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We meet: Visas are a form of trade and financial benefit to mexico

#### C/I Building economic ties across borders.

Ike 2013 Dr Pius Ike Department of Agricultural Economics, Nigeria, The Role of Economic Development in Peacebuilding, Paper presented at PIND’s Niger Delta Development Forum– Supporting Poverty Reduction through Partnership, Held at Novotel, Port-Harcourt, 21 -22 November 2012 http://ndpifoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/Paper-presented-at-NDDF/Paper%206%20-%20The%20Role%20of%20Economic%20Development%20in%20Peacebuilding.pdf

Cross-Border Economic Engagement: Building economic ties across international boundaries adds an additional layer of complexity due to the politicized nature of borders and the increased vigilance of the concerned states and their regional neighbors. Local businesses can act as a powerful constituency for peace under these circumstances, nurturing economic interdependence and advocating for reform when political tensions preclude other forms of engagement.

#### We meet: US immigration interacts with Mexico government

US Chamber of Commerce, 2013, “The U.S.-Mexico Leadership Initiative Vision 2020: Enhancing the U.S.-Mexico Economic Partnership,” http://www.uschamber.com/international/americas/us-mexico-leadership-initiative-vision-2020-enhancing-us-mexico-economic-par

The U.S.-Mexico relationship has reached a critical moment. The North American Free Trade Agreement partnership is nearly two decades old. Immigration controversies have become a political flash-point between our countries. Security has become a growing concern at and around the border and for travelers and investors. Both countries compete in an increasingly competitive global environment. In this moment, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is launching a CEO-level Leadership Initiative to execute a strategy for enhanced economic engagement between the United States and Mexico. The Leadership Initiative will provide the strategic energy behind Vision 2020, a five-point plan for enhancing the U.S.-Mexico economic partnership, with a view toward making the relationship a global model for bilateral best practices by the year 2020.

#### Counter-interp: “Toward” does not require engagement “in” or “on” the target country

Holcomb 95 – Charles R. Holcomb, Judge on the Texas Court of Appeals, “Gary Carlton Camp, Appellant v. The State of Texas, Appellee”, 925 S.W.2d 26; 1995 Tex. App. LEXIS 2769, 10-30, Lexis

Because the indictment alleged that the appellant pointed a weapon "towards" the officer, but the testimony stated that the weapon was not pointed "at" the officer, an analysis of the meanings of these prepositions is required. Basically, "at" and "towards" are interchangeable prepositions. "At" is a "term of considerable elasticity of meaning, and somewhat indefinite." Black's Law Dictionary 114 (5th ed. 1979). Further, "at" often expresses simply nearness and proximity. Accordingly, "at's" indication of nearness and proximity equates with "towards" direction.

HN2 Of particular note is the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of "at": Of motion directed towards; In the direction of, towards, so as to get at; often with hostile intent, "against"; in to run, rush, go, have, throw, shoot, let drive, aim, etc. at. Oxford English Dictionary, Volume I, page 739 (emphasis in original). Correspondingly, "toward" indicates direction toward something aimed at. Oxford English Dictionary, Volume 18, page 314.

HN3 Texas case law has provided very general and sweeping interpretations of otherwise specific words. A series of old cases, but adopted and quoted by the Court of Criminal Appeals as late as 1992, have defined "at" in terms of bond forfeitures as used in the phrase "at the courthouse door." Calling the name of the defendant some twelve feet away from the courthouse steps, rather than "at" the courthouse door, satisfied the statutes. The court quoted "Webster" as defining "at:" Primarily this word expresses the relation of presence, nearness in time or place or direction towards. It is less definite than "in" or "on"; "at" the house may be "in" or "near" the house.

HN4 Texas courts interpret "at" as indicating a general area, rather than specific point where an action occurs and is equivalent to "toward."

#### a. Predictability: bright line for engaging a country enables guided research and aff and neg ground—contrived interps bad because they always exclude us

#### b. Topic education: acting near a country teaches us about multilateral relations, and our immigration policy is central to US Mexico economic engagement

And, apply sufficiency to competing interpretations. Aff doesn't have to prove the interp is net better-- just a minimum standard of solving enough ground

Reasonability – good is good enough, core of the topic debated in congress now

# Coercion

No link – not coercion, they have the choice to come

## coercion is critical to prevent economic collapse

**Amy 08 (**Douglas J, Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College, “The Forgotten Achievements of Government” <http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=7&p=2>) (greenhill-cp)

### But once we begin to look at the actual performance of major government programs, we see that the vast majority of them have produced substantial improvement in the problem areas that they are addressing – they have produced successful results. This is not the conventional wisdom, but it is what the evidence shows if you bother to look at it. Let’s consider some of that evidence. An Initial List of Government Achievements6 Let’s start by taking up Rush Limbaugh’s challenge: can we name any government programs that have worked? Actually, that is quite easy to do. What follows is a short list of some of the federal government’s greatest accomplishments. These are policy programs that have not only worked, but have been very successful and have greatly improved the quality of life of most Americans. Regulation of the Business Cycle. The federal government uses a variety of monetary and fiscal policies to limit the boom and bust cycles of the economy. For example, it adjusts interest rates to give a boost to the economy when it is slowing down. Thanks to these policies, the U.S. has not suffered an economic depression since the 1930s. We tend to overlook the fact that before government took on this responsibility, severe depressions were a routine and recurring problem in this country – occurring in 1819, 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893, 1907 and 1929. And we have all but forgotten the enormous amount of human suffering caused by these economic meltdowns – the massive joblessness, the destitution, the rampant hunger, the disease, the riots, the hopelessness and the despair. By any measure, eliminating these depressions and this misery has been one of the greatest – and largely unheralded – achievements of our federal government.
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#### The roll of the ballot is to simulate the effects of the 1AC—they should only defend the status quo or a competitive advocacy based off plan action—key to fairness and good advocacy skills

Perms

) There’s always value to life –Prefer our ev because of Frankl’s subject position.

