# Nativism DA

### Uniqueness

#### A.Hate groups are weak now because they are expanding without a message, militant splinters are becoming more radicalized

Reid Ross and Burley, Alternet, 17 [Alex; Shane; 11-27-17; "Will the Alt Right Produce the Next Timothy McVeigh?"; https://www.alternet.org/news-amp-politics/will-alt-right-produce-next-timothy-mcveigh; accessed 6-14-18; PAC]

Even in deeply conservative areas of the country, white nationalist organizations struggle to find adherents, so they enlist more mainstream figures to aid in their recruitment. For years, those were paleoconservatives like Pat Buchanan. More recently, they're online pseudo-celebrities like Milo Yiannopoulos and Mike Cernovich. When these personae self-destruct or repudiate the movements they've championed, refusing to go down with their more radical associates, the true believers begin to lash out in desperation. Lane Davis, a former Yiannopoulos intern dismissed by the former Breitbart editor, recently murdered his own father during a domestic dispute.

The timeline of alt right attacks over the last year reveals its hate crimes are growing in intensity, and some of the more recent incidents suggest it's moving towards "leaderless resistance." On November 1, Scott Ostrem was arrested for what appears to have been the racist murder of three Latinos outside of a Walmart on the outskirts of Denver, Colorado. Just over a week later, on November 10, former Air Force member and Dylann Roof admirer Devin Kelley murdered 26 people in Sutherland Springs, Texas.

Richard Spencer's movement presently finds itself in a state of disintegration. As it continues to fracture, many of its members will be reabsorbed into American society, but not all of the virulent racists and misogynists it has cultivated will go quietly. The alt right has already penetrated the U.S. military and local police departments. If a splinter faction were to go underground, adopting a "leaderless resistance" aimed at "national revolution," the alt right or whatever formation it ultimately assumes could become more deadly than ever.

So-called Anticom groups and other openly identitarian groups are already forming "defense squads" in preparation for armed conflict with the left or anyone they rightly or wrongly associate with Antifa. Many believe that “total revolution and anarchy from the likes of Bob Mathews and Tim McVeigh are the only solutions remaining,” as Order member David Lane wrote from prison in 2005. They have the training to carry out massive acts of violence, and while their movement may have stalled, autonomous acts of terror remain extraordinarily dangerous.

These are the kinds of acts Richard Spencer is ultimately inviting at college campuses across the country. As organized resistance continues to shut down his recruitment efforts, the alt right will lose the momentum and manpower needed to see through its vision. But this requires that local communities take the threat he poses seriously, even as Spencer hops around on stage, insisting that he only wants to have a conversation.

### Link

#### B. Pro-immigration policies spur racist backlash and gives far right extremists something to rally around

Abrajano and Hajnal, UC San Diego Political Science Professors, 17 [Marisa; Zoltan; 2-28-17; "White Backlash: Immigration, Race, and American Politics"; pages.ucsd.edu/~zhajnal/resources/white-backlash-manuscript.pdf; pg 26-7; accessed 6-14-18; PAC]

In this chapter, we argue that far from the nation moving away from the use of race as dividing line, immigration is actually leading to greater divisions and greater tensions – at least in the political sphere. As the immigrant population has grown, more and more Americans have become aware of the demographic, economic, and cultural changes that are occurring. For many that awareness has spurred real anxiety. The fear is driven in part by the size of the immigrant population itself but more substantially by an immigrant threat narrative that is perpetuated by the media and politicians alike. As the number of immigrants coming to this country has grown over the past half century, so too has attention to this narrative. Images of immigrants clandestinely crossing the US-Mexico border, committing crimes, and demanding ever more from the nation serve to heighten anxiety among those who may already be concerned about the direction the nation is taking. Once aroused that anxiety seeks a political home. When the two major parties chart divergent courses on the question of immigration, with one often bemoaning the social, cultural, and economic costs associated with immigrants and the often willing to admit the benefits that immigration can provide, the political choice for Americans becomes clear. For those who fear the changes wrought by immigration, the Republican Party provides a natural home.

The end result, we contend, is a rightward shift for a large segment of white America. As anxiety about immigration has grown, white partisanship and politics has become increasingly affected by this issue, with more and more white Americans espousing a less generous, more indignant politics that seeks to punish immigrants that violate American norms and strives to cut off services and other public goods that could benefit immigrants.

### Internal Link

#### Threat of violence will be high – iceberg theory

Perliger, UMass Lowell Criminology Professor, 17 [Arie; Newsweek; 6-4-17; "Homegrown Terrorism and why the Threat of Right-Wing Extremeism is Rising in America"; www.newsweek.com/homegrown-terrorism-rising-threat-right-wing-extremism-619724; accessed 6-14-18; PAC]

The number of violent attacks on U.S. soil inspired by far-right ideology has spiked since the beginning of this century, rising from a yearly average of 70 attacks in the 1990s to a yearly average of more than 300 since 2001. These incidents have grown even more common since President Donald Trump’s election.

The Southern Poverty Law Center, a nonprofit that researches U.S. extremism, reported 900 bias-related incidents against minorities in the first 10 days after Trump’s election—compared to several dozen in a normal week—and the group found that many of the harassers invoked the then-president-elect’s name. Similarly, the Anti-Defamation League, a nonprofit that tracks anti-Semitism, recorded an 86 percent rise in anti-Semitic incidents in the first three months of 2017.

Beyond the terror that victimized communities are experiencing, I would argue that this trend reflects a deeper social change in American society.

The iceberg model of political extremism, initially developed by Ehud Shprinzak, an Israeli political scientist, can illuminate these dynamics.

Murders and other violent attacks perpetrated by U.S. far-right extremists compose the visible tip of an iceberg. The rest of this iceberg is under water and out of sight. It includes hundreds of attacks every year that damage property and intimidate communities, such as the recent attempted burning of an African-American family’s garage in Schodack, New York. The garage was also defaced with racist graffiti.

Data my team collected at the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point show that the significant growth in far-right violence in recent years is happening at the base of the iceberg. While the main reasons for that are still not clear, it is important to remember that changes in societal norms are usually reflected in behavioral changes. Hence, it is more than reasonable to suspect that extremist individuals engage in such activities because they sense that their views are enjoying growing social legitimacy and acceptance, which is emboldening them to act on their bigotry.

### Impact

#### C. Impact – Far right terrorists would use a WMD

Beutel, Southern Poverty Law Center, 18 [Alejandro; 2-20-18; "The radical right and weapons of mass destruction - an enduring threat to the American homeland"; https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2018/radical-right-and-weapons-mass-destruction-—-enduring-threat-american-homeland; accessed 6-14-18; PAC]

The individual chiefly responsible for the illicit material was William Krar, a violent, far-right, antigovernment extremist from New Hampshire. Krar, 63, was active in the New Hampshire militia scene and had ties to members of the New Jersey Militia group.

When federal agents raided his storage locker in Noonday, they found copies of Henry Ford’s antisemitic screed The International Jew, along with a copy of the violent white supremacist fantasy novel The Turner Diaries, which served as inspiration for Timothy McVeigh’s infamous 1995 bombing of a federal building in Oklahoma City that killed 168 people.

Despite the fact that a chemical WMD was found on American soil at a time of high public concern about terrorism, the incident generated little media fanfare or public attention.

Drawing from a number of various open sources, the SPLC has identified at least 17 cases of extremists since 1993 — 16 of those involving U.S. far-right extremists who have sought to, or successfully acquired, deadly chemical, biological or radiological weapons capabilities.

#### WMD attack would cause nuclear lashout

Pifer, Brookings Institution Arms Control Initiative Director, et al, 10 [Steven; Richard C Bush, Vanda Felbab-Brown, Martin S. Indyk, Michael O'Hanlon, Kenneth M. Pollack; May 2010; Foreign Policy at Brookings; "U.S. Nuclear and Extended Deterrence: Considerations and Challenges"; https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/06\_nuclear\_deterrence.pdf; pg 45-47; accessed 11-11-17; PAC]

The United States has at times recognized this reality. It publicly committed not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states, unless the latter are allied with nuclear powers in wartime operations (and now has aligned its NSAs to non-nuclear weapon states in compliance with the NPT). Yet American policy had not been consistent. Even while making such NSA commitments at various points, the United States has also sought to retain nuclear weapons as an explicit deterrent against other, nonnuclear forms of weapons of mass destruction, as a matter of targeting policy and nuclear weapons doctrine.106

There was an element of hypocrisy in this previous American pledge not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states when combined with a willingness to consider using nuclear weapons in response to a biological (or even chemical) attack. Others noted this contradiction and chastised the United States for it. One thoughtful and well-argued study in the 1990s asserted that nuclear weapons should never be used against biological (or chemical) threats or in retaliation for such attacks. In considering the possibility of an extremely destructive biological agent that killed as many as nuclear weapons might, the authors wrote that “… it would be technically and operationally difficult to achieve such high numbers of casualties with biological weapons, and no nation is known to possess weapons so effective.”107 It is a good reason that, as a normal matter of policy, the United States should not plan on any nuclear response to attacks by lesser types of weapons of mass destruction, especially the types of attacks that might be anticipated today or that have been witnessed in the recent past (for example, the chemical attacks during the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s).108 From this standpoint, the Nuclear Posture Review reached a sound conclusion on responding to a BW or CW attack.

But this argument is perhaps more persuasive for the technologies of the present rather than a hypothetical situation in the future; things could change over time. That is the crux of the challenge for future policy and doctrine regarding whether nuclear weapons should have a future purpose of helping deter advanced biological attack.

Biological weapons could become much more potent in coming decades. Biological knowledge certainly is advancing rapidly. To take one metric, the number of genetic sequences on file, a measure of knowledge of genetic codes for various organisms, grew from well under five million in the early 1990s to 80 million by 2006.109 The number of countries involved in biological research is growing rapidly as well. What about 25 to 50 years from now, a day that current policymakers must contemplate when considering lasting changes to doctrine as well as the pursuit of a nuclear-weapons-free world?

