

Notes

General Argument

The Overpopulation DA argues that the US population is declining or stabilizing, but a big increase in immigration will reverse these trends and encourage more population growth in the US and in developing countries, which hurts the environment. The basic premise of this strategy is that instead of an unlimited individual right to mobility we should have rights that are balanced with non-human interests (i.e. animals and the environment).

There is a long history of people using “overpopulation” arguments to justify racist immigration policies and eugenics — the idea that we should curate the human gene pool by eliminating people deemed “less worthy” than others. Despite that history, population concerns are a major objection to immigration that is voiced by both the left (environmentalists) and the right (nativists.) The cards in this file represent the “left” objection to immigration. While there is plenty of evidence making overpopulation arguments from the right, those arguments are largely different like “immigrants will use up the welfare state” or “immigrants overwhelm health care infrastructure.” In this debate, the negative will argue that people moving to the US increases consumption of natural resources, and that emigration allows home countries to adopt less environmentally responsible policies because they know immigration will happen and will make up for it.

Affirmative Answers

There are two major categories of aff responses — case outweighs, and substantive responses to the DA itself.

If you read an economy advantage, you should focus on the short timeframe of your impact and how it might turn or interact with the negative’s environment impacts. Why might the environment get worse if the economy collapses?

If you read a morality advantage, you want to focus on the reasons the rhetoric/policy of the overpopulation argument is racist and dangerous. You can also use the 1AC impact cards from the morality advantage to explain that we should not be concerned with the consequences of the policy.

There are also substantive responses to the DA — how close is the US to being overpopulated? What is the relationship between immigration and damage to the environment? The aff has evidence to push back against each of the major negative claims.

Overpopulation DA Glossary

Carrying Capacity — the number of people a country or parcel of land can sustainably provide for

Demographics — population statistics about a nation

Demographic decline — the idea that a nation can “age” - i.e. its average population can get older, which creates problems like there aren't enough workers or social security runs out of money as there are more people taking out than putting in

Limits to growth — there are natural, environmental ceilings on how much economic or population growth can occur, pushed beyond these limits the ecosystem will collapse

Negative

1NC

1NC — Overpopulation DA

The [first/next] off is the Overpopulation DA.

First, the US population is declining now. Continued decline is crucial to combat environmental destruction and climate change.

Dodson 18 — Jenna Dodson, Assisting Researcher at the Overpopulation Project, Ms.C. from Virginia Commonwealth University, 2018 (“US birth rate lowest in 30 years – the overlooked benefits,” The Overpopulation Project, May 24th, Available Online at <https://overpopulation-project.com/2018/05/24/the-united-states-birth-rate-in-2017-good-news/>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

The United States’ birth rate has fallen to a 30-year low, and the media is giving this new figure much attention. Unfortunately, most of that attention is misplaced. Since last week, countless news organizations released articles reviewing the new report from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) that documents the 3,853,472 births last year. Overall, the vast majority of articles are cautionary, referencing problems commonly associated with degrowth such as aging societies and shrinking labor forces. It is true that if the total fertility rate of 1.76 is sustained, then the current generation will not be replaced. However, the fertility rate has generally been below replacement level since 1971. And why is this portrayed as a bad? In fact, **it is very much the opposite – it is an opportunity. An opportunity that necessitates a departure from our obsession with growth, and a willingness to embrace a new perspective**. USA birth rate and number of births **The United States is home to over 326 million people, who on average, each emit 16.5 metric tons of carbon dioxide per year. Despite the average American consuming roughly the same amount of energy as 60 years ago, total emissions have increased by 180%. The primary driver of this increase? Population growth**. Furthermore, **population growth has been identified by the International Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] as a key driver of anthropogenic emissions leading to climate change**. Climate change impacts society in a variety of ways, including changes in rainfall and crop yields, water stress, effects on human health, and even energy supply. Recent research has shown that **the highest-impact action to reduce personal emissions and help slow climate change is to have one fewer child**. Fewer births that can contribute to a lower population growth and alleviate climate change impacts is a promising figure to be encouraged. As many news responses point out, **a trend of lower birth rates would also shift the demographic structure of the United States towards an older population**. However, what the news sources neglected to include were the positive effects of population aging. Firstly, **an aging population would augment the emission reduction from fewer births through a reduction in energy consumption**. A study from the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research found that **aging populations are associated with improvements in education, increased productivity, shared wealth, higher quality of life, and overall healthier populations**. Over time, aging

populations from declining birth rates will lead to fewer people – this is already happening in more than 20 countries, including Japan and many countries in Eastern Europe. With the appropriate social programs and policies, a smaller, older population can provide social and environmental benefits for the betterment of the country. **There are substantial social and environmental benefits to be had from declining birth rates in the United States.** Last year, the decline was primarily driven by a decrease in unintended teen pregnancies and an increase in women joining the workforce, indicators of social progress. **If this degrowth continues, the United States has the opportunity to expand on this progress, reduce emissions, and allocate more resources to each citizen. This will enhance the benefits of an aging society to improve the overall quality of life for its population, and environment.**

Second, immigration restriction is vital to efforts to control international population.

Miller 13 — David Miller, Professor of Political Theory at Oxford University, Fellow at Nuffield College, former Professor at the University of Lancaster, trained in philosophy at Cambridge and Oxford, 2013 (“The Case for Limits,” in Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics, 2nd Edition, ed. Andrew I. Cohen and Christopher Heath Wellman, 2013, ISBN-10: 1118479394)

The second reason for states to limit immigration that I want to consider concerns **population size**.¹ This **is a huge, and hugely controversial, topic**, and all I can do here is to sketch an argument that links together the issues of immigration and population control. The latter issue really arises at two different levels: global and national. **At the global level, there is a concern that the carrying capacity of the earth may be stretched to breaking point if the total number of human beings continues to rise** as it has over the last half century or so. **At national level, there is a concern about the effect of population growth on quality of life and the natural environment.** Let me look at each level in turn. **Although there is disagreement about just how many people the earth can sustain** before resource depletion – the availability of water, for example – becomes acute, **it would be hard to maintain that there is no upper limit.** Although projections of population growth over the century ahead indicate a leveling off in the rate of increase, we must also expect – indeed should welcome – **increases in the standard of living in the developing world that will mean that resource consumption per capita will also rise significantly.** **In such a world it is in all our interests that states whose populations are growing rapidly should adopt birth control measures** and other policies to restrict the rate of growth, **as both China and India have done in past decades. But such states have little or no incentive to adopt such policies if they can “export” their surplus population through international migration,** and since the policies in question are usually unpopular, they have a positive incentive not to pursue them. **A viable population policy at global level requires each state to be responsible for stabilizing, or even possibly reducing, its population over time, and this is going to be impossible to achieve if there are no restrictions on the movement of people between states.** **At national level, the effects of population growth may be less catastrophic, but can still be detrimental to important cultural values.** What we think about

this issue may be conditioned to some extent by the population density of the state in which we live. **Those of us who live in relatively small and crowded states experience daily the way in which the sheer number of our fellow citizens, with their needs for housing, mobility, recreation, and so forth, impacts on the physical environment, so that it becomes harder to enjoy access to open space, to move from place to place without encountering congestion, to preserve important wildlife habitats, and so on.** It's true, of course, that **the problems arise not simply from population size, but also from a population that wants to live in a certain way** – to move around a lot, to have high levels of consumption, and so on – **so we could deal with them by collectively changing the way that we live**, rather than by restricting or reducing population size (De-Shalit, 2000). **Perhaps we should. But this, it seems to me, is a matter for political decision: members of a territorial community have the right to decide whether to restrict their numbers, or to live in a more ecologically and humanly sound way, or to do neither and bear the costs of a high-consumption, high-mobility lifestyle in a crowded territory. If restricting numbers is part of the solution, then controlling immigration is a natural corollary.** (371-2)

Third, immigration to the US is a “safety valve” that stops environmental reforms in other countries. Instead, the US can be a global leader in sustainability.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Now, **if emigration helped America's source countries get their own demographic houses in order**, or opened up an ecological space that they used to create more sustainable or just societies, **a case might be made for** continuing to allow mass **immigration** into the U.S. **Instead, America's permissive immigration policies appear to enable demographic and ecological irresponsibility and continuing social injustice.** As an example, **consider Guatemala**, where currently about ten percent of the adult population lives and works in the U.S., and a recent poll showed that most young Guatemalans hope to do so in the future. Guatemalan women's total fertility rate averaged 4.6 children in 2005, for an annual growth rate of 2.4 percent per year.³⁵ **The Guatemalan government outlaws abortion** (except when a mother's life is at risk) **and does little to encourage contraception. Guatemala has high deforestation rates and an unjust, highly inequitable distribution of wealth. But there is little effort to change any of this**, perhaps **because the negative effects of local overpopulation are lessened through immigration and counterbalanced**, for many individuals, **by the positive incentives of having more remittances from family members in the United States. Americans should do what we can to help other countries move toward sustainability, whether that means increasing funds for green development projects, or shutting off the “safety valve” which**

allows political elites to postpone necessary reforms. But we believe that **our primary responsibility is to create a sustainable society in the United States. Not just because our local environmental duties are important.** Not just because this is the main way we may further our responsibilities as global citizens. Perhaps **most significant would be the powerful example of the world's wealthiest nation**—the land of “The Apprentice” and “Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?”—**rejecting the path of endless growth and embracing sustainability.** **Limiting immigration into the United States and stabilizing our population would send a powerful message around the world that the time to create just, sustainable societies is now.** (27)

Finally, immigration is the most important factor for population and consumption. Limiting it prevent extinction.

Kolankiewicz 10 — Leon Kolankiewicz, environmental scientist and national natural resources planner, masters in environmental planning from U of British Columbia, worked with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Dept of Environmental Conservation, U Wash, U New Mexico, 2018 (“From Big to Bigger: How Mass Immigration and Population Growth Have Exacerbated America's Ecological Footprint,” Progressives for Immigration Reform, Policy Brief #10-1, Available Online at <http://progressivesforimmigrationreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/big-to-bigger.pdf>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

As of early 2010, the United States has a rapidly growing population of 308 million.³³ In the 1990s, U.S. population expanded by nearly 33 million, the largest single decade of growth in American history since the decennial national censuses began in 1790. The 1990s exceeded even the peak decade of the Baby Boom, the 1950s by nearly five million (Figure 7). The 2001-**2010** decade **now drawing to a close will approach this record increment.** Far from coasting to a stop or cessation in growth, **U.S. population remains stubbornly and persistently high, and is literally growing with no end in sight.** At current growth rates, every year more than three million net new residents are added to the U.S. population.³⁴ The U.S. Census Bureau projects that by 2050, the population of the United States will have grown to 439 million. This is an increase of 131 million, or 43 percent, over our current population of 308 million. In 2050, if the Census Bureau’s current projections come to pass, the U.S. population would still be adding 3.45 million residents a year (more than today, though the annual growth rate will have declined somewhat), and there would be 5.7 million births compared to 4.3 million annual births today.³⁵ Yet **it is misleading to imply that increased births would be the dominant force behind this massive population growth.** That is because **many of those births would not occur,** or at least would not occur in the United States, **were it not for the persistently high levels of net immigration** that are assumed by the Census Bureau in these projections. In 2050, the Bureau’s projections assume “net international migration” (immigration minus emigration) of 2.05 million, an increase from 1.34 million in 2010. This **assumption reflects the Bureau’s**

professional judgment that domestic and international pressures to further increase already high immigration rates will only intensify.