Phyllis D. Coontz**,** PhD Graduate School of Public and International Affairs University of Pittsburgh, et al, JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSING, 2001, 18(4), 235-246 – J-Stor

In the 1950s, psychiatrist and theorist Viktor Frankl (1963) described an existential theory of purpose and meaning in life. Frankl, a long-time prisoner in a concentration camp, re- lated several instances of transcendent states that he experienced in the midst of that terri- ble suffering using his own experiences and observations. He believed that these experi- ences allowed him and others to maintain their sense of dignity and self-worth.

Frankl (1969) claimed that transcendence occurs by giving to others, being open to others and the environment, and coming to accept the reality that some situations are un- changeable. He hypothesized that life always has meaning for the individual; a person can always decide how to face adversity. Therefore, self-transcendence provides mean- ing and enables the discovery of meaning for a person (Frankl, 1963). Expanding Frankl's work, Reed (1991b) linked self-transcendence with mental health. Through a developmental process individuals gain an increasing understanding of who they are and are able to move out beyond themselves despite the fact that they are ex- periencing physical and mental pain. This expansion beyond the self occurs through in- trospection, concern about others and their well-being, and integration of the past and fu- ture to strengthen one's present life (Reed, 1991b).

No RC

Scott D. Sagan – Department of Political Science, Stanford University – ACCIDENTAL WAR IN THEORY AND PRACTICE – 2000 – available via: www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc

To make reasonable judgements in such matters it is essential, in my view, to avoid the common "fallacy of overdetermination." Looking backwards at historical events, **it is always tempting to underestimate the importance of the immediate causes of a war** and argue that the likelihood of conflict was so high that the war would have broken out sooner or later even without the specific incident that set it off. If taken too far, however, **this tendency eliminates the role of contingency** in history **and diminishes our ability to perceive the alternative pathways** that were present to historical actors. The point is perhaps best made through a counterfactual about the Cold War. During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, a bizarre false warning incident in the U.S. radar systems facing Cuba led officers at the North American Air Defense Command to believe that the U.S. was under attack and that a nuclear weapon was about to go off in Florida. Now imagine the counterfactual event that this false warning was reported and believed by U.S. leaders and resulted in a U.S. nuclear "retaliation" against the Russians. How would future historians have seen the causes of World War III? One can easily imagine arguments stressing that the war between the U.S. and the USSR was inevitable. War was overdetermined: given the deep political hostility of the two superpowers, the *conflicting ideology*, the escalating arms race, nuclear war would have occurred eventually. If not during that specific crisis over Cuba, then over the next one in Berlin, or the Middle East, or Korea. From that perspective, focusing on this particular accidental event as a cause of war would be seen as misleading. Yet, we all now know, of course that a nuclear war was neither inevitable nor overdetermined during the Cold War.

Ethics 1st wrong – utility is net more ethical

Williams ‘5

(Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth,

The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations, p. 174-176)

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of 'self-clarification', and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what Schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in International Relations, has called a 'reflexive principle'. In the wilful Realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful Realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the Realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the 'reality' of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one's views. The blithe, self-serving, and uncritical stances of abstract moralism or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world 'as it is'. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, Realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable 'object' that is not reducible to one's wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 Objectivity is not a naive naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one's will. A recognition of the limits imposed by 'reality' is a condition for a recognition of one's own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one's own will**.** But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful Realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the precondition for freedom. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 But it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility
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#### Wont pass – Delays and Obamacare means Republicans fight

Matthews 9/12/13 – Laura, “Government Shutdown 2013: House Delays Continuing Resolution Vote, Lacks Support” International Business Times, Available online @ http://www.ibtimes.com/government-shutdown-2013-house-delays-continuing-resolution-vote-lacks-support-1404778)//ghs-mm

Government Shutdown 2013: House Delays Continuing Resolution Vote, Lacks Support¶ By Laura Matthews¶ The likelihood of a federal government shutdown in 18 days increased Thursday, when the House Republican leadership delayed a vote on a continuing resolution that had been scheduled for that day. The reason is simple: They just don’t have the votes.¶ House Appropriations Committee Chairman Hal Rogers, R-Ky., introduced the stopgap measure on Tuesday to keep the government running past the end of September and to give lawmakers some breathing room to find a permanent solution to the budget issues. It appropriated $986.3 billion to keep the government running until Dec. 15.¶ But in a deal-breaker for many Republicans, the Rogers bill doesn’t include language to defund Obamacare. The House leadership instead chose to include a separate concurrent resolution with specific language that no funding should go toward implementing Obamacare. The leaders were hoping this would force the Senate to vote on the defunding legislation. Conservatives among the rank and file want the "defund Obamacare" language included in the main bill.¶ Now, without their own caucus's Republican support, the leadership is left in search of a new strategy, particularly one that would get the votes.¶ Some Senate Republicans have also balked at the House leadership’s plan, calling it a procedural trick that would allow the Democrats to vote down the defunding bill and pump money into the health care law.¶ The government will need new funding on Oct. 1, as the current resolution ends on Sept. 30. The Treasury also faces a potential default in mid-October, meaning the budget battles will drag on.¶ The Los Angeles Times reported that a vote will be rescheduled next week after the strategy has been fully explained to the concerned group of lawmakers. “I don’t think more time is going to fix this bill,” Rep. Thomas Massie, R-Ky., told the Times.¶ Others like Rep. Jason Chaffetz, R-Utah, have said the plan is “hocus-pocus.”

