citizens travel to Cuba is not a gift to the Castros — it is in the interest of our own citizens," Berman said after the House committee vote this summer. "It's time to trust our own people and restore their right to travel." It's the sort of argument Obama usually agrees with. But now he may need to show how strongly he concurs when Congress returns next month.

### Plan costs capital – other priorities

#### Plan unpopular – Obama expending PC elsewhere

Hadar 9 - Leon T. Hadar is a research fellow in foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute in Washington DC (Leon, “Obama Must Move beyond Pseudo-Events”, Lebanon Daily Star, May 11 2009, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/obama-must-move-beyond-pseudoevents>)//CB

But style and media management aside, it is too early to conclude whether Obama will press ahead in transforming foreign policy pseudo-events into real events. His continuing preoccupation with the economic crisis clearly limits his ability to launch dramatic diplomatic initiatives. Doing away with the embargo with Cuba or reassessing US policy in the Middle East would require costly fights with powerful forces in Washington. For now, Obama is expending his political capital elsewhere.

There is no doubt that through his personality and life-story, coupled with the manufactured media events, friendly gestures and cool style, Obama has been provided with an opportunity to change America’s global brand name. But the expectations created by the new president’s media image and style of foreign policy need to be matched to specific policy. Such new initiatives in the foreign policy arena will force Obama to use his political capital.

Without a speedy end to the recession, it is more likely that Obama will continue muddling through in the global arena and refrain from enunciating any coherent grand strategy. The danger is that political players at home and abroad will attempt to advance their policy agendas that may conflict with Obama’s. If their efforts ignite a global crisis, that would test more than the new president’s style and public relations skills.

### A2 less unpopular now

#### The embargo is still controversial

Planas 2/07/2012 ( Roque, author FOX news,” US Embargo on Cuba Turns 50”, http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2012/02/07/us-embargo-on-cuba-turns-50/)

Within the United States, public opinion favors reestablishing diplomatic relations with Cuba, while the embargo itself remains controversial. A poll released by Angus Reid on Monday found two-thirds favor reestablishing diplomatic ties, while only 51 percent supported ending the embargo.

Cuban Americans remain slightly more wary of an opening, though generational change and the influx of immigrants born after the revolution has dampened the aggressive anti-Castroism that once characterized the community.

A Florida International University poll of Cuban Americans conducted in September of last year found that 57 percent favored removing travel restrictions to the island for all Americans and 58 percent supported reestablishing diplomatic relations. By contrast, 56 percent of Cuban Americans said they still supported the trade embargo, even though 80 percent said they did not believe the policy worked well.

Francisco Hernandez, the president of the Cuban American National Foundation, explained why Cuban-Americans may hold seemingly contradictory views about the sanctions.

## Mexico

### Trade Talks Unpopular

#### TPP’s with Mexico are unpopular – isolation from Congress still fuels opposition

**Trew & Rocha ’12** (Stuart Trew and Manuel Perez-Rocha, Stuart Trew is the trade campaigner for the Council of Canadians.Manuel Pérez Rocha is a Mexican national and an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington D.C., “Don’t expand NAFTA”, <http://fpif.org/dont_expand_nafta/>) (JN)

With Canada and Mexico joining the TPP, the agreement is looking more and more like a substitute for the FTAA. So it is not surprising that opposition to the TPP is growing as quickly as it did against that former attempt to expand the neoliberal model throughout the Western hemisphere.

The intense secrecy of the TPP negotiations is not helping the Obama administration make its case. In their statement, North American unions “call on our governments to work with us to include in the TPP provisions to ensure strong worker protections, a healthy environment, safe food and products, and the ability to regulate financial and other markets to avoid future global economic crises.” But the truth is that only big business is partaking in consultations, with 600 lobbyists having exclusive passwords to online versions of the negotiating text.

A majority of Democratic representatives (132 out of 191) have expressed that they are “troubled that important policy decisions are being made without full input from Congress.” They have written to U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk to urge him and his staff to “engage in broader and deeper consultations with members of the full range of committees of Congress whose jurisdiction touches on the wide-ranging issues involved, and to ensure there is ample opportunity for Congress to have input on critical policies that will have broad ramifications for years to come.” In their letter, the representatives also challenge “the lack of transparency of the treaty negotiation process, and the failure of negotiators to meaningfully consult with states on the far-reaching impact of trade agreements on state and local laws, even when binding on our states, is of grave concern to us.” U.S. Senators, for their part, have also sent a letter complaining of the lack of congressional access to the negotiations. What openness and transparency can we in Canada and Mexico expect when the decision to join the TPP, under humiliating conditions, was made without any public consultation?

### Aid Unpopular

#### Lack of concern for Human Rights keeps putting aid to Mexico on the backburner

**Seelke ’13** (Clare Ribando Seelke, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, “Mexico and the 112th Congress”, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32724.pdf>) (JN)

Those conditions would retain the condition related to torture, as well as require the State Department to report that Mexico has reformed its military justice code and is requiring police and military officials to immediately transfer detainees to civilian judicial authorities. Thus far, the State Department has submitted three 15% progress reports on Mexico to congressional appropriators (in August 2009, September 2010, and August 2012) that have met the statutory requirements for FY2008-FY2012 Mérida funds that had been on hold to be released. Nevertheless, the State Department has twice elected to hold back some funding pending further progress in key areas of concern. In the September 2010 report, for example, the State Department elected to hold back $26 million in FY2010 supplemental funds as a matter of policy until further progress was made in the areas of transparency and combating impunity.96 Those funds were not obligated until the fall of 2011. In the August 2012 report, the State Department again decided to hold back all of the FY2012 funding that would have been subject to the conditions (roughly $18 million) as a matter of policy until it can work with Mexican authorities to determine steps to address key human rights challenges. Those include: improving the ability of Mexico’s civilian institutions to investigate and prosecute cases of human rights abuses; enhancing enforcement of prohibitions against torture and other mistreatment; and strengthening protection for human rights defenders.97

## Venezuela

### Refusing to Engage

#### Venezuelan engagement unpopular – refusal to help Maduro

Weisbrot 5/3/13 - co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research (Mark, “What Does the Future Hold for U.S.-Venezuela Relations?”, Inter-American Dialogue, May 3 2013, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3297>)//CB

According to a New York Times report on April 15, Maduro reached out to the Obama administration through Bill Richardson just before the election. The administration gave its answer within 48 hours, and it was a lot worse than 'no, thank you.' By refusing to recognize Venezuela's election results, and saying that a '100 percent audit' of the vote count was 'necessary,' the Obama administration was saying, 'we hate you, and we are going to do everything we can to undermine your ability to govern.' It was really an escalation of Washington's involvement in Venezuelan politics not seen since its support for the military coup of 2002. It was also disingenuous: given the results of the election-day audit of votes from 53 percent of the voting machines, a further audit could not possibly change the result. A statistical analysis we did shows that the probability of getting the April 14 audit result if the true winner were Capriles is far less than one in 1 quadrillion. The Obama administration's attempt to delegitimize Venezuela's election, although it was completely isolated in the world, indicates that there is no inclination from Washington to significantly improve relations with Venezuela in the foreseeable future. This is regardless of what Maduro does. As for businesses' political risk, I don't see any reason these would increase. The risk of expropriation has always been very small compared to normal investment risks such as prices of outputs or inputs.

#### Venezuelan government unpopular with Congress – refusal to acknowledge Maduro

Gayathri 4/20/13 - Gayathri writes about geopolitics and business for International Business Times (Amrutha, “Nicolas Maduro Takes Charge as Venezuelan President; US Does Not Recognize Maduro’s Win”, International Business Times, April 20 2013, <http://www.ibtimes.com/nicolas-maduro-takes-charge-venezuelan-president-us-does-not-recognize-maduros-win-1205675>)//CB

Russian President Vladimir Putin and Cuban leader Raul Castro congratulated Maduro on his win, according to the BBC.

The governments of Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Bolivia and Argentina, among others, have also voiced support for Maduro.

However, the U.S. State Department has backed Venezuelan opposition’s demand, saying it would not recognize Maduro without a recount. It was joined by the governments of Panama and Paraguay, the Associated Press news agency reported.

U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said on Wednesday that Washington had not decided whether to recognize Maduro as president.

“That evaluation has to be made and I haven't made it,” Kerry told the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, as reported by Reuter’s news agency. “We think there ought to be a recount.”

“Obviously, if there are huge irregularities, we are going to have serious questions about the viability of that government,” he added.

### Engagement Unpopular

#### Opposition to Venezuelan engagement – sanctions and revocation of visa

Sullivan 4/9/13 - Specialist in Latin American Affairs (Mark, “Hugo Chávez’s Death: Implications for Venezuela and U.S. Relations”, Congressional Research Service, April 9 2013, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42989.pdf>)//CB

Over the years, U.S. officials have expressed concerns about human rights, Venezuela’s military arms purchases, its relations with Iran, and its efforts to export its brand of populism to other Latin American countries. Declining cooperation on anti-drug and anti-terrorism efforts has been a major concern. The United States has imposed sanctions: on several Venezuelan government and military officials for helping the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) with drug and weapons trafficking; on three Venezuelan companies for providing support to Iran; and on several Venezuelan individuals for providing support to Hezbollah. In late 2010, the Chávez government revoked an agreement for U.S. Ambassador-designate Larry Palmer to be posted to Venezuela. The Obama Administration responded by revoking the diplomatic visa of the Venezuelan Ambassador to the United States.