If the factors behind demographic change are divided between “net natural increase” (births minus deaths) and “net migration” (immigration minus emigration), then in 2050, 41 percent of the annual increment of 3.45 million would be attributable to net natural increase, and 59 percent would be due to net migration. However, even this breakdown understates the decisive influence that the level of immigration has in determining America’s demographic future. **The full impact of immigration on demographic trends only becomes apparent when the U.S.-born descendants of immigrants are accounted for because, after all, these U.S. births would not have occurred but for the prior acts of migration** by eventual parents that made them possible. **When births to immigrants are accounted for, demographers at the Pew Research Center calculated** recently that: If current trends continue, the population of **the United States will rise to 438 million in 2050**, from 296 million in 2005, **and 82 percent of the increase will be due to immigrants** arriving from 2005 to 2050 and their U.S.-born descendants.³⁶ [emphasis added] Figures 8-10 graphically illustrate the powerful role of immigration policy in shaping current and future U.S. demographic trends. Figure 8 shows U.S. population growth from 1790 to 1970; the steepening curve, one characterized by larger and larger increments over time is a shape characteristic of all phenomena experiencing exponential growth. If, however, the 1970 levels of demographic components (net immigration, fertility or birth rates, and mortality rates) had been maintained over the decades that followed, the growth trajectory would have appeared more like that of the curve in Figure 9, rather than the much steeper curve in Figure 8. At the time of the first celebration of Earth Day in 1970, young environmentalists who had just finished reading Paul Ehrlich’s best-selling 1968 book *The Population Bomb* and listening to one of Earth Day Founder Senator Gaylord Nelson’s moving speeches believed whole-heartedly in the cause and necessity of U.S. and global population stabilization. They endorsed the view of popular cartoonist Walt Kelly’s character Pogo that, “We have met the enemy and he is us” (a play on words of the famous line by Commodore Perry: “We have met the enemy, and they are ours”). In other words, the more of “us” there are, the more “enemies,” or at least environmental burdens Mother Earth faces. If this generation had been able to realize its vision of slowing and then stopping U.S. population growth and reining in the environmental degradation it caused, the trajectory might have looked something like that of the curve in Figure 9. Growth would have tapered off and America’s population would never have hit 300 million. Instead, because of the rapidly rising wave of immigration unleashed by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, Americans and their environment are facing the grim, and utterly unsustainable, future of ever-greater demographic pressures represented by Figure 10. What bearing do these “inconvenient truths” have on America’s Ecological Footprint? In a nutshell — everything. Current immigration levels are enlarging the already enormous U.S. Ecological Footprint and ecological deficit. With the U.S. population booming by more than 10 percent a decade, the only way to maintain — much less reduce the current, unacceptable size of our EF is to reduce our per capita consumption every decade by more than 10 percent — not just for one or five decades, but

indefinitely, for as long as population growth continues. One doesn't have to be a physicist or a political scientist to recognize that an achievement of this magnitude would be technically and politically unrealistic, if not impossible. America is already in ecological overshoot, and massive population growth driven by high immigration rates only serves to exacerbate the situation. Figure 11 shows current trends with respect to the Ecological Footprint and Biocapacity of the United States from 1961 through 2006.³⁷ As is evident from the crossing lines in this graph, America's EF first surpassed its biocapacity in the late 1960s, just prior to the first Earth Day. Since then the gap or ecological deficit has only continued to widen. While the addition of each new American does not necessarily increase our per capita or per person (as opposed to our aggregate) EF — only increased per capita resource consumption and CO₂ generation does that, it does directly decrease our per capita biocapacity, and thus increases our ecological deficit. Population growth does this in two ways. First, **given a fixed biocapacity** — that is, a land base that is demonstrably finite and constant, with fixed maximum acreages of potential cropland, grazing land, forestland, and fishing grounds — **it is a simple mathematical reality that adding more people** who depend on this ecologically productive land base **reduces per capita biocapacity**. Second, **the more than three million new Americans added every year require space and area in which to live, work, play, shop, and attend school**. As open space is converted into the "built-up land" category, some combination of forestland, cropland, and grazing land is inevitably developed. (In the 1950s, Orange County, California, home to Disneyland, was touted by developers as "Smog Free Orange County," but by the 1990s, after four decades of relentless sprawl development to accommodate Southern California's multiplying millions, it became known as "Orange Free Smog County"). In this way, our country's biocapacity is steadily and inexorably diminished by a growing population. The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS's) National Resources Inventory (NRI) estimated that the United States lost 44 million acres of cropland, 12 million acres of pastureland, and 11 million acres of rangeland from 1982 to 1997, for a total loss to our agricultural land base of 67 million acres over this 15-year period.³⁸ (One explanation of the much higher acreage of lost cropland than pastureland and rangeland was that a larger fraction of the cropland acreage was not "lost" per se, but deliberately "retired" from active production into the so-called Conservation Reserve Program or CRP, a program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farm Service Agency. These were lands of marginal quality and high erodibility, lands on which modern, intensive agriculture is unsustainable). All 49 states inventoried lost cropland. Overall cropland losses continued in the next NRI published in 2007.³⁹ The impacts of the loss of this land extend beyond agriculture. The USDA has estimated that each person added to the U.S. population requires slightly more than one acre of land for urbanization and highways.⁴⁰ Clearly, more land is required as more people are added to our population. A comparison of NRI acreage — 25 million acres of newly developed land over the 1982-1997 period and 67 million acres of agricultural land lost shows that development per se is not responsible for all or even half of agricultural land loss. Arable land is also subject to other natural and manmade phenomena such as soil erosion (from both water and wind), salinization, and waterlogging that can rob its fertility, degrade its productivity and

eventually force its retirement or increase its dependency on ever greater quantities of costly inputs like (fossil-fuel derived) nitrogen fertilizers. Arguably, however, much of these losses are due to over-exploitation by intensive agricultural practices needed to constantly raise agricultural productivity (yield per acre) in order to provide ever more food for America's and the world's growing populations and meat-rich diets. Thus, the potent combination of relentless development and land degradation from soil erosion and other factors is reducing America's productive agricultural land base even as the demands on that same land base from a growing population are increasing. If the rates of agricultural land loss that have prevailed in recent years were to continue to 2050, the nation will have lost 53 million of its remaining 377 million acres of cropland, or 14 percent, even as the U.S. population grows by 43 percent from 308 million to 440 million.⁴¹ Continuing on to 2100, the discrepancy between booming population numbers and declining cropland acreage widens even further (Figure 12). The Census Bureau's "middle series" projection (made in the year 2000) is 571 million, more than a doubling of U.S. population in 2000.⁴² (The "highest serious" projection was 1.2 billion, and actual growth since these projections were made has been between the middle and highest series). If the same rate of cropland loss were to continue, the United States would lose approximately 106 million acres of its remaining 377 million acres of cropland, or nearly 30 percent. Cropland per capita, that is, the acreage of land to grow grains and other crops for each resident, would decline from 1.4 acres in 1997 to 0.47 acres in 2100, a 66 percent reduction. If this occurs, biotechnology will need to work miracles to raise yields per acre in order to maintain the sort of diet Americans have come to expect. These **ominous, divergent trends** — an increasing population and declining arable land, have actually **led some scientists to think** the unthinkable: that one day **America may no longer be able to feed itself, let alone boast a food surplus for export** to the world. In the 1990s, Cornell University agricultural and food scientists David and Marcia Pimentel and Mario Giampietro of the Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione in Rome, Italy, argued that by approximately 2025, the United States would most likely cease to be a food exporter, and that food grown in this country would be needed for domestic consumption. These findings suggest that by 2050, the amount of arable land per capita may have dropped to the point that, "the diet of the average American will, of necessity, include more grains, legumes, tubers, fruits and vegetables, and significantly less animal products."⁴³ While this might, in fact, constitute a healthier diet both for terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and for many calorically and cholesterol-challenged Americans, it would also represent a significant loss of dietary choice. As nations get wealthier, they tend to "move up the food chain" in the phrase of the Earth Policy Institute's Lester Brown, that is they consume higher trophic level, more ecologically demanding and damaging meat and dairy products, but were these predictions to hold true, Americans, for better or worse, would be moving in the opposite direction. From 2005 to 2006, the U.S. per capita ecological deficit widened from 10.9 to 11.3 acres, continuing the long-term trend depicted in Figure 11. Assuming the Census Bureau's official population projections for 2050 actually do happen, the U.S. population would be 43 percent larger than at present. Even if there were no further increase in the U.S. per capita EF, which is, as can be seen from the 45-year trend in Figure 11, a rather generous

assumption, a 43 percent increase in the U.S. population would correspond to a further 43 percent reduction in biocapacity per capita, even without the types of continuing land and resource degradation just discussed above for cropland. The 2006 U.S. biocapacity was 10.9 global acres (ga) per capita. By 2050, if current U.S. demographic trends and projections hold, this will have been reduced to 6.2 ga per capita. If the per capita American EF of consumption were to remain at the 2006 value of 22.3 ga, the ecological deficit in 2050 would increase to 16.1 ga per capita. In essence, **if we American “Bigfeet” do not opt for a different demographic path than the one we are treading now, Ecological Footprint analysis indicates unequivocally that we will continue plodding ever deeper into the forbidden zone of Ecological Overshoot, trampling our prospects for a sustainable future.** Incidentally, **we would also be trampling the survival prospects for many** hundreds of endangered **species** with which we share our country. These birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, reptiles, butterflies, mussels, and other taxa are menaced with extinction by our aggressive exploitation of nearly every ecological niche, nook, and cranny. In nature, no organism in overshoot remains there for long. **Sooner or later, ecosystem and/or population collapse ensues.** Are we humans, because of our unique scientific acumen, immune from the laws of nature that dictate the implacable terms of existence to all other species on the planet? Our political, economic, and cultural elites seem to think so, and en masse, we certainly act so. Yet ironically, **many scientists themselves believe otherwise: that all-too-human hubris, unless checked by collective wisdom and self-restraint, will prove to be our undoing, and that civilization as we know it may unravel.**⁴⁴

1NC — Morality Advantage Supplement

[Add this to your 1NC — Morality Advantage Answers if they read the Morality Advantage.]

Mobility rights are anthropocentric — they make it impossible to limit human consumption.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Perhaps **the most important objections raised against restrictive immigration policies are that they are unjust**, because they are unfair to potential immigrants. One concise way of stating this point is to say that would-be immigrants have a right to live and work in the United States. While some immigrants’ rights proponents argue for abolishing national borders altogether, **most assert a general human right to freely move** and settle without regard to national borders, subject to reasonable state restrictions to keep out criminals and prevent gross harms to receiving societies. **Clearly this right does not exist in American law**. The Constitution names no right to immigrate, and the Supreme Court has consistently upheld the federal government’s right to regulate immigration into the country. **Neither does such a right exist in international law**. The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not assert a general human right to immigrate into the country of one’s choice; nor do other major framework international rights treaties.²² Proponents, then, claim first the existence of a moral right to immigrate freely across borders, and second that national laws should be amended accordingly. What arguments do they provide for creating this new and important legal right? Chandran **Kukathas gives the following “liberal egalitarian” argument** for open borders. From a proper universalistic moral point of view, he maintains, citizens of rich countries have no special claims to the resources and opportunities into which they have been born. “Egalitarianism demands that the earth’s resources be distributed as equally as possible,” he writes, “and one particularly effective mechanism for facilitating this is freedom of movement.” Egalitarians want to equalize not just resources, but opportunities. Allowing people to migrate from poor, overcrowded countries with high unemployment and little chance for economic advancement to wealthier, less crowded countries equalizes opportunities. “Our starting point,” Kukathas suggests, “should be a recognition of our common humanity and the idea that both the resources of the earth and the cooperation of our fellows are things to which no one has any privileged entitlement.” For these reasons, “the movement of peoples should be free.”²³ **This is a powerful argument**, since it rests on egalitarian values that many people share. It also relies on the common thought: “What right do I have to ‘shut the door’ on people who are just as good as I am and who, through no fault of their own, have been born into less happy circumstances?” Kukathas’ argument may speak particularly strongly to people who feel some sympathy with egalitarianism, but not enough to do anything about it personally, for it says to

wealthy Americans, “You don’t have to give up anything yourself to help poor people overseas live better lives. You can fulfill any moral obligations you may have toward them by allowing them to come here and cut your grass, cook your food and diaper your children.” Nevertheless, **despite these strengths, there are good reasons to reject the liberal egalitarian argument** for open borders. **Any rights claim must be tested against its effects on all interested parties— not just the parties pressing the claim.** Even widely accepted, fundamental **human rights must be balanced against other rights** and other important **interests**. As we have seen, current **high levels of immigration** into the United States **are leading to a larger population, which makes it much harder to share the landscape generously with nonhuman beings.** **Allowing a general right to immigrate into the U.S. would greatly accelerate this process.** **With “open borders,” the interests of nonhuman nature would be sacrificed completely to the interests of people.** **The economic interests of would-be immigrants would trump the very existence of many nonhuman organisms, endangered species, and wild places in the United States.** Kukathas (and most immigrants’ rights advocates) **can accept this trade-off.** As the previous quotes illustrate, **Kukathas sees nature essentially as “the Earth’s resources”;** **the only question to ask about them is how people may divide them up fairly and efficiently.** In seeking to make sense of Australian environmentalists’ arguments for limiting immigration, he reduces these to worries that “parks and sewerage services” will be “degraded”—**a revealingly soulless locution.**²⁴ **But those of us who reject this anthropocentric perspective must consider the interests of the nonhuman beings that would be displaced by an ever increasing human presence.** We ourselves believe that the **human appropriation of natural landscapes has progressed so far in America, that any further appropriation is unjust.** Some readers might not be willing to go that far (although if that is the case, we wonder what you are waiting for). But it is important to realize that **accepting a general right to immigrate leaves no room to take nature’s interests seriously,** in the U.S. or elsewhere, **since it ensures that the human appropriation of nature will continue to increase. For this reason alone, it must be rejected by anyone committed to generous sustainability.**(18-19)

2NC/1NR

Extend: “Mobility Rights are Anthropocentric”

Reject social justice liberalism. Its knowledge claims create a slippery slope to an ecological crisis.