#### Obama has zero political capital

Business Monitor 9/10/13

(“Obama Facing Rising Political Risks From Syria” lexis//sd)

BMI View: US President Barack Obama is facing rising political risks from Syria. Regardless of what actions he takes, his political capital will be eroded. Risks to the US's global sta nding are also high, and there are unlikely to be any 'good' outcomes of the Syria crisis.

US President Barack Obama is facing rising political risks from the current situation in Syria. Obama is still advocating military action against the regime of Bashar al-Assad to punish it for its alleged use of chemical weapons on August 21, in an attack that apparently killed more than 1,400 people. However, Obama is facing substantial domestic opposition to a US strike, and only limited support from US allies. Meanwhile, his switches from relatively hawkish to dovish positions could make him appear indecisive. The President is due to make a televised address on the Syria situation to the American people on the evening of September 10 , but we believe it is doubtful if he can sway the public into supporting a fourth military intervention in the Muslim world (after Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya). Meanwhile, efforts by Russia to find a diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis could delay a US airstrike. This could allow the Assad regime to better prepare for an American attack, or prompt the Syrian rebels to carry out some sort of provocation, with the aim of forcing the US into action. Regardless of what decision Obama makes, his political capital will be eroded.

#### Fight over ObamaCare thumps budget debates

Times-Picayune 9/12 (Bruce Alpert, “Will fight over ObamaCare lead to government shutdown?”, http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2013/09/will\_fight\_over\_obamacare\_lead.html)//lm

House GOP conservatives, intent on defunding ObamaCare , have blocked a funding bill written by their leaders -- raising new threats of a government shutdown Oct. 1.¶ The rejected plan would have included separate spending resolution and a defunding of the Affordable Care Act, forcing the Senate to vote on both, but allowing the spending plan to take effect, if, as expected, the chamber's Democratic majority rejected the defunding measure.¶ But House Speaker John Boehner , R-Ohio, pulled the spending bill from the House schedule this week when it appeared doubtful he had enough votes to pass it.¶ A sizeable number of House conservatives are insisting that the defunding resolution be included in the spending bill, leaving it up to Senate Democrats and the president whether to accept it or allow a government shutdown.¶ The House Republican Study Committee, headed by Rep. Steve Scalise , R-Jefferson, is quietly drafting a new plan that would trade a one-year delay in implementation of the Affordable Care Act for relief from some of the sequester cuts Democrats, the Obama administration and some Republicans say threaten government services, including defense.¶ Scalise would not address the latest proposal from the RSC, where resistance to the GOP leadership plan is the most intense.¶ But he said: "We can achieve victory for American families without a government shutdown, but I will not surrender in the fight to delay ObamaCare for all Americans," Scalise said. "We must use every legislative avenue available, through the Continuing Resolution (funding bill) the debt ceiling, and sequester conversations to free the country from the President's train-wreck of a healthcare law. I will continue pushing for a CR that delays ObamaCare for one year and, while we're not there yet, productive conversations towards that goal continue."¶ The White House rejected any deal that impacted the Affordable Care Act. O

n Oct. 1, online exchanges, or marketplaces, are supposed to open up, allowing people to purchase health insurance and quality for the law's subsidies for individuals earning up to $43,000 and families up to $92,000.¶ "We will not accept anything that delays or defunds ObamaCare," Obama Press Secretary Jay Carney said Wednesday. "Harming the economy to refight old political battles, to refight a battle that was waged and ended when Congress passed the law, the president signed the law, (and) the Supreme Court upheld the law is not in the interest of the American middle class."¶

#### 8% chance of the internal link

**Beckman and Kumar**, September **2011** (Matthew – associate professor of political science UC Irvine, and VImal – economic professor at the Indian Institute of Tech, Opportunism in Polarization, Presidential Studies Quarterly, 41.3)

The final important piece in our theoretical model—presidents' political capital— also finds support in these analyses, though the results here are less reliable. Presidents operating under the specter of strong economy and high approval ratings get an important, albeit moderate, increase in their chances for prevailing on "key" Senate roll-call votes (b = .10, se = .06, p < .10). Figure 4 displays the substantive implications of these results in the context of polarization, showing that going from the lower third of political capital to the upper third increases presidents' chances for success by 8 percentage points (in a setting like 2008). Thus, political capital's impact does provide an important boost to presidents' success on Capitol Hill, but **it is certainly not potent enough to overcome basic congressional realities**. Political capital is just strong enough to put a presidential thumb on the congressional scales, which often will not matter, but can in

#### PC not real- it’s a myth- vote based on ideology

Frank Moraes is a freelance writer with broad interests. He is educated as a scientist with a PhD in Atmospheric Physics. He has worked in climate science, remote sensing, and throughout the computer industry. And he has taught physics. 1-8-2013 <http://the-reaction.blogspot.com/2013/01/political-capital-is-myth.html>