### Supporting the Opposition

#### Venezuela unpopular to Congress - fueling opposition groups and demands for vote recount

Fernandez 4/20/13 - Yusuf Fernandez is a journalist and the secretary of the Muslim Federation of Spain. He has also published articles in leading Spanish newspapers (Yusuf, “US-backed soft coup fails in Venezuela”, Press TV, April 20 2013, <http://www.presstv.com/detail/2013/04/20/299277/usbacked-soft-coup-fails-in-venezuela/>)//CB

According to many media, Venezuelan opposition has been receiving money and other support from the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), the International Republican Institute (IRI), USAID and several US-backed NGOs. Some media have also claimed that Capriles plans his electoral strategies with US political consultants.

One month before the elections, Roberta Jacobson, US Assistant Secretary of State for the Western Hemisphere, said in an interview with the Spanish newspaper El Paيs, known by its hostility towards the Bolivarian Revolution, that “it will be a little difficult” for Venezuela's elections to be “clean and transparent” adding that “Capriles could be a very good president”. Venezuela, for its part, rejected US criticism against its electoral system. “Statements from US officials are part of a long campaign to discredit Venezuelan institutions,” said a senior official with the National Electoral Council (CNE).

The Obama administration has also refused to recognize Nicolas Maduro as President. Testifying before Congress, Secretary of State John Kerry backed Capriles´s call for a vote recount. He also warned that if it was found that there were irregularities during the electoral process, as reported by the opposition, Washington would require “serious explanations” to the Venezuelan government. For her part, Cuban-born and extremist Republican Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen urged Kerry not to legitimize the “corrupt policies of a loyal to Chavez,” referring to Maduro.

Actually, the US calls for a recount were a rude interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and an open support for the right-wing candidate, who, Washington hoped, should put an end to Venezuelan independent foreign policies and revolutionary social and economic policies, which have resulted in a steep decline of poverty and illiteracy rates in the country.

#### Funding the Venezuelan opposition

Waters 4/19/13 (Anita, “U.S. taxes support Venezuelan right-wing opposition”, People’s World, April 19 2013, <http://peoplesworld.org/u-s-taxes-support-venezuelan-right-wing-opposition/>)//CB

Our tax dollars, funneled through the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, and nominally "non-partisan" organizations like the International Republican Institute (IRI) and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), have trained, supported and equipped members of the Venezuelan opposition, including Henrique Capriles, for at least a dozen years.

Take, for example, the National Endowment for Democracy, a "nonpartisan" foundation that spends 1.5 million tax dollars on projects with virtuous and wholesome goals like: "creation of a new generation of political leaders with a deeper understanding of democratic values" and "promote dialogue among Venezuelan youth on the importance of freedom of expression." One can imagine how a deeper understanding of democratic values is conveyed with pro-U.S. messages of allegiance toward the United States, and "freedom of expression" that doesn't include expressing support for Hugo Chavez.

### Snowden proves

#### Venezuelan engagement unpopular – Snowden straining relations

Forero and Englund 7/8/13 - Juan Forero is based in Bogota, Colombia, for The Washington Post and is responsible for covering South America. He has also reported from Mexico, Cuba, Nicaragua and other countries. A Pulitzer Prize winner, Will Englund is on his third tour as a Moscow correspondent (Juan and Will, “With Snowden offer, Venezuela’s Maduro is on world stage”, Washington Post, July 8 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/with-snowden-offer-venezuelas-maduro-is-on-world-stage/2013/07/08/35d83f42-e812-11e2-818e-aa29e855f3ab_story.html>)//CB

Among those offering sanctuary to Snowden, anti-imperialist Venezuela stands out: a country with an intense antipathy toward the United States and just enough muscle to make his escape from American law enforcement a possibility. It also appears that Russian officials, eager to end the diplomatic fallout of having Snowden in Moscow, see their close ally, Venezuela, as offering the clearest solution.

“The situation with Snowden is creating additional tension in relations with Washington that are complex as they are,” Alexei Pushkov, head of the foreign affairs committee of the lower house of the Russian parliament, told the newspaper Kommersant on Monday.

Pushkov, whose comments dependably reflect the Kremlin’s position on foreign affairs, said the Snowden saga needed to be settled before President Obama arrives in September to meet with his Russian counterpart, Vladimir Putin. “And judging by the way things are unfolding,” Pushkov told the newspaper, “this is how it’s going to be.”

Over the weekend, Pushkov had also said that giving asylum to Snowden in Venezuela could not damage Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro, because his government’s relations with Washington are already in tatters. “It can’t get worse,” Pushkov said in a Twitter message.

# Immigration Good - Neg

## Uniqueness

### Vote Soon

#### The House will act on immigration soon.

Bolton, 7/14/13 ( Alexander, author at The Hill, “McConnell urges House GOP to move immigration legislation”, http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/310881-mcconnell-urges-house-republicans-to-move-immigration-legislation)

Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has said he will not schedule a vote on the Senate bill in the House and that any bill that he brings to the floor must have majority support within the House Republican conference.

House Republicans are expected to move immigration reform piecemeal with a series of smaller bills. Legislation eventually granting citizenship to millions of illegal immigrants is not expected to be one of the proposals advanced by the House GOP leadership.

The lower chamber may consider committee-passed proposals to bolster border security and interior enforcement before the August recess.

The House Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees have approved five pieces of immigration leislatiogn, so far.

Not all of the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants living in the country are expected to apply for the path to citizenship as defined in the Senate bill.

The Congressional Budget Office projected that there could still be as many as seven million illegal immigrants living in the United States in 2023 if the Senate bill became law.

Conservative critics of the bill have noted that 40 percent of illegal immigrants are in the country because they overstayed visas.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) predicted on “Meet the Press” that the House would act on the issue.

“They will act,” he said. “They have to. This is something that — the vast, vast majority of the Republicans, Democrats, and Independents support. And John Boehner should let the House vote. That's all he has to do. If the House voted, it would pass overwhelmingly.”

### Will Pass

#### Hatch trying to get Republicans from the House on board.

Canham 7/14/2013 ( Matt, updated at The Salt Lake Tribune, “Hatch ‘counting on’ House to pass immigration reform”, http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/politics/56593892-90/hatch-senate-sltrib-counting.html.csp0

Washington » In the tone of a supportive father, Sen. Orrin Hatch encouraged House Republicans on Sunday to pass immigration legislation that when merged with the Senate plan would ultimately "solve this festering sore that exists in our country today."¶ He was referring to the 11 million people now in the country illegally, the touchiest topic in the immigration reform debate.¶ "Most of them are pretty good people and they’d like to be Americans, or at least they would like to have a job here," said Hatch, R-Utah, on ABC News’ This Week. "We can work these problems out and I think the Senate bill goes a long way in trying to do that."¶ But the House refuses to debate the Senate bill, with the Republican majority deciding last week to push their own piecemeal legislation. None of those proposals so far deal with the broad legalization of the undocumented.¶ Utah’s three Republican House members agreed with the move for smaller proposals that will focus first on border security and two of them — Reps. Jason Chaffetz and Chris Stewart — have said they oppose plans that offer amnesty to immigrants who illegally crossed the border or overstayed a visa.¶ Rep. Rob Bishop, R-Utah, and Rep. Jim Matheson, D-Utah, have not made such definitive statements on the issue, though they also haven’t supported the Senate’s path to citizenship, which would take at least 13 years.¶ Hatch was one of 14 Republicans who did back that plan, saying it ends the current "de facto amnesty" for unauthorized immigrants by requiring them to register with the government, pay a fine and start paying taxes.¶ The rift has caused many in the political world, including people like Stewart, to take a pessimistic view that Congress will pass a new immigration law soon.¶ Hatch isn’t one of them. He believes that the Republican House could offer proposals to strengthen the Senate bill and that a conference committee of the two bodies could craft a plan that could ultimately become law.

#### Polls show that the bill will pass.

Rouge 7/13/13 (Baton author at Shreveport Times, “Burland: Now is time for immigration reform”, http://www.shreveporttimes.com/article/20130714/OPINION04/307140016/Burland-Now-time-immigration-reform)

It’s hard to imagine a better time than right now to pass comprehensive immigration reform in Washington. The “Gang of Eight” bill, a bipartisan effort led by four Republicans and four Democrats in the U.S. Senate, has the overwhelming support of Louisianans, according to a poll just released by the Partnership for a New American Economy, the Alliance for Citizenship and Republicans for Immigration Reform.¶ Specifically, 70 percent of Louisianans polled said they strongly or somewhat support the bipartisan immigration reform legislation being debated in Washington. Moreover, 80 percent of those polled said they strongly or somewhat support a bill that includes a tough but fair path to citizenship and 63 percent say they are more likely to vote for an elected official who supports comprehensive immigration reform that includes a path to citizenship. Those numbers clearly show a distinct advantage to our U.S. senators if they support the proposed legislation.¶ Time is of the essence. If our elected leaders are going to move this country forward by modernizing our broken immigration system, they must do it now — and there is strong support in our state for this. An overwhelming 86 percent of the likely voters surveyed in the poll believe it is important to pass this legislation this year.¶ I encourage Senators Mary Landrieu and David Vitter to do everything they can to help pass this bill as soon as possible.

#### Immigration will pass but it’s a fight.

Halloran 7/10/13 (Liz, Washington correspondent for Digital News, “House GOP: We Won't Consider Senate Immigration Bill”, http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/07/10/200860744/house-gop-we-wont-consider-senate-immigration-bill)

A majority of the fractious House Republican Conference lined up in opposition to (barely) bipartisan legislation already approved by the Democratic-controlled Senate, despite the urging of leaders to do something on the issue.

NPR's Tamara Keith tells us that after the meeting, Colorado Rep. Doug Lamborn said "there's almost unanimous agreement among the Republicans that the Senate bill is fatally flawed."

The Senate bill includes a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, a provision that's anathema to the majority of House Republicans, most of whom reside in electorally safe, predominantly white districts.