Bowers 8 — C. A. Bowers, Professor of Environmental Studies at Oregon, 2008 (“Transitions: Educational Reforms that Promote Ecological Intelligence or the Assumptions Underlying Modernity?,” University of Oregon Press, Available Online at <https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/handle/1794/8618>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

Yet there continue to be differences between how liberals understand the nature of progress. A useful way of identifying these differences is to identify liberals working to alleviate poverty and various forms of exploitation as **social justice liberals**. Liberals who use critical inquiry to develop new technologies and to exploit new markets should be labeled as market liberals. The former were and continue to be critical of the exploitive nature of the free enterprise system, while the latter were and still are willing to let the “invisible hand” supposedly operating in the free market system distribute the benefits to the deserving—which usually means those who are already privileged. Given these differences, and they are hugely important, the two groups of liberals nevertheless **share a common set of silences and prejudices**. **Already mentioned is their shared prejudice of the knowledge systems of other cultures—particularly indigenous cultures. They also share a very narrow and thus basic misunderstanding of the nature and importance of cultural traditions.** In effect, **they** both **fail to recognize the misconceptions of the Enlightenment thinkers who** only identified oppressive traditions, and **did not understand the intergenerational knowledge and skills that enabled communities to be more self-sufficient and to have complex symbolic lives.** And both **social justice** and market **liberals fail to understand that language is not simply a conduit in a sender/receiver process of communication, but instead is metaphorically layered in ways that reproduce past misconceptions in today’s taken-for-granted patterns of thinking. This latter oversight accounts for how** both **social justice** and market **liberals are continually embracing whatever is represented as a progressive step forward—and not asking about which traditions are vital** to the well-being of community **and to a sustainable future** are being lost. There are many unrecognized assumptions that are shared by students on university campuses who identify themselves as conservatives and the professors whom they regard as subverting the American way of life. Again, the failure to recognize the shared assumptions and silences can, in part, be traced to the failure of universities to engage students in a discussion of the writings of the early political theorists whose influence continues to today. The misunderstandings resulting from this lack of historical knowledge are particularly evident when the beliefs and values of the self-identified conservative students are compared with the market liberal agenda promoted by the CATO and American Enterprise Institutes. Indeed, they turn out to be nearly identical—though some of these students balk at the idea of open debate as advocated by the American Enterprise Institute. As most university faculty embrace social justice liberalism they see no reason to introduce students to the thinking of philosophical conservatives or to the

ideas of classical liberal thinkers. And the few social justice faculty who are introducing their students to the writings of environmental writers such as Rachel Carson, Aldo Leopold, Wendell Berry, and Vandana Shiva fail to clarify for students that these are essentially conservative environmental thinkers. By not engaging students in discussions of the different forms of conservatism, including the faux conservatism of President George W. Bush and his religious, corporate, and military base of support, students are more likely to accept without question Lakoff's designation of environmentalists as liberal progressive activists. And they will continue to perpetuate the silences and prejudices that have been an aspect of liberal thinking since the time of the Enlightenment—which will keep them from recognizing that revitalizing the diversity of the world's cultural commons will be a necessary part of achieving a sustainable future. **The reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Control, [IPCC] which reflect the consensus thinking of 600 scientists from more than 100 countries on the nature and causes of global warming, brings into focus another aspect of the slippery slope that both the market and social justice liberals are greasing. As the melting of the permafrost in the northern latitudes release the vast quantity of methane gas that is an even greater contributor to global warming than carbon dioxide, as the glaciers that are the source of fresh water for hundreds of millions of people disappear, as the temperature of the world's oceans rise and as the oceans absorb more CO2 that contribute to their increased acidity, as droughts and changes in weather patterns forces the migration of plants, animals, and people, and as more of the world's major fisheries near collapse, the convergence of the slippery slope leading to environmental catastrophe with the slippery slope leading to a fascist form of government become a more likely possibility.** What is not usually recognized is that the emergence of fascism between the two world wars resulted when democratic institutions became so weakened that they were no longer able to address the sources of economic and social unrest. **People have demonstrated time and again that they prefer order over chaos, and they have often embraced the strong political leader who, as the supreme "decider", does away with the seemingly endless debates which are at the center of the democratic process.** The convergence of economic unrest resulting from the globalization of the market liberal agenda with **the deepening ecological crises could easily lead to a repeat of this earlier history.** Both market and **social justice liberals carry forward the silences and prejudices that have been part of the legacy of Enlightenment thinkers—**indeed some of these silences and prejudices can be traced back to the thinking of Plato who invented the idea of pure thinking that supposedly is free the of cultural influences carried forward through narratives. These include the intergenerational knowledge, skills, and activities that enable members of communities to live more self-sufficient and thus less money and consumer dependent lives. **Working to conserve the diversity of the world's languages and thus the diversity of knowledge of local ecosystems is yet another critical area of concern that is not being given adequate attention by social justice liberals who, unlike Krugman, refuse to consider anything that is associated with the word conservatism—partly because they lack knowledge of the many forms of conserving that are an inescapable part of daily life—and partly because the word conservatism is now associated with authoritarian politics** and the pursuit of economic self-interest. There are

many other analogs than those associated with the ideas and policies of market liberals that need to be considered in determining the different meanings of the word “conservatism”. Briefly, learning to think and communicate in the language of one’s cultural groups conserves its many taken-for-granted patterns of thinking and values. Our DNA is also a powerful conserving force that influences the most fundamental aspects of our biology. The taken-for-granted nature of most of our cultural knowledge and values is also an inescapable aspect of what can be referred to as embodied conservatism. And then there is temperamental conservatism which is expressed in a preference for certain foods, wearing certain clothes, having certain friends, and so forth. These different expressions of conservatism are largely part of our embodied experiences, and are different in fundamental ways from conservative ideas of how societies should be organized and governed. In order to conserve the gains in social justice and civil liberties it is important to keep in mind that not all of conservative ideas, such as those advocating the right of states to enforce racist policies, the cultural tradition of child brides, honor killings, and poll taxes, should be carried forward. On the other hand, the current practice of using the word to stigmatize individuals and groups who are more aware of the traditions that are the basis of their mutually supportive and intergenerationally connected communities should not be continued. In order to make more informed judgments of about the different expressions of conservatism—judgments about what should be supported and what should be resisted—we need to expand our political vocabulary. In addition to rectifying our use of political terminology so that labels accurately reflect the beliefs and practices of different groups, we need to follow the practice of different religious groups who use adjectives that identify the religious group’s specific orientation or the tradition it is part of. Examples include the distinction between Orthodox and Reform Judaism, Greek Orthodox Christians and Evangelical Christians, moderate and fundamentalists Muslims, and so forth. The adjectives are not always as accurate as we would like, but they avoid the problem of including a wide range of interpretations and agendas under a single rubric. The distinction between market and social justice liberals is an example that has been introduced here. Other examples might include environmental conservatives and indigenous conservatives. The problem of relying upon a single rubric can be seen in Thomas Frank’s reference to the Christians in Kansas who support President George W. Bush’s efforts to dismantle the separation of powers and the Constitution as conservative. Referring to them as members of the religious right would have brought into focus their political agenda, which included abolishing abortion, gays, separation of church and state, and equal opportunities for women and other previously marginalized groups. Journalists and media pundits need to use the label of extremists if it accurately represents the political agenda of certain individuals and groups. For example, Vice-President Richard Cheney and David Addington need to be identified as extremists. And there is a need to use the label of fascist when it accurately fits the ideas and political agenda of an individual or group. It is important to note that few graduates of our universities possess a knowledge of the core ideas and practices shared by different fascist regimes, and thus are unable to recognize political trends that are moving the society in that direction. Most of all, we need to avoid the intellectual laziness that characterizes so much of our formulaic use of conservative and liberal.

There is an urgent need for the more reflective people to criticize our universities for their failure to educate students about the history of ideas we now refer to as ideologies—including the need for them to understand which **ideologies** are **contributing to overshooting the sustaining capacity of the Earth's natural systems**. If we can't get this figured out we will continue to be caught in the double bind of promoting the globalization of the consumer dependent lifestyle while at the same time searching for the technologies that will slow the rate of global warming partly being caused by consumerism. And our difficulties will be further exacerbated if the current misuse of our most prominent political language continues to marginalize the awareness that **in this era of political uncertainties and deepening ecological crises we need a political discourse that addresses what needs to be conserved**. Pg. 87-89

Link — Immigration (General)

Immigration is the *vital* internal link to combatting population growth.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 31, March)

The environmental argument for reducing immigration into the United States **is** relatively straightforward: (1) Immigration **levels are at a historic high** and **immigration is now the main driver of U.S. population growth**. (2) **Population growth contributes significantly to a host of environmental problems** within our borders. (3) **A growing population increases America’s large environmental footprint beyond our borders and our disproportionate role in stressing global environmental systems**. (4) **To seriously address environmental problems at home and become good global environmental citizens, we must stop U.S. population growth**. (5) **We are morally obligated to address our environmental problems and become good global environmental citizens**. (6) **Therefore, we should limit immigration** into the United States **to the extent needed to stop U.S. population growth. This conclusion rests on a straightforward commitment to mainstream environmentalism, easily confirmed empirical premises, and logic**. Nevertheless, it is not the consensus position among American environmentalists. Some **environmentalists** support continued high levels of immigration, while most **are uncomfortable with the topic** and avoid discussing it. **So strong is this aversion that groups** such as the Sierra Club, which during the 1970s prominently featured strong commitments to U.S. population stabilization, **have dropped domestic population growth as an issue**.¹ Several years ago, the group Zero Population Growth went so far as to change its name to Population Connection (“PC” for short). In 2006, the United States passed the 300 million mark in population—that’s 95 million more people than were here for the first Earth Day in 1970—with little comment from environmentalists. In 2007, as Congress debated the first major overhaul of immigration policy in nearly twenty years, leaders from the principal environmental organizations remained silent about competing proposals that could have meant the difference between a U.S. population of 300 million, 600 million, or 1.2 billion people in 2100. Like immigration policy for the past fifty years, **immigration policy for the next fifty looks likely to be set with no regard for its environmental consequences. We believe this situation is a bad thing**. As committed environmentalists, **we would like to see our government set immigration policy** (and all government policy) **within the context of a commitment to sustainability**. We don’t believe that the goals we share with our fellow environmentalists and with a large majority of our fellow citizens—clean air and clean water; livable, uncrowded cities; sharing the land with the full complement of its native flora and fauna—are compatible with continued population

growth. It is time to rein in this growth—or forthrightly renounce the hope of living sustainably here in the United States.(5-6)

Link — Open Borders

Open borders causes exploitive behavior that weakens state safety nets and destroys the biosphere.

Daly 13 — Herman Daly, Professor at the University of Maryland School of Public Affairs, former senior economist in the environment department of the World Bank, cofounder of the journal Ecological Economics, 2013 (“Open Borders and the Tragedy of Open Access Commons,” CASSE: Center for the Advancement of the Steady State Economy, June 3rd, Available Online at <https://steadystate.org/open-borders-and-the-tragedy-of-open-access-commons/>, Accessed 08-08-2018)

“Open borders” refers to a policy of unlimited or free **immigration**. I argue here that it is a bad policy. **If you are poor and your country provides no social safety net, you move to one that does. If you are rich and your country makes you pay your taxes, you move** (or at least move your money) **to one that doesn’t**. Thus **safety nets, and public goods in general, disappear as they become both overloaded and underfunded**. That is the “world without borders,” and without community. **That is the tragedy of open access commons**. Some will think that I am attacking a straw man, because, they will say, no sensible person really advocates open borders. They simply advocate, it will be said, “more generous levels of immigration, and a reasonable amnesty for existing illegal immigrants.” I agree that some form of strictly conditional amnesty is indeed necessary as the lesser evil, given the impasse created by past non-enforcement of our immigration laws. Deporting 12 million long-settled residents is too drastic and would create more injustices than it would rectify. But unless we enforce immigration laws in the future there will soon be need for another amnesty (the first, often forgotten, was in 1986), and then another — a de facto open-borders policy. Nevertheless, the policy of open borders should be fairly discussed, not only because some people explicitly advocate it, but also because many others implicitly accept it by virtue of their unwillingness to face the alternative. Immigration is a divisive issue. A good unifying point to begin a discussion is to recognize that every country in the world has a policy of limiting immigration. Emigration is often considered a human right, but immigration requires the permission of the receiving country. Some countries allow many legal immigrants. Others allow few. As the World Bank reported in its Global Bilateral Migration Database: The United States remains the most important migrant destination in the world, home to one fifth of the world’s migrants and the top destination for migrants from no less than sixty sending countries. Migration to Western Europe remains largely from elsewhere in Europe. There are also arguments about the emigration side of open borders — **even if emigration is a human right, is it unconditional? Might “brain-drain” emigrants have some obligation to contribute something to the community that educated and invested in them**, before they emigrate to greener pastures? Immigrants are people, and deserve to be well treated; immigration is a policy, and deserves reasoned discussion in the public interest. It seems that neither expectation is fulfilled, perhaps partly because the world has moved from largely empty to quite full in only one lifetime. What

could work in the world of two billion people into which I was born, no longer works in today's world of seven billion. **In addition to people, the exploding populations of cars, buildings, livestock, ships, refrigerators, cell phones, and even corn stalks and soybean plants, contribute to a world full of "dissipative structures" that, like human bodies, require not only space but also a metabolic flow of natural resources beginning with depletion and ending with pollution. This growing entropic throughput already exceeds ecological capacities of regeneration and absorption, degrading the life-support capacity of the ecosphere.**

Extend: “Population Growth Increases Environmental Harms”

Population growth exacerbates every major environmental issue.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