As of 2008, more than 160 states had ratified and acceded to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, but one of its weaknesses is the lack of verification measures. One can naturally hope that better monitoring and verification concepts will be developed in the biological field—just as they must clearly be improved in the nuclear realm if abolition is ever to be feasible even on its own more narrow terms.110 But these techniques will be very hard to devise, and probably rather imperfect in their ability to provide timely warning. One can try various forms of direct as well as indirect monitoring—the latter including looking for mismatches between the numbers of trained scientists and professional positions available to them in a given country, or a mismatch between the numbers of relevant scientists and associated publications.111 Big disparities could suggest hidden programs. One can also build up disease surveillance systems and create rapid-response BW investigation teams to look into any suspected development of illicit pathogens or any outbreak of associated disease.112 But the United States will still need a good deal of luck to discover many hypothetical biological weapons programs. Any countries bent on cheating will have a good chance of success in hiding their associated research and production facilities.

For Americans, who long led the way in biology, it is sobering and important to remember that even today, at least half of all important biological research is already done abroad. It often takes place in small facilities that are very hard if not impossible to identify from remote sensing.113

For such reasons, it is eminently possible that an advanced “bug”—perhaps an influenza-born derivative of smallpox resilient against currently available treatments, for example—could be developed by a future aggressor state. Such a bug could combine the contagious qualities of the flu with the lethality of very severe diseases.114 This could dramatically alter the calculations of BW use.

It is such a prospect that led University of Maryland scholar John Steinbruner to note “One can imagine killing more people with an advanced pathogen than with the current nuclear weapons arsenals.”115 The state developing this BW agent might simultaneously develop a vaccine against the new disease and use that vaccine to inoculate its own people. It might then use the biological pathogen as a weapon, or a threat, against another country. That could be a country it was interested in conquering; it could also threaten use against the United States and broader international community, to deter other countries from coming to the rescue of another state being attacked directly by the aggressor (analogous to how Saddam Hussein would have liked to deter the U.S.-led coalition from coming to Kuwait’s aid in 1990-1991). If the United States faced the prospect of millions of its own citizens, or hundreds of thousands of its own troops, becoming sick as it considered a response to aggression, and its only recourse was conventional retaliation, its range of options could be limited. Indeed, the very troops called on to carry out the retaliation might become vulnerable to the disease, jeopardizing their physical capacity to execute the conventional operation. Perhaps they could be wellprotected on the battlefield, once suited up, but they could be vulnerable before deployment, along with the rest of the American population. A potential adversary, seeing these possibilities, might find the concept of such an advanced pathogen very appealing.

Would there be a clear and definitive policy or moral argument against the use of a nuclear weapon in retaliation for a BW attack that killed hundreds of thousands—or even millions—of Americans? If the origin of the attack could be identified, as it might well be under numerous scenarios like the one sketched above, and if huge numbers of American civilians had been targeted, the case for restraint would be hard to make. At the least, it might be no stronger than the case for absorbing a nuclear weapons strike and choosing not to retaliate.

What if the United States thought a biological attack by an aggressor imminent? Or what if it had already suffered one attack and others seemed possible? In such circumstances, there could be potential value in a nuclear retaliatory threat against the belligerent state, warning that any future use of biological attacks against the American people or U.S. allies might produce a nuclear response.116

In his classic book on just and unjust war, Michael Walzer asserted that “Nuclear war is and will remain morally unacceptable, and there is no case for its rehabilitation.” He also argues “Nuclear weapons explode the theory of just war. They are the first of mankind’s technological innovations that are simply not encompassable within the familiar moral world.” This would seem to argue (since biological weapons of certain types predated nuclear technologies) that in fact nuclear deterrent threats could never be justifiable against a biological attack. However, the logic of Walzer’s overall case against nuclear weapons is based explicitly on their indiscriminate and extreme effects—characteristics that advanced biological pathogens, which did not exist when he wrote the above words, would share. It is hard to argue that nuclear deterrence of an adversary’s possible use of an advanced pathogen that could kill a million or even ten million is less justifiable than the use of nuclear deterrence against an adversary’s nuclear arms.117

Indeed, it is possible that a nuclear response to such a biological attack might be conducted in a more humane way than the BW attack. Nuclear responses might target military bases and command headquarters, for example. To be sure, civilians would also be at risk in such a nuclear attack, but in proportionate terms a nuclear retaliatory blow could well cause a smaller fraction of casualties among innocent civilian populations than would a biological pathogen.118

U.S. policymakers had to bear in mind what is possible, at least theoretically, with advanced engineered pathogens. As Steinbruner notes, in discussing the contagiousness of certain flu-borne ailments,

“One strain infected an estimated 80 percent of the world’s population in a sixmonth period. Normally the incidence of disease among those infected is relatively low, as is the mortality rate of those who contract the disease. However, aviary strains of the virus have killed virtually all of the birds infected, which suggests the possibility of highly lethal human strains as well.”119

It was these kinds of considerations that led the Nuclear Posture Review to incorporate a hedge with regard to biological weapons. While U.S. policy now is not to respond with nuclear weapons for a CW or BW attack by a non-nuclear weapons state, the U.S. government retained the option to reconsider nuclear retaliation with regard to BW if there were major advances in biotechnology that were put to use for BW purposes.

But the other side of the argument is not inconsequential, either. Advanced biological pathogens may never be developed; nuclear weapons already have been not only developed but mass-produced and used. Retaining the threat of nuclear retaliation based on hypothetical concerns about possible future developments with biological agents that are far from inevitable may be unnecessary and unjustified. Surely it would be seen as cynical in the eyes of some, as a barely veiled attempt to find an excuse to maintain dependence on nuclear arms, and could undercut the value of the policy change in reducing the relevance of nuclear weapons.

Moreover, if a biological weapon with mass casualty features ever were developed and utilized to devastating effect, the United States would not be constrained in its retaliatory options in any event. If a million Americans, Germans, Italians or Japanese were killed by a superbug, it would be hard to imagine a particularly strong international criticism if Washington reversed its previous pledges and responded with nuclear arms. If necessary, this point could be conveyed privately through diplomatic channels to U.S. allies in advance, as a way of shoring up the credibility of the American extended deterrent even as the formal role of nuclear weapons was publicly constrained by announcement of a new doctrine. This could offer a way to avoid allowing the unlikely and extreme scenario of horrific biological attack to stand in the way of the more immediate agenda of reducing the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. security policy.

# Brain Drain DA

### Uniqueness

#### Brain drain low now- immigrants worldwide are returning home

Hirsch 12 (Michelle, “US Educated Immigrants Returning to Their Homelands”). May 14. *Fiscal Times*. [http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2012/05/14/US-Educated-Immigrants-Return-to-Their-Homelands //](http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2012/05/14/US-Educated-Immigrants-Return-to-Their-Homelands%20//) LDonn

Demographers were stunned last month when new data revealed a trend reversal: immigrants are no longer flocking to the U.S., and some have made a U-turn and returned home. Data from the Internal Revenue Service show that 1,800 people, mostly living abroad, either renounced their U.S. citizenship or handed in their green cards—more than the total number of people who did so in 2007, 2008, and 2009 combined. A few made the choice to avoid paying U.S. taxes on income earned abroad, but others are seeking greener pastures in the global economy. With the U.S. facing a shortage of skilled workers, the wave of immigrants who are turning their backs on America is foreboding. A growing population of highly-educated Americans and foreign nationals educated in the states are less committed to living and working in the U.S., preferring to return to their homelands, many of which are emerging economies. “It’s only really come to light in the last year or two, but we’re noticing a pattern of highly-skilled children of foreign-born U.S. immigrants leaving the U.S. for the countries where their parents were born,” said Madeleine Sumption, a policy analyst at the Migration Policy Institute. Sumption says the trend is strong in China, India and Brazil where dramatic economic growth over the last decade has opened up opportunities for entrepreneurship and led U.S. multinationals to hire overseas employees with western educations. “We’re putting together a picture of what’s happening partly from data and partly from anecdotal evidence since it’s a relatively new phenomenon.” Entrepreneurship experts say a combination of booming developing economies, a still-soft U.S. economy, and difficulty obtaining green cards is driving foreign-born U.S. students who in past years would have remained in the U.S. on temporary visas to move home. “Some of the sheen has come off the U.S. economy as the place to make your fortune—especially if you’re from another country and have a U.S. education,” said Robert Litan, vice president of research and policy at the Kauffman Foundation. “They know all the hot things that are going in the United States, and see a real opportunity to replicate them or do something similar in their home country that doesn’t have it.” According to data from the Brazilian government, U.S. applications for permanent work visas in Brazil rose 77 percent between 2008 and 2011, and temporary visas rose 36 percent during that time. China and India have not released those same statistics, though other data point to growing numbers of American-educated individuals choosing to move to those countries [China and India]. The Chinese Ministry of Education estimates that the number of Chinese living overseas who returned to China more-than tripled between 2007 and 2010 from 44,000 to 135,000. Government officials in India say they’ve seen a steep rise in the number of people of Indian ancestry entering the country over the past several years. At least 100,000 Indians, including students returned in 2010, according to Alwyn Didar Singh, a former Secretary at the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs. “If one were to estimate, a majority of the professionals returning, as also students, would be from the US,” he told The Fiscal Times. Litan says if the U.S. economy were growing at a 4 percent rate rather than the current rate of about 2 percent, the number of voluntary departures would likely decline. In contrast, India and China’s economies are expanding at around 7 percent. The challenge for the U.S. is how to keep educated foreign students in the U.S. That would require overhauling immigration policies. Currently, if a foreign student wants to remain in the U.S. after graduation, he or she must be sponsored by an employer and apply for an H1B Visa. Those visas, which expire after six years, preclude foreigners from starting their own companies. To stay here, the worker must apply for a green card, which also requires sponsorship The U.S. government caps the number of green cards available each year at 140,000, with every country limited to no more than 9,800.