Yesterday, Jonathan Chait metaphorically scratched his head: "Nominating Hagel Most Un-Obama Thing Ever." He can't understand this nomination given that (1) Hagel will be a hard sell and (2) Obama doesn't much listen to his advisers anyway. It is interesting speculation, but I wouldn't have even thought about it had he not written, "Why waste political capital picking a fight that isn't essential to any policy goals?"¶ This brought to mind something that has been on my mind for a while, as in posts like "Bipartisan Consensus Can Bite Me." I'm afraid that just like Santa Claus and most conceptions of God, "Political Capital" is a myth. I think it is just an idea that Villagers find comforting. It is a neat narrative in which one can straightjacket a political fight. Otherwise, it is just bullshit.¶ Let's go back to late 2004, after Bush Jr was re-elected. He said, "I earned capital in the political campaign and I intend to spend it." What was this thing that Bush intended to spend? It is usually said that political capital is some kind of mandate from the masses. But that is clearly not what Bush meant. He got a mandate to fuck the poor and kill the gays. But he used his political capital to privatize Social Security. One could say that this proves the point, but does anyone really think if Bush had decided to use his political capital destroying food stamps and Medicaid that he would have succeeded any better? The truth was that Bush's political capital didn't exist.¶ Let's look at more recent events: the Fiscal Cliff. Obama didn't win that fight because the people who voted for him demanded it. He won it because everyone knew that in the new year he would still be president. Tax rates were going up. Boehner took the Fiscal Cliff deal because it was the best deal that he felt he could get. He didn't fold because of some magic political capital that Obama could wave over him.¶ There is no doubt that public opinion does affect how politicians act. Even politicians in small safe districts have to worry that larger political trends may end up making them look stupid, out of touch, or just cruel. But beyond that, they really don't care. If they did, then everyone in the House would now be a Democrat: after all, Obama won a mandate and the associated political capital. But they don't, because presidential elections have consequences -- for who's in the White House. They don't have much consequence for the representative from the Third District of California.

#### WINNERS WIN.

**Singer 9** (Jonathan, Editor – MyDD and JD – University of California, Berkeley, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital”, MyDD, 3-3, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### Republicans want a guest-worker program

Johnson, 13 (Fawn, correspondent, May 29th, “Republican Platform Calls for Guest-Worker Program,” National Journal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/2012-conventions/republican-platform-calls-for-guest-worker-program-20120821)

Republicans are attempting to balance their party's disparate opinions on immigration by taking a tough stance on illegal immigrants in the United States while at the same time calling for a new temporary foreign worker program. The Republican National Committee's 2012 platform on immigration, adopted on Tuesday, calls for a "legal and reliable source of foreign labor through a new guest-worker program." "It wasn't even attacked," crowed Brad Bailey, a Texas restauranteur who lobbied heavily for the inclusion of a guest-worker program in the document. Bailey was expecting immigration hard-liners to go after the proposed temporary worker program because a standard GOP campaign line says that illegal immigrants are taking jobs from Americans. Businesses dispute that statement, saying there are many jobs (like roofing and fruit-picking) that Americans won't do. The Republican platform also seeks long-term detention for "dangerous but undeportable aliens" and proposes to make gang membership a deportable offense. It is typical of electoral policy platforms to be vague on details--this isn't legislation, after all. It's the tone that counts. Note the crime-related wording when it comes to gangs and detention, reinforcing an idea important to Republicans: that they are tougher on illegal immigration than President Obama. "Complaining about the problem is no longer working. Republicans need to lead in repairing our nation's immigration policy," Bailey said on Monday in an e-mail to supporters of a guest-worker program. The Hispanic vote is in play in the general election, and how Republicans handle the immigration question will be a critical factor in determining whether conservative Hispanic voters can be convinced to cast their votes for Mitt Romney. Hispanics as a group tend to be more conservative than traditional Democrats; half identify themselves as "independent,"

according to a recent Gallup poll. But two-thirds of them voted for President Obama in 2008, in part because he promised to push for a broad immigration overhaul that would create a path to citizenship for some illegal immigrants. Some Republican strategists worry that harsh rhetoric from Republicans about immigration will scare those independent Hispanics away. The inclusion of a guest-worker program in the GOP platform marks a victory for business-oriented Republicans who are worried that a strict "enforcement-only" approach to immigration will ruin certain industries, such as agriculture, which relies heavily on undocumented immigrant labor. "It was brutal," said Bailey, the founder of the free-market nonprofit group The Texas Immigration Solution, who is lobbying aggressively for businesses' access to foreign labor at the Republican National Convention. "I'm a rookie. I didn't know anybody. I was stopping people during bathroom breaks." Bailey is flaming a tinder box within a party that has struggled for years with its commitment to "the rule of law," which sometimes conflicts with businesses' consistent use of immigrant labor--both legal and illegal. With some 12 million illegal immigrants working in the United States, it is difficult to imagine the government committing the resources to extricating all of them. Yet Republicans chafe at any policy that would ease off on punishment for immigration violations. "We are a party that recognizes that illegal means illegal," said Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach, a platform committee member and outspoken immigration hard-liner who was the brains behind Arizona's tough immigration law. "If you want to open a job tomorrow, you can remove an illegal immigrant today." Kobach's considerable influence was on display at the Republican platform committee meeting on Tuesday, as he shot down several suggestions from other members who questioned the necessity of mandating electronic verification of workers or asked for market-based quotas on foreign workers. At Kobach's request, the committee added language to the platform calling for mandatory electronic verification of workers, a border fence, and an end to "sanctuary cities" and in-state tuition for illegal immigrant college students. Bailey knew he was fighting an uphill battle when he brought his proposal for a temporary worker program to the Republican convention. He is one of many business leaders who say enforcement-minded Republicans should adopt a broader view of immigration to acknowledge their need for labor. Many business leaders want more than a guest-worker program. Texas has advocated work visas for undocumented immigrants who are already in the country. But that idea goes too far for GOP members who are squeamish about giving any legal status to illegal aliens. "When you are sitting in the back of the room and have no relationships with anyone on the subcommittee, you are fighting an uphill battle," Bailey wrote in his e-mail. "We understand that this is NOT a perfect document. But sometimes in life and in politics we have to compromise and negotiate."