California Rep. Buck McKeon, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said: "There was pretty strong consensus that the border has to be secured before anything else." Including a path to citizenship.

According to Louisiana Rep. John Fleming, House Speaker John Boehner reassured the conference — as he has done in public and private many times before — that he will not allow an immigration bill to pass without a majority of the majority, a practice referred to as the Hastert Rule.

Fleming said he trusts Boehner when he says any immigration bill will pass with a majority of the majority. But he still worries that the Senate could take that bill up, modify it and then jam the House — putting pressure on them to pass something with a majority of Democrats and only a few Republicans.

"We control the House, we Republicans, and our constituents hold us accountable ... so that is our concern. We want to be sure that something like that doesn't happen," Fleming said. "That whatever passes out of the House has a majority of Republicans that support it."

#### Republicans supporting Immigration.

Halloran 7/10/13 (Liz, Washington correspondent for Digital News, “House GOP: We Won't Consider Senate Immigration Bill”, http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/07/10/200860744/house-gop-we-wont-consider-senate-immigration-bill)

Democratic groups have funded advertising campaigns that target Republican House members perceived as persuadable on the immigration issue and those in districts where Latinos represent a growing constituency.

But the pressure has had negligible results.

One of those targeted, Rep. Mike Coffman of Colorado, has said he would consider a path to citizenship for young people brought to the country illegally by their parents. But he told us late Tuesday that he was "unsure about what to do with the adults."

Rep. Joe Heck of Nevada, a Republican in a politically competitive district with a Latino population of 16 percent, also supports the so-called Dream Act piece of immigration overhaul.

Here's what his spokesman Greg Lemon told us this week:

"Congressman Heck believes that we should find a way to give young people who were brought here illegally a chance to make a life for themselves in the only country they have ever known. His concern is making sure those young people are prepared to succeed and provide for their future families."

To Heck, that translates to a requirement of four years in the military, an associate or undergraduate degree, or a vocational certificate.

But on a pathway to citizenship? "His position has always been that he is open to considering proposals that address earned citizenship," Lemon said. "The process must be tough but fair, and not penalize those already waiting in line." And, he said, they must be linked to border security measures that extend beyond the Senate bill's 10-year sunset.

New York Rep. Michael Grimm, whose Staten Island-based district's Latino population now exceeds 15 percent, opposes the Senate bill "because it doesn't contain strong enough enforceable triggers," his spokeswoman, Carol Danko, told us. "Since the House seems likely to bring up its own bill, he will have to see it first before he can make a decision on how he will vote.

That leaves Republicans like freshman Rep. David Valadao, whose California district is 70 percent Latino, a rare GOP advocate of comprehensive immigration reform.

"Our office as a whole is going to remain hopeful on this," said Anna Vetter, Valadao's spokeswoman. "A lot of our members who don't support it either don't understand the issue fully, or aren't directly affected by it."

#### Schumer- Bill will pass if Republicans on board.

Lillis 7/09/13 (Mike, author at the Hill, “Schumer: House must back citizenship or immigration bill dies”, http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/309863-schumer-no-conference-on-immigration-unless-house-backs-citizenship)

The prospects for immigration reform legislation will be bleak unless the House backs a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants, Sen. Charles Schumer warned Tuesday.

The New York Democrat said the piecemeal approach championed by House GOP leaders is a recipe for failure and suggested there will be no House-Senate negotiations unless the Republicans also consider a citizenship pathway alongside their enforcement-focused bills.

"Without a path to citizenship, there is not going to be a bill — there can't be a bill. And to go to conference with various pieces without a path to citizenship … is a path to a cul-de-sac, to no immigration bill," Schumer, a member of the bipartisan group that negotiated the Senate immigration deal, told reporters in the Capitol.

"The bottom line … is that, without a path to citizenship, they [Republicans] will go to conference and just say, 'Well, take our bill without a path to citizenship,'" he added. "There's got to be a path to citizenship, and I don't think you can get Democrats to vote for things without a path to citizenship. It was our bottom line from the beginning."

With Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) vowing not to consider any immigration bills that lack the majority support of his divided conference — and with a number of House conservatives revolting against any citizenship benefits — some political observers have predicted House GOP leaders would try to pass their security-focused piecemeal approach as a way to move the process along.

But Schumer, who met with the House Democratic Caucus on Tuesday morning, said that strategy simply wouldn't work. The Democrats, he said, are lining up en masse to oppose any House process that excludes the possibility of citizenship.

#### Democrats are willing to add to the bill to get it passed.

Lillis 7/09/13 (Mike, author at the Hill, “Schumer: House must back citizenship or immigration bill dies”, http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/309863-schumer-no-conference-on-immigration-unless-house-backs-citizenship)

House Democrats, as the minority party in the lower chamber, say they're ready to accept immigration reforms more conservative than those passed by the Democratically controlled Senate. But they've also warned that — as was the case with the Farm Bill — they won't support just any proposal, even for the sake of getting it to conference.

The Democrats have been vague about what they would deem unacceptable on the House floor, but Tuesday's comments are the clearest indication yet that a piecemeal approach without the option of citizenship would fall into that category.

Asked Tuesday if there is some middle ground that Democrats would accept, a path to permanent residency, say, in lieu of citizenship, Schumer responded with an emphatic, "No."

"America has stood for citizenship. We have a Statue of Liberty here. It never has said, 'You come here, and you'll be second class,'" he said. "We will not stand for it. It will not happen."

Boehner, for the most part, has kept a distance from the immigration fight, offering broad support without making specific policy demands. But on Monday, the Speaker played a few more of his cards when he stipulated that border-security improvements must be in effect — not just in the works — before illegal immigrants would be eligible for provisional legal status.

"It’s real clear, from everything that I’ve seen and read over the last couple of weeks, that the American people expect that we’ll have strong border security in place before we begin the process of legalizing and fixing our legal immigration system,” he told reporters.

Such a trigger would mark a shift from the Senate bill, which sets targets for enhanced border security but does not hinge residency benefits on meeting them.

Schumer said Democrats are ready to look at different triggers but warned that "they can't be used by someone who's against a path to citizenship to block it."

#### McConnell urging Republicans to move on CIR.

Bolton, 7/14/13 ( Alexander, author at The Hill, “McConnell urges House GOP to move immigration legislation”, http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/310881-mcconnell-urges-house-republicans-to-move-immigration-legislation)

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (Ky.) on Sunday urged Republicans in the House to move on immigration reform legislation.

Even though McConnell voted against the Senate immigration reform bill, he hopes the House will pass something that can be melded with the Senate proposal in conference negotiations.

“I don't think anybody's satisfied with the status quo on immigration,” he said in an NBC “Meet the Press” interview. “And I hope the House will be able to move forward on something and we can get this into conference and get an outcome that will be satisfactory for the American people.”

He said the Senate bill is “deficient” on border security, even though it included an amendment to double the number of border patrol agents to 40,000 and spend an additional $38 billion on border security. The bill spends a total of $46 billion on securing the U.S.-Mexico border.

McConnell said border security is a bigger issue for him than the question of putting an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship.

## Impact Cards

### 1nc Food Security

#### Immigration reform is key to food security

Fitz 12 (Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center for American Progress, Time to Legalize Our 11 Million Undocumented Immigrants, November 14th, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/11/14/44885/time-to-legalize-our-11-million-undocumented-immigrants/)

Nowhere is the tension between immigrant labor and the economy more obvious than in agriculture. By most estimates, undocumented immigrants make up more than half of the workers in the agriculture industry. Likewise the U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that each farm job creates three “upstream” jobs in professions such as packaging, transporting, and selling the produce, meaning that what happens in the agricultural sector affects the economy as a whole.¶ Agriculture is particularly susceptible to the whims of the labor market, since crops become ripe at a fixed time and must be picked quickly before they rot. Migrant laborers often travel a set route, following the growing season as it begins in places such as Florida and works its way north. Disrupting this flow of pickers can be devastating to local economies and the nation’s food security.¶ After the passage of Georgia’s anti-immigrant law, H.B. 87, for example, the Georgia Agribusiness Council estimated that the state could lose up to $1 billion in produce from a lack of immigrant labor. A survey of farmers conducted by the Georgia Department of Agriculture found 56 percent of those surveyed were experiencing difficulty finding workers—a devastating blow to the state. Even a program by Gov. Nathan Deal (D-GA) to use prison parolees to fill the worker shortage quickly fell apart, with most walking off the job after just a few hours.¶ Creating a process for legalizing these undocumented workers would help stabilize the agricultural workforce and enhance our nation’s food security. It would also diminish the incentive of states to go down the economically self-destructive path that Georgia, Alabama, Arizona, and others have pursued.

#### Food shortages lead to extinction.

Brown, founder of the Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute, ‘9

[Lester, “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May]

The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such a collapse is possible. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever.As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk.States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy.Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six).Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.

### Key to Food Security

#### Lack of immigration reform kills agriculture – drives up food prices

Pete 7/9/13 – writer for Northwest Indiana Times (Joseph, “Ag secretary calls for passage of immigration reform bill”, NWI, July 9 2013, <http://www.nwitimes.com/news/local/lake/ag-secretary-calls-for-passage-of-immigration-reform-bill/article_6fc45fb8-7fd5-5444-b37d-46b57868cb57.html>)//CB

Apples, cherries and other unpicked fruit could rot away if Congress doesn't pass an immigration reform bill soon, the nation's top agricultural official said.

Farmers could lose the immigrant labor they need to harvest crops, milk cows or process livestock, and they might decide to shut down their farm operations or move them out of the country, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack told The Times in a telephone interview.

Northwest Indiana residents could end up paying higher prices at the grocery store if there is a smaller food supply or the produce has to travel farther.