What of premise (2) **that population growth contributes significantly to a host of environmental problems** within our borders? Here, unfortunately, **we’re faced with an embarrassment of riches**. From many potential examples, **let us briefly discuss one: urban sprawl**. In the past two decades, **sprawl, defined as new development on the fringes of existing urban and suburban areas, has come to be recognized as an important environmental problem in the United States. Between 1982 and 2001, the United States converted 34 million acres of forest, cropland, and pasture to developed uses, an area the size of Illinois**. The average annual rate of land conversion increased from 1.4 million acres to 2.2 million acres over this time, and continues on an upward trend.⁴ **Sprawl is an environmental problem for lots of reasons, including increased energy consumption, water consumption, air pollution, and habitat loss for wildlife. Habitat loss is by far the number one cause of species endangerment** in the United States⁵; unsurprisingly, **some of the worst sprawl centers** (such as southern Florida and the Los Angeles basin) **also contain large numbers of endangered species**. What causes sprawl? Transportation policies that favor building roads over mass transit appear to be important sprawl generators. So are zoning laws that encourage “leapfrog” developments far out into the country, and tax policies that allow builders to pass many of the costs of new development on to current taxpayers rather than new home buyers. Between 1970 and 1990, these and other factors caused Americans’ per capita land use in the hundred largest metropolitan areas to increase 22.6 percent. In these same areas during this same period, however, the amount of developed land increased 51.5 percent.⁶ What accounts for this discrepancy? The number one cause of sprawl by far is population growth. New houses, new shopping centers, and new roads are being built for new residents. As figures 2a and 2b illustrate, in recent decades, cities and states with the highest population growth rates have also shown the most sprawl. The most comprehensive study to date on the causes of sprawl in the United States analyzed several dozen possible factors. Grouping together all those factors which can increase per capita land use and comparing these with the single factor of more “capitas,” it found that in America between 1982 and 1997, fifty-two percent of sprawl was attributable to population increase, while forty-eight percent was attributable to misguided policies that increased land use per person.⁷ Some **“smart growth” advocates resist the conclusion that population growth is an important sprawl factor**, partly because they don’t want to obscure the need for good planning and land use policies. **They point out that several metropolitan areas that lost population in recent decades exhibited significant sprawl,**

including St. Louis, Detroit, and Pittsburgh. Of America's hundred largest metropolitan areas, eleven lost population between 1970 and 1990; yet, they sprawled an average of twenty-six percent (see figure 2a). This shows that poor land use planning and bad transportation, zoning and tax policies are indeed important in generating sprawl. On the other hand, **cities with growing populations sprawled even more. Several states that managed to decrease their per capita land use during this period also sprawled, due to high rates of population growth. From 1982 to 1995, Nevada decreased its per capita land use twenty-six percent while sprawling thirty-seven percent, due to a whopping ninety percent population increase. Arizona decreased per capita land use thirteen percent while its population increased fifty-eight percent, generating forty percent sprawl.**⁸ These examples show that population growth also causes sprawl. **The bottom line is that if we want to stop sprawl, we must change the transportation, tax, zoning, and population policies that encourage it. We will not stop sprawl if we simply accept as inevitable that factor—population increase—which the best research shows accounts for over half of the problem. Nor will we solve our other major domestic environmental problems because premise two is true.** (9-11)

They Say: “Morality Outweighs”

Community concerns can justify restricting individual right to migration.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

A general right to immigrate also would conflict with American citizens’ right to self-government. Immigration can change the character of a society, for better or worse; large-scale immigration can change a society quickly, radically and irrevocably. Since self-government is a fundamental and well-established human right, the citizens of particular nations arguably should retain (through their elected officials) significant control over immigration policies. As Michael Walzer puts it, in an influential discussion of immigration, “Admission and exclusion are at the core of communal independence. They suggest the deepest meaning of self-determination. Without them, there could not be communities of [a specific] character, historically stable, ongoing associations of men and women with some special commitment to one another and some special sense of their common life.”²⁵ **The citizens of a nation may work hard to create particular kinds of societies: societies which are sustainable, for example, or which limit inequalities of wealth, or which treat women and men as equals. They typically develop feelings of affiliation and social commitments that have great value in themselves and that enable communal projects which create further value. It seems wrong to suggest that these achievements, which may provide meaning, secure justice, and contribute substantially to people’s quality of life, must be compromised because people in other countries are having too many children, or have failed to create decent societies themselves. Such a situation does not call for the creation of a new right which undermines the self-government of others. Instead, it suggests that would-be immigrants need to take up responsibilities for self-government which they and their leaders have neglected in their own countries.**² (19-20)

They Say: “Right to Migration Outweighs”

Environmental limits to the right to migrate demand no open borders.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Environmentalists also worry that increasing human numbers will rob future generations of their right to enjoy a healthy environment with its full complement of native species. As the authors watch increasing numbers of people displace wildlife along Colorado’s Front Range, we recall a rueful passage from Henry David Thoreau’s journal, as he reflected on his own Concord landscape: When I consider that the nobler animals have been exterminated here, I cannot but feel as if I lived in a tamed, and, as it were, emasculated country . . . I take infinite pains to know the phenomena of the spring, thinking that I have here the entire poem, and then, to my chagrin, I hear that it is but an imperfect copy that I possess and have read, that my ancestors have torn out many of the first leaves and grandest passages, and mutilated it in many places.²⁷ We believe that like Thoreau, **our descendants will “wish to know an entire heaven and an entire earth.”** **Since a growing population undermines the right of future Americans to enjoy a safe, clean environment** and to know and explore wild nature, **we must reject a general right to freely immigrate** into the United States. **For American environmentalists the interests of nonhuman nature, the right and responsibility of self-government, and our concern for future generations, all come together in our efforts to create a sustainable society.** **Because we take this responsibility seriously and because it cannot be achieved without stopping America’s population growth, we must reject a general right to immigrate** into the United States. **Please note that this discussion does not deny the importance of human rights. It presupposes them.** Rights allow us to protect important human interests and create egalitarian societies which maximize opportunities for people to flourish. We believe **rights are justified ultimately because they contribute to such human flourishing. But when rights are pressed so far as to undermine human or nonhuman flourishing, they should be rejected.**²⁸ (20-1)

They Say: “Immigration Prevents Fiscal Crisis”

This is a ponzi scheme, not rational economics.

Anton 18 — Michael Anton, lecturer and research fellow at Hillsdale College, former national security official in the Trump Administration, 2018 (“Why do we need more people in this country, anyway?,” Washington Post, June 21st, Available Online at https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/why-do-we-need-more-people-in-this-country-anyway/2018/06/21/4ee8b620-7565-11e8-9780-b1dd6a09b549_story.html?utm_term=.74ebf5d9f4bd, Accessed 08-09-2018)

Another argument for more people is to point to falling birthrates among the native-born. In fact, the United States remains near the top of birthrates in the developed world. Regardless, consider that immigration not only lowers wages but also raises housing prices by increasing demand and stresses public schools by adding non-English-speaking students. And as such factors worsen, research suggests that people are putting off marriage - which reduces birthrates. Related is the claim that **more people are necessary to solve our looming entitlement crisis. This quickly falls apart once you think it through.** In 1967, future Nobel laureate Paul **Samuelson favorably compared Social Security to a Ponzi scheme, arguing that it will be sustainable because younger people will always outnumber retirees. But does anyone really believe that the United States - or any country - is capable of sustaining population growth without end?** Somehow, **the United States needs to find a way to meet its fiscal commitments without stuffing the land beyond the bursting point.**

Fixation on growth is immoral — must consider environment first.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

On the other hand, **focusing on whether mass immigration is “good for the economy” ignores the fact that any immigration policy creates economic winners and losers. According to Harvard economist George Borjas, “Immigration induces a substantial redistribution of wealth, away from workers who compete with immigrants and toward employers and other users of immigrant services.”**³⁷ It does so because compared to other industrialized nations, the U.S. imports a much higher percentage of less-educated, lower-skilled workers; Borjas notes that “between 1980 and 1995, immigration increased the number of high school dropouts by 21 percent and the number of high school graduates by only 4 percent.” During this same period, the wage disparity between these two groups increased 11 percent, with perhaps half of that disparity a result of mass immigration.³⁸ Borjas calculates that between

1980 and 2000, immigration reduced the average annual earnings of high school dropouts by 7.4 percent, or \$1,800 on an average salary of \$25,000.³⁹ For these workers, who could least afford it, real wages actually declined during this period. **While the economic effects of immigration are complex and the details are open to debate, it appears that over the past few decades high immigration levels have contributed to increased economic growth, lower wages for the poorest Americans, and an increase in economic inequality in the United States. Continued high levels of immigration will likely further these trends. Far from strengthening the case for continued mass immigration, these effects provide three additional reasons to oppose it. First, an immigration policy which benefits rich citizens (who hire immigrants) at the expense of poor citizens (who compete with them) seems prima facie unjust.**⁴⁰ If Americans want to help poor foreigners, we should not do so on the backs of our own poor citizens. **(Liberal proponents of mass immigration are as loath to accept its effects on workers' wages as they are to accept its demographic and environmental effects. But this is willed ignorance. After all, trade groups representing landscapers and restaurant owners lobby for increased immigration precisely because it allows their members to hire workers for less money.)** **Second, accepting greater economic inequality in exchange for greater overall wealth seems a foolish trade-off for Americans today. We are already wealthy enough to provide for our real needs and reasonable desires. Further wealth when combined with greater inequality is a recipe for frustration, envy, and social tension.** **Third, mass immigration's contribution to economic growth, far from being a net good, gives environmentalists their most important reason to oppose it. Human economic activity is the primary driver of ecological degradation. Future generations are going to have to reject the paradigm of an ever-growing economy and instead develop a sustainable economy which respects ecological limits.**⁴¹ **The sooner we get cracking on this, the better. Here in the United States, economic and demographic "growthism" are intimately intertwined—yet another reason why American environmentalists cannot ignore domestic population issues.**

(28-9)

They Say: “Legal Immigration Not Key”

Legal immigration is the primary driver of population growth, not “illegal” immigration.

Hurlbert 1 — Stuart H. Hurlbert, Professor of Biology and Director of the Center for Inland Waters at San Diego State University, 2001 (“Wall Street Journal Needs to Open Its Eyes, Not Border,” San Diego State University News Center, July 4th, Available Online at <http://www.sci.sdsu.edu/salton/OpenBorderBartleyWSJ.html>, Accessed, 08-09-2018)

Mr. Bartley's paean to high immigration rates and open borders reflects considerable misunderstanding of the big picture. I comment on only two of its many blindspots: the environment and the "unstoppability" of immigration. Rapid population growth is the major cause of accelerating environmental degradation in the U.S. This population growth is now driven primarily by legal immigration. Illegal immigration is a significant but secondary driver. And, in distant third place, are births to U.S. citizens, or rather the difference between births and deaths among citizens. Our population growth rate is now higher than that of any other industrialized nation. Combined with our high per capita rates of resource consumption and waste generation, this rate of population growth occasions great environmental damage. Some of it is irreversible, and all of it is our legacy to our children and grandchildren. Thus it is accurate to say that immigration is the greatest controllable cause of environmental degradation in the U.S. The environment, of course, has never been a matter of prime concern to the Wall Street Journal, so to see it neglected or 'externalized' from an analysis once again is no surprise.

They Say: “US Population Declining Now”

Doesn't justify open borders.

Cassidy 18 — John Cassidy, political and economics columnist at The New Yorker, 2018 (“Why the United States Needs More Immigrants,” The New Yorker, June 22nd, Available Online at <https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-columnists/why-the-united-states-needs-more-immigrants>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

This **shortage of young people is far from just an American phenomenon.** (In many European countries, the age-dependency ratio is rising even faster.) **This doesn't justify a policy of open borders.** But it does mean that the United States needs a President who is willing to face the real challenges facing the country, and recognize the benefits of large-scale immigration.

They Say: "Immigration Inevitable"

Immigration not inevitable — selective enforcement drives it now.

Hurlbert 1 — Stuart H. Hurlbert, Professor of Biology and Director of the Center for Inland Waters at San Diego State University, 2001 ("Wall Street Journal Needs to Open Its Eyes, Not Border," San Diego State University News Center, July 4th, Available Online at <http://www.sci.sdsu.edu/salton/OpenBorderBartleyWSJ.html>, Accessed, 08-09-2018)

It is equally misguided for Mr. Bartley to state that "There is no realistic way to stop the resulting flow of people [across our borders] -- certainly no way that would be acceptable to the American conscience." The great majority of Americans want a reduction in legal immigration and a halt to illegal immigration -- and know full well that there are perfectly "acceptable" means to achieve both objectives. What we do not find "acceptable" is the kowtowing of Congress and the Executive Branch to the powerful special interests fighting for cheap labor and cheap causes. With respect to legal immigration all that is needed is legislation to reduce levels to what they were say, in the 1950s and 1960s. Why would most Americans not find this "acceptable?" With respect to illegal immigration, this is high only because for decades we have offered many rewards and essentially no penalties to those who attempt it. Those who hire illegal aliens likewise are usually given a free pass. To solve this problem, little more is required than to enforce laws already on the books -- laws clearly "acceptable" to the American people. Recent **testimony by Mr. Roy Beck before the House Judiciary Committee has thoroughly documented the failure of The Executive Branch to enforce U.S. immigration laws** or to assist communities heavily impacted by illegal immigrants. This dereliction of duty has risen to a level that a growing portion of the U.S. population views as treasonous. Mr. Beck offers a number of constructive suggestions that could bring about rapid reversal of this dangerous state of affairs.