#### Farm Lobbies pushes plan and are central to influence GOP

Nixon, 4/18 (Ron, Domestic Correspondent at The New York Times, April 18, 2013, “Fate of the Immigration Bill May Hinge on Farm Districts,” The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/

2013/04/19/us/immigration-bills-fate-may-hinge-on-farm-districts.html?\_r=0)

A coalition of 11 agriculture groups has launched a major lobbying campaign in support of an immigration overhaul. Members of the effort, known as the Agricultural Workforce Coalition, see representatives from districts where thousands of jobs depend on agriculture as key to any effort to pass the legislation. Agriculture Department data shows that Republicans represent 17 of the top 20 districts where agriculture is a major industry. And farm groups are hoping that local concerns will trump national politics as the legislation moves forward in the Republican-controlled House, where it will most likely face a tough challenge from conservatives who have been hostile to previous attempts to change the system. “Republicans from big agriculture districts will definitely be the deciding factor in getting any type of immigration reform through the House,” said Dean Norton, a dairy farmer who is president of the New York Farm Bureau. “There is a lot of clamoring in these districts to do something about immigration.” Mr. Hastings has not said if he would support the immigration legislation introduced in the Senate, but he has backed efforts to help the farm sector in the past. Neal Kirby, Mr. Hastings’s spokesman, said the congressman “has long advocated for a guest worker program for agriculture that is workable and will provide central Washington farmers with the legal work force they need to fill jobs that Americans are not” willing to do. “Developing a workable program as a part of immigration reform is critical to central Washington’s economy,” he said. The farm sector has been a core constituency of the Republican Party for many years. Campaign contribution data from the Center for Responsive Politics, a Washington research group, shows that since 1990, agriculture interests have mostly given to Republicans in Congress. Last year, farm-heavy districts voted overwhelmingly for Mitt Romney. Tom Nassif, president of the Western Growers, and Chuck Conners, president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, two of the organizations pushing for immigration legislation, were advisers to Mr. Romney during the campaign. Agriculture’s main focus is on changing the H-2A visa program, which allows fruit and vegetable growers, slaughterhouses and other agribusinesses to hire temporary workers for jobs that cannot be filled by Americans. The system allows foreign workers to enter the country on a visa for no longer than one year. But agriculture officials say the current system does not work because industries like dairy farming and meat production are year-round enterprises and are unable to fill their need for workers. They also say the program is overly bureaucratic. Among the changes the farm sector wants to see is the replacement of the seasonal visa program with one that would allow workers to accept a job under a three-year visa. The agriculture groups, which lobbied heavily on Capitol Hill as a group of senators worked to draft an immigration bill, say they will soon began a similar campaign in the House. “We will bring the weight of growers in all 50 states to the Senate and the House in support of this legislation,” said Tom Stenzel, chief executive of the United Fresh Produce Association, a trade group of fruit and vegetable growers. Despite high unemployment in Mr. Hastings’s Washington district, growers and other farm interests there say they still suffer from worker shortages because of current immigration laws. Mr. Kirby, Mr. Hastings’s spokesman, said the congressman had met with the farm lobbying coalition and had been in contact with growers. “This has been a longtime priority of Congressman Hastings,” he said.

#### Congressman Hastings pushes the plan

Nixon, 4/18 (Ron, Domestic Correspondent at The New York Times, April 18, 2013, “Fate of the Immigration Bill May Hinge on Farm Districts,” The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/

2013/04/19/us/immigration-bills-fate-may-hinge-on-farm-districts.html?\_r=0)

WASHINGTON — Any chance of getting immigration legislation through the House will most likely depend on representatives like Doc Hastings. While he has not been the most outspoken about immigration issues, proponents of an overhaul are counting on Mr. Hastings, a Republican, for one reason: His Congressional district, which cuts a wide path through the center of Washington State, depends heavily on agriculture, an industry with a significant stake in the outcome of the debate. Much of Washington’s $46 billion agriculture sector is in Mr. Hastings’s district, where farmers grow everything from apples to wheat. Local agribusinesses there rely on a work force largely composed of immigrants, thousands of whom are believed to be in the country illegally.

#### Democrats wont give in – they wont cooperate with Obama

Politico 9/12

(“White House determined not to give ground on Obamacare,” pg online @ http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/white-house-obamacare-debt-negotiations-96741.html#ixzz2espuWEAd //ghs-ef)

But Democrats in Congress say they aren’t so sure that the White House is really ready to back up its rhetoric, particularly on a short-term spending bill known as a continuing resolution that would lock in lower spending levels than House Democrats want and take political pressure off of House Republican leaders. While the White House won’t give ground on Obamacare with regard to the CR, House Democratic leaders are far more inclined to let the government shut down over the spending levels or length of the extension than their White House counterparts. “Our leadership thinks the time has come to draw a line in the sand, not do a short-term extension,” said a senior Democratic aide. “They’re ready for a flash and a pop.”