Vilsack is talking with media outlets all over the country to urge lawmakers to approve immigration reform, which passed the U.S. Senate with 68 votes a few weeks ago but which has since languished in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The former governor of Iowa argues the bill would retain a stable workforce of farmhands, secure the borders, establish a pathway to citizenship and boost the economy.

Immigrants would be more likely to make major purchases, pay taxes and contribute to Social Security if they didn't fear the possibility of being deported, Vilsack said.

"Comprehensive immigration reform brings people out of the shadows, out of a cash economy and into the regular economy," he said. "They're more likely to purchase a home or a car if they're appropriately documented,"

The Congressional Budget Office estimates the additional tax revenue would reduce the deficit by up to $200 billion over the next 10 years. The Gross Domestic Product is projected to increase by at least half a percentage point, Vilsack said.

Critics of the legislation, such as Republican Indiana Sen. Dan Coats, said the borders should be secured before a path to citizenship is established.

"When the underlying bill basically says the Secretary of Homeland Security will state that the the department has a strategy to address the border security problem, that does not play very well with people who have seen strategies promised before," Coats said in a speech before the Senate. "They want to see results."

Vilsack said the legislation include a historic amount of investment in border security, which would result in 700 miles of fence along the country's southern border and twice as many border patrol agents.

"It's time to fix the broken immigration system by securing the border and giving those currently in the workforce an earned pathway to citizenship that will bring them out of the shadows," he said.

The issue is urgent because farmers are having trouble finding enough immigrant workers to harvest fruit and other crops, which could be lost, Vilsack said. Scarcity would drive up food prices if that happens.

Frustrated farmers could end up moving some operations south of the border, and turning fields over to developers or row crops like corn and soybeans that can be harvested by machine. America's food supply would end up less safe and secure, Vilsack said.

"The agricultural producers can't grow it if no one's there to pick it at the right time," he said.

#### Immigration reform key to food security – shortage of workers affects crops

Dairy Business 6/21/13 (“Mooney: Current immigration policy a threat to food security”, Dairy Business, June 21 2013, <http://dairybusiness.com/seo/headline.php?title=mooney-current-immigration-policy-a-threat-to&date=2013-06-21&table=headlines>)//CB

Current immigration policy is threatening access to quality, affordable food in this nation, Dairy Farmers of America, Inc. (DFA) board chair Randy Mooney asserted during a USDA forum on comprehensive immigration reform in Kansas City.

U.S. Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack was the keynote speaker at the event. Former Kansas City mayor and current Congressman Emanuel Cleaver also voiced support for immigration policy reform.

“Because of America’s farmers, we enjoy abundant, safe and affordable food in this country,” Mooney said. “In order to ensure that continues, we need Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform. For the dairy industry — an industry where there is no such thing as a day off — there is no viable visa program to provide a legal, stable and knowledgeable workforce that ensures milk and other dairy products get into the dairy case, our lunch programs and more.”

Mooney emphasized that the need for qualified workers is an issue bigger than dairy, pointing to specialty crops such as lettuce, strawberries and apples that also require labor that is not desirable to domestic workers. Similarly, a shortage of workers affects crop farmers, directly for their own farms and for farmers who buy their product.

“Without immigration reform, we’re making it more difficult for farmers to harvest their crops,” Mooney said. “As a result, we are going to make it more difficult for consumers to access affordable food. We could even risk allowing more of our food production to move overseas.”

“We are fortunate to have a food system that allows us to deliver safe, quality, affordable food to our families,” Mooney concluded. “Immigration reform is important for all of agriculture, for rural America, for consumers and for the nation’s economy.”

Mooney’s sentiments were echoed by Secretary Vilsack. “We are blessed by the most productive, most innovative and most hard-working farmers and ranchers,” Vilsack said. “American agriculture is the greatest in the world, but we risk that if we don’t have certainty in our farm policy and we don’t have comprehensive immigration reform.”

#### Key to food

Gaskill ’10 (Ron Gaskill is director of congressional relations for the American Farm Bureau Federation. Worker shortage urges immigration reform efforts April 9, 2010 Season Right for Meaningful Immigration Reform By Ron Gaskill)

Even in these times of higher-than-usual unemployment, most farmers and ranchers still struggle to find all the workers they need for a successful season. Serious concerns that not enough domestic workers will choose to work in agriculture has become a harsh reality across the countryside. About 15 million people in the United States choose non-farm jobs at wages that are actually lower than what they could earn by working alongside farmers and ranchers. The on-farm jobs and opportunities are there, but many workers choose not to take advantage of them. The issue is rapidly moving from one centered on a lack of resources, to one with food insecurity at its heart. Farmers and ranchers are the ones being squeezed; caught between a domestic labor force that doesn’t want agricultural work, government policy that fails to recognize the seriousness of the problem and an administration that consistently makes it harder to hire workers. U.S. consumers will continue to eat fresh fruits and vegetables regardless of how the labor scenario ultimately plays out. But, whether or not those fruits and vegetables are grown in the U.S. or imported from other countries where labor is more plentiful greatly concerns Farm Bureau. It’s past time for our nation’s policymakers to translate grassroots concern into meaningful action. As much as we believe in a farmer’s right to farm, Farm Bureau fully respects the right of U.S. workers to choose other lines of work. But, on the flip side, as employers, we must be able to legally employ those who do want to work, even if they’re from other countries. Comprehensive immigration reform is needed, so that America’s farmers and ranchers can continue to produce an abundant supply of safe, healthy food, as well as renewable fuels and fiber for our nation.

### Food Security Good Impacts

#### Prices spikes kill billions and cause global war

**Brown 7** (Lester R., Director – Earth Policy Institute, 3-21, http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/2007/Update65.htm)

Urban food protests in response to rising food prices in low and middle income countries, such as Mexico, could lead to political instability that would add to the growing list of failed and failing states. At some point, spreading political instability could disrupt global economic progress. Against this backdrop, Washington is consumed with “ethanol euphoria.” President Bush in his State of the Union address set a production goal for 2017 of 35 billion gallons of alternative fuels, including grain-based and cellulosic ethanol, and liquefied coal. Given the current difficulties in producing cellulosic ethanol at a competitive cost and given the mounting public opposition to liquefied coal, which is far more carbon-intensive than gasoline, most of the fuel to meet this goal might well have to come from grain. This could take most of the U.S. grain harvest, leaving little grain to meet U.S. needs, much less those of the hundred or so countries that import grain. The stage is now set for direct competition for grain between the 800 million people who own automobiles, and the world’s 2 billion poorest people. The risk is that millions of those on the lower rungs of the global economic ladder will start falling off as higher food prices drop their consumption below the survival level.

#### Even without escalation, half the planet dies

**Brown 5** (Lester, President of Earth Policy Institute, MPA – Harvard, Former Advisor to the Secretary of Agriculture, Outgrowing The Earth, http://www.earth-policy.org/Books/Out/)

“Many Americans see terrorism as the principal threat to security,” said Brown, “but for much of humanity, the effect of water shortages and rising temperatures on food security are far more important issues. For the 3 billion people who live on 2 dollars a day or less and who spend up to 70 percent of their income on food, even a modest rise in food prices can quickly become life-threatening. For them, it is the next meal that is the overriding concern.”

#### And --- food conflicts go global --- triggers World War 3

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

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

### Key to Green Tech

#### Immigrants key to green technology

Herman and Smith 10 – Richard Herman is a Cleveland Immigration Lawyer with offices in Columbus and Cincinnati. Robert Smith is a veteran journalist who covers international cultures and immigration issues for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Ohio’s largest newspaper (Richard and Robert, “Why Immigrants Can Drive the Green Economy”, Huffington Post, June 29 2010, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-herman/why-immigrants-can-drive_b_629451.html>)//CB

It should come as no surprise that immigrants will help drive the green revolution. America's young scientists and engineers, especially the ones drawn to emerging industries like alternative energy, tend to speak with an accent.

The 2000 Census found that immigrants, while accounting for 12 percent of the population, made up nearly half of the all scientists and engineers with doctorate degrees. Their importance will only grow. Nearly 70 percent of the men and women who entered the fields of science and engineering from 1995 to 2006 were immigrants.

Yet, the connection between immigration and the development and commercialization of alternative energy technology is rarely discussed. Policymakers envision millions of new jobs as the nation pursues renewable energy sources, like wind and solar power, and builds a smart grid to tap it.

But Dan Arvizu, the leading expert on solar power and the director of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy in Golden, Colorado, warns that much of the clean‐technology talent lies overseas, in nations that began pursuing alternative energy sources decades ago.

The 2000 Census found that immigrants, while accounting for 12 percent of the population, made up nearly half of the all scientists and engineers with doctorate degrees. Their importance will only grow.

Expanding our own clean‐tech industry will require working closely with foreign nations and foreign‐born scientists, he said. Immigration restrictions are making collaboration difficult. His lab's efforts to work with a Chinese energy lab, for example, were stalled due to U.S. immigration barriers.

"We can't get researchers over here," Arvizu, the son of a once‐undocumented immigrant from Mexico, said in an interview in March 2009, his voice tinged with dismay. "It makes no sense to me. We need a much more enlightened approach."

Dr. Zhao Gang, the Vice Director of the Renewable Energy and New Energy International Cooperation Planning Office of the Ministry of Science and Technology in China, says that America needs that enlightenment fast. "The Chinese government continues to impress upon the Obama administration that immigration restrictions are creating major impediments to U.S.‐China collaboration on clean energy development," he said during a recent speech in Cleveland.