### Link

#### The plan will make immigrants go to the United States – cross-apply their own evidence

**Raveesh 13** ( S., “Brain Drain: Socio-Economic Impact on Indian Society”). International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714 www.ijhssi.org Volume 2 Issue 5 ǁ May. 2013ǁ PP.12-17/ LDonn

The growth in knowledge intensive activities in the developed world has led to a growing demand for Science and Engineering professionals. With an important reserve of trained people in this domain, India is becoming a major supplier of human capital for the advanced economies. India is sending large numbers of these specialists compared to other important origin countries. A relevant example is the number of Indian students in science and engineering enrolled in US undergraduate degree programs. India, China, and South Korea are the top countries of origin for foreign students in the United States in science and engineering: India with 68,000 students in 2009 accounts for the largest number of foreign students here, followed by China with 54 000 students. Together these countries account for almost 47% of all foreign science and engineering student enrolled in U.S universities9. Germany is also recruiting foreign students from India, notably in engineering and computer sciences. The United States remain the most important host country of highly-skilled Indian migrants with more than 80% of Indian skilled migration to all developed countries. In the host countries, Indian migrants are among the besteducated and highest-earning groups. The US Census Bureau‟s 2008 American Community Survey found that 74.1% of an estimated stock of 1.6 million of Indian immigrants held at least a bachelor's degree, and 68.9% were hired in management, professional, and related positions (Naujoks, 2009). According to the US Government Accountability Office (GAO), 46.9% of highly-skilled workers admitted under the H-1B visa between fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2009 were born in India10. In 2004, the US was the favored destination of 62% of the 71,290 physicians emigrating from India while 32% chose the UK (Bhargava, Docquier, and Moullan, 2010). In the European Union, the UK is the first destination of highlyskilled Indian migrants attracting two thirds of the total number of Indian migrants in Western Europe (Khadria, 2008). Indians also represented more than 40% of the estimated 22,000 entries under the UK‟s Highly-Skilled Migrant Program.

### Link – H1B

#### H1B Visas attracts Indian medical personnel —that causes brain drain, and concurrently kill all attempts at health care improvement Baptiste 14

(By [Nathalie Baptiste](https://www.thenation.com/authors/nathalie-baptiste/) and [Foreign Policy In Focus](https://www.thenation.com/authors/foreign-policy-focus/), February 26, 2014, Nathalie Baptiste ([@nhbaptiste](http://twitter.com/nhbaptiste)) is a journalist based in Washington, DC, who writes about criminal justice, policing reform, and politics. Her work has appeared in The American Prospect and Mother Jones.Foreign Policy in Focus (FPIF) is a “Think Tank Without Walls” at the Institute for Policy Studies that connects the research and action of more than 800 scholars, advocates, and activists seeking to make the United States a more responsible global partner. Brain Drain and the Politics of Immigration” , <https://www.thenation.com/article/brain-drain-and-politics-immigration/> , Accessed 7/11/18, ASaini)

The increase of available H-1B visas allows for highly educated foreigners to pursue a more prosperous career in the United States. But what does it mean for the countries they leave behind? In India, home to the [large majority](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-08-20/india-nabs-nearly-two-thirds-of-u-s-h-1b-visas.html) of H-1B visa recipients, many medical students opt to study abroad because of rising costs and limited capacity at their public institutions. The medical brain drain in India not only reduces the number of doctors available for care, but it also removes [the people needed](http://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcript.php?storyId=16783065) to push for healthcare reforms. Considered the [most privatized health system](http://www.dw.de/indias-health-services-in-urgent-need-of-treatment/a-15969421) in the world, India’s public health system is made up of mainly rural health centers that lack basic infrastructure, medicines and staff. India spends only 0.9 percent of its GDP on healthcare, which promotes a large private healthcare industry that [remains inaccessible](http://www.dw.de/indias-health-services-in-urgent-need-of-treatment/a-15969421) to the poor. The wealthy [can afford to be treated](http://www.dw.de/indias-health-services-in-urgent-need-of-treatment/a-15969421) at a state-of-the-art hospital for a stomach ache, while the poor must walk long miles to receive treatment for sicknesses and sometimes discover that the medicine they need is unavailable. The shortage of doctors is staggering: there are [only six doctors](http://www.dw.de/brain-drain-of-medical-students-in-india-higher-than-ever/a-17266607) for every 10,000 patients. People in need of medical attention may spend days waiting in line for tests or drugs because there are simply [not enough doctors](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/01/world/asia/01iht-medical.1.16607251.html?_r=0) and nurses available to tend to their medical needs. India is not the only country that suffers from brain drain, and the loss of human capital does not only affect the medical industry. Zimbabwe is struggling to keep its education sector from collapsing [after losing 45,000](http://www.afronline.org/?p=4997) teachers in 2010 alone. Haiti has [lost more college graduates](http://www.haitian-truth.org/remarks-with-haitian-prime-minister-laurent-lamothe/) than any other country in the world. Brain drain is occurring in every region of the developing world. Plugging the Drain Ensuring that skilled workers have opportunities to flourish at home is ultimately a challenge for source countries, not the richer countries that absorb them when they leave. But the loss of brain power to the United States and other developed countries creates an unfortunate cycle for poorer countries: educated individuals migrate, leaving their home countries’ tax base and infrastructure in poor shape. The weakened infrastructure in turn means that more people will leave, driving the cycle onward. In order to solve this problem, the governments of developing nations should strive to create incentives for their educated workers to stay home and use their abilities to create a better and more sustainable society. Perhaps developed countries can provide some assistance through educational partnerships or other forms of cooperation. But because freedom of movement is an inalienable human right, neither the United States nor the source countries can (or should) simply prohibit skilled workers from moving around the globe. Meanwhile, the United States should reconsider its own prejudices about foreign workers. In their drive to welcome skilled laborers to the United States, US policymakers often overlook the value of unskilled and semiskilled migrants. The construction, agricultural and homecare industries, for example, all rely heavily on the labor of a foreign-born workforce. These are seldom the people praised by pundits as the “best and brightest,” but they’re vital to the US economy and perform valuable work for their fellow Americans.

### Link – EB5

#### Estimates say India will lose 500 million due to EB5 Visas – the aff would cause it to increase even more. Zhou 7/12

(Youyou Zhou, a visual journalist on the Quartz Things team. She designs for the web, writes stories and builds data visualizations. Prior to Quartz, she worked for The Associated Press as an interactive producer, where she covered the U.S. elections and Venezuela crisis. Youyou graduated from University of Missouri with a Bachelors degree in Convergence Journalism. , “Rich Indians are finding a way into the US with ‘golden visas’”, Quartz India, <https://qz.com/1326227/spurned-by-h-1b-indians-are-getting-us-green-cards-with-eb-5-golden-visa/> , Accessed 7/12/18, ASaini)

The wealthy Chinese have been paying hundreds of thousands of dollars to effectively buy legal US residency. Now it’s a tactic taking off with Indians. The US will grant permanent residency, colloquially known as a green card, to foreign nationals who invest as little as $500,000 into the US economy. This “investor visa” is known as the EB‑5. Investors from mainland China have received the vast majority of these visas in the past decade. However, growth in applications from Chinese nationals has nearly stopped due to the staggering visa backlogs they face. India, currently the third largest country of EB-5 investors, has became the new focus of efforts by US real estate developers and businesses, to secure investment from abroad. India is rapidly catching up. The number keeps increasing. There were 307 Indian investors waiting in the EB-5 visa queue by November 2017, according to a US Department of State report (pdf, p. 11). Those are folks who had submitted their applications but haven’t gained approval yet. Rogelio Caceres, the co-founder of LCR Capital Partners—a company that connects foreigners with money to EB-5-eligible investment projects—told Quartz that his company is working with about 200 Indian clients. He estimated that 500 to 800 Indians were applying or would apply for EB-5 visas this year, and more than 1,000 would apply in 2019.

### Link – China

#### US incentives cause China brain drain

Zweig and Changgui ’95 (David Zweig, Ph.D., The University of Michigan, 1983 - Chair Professor, Division of Social Science, and Director, Center on China’s Transnational Relations, and Chen Changgui, China's Brain Drain to the United States : Views of Overseas Chinese Students and Scholars in the 1990s, 1995 http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/ieas/CRM\_047.pdf)

Given the exceptionally low return rate in all studies of the Chinese brain drain, China is suffering a significant loss of brainpower. But how great is this loss? If these people are still making contributions to China, their families, and their home units, China may benefit from "storing brainpower overseas.'"\* The following section will assess the extent of the loss, as well as the potential benefits to China of having so many talented Chinese abroad. One measure of the loss caused by the brain drain is the investment China has made in these non-returnees. Is China losing highly qualified people in whom the state had already made a major investment, or are many of the people going to the United States actually gaining much of their training overseas? According to Chang, despite the fact that the return rate of Taiwanese students studying in the United States has been only 18 percent, the loss is not so great because the vast majority of these people were trained in the United States and therefore reflect a "migration and education" pattern, rather than an exodus of high-class scientists and engineers.^ One can compare this to India, where a highly developed education system trains many Ph.D.s who are educated at home and then migrate to the developed world. In this case, the loss is much greater. To assess this factor we looked at our interviewees' edu cational levels when they left China. Our findings suggest that there is significant loss, but not as much as that suffered by Third World coun tries that lose fully trained faculty members, mostly because China to date has not produced many Ph.D.s. In our sample, only 9 people (3.3 percent) had already attained the Ph.D. before leaving China; the major ity had completed their undergraduate training (49.1 percent) or had received an M.A. in China (44.6 percent) and had left China to get a Ph.D.^ This situation reflects the "migration and education" pattern in Taiwan's and South Korea's brain drain, where students went to the United States to earn the Ph.D. but did not return. From this perspec tive, despite the fact that China does not produce a large number of undergraduate students and that the cost of training them is borne by the state, losing people with only a B.A. is more a loss of potential brain power than a loss of already trained talent. On the other hand, if our sample is even somewhat representative of the Chinese student population in the United States, then tens of thousands of very valuable M.A. students have been leaving China and not returning. For a society producing a limited number of Ph.D.s, the master's degree is quite important, as many of these people become university lecturers and form the key source of the future generation of Chinese scientists and researchers.^ Moreover, as 45 percent of our sample (124) came to the United States to get Ph.D.s, the loss of potential brainpower is significant, especially if many of them do get this advanced degree and do not return to China.