#### Obama wont negotiate – pc not key

Groche 9/13

(“WSJ Forgets GOP Taking Debt Ceiling Hostage,” http://mediamatters.org/mobile/blog/2013/09/13/wsj-forgets-gop-taking-debt-ceiling-hostage/195873)

Congress faces a deadline in mid-October to pass legislation that would raise the debt limit. Mr. Obama has said he would refuse to negotiate with Republicans on terms for raising the borrowing limit and that Congress must allow the Treasury to pay for spending already approved by lawmakers.

But Mr. Boehner (R., Ohio) told reporters Thursday that stance was a departure from numerous precedents, in which the White House and Congress agreed to budget changes in exchange for a debt-limit increase.

#### Non-unique: DHS engages Mexico on immigration and enforcement

DHS no date

(“Office of International Affairs Mission” pg online at http://www.dhs.gov/office-international-affairs//sd)

Engages foreign allies, particularly Canada, Mexico and the United Kingdom, in guiding security agreements that further support the mission of the Department and improve immigration policy, visa security, aviation security, border security and training, law enforcement, and cargo security.

#### Union lobby on terminal decline—no political clout with Democrats—economic downturn and shifted focus

Boston Globe 12

(“Unions’ political donations falling as their power fades” Sep 3, pg online at http://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2012/09/02/unions-political-clout-waning/A5eLjX1Ak5D3RvxqlqC1xH/story.html//sd)

As once-powerful organized labor­ loses members and influence, unions have become more ­focused on organizing workers and protecting their rights than on funneling money to politicians. Donations to Democratic candidates and committees by labor political action committees were down more than 20 percent from January 2011 to June 2012, compared with the same period leading up to the 2008 election, according to the Center for Responsive Politics, a nonpartisan research group in Washington. That decline is just one sign that the political clout of unions is waning just when they need it the most, labor specialists say. The past year has seen antiunion politicians triumph, labor laws get weaker, and public opinion of unions sour, making it unlikely that organized labor will have a big impact on the fall elections. “This is in many ways the last gasp of the labor movement politically,” said Gary Chaison, a professor of industrial relations at Clark University in Worcester. “The irony is that they need a victory by the White House and the Democrats to rebound, but on the other hand, because they’re so slim on resources and energies, and their public image is so tarnished, they’re limited in what they can do.” Unions have suffered a number of political blows in the past year. Scott Walker, the Republican governor of Wisconsin, won a recall election prompted by his decision to limit collective bargaining for public sector unions. In California, residents of San Jose and San Diego voted to cut city workers’ pension benefits, and Indiana became the first Midwestern manufacturing state to enact a “right to work” law, preventing workers from being required to join unions or pay dues in union shops. In Massachusetts, the state’s two largest teachers unions abandoned plans to fight legislation that reduced the role of seniority in teacher promotions and placements. The labor movement is clearly falling out of favor, with only 52 percent of respondents to a 2011 Gallup poll saying they approved of unions, down from 75 percent in the 1950s. Nationwide, less than 12 percent of the workforce is unionized, compared with more than 20 percent in the early 1980s, according­ to the US Department of Labor. With unions, particularly those representing public employees, forced to make concessions and under pressure in a weak economy to make more, organized labor has to devote less energy to politics and more to saving itself, Chaison said. “The political agenda has to take a back seat to all that’s changing,” he said. “Most unions are just trying to tread water. It’s just protecting what they had in the past.” The AFL-CIO, the nation’s largest labor federation, said it has shifted its strategy from pouring money into Democratic campaign coffers to building a broader coalition to support proworker candidates and causes. The Supreme Court’s 2010 Citizens United ruling, which struck down limits on corporate and union political activities and contributions, has allowed the AFL-CIO to expand its political organizing efforts beyond union members. Before the decision, unions had to limit spending on political activities to union members; now they can team up with organizations­ such as ­MoveOn.org Political Action to knock on doors and send out political mailings to any voter. The Amalgamated Transit Union, an AFL-CIO member that represents transit workers across the United States and Canada, has also shifted its focus from supporting candidates and lobbying elected officials to organizing the public. With funding for public transportation under pressure, even as gasoline prices soared and ridership spiked, the union took money it had previously devoted to lobbying politicians and used it to mobilize riders. Last summer in Fall River and New Bedford, for example, the union hired a part-time organizer to persuade bus passengers to appeal for better service. As a result, 2,000 bus riders took up the cause of 100 local union members and persuaded their mayors to add bus service, at the same time routes were being cut in other cities. “In the past, the unions have given a considerable amount of money to candidates and parties, and that money this year, this cycle, is to some extent being invested in building the workers’ infrastructure,” said Michael Podhorzer, AFL-CIO political director. “Instead of writing checks, we’re creating a volunteer organization, an activist organization that goes on beyond election day.” Unions, however, could be in for a reality check if the Republicans win big in November, said David Paleologos, director of the Suffolk University Political Research Center. As a pollster, he views the political landscape as dots on a graph and visualizes this fall’s election as an inflection point for unions: the point at which, after dropping slowly for years, union strength either starts recovering or declining sharply. Under Republican leadership, he said — starting with Mitt Romney, who has vowed he will “stand up to Big Labor” — “that line would be in a free fall.” Whatever the outcome of the election, the traditional shape and structure of organized labor are likely to change significantly due to weakened labor laws, said Marquita Walker, a labor studies professor at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. Walker foresees a new breed of worker associations with fewer rules and looser boundaries. Textile workers from Bangladesh could band together with textile workers in Texas; metal workers from around the world could team up to demand more rights. Corporations are “running roughshod” over employees, Walker said, and workers are bound to band together to regain their voice. “The current state of unionism can’t sustain itself,” she said. “They’ll diminish to the point that they’ll have to resurface in a different way.”