So what's the problem? Some of it can be attributed to national security restrictions that impede international collaboration on clean energy. But Arvizu places greater weight on immigration barriers, suggesting that national secrecy is less important in the fast‐paced world of green‐tech development. "We are innovating so fast here, what we do today is often outdated tomorrow.

Finding solutions to alternative energy is a complex, global problem that requires global teamwork," he said.

We need an immigration system that prioritizes the attraction and retention of scarce, high‐end talent needed to invent and commercialize alternative energy technology and other emerging technologies.

### Foreign Relations – India, China, Phillipines

#### Immigration reform increases worker and family visas – increases relations with India, China, Philippines

Hesson 4/17/13 - Ted Hesson is the immigration editor for Univision News. He earned his master’s degree at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and his bachelor’s degree at Boston College (Ted, “How Immigration Reform Revamps Employment Visas”, ABC News, April 17 2013, <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/immigration-reform-explainer-employment-based-visas/story?id=18978680#.UeNAjI2Tif4>)//CB

As it stands, immigrants from a single country can't use more than 7 percent of the total allotment of employment visas in any given year.

So even though there are lots of immigrants from countries like India and China who are qualified to get a visa to the U.S., they can't because their country quickly hits that 7 percent cap.

The Senate bill would get rid of that limit.

This would open pathways to immigrants from India and China, but would mean a less diverse immigration system overall.

Family visas will also change.

The limit for any one country is currently set at 7 percent of the total family visas given out that year by the U.S., but that figure would be raised to 15 percent. Such a change could mean more immigrants from countries like Mexico and the Philippines.

So if these countries don't need to worry about limits on the number of visas from their home countries, how will they come to the U.S.?

### Worker Exploitation

#### Immigration reform prevents worker exploitation

Chacón 13 - Justin Akers Chacón is a professor of U.S. History and Chicano Studies in San Diego, California (Justin, “Immigrant rights at a crossroads”, ISR, May 2013, <http://isreview.org/issue/83/immigrant-rights-crossroads>)//CB

Deportation targets a large section of the workforce for the sole reason of working without documents. For example, in California 53 percent of deportation proceedings in 2011 were based solely on that violation, up more than 2,000 cases statewide from 2010. Meanwhile, “the share of potential ­deportees charged with an aggravated felony—including violent, drug and theft-related crimes—has remained steady the past five years at 4 percent.”29 The intensification of detention and deportation under the Obama administration was highlighted during a massive immigrant roundup at the end of March 2012. ICE agents detained 3,168 undocumented immigrants over the course of six days in a national operation across all fifty states, three territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.30 Dubbed “Operation Cross Check,” it was the largest single coordinated immigration sweep in US history. These national raids are taking place concurrently with the systematic, mass firings of undocumented workers through workplace “immigration audits,” which began under the Obama administration in 2009. An audit requires an employer to verify employee documentation with ICE agents, and to fire those without papers or risk fines and penalties. There were over 2,300 companies audited in 2011.31 There have been some recent instances of employers “self-auditing” at a time when their workers have tried to form or join unions, effectively using the audit as a union-busting tool.32

In practice, enforcement policy has done little to alter the realities of immigration. Rather, it leads to the increased isolation and oppression of immigrant workers. As a result, elements of Jim Crow era segregation are reinstituted in communities, cruel and unusual forms of punishment are invented, and federal immigration agents target, detain, and deport thousands of individuals each day across the border in an extrajudicial manner. Without legalization, immigrant workers have limited means to leverage their legal rights to challenge low wages and poor working conditions. Intensified internal enforcement, along with the conditions of vulnerability in a recessionary period, mean that most workers will remain on the job but in conditions that breed fear and underconfidence. Under these conditions a substantial exploitable workforce can be maintained. This has led immigration expert Douglas Massey to conclude that “discrimination against a large number of Mexicans is mandated by federal law.”33

# Immigration Bad - Aff

## General Theory Cards

### Economic Aid doesn’t cost Capital

#### Economic aid policies don’t spend political capital – ideology controls the vote

**Milner & Tingley ’11** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “Who Supports Global Economic

Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy”, <http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)> (JN)

The two issue areas also differ in terms of the role of ideology. For our general economic aid votes, the ideological convictions of legislators play a more substantial role than in trade. Lumsdaine and others have suggested that ideological inﬂuences in aid should be strong because the material consequences are more limited and because aid addresses the same core left-right ideological debates. 83 We thus ﬁnd strong support for aid on the more liberal wings of both parties, and a general alignment of Democrats in favor of aid as a means of redistributive transfer to poorer countries and Republicans opposed to such redistributive intervention. General economic-aid votes show a marked inﬂuence of ideology, but the inﬂuence of ideology drops signiﬁcantly for votes more tightly linked to U.S. national security

### Ideology Trumps

#### Legislators vote on ideology – even labor interest is irrelevant

**Milner & Tingley ’10** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF U.S. FOREIGN AID:

AMERICAN LEGISLATORS AND THE DOMESTIC POLITICS

OF AID”, [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/dtingley/files/enp.pdf)](http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)) (JN)

Interests matter, but so does ideology. Legislators respond not just to the material interests of their constituents, but also to their ideological predispositions. Legislators in left-leaning districts favor economic aid more than do right-leaning ones. On military aid, however, this relationship is reversed.

Districts and legislators who prefer a larger role for the government in the economy and have stronger tastes for egalitarianism seem to be more disposed toward providing economic aid to others abroad. As Lumsdaine argued, a preference for government intervention at home to alleviate poverty appears to carry over to the international realm. Research on other countries suggests that this ideological pattern of support exists in other donors (Tingley, unpublished). The support that we sometimes ﬁnd by organized labor for aid seems to rest heavily on its ideological appeal. But unlike in trade where conservative individuals generally support free trade, conservatives tend to oppose foreign economic aid.

### President doesn’t push plan

#### President doesn’t push foreign aid policy – knows efforts are ineffective, domestic constituent concerns outweigh

**Milner & Tingley ’10** (Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Chair of the Department of Politics and an Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, “THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF U.S. FOREIGN AID:

AMERICAN LEGISLATORS AND THE DOMESTIC POLITICS

OF AID”, [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/dtingley/files/enp.pdf)](http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20(2011)%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf)) (JN)

More generally, our analysis implies that foreign aid policy is not driven solely by American foreign policy objectives, but also responds to underlying domestic political conditions. Presidents do not seem to dominate aid policy; their positions and preferences are not among the key factors that we identify in aﬀecting a legislator’s votes on economic aid. Aid may well be used as an exchange mechanism to alter other countries’ behavior, but it must ﬁrst command enough domestic support to win Congressional approval (Bueno de Mesquita and Smith, 2007). The existing literature that examines whether donor interests or recipient needs shape aid indirectly tests whether domestic interests matter by examining the characteristics of the recipients (Alesina and Dollar, 2000; McKinley and Little, 1979). In contrast, our study shows that domestic interests in the donor country directly aﬀect foreign aid. Presidents must construct aid policy so they can garner majority support for aid in Congress. Legislators do not vote on aid randomly; they take into account its eﬀects on their districts and vote accordingly. Political economy models can well explain this.

### PC fails

#### PC fails – Presidents overestimate ability to persuade

Rockman 12 - Department of Political Science, Purdue University (Bert, “The Obama Presidency: Hope, Change, and Reality”, October 10 2012, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00921.x/full>)//CB

In sum, we know that the window of opportunity for American presidents is more often brief than not, and the opening is often slight. Big initiatives are rarely monumentally popular and they require a lot of political capital. Unless presidents have massive political majorities on their side, it is difficult to get more than a small number of major initiatives through the legislative process. Those massive political majorities when they do appear often vanish as rapidly as the next election cycle.

It is often the case that presidents extend themselves beyond where their political support ends. George Edwards (2012) points out that Obama did just that, and that there was not extensive support for many of Obama's initiatives, particularly his health-care initiative. He speculates that this may have cost Obama dearly in successfully implementing initiatives that would have helped him in other spheres more critical to his political fortunes and, perhaps, the fortunes of the country. This is probably true, and, equally probably, inevitably true. Almost all presidents (perhaps Bush 41 aside and possibly Eisenhower as well) have ambitions beyond their grasp mainly because they are central to their political base. Even Ronald Reagan's economic plans were not wildly popular when he came to office. The public-supported deficit reduction more than tax reduction. Mass opinion on day-to-day political issues, of course, is deeply susceptible to how issues get framed and who gets the jump on framing them. Obama pushed healthcare as a major initiative because it had been in the Democrats’ in-basket for decades. His plan was based on that adopted, ironically, by his Republican rival, Mitt Romney, when the latter was governor of Massachusetts. Moreover, the individual mandate was, in fact, supported by prominent Republicans as an alternative to the Clinton plan during the last great debate on and failure to enact major health-care reform. The point is that all presidents will—indeed must—lead beyond their most cautious instincts because it is vital to their political base to do so and to the ambitions they hold for their administrations. Folding the tent too early is likely an admission of political frailty.

The important point here is that opinions about specific issues are typically not deeply held or, for that matter, much informed among significant segments of the public. The so-called political center is not vital; it is relatively flaccid. Nonopinions often dominate in that region. It is among the political bases of either party or those for whom the parties are important cue-givers that are unlikely to show any opinion movement. So, presidents go for the gold because it is expected of them by their most loyal supporters, and the failure to do so is often thought to be evidence of timidity. Like most prospectors, they get more dross than gold. And, the deeper and more complicated the changes they wish to make, the less likely they are to get their way. Presidents, according to Edwards, mostly overestimate their ability to be successful particularly through persuasion. Their failures have consequences for their future capabilities.