They Say: “Population Arguments Are Racist”

Here’s a defense of our population impact from an external organization that’s not critiqued by their evidence. It proves sustainability claims aren’t inherently tied to violent nativism or excusing US consumption.

Assadourian 17 — Erik Assadourian, Senior Fellow at the Worldwatch Institute and a sustainability researcher who is primarily focused on rooting out the plague of consumerism and overconsumption; The Worldwatch Institute is a globally focused environmental research organization that was named as one of the top ten sustainable development research organizations by Globescan Survey of Sustainability Experts, 2017 (“Why We Must Talk About Population,” Millennium Alliance for Humanity and the Biosphere, October 10th, Available Online at <https://mahb.stanford.edu/blog/must-talk-about-population/>)

As for immigrants—sure it probably wasn’t the best idea for Professor Phil Cafaro to go on Tucker Carlson’s show to support anti-immigrant sentiments, but Cafaro’s point is valid, even if uncomfortable and confusing for progressives. Until America has a one-planet footprint, all new immigrants are going to increase global impacts because they’ll consume more in the US than in their home countries. (This even suggests all adoption ideally should be domestic, which opens a-whole-nother can of worms!)

That’s not to say we should ban immigration or foreign adoption, but it means we should have a clear plan around immigration (along with one on reducing American consumption)

and we should offset immigration by reductions in births of Americans (easier done if we have a population goal in mind for the United States). This offset is essentially what’s happening in European countries that have smaller than replacement rate birthrates—but the problem there is that this cultivates anti-immigrant sentiments as white European populations darken. With America at least, we have always been an immigrant nation so theoretically we could adapt, though obviously the current administration and its supporters are fomenting the same fears and biases that Americans have shown since its early days, as waves of immigrants from Ireland, Southern Europe, China, and Mexico started arriving.

Setting Goals

Is it so scary or morally fraught to start advocating for a smaller global population—or at the very least start talking openly about population challenges? Is it impossible to imagine nurturing a one-child family size norm in the US and Europe (where each child’s impact is many times greater than a child’s in a developing country)? One is good. Two is enough. Three is too many.

As Roberts notes, momentum is already bringing us toward smaller family sizes—but that same momentum is also bringing us toward higher consumption rates. Some smart social marketing and celebrity modeling could bring us toward reductions in population (as well as consumption) quicker. Breaking the myth that sole children are spoiled and lonely—as Bill McKibben did in his

great book *Maybe One*—would be a good place to start. As would showing the economic and environmental benefits of having one child. And so would making it cool to have one child. Perhaps that’s the marketing slogan we use: “It’s Hip to Have One.”

And let developing countries shape their own population targets so as to avoid the obvious criticisms of imperialism (maybe it’s even time for a Framework Convention on Population Growth to go along with the Framework Convention on Climate Change—so all countries can feel ownership in this effort). But **clearly, population stabilization is as important** in developing countries—not because of the immediate effects on human impact (I), but **because as Earth systems finally break down after the** decades of **abuse we’ve delivered, people are going to retreat from their flooding towns,** their drought stricken lands, their war-torn regions, **and** they’re going to have to **go somewhere. And then the right-wing extremists will** say “we told you so,” waving their copies of *Camp of Saints* in their hands as they do, and **be perfectly poised to take over more government institutions—and that may be the population crisis’ scariest outcome of all.**

Preserving sustainability is a moral obligation — aff ethics are anthropocentric.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 31, March)

That we are good environmentalists is captured by premise (5) that **we are morally obligated to address our environmental problems and become good global environmental citizens.** We will not argue for this premise here, or provide a detailed statement of what it amounts to in practice. **Environmentalism means many things to many people. Still, there are two general goals to which most environmentalists subscribe:** (1) **creating societies that leave sufficient natural resources for future human generations to live good lives; and (2) sharing the landscape generously with nonhuman beings.** Let’s call this “generous sustainability,” to differentiate it from more selfish, narrow, economically-defined conceptions of sustainability. We believe **a moral commitment to “generous sustainability” captures the core of environmentalism.** **Such a commitment is explicitly endorsed by all the main environmental philosophies espoused today, including** Rolston and Callicott’s **intrinsic value theory, Norton’s enlightened anthropocentrism, Naess’ deep ecology, Warren and Plumwood’s ecofeminism, and Cafaro and Sandler’s environmental virtue ethics.** We therefore take it as true, for the purpose of our argument. (15-16)

Coping with population growth requires pragmatism — environmental harms hurt the least well off most.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 31, March)

But why should this population growth matter? Because, finally, **some** environmentalists **argue** that **immigration just moves people around, so it is** (or may be) **environmentally neutral**. As one reader of an earlier version of this paper commented, “Efforts to reduce overpopulation in New York or the United States do not help alleviate overpopulation worldwide, because **people who aren’t let in have to go someplace else**.” Added another reader, “**Ecological damage may be worse if people remain in their home countries** rather than immigrating to the U.S. Immigration restrictions seem to privilege the USA’s wild places over other, perhaps more biodiverse, places around the world.” Although one of us has spent time overseas working to protect endangered species, **we plead guilty to a special concern for America’s wildlife** and wildlands. But we don’t apologize for it. **Environmentalism necessarily involves love, connection and efforts to protect particular places**. Environmental philosophers should think long and hard before advocating anything that weakens this “local focus,” because a passionate connection to places that are “near and dear” to us is how environmentalism works, in Boston or Beijing. **Thinking locally doesn’t involve believing American** (or Chinese) **landscapes are more valuable than others. It involves acting as if they are the most important landscapes in the world and using our most accessible political levers to protect them**. **Although questions about the justice of moral particularism are vexed, we believe that a large degree of “environmental particularism” is justified, on both ethical and pragmatic grounds**. However, **cosmopolitan ethical universalists who reject our parochialism should still support our proposal to reduce immigration** into the United States, **since doing so would also benefit the rest of the world**. They should do so because **moving people to America, far from being environmentally neutral, increases overall global resource consumption and pollution**. **This increase in consumption in turn threatens to weaken the already stressed global ecosystem services that we all depend upon—with the world’s poorest people facing the greatest danger from possible ecological failures**. Consider a table comparing the average U.S. “ecological footprint” with averages from our ten largest immigration “source” countries. On average, **immigrating from nine of these ten countries greatly increases an individual’s ecological footprint—and the ecological footprints of his or her descendants—by 100 percent to 1,000 percent or more**. In the case of Mexico, which accounts for nearly a third of all immigration into America, immigration increases individuals’ consumption and pollution approximately 350 percent.³⁴ **There probably are cases where immigrants consume more but do less ecological damage than they would have had they remained in their countries of**

origin (slash-and-burn agriculturalists inhabiting biologically rich forests?), **but clearly these are the exceptions.** **More Americans is bad news for America's native flora and fauna. But given global warming, it is also bad news for poor people living in the Sahel or in the Bhrmaputra Delta.** (25-6)

They Say: “Technology Solves”

Technology changes too uncertain — we can’t risk it.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Clearly premises two and three are true: U.S. population growth contributes seriously to both domestic and global environmental problems. **Can we** go further and **state**, with premise (4) **that in order to seriously address environmental problems at home and become good global environmental citizens, we must stop U.S. population growth? Yes, we can. It is** of course **possible to spin out scenarios in which America’s population doubles**, triples, or quadruples, **and yet we still manage, through miracles of technological creativity** or ethical self-sacrifice, to become ecologically sustainable. **But these fantasies are implausible, and therefore morally suspect as a basis for action** (or inaction). **Given the difficulties of getting 300 million Americans to curb their consumption, there is no reason to think we will be able to achieve sustainability with two, three, or four times as many Americans.**¹⁴ Consider global warming again. Most readers will be familiar with a version of Pacala and Socolow’s “wedge diagram” below, a heuristic designed to help us think about the steps needed to address global warming. **Each “wedge” in the “stabilization triangles”** (fig. 3a and fig. 3b) above **represent a technological change** or (much less frequently) a decrease in consumption **which, if fully implemented, would keep one billion metric tons of carbon from being pumped into the air** fifty years from now. **The authors reckon eight such wedges must be implemented**—not to reduce atmospheric CO₂; not to stabilize CO₂ levels—but **simply to keep atmospheric carbon from pushing past potentially catastrophic levels** during this period.¹⁵ Following on this work, scientists with the Natural Resources Defense Council produced a similar analysis for potential U.S. climate action. Since U.S. emissions are almost twenty-five percent of global emissions, a “U.S. wedge” can be defined as an emission reduction of a quarter billion metric tons of carbon fifty years from now. Assuming we do our part, they also believe eight U.S. wedges are needed to avert a possible climate catastrophe.¹⁶ Potential wedges include:

- Passenger vehicle efficiency, 1.1 Wedges (0.27 billion ton reduction): Increase the average fuel economy of vehicles to fifty-four miles per gallon, compared with twenty-four miles per gallon under business as usual.
- Renewable energy, 1.6 Wedges (0.39 billion ton reduction): Increase renewable energy (e.g., wind and biomass) to thirty percent of total electricity generation by 2050, compared with less than five percent under business as usual. This much electricity could be supplied by 250,000 2-MW-turbines, spread over 20 million acres of land.
- Carbon capture and storage, 1.3 Wedges (0.32 billion ton reduction): Unproven, yet-to-be-developed technology is applied to state-of-the-art coal-fired power plants generating 160 GW of electricity. Additional CO₂ captured from natural gas production facilities, large industrial

sources, and ethanol plants. We can probably agree that convincing Americans to implement such sweeping, expensive changes will be difficult. Some of these wedges might not pan out technically; most of them have their own environmental costs. Remember: we need eight wedges to do our part. Now compare these figures with two U.S. population wedges that we've calculated, one positive and one negative. First the positive wedge: • Population increase slowed, 1.2 Wedges (0.31 billion ton reduction): Immigration is halted, resulting in 57.3 million less U.S. citizens fifty years from now. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, in 2005 Americans averaged 5.4 metric tons of carbon generated per capita. That means that each 46.2 million people added to the U.S. population adds one more wedge of a quarter billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere. Immigration is set to add 57.3 million more people to the U.S. population in the next fifty years; preventing that population increase would provide over one full U.S. wedge. Remember, though, that immigration can go up as well as down. So here is a second, de-stabilization wedge: • Population increase accelerated, 1.4 wedges (0.34 billion tons): Immigration is increased from 1.5 million to 2.25 million per year, resulting in 63.2 million more U.S. citizens fifty years from now. **If the 2007 Bush/Kennedy immigration "reform" bill had passed Congress, immigration might have increased from 1.5 to 2.25 million annually.17 By our calculations, it would have increased America's population by 63.2 million more people over the next fifty years—pumping another 0.34 billion tons more carbon into the air annually. Adding that many more people would equal almost one and a half U.S. wedges18 Such considerations suggest that while we cannot prove that premise (4) is true, it is highly probable: we must stop U.S. population growth in order to meet our environmental responsibilities. If we are good environmentalists, that should be enough.** (12-15)

They Say: “US Not Key”

Population is not exclusively an international issue: environmentalism is the buildup of local efforts.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Another argument made by many American environmentalists is that overpopulation is important, but that it is a global, not national issue that can only be solved through international action. The world’s population increased by seventy-six million people in 2006 and ninety-five percent of that increase occurred in the developing world. **Rather than cutting immigration to keep our own population from growing, they argue, we should fund family planning overseas.** We should **provide more foreign aid, and redirect trade** and other government policies **to help the poor**, so fewer of them will feel compelled to leave their countries in order to live decent lives. If we do these things, we will act humanely and help both poor people and the environment. **Before analyzing this argument, we should pause for a moment to appreciate its oddity.** **No one argues that “deforestation is a global problem; therefore, we shouldn’t worry about deforestation in our own country,** or on the local landscape.” Or “species loss is a global problem, therefore we should fund species protection efforts elsewhere, to the exclusion of efforts where we live.” **Those who care about deforestation or species extinction often work especially hard to prevent them in the places they know best,** and are applauded for doing so. Besides, **“global” efforts to halt deforestation and species loss are largely a summing up of local and national efforts** focused on particular forests and species. **This is how environmentalism works,** when it works. **Advocates for an exclusively global approach to overpopulation owe us explanations for why this one issue should play out differently and how** it could play out differently, while still leading to environmentally acceptable results. **But no such arguments are forthcoming, and none seem remotely plausible.** Comforting as it is, **the “globalist” argument fails,** partly **because it mischaracterizes overpopulation, which in fact can occur at various scales.** **It makes sense to say that “the world is overpopulated;** we do not know whether essential global ecosystem services can be sustained at these numbers over the long haul.” **But it also makes sense to say that “Tokyo is overpopulated;** its sidewalks, streets, and trains are so crowded that there is no room to move.” Or “Nigeria is overpopulated; its population is so large and is growing so fast that it has trouble providing jobs for its young adults, or building sufficient water and sewer facilities for its cities.” **Just as Tokyo’s citizens may try to alleviate local air pollution and Nigeria’s citizens may try to protect their remnant forests, so they may try to address local or**

national overpopulation. After all, they will have to live directly with their failure to do so and they cannot wait for the world to solve all its problems before they act to solve their own. (24)