### India Impact

#### Brain Drain hurts the Indian Economy

Kariyatil Krishnadas 1,( Kariyatil Krishnadas is editor of TechIndia, “Brain drain hurts developing nations, U.N. reports”, <http://www.eetimes.com/document.asp?doc_id=1143665&>)//SD

BANGALORE, India — The exodus of Indian engineers mostly to the United States costs India $2 billion annually, according to a recent U.N. study. While the United Nations Human Development Report 2001 stresses that "technology itself has become a source of economic growth" for countries like India, many of the benefits are being outweighed by the brain drain of engineering talent. "Rich nations have been opening their doors to developing-country professionals at a high cost to the home countries," the U.N. study warned. Based on the $15,000 to $20,000 average total cost of providing a university education in India, the country losses as much as $2 billion a year in technical investment. While migrating Indian engineers enjoy a higher social status, they are often derided as "slaves to the almighty dollar," or as individuals who, while benefiting from a highly subsidized government education here, have no incentive to help the Indian society that has trained them.

#### Indian growth is key to check Indo-Pak conflict

Mamoon & Murshed 10 Dawood, Professor at School of Management and Economics of University of Islamabad, affiliate of Harvard Business School's Micro Economics of Competitiveness, and Pedagogy and Research affiliate at George Mason University; and S. Mansoob, Professor of International Economics at the Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham and Professor of the Economics of Conflict and Peace at the Institute of Social Studies, the Hague, 3-7-10, “The conflict mitigating effects of trade in the India-Pakistan case”, original paper, <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10101-010-0074-y.pdf> //kent – wh

However, if India is able to export or import more, this would at least put a check on any rise in the severity of conflict and hostilities would adjust to some average level. Any decline in Indian trade will enhance hostilities. The current low levels of bilateral trade between Pakistan and India is conflict enhancing, so more trade with increased exports by both sides to each other should be encouraged. More access to Pakistani markets on the Indian side may not lead to conflict mitigation if Pakistan is not able to also export more to India. A rise in education expenditure puts a check on hostilities, as seen in Graph 1e. Graph 1f is the standard representation of India-Pakistan conflict, and not only best fits historical trends but also explain the rationale behind recent IndiaPakistan peace initiatives with decreasing hostilities when not only India but Pakistan also has had economic growth rates as high as 7% per annum. The forecasts suggest that conflict will rise, even if there is a significant increase in combined democracy scores, if growth rates plummet. Both Pakistan and India have seen many such years, when hostilities between both countries rose significantly when at least one of the countries is performing poorly, but were channeling more resources on the military as a proportion of their GDPs. The forecasts favour the economic version over the democratic version of the liberal peace. Thus one may look at current peace talks between both countries with optimism as both are performing well on the economic front and channeling fewer resources on the military as a proportion of national income, while at the same time having a divergent set of political institutions, though recently Pakistan has edged towards greater democracy with elections in February 2008.

#### Indo-Pak war escalates – we’re on the brink

Sebastien Roblin 17 (Sebastien Roblin, journalist @ the national interest, 11-26-2017, "A War Between India and Pakistan: Nuclear Weapons Could Fly (And Millions Die)," National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/war-between-india-pakistan-nuclear-weapons-could-fly-23370, Accessed: 7-11-2018 //kent - wh)

Pakistan does have to fear the potential of an Indian counterstrike intended to retaliate for a terrorist attack by Pakistani-aligned groups, such as the killing of 166 in Mumbai by Lashkar-e-Taiba in 2008 or the attack on Indian parliament in 2001 by Jaish-e-Muhammad. In both cases, the attackers had ties with Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence, and Islamabad has shown limited willingness or ability to crack down on these groups. Complicating matters, civilian control of the military is far from consolidated in Pakistan, and it would be quite possible for ISI or some other agency to carry out such activities on its own initiative without the knowledge or support of the head of state. India’s military has formulated a “Cold Start” doctrine to enable its forward-deployed land forces to launch an armored assault into Pakistani territory on short notice in response to a perceived provocation from Islamabad. This new strategy was devised after the Indian Army’s armored strike corps took three weeks to deploy to the border after the attack on the Indian parliament in 2001, by which time Pakistan had already mobilized its own troops. Islamabad sees nuclear weapons as its deterrent against a conventional attack, and Cold Start in particular. This is demonstrated by its refusal to adhere to a “No First Use” policy. Pakistan has an extensive plutonium production capacity, and is estimated to possess 130 to 140 warheads, a total that may easily increase to 220 to 250 in a decade, according to a report by the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. Many of the new weapons are smaller, short-range tactical weapons intended for targeting frontline troops. To enable a second-strike capability, Pakistan has also empowered local commanders to launch retaliatory nuclear strikes in case the chain of command is disrupted. While battlefield nuclear weapons are less likely to cause the mass civilian casualties that a strike against a densely populated city would produce, they are deeply worrying in their own way: a state may be more tempted to employ tactical nuclear weapons, and perceive doing so as being intrinsically less risky. However, many simulations of nuclear war suggest that tactical-nuclear-weapon usage rapidly escalates to strategic weapons .

### Africa Impact

#### African econ collapse causes war – empirics

Corinne Graff et. al 6 (Corinne Graff, research analyst and a fellow in the Global Economy and Development program; Janet Lewis, assistant professor of Political Science @ USNA; and Susan E. Rice, senior fellow in Foreign Policy at Brookings, served on the staff of the National Security Council and as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs during President Bill Clinton's second term, distinguished visiting research fellow in the School of International Service (SIS) at American University, confirmed by Obama as permanent representative to the UN, 12-19-2006, "Poverty and Civil War: What Policymakers Need to Know," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/research/poverty-and-civil-war-what-policymakers-need-to-know/, Accessed: 7-13-2018 //kent - wh)

From Sierra Leone to Tajikistan and Indonesia’s Aceh Province, civil war has erupted in countries suffering from persistent poverty or sharp economic decline. These conflicts sap already depleted national resources and further cripple the fragile economies of some of the world’s poorest countries, while claiming millions of innocent lives. They may also suck in neighboring countries, exacerbate regional instability, and require costly military intervention by outside powers. Civil wars often have significant security implications for more distant peoples as they are ideal incubators of transnational security threats such as terrorism, weapons proliferation, criminal activity and infectious disease. Recent examples of poor countries that have plunged into civil war abound. Sierra Leone was one of the world’s poorest countries with a per capita GNI of $180 when its brutal civil war broke out in 1991.1 The war resulted in the U.N. authorizing the deployment of a 17,500-strong peacekeeping mission, at a cost of $2.8 billion.2 Ivory Coast – once considered a model of relative prosperity and stability in Africa – experienced steadily declining per capita GNI which dropped from $1,120 in 1980 to $650 in 2000, when civil conflict erupted for the first time since independence. In Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo), two full-scale wars erupted in the mid-1990s, ultimately resulting in the deaths of an estimated 4 million people and requiring the eventual deployment of 17,000 U.N. peacekeepers. The conflicts’ immediate precipitating factors were external [the economy].3 However, domestic factors helped fuel Congolese rebel movements that fought a simultaneous and sustained civil war. These factors likely include decades of intense kleptocracy, lack of basic infrastructure throughout the vast country, inter-communal tensions manipulated by long-time dictator Mobutu Sese Seko and his successors, and dire poverty. In 1995, Zaire’s GNI per capita stood at $130, making Zaire the second poorest country in the world. Today, the DRC remains violent in places and highly unstable. The risk of renewed conflict remains high, in part because economic conditions have not improved in any meaningful way: GNI per capita remains the second lowest in the world, having dropped to $120.

### Impacts

#### Economic decline of immigrant-sending countries leads to war – causes leaders to adopt protectionist policies and dichotomize themselves from the rest of the world – increasing and fostering tensions that result in war. In addition, the risk of diversionary war that quickly escalate infinitely increases. Take WWII as an example.

#### Indian Growth Solves South Asian Conflict – the aff would stop this from happening

Mamoon & Murshed 8 (Dawood Mamoon works for Institute of Social Studies in the Netherlands, S. Mansoob Murshed works The Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham and Centre for the Study of Civil War (CSCW), “The conﬂict mitigating effects of trade in the India-Pakistan case”, http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10101-010-0074-y.pdf)//SD

However, if India is able to export or import more, this would at least put a check on any rise in the severity of conflict and hostilities would adjust to some average level. Any decline in Indian trade will enhance hostilities. The current low levels of bilateral trade between Pakistan and India is conflict enhancing, so more trade with increased exports by both sides to each other should be encouraged. More access to Pakistani markets on the Indian side may not lead to conflict mitigation if Pakistan is not able toalso export more to India. A rise in education expenditure puts a check on hostilities, as seen in Graph 1e. Graph 1f is the standard representation of India-Pakistan conflict,and not only best fits historical trends but also explain the rationale behind recent India-Pakistan peace initiatives with decreasing hostilities when not only India but Pakistan also has had economic growth rates as high as 7% per annum. The forecasts suggest that conflict will rise, even if there is a significant increase in combined democracy scores, if growth rates plummet. Both Pakistan and India have seen many such years, when hostilities between both countries rose significantly when at least one of the countries is performing poorly, but were channeling more resources on the military as a proportion of their GDPs. The forecasts favour the economic version over the democratic version of the liberal peace. Thus one may look at current peace talks between both countries with optimism as both are performing well on the economic front and channeling fewer resources on the military as a proportion of national income, while at the same time having a divergent set of political institutions, though recently Pakistan has edged towards greater democracy with elections in February 2008.

# Base DA

### Uniqueness

#### Trump’s approval rating steadily increasing over the last month – unbiased polls prove. – November 4th, 2018

<https://www.realclearpolitics.com/eptolls/other/president_trump_job_approval-6179.html>

Trump’s approval rating has improved to 43.6% as of November 4th, 2018.

#### Prefer this to any NUQ evidence they might read in the next speech, our evidence is literally from 5 days ago whereas theirs is months old.

#### Trump rating surging now – base likes him

Janet Hook 10/21/18 Published on the Wall Street Journal. “Interest in Midterms Surges, Along With Trump Approval Rating” <https://www.wsj.com/articles/interest-in-midterms-surges-boosting-trump-approval-rating-1540126920>

Voter interest in the midterm elections has surged to records within both parties, helping to drive up President Trump’s approval rating while maintaining the Democrats’ lead as the party most preferred to lead Congress, a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll has found.

The findings point to an energized electorate, buffeted by dynamics that bring great uncertainty to the outcome of an election just two weeks away

Nearly two thirds of registered voters showed a high level of interest in the election—the highest ever recorded in a midterm election since the Journal/NBC poll began asking the question in 2006.