#### Labor already on board

Stiles 6-21-13

Political reporter at National Review

Immigration: Democrats on Board By Andrew Stiles 6-21-13 http://www.nationalreview.com/article/351666/immigration-democrats-board-andrew-stiles

Notably, the AFL-CIO, which opposed the 2007 legislation, is backing the Gang of Eight, having struck a deal with Senator Chuck Schumer (D., N.Y.) and the Chamber of Commerce on the issue of guest workers. By signing on to the Gang’s proposal, the powerful union (with its supersized campaign war chest) has given most Democrats a green light to support it. A top Republican senator tells National Review Online he wouldn’t be surprised if every Democrat voted for the proposal, given the strong desire to pass it with at least 70 votes and put pressure on the GOP-controlled House.

#### Immigration win bolsters Obama and crushes GOP

Atlantic 8/28/13

(“Obama's Immigration Nuclear Option: Stopping Deportations Unilaterally” pg online at http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/08/obamas-immigration-nuclear-option-stopping-deportations-unilaterally/279138///sd)

But some liberals, like TPM’s Josh Marshall, are already saying it’s time to “stop pretending that this bill is going to pass” and start blaming Republicans for killing it instead. And immigration reformers are prepared to change their tune if things get to that point. “In the final analysis, if Republicans block it in the House, of course we’re going to look at all of our options, including pressing the president,” Sharry said. The big question is whether Obama would consider such a move, and that is something no one seems to know. His official position is that he is not considering it: “The only solution to this problem is for Congress to fix the broken immigration system by passing comprehensive reform,” a spokesman said earlier this month. Advocates say that is also what they are told behind the scenes: “The White House cuts off the conversation whenever it comes up. They want to keep the pressure on Republicans to pass legislation, as do we,” Sharry said.\* If Obama pulled the trigger, though, Sharry believes that would spell disaster for Republicans: “They are both going to be blamed and open the door to Obama being seen as the Great Emancipator.”

# Agri

#### Food security is key to preventing East Asian instability

Smith98-- Research Fellow of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (Paul, “FOOD SECURITY AND POLITICAL STABILITY

IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION”, 9/11, http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Report\_Food\_Security\_98.html) EL

For the Asia-Pacific region, food security is likely to emerge as a major security concern in the coming century, especially given the fact that so many Asian countries already consider food security to be an essential ingredient of their national sovereignty or national security. Moreover, for some countries—such as North Korea and China—food security is likely to be intertwined with future prospects of political stability and regime survival

. Similarly, if Asian countries increasingly rely on the international trading system to maintain their food security, these trading relationships—such as with the United States and other major exporters—will likely have collateral political effects that will in turn have long-term strategic implications. Finally, rapid population growth in the Asia-Pacific region, while not necessarily a direct cause of food insecurity, will certainly reduce the margin of error for policymakers in the event that they indulge in poor agricultural planning or engage in other forms of food security miscalculation.

#### Extinction

Yee and Storey 2 Herbert is a Professor of Politics and IR @ Hong Kong Baptist University, and Ian is a Lecturer in Defence Studies @ Deakin University. “The China Threat: Perceptions, Myths and Reality,” p. 5

The fourth factor contributing to the perception of a China threat is the fear of political and economic collapse in the PRC, resulting in territorial fragmentation, civil war and waves of refugees pouring into neighbouring countries. Naturally, any or all of these scenarios would have a profoundly negative impact on regional stability. Today the Chinese leadership faces a raft of internal problems, including the increasing political demands of its citizens, a growing population, a shortage of natural resources and a deterioration in the natural environment caused by rapid industrialization and pollution. These problems are putting a strain on the central government’s ability to govern effectively. Political disintegration or a Chinese civil war might result in millions of Chinese refugees seeking asylum in neighbouring countries. Such an unprecedented exodus of refugees from a collapsed PRC would no doubt put a severe strain on the limited resources of China’s neighbours. A fragmented China could also result in another nightmare scenario- nuclear weapons falling into the hands of irresponsible local provincial leaders or warlords. From this perspective, a disintegrating China would also pose a threat to its neighbours and the world.

#### Food insecurity supercharges all their impacts

Pinstrup-Anderson 5/18 (Per, H. E. Babcock Professor of Food, Nutrition and Public Policy, the J. Thomas Clark Professor of Entrepreneurship, and Professor of of Applied Economics at Cornell University and Adjunct Professor, Copenhagen University,“Food Security and Human Conflict—Per Pinstrup-Andersen” May 18, 2012, [http://smkern.com/pinstrup/wordpress/?p=317)](http://smkern.com/pinstrup/wordpress/?p=317)//MM)

As shown in Fig. 1, conflict is more likely to occur in countries with a high prevalence of food insecurity (4). Thus, countries where conflict subsequently occurred had a 45% higher prevalence of food insecurity prior to the conflict onset. They also suffered from higher child malnutrition and mortality rates and more poverty, while access to safe water and economic growth were lower. Multivariate analysis, controlling for each variable, identified poverty (headcount poverty), child mortality and child malnutrition prior to conflict to be significantly associated with conflict onset.

Food insecurity is most likely to trigger conflict in situations where other grievances, such as opposition to the existing political power structure and increasing prices for fuel and public transportation are present. Thus, although claims have been made that the Arab Spring began with food riots caused by increasing food prices, a number of other grievances played key roles. Conflict flourishes in an environment of poverty, political oppression, inequality, human rights abuses and food insecurity.