US is already overpopulated.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Returning to the United States, a strong case can be made that we are overpopulated right now. Signs of stressed ecosystems and lost biodiversity abound. Certainly we have not yet found a way to bring air and water pollution within limits acceptable to human health, nor have we stemmed the loss of productive farmlands and wildlife habitat, nor have we recovered more than a handful of the hundreds of species we have endangered. As we have seen when considering global warming, a large and growing population also makes it much harder for Americans to live up to our environmental responsibilities as global citizens. Let us be clear: **advocates for international action are correct that wealthy countries should help poor countries stabilize their populations. However, “think globally, don’t act locally” is terrible advice. It is possible and necessary to work on multiple levels at once.** We can make more generous contributions to the United Nations Population Fund and cut back on national immigration levels and limit local building permits. **Efforts at one level and in one place can only strengthen efforts at other levels and in other places. Meanwhile, population growth is a problem in America right now. If you live in the United States, the chances are good that your community is threatened by environmentally damaging development that is being caused** (or justified, in the planning stages) **by population growth.** (25)

They Say: “It’s About Consumption Not Population”

Consumption can’t be divorced from population growth because per capita consumption is what matters. The US is enormous.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

Environmentalists sometimes give specifically environmental reasons for supporting—or at least tolerating—high levels of immigration. One common argument says that we should focus on consumption, not population as the root cause of our environmental problems. “Don’t buy big suburban houses; don’t buy gas guzzlers; don’t put air conditioners in those houses and cars. Americans’ high level of consumption is the problem—not our population.” This argument is appealing because it seems to put the responsibility for change where it belongs: not on poor immigrants but on average Americans, who do consume too much and who could consume less without harming their quality of life. But as we have seen, it is Americans’ overall consumption that determines our environmental impact. Overall consumption equals per capita consumption multiplied by population. So if high consumption is a problem, population growth must be, too. In a variation on this theme, immigrant advocates sometimes assert that immigrants (or perhaps “recent immigrants,” or “most recent immigrants”) consume less than the average American. One problem with this argument is that there are apparently no good figures comparing immigrants’ and native-born Americans’ consumption patterns. But the main problem is that it focuses on a moment in time, rather than thinking through the long-term effects of population growth. Immigrants’ lower consumption levels, if they exist, are presumably a function of their relative poverty. But immigrants are not coming to America to live in poverty, but to achieve “the American dream” and pass greater opportunities on to their children and grandchildren. Two million more immigrants this year may mean ten million more Americans one hundred years from now—and if history is any guide, those ten million Americans will live pretty much like other Americans. The descendants of last century’s Jewish and Italian immigrants do not seem to consume less than the average American today; there is no reason to think that the descendants of today’s Mexican and Chinese immigrants will consume less than the average American one hundred years from now. Bottom line: if American consumption levels are too high, the problem is only made worse by population growth. (23-4)

Addressing population through immigration tackles “low hanging fruit” — it’s the least intractable element.

Cafaro and Staples 9 — Philip Cafaro, Senior Researcher at The Overpopulation Project, Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State, former president of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, and Winthrop Staples, MA from Colorado State, 2009 (“The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States,” Environmental Ethics, Vol. 31, March)

As environmentalists, though, we need to “think globally.” So what of premise (3) that a growing population increases America’s large environmental footprint beyond our borders and our disproportionate role in stressing global environmental systems? **Consider global warming, arguably the most important environmental challenge** facing the world in the twenty-first century. **Nothing mortifies American environmentalists more than our country’s failure to show leadership in combating global warming. As the world’s largest economy and historically largest greenhouse gas emitter, the United States has a moral obligation to lead the world in meeting this challenge.** A good start would be **striving to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions** at 1990 levels (the Kyoto protocol, rejected by the U.S., calls for an initial reduction of five percent below 1990 levels). **Meeting even this modest objective will prove difficult, however, if our population continues to grow.** **Look at the numbers.** U.S. CO₂ emissions increased 20.4 percent between 1990 and 2005, from 4,991 to 6,009 million metric tons,⁹ which means that **we would have to decrease our emissions 20.4 percent per person to get back to 1990 levels, at our current population. But if we double our population, as we are on track to do** in six decades, **we will have to decrease per capita emissions 58.5 percent in order to reduce CO₂ emissions to 1990 levels—almost three times as great a per capita reduction.** **Such reductions will be much more expensive and demand greater sacrifice from Americans. They are thus less likely to happen.** “Hold on a minute,” **critics** may **respond.** “**We can and should cut our carbon emissions sixty percent or even more.** The technologies exist and America is wealthy enough to meet our moral obligation to address global warming. **The problem,** above all, **is Americans’ hoggish overconsumption.**” **We agree.**¹⁰ **Limiting consumption must play an important role** in addressing global warming. American environmentalists should work to enact policies that reduce our fossil fuel consumption as much as possible. Such policies should include increased taxes on fossil fuels; redirecting transportation funding from highway construction to mass transit; heavy subsidies for wind and solar power; large increases in auto fuel standards; improved building codes that reduce the energy needed for heating and cooling; and more. **However, re-engineering the world’s largest economy and changing the consumption patterns of hundreds of millions of people are immense undertakings that will be difficult, expensive and (we may assume) only partly successful.** Al Gore has stated that global **warming is “the moral challenge of our time”;** many of us agree with him. **But if Americans are serious about doing our part to limit global**

warming, the “multiplier effect” of population growth is too important to ignore. Again, look at the numbers. Between 1990 and 2003, U.S. per capita CO2 emissions increased 3.2 percent, while total U.S. CO2 emissions increased 20.2 percent.¹¹ Why the discrepancy? During that same period, America’s population increased 16.1 percent.¹² More people drove more cars, built more houses, etc. Population growth greatly increased total emissions, and it is total emissions, not per capita emissions, which quantify our full contribution to global warming. Before we go on, please note: we do not claim that by itself, halting U.S. population growth will solve sprawl or meet our global-warming responsibilities. On the contrary, Americans must reduce our per capita consumption of land and energy in order to meet these challenges. On the other hand, the evidence clearly shows that recent population growth has increased Americans’ total land and energy consumption and made these problems even worse. Americans must address both overconsumption and overpopulation if we hope to create a sustainable society and contribute to a sustainable world.¹³ (11-12)

Affirmative

2AC

2AC — Overpopulation DA

Turn — US population is cratering now — increased immigration key to resolve fiscal crisis.

Cassidy 18 — John Cassidy, political and economics columnist at The New Yorker, 2018 (“Why the United States Needs More Immigrants,” The New Yorker, June 22nd, Available Online at <https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-columnists/why-the-united-states-needs-more-immigrants>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

As controversy continued to rage on Thursday about the Trump Administration’s policy of separating migrant families at the southern border, **the Census Bureau published new data that show why the United States will need more immigrants, not fewer**, in the coming decades. **Demographers and economists have been warning that the aging baby-boomer population presents a serious challenge to the nation’s finances, as the ratio of seniors to working-age adults—the age-dependency ratio—rises.** The reason is straightforward: **Social Security and Medicare are largely financed on a pay-as-you-go basis**, which means that some of the taxes paid by current workers are transferred to current retirees. **If the dependency ratio rises, the financial burden on the working-age population also increases.** A front-page piece in Thursday’s Wall Street Journal pointed out that **this problem was contained for a long time because the age-dependency ratio remained relatively steady.** In 1980, there were nineteen Americans age sixty-five or older for every hundred Americans between the ages of eighteen and sixty-four. The dependency ratio was nineteen per cent. By 2010, it crept up to twenty-one per cent, an increase of just two percentage points in thirty years. **But the end of 2010 marked an important threshold. In 2011, the first members of the baby-boom generation** (people born between 1946 and 1964) **turned sixty-five.** By 2017, the age-dependency ratio had risen to twenty-five per cent—an increase of four percentage points in just seven years. In the coming decades, it is expected to rise even more sharply. By 2030, “the ratio would climb to 35 retiree-age Americans for every 100 of working age . . . and 42 by 2060,” the Journal story said, citing projections released earlier this year. **These projections take into account the big rise in immigration that occurred between 1990 and 2010.** During those twenty years, according to Census Bureau data, the total number of foreign-born people (documented and undocumented) living in the United States roughly doubled, to about forty million. **But this influx of working-age people—the vast majority of whom are immigrants of working age—wasn’t enough to offset a decrease in birth rates that began in the nineteen-seventies and has recently accelerated. The easiest way to grasp the seriousness of what is happening is to look at the fertility rate**, which is the average number of babies born to mothers between the ages of fifteen and forty-four. **Merely to replace the existing population, the fertility rate needs to be about 2.1 per cent.** During the baby-boomer years, it reached 3.7 per cent. **In 2017, it was just 1.76 per cent.** If this trend persists, as it seems likely to do, it portends a declining population and a sharply rising dependency ratio. From a public-finance perspective, there are several possible ways to tackle the looming challenge. One is to reduce the level of

retirement benefits significantly—but that would be very unpopular and difficult to achieve politically. A second option is to increase the proportion of people who are working, among both working-age people and senior citizens. That, too, would be a mighty challenge, because the trend is going in the opposite direction. Since the start of 2000, the employment-to-population ratio among adults sixteen or older has fallen, from 64.6 per cent to 60.4 per cent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. To be sure, the Great Recession and its aftermath were partly responsible for this decline. But so was the aging population: employment rates tend to decline in older-age cohorts. **The final option is to welcome more immigrants, particularly younger immigrants, so that, in the coming decades, they and their descendants will find work and contribute to the tax base. Almost all economists agree that immigration raises G.D.P. and stimulates business development by increasing the supply of workers and entrepreneurs.** There is some disagreement about the net fiscal impact of first-generation migrants. The argument is that they tend to be less educated and therefore earn lower wages than the native population, and that they tend to contribute less in taxes. But this is disputed. There is no doubt about the contribution that immigrant families make over the longer term, however. “Second-generation adults—the children of immigrants—had, on average, a more favorable net fiscal impact for all government levels combined than either first-generation immigrants or the rest of the native-born population,” a study of the period from 1994–2013 by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, published in 2016, pointed out. “Reflecting their slightly higher educational achievement, as well as their higher wages and salaries, the second generation contributed more in taxes on a per capita basis during working ages than did their parents or other native-born Americans.” In the long run, welcoming immigrants is a good investment for the United States. The entire history of the country demonstrates this fact. But the current President wants to go in the opposite direction. Along with introducing draconian measures to curb the influx of undocumented migrants, he wants to slash legal immigration. At the moment, the United States grants permanent-resident status to about a million people a year, and many of these folks go on to become U.S. citizens. Trump wants to cut this number in half, roughly speaking. His policy isn’t driven by economics, of course. As he more or less admitted earlier this year, with his derisive comments about immigrants from “shithole countries,” it is driven by racism and a desire to resist the emergence of a nonwhite majority in the United States—a transformation that is inevitable and necessary. What’s largely driving this transformation is the aging of the white population and a concomitant fall in white birth rates. In twenty-six states, according to a recent study from the Applied Population Lab at the University of Wisconsin, deaths in the white population now outnumber births. In other words, the number of white people in America is declining. The new Census Bureau figures suggest that this is also true on the national level. In 2016 and 2017, the number of white, non-Hispanic Americans fell by forty-one thousand, according to the Journal report. That number is partly an artifact of the opioid epidemic, but the underlying picture is clear: **with the native white population aging rapidly, the U.S. economy and fiscal system are in dire need of other groups to pick up the slack. Fortunately, there are eager candidates,**

including the roughly six million non-Americans who file immigration applications every year, and the thousands of parents and children currently languishing in detention centers operated by U.S. immigration authorities and the Department of Health and Human Services.

Population arguments are a smokescreen for racism.

Roberts 18 — David Roberts, Vox environment and climate writer, 2018 (“I’m an environmental journalist, but I never write about overpopulation. Here’s why.,” Vox, July 11th, Available Online at <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2017/9/26/16356524/the-population-question>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

When political movements or leaders **adopt population control as a central concern** ... let’s just say **it never goes well.** **In practice, where you find concern over “population,” you very often find racism, xenophobia, or eugenics lurking in the wings.** **It’s** almost **always**, ahem, **particular populations that need reducing.** **History is replete with examples**, but perhaps the most germane recent episode was less than **20 years ago**, at **the Sierra Club**, which **was riven by divisions over immigration.** **A group of grassroots members**, with some help from powerful funders, **attempted to take over** the national organization. **These members advocated sharply restricting immigration, saying** the US should be reducing rather than increasing its **population.** **Their contention is that the country’s open immigration policies are hurting the environment by bringing in poor immigrants and making them richer**, thus increasing their environmental impact. **Of course, they swore up and down that xenophobia had nothing to do with it.** **The Sierra Club won that fight**, and the “green anti-immigrant” movement has mostly been driven to the fringes, **but conservative media is still getting ratings out of it.** If you can stomach it, watch this entire segment with Tucker Carlson of Fox News — it hits all the usual notes, culminating in an interview with some professor who wrote a book about reducing immigration for environmental reasons. **I don’t doubt that it’s possible to be concerned about the environmental stresses population brings without any racism or xenophobia** — I’ve met many people who fit that description, and there were well-meaning (if quite mistaken) population-focused groups in the ’70s and ’80s — **but in terms of public discussion and advocacy, anyone explicitly expressing that concern starts out behind the eight ball.** **The mere mention of “population” raises all sorts of ugly historical associations.**

No overpopulation crisis — doomsayers have been wrong for generations.