#### PC not key – studies show Presidential influence limited

Villalobos and Sirin 11 - José D. Villalobos and Cigdem V. Sirin are assistant professors of political science at the University of Texas, El Paso (Jose and Cigdem, “Agenda Setting from the Oval Office: An Experimental Examination of Presidential Influence over the Public Agenda”, Oxford Journals, July 28 2011, <http://ijpor.oxfordjournals.org/content/24/1/21.full#ref-2>)//CB

This study employs an experimental approach to isolate and directly test the extent to which presidents can affect public perceptions of issue importance and support for policy action, taking into consideration key factors that condition such effects. Our findings provide new empirical evidence that presidents can, in fact, positively influence public opinion through agenda setting, particularly by increasing the perceptual importance of low salience foreign policy issues. However, the results also indicate that such positive effects do not translate into public support for policy action; instead, presidential appeals actually decrease support. Last, our study offers new evidence that employing bipartisan cues can help presidents further increase public perceptions of issue importance, though such cues are unlikely to spur increased support.

Over the years, scholars have asserted that U.S. presidents play an important role at the agenda setting stage of the policy making process (Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; Cohen, 1995, 1997; Downs, 1972; Kingdon, 1995; Light, 1991). Given their formal position atop the hierarchy of the executive branch and high visibility in the media, it makes sense that presidents would have “a presumptive right to play a leading role in identifying and defining the problems that command governmental attention” (Cobb & Elder, 1972, p. 182; Jones, 1994; Kingdon, 1995). Nevertheless, despite a vibrant and growing literature, important questions linger concerning the full extent to which presidents can be influential agenda setters.

In a recent critical overview of presidential agenda-setting research, Wood (2009) points out that, “Although it seems evident that presidents should be influential agenda setters at both the systemic and institutional levels, hard scientific evidence showing that presidents are influential agenda setters is limited” (p. 109). Among the quantitative studies that systematically examine the agenda-setting ability of presidents, most scholarly work has been restricted to time series research designs. Even though time series analyses have proved to be highly valuable in contributing to the accumulation of scientific knowledge in this area of research, limitations in historical data often oblige scholars to resort to using short time periods, a small sample of issues, and a few administrations (see Lawrence, 2004, p. 17). As a viable alternative to time series research, Wood (2009, p. 117) posits that scholars should look to experimental designs for further exploring presidential influence in agenda setting.

### A2 Foreign Policy Focus Link

#### Obama’s agenda can be changed – tactical choices

Meernik and Ault 13 – James Meernik is a Professor of Political Science, University of North Texas. Michael Ault is an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, California State University (James and Michael, “The tactics of foreign policy agenda-setting: Issue choice and the president’s weekly radio address”, Sage Journals, March 2013, <http://ias.sagepub.com/content/16/1/74.short>)//CB

The American president’s foreign policy agenda represents a complex mix of policy preferences driven both by necessity and choice. It would seem that, given the ability of other actors to substantially influence the nature of the president’s foreign policy agenda, and given the president’s own limited time, attention and expertise, the president’s ability to put issues on his foreign policy agenda would be fairly circumscribed. However, is this necessarily the case? In fact, we argue and show that presidents are able to manipulate the foreign policy agenda and make tactical choices regarding when to emphasize foreign policy issues in order to advance their policy preferences. We argue that presidents’ weekly radio addresses to the nation represent one such expression of presidential agenda-setting that scholars have largely neglected. It is our contention that presidents use these speeches to direct or redirect domestic attention away from some issues and toward others. We model the president’s foreign policy agenda, as expressed in the choice of issues selected for the weekly radio addresses, as a function of the president’s policy preferences regarding the US domestic political environment and the international environment and other key factors.

## Immigration Uniqueness

### Won’t Pass

#### Immigration won’t pass - piecemeal division, ideological orthodoxy, lack of trust in Obama, complexities with citizenship, the Hatsert rule, and Boehner’s job

**Silverleib and Cohen 7/12** (Alan Silverleib and Tom Cohen, staff writers for CNN, “Five reasons immigration reform isn't close to the finish line”, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/11/politics/immigration-reform-5-things/index.html>) (JN)

House Republicans made clear Wednesday they opposed the comprehensive approach of the Senate and intended to consider the issue in a series of bills that will take months to reach final votes.

Agreeing to disagree on immigration Political Gut Check - Immigration Bush: The immigration system is broken

In addition, the House GOP caucus was deeply divided on the question of eventual citizenship for undocumented immigrants, with some calling for a path to legal status while others opposed any kind of what they labeled amnesty for those who broke the law.

While House leaders warned the party faced political harm if it failed to act on immigration legislation, a vital issue for Hispanic Americans who comprise the nation's largest minority demographic, the piecemeal approach and divisions over the legalization issue portend a messy and uncertain future for the issue.

Here are five reasons why:

Bipartisanship necessary in Senate, not the House.

A 60-vote majority is needed to push major legislation through the 100-member Senate, which means Senate Democrats and Republicans usually have to work together to get anything substantive accomplished.

The House, however, does not often require such a super-majority. As long as a simple majority sticks together, it can do virtually anything it pleases.

Mix that rule with increasing ideological orthodoxy and a decreasing willingness to compromise -- particularly within the conservative ranks of the majority House GOP -- and you have a recipe for stalemate with the Democratic-controlled Senate.

"Passing any version of the Gang of Eight's bill would be worse public policy than passing nothing," conservative pundits Bill Kristol and Rich Lowry argued Tuesday in National Review Online. "House Republicans can do the country a service by putting a stake through its heart."

In today's hyper-partisan political climate, doing nothing is the easiest path for House Republicans to take and even a bragging point for tea party conservatives who came to Washington to shake up the status quo.

While moderate House GOP leaders call for passing some kind of immigration legislation to avoid a potential political backlash, conservatives in the rank-and-file say such fears are unfounded as voters will reward Republicans for opposing what they call a bad Senate bill.

Republicans don't trust Obama on border security.

Kansas Rep. Tim Huelskamp might have said it best. The two-term conservative Republican tweeted Wednesday that "trusting Obama (with) border security is like trusting Bill Clinton (with) your daughter."

Ouch.

Virtually every congressional Republican says the Mexican border needs to be properly enforced before Democrats get their priority -- a path to citizenship for America's 11 million undocumented residents. Sens. Bob Corker, R-Tennessee, and John Hoeven, R-North Dakota, added billions for Mexican border security to the "Gang of Eight" bill.

For a lot of Republicans, though, the issue involves trust, not money. They remember the last major immigration reform effort, in 1986 under GOP President Ronald Reagan, that also called for tightened immigration controls while giving three million undocumented immigrants legal status.

They say the amnesty occurred but the tougher border controls didn't, leading to the much-worse situation today.

Now they don't trust Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano to secure the border. They also claim Obama's recent decision to delay implementation of part of health care reform showed the administration can't be counted on to fully enforce any law.

By taking a piecemeal approach, House Republicans hope to secure the tougher border security they seek before acting on a separate plan that could provide legal status for at least some undocumented immigrants.

In short, pass a border security bill now, and then come back to the legalization issue once everyone agrees the border is sealed. Democrats reject such an approach.

The conundrum of citizenship/legalization

While the Senate measure provides a multi-year path to citizenship for most undocumented immigrants, House Republicans made clear Wednesday they remained split about 50-50 on the matter.

Reasons for opposing any kind of legalization range from punishing lawbreakers to political protectionism, with conservatives fearing that most immigrants given what they call amnesty and the eventual right to vote will lean Democratic.

However, the issue of legalizing immigrants is broad and complex, creating lots of uncertainty.

For example, the Senate bill would automatically give immigrants living illegally in the United States temporary legal status as "registered provisional immigrants." Only when certain border security steps had been taken could they apply for permanent residency, or green cards, as a step toward potential citizenship in process that would take more than a decade.

Many House Republicans made clear they don't want any kind of legal status for undocumented immigrants until the borders are secure. Even those open to legalization don't want it to include a path to full citizenship.

The labels and definitions of legal status will be a major sticking point in the continuing debate, but also could be a source of compromise.

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia told Wednesday's GOP caucus meeting that children of undocumented immigrants brought illegally to America through no fault of their own should be provided a path to legal status, a position strongly favored by Democrats.

The backing of Cantor and other House Republicans for such a provision showed room for maneuvering exists.

After meeting with Obama at the White House on Thursday, GOP Sen. John McCain of Arizona called on House Republicans to negotiate an immigration bill.

"We are ready to sit down with you and negotiate and bring this issue to a conclusion," said McCain, part of the bipartisan Senate "Gang of Eight."

Sweeping reform isn't popular with GOP in either chamber.

There may be more Senate GOP support for comprehensive immigration reform, but not that much. Only 14 of 46 GOP senators backed the "Gang of Eight" bill heralded in its creation as a triumph of bipartisanship in a sharply divided Congress. Why should House Republicans be more in favor?

Remember that all politics is still local -- especially in the House. Many House Republicans represent ruby red districts with few Hispanics, where any path to citizenship is unpopular and the big fear is a primary challenge from the right.

Which leads us to ...

The Hastert rule

House Speaker John Boehner has made clear that the House will only take up immigration reform that is backed by a majority of its Republican members. That is keeping with the maxim of former House Speaker Dennis Hastert that prevented votes on legislation that lacked strong support from the controlling party.

Democrats contend the Senate version would pass the House with a few dozen Republicans joining them to overcome opposition by most of the GOP caucus.

While it is unclear if that's true, permitting it to happen would antagonize many of Boehner's fellow Republicans.

"If the speaker allows a vote on any immigration bill that results in passage despite a majority of the Republican conference voting against it, then it will be interesting to see if he can muster the votes to get re-elected after the next election," Alabama GOP Rep. Mo Brooks recently told CNN.