“It’s a barnburner,” Bill McInturff, a GOP pollster who conducted the survey with Democrat Fred Yang, said of the surge of voter interest. “There’s a switch that’s been flipped...They are engaging in the campaign and the process.”

In the aftermath of the bitter confirmation fight over Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, Republicans have closed the once-large gap between their voters’ and Democrats’ interest in the election. Now, 68% of Republican voters and 72% of Democrats say they are very interested in the election—the highest recorded for either party by the survey in a midterm election.

Hand in hand with Republicans’ increased election interest is a rise in Mr. Trump’s job-approval rating to 47%, the highest mark of his time in office, with 49% disapproving of his performance. That is an improvement from September, when 44% approved and 52% disapproved of his performance.

Democrats still lead on the question of which party should control Congress. Among poll respondents identified as likely voters, 50% prefer Democrats, while 41% prefer Republican control, about the same as in last month’s poll. Among all registered voters, a broader group of respondents, Democrats’ advantage over the GOP is narrower—48% to 41%.

Mr. Yang said the poll results include signs that the widely predicted “blue wave” of Democratic gains in the House in 2018 now is running into a “riptide of uncertainty [that] has been created with a surge of Republican intensity.”

### Link – Generic

#### **The aff causes the base to leave**

Fabian & Easley 17 (9/18, Jordan & Jonathon, The Hill authors, “Trump bets base will stick with him on immigration”, The Hill, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/350947-trump-bets-base-will-stick-with-him-on-immigration>)

But if Trump does go back on key campaign promises, it could present a different kind of challenge for him. As a candidate, Trump energized his supporters with his pledges to scrap DACA, deport the roughly 11 million immigrants living illegally in the U.S. and build a wall along the southern border to stop them from entering. Immigration, in short, was perhaps the biggest animating force of his candidacy. King tweeted that if reports of the president’s dealings are correct, “Trump base is blown up, destroyed, irreparable, and disillusioned beyond repair. No promise is credible.” But the president expressed confidence Republicans would stick with him even if he helps DACA recipients, telling reporters Thursday many are “very, very happy with what we’re doing.” The former campaign adviser endorsed Trump’s view, saying his support is “not tied to a specific policy, it’s tied to disrupting, it’s tied to shaking up the status quo.” “That’s what the base likes, bringing disruption to a city that has been mired in gridlock,” the aide said. On Friday, Trump tacitly acknowledged his newfound love for bipartisanship carries political risk. The president rallied supporters with a string of tough-talking early morning tweets on the terror attack at London subway station and an ESPN host who called him a white supremacist. He also reassured his backers that “CHAIN MIGRATION cannot be allowed to be part of any legislation on Immigration!” The term refers to the practice of immigrants with legal status sponsoring certain family members so that they can come to the U.S. Yet some of Trump’s allies continue to question why he seems to be prioritizing a top issue for Democrats, the status of immigrants in the U.S. illegally, over his campaign promise to build a border wall. By not demanding wall funding be attached to a DACA bill, Trump supporters say he is giving away his most valuable bargaining chip in exchange for vague promises of stronger border security from Schumer and Pelosi. Trump once bragged that his supporters are so loyal, he could shoot someone in the street and he would not lose support. Dan Stein, president of the Federation for American Immigration Reform, said Trump’s proposed DACA deal would put that notion to the test. “Donald Trump would have been better off going onto Fifth Avenue and shooting someone,” said Stein, whose group favors lower levels of both legal and illegal immigration. “He said his base wouldn’t care if he did that. The base cares about this.” Stein speculated the president might be “convinced that dealing on DACA will win him new supporters” who could help him win in 2020. The former campaign aide said Trump’s supporters wouldn’t have a better option in 2020, regardless of what he does on immigration. “It’s not 2016 Trump against 2020 Trump,” the aide said. “It’s Trump running against [Sens.] Elizabeth Warren or Bernie Sanders, and it’s not like these voters would run to vote for the other side.” In the short term, conservatives' anger at Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) and Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) has provided a buffer for Trump against the backlash from his base. Frustration with the GOP leaders gave Trump room to break with them and strike an agreement with Democrats on a deal to extend the nation’s borrowing limit and fund the government. That dynamic could persist until Republicans begin notching legislative victories of their own. “He has such a diverse coalition and his base elected him knowing that he isn’t overly ideological,” said a GOP consultant who requested anonymity. “Poll after poll shows that Republicans will blame Ryan and McConnell every single time, so he has leeway here.” But the consultant warned that cover might not last forever, because “it’s never a good sign to have key influencers turn their backs.” Key figures on the right warn that immigration is a different animal from other policy areas. Trump’s tough talk on the issue was a major reason why the right rallied behind him in 2016 over GOP establishment figures like former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush (R) and Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). “He succeeded in the primary because of immigration,” Stein said. “He would not have won the primary if he had taken a stance on DACA amnesty, [Sen.] Ted Cruz would have won. The base simply will not accept this.”

### Link – Refugees

#### Trump’s base hates refugees – fears of terrorism

Saul 17 (1/29, Josh, senior writer at Newsweek, “POLL, TRUMP BACKERS SHOW SUPPORT FOR IMMIGRATION BAN”, NewsWeek, http://www.newsweek.com/trump-voters-back-immigration-ban-549887)

While President Donald Trump’s executive order blocking immigration from seven Muslim-majority nations sparked protests and confusion across the U.S., almost half of American voters are in favor of blocking immigration from “terror prone” countries, according to a newly released poll. “American voters support 48 – 42 percent suspending immigration from ‘terror prone’ regions, even if it means turning away refugees from those regions,” states a press release from Quinnipiac University, which questioned 899 people by calling their landline and cell phones in early January. The poll reflected the strong anti-immigration and anti-refugee views held by Trump supporters in Northeastern Pennsylvania, a region that was crucial in the president’s surprise victory last year. “Our first priority should be the safety of Americans,” says Tino Altavilla, a freshman at King’s College in northeast Pennsylvania. Asked his opinion of the executive order Trump signed Friday afternoon, the physics major said he doesn’t believe every Muslim is a terrorist but that the vetting system needs to be improved before any more people from Middle Eastern countries are allowed into the U.S. “Imagine Syria. There are very few records on some of the people because it’s a war zone.” Altavilla voted for Trump in November, just like almost 60 percent of voters in Luzerne County, which flipped from supporting Obama by 5 points in 2012 to a 20-point victory for Trump. A third-generation Italian-American, Altavilla tells Newsweek that he thinks Trump should have presented the executive order as a “hold” instead of a “ban,” but that he agrees with Trump’s order. “I’m not sure if his handling was correct, but what he did was correct.” Most Trump voters from this mountainous county, a two-hour drive west of New York City, were quick to voice their support for the executive order that blocks citizens of seven mostly-Muslim countries from coming to the U.S. for at least three months, bans all refugees for four months and bars Syrian refugees indefinitely. They saw the ban as a smart way to protect the country from terrorist attacks, and they dismissed arguments that the order amounted to a religious ban or comparisons between the order and America’s rejection of Jews fleeing Nazi Germany. “I don’t think he’s picked out a religion, he’s picked out countries that need more vetting,” retired Army lieutenant colonel Stephen Urban, a Democrat who supported Bernie Sanders in the primary and Trump in the general, tells Newsweek. Urban thinks it’s important to view the immigration order in the context of Trump’s recent directive to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents. “I support his policy 100 percent,” Urban says. “He just wants to have [agents] in place to process people and make sure they’re vetted.” Even a Trump voter whose father immigrated from the Middle East called the motive behind the order “understandable” and says it doesn’t lessen his support for Trump, though he does think it incorrectly paints too many people as potential enemies. “I don’t agree with it, but I’m not on the protest bandwagon,” says Mark Rabo, 40, a heavy equipment operator in Luzerne County whose father was an immigrant from Jordan. (His mom immigrated from what is now the Czech Republic and voted for Hillary Clinton in November.) “What needs to happen is there needs to be legislation to screen out and vet people who are on a watchlist or part of a known terrorist group.”

### Link – Non-white Immigration

#### The base hates legal immigration for people who aren’t white and Christian

Beinart 18 (2/18, Peter, associate professor of journalism and political science at the City University of New York & Atlantic editor, “It's Not Illegal Immigration That Worries Republicans Anymore”, The Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/02/what-the-new-gop-crack-down-on-legal-immigration-reveals/553631/)

What explains this? Trump’s great hidden advantage during the 2016 Republican presidential primary was his lack of support from the GOP political and donor class. This allowed him to jettison positions—in support of free trade, in support of the Iraq War, in support of cutting Medicare and Social Security—that enjoyed support among Republican elites but little support among Republican voters. He did the same on immigration, where the “legal good, illegal bad” distinction turned out to be much more popular among the party’s leaders than among its grassroots. Cribbing from Ann Coulter’s book, Adios America, Trump replaced the legal-illegal distinction with one that turned out to have more resonance on the activist right: The distinction between white Christian immigrants and non-white, and non-Christian ones. The words “illegal immigration” do not appear in Trump’s presidential announcement speech. Instead, Trump focused on immigrants’ country of origin. “When Mexico sends its people,” he declared, “they’re not sending their best … They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists … It’s coming from more than Mexico. It’s coming from all over South and Latin America, and it’s coming probably—probably—from the Middle East.” Trump, who often says bluntly what other Republicans say in code, probably realized that “illegal immigrant” was, for many voters, already a euphemism for Latino or Mexican-immigrants. In their book White Backlash, the political scientists Marisa Abrajano and Zoltan Hajnal cite a poll showing that 61 percent of Americans believe that most Latino immigrants are undocumented even though only about a quarter are. “When Americans talk about undocumented immigrants, Latinos or immigrants in general,” they note, “the images in their heads are likely to be the same.” What really drove Republican opinion about immigration, Trump realized, was not primarily the fear that the United States was becoming a country of law-breakers. (Republicans, after all, were not outraged about the lack of prosecution of tax cheats.) It was the fear that the United States—which was becoming less white and had just elected a president of Kenyan descent—was becoming a third-world country. When the Public Religion Research Institute and Brookings Institution asked Americans in 2016 their views of immigration from different parts of the world, it found that Republicans were only three points more likely than Democrats to want to reduce immigration from “predominantly Christian countries” and only seven points more likely to want to reduce immigration from Europe. By contrast, they were 33 points more likely to support reducing immigration from Mexico and Central America and 41 points more likely to support reducing immigration from “predominantly Muslim countries.” What really drives Republican views about immigrants, in other words, is less their legal status than their nation of origin, their religion, and their race. Trump grasped that during the campaign, and in coalition with a bevy of current and former Southern Senators—Jeff Sessions, David Perdue and Tom Cotton—he has used it to turn the GOP into a party devoted to slashing legal immigration. On Thursday, when presented with a bill that traded the legalization of Dreamers for more border security but did not reduce legal immigration, only eight Republican Senators voted yes. However, 37 voted for a bill that legalized the “Dreamers,” added more border security, and substantially reduced legal immigration.