Riley 8 — Jason L. Riley, Senior Fellow @ The Manhattan Institute, member of the Wall Street Journal Editorial board, 2008 (Let Them In: The Case for Open Borders, ISBN-13: 978-1592403493, p.20-35)

Not all early proponents of eugenics were reactionary bigots. Many prominent progressive and socialist reformers also cottoned to the idea, reasoning that eugenics would help temper evil, unwieldy free-market capitalism and lead to more egalitarian socioeconomic outcomes. Europeans in this camp included Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, and George Bernard Shaw. And U.S. advocates included not only Justice Holmes but also Margaret Sanger, the birth control advocate who wanted “more children from the fit, less from the unfit.” The founder of Planned Parenthood, Sanger is celebrated today as a feminist icon, but she was also a strong supporter of the 1924 immigration law, calling Eastern Europeans a “menace” to civilization. “While I personally believe in the sterilization of the feeble-minded, the insane, and the syphilitic,” she wrote in 1919, “I have not been able to discover that these measures are more than superficial deterrents when applied to the constantly growing stream of the unfit. . . . Birth control, on the other hand, not only opens the way to the eugenicist, but it preserves his work.” Nicholas Eberstadt, a demographer at the American Enterprise Institute who’s written extensively about population control, says “the Hitler branch of eugenics was completely discredited, but the Sanger branch was not. And the Sanger branch gets us to today’s zero population growth movement.” **The “people are pollution” crowd often cites** the eighteenth-century classical liberal economist Thomas Robert **Malthus as their muse. But,** just as John Maynard Keynes ultimately disowned what’s referred to today as “Keynesian economics,” **Malthus,** in the end, **was no Malthusian.** Which is to say that he was not immune to facts. And **those invoking his name** to buttress their antinatal arguments **are distorting his population theory** by ignoring the evolution of his arguments. In 1798, at age thirty-two, Malthus published (anonymously) An Essay on the Principle of Population, in which he stated that “the power of population is indefinitely greater than the power of the earth to produce sustenance for man.” He further explained: “Population, when unchecked, increases in geometric ratio. Subsistence increases only in arithmetical ratio. A slight acquaintance with the numbers will show the immensity of the first power in comparison to the second.” **Malthus’s limits theories were wrong, as contemporary economic giants** like David Ricardo **did not hesitate to tell him, and as Malthus himself acknowledged in later editions** of his initial essay. During his own lifetime, his prediction that more people would tend to produce a drop in the standard of living was proved false. Population and living standards rose simultaneously, and continue to do so today. **Malthus would later say that he overstated his case.** He conceded that all sorts of things can postpone or prevent the collision of human numbers and resources, including technological progress and what he called “moral restraint,” or the rational decision by people to have fewer children. Malthus’s views adjusted over time as he looked at his “diminishing returns” model in more detail. In the second edition he wrote, “I have endeavored to soften some of the harshest conclusions of the first Essay.” And in his conclusion to the fifth edition, he said: From a review of the state of society in former periods, compared with the present, I should certainly say that the evils resulting from the principle of population have rather diminished than increased . . . [and] it does not seem unreasonable to expect that they will be still further diminished. . . . He continued: On the whole, therefore, though our future prospects respecting the mitigation of

the evils arising from the principle of population may not be so bright as we could wish, yet they are far from being entirely disheartening, and by no means preclude a gradual and progressive improvement in human society. . . . To the laws of property and marriage, and to the apparently narrow principle of self-interest which prompts each individual to exert himself in bettering his condition, we are indebted for all the noblest exertions of human genius. Many popular and professional writers today “rely on the first edition’s conclusions as being the essential Malthus,” said the late economist Julian Simon, but “Malthus himself was a powerful critic of ‘Malthusianism.’” Even Malthus biographer William Petersen noted, “From the first to the seventh edition of *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, its author moved from an ecological to a sociological perspective . . . and—most remarkably—from an unrelenting pessimism to a cautious optimism.” It wouldn’t be a stretch to describe neo-Malthusians as the opposite of cautious and optimistic. Paul Ehrlich, their demigod, opened his 1968 book, *The Population Bomb*, with these words: “The battle to feed humanity is over. In the 1970s and 1980s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now.” In 1967, Lester Brown, another leading green who later founded the Worldwatch Institute, said, “The trend in grain stocks indicates clearly that 1961 marked a worldwide turning point. . . . [F]ood consumption moved ahead of food production.” In his 2000 bestseller, *Earth in the Balance*, former vice president Al Gore insisted that “population is pushing many countries over an economic cliff as their resources are stripped away and the cycle of poverty and environmental destruction accelerates.” **What’s regrettable is that the views of these environmental ideologues haven’t remained on the intellectual fringe, where they belong. Instead, they’ve guided the thinking of governments, international organizations, the press, and large swaths of an unwitting public. The notion that population growth causes or exacerbates poverty, resource scarcity, and ecological carnage has become received wisdom.** In 1972 the Club of Rome, an influential global think tank, issued its “Limits to Growth” study, where it warned that the pace of population growth would lead directly to severe shortages of food, energy, minerals, trees, and other resources. In 1980, the Carter administration issued the “Global 2000 Report,” which stated: “If present trends continue, the world in 2000 will be more crowded, more polluted, less stable ecologically, and more vulnerable to disruption than the world we live in now. Serious stresses involving population, resources, and environment are clearly visible ahead. Despite greater material output, the world’s people will be poorer in many ways than they are today.” A 1994 World Population Conference report, signed by delegates from more than a hundred nations, called for “a sustainable balance between human numbers and the resources of the planet.” And so on. Over the decades, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State Department, U.S. Aid for International Development, the World Bank, the United Nations, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the MacArthur Foundation, among others, have forecasted fertility-related doom. In most cases, **enough time has passed to prove empirically that these predictions were spectacularly wrong. But then, facts and evidence don’t really matter much to entrenched population alarmists. They are unwilling to test their hypotheses against data**

and reject them if they prove to be false. That's because **hard-core environmentalism is much more of a secular theology than a reality-based, empirically sensitive approach to the world.**

And the essence of a faith is that your confidence in a proposition is not shaken by any factual disproof of given tests. "For the socialist eugenicists and population controllers of the 1960s," Eberstadt tells me, "the proof of the righteousness of their viewpoint seemed to be the acceleration and rapid growth of population in the lowest-income areas of the world; the seeming slowdown of world cereal production; and the growing gap in food production generally between rich and poor areas." Unfortunately for the doomsayers, however, things got a lot better in much of the world after the 1960s, and in very demonstrable ways. "The availability of food increased," says Eberstadt, "and the nutritional status of virtually all of the planet substantially improved, as reflected in further drops in death rates and further increases in life spans." There are exceptions to this good news, such as in sub-Saharan Africa, but they remain exceptions, and trying to link that region's troubles to "overpopulation" is highly implausible given that Africa is the world's most thinly populated continent. Overall, however, **the second half of the last century saw humans living longer and family sizes dropping. It also saw a steady decrease in the inflation-adjusted price of food, a trend that by itself should be the death knell to the Ehrlichean worldview.** After all, **prices are an objective measure of scarcity**, and the price of major cereals have fallen dramatically over the past hundred years, despite the fact that the Earth's population nearly quadrupled between 1900 and 2000. Economic historian Angus Maddison's *Monitoring the World Economy: 1820-1992* and *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective* were published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in 1995 and 2001, respectively. Students of economic history consider his calculations to be the gold standard, and the trends he documents present a devastating blow to those trying to link population increases to resource reductions. **Between 1900 and 2000, infant mortality rates fell while life expectancy doubled, and the earth's population proceeded to swell from around 1.6 billion to more than 6 billion. Both the rapidity and the magnitude of the growth were unprecedented.** It **was a full-fledged neo-Malthusian nightmare.** **Yet over the same period,** according to Maddison, **global gross domestic product per capita more than quadrupled, and global economic output grew by a factor of eighteen.** Remarking on the significance of Maddison's findings, Eberstadt noted, "If the demand for goods and services has multiplied nearly 20-fold during the 20th century, humanity's demand for, and consumption of, natural resources has also rocketed upward. But despite humanity's tremendous new pressures on planetary resources, the relative prices of virtually all primary commodities have fallen over the course of the 20th century, and many of them, quite substantially." Back **in 1980, Julian Simon wagered Ehrlich that Ehrlich and several of his pessimistic colleagues couldn't name any natural resources that would become more expensive** over the next decade. **Ehrlich and Co. chose copper, chromium, tin, nickel, and tungsten. They lost the bet handily.** Every single one of the minerals declined in price. **Maddison's research justifies Simon's optimism.** Between 1900 and 1998, the price of corn, wheat, and rice fell by 70 percent. Between 1900 and 1999, the price of metals and nonfood

agricultural commodities—including aluminum, copper, nickel, zinc, tin, lead, cotton, rubber, palm oil, and wool— also declined. "Suffice then to say," writes Eberstadt, "that the 20th century's population explosion did not forestall the most dramatic and widespread improvement in output, incomes, and living standards that humanity had ever experienced. " (29-35)

Turn — migration is net positive for the environment — it increases regulation.

Johnson 9 — Kevin R. Johnson, Professor of Public Interest Law at UC Davis School of Law, JD from Harvard, BA in Economics from UC Berkeley, 2009 (Opening the Floodgates: Why America Needs to Rethink its Borders and Immigration Laws, 2009, ISBN-13: 978-0814743096, p. 24)

There also are environmental concerns raised about immigration. Some **restrictionists express fears about overpopulation** of the United States. They contend that the nation already is overpopulated and therefore should not accept any more immigrants. Segments of the environmental movement have had distinctly anti-immigrant, nativist strands.⁶⁴ **These concerns resound with the "not in my backyard" mentality** that is prevalent in zoning and siting decisions regarding hazardous activities in communities across the United States. **With its environmental protections and a commitment to conservation not often found in the developing world, the United States in many ways offers a more environmentally conscious alternative to a migrant's homeland. Environmental arguments thus militate for, not against, open borders.** True, change will come with open borders. **The population of the United States might increase.** We as a nation will face environmental challenges with an increased population. **However, the population changes may occur even if the law fails to authorize more liberal admissions** of immigrants. **Absent legal avenues for migration, undocumented immigrants still will come, but without the imprimatur of the law. The United States must learn to manage migration flows in sensible ways, rather than attempt to deny their existence or engage in the impossible task of completely cutting them off.** (24)

US not key — population impact on global environment is infinitesimal.

Stone 17 — Lyman Stone, agricultural economist at the US Department of Agriculture, Vox columnist, regional population economics researcher, advisor at Demographic Intelligence, 2017 ("Why you shouldn't obsess about "overpopulation", " Vox, December 12th, Available Online at <https://www.vox.com/the-big-idea/2017/12/12/16766872/overpopulation-exaggerated-concern-climate-change>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

But **this is all moot when considering the United States! The US has lower carbon intensity per dollar of GDP than average for the world, and US population growth is an extremely small component of global emissions forecasts.** And since US population and GDP growth are

already extremely low in comparison to the rest of the world, marginally raising fertility will have an infinitesimally small impact on the growth path of carbon emissions. Virtually the entire determinative calculation for future carbon emissions can be summed up in the pace of shifts away from fossil fuels in the largest economies, and the population and economic growth trajectories in developing countries. As you can see, even if US population stopped growing at around 325 million people in 2017 and flatlined out, it would produce at best a marginal change in global emissions. Plus, accomplishing that trend would require draconian anti-fertility policies and extremely strict immigration laws. On the other hand, even if US population rises over 500 million people, the impact on the world is barely noticeable.

Meanwhile, lowering US carbon intensity by about a third, to around the level of manufacturing-superpower Germany today, has a bigger effect than preventing 100 million Americans from existing.

Technology solves — US population impacts can be fully offset by renewables. Critics underestimate that *this transition is coming and will be viable.*

Jacobson 15 — Mark Zachary Jacobson, professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University and director of its Atmosphere/Energy Program, 2015 (“Low-cost solution to the grid reliability problem with 100% penetration of intermittent wind, water, and solar for all purposes,” Proceedings of the National Academies of Science, December 8th, Available Online at

http://www.pnas.org/content/112/49/15060?ijkey=88324167c821045c2031dbbaff6c594fd866e131&keytype2=tf_ipsecsha)

The large-scale conversion to 100% wind, water, and solar (WWS) power for all purposes (electricity, transportation, heating/cooling, and industry) is currently inhibited by a fear of grid instability and high cost due to the variability and uncertainty of wind and solar. This paper couples numerical simulation of time- and space-dependent weather with simulation of time-dependent power demand, storage, and demand response to provide low-cost solutions to the grid reliability problem with 100% penetration of WWS across all energy sectors in the continental United States between 2050 and 2055. Solutions are obtained without higher-cost stationary battery storage by prioritizing storage of heat in soil and water; cold in water and ice; and electricity in phase-change materials, pumped hydro, hydropower, and hydrogen.