#### Not happenin’ – Disagreement about Senate bill, skepticism, and pressure which outweighs Hispanic vote

**Salvanto and Hendin 7/13** (Anthony Salvanto and Robert Hendin, staff writers CBS News, “Why Immigration reform faces an uphill battle in the House”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57593521/why-immigration-reform-faces-an-uphill-battle-in-the-house/>) (JN)

We haven't seen any polling on this, but we'd wager that few Americans outside D.C. know what the "Hastert Rule" is. And who could blame them? It isn't even a written rule. But it does help highlight the pressures in the Republican conference right now as it wrangles with immigration reform, and the way Congress operates in this new era.

When they assembled this week to map out their approach, House Republicans made clear they won't be taking up the Senate's "gang of eight" bill because not all House GOP members support it. Many expressed principled disagreement with the policy; still others said they were skeptical that the Senate bill's plan for border enforcement - which they prioritize - would really happen.

Dim prospects for comprehensive immigration bill in House

McCain, Schumer put positive spin on House immigration plans

Many national Republicans see an immigration measure as a step toward making inroads with Hispanic voters, who have growing clout and have voted overwhelmingly Democratic. But House members' political calculus can be - by design - very different from the Senate's, and probably from those looking to steer the national party's "brand." The thought of primaries or voter anger back home might outweigh the allure of any gains for the national party from appealing to Hispanic voters (or, at least, by not continuing to do things unappealing to Hispanic voters).

#### No momentum - delay of health care law creating Republican distrust about the enforcement of border security

**Fox News 7/14** (Fox News quoting Iowa Republican Representative Steven King, “House Republicans press new immigration tactic: Obama won't enforce border security”, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/14/house-republicans-press-new-immigration-tack-obama-wont-enforce-border-security/>) (JN)

Congressional Republicans pressed ahead Sunday with their emerging stance on immigration reform, arguing President Obama delaying the implementation of his health care law raises major concerns about whether he’ll enforce border security measures in immigration laws.

“We cannot fix with laws things the president refuses to do,” Iowa Republican Rep. Steve King told “Fox News Sunday.”

Though well known as one the House’s most conservative members, King has emerged as perhaps the chamber’s most vocal opponent of the Senate’s immigration bill, which includes $40 billion toward additional security along the U.S.-Mexico border and a path to citizenship for at least some of the roughly 11 million illegal immigrants now living in the United States.

House Republicans appeared to emerge with the new strategy after a closed-door meeting Wednesday, which was preceded by the Obama administration saying earlier this month that it will delay the start of the so-called employer mandate part of the president’s signature health care law until after the 2014 elections.

“If the president can selectively enforce ObamaCare, what’s to say he cannot selectively enforce border security?” House Minority Leader Eric Cantor said ahead of the meeting.

#### Won’t pass – needs movement on border security first

**AP 7/11/13** (Associated Press, “House GOP in no rush to pass immigration reform”, http://www.salon.com/2013/07/11/gop\_rejects\_comprehensive\_approach\_on\_immigration\_ap/singleton/) (JN)

Other lawmakers said even that approach raised concerns. Dealing with border security, they said, could lead to negotiations with the Senate that could morph into a compromise granting citizenship for some of the immigrants in the country illegally. They sought and received assurances from Boehner that he wouldn’t let that happen, according to Rep. Kevin Cramer of North Dakota.

Boehner had said he wants the House to pass legislation on the subject before lawmakers go home for a four-week break over August, beginning with a measure to toughen border security. He has also said he won’t put any bill on the House floor that doesn’t have the support of at least half of the GOP rank and file, a pledge that only increases the challenge for Democrats and others who want to give a chance at citizenship to millions now in the country illegally.

### A2 Passed the Senate

#### Senate Immigration bill won’t pass [in the House] – unconstitutional and lacks votes

**Dinan 7/11** (Stephen Dinan, staff writer, CEO of The Shift Network, speaker, “Reid blocks own immigration bill from House vote”, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jul/11/reid-blocks-own-immigration-bill-house-vote/>) (JN)

Democratic leaders have told the House to pass the Senate immigration bill as is, but they can’t — because Majority Leader Harry Reid hasn’t actually sent the bill over to the House yet.

Two weeks after senators voted 68-32 to pass the bill, Mr. Reid is still holding the 1,200-page measure in his chamber, which means there is no Senate bill for the House to consider.

SPECIAL COVERAGE: Immigration Reform

House Republicans said they don’t expect Mr. Reid to ever send the bill over to them because it would set up an embarrassing vote that would deem the bill unconstitutional, since it raised revenue — a power the Constitution gives to the House, not the Senate.

“The Senate-passed immigration bill is a clear violation of the ‘origination’ clause of the Constitution, which states ‘All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills,’” Rep. Steve Stockman, a Texas Republican, said in a letter to colleagues on Wednesday.

Mr. Stockman got some powerful support Wednesday evening when Congress’s chief tax-writer, House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp, agreed: “Chairman Camp: Senate immigration bill a revenue bill; unconstitutional and cannot be taken up by the House,” his committee said in a Twitter message.

If Mr. Reid were to send the bill over, Republicans could schedule a vote to assert the House’s constitutional prerogatives in a move known as issuing a blue slip — a designation that officially rejects the bill and forces it back to the Senate.

The Senate bill has become the focus on an intense debate after it passed the chamber last month.

House Speaker John A. Boehner has repeatedly said the bill is dead, and on Wednesday he and his GOP colleagues laid out a strategy that moves the other direction, splitting the issue up into smaller pieces rather than passing a giant legalization bill as the Senate did.

But Mr. Reid and Sen. Charles E. Schumer, the New York Democrat who is chief author of the Senate bill, have both said they doubt the House can pass its own bills, and have predicted that eventually the GOP will relent and put the Senate bill up for a House vote.

### A2 Will pass b/c Election

#### Immigration has no impact on election concerns – polling data proves

**Killough 7/12/13** (Ashley Killough, freelance journalist and student at Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, “Poll: More than two-thirds doubt immigration bill can pass”, <http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/07/12/poll-more-than-two-thirds-doubt-immigration-bill-can-pass/>) (JN)

And the longer it takes for Congress to move on an immigration bill, the more likely it will become a big issue in next year's mid-term elections.

But the poll indicates that a plurality of voters–47%–say their elected leaders' votes on the bill will make no difference on whether they decide to support their representatives' respective re-election bids. Twenty-eight percent say a vote for immigration reform make them more likely to back their representative, while 19% say it will make them less likely to do so.

Five reasons immigration reform isn't close to the finish line

Breaking it down by party, 45% of Republicans say it makes no difference, while slightly less–20%–say it makes them more likely and 30% say it makes them less likely to support their representative.

For Democrats, 45% say it makes no difference, while 44% say it makes them more likely and 6% say less likely.

The Quinnipiac University survey was conducted June 28-July 8, with 2,014 registered voters nationwide questioned by telephone. The survey's overall sampling error is plus or minus 2.2 percentage points.

## Link Stuff

### A2 Focus Link

#### No focus link – GOP apathetic towards the process – no specific plans, no timetable, no urgency AP 7/11 (Associated Press, “House GOP in no rush to pass immigration reform”, <http://www.salon.com/2013/07/11/gop_rejects_comprehensive_approach_on_immigration_ap/singleton/>) (JN)

WASHINGTON (AP) — House Republicans are embracing a step-by-step approach to immigration, in contrast to the sweeping plan passed by the Senate and backed by the White House. But they’re offering neither specifics nor a timetable — nor any mention of possible citizenship for an estimated 11 million immigrants living in the country unlawfully.

Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and other Republican leaders said in a statement the administration “cannot be trusted to deliver on its promises to secure the border and enforce laws as part of a single, massive bill like the one passed by the Senate.”

House GOP lawmakers streaming out of a two-hour meeting on immigration Wednesday also shrugged off a long-distance nudge from former President George W. Bush, who called on Congress to reach a “positive resolution” on the issue.

America can be a lawful society and a welcoming society at the same time,” Bush said at a naturalization ceremony at his presidential library in Dallas. “We care what people back home say, not what some former president says,” declared Rep. Tim Huelskamp, R-Kan. President Barack Obama is to meet Thursday with two authors of the Senate measure, John McCain, R-Ariz., and Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., in the Oval Office. The Republican meeting in the Capitol was arranged as a listening session for the House GOP, their first such session since the Senate approved far-reaching legislation last month on a bipartisan vote of 68-32. Lawmakers said afterward there was support for a bill to create a path to citizenship for immigrants who were brought to the country as children illegally by family members, an idea advanced by Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia. Several members of the rank and file said Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., had made a particularly strong appeal for a comprehensive approach, which includes possible citizenship for the 11 million. But others emphasized there was virtually no support for the Senate’s approach of one sweeping measure that dealt with immigration in all its forms. And there is no clear timetable. “I don’t sense any urgency,” said Rep. John Fleming of Louisiana. Rep. Peter King of New York said that if any legislation came to the floor for a vote this month, it would deal only with border security.

## Impact Cards

### A2 Econ IL

#### No benefits to immigration – unemployment and negative effects

Flynn 7/13/13 - political columnist (Mike, “WHITE HOUSE OVERSELLS ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF IMMIGRATION REFORM”, Breitbart, July 13 2013, <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/07/13/white-house-oversells-economic-benefits-of-immigration-reform>)//CB

The White House report draws heavily from a CBO analysis on the economic impact of the Senate bill, released in mid-June. The CBO estimates that, under the Senate bill, in 20 years, the nation's GDP would be $1.4 trillion higher than it otherwise would be if the bill didn't pass. The Administration claims the bill will grow the economy by 5.4% in that time-frame.