#### Trump’s base is key

O’Reilly 17 (6/8, William F.B., staff @ Newsday, “Will Comey testimony begin to crack Trump’s base?”, http://www.newsday.com/opinion/columnists/william-f-b-o-reilly/will-comey-testimony-begin-to-crack-trump-s-base-1.13715337)

It shouldn’t matter how the president is perceived by his political base. But it means everything in reality: As long as Trump retains significant grass-roots Republican support, just 20 or 25 percent, members of Congress won’t break with him en masse. Doing so would spell political suicide for them in 2018, through primary challenges and/or Republicans bass fishing instead of voting during the midterm elections (the same may happen if this Congress can’t pass tax reforms). Republican support for Trump hovers at around 80 percent right now, with somewhere between a quarter and half of that hard core support.

### Internal Link

#### They’re the last line of defense against his total collapse

Catanese 17 (6/2, David, staff @ US News, “Trump's Last Line of Defense”, https://www.usnews.com/news/the-report/articles/2017-06-02/donald-trumps-supporters-are-his-last-line-of-defense)

Inside Washington, Donald Trump's 4-month-old presidency appears to spin in a perpetual state of crisis and chaos, achieving few tangible successes and beset by weekly distractions. But in far and wide pockets of the country, where legions of loyal Trump supporters remain, a very different picture is being discerned. They see a media corps obsessed with a Russia investigation despite no evidence of a crime, all too easily swallowing an excuse for Hillary Clinton's loss. They see a Democratic Party lurching further to the left and practicing pure obstructionism to appease its inflamed base. They see a coterie of prosperous, smug elites stationed in power centers and unable to comprehend the everyday hardships spoken to by this president. And they see all of them hellbent on taking down Trump, whatever the cost to the country. U.S. News conducted email interviews with more than a dozen readers who defended Trump in their reactions to previous stories. These folks are angry, distrustful and sometimes intemperate, reflecting similar characteristics of the commander in chief. Some are true believers who salute all of Trump's actions, no matter how contentious or disputed. Others are clear-eyed about the president's flaws, but are more disturbed by the drumbeat of a contemptuous opposition. Not all of them consider themselves conservatives; some even voted for former President Barack Obama – twice. Given the current polls showing Trump's subpar popularity, members of this group are clearly the minority, but they also constitute the president's last line of defense as he toils in a capital that becomes more hostile by the day.

### Impact

#### Trump will engage in a diversionary war to rally the base – few checks and many likely scenarios for conflict

Power 17 Jonathan, 4-7-2017, a foreign affairs columnist for the International Herald Tribune, writer for the IDN-INPS, "Trump has Cards Up his Sleeves to Avoid Impeachment," Global Geopolitics & Political Economy Net, <http://www.globalgeopolitics.net/2017/06/15/trump-has-cards-up-his-sleeves-to-avoid-impeachment/> //saenl

Some of the “best” are working to bring down President Donald Trump, yet are they ready to cut to the chase? He has cards up his sleeve. He came to power partly because he won the support of working class and lower middle class whites who were prepared to vote against their economic interest for the sake of the nationalism that Trump espoused. Neither Keir Hardie nor Franklin Roosevelt nor Bernie Sanders were their leader. It was Trump. I don’t find it difficult to imagine how Trump could play the nationalist card that would rally his electorate. The “best” would be against this, but how many would be convinced enough to go out on the street, French style, and demand Congress impeach him? I doubt if the Harvard professors would or journalists from the New York Times, business men, school teachers, doctors, civil servants or airline pilots. Of course, as with the civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam War protests, there would be students in the front row. Then there would be clergy, a few professors from the University of Wisconsin, novelists, Senator Sanders and at most 50 members of Congress. The police would easily face them down and disperse them. “Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel”, said Samuel Johnson. So is extreme confrontation, or even war. What follows is not my scenario. It is that of Philip Gordon, writing in the current issue of the respected “Foreign Affairs”. He was Barack Obama’s Special Assistant for the Middle East, North Africa and the Gulf regions. Those who have dormant passionate intensity in their bones should read it and act now before it is too late. Events can move fast. “A week is a long time in politics”, said the former British prime minister, Harold Wilson. Trump could begin his diversionary tactics with Iran, his arch-enemy during the campaign. Gordon says, let’s suppose that a dozen Americans are killed in an attack in Iraq by an Iranian-supported militia. Two days later, Trump imposes further sanctions on Iran, effectively torpedoing the de-nuclearisation agreement negotiated by Obama. Iran continues to test its missiles. It steps up its support for the Syrian government. Later in the year, the situation having deteriorated further, Iran announces it will resume prohibited nuclear activities, including testing advanced centrifuges and expanding its stockpile of low-enrich uranium. Frustrated by continued Iranian support for the Houthi rebels in Yemen, the Pentagon steps up patrols in the Strait of Hormuz and loosens the rules of engagement for U.S. forces. When an Iranian patrol boat aggressively approaches a U.S. cruiser, the ship fires and kills 25 Iranians. Revenge is swift and 6 more American soldiers in Iraq are killed. In return Trump authorises a cruise missile attack on the Islamic Revolutionary Guard. Nationalist fervour increases in Iran, and also in America. Iran lets its nuclear scientists off the leash. Next, U.S. bombers destroy Iran’s nuclear facilities. A good chunk of the U.S. electorate cheers him on. Anti-Trump congressmen feel that they couldn’t continue with their effort to impeach him while America was in such a serious situation. Experts later called the confrontation with China the most dangerous one since the Cuban Missile Crisis that almost erupted into nuclear war. The president’s advisor, Steve Bannon, said at the beginning of the Administration: “We’re going to war in the South China Sea in five to ten years.” Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, pushed by Trump, warns that China’s access to the islands there “is not going to be allowed”. At the same time North Korea tests another long-range missile capable of reaching the western sea-board of the US. Trump demands that China pressure North Korea to stop the provocation or it would go to war with the North. China is worried about the mass of refugees that would pour into China if the regime collapsed. Also it doesn’t want U.S.-backed troops to advance to its border with the North. It refuses Trump. Trump then says the days of placating China are over. Sanctions are imposed. President Xi Jinping feels he has to retaliate. He imposes a 45% tariff on imports and sells $100 billion of U.S. Treasury bonds. Next follows an incident in the South China Sea, a clash between American and Chinese naval boats. Each side’s carriers are rushed to the region. There is a military stand-off that looks like stretching into the distant future. U.S.-China relations are in ruins. But Trump is off the hook for the rest of his term. During the next election? Perhaps war with North Korea.

# China Brain Drain

### UQ + Link

#### Immigration restrictions give China the opportunity to attract talent – that’s key to Chinese innovation and successful completion of OBOR

Wang, 17 **-**  Wang Huiyao, researcher for the Center for China & Globalization,a leading Chinese global think tank dedicated to the areas of China and globalization studies, the globalization of Chinese talent and the globalization of Chinese enterprises (“Seize Timing of USA Tightening Restrictions on Immigration” Feb, <http://en.ccg.org.cn/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/CCG-Report%EF%BC%9ASeize-Timing-of-USA-Tightening-Restrictions-on-Immigration-Adopt-More-Open-Policies-to-Attract-InternationalTalent-.pdf>

Since the Sept. 11th terrorist attack, the US government has tightened up immigration policies, and the situation was even exacerbated by the financial crisis afterwards. After President Donald Trump was sworn in, he rolled out more policies against globalization and focused on America’s interest.The US President believes immigrants are a key reason for terrorism that threatens the US homeland security and also for the unemployment problem. On January 27th, 2017, President Trump signed an Executive Order titled “Protecting the Nation from foreign terrorists entry into the United States” (the socalled “Muslim ban”). The measure prohibited for a period of three months the entry into the US of citizens from seven countries. The ban halted the Refugees Admission Program for 120 days, and suspended indefinitely the reestablishment in the USA of a Syrian refugee program launched by the Obama administration. Besides, the US media revealed that Trump government also intended to issue a decree to cancel the H1-B Visa Lottery system that prioritizes foreign students graduating from the US higher education institutions. The Draft Decree also was reported to revoke the Obama administration’s policy to extend from 12 to 36 months the STEM OPT (Optional Practical Training for students with Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics degrees). These new immigration policy measures encountered strong opposition both at home and abroad, especially the science and technology community. Even though the American Federal Judiciary has blocked the “Muslim ban”, Trump’s attitude against globalization leads us to believe that the restrictions on immigrants might still be enacted one day in the future.

On the contrary, China is currently reforming the immigration policies with an aim to establish a more open and flexible system to attract international talents. In December, 2012, the Organization Department of the Central Committee of CPC, the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security and other 25 government agencies jointly issued the “Administrative Measures on Entitlement of Foreigners with Chinese Permanent Residence”. In June, 2015, the Ministry of Public Security expanded the fields in which foreigners who apply for a Chinese Permanent Residence (Chinese Green Card) can work, based on the regulations of the “Measures for the Administration of Examination and Approval of Foreigners’ Permanent Residence in China”. Since then, Beijing, Shanghai, Fujian, and Guangdong, among other places, adopted new policy measures for the issuance of visa and residence permits to foreigners, to build a more open and flexible environment for them to live and work in China. In March, 2016, Zhongguancun became the first area to pilot the 20 new entry and exit policies for foreigners adopted by the Ministry of Public Security to support mass innovation in Beijing. These measures are expected to make it easier for foreign talent to enter and exit China to start their own business.