This study addresses the greatest concern facing the large-scale integration of wind, water, and solar (WWS) into a power grid: the high cost of avoiding load loss caused by WWS variability and uncertainty. It uses a new grid integration model and finds low-cost, no-load-loss, nonunique solutions to this problem on electrification of all US energy sectors (electricity, transportation, heating/cooling, and industry) while accounting for wind and solar time series data from a 3D global weather model that simulates extreme events and competition among wind turbines for available kinetic energy. Solutions are obtained by prioritizing storage for heat

(in soil and water); cold (in ice and water); and electricity (in phase-change materials, pumped hydro, hydropower, and hydrogen), and using demand response. **No natural gas, biofuels, nuclear power, or stationary batteries are needed.** **The resulting 2050–2055 US electricity social cost for a full system is much less than for fossil fuels.** These results hold for many conditions, suggesting that low-cost, reliable 100% WWS systems should work many places worldwide.

Worldwide, the **development of wind, water, and solar (WWS) energy is expanding rapidly because it is** sustainable, clean, safe, widely available, and, in many cases, **already economical.** However, utilities and grid operators often argue that today's power systems cannot accommodate significant variable wind and solar supplies without failure (1). Several studies have addressed some of the grid reliability issues with high WWS penetrations, but no study has analyzed a system that provides the maximum possible long-term environmental and social benefits, namely supplying all energy end uses with only WWS power (no natural gas, biofuels, or nuclear power), with no load loss at reasonable cost. **This paper** fills this gap. It **describes the ability of WWS installations, determined consistently over each of the 48 contiguous United States** (CONUS) and with wind and solar power output predicted in time and space with a 3D climate/weather model, accounting for extreme variability, to provide time-dependent load reliably **and at low cost** when combined with storage and demand response (DR) **for the period 2050–2055, when a 100% WWS world may exist.**

1AR

Extend: “No US Population Crisis”

US is not close to carrying capacity — claims to the contrary are a racist dog whistle.

Johnson 9 — Kevin R. Johnson, Professor of Public Interest Law at UC Davis School of Law, JD from Harvard, BA in Economics from UC Berkeley, 2009 (Opening the Floodgates: Why America Needs to Rethink its Borders and Immigration Laws, 2009, ISBN-13: 978-0814743096, p. 159-160)

Moreover, **despite persistent claims that the nation has reached its “carrying capacity,” it is far from self-evident** that the United States is overpopulated or that the country is even approaching its population limit. **Although** it is true that **certain urban areas** of the country **have relatively high population densities, that density fails to approximate that found in certain cities and regions of the world.** Moreover, **many regions** of the United States **are not densely populated at all.** In fact, some states, such as Iowa, have actively sought to attract immigrant workers in recent years. Today, many immigrants settle in the South and Midwest, where there is room to build and expand, a need for labor, and relatively inexpensive housing. Continued migration into less populous regions of the United States minimizes the risk of overpopulation in the major cities. Even California, most closely associated with the metropolises of Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay area, has thinly populated areas. In addition to its Mexican colonias, the Central Valley has seen the emergence of many diverse communities over the past twenty years. Today, Sikh Indians, Hmong, Vietnamese, Chinese, Russians, and many other groups make up a significant portion of the area’s population. Besides adding much richness to the region, immigrants have contributed to a booming, robust economy that today includes manufacturing, technology, and other industries in addition to its world-renowned agricultural sector of state and local economies. **Put simply, the claim that immigration must, or could, be curtailed to save the environment in the United States has not been proved.** Indeed, **the current system**, as well as proposed reforms, **may damage the environment.** Some observers, for example, even claim that **the construction of massive fences along the U.S.-Mexico border may injure the natural habitat of desert animals.**⁹⁸ At a bare minimum, **we as a nation must be careful to avoid having legitimate environmental concerns with pollution and overpopulation employed as scare tactics in the concerted efforts to build support for a nativist agenda.** Similar issues often arise with respect to efforts at exclusionary zoning, in which local zoning laws may be used to exclude “undesirable” elements, often meaning the poor and racial minorities. Zoning, and planned growth, is a good thing; exclusionary zoning is not. Unfortunately, some restrictionists who seek to close the border to the people of the developing world want to do exactly the same thing as advocates of exclusionary zoning. (159-60)

Extend: “Immigration Net Positive”

Ignore population scare tactics — immigration reduces pollution due to US environmental laws.

Johnson 9 — Kevin R. Johnson, Professor of Public Interest Law at UC Davis School of Law, JD from Harvard, BA in Economics from UC Berkeley, 2009 (Opening the Floodgates: Why America Needs to Rethink its Borders and Immigration Laws, 2009, ISBN-13: 978-0814743096, p. 158-159)

At various times, concerns have been raised about the environmental consequences of immigration. Restrictionists argue that the “flood” of immigrants coming to the United States will result in overpopulation. The argument effectively amounts to an economic concern with the allocation of a perceived scarce resource, in this case access to this country. To those who fear overpopulation of the United States, limits on immigration promise to keep a lid on population growth. Concerns with the world population, as well as the global environment, are secondary to those who adopt this type of “America-first” attitude. Basically, the environmental argument is that the United States has met or exceeded its “carrying capacity” and cannot accommodate the current flow of immigrants coming to this country.⁹⁴ It is one of the most common restrictionist arguments. The Federation for Immigration Reform, a highly visible restrictionist advocacy group, regularly makes environmental arguments for limiting immigration.⁹⁵ After years of internal turmoil, a vocal faction of the Sierra Club unsuccessfully sought to make immigration control a central issue on the organization’s agenda in 2005.⁹⁶ Ultimately, anti-immigrant arguments based on environmental degradation and over-population are little more than a scare tactic. Environmental disaster is just one of the litany of negative consequences allegedly attributable to immigrants that anti-immigrant activists trot out to strike fear into the hearts of the general public. Environmental arguments often are thrown in as an afterthought to add fuel to the nativist fire. As exemplified by the internal dispute within the Sierra Club, these arguments, in certain circumstances, appeal at some level to environmentalists and their sympathizers. According to the rationale for the environmental argument, the United States should be able to keep what it has in terms of the environment, and the rest of the world is simply out of luck. However, from an overall environmental perspective, the world as a whole may benefit from greater migration to the United States. This nation has environmental protections in place, a commitment to recycling, and a general awareness of, and sensitivity to, environmental issues, a combination that is rare in many countries. Many nations, particularly those in the developing world, lack the kind of environmental consciousness shown in the United States. Developing nations, for obvious reasons, often tend to focus more on economic development than on environmental protection. Immigrants from the developing world come to the United States and live, work, and consume in a more environmentally conscious country than the one from which they came. As a result, immigrants use resources in a more environmentally sound way in this country. In addition, they do not contribute to the environmental degradation of their native

country. Significant environmental problems found in much of the developing world, such as air and water pollution, thus might be reduced by the migration of people to the United States. Such environmental benefits militate in favor of more liberal immigration admissions to the United States. Consequently, an open-borders system might be a more "green" U.S. immigration policy than a closed-border regime.⁹⁷ (158-9)

Extend: “Population Arguments are Racist”

This is more than impact defense. We also criticize their thesis — population arguments are false and violent. They foster unacceptable, anti-immigrant agendas.

Levinson et al. 10 — Jenny Levison, Interim Senior Vice President of Development & Partnerships at the new Race Forward, the union of two leading racial justice non-profit organizations: Race Forward and Center for Social Inclusion (CSI), 2010 (“Apply The Brakes: Anti-Immigrant Co-Optation of the Environmental Movement,” Center for New Community, Available Online at http://imagine2050.newcomm.org/wp-content/uploads/ATB_shortreport.pdf)

The discussion that ATB seeks to broadcast is **essentially neo-Malthusian**. The theory was born when **Thomas Malthus** published “An Essay on the Principle of Population in 1798” in which he **stated that the discrepancy between the rate of population and the rate of food growth would lead to a permanent food shortage for humans. Malthus’ works gained influence** in rapidly transforming 19th Century England **and**, combined with later Social Darwinism, **were used to justify ideologies that essentially blamed the victims of early industrial development** — a development that swallowed up, displaced and destroyed populations, and which was itself highly artificial and environmentally destructive — **for their own misfortune**.

Specifically, **anti-immigrant activists belonging to the neo-Malthusian tradition claim that populations are constrained by the carrying capacity of the environment, and that population growth causes environmental degradation. They argue that immigrants contribute to the degradation of the environment by** urban sprawl, congestion, pollution, waste generation, **water consumption, land conversion, depletion of natural resources, and biodiversity loss**, and have gone so far as to create a formula (change in pollution multiplied by change in population) to demonstrate these relationships.^{5,6} Neo-Malthusian doctrine has been invoked over the years by **these individuals** and organizations to **argue that compassion for those starving and destroyed eventually backfires, leading to greater future catastrophe.**

ATB **arguments on immigrants and population** pull directly from the neo-Malthusian stance — **displacing blame from the negative influence of** economic **globalization onto populations that are the worst impacted. This push** by ATB to distort “cause and effect” **serves to intentionally transform a** holistic **environmental philosophy based on greater care** towards the world and each other, **into misanthropy.** Ecological thinking based on dynamic and interconnected natural systems turns into a philosophy that treats national and state borders as unchallengeable nature. **People become pollutants, with all the racial overtones of such a social construction.**

(Note: “ATB” is an acronym that references “Apply the Brakes” – a group that sometimes advances claims about the need to reduce immigration as part of a broader agenda to reduce the environmental impacts of US population growth.)

Their evidence all has the same racist pedigree — be highly skeptical of environmental arguments against immigration.

Riley 8 — Jason L. Riley, Senior Fellow @ The Manhattan Institute, member of the Wall Street Journal Editorial board, 2008 (Let Them In: The Case for Open Borders, ISBN-13: 978-1592403493, p.22-25)

Over the past **four decades, Tanton has birthed or bank-rolled a loose-knit network of anti-immigrant** and antinatal **groups** that continue to impact the national debate. **In addition to FAIR, the Center for Immigration Studies, and NumbersUSA, it includes the American Immigration Control Foundation, Californians for Population Stabilization, and ProjectUSA.** According to **the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)**, which **labeled him “the Puppeteer” of the restrictionist movement, the “vast majority of American anti-immigration groups**—more than a dozen in **all—were** either **formed,** led, or in other ways made possible **through Tanton’s efforts.”** And if you’re wondering why SPLC, a civil rights organization that specializes in tracking “hate groups,” has Tanton on its radar screen, it’s because **the good doctor is also in cahoots with individuals and organizations that preach white supremacy. FAIR,** by Tanton’s own reckoning, **has received** some **\$1.5 million from the Pioneer Fund, a group dedicated to racial purity through eugenics.** In the 1980s Tanton hosted retreats to discuss U.S. immigration policy, and attendees included open racists like Jared Taylor of the New Century Foundation. Taylor holds conferences attended by the likes of Klansman David Duke and edits a newsletter, American Renaissance, that’s very popular with the white nationalist set. Tanton also wrote memos to attendees that betrayed a racialist agenda. In one that was later leaked to the press, Tanton said, “As Whites see their power and control over their lives declining, will they simply go quietly into the night?” And complaining about high Latino birth rates, he wrote, “Perhaps, this is the first instance in which those with their pants up are going to get caught by those with their pants down!” **Tanton doesn’t merely hobnob with racists. He employs them and actively promotes their views.** **The Tanton network’s publishing arm is The Social Contract Press, which publishes and distributes the works of all manner of unsavory characters.** Among the more notable contributors is Peter Brimelow, a politically conservative anti-immigration immigrant from Britain who runs the white nationalist Web site, VDARE. Another favorite was the late Sam Francis, a VDARE writer and conservative columnist who was sacked by the Washington Times after giving a speech (at an American Renaissance conference) describing how the white race is bestowed with superior genes. The editor of Social Contract Press, founded by Tanton in 1990, is Wayne Lutton, another ardent white nationalist. Lutton is a trustee at Jared Taylor’s New Century Foundation and speaks at American Renaissance events. He sits on the advisory board of the Council of Conservative Citizens, the successor group to the White Citizens’ Council that fought desegregation in the 1950s and 1960s. Pseudonymously, Lutton writes articles for The Journal of Historical Review, the in-house publication of the Holocaust-denying Institute for Historical Review. In 1994, he and Tanton coauthored a book titled The Immigration Invasion. When I travel the country to report on immigration, or speak

to groups in the know about Tanton and his network, **I'm often asked why the mainstream media continue to cite groups like FAIR** and the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) **without mentioning their origins or ulterior motives**. CIS "reports" are given the gravitas of the **Brookings Institution's**, and FAIR is described as an organization that merely favors less immigration, when in fact its stated goal is to cut the U.S. population in half. My reply is that in most cases **it should be chalked up to ignorance** (or laziness) rather than malice. The space constraints and daily deadlines of newspaper journalism often lend themselves to only so much exposition. But **it's a credit to Tanton's tenaciousness that his "puppets"—folks like Dan Stein, Roy Beck, and Mark Krikorian—are considered by the press** (and lawmakers) **to be legitimate policy analysts making good-faith restrictionist arguments**. Krikorian has written for the highly regarded Jewish neoconservative magazine *Commentary* and even managed to ingratiate himself with select movement conservatives. He writes regularly for *National Review*, which happens to count a fair number of devout Catholics among its editors. If there's one thing that bugs Tanton more than all those dusky people crossing the Rio Grande and overpopulating his country, it's that too many of them are Catholic, or so he once told the Associated Press. (22-5)