Which sounds impressive, until one realizes that we are talking about a 20 year window here. An incremental growth of 5% over two decades isn't exactly an economic bonanza. In that time-span the US economy will generate $300-500 trillion in total economic impact. An extra few trillion is at the margins or the margins.

Worse, the economic benefits the CBO estimates will accrue only begin at least a decade after enactment. Through 2031, Gross National Product, which measures the output of US residents and firms, would be lower than it otherwise would be. In ten years, the per capita GNP would be almost 1% lower than without the Senate bill.

The CBO analysis also shows that average wages of American workers would be lower than they otherwise would be through at least the first 10 years of the law's enactment. The unemployment rate would also rise for the first decade, due to a large increase in the labor force.

Supporters and opponents of immigration reform both overstate its economic impact. In a nation of more than 300 million people and a $16 trillion economy, any economic impact is going to be felt at the margins. The CBO, however, finds that, for at least a decade, the economic effects of the Senate bill are negative at the margins. After 2 decades, the CBO says the effects become positive at the margin.

A decade of relatively worse economic performance to secure marginally better performance 20 years from now is not an obviously good bargain. One can make many argument in favor of immigration reform. Economic growth, however, seems a very weak one.

### A2 Food IL

#### Innovation solves the impact

**Krikorian 4** [Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, "Flawed Assumptions Underlying Guestworker Programs," February, http://www.cis.org/articles/2004/back204.html]

Another assumption that underlies a guestworker program is that the infusion of low-skilled foreign labor will not retard the process of technological innovation and increasing productivity. Unfortunately, elementary economics tells us that capital is likely to be substituted for labor only when the price of labor rises, something a guestworker program is specifically intended to prevent. A 2001 report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston highlights this problem by warning that a new wave of low-skilled immigrants over the course of this century may slow growth in U.S. productivity.16 That this is so should not be a surprise. Julian Simon, in his 1981 classic, The Ultimate Resource, wrote about how scarcity leads to innovation: It is all-important to recognize that discoveries of improved methods and of substitute products are not just luck. They happen in response to scarcity a rise in cost. Even after a discovery is made, there is a good chance that it will not be put into operation until there is need for it due to rising cost. This point is important: Scarcity and technological advance are not two unrelated competitors in a Malthusian race; rather, each influences the other.17 As it is for copper or oil, this fact is true also for labor; as wages have risen over time, innovators have devised ways of substituting capital for labor, increasing productivity to the benefit of all. The converse, of course, is also true; the artificial superabundance of a resource will tend to remove much of the incentive for innovation. Stagnating innovation caused by excessive immigration is perhaps most apparent in the most immigrant-dependent activity the harvest of fresh fruit and vegetables.18 The period from 1960 to 1975 (roughly from the end of the "Bracero" program, which imported Mexican farmworkers, to the beginning of the mass illegal immigration we are still experiencing today) was a period of considerable agricultural mechanization. Although during hearings on the proposed termination of the Bracero Program in the early 1960s, California farmers claimed that "the use of braceros is absolutely essential to the survival of the tomato industry," the termination of the program prompted mechanization which caused a quintupling of production for tomatoes grown for processing, an 89 percent drop in demand for harvest labor, and a fall in real prices.19 But a continuing increase in the acreage and number of crops harvested mechanically did not materialize as expected, in large part because the supply of workers remained artificially large due to the growing illegal immigration we were politically unwilling to stop. An example of a productivity improvement that "will not be put into operation until there is need for it due to rising cost," as Simon said, is in raisin grapes.20 The production of raisins in California’s Central Valley is one of the most labor-intensive activities in North America. Conventional methods require bunches of grapes to be cut by hand, manually placed in a tray for drying, manually turned, manually collected. But starting in the 1950s in Australia (where there was no large supply of foreign farm labor), farmers were compelled by circumstances to develop a laborsaving method called "dried-on-the-vine" production. This involves growing the grapevines on trellises, then, when the grapes are ready, cutting the base of the vine instead of cutting each bunch of grapes individually. This new method radically reduces labor demand at harvest time and increases yield per acre by up to 200 percent. But this high-productivity, innovative method of production has spread very slowly in the United States because the mass availability of foreign workers has served as a disincentive to farmers to make the necessary capital investment.

### A2 Food Impacts

#### No impact to food prices – the poorest are insulated from global markets

**Paarlberg 8** (Robert, Professor of Political Science – Wellesley College, “It's Not the Price that Causes Hunger”, The International Herald Tribune, 4-23, Lexis)

International prices of rice, wheat and corn have risen sharply, setting off violent urban protests in roughly a dozen countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But is this a ''world food crisis?'' It is certainly a troubling instance of price instability in international commodity markets, leading to social unrest among urban food-buyers. But we must be careful not to equate high crop prices with hunger around the world. Most of the world's hungry people do not use international food markets, and most of those who use these markets are not hungry. International food markets, like international markets for everything else, are used primarily by the prosperous and secure, not the poor and vulnerable. In world corn markets, the biggest importer by far is Japan. Next comes the European Union. Next comes South Korea. Citizens in these countries are not underfed. In the poor countries of Asia, rice is the most important staple , yet most Asian countries import very little rice. As recently as March , India was keeping imported rice out of the country by imposing a 70 percent duty. Data on the actual incidence of malnutrition reveal that the regions of the world where people are most hungry, in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, are those that depend least on imports from the world market. Hunger is caused in these countries not by high international food prices, but by local conditions, especially rural poverty linked to low productivity in farming. When international prices are go up, the disposable income of some import-dependent urban dwellers is squeezed. But most of the actual hunger takes place in the villages and in the countryside , and it **persists even when international prices are low**. When hunger is measured as a balanced index of calorie deficiency, prevalence of underweight children and mortality rates for children under five, we find that South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in 2007 had hunger levels two times as high as in the developing countries of East Asia, four times as high as in Latin America, North Africa or the Middle East, and five times as high as in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa are hungry even though their connections to high-priced international food markets are quite weak. In the poorest developing countries of Asia, where nearly 400 million people are hungry, international grain prices are hardly a factor, since imports supply only 4 percent of total consumption - even when world prices are low. Similarly in sub-Saharan Africa, only about 16 percent of grain supplies have recently been imported, going mostly into the more prosperous cities rather than the impoverished countryside, with part arriving in the form of donated food aid rather than commercial purchases at world prices. The region in Africa that depends on world markets most heavily is North Africa, where 50 percent of grain supplies are imported. Yet food consumption in North Africa is so high (average per capita energy consumption there is about 3,000 calories per day, comparable to most rich countries) that increased import prices may cause economic stress for urban consumers (and perhaps even street demonstrations) but little real hunger. Import dependence is also high in Latin America (50 percent for some countries) but again high world prices will not mean large numbers of hungry people, because per capita GDP in this region is five times higher than in sub-Saharan Africa. There is a severe food crisis among the poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, but it does not come from high world prices. Even in 2005 in sub-Saharan Africa, a year of low international crop prices, 23 out of 37 countries in the region consumed less than their nutritional requirements. Africa's food crisis grows primarily out of the low productivity, year in and year out, of the 60 percent of all Africans who plant crops and graze animals for a living. The average African smallholder farmer is a woman who has no improved seeds, no nitrogen fertilizers, no irrigation and no veterinary medicine for her animals. Her crop yields are only one third as high as in the developing countries of Asia, and her average income is only $1 a day.

#### Billions won’t die – their data is wrong

**Khosla 7** (Vinod, Founder – Sun Microsystems and Khosla Ventures, “Food versus Fuel” or the “Salve for Africa”?, <http://www.khoslaventures.com/presentations/FOODvFUEL.pdf>)

Stopping bad policy is a worthwhile goal, but we should not abandon all biofuels. There is no doubt that we can produce biofuels in the right or wrong way. However, at each step, we need to evaluate the costs of biofuels vs. the long-term costs of continuing with our current path. There exists vast tracts of underutilized pastureland worldwide and good energy crop practices can improve the sustainability of farming while meeting our energy needs. Lester Brown’s assertions that food supplies are likely to be threatened by corn ethanol (800M motorists vs. 2 billion poor people) is **illogical and ill-thought out** – the data is extrapolated from corn ethanol projections (without a basic understanding that cellulosic, and not corn ethanol, is the long term future) is flawed at best. To repeat what we have cited before: taking this “logic” to Brown’s idealistic vision of wind power – it would be akin to extrapolating to “if we produced all our electricity with wind 75% of the planet would be without electricity 75% of the time (or worse!)”. Irrational, fear-mongering extrapolation of data leads to irrational results.

### Endangers Border Community

#### Immigration bill bad – endangers those living in border communities

Right Side News 7/8/13 - Right Side News reports on comprehensive immigration reform legislation being charted this week by the GOP House from the Federation for American America the Free Immigration Reform (“Immigration Reform News and Impact on US Homeland Security July 8, 2013”, Right Side News, July 8 2013, <http://www.rightsidenews.com/2013070832857/us/homeland-security/immigration-reform-news-and-impact-on-us-homeland-security-july-8-2013.html>)//CB

Although the Senate recently passed S. 744, the Gang of Eight's 1,200 page bill that would immediately grant amnesty to illegal aliens in the U.S. before any enforcement efforts are made, several open borders groups are now opposing the bill based on border security provisions they say are too extreme.

"[W]e cannot support a bill that is [] guaranteed to increase death and destruction in immigrant life through increased militarization of the border," the pro-amnesty group presente.org said in a June 24 statement. The Border Network for Human Rights made a similar statement last week, saying S. 744 no longer represents their interests. "If this bill becomes the law, it will swallow our traditional values of freedom and liberty for all and gravely endanger our rights and dignity. For the more than six million people who live in border American communities between San Diego, California and Brownsville, Texas, S.744 is a promise of abuse, violation and death."