On Feb. 6th, 2017, the central government made a step forward in the immigration policy reforms and required the effort to improve the permanent residence permit system, as it is required by the national talent development strategy.

The recent US policies that impose more restrictions on immigration is closing the door to many international talent. However, America’ s loss could be China’s gain. China can seize the opportunity to attract more outstanding talent to tackle the problems of its aging population and to find more resources for its development initiatives, such as mass innovation and “One Belt, One Road”.

### Internal Link

#### Successful OBOR solves regional energy security

Qiang 15 — Qiang is secretary general of the Global Forum on Energy Security and director of the energy economics division at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (Liu Qiang, 6-12-2015, "China's 'One Belt, One Road' offers energy security for Asia and beyond," Published by South China Morning Post, http://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1820505/chinas-one-belt-one-road-offers-energy-security-asia-and, Accessed 6-15-2018, JWS)

China's fast economic growth in the past 30 years has dramatically transformed the global landscape. This transformation will only continue under the "One Belt, One Road" initiative set out by President Xi Jinping . This proposed initiative will propel China and the region towards a more dynamic economic system. At home, "One Belt, One Road" will connect the inland areas, furthering their development to the levels seen in cities such as Beijing, Shanghai, Shenzhen and Guangzhou. Beyond China, the initiative will create stronger links of energy, transport and information along the historical Silk Road that connects Europe to the Middle East to Asia, and the Maritime Silk Road that encompasses Southeast Asia, Oceania and East Africa. These connections will integrate markets into a dynamic economic system and offer the chance to improve the regional security situation. They will also transform the regional energy landscape. Currently, Asia faces several energy needs. Its growing countries are demanding more energy as well as energy-intensive products such as iron, steel, cement, electric appliances and cars. They are also increasingly looking to adopt clean energy. This fast-growing energy consumption requires more reliable and efficient infrastructure and markets. To meet the rapidly rising demand that comes with the region's economic development and is fuelling it, Asia's investment in the oil, gas and power sectors could be as high as US$10 trillion over the next 20 years, according to the International Energy Agency. Through the "One Belt, One Road" initiative, China will help to offset some of these major challenges. It will invest in energy projects ranging from upstream projects, oil and gas pipelines, and liquefied natural gas terminals to high-voltage power lines, nuclear power and renewable energy. It will create a more efficient and better integrated energy network. In terms of energy project investment, the natural gas sector is already feeling the impact of the "One Belt, One Road" initiative. As demand increases across Asia for natural gas as a cleaner substitute for coal and oil, it is driving Qatar, Iran, Indonesia and Australia to raise their output. China and Russia have already signed a long-term natural gas contract and there is the possibility that North America will sell natural gas to East Asia in the future. As such, a hub and proper pricing system is necessary to facilitate the fast-growing market for natural gas in the region. Some of China's harbour cities such as Shanghai and Tangshan , in Hebei , have put forward the idea of developing a natural gas hub. Given the rising demand, participation by other East Asian economies can turn this vision into reality. In terms of a more integrated energy network, the design of the "One Belt, One Road" initiative offers all Asian countries better energy connectivity, more economic opportunities for local communities and stronger communication among different nations and peoples. The initiative will also help mitigate the risks currently inherent in the transport of fuel and other goods through unstable, insecure or unfriendly channels. The result will be strengthened energy and geopolitical security, as well as a more stable regional energy market.

#### Broader efforts to solve energy concerns alleviate water tensions in Central Asia

Hongzhou 17 — Hongzhou is Research Fellow at the China Programme, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (Zhang Hongzhou, 2-2-2017, "Can China solve Central Asia’s impending water crisis?," Published by East Asia Forum, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2017/02/02/can-china-solve-central-asias-impending-water-crisis/, Accessed 6-20-2018, JWS) \*\*\*Note: Silk Road Economic Belt is a part of OBOR

With the beginning of the construction of the Rogun Dam, tensions over shared waters are likely to rise. The stakes are high. China should pay close attention to the risks posed by water conflicts to its Silk Road Economic Belt. China needs to lead by example by successfully managing the Ili and Irtysh rivers with Kazakhstan. Encouragingly, compared with its water policies on other major transboundary rivers, China has a relatively high level of institutionalised cooperation with Kazakhstan. For instance, the two countries signed an agreement on the common use and protection of transboundary rivers in 2001. And they launched the China–Kazakhstan Friendship Joint Water Diversion Project on the Khorgos River in April 2011. China can take the lead in mediating water disputes among Central Asian countries. As a first step towards this aim, China needs to expedite the conclusion of a comprehensive Agreement on Water Distribution of Cross-Border Rivers. More importantly, China could help facilitate the adoption of the ‘nexus approach’ to managing water conflicts in Central Asia. The nexus approach recognises that water, energy and food systems are inseparable. Food production accounts for 70 per cent of total global freshwater withdrawals, making it the largest user of water. Water is also needed to produce, transport or use all forms of energy. Meanwhile, the food production and supply chain consumes about 30 per cent of total global energy. And energy is needed to produce, transport and distribute food as well as to extract and treat water. Efforts in the food and energy production systems could therefore help to alleviate water stress in Central Asia. While agriculture consumes 70 per cent of the fresh water usage in Central Asia, 50–80 per cent of that is wasted due to faulty irrigation systems. Agricultural modernisation will help to keep regional water conflicts under control. China has much to offer on this front. First, with ample foreign reserves, China could invest in Central Asia’s backward agricultural infrastructure, particularly in modernising its irrigation systems. Second, water-saving technologies and drought-resistant seeds from China could further reduce water demand in Central Asia’s agricultural sector. Third, by promoting interregional and intraregional agricultural trade across Central Asia, China could help facilitate the development of a better cropping structure. For instance, by importing water-intensive crops such as rice and wheat, Uzbekistan could allocate more of its arable land to the production of drought-resistant crops like potatoes. Finally, rebuilding the regional energy market in Central Asia could help to normalise water ties between the downstream and upstream countries. With some 300 days of sunshine per year and vast wind resources, the potential for renewable energy production in Central Asia is enormous. After years of massive investment, China is now the leading producer of renewable energy worldwide. Greater Chinese investment and technological transfer in Central Asia’s solar and wind sectors would contribute to the regional’s energy security and avert its current water crisis.

### Impact

#### Central Asian water scarcity leads to war

Mirovalev 16 — (Mansur Mirovalev, 3-23-2016, "Are 'Water Wars' imminent in Central Asia?," Published by No Publication, https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2016/03/water-wars-imminent-central-asia-160321064118684.html, Accessed 6-20-2018, JWS)

Apart from global warming, experts blame the perennial drought on the Soviet system of swapping water for energy - for its collapse. "The root of the problem is the disintegration of the resource-sharing system the Soviet Union imposed on the region until its collapse in 1991," the International Crisis Group, a conflict studies think-tank, said in a 2014 report entitled Water Pressures in Central Asia. Mountainous Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan had few natural resources, but boasted massive dams and hydropower plants. They used to receive coal and natural gas from downstream Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. The system was designed to turn Central Asia into a strategic source of cotton but fell apart by the late 1990s amid squabbles over energy pricing and unpaid debts, and "a plethora of bilateral and regional agreements and resolutions concluded in that decade failed to fix it," the report said. These days, Kyrgyzstan is withholding water in massive upstream reservoirs releasing it according to electricity generation needs - that is in winter - and not the interests of now-foreign farmers next door. The dust-ups over water are aggravated by bad blood. Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan have been at odds for decades. Hundreds of people were killed in violent ethnic clashes in the Kyrgyz part of the Ferghana valley in 1990 and 2010, and the latter conflict prompted a brief exodus of hundreds of thousands of refugees. Unsurprisingly, the word "war" resurfaced when Moscow threw its weight and money to revive Soviet-era designs to build five more dams and hydropower stations in Kyrgyzstan. The Kremlin pledged to finance the $3.2bn project on the Naryn River, Syr Darya's tributary, as part of its political effort to restore its foothold in Central Asia. Uzbek President Islam Karimov wasn't very subtle with his warning. "Control over water resources in the republics of Central Asia may lead to a full-scale war," he said in October.

# Espionage DA (coupled with AI CP)

### Uniqueness

#### Trump restricting Chinese immigration---that prevents Chinese espionage

Noah Smith 18 – is a Bloomberg Opinion columnist. He was an assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University. [“Trump Is Closing Doors to World’s Smartest People”, Bloomberg Opinion, June 4th, <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2018-06-04/trump-is-closing-doors-to-world-s-smartest-people>, AZ]

Now, the administration of President Donald Trump has announced plans to restrict Chinese students’ ability to study in the U.S. The visas of Chinese graduate students working in robotics, aviation and high-tech manufacturing will be limited to just one year, and visa clearances will become more difficult to obtain.

The ostensible purpose of these restrictions is to prevent Chinese industrial espionage. China steals vast amounts of intellectual property from American companies, depriving those companies of their competitive edge and resulting in fewer jobs and lower wages in the U.S. It’s a serious problem, and represents one weakness that open societies face when competing with closed, centrally managed nations.

### Link

#### Immigration allows Chinese human intelligence to come to the US---that allows Chinese espionage of US military capabilities

Philip Caruso 18 – is a candidate for JD and MBA degrees at Harvard, where he is a Tillman Scholar and Terence M. Considine Fellow in Law & Economics. [“The Rising Tide of China's Human Intelligence”, Lawfare, March 1st, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/rising-tide-chinas-human-intelligence>, AZ]

These cases might seem like relatively run-of-the-mill espionage and counterespionage affairs. However, over the last few years, the Communist Party has clearly turned its attention to both military and civilian intelligence reform, including the creation of a foreign-intelligence-focused entity. Moreover, the recent uptick in arrests comes against a baseline of historically limited Chinese human intelligence activity directed at foreigners. Chinese intelligence services have long co-opted the growing number of Chinese nationals living and traveling abroad for intelligence purposes, in part due to reduced risk. By leveraging a large network of individuals to each collect small pieces of information, the risk of detection and prosecution was diminished. But stealing valuable military and intelligence information requires the recruitment of American spies with privileged access to such information and in positions of scrutiny by U.S. counterintelligence entities—a far riskier proposition for China, potentially leading to embarrassment and international incidents. Thus far, that risk has made the relative anonymity of other espionage tools, such as cyber intrusions, more attractive for stealing government secrets. So why does China appear to have stepped up this riskier form of human intelligence now? What’s changed? The latest human intelligence campaign coincides with a decade of growing strategic competition between China and the U.S. for influence in the Asia-Pacific region, characterized by confrontational statements by both sides over trade, North Korea, the South China Sea, Taiwan, and more. The establishment of Chinese military bases in the South China Sea, U.S. naval freedom of navigation operations, China’s declaration of air defense identification zones, U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, and potential U.S. military action in North Korea have all raised the risk of miscalculation by either the U.S. or China, which in turn has motivated China to redouble efforts to better understand U.S. military capabilities, readiness, intentions, and decision-making regarding any future crisis. And to assess intentions and decision-making, few tools are as effective as human intelligence. For this reason, the past ten years have given China a strong incentive to increase human intelligence directed towards U.S. government employees in order to avoid a catastrophic confrontation with the United States. And alongside this new incentive, several factors have combined to benefit Chinese intelligence services and enable the growth of the country’s human intelligence operations. First, the free movement of people and information throughout the globalized world facilitates human intelligence collection targeting Americans. During the Cold War, few Americans and Chinese traveled between their respective countries. It was difficult for American agents of Chinese intelligence services to travel to or from the China without being caught. This intensified the risk of information and money transactions between countries. Since the Cold War, however, such barriers have largely fallen. The number of Chinese visitors to the U.S. surged sixteen-fold to almost four million between 2002 and 2017. In addition, immigration from the China to the U.S. has increased from less than 40,000 annually in the late 1980s to almost 75,000 annually in 2015. Of course, the vast majority of such travel and immigration is benign. But the practical challenge of mounting an effective and continuous counterintelligence response to such a large influx of people creates an opening for foreign intelligence activity.

### Internal Link

#### Chinese espionage destroys US economic and military superiority

ANDREW MIILLER 18 – Writer for the the Trumpet. [“Approximately 25,000 Chinese intelligence officers are working in the U.S.”, The Trumpet, April 16th, <https://www.thetrumpet.com/17145-chinese-spies-steal-us-tech-secrets>, AZ]

Chinese technology spies are stealing classified information from United States universities, security experts testified before Congress on Wednesday. They warned that Chinese researchers and students are passing on artificial intelligence, robotics and other cutting-edge technologies to their homeland. “China has a government-directed, multifaceted secret program whose primary task is technology acquisition, as well as a highly refined strategy to develop and exploit access to advantageous information through the global telecommunications infrastructure,” said former national counterintelligence executive Michelle Van Cleave. The Chinese government is stealing technology for both military and commercial use. The goal is to speed up China’s military modernization and give China insight into the weaknesses of U.S. weapons systems. “In the case of robotics and AI, two fields of study with the potential to fundamentally change the international economy as well as the future of war-fighting, China has released the Robotics Industry Development Plan and Next Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan with the goals of China assuming global leadership in the coming decades,” said Michael Wessel, chairman of the U.S.-China Economic Security Review Commission. To accomplish its large-scale technology theft, China is using some of the 350,000 Chinese students in the U.S. for intelligence work. An electrical engineering professor at the University of Tennessee was convicted of collaborating with some of his Chinese students to send classified defense technology to the Chinese government in 2008. The U.S. Department of Justice charged six Chinese nationals with passing technology secrets from Avago Technologies Ltd. and Skyworks Solutions Inc. on to China in 2015. Such information has helped China establish multibillion-dollar companies like Kuang-Chi Science Ltd., which develop telecommunication, aerospace and AI technologies. To stop China from stealing classified information, Van Cleave recommends the U.S. go on the offensive against foreign spies. She laments the fact that former President Barack Obama weakened counterintelligence efforts by dividing America’s counterspy program into individual departments. Van Cleave continued: “The national head of counterintelligence was rebranded director of a security and CI center, his duties further dissipated by the fixation on leaks and insider threats driven by the grievous harm done by Snowden, Manning, et al.” She was referring to whistleblowers Edward Snowden and Bradley Manning. China continues to use agents, front companies and joint research ventures to steal American technology. These espionage activities are helping to undermine U.S. economic and military superiority. In his book The Hundred-Year Marathon: China’s Secret Strategy to Replace America as the Global Superpower, American defense policy adviser Michael Pillsbury recounts how he first came across a strategy referred to as “assassin’s mace.” He read an article by three of China’s preeminent military strategists that discussed new technologies that might allow China to defeat America by using technology as a secret weapon. The article called for the development of tactical laser weapons to be used in antiship missile defense systems, electromagnetic pulse weapons, radar-jamming technology and cyberweapons. Maj. Gen. Li Zhiyun, the director of foreign military studies at China’s National Defense University, published an anthology of the works of 64 Chinese military authors. The anthology details a long list of U.S. military weaknesses vulnerable to exploitation by “assassin’s mace” technologies. The most prominent weaknesses listed are America’s overreliance on high-tech computer systems, satellite technology, and long maritime supply lines. There are now 25,000 Chinese intelligence officers working for Beijing’s spy networks in the United States. This is according to a Chinese dissident with close ties to the Chinese government. Stealing American technology is a major way China plans to develop its military to a point where it could challenge the U.S. Many Americans assume that their country will be the world superpower for the foreseeable future. Yet there is a sobering prophecy in the Bible that America’s military strength will be cut off when it reaches the zenith of its power. “And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord, that I will cut off thy horses out of the midst of thee, and I will destroy thy chariots: And I will cut off the cities of thy land, and throw down all thy strong holds: And I will cut off witchcrafts out of thine hand; and thou shalt have no more soothsayers: Thy graven images also will I cut off, and thy standing images out of the midst of thee; and thou shalt no more worship the work of thine hands. And I will pluck up thy groves out of the midst of thee: so will I destroy thy cities” (Micah 5:10-14). This passage describes the military downfall of end-time Israel (the Americans, the British, the Jews and other related peoples). When end-time Israel reaches the zenith of its power, God cuts off its armaments of war and throws down its strongholds. He breaks the pride of its power. Why? Because the people have turned away from Him to embrace “witchcraft” and “soothsayers.” This means the people look to false teachers who refuse to teach God’s commands. They promote lawlessness and moral relativism. They endorse sins like abortion, adultery, drug abuse, homosexuality, lying and sexual promiscuity. They indulge in shallow religions, false doctrines and even literal witchcraft. Espionage is a major way America’s military strongholds could be thrown down. China’s military is already on par with the U.S. in East Asia. This means America’s military bases that protect vital trade routes are becoming vulnerable. The only real solution to this crisis is to turn back to the one source that gave America its power: Almighty God.

### Impact

#### Undermines US superiority and alliance system

USCC 16 – [“SECTION 3: CHINESE INTELLIGENCE SERVICES AND ESPIONAGE THREATS TO THE UNITED STATES”, November 16th, <https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Annual_Report/Chapters/Chapter%202%2C%20Section%203%20-%20China%27s%20Intelligence%20Services%20and%20Espionage%20Threats%20to%20the%20United%20States.pdf>, AZ]

Implications for U.S. National Security China’s illicit extraction of sensitive U.S. national security information has far-reaching consequences for U.S. interests. In recent years, Chinese agents have extracted data on some of the most advanced weapons and weapons systems in the U.S. arsenal, such as jet fi ghters and unmanned submersible vehicles. The loss of these and other sensitive defense technologies undermines U.S. military superiority by accelerating China’s military modernization and giving China insight into the capabilities and operation of U.S. weapons and weapons systems. The United States shares weapons, weapons systems, and operational plans with its allies and partners, many of whom China has targeted with espionage operations. China’s infiltrations of these countries’ defense establishments have significant implications for U.S. alliance stability. If the United States perceives significant security risks in sharing information and equipment with its partners, it could hesitate to provide such support in the future.123 Even when China is not successful in extracting sensitive information, public reports of failed espionage attempts—such as the many recent reports of Chinese agents apprehended in Taiwan 124—could undermine U.S. confidence in its partners and contribute to a deterioration in bilateral defense relations. China’s infiltrations of the information systems of U.S. government organizations with a role in national security, along with infiltrations of the e-mail accounts of prominent U.S. government officials, could give China insight into U.S. government national security decision making and provide China with opportunities to manipulate it. These breaches could give China insight into inter-nal U.S. discussions of issues relevant to U.S.-China contingencies, potentially allowing China to anticipate and counter U.S. actions, including military operations. Moreover, these breaches could give Chinese intelligence information useful for targeting and recruiting agents for espionage and influence operations. The Chinese intelligence threat to U.S. national security will grow as China reforms and centralizes its intelligence apparatus and gains experience conducting intelligence collection operations. Its HUMINT operations, in particular, already appear to be growing more aggressive and extensive.125 China’s intelligence processing and communication to decision makers is likely to become more effective and efficient as the PLA moves toward joint, integrated intelligence operations. The potential resubordination and centralization of elements of the former PLA General Staff Department intelligence departments to the new Strategic Support Force also could create a more streamlined and well-coordinated intelligence apparatus. Conclusions • Chinese intelligence has repeatedly infiltrated U.S. national security organizations and extracted information with serious consequences for U.S. national security, including information on the plans and operations of U.S. military forces and the designs of U.S. weapons and weapons systems. This information could erode U.S. military superiority by aiding China’s military modernization and giving China insight into the operation of U.S. platforms and the operational approaches of U.S. forces to potential contingencies in the region. • China’s growing technical intelligence collection capabilities could strengthen China’s hand in a contingency. Its extensive network of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets and continued development and deployment of increasingly advanced ISR platforms will increase the ability of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) to monitor U.S. forces. Moreover, the enhanced jointness of PLA intelligence at the theater level will facilitate the integration of data collected by these platforms to form a more comprehensive, real-time battlefield picture. • Chinese intelligence reportedly has repeatedly targeted and succeeded in infiltrating the personal e-mail accounts of leading U.S. government officials. These infiltrations could give China insight into highly sensitive U.S. national security decision-making processes. • China’s infiltration of the national security establishments of U.S. allies and partners could allow China to indirectly access sensitive U.S. national security information. Moreover, these breaches could undermine the strength and stability of U.S. alliances by causing the United States to hesitate to share sensitive information with its partners.