#### Food insecurity turns drug-conflict in Mexico, Colombia, and Peru

Pinstrup-Anderson 5/18 (Per, H. E. Babcock Professor of Food, Nutrition and Public Policy, the J. Thomas Clark Professor of Entrepreneurship, and Professor of of Applied Economics at Cornell University and Adjunct Professor, Copenhagen University,“Food Security and Human Conflict—Per Pinstrup-Andersen” May 18, 2012, [http://smkern.com/pinstrup/wordpress/?p=317)](http://smkern.com/pinstrup/wordpress/?p=317)//MM)

Hunger, poverty and hopelessness associated with political oppression were key triggers in recent conflicts in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Rwanda. Drug-related conflict in Mexico, Colombia and Peru were also associated with poverty and food insecurity (5, 6, 7). Food insecurity and other human suffering aligned with caste, religion, and ethnicity exacerbate tension and conflict.

On-going conflicts are causing widespread food insecurity in Somalia, The Republic of Congo, Sudan and several other countries. Conflict may cause food insecurity through the destruction of rural infrastructure, reductions in livestock herds, deforestation, widespread use of land-mines and population movements (8). During the armed conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the first half of the 1990s, the number of farm animals halved and the agricultural area cultivated dropped by 55%. A study comparing food production growth rates before, during and after conflict in 38 countries found a drop from 3.6% annual growth five years prior to the conflict onset to 0.8% during the conflict and increasing to 4.1% five years after the conflict (ibid). Average dietary energy intake dropped from 2,224 kcal/person five years prior to the conflict to 2,077 during the conflict in spite of large inflows of food aid during the conflicts.

As population growth, dietary transitions and biofuel production add pressure on land and water resources, the control over the use of land and water essential for food security has become an important source of conflict both within and between countries.

\\\

Current efforts by middle and high-income country governments and transnational corporations to gain control over land for the production of food and raw materials for biofuel in low-income countries cause conflict as smallholder farmers, who often do not have legal title to the land, are pushed off the land they cultivate with no viable alternatives for achieving food security (9).

# DHS

#### Border security solves bioterror

**Francis ’01** (Sam, Syndicated Columnist, Immigration Reform: No, 11-15, [http://www.vdare.com/francis/bush\_ amnesty\_si.htm](http://www.vdare.com/francis/bush_%20amnesty_si.htm))

It's been like pulling teeth, but the reality of the alien terrorist threat within the United States is finally forcing even the pro-immigration Bush administration to recognize the suicidal folly of tolerating mass immigration from countries and cultures profoundly different from our own. Last week the president himself uttered the first words that indicate he's starting to perceive where the real danger comes from. [[Read transcript](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-15.html) , listen via [RealAudio.](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-15.a.ram)] Acknowledging that "never did we realize that people would take advantage of our generosity to the extent that they have," Mr. Bush ticked off a [list of changes](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-13.html) in how the country would receive—or not receive—immigrants in the future. Tighter visa security and procedures, the most popular mantra of the hour, were high on the list, but so were new regulations forbidding the entry of suspected and potential terrorists. Later in the week, Attorney General [John Ashcroft](http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/speeches/2001/agcrisisremarks10_31.htm) unveiled a new list of 46 more groups for the list of known terrorist organizations. This is progress, sort of. Apparently it requires immense concentration of mind and steely girding of loins for the ruling class to see that letting just about anyone who wants to come here enter the country and wander about at will is really not a good idea in itself, let alone the most effective way to deter foreign terrorists. Even with the new announcements, the president had to pause every other sentence to explain that he's really not against immigration per se. Although we need to "tighten up the visas," Mr. Bush also insisted "that's not to say we're not going to let people come into our country; of course we are." Then again, just because some people we let into our country are evil and need to be "brought to justice," "by far the vast majority of people who have come to America are really good, decent people—people that we're proud to have here." Maybe so, but it ought to be unnecessary for the president to have to keep saying it. No doubt most of the people of Afghanistan are "really good, decent people" as well, but neither the president nor the military leaders planning the bombing campaign feel the necessity to tell us so. As for the late and unlamented "amnesty for illegal Mexican immigrants," that dominated the news [prior to Sept. 11](http://www.vdare.com/francis/contra_gigot.htm), it turns out that amnesty is not quite as late as some had thought. "It's [not dead](http://www.vdare.com/francis/amnesty_its_alive.htm)," says White House press secretary [Ari Fleischer](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011029-8.html#Immigration-law), but due to "other duties," drawing up the amnesty plan just "has not moved at the pace the president had hoped it would move." What all of this means is that the ruling class in general and the Bush administration in particular have not really changed their minds about immigration one iota. It's just that they have at least enough political sense to grasp that most Americans know immigration is a major reason why we have foreign terrorism at all, why we are having to worry about continuing [anthrax attacks](http://www.vdare.com/francis/anthrax.htm), why we need to keep worrying about what immigrant terrorists are planning to do to us in the future, and why the FBI and similar agencies keep issuing warnings about imminent terrorist attacks. If there were no Arabic or Muslim immigrants here, if those here who are clearly sympathetic to terrorism or are clearly anti-American in their religious and political views were kicked out, there would not be much of a terrorist threat at all.

#### Bioterror causes extinction

**Steinbrenner ’97** (John, Snr Fellow – Brookings, Foreign Policy, 12-22, Lexis)

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer