

Notes

General Summary of the Affirmative

This affirmative argues that the United States should remove restrictions on high skilled immigration in order to insure that U.S. universities are able to attract the best students in the world. The thesis of the AFF is that foreign students choose to attend American universities because of the prospect that they will be able to stay and work in the United States after they graduate. Current visa policies are causing many students to doubt whether that is true.

The reason that high skilled immigrants are good for universities is that they tend to pay full tuition (unlike many domestic students who receive scholarships, grants and in-state discounts) and that they tend to enroll in advanced graduate programs that specialize in innovative research.

There are two main types of research:

- Basic (aka fundamental or pure) research, which is driven general scientific curiosity or interest rather than an expressed intention to create or invent something. It is generally a pre-requisite to other forms of research.
- Applied Research, which is designed to solve specific practical problems.

The AFF argues that universities fulfill a unique role in society by conducting basic research. The argument says that it is necessary for universities to do this research because profit motives prevent private companies from investing in it.

Despite the fact that it doesn't target specific problems, basic research is important, because it often yields new innovations that transform society and contribute to the economy.

General Summary of the Negative

In addition to case defense, there are two case turns that can be added to the 1NC frontline against the advantage.

The **Internal Brain Drain turn** argues that bringing immigrants into the US to study at universities is a bad thing, because it deters domestic students from entering into those fields of study.

The **Chinese Espionage turn** argues that bringing immigrants into the US to study allows China to steal technological secrets and use the innovations developed through research for themselves.

AFF

1AC

1AC — Innovation Advantage

Contention 1 is the Innovation Advantage.

First, restrictions on immigration are driving down international student enrollment in U.S. universities.

SAUL '18 (Stephanie; New York Times, “As Flow of Foreign Students Wanes, U.S. Universities Feel the Sting,” 1/2, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/02/us/international-enrollment-drop.html>)

Just as many universities believed that the financial wreckage left by the 2008 recession was behind them, campuses across the country have been forced to make new rounds of cuts, this time brought on, in large part, by a loss of international students.

Schools in the Midwest have been particularly hard hit — many of them non-flagship public universities that had come to rely heavily on tuition from foreign students, who generally pay more than in-state students.

The downturn follows a decade of explosive growth in foreign student enrollment, which now tops 1 million at United States colleges and educational training programs, and supplies \$39 billion in revenue. International enrollment began to flatten in 2016, partly because of changing conditions abroad and the increasing lure of schools in Canada, Australia and other English-speaking countries.

And since President Trump was elected, college administrators say, his rhetoric and more restrictive views on immigration have made the United States even less attractive to international students. The Trump administration is more closely scrutinizing visa applications, indefinitely banning travel from some countries and making it harder for foreign students to remain in the United States after graduation.

While government officials describe these as necessary national security measures, a number of American colleges have been casualties of the policies.

“As you lose those students, then the tuition revenue is negatively impacted as well,” said Michael Godard, the interim provost at the University of Central Missouri, where 944 international students were enrolled in the fall, a decline of more than 1,500 from the previous year. “We’ve had to make some decisions, budgetary decisions, to adjust.”

International students pay double the \$6,445 tuition of Missouri residents, and the lost revenue amounts to \$14 million, according to Roger Best, the chief operating officer for the school, in Warrensburg, Mo. Dr. Best said that the university has been forced to cut instructors in computer programs, where many of the foreign students were enrolled, as well as defer maintenance and shave money from other departments, such as the campus newspaper.

Nationwide, the number of new foreign students declined an average of 7 percent this past fall, according to preliminary figures from a survey of 500 colleges by the Institute of International Education. Nearly half of the campuses surveyed reported declines.

Now that the revenue stream appears to be diminishing, the financial outlook may be dire enough to weigh down the bond ratings of some schools, making it more expensive for them to borrow money, according to Moody's Investors Service. Last month, Moody's changed its credit outlook for higher education to "negative" from "stable."

"Growing uncertainty for international student enrollment stems from immigration policies that are in flux," Moody's said, warning that universities without global brand recognition would be hit hardest. While some flagship public and elite private colleges have been affected, the Institute of International Education said, the biggest impact will be felt by second-tier institutions.

The shift comes just as some states also are experiencing a drop in domestic students, partly the result of a decline in birthrates two decades ago. This year, the number of domestic undergraduate students dropped 224,000, or **1 percent**, according to the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.

An increasingly diverse population in that age group means that more of the students come from low-income families in which no one has ever gone to college, also presenting recruitment challenges for universities, according to Doug Shapiro, the organization's executive research director. "Affordability issues are the biggest hurdles," Mr. Shapiro said. "There's only so much you can do with recruiting if the families can't afford the tuition."

Officials at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kan., reported an overall enrollment decline of more than 900 students, including 159 fewer international students. One official cited a "perfect demographic storm." Budget cuts are underway.

Faced with a demand from the university that it trim its budget, faculty in the school's modern languages department picked Italian as the language to cut, a decision that will save the university the salary of its only Italian professor, which one faculty member said was about \$47,000. A final decision is still pending.

"This definitely undermines that idea of diversity many **U.S. universities** proclaim to promote across the country," said Alessia Salamina, the professor whose job is in jeopardy. **"This is in fact a national emergency,"** not only a K-State one."

According to the institute's survey, **enrollment is falling from a broad range of countries, including China and India, the two biggest sources of students.** Among countries covered by Mr. Trump's travel ban, Iran is the largest, though it can still send students to the United States.

Second, the U.S. is the current leader in attracting international students, but uncertainty regarding visas is causing perception of prestige to slip. Maintaining leadership in attracting talent is vital to innovation.

KLIMAVICIUTE '17 (Luka; Migration Policy Institute, "To Stay or Not To Stay: The Calculus for International STEM Students in the United States," 1/4, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/stay-or-not-stay-calculus-international-stem-students-united-states>)

Overview of STEM Students in the United States

There were more than 1 million international students in the United States in the 2015-16 school year—a record level and a 7 percent increase over the previous year. This includes nearly 150,000 participating in Optional Practical Training (OPT) following completion of their studies. International students made up 5 percent of the more than 20 million students overall in U.S. higher education. **More international students study in the United States than in any other country, and the U.S. international student population is nearly twice that of the United Kingdom, the second top destination.**

Of international students in the United States, 41.6 percent were enrolled in STEM fields, compared to 35 percent of all students at the undergraduate level and 22 percent at the graduate level. International students are more prevalent in graduate STEM programs than undergraduate: one-third (10,000) of all STEM PhDs awarded in 2013 went to students from abroad, compared to 5 percent (roughly 16,000) of all STEM undergraduate degrees. In 2014, half of all foreign undergraduate STEM students came from China, Saudi Arabia, and South Korea. **Chinese and Indian students comprised more than two-thirds of international graduate student enrollment in the United States,** with Iran a distant third.

To Stay or Not To Stay

Many factors are involved in an international student's decision to stay or leave the United States after graduation, and the choice is not always clear. Forty-eight percent of international doctoral STEM students reported intending to remain after graduation, 12 percent said they wished to leave, and roughly 40 percent said they were undecided, according to a survey conducted in 2015 by Xueying Han and Richard P. Appelbaum. This sizeable undecided share raises a question about whether the United States will remain as popular a work destination in the future. **Career opportunities play an important role in these decisions:** there is an 87 percent likelihood that those who chose to study in the United States because of future job prospects will stay after graduation. Students find the United States especially attractive for work in the private sector or for start-ups—77 percent of those who said they wished to work for a company or launch their own business hoped to stay, compared to 68 percent who reported considering careers in academia, government, or nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Students who intended to leave said family was the main reason for their decision.

International student perceptions of the United States are growing more negative, which could increase their chances of leaving. When asked in 2008, a majority of international STEM and business students enrolled in U.S. higher education institutions said the best days of the U.S. economy were behind it. Furthermore, the U.S. share of international student enrollment declined from 28 percent in 2001 to 22 percent in 2014. This is significant because 57 percent of all doctoral engineering degrees awarded in 2012-13 went to foreign graduates, and so did 53 percent of doctoral computer science degrees—two fields with labor shortages.

Still, international student enrollment in the United States has increased in absolute numbers because more students now study internationally than ever before. In addition, more international students are staying in the United States after graduation. In 2011, 64 percent of science and engineering PhDs (including those in the social sciences) had stayed in the United States for five to ten years after graduation, an 8 percentage point increase from 2001, according to Michael G. Finn from the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. The share of doctoral students who remain in the United States declines slightly as they age, but more international science and engineering doctorates are staying now than at any other point in the past 15 years. **Even though the share of foreign students who choose U.S. colleges and universities has declined, the United States is now more appealing as a postgraduation home for those specialists who do decide to study there.**

Labor Shortages and Surpluses

To determine whether the United States should incentivize more international STEM students to remain postgraduation, it is important to assess whether the U.S. economy needs them, and if so, in which fields and at what education levels. On the first point, the evidence is mixed. In 2012, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology issued a report arguing that the U.S. labor market would need 1 million more STEM specialists by 2018 than were being produced at current rates. Yet, 74 percent of STEM college graduates did not work in a STEM occupation in 2014, the U.S. Census Bureau reported. Furthermore, of computer science graduates who do not work in information services, 32 percent reported they could not find a job relevant to their skills, according to the Economic Policy Institute. Based on such contradictory evidence, it is difficult to say whether the economy needs more STEM workers, or if incentivizing more international students to work in the United States would increase competition for already scarce jobs.

However, a more nuanced picture shows that labor shortages for some jobs do in fact exist. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) researchers examined individual STEM occupations instead of studying STEM graduates as a homogenous group. Based on data from 2010 to 2014, they found that labor shortages exist, but not in all STEM fields: in particular, the private sector lacks software developers, petroleum engineers, and data scientists. The government sector, too, has experienced shortages of nuclear and materials science engineers. These occupations require more than a bachelor's degree, explaining why some STEM

graduates have difficulty finding a job. However, the MIT researchers reported a surplus of biomedical PhDs and the demand for physics PhDs is not very high. Therefore, immigration incentives might focus on the most-needed specialists: computer scientists and engineers.

Policy Framework for International STEM Students

In recognition of the role international STEM students play in the economy, **current immigration policy already provides some pathways for these graduates to work in the United States**. All international students are eligible for one year of Optional Practical Training (OPT) after they complete their studies, during which they can work in a job related to their area of study. Once the year ends, non-STEM graduates must find an employer willing to sponsor them for a work visa (for example, an H-1B visa) whereas STEM graduates are eligible for an OPT extension for up to 24 additional months. At the end of the extension, STEM graduates must receive a work visa to continue working legally.

However, even for the best and brightest, the path to long-term residency can be lengthy, expensive, and uncertain. For instance, H-1B visas are given out for a maximum of six years, during which time employees cannot switch employers without being reapproved for the H-1B status. Furthermore, the United States grants 85,000 H-1Bs each year (including 20,000 allotted for graduates with a master's degree or higher from U.S. universities), with a roughly one in three chance of receiving an H-1B based on the number of people who apply (for fiscal year 2017, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services received more than 236,000 such petitions).

Growing Competition Abroad

Slim chances of receiving an H-1B visa and the inability to switch employers without getting reapproved for the visa contrast with policies that favor STEM immigrants in other countries. In New Zealand, most skilled foreign workers apply for permanent residence through the Skilled Migrant Category, a points-based system where candidates can gain almost half the number of points required by having a job offer in a labor shortage field, most typically STEM. In October 2016 Australia announced that STEM master's and doctoral students will be given an additional 5 out of 60 points toward permanent residency. Australia has no quota for temporary skilled workers, and international students who possess critical skills can work in the country for up to four years after graduation. These policies, along with the depreciation of the Australian dollar, have helped increase the number of international students choosing to study in Australia.

A similar policy exists in Canada, where international students can stay for up to three years after graduation as long as they find a job. Creating a path from study to permanent residence helped Canada increase the share of foreign students as a percentage of all students, from just below 5 percent in 2000 to almost 10 percent in 2014; the United States by contrast has held steady at around 4 percent for the last 15 years. China also introduced notable reforms. Whereas a worker's permit in China typically lasts one year, the R visa for talented workers

(often researchers and engineers) grants permission to stay in the country for up to five years. China also provides resettlement subsidies through the Thousand Talents Plan (TTP), intended to help fill China's labor shortages in highly skilled occupations. The TTP was initially aimed at recruiting 2,000 skilled professionals within five to ten years, but ended up bringing 4,180 highly skilled workers to China in the first six years, one-third of whom have become permanent residents.

Some countries have gone so far as to actively recruit graduates from top U.S. universities by offering alternatives to the complex U.S. visa system. Switzerland, for example, set up a "science consulate" near MIT and Harvard to promote Swiss firms directly to students. Other countries are launching start-up visas—an immigration route particularly relevant to technology workers. In 2013, Canada launched one of its own, which Citizenship and Immigration Minister Jason Kenney said in part targets entrepreneurs "stuck on temporary visas" in the United States. Chile, too, launched a competition where start-up CEOs compete for capital, office space, and a permit for one year of residence, subject to extension based on the company's performance. Since its launch in 2013, this initiative has attracted more than 1,000 entrepreneurs to Chile—including dozens of international graduates of U.S. schools who have founded at least 47 companies.

As other countries increasingly compete for highly skilled migrants, should there be any cause for concern in the United States? Beyond filling labor market demands, STEM graduates also help the United States remain one of the most innovative countries in the world. The World Bank estimates that **for every 10 percent increase in the number of foreign graduate students in the United States, university patent grants increase by 6.8 percent** and nonuniversity patents by 5 percent. **The United States therefore risks becoming less innovative if fewer STEM students choose it as a study and work destination.**

Third, International Students are necessary for conducting basic research. Universities rely on them to attract and retain high level faculty.

ANDERSON '14 (Stuart; former staff director of the Senate immigration Subcommittee, is executive director of the National Foundation for American Policy, a policy research organization, "International Students Are Vital to U.S. Higher Education," International Educator, May-June, https://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/ie_mayjun14_frontlines.pdf)

International students are key to supporting research at U.S. universities, which helps retain and attract top faculty. Tables 3 through 7 illustrate that at schools such as Rice University, Indiana University, Purdue University, Ohio State, and others, international students generally comprise 60 to 80 percent of the graduate students in electrical engineering, computer science, chemical engineering, and other fields. **In 2010, U.S. universities conducted 51 percent of all basic research performed in the United States,** according to the National Science Foundation.⁵

“We are a research university, and in computer science that means that **much of the research is done by teams led by professors with experiments carried out by graduate students,**” explains Professor Christopher Raphael, chair of the computer science department at Indiana University. “**This model only works if we can get high-quality PhD students, and we would be hard pressed to get the number we need solely from the United States.**”⁶

The high level of international students plays a role in universities being able to attract and retain faculty, which benefits U.S. students. “**If we were not to place such a heavy emphasis on research, we wouldn’t be able to get faculty that teach the wide range of things we do, with the appropriate expertise, so our educational mission would suffer,**” said Raphael. “**Really the most important part of the educational experience is to work closely with highquality faculty, as one does directly at the PhD stage. So the research and the education are of a piece.**”⁷

Professor Stuart Cooper, department chair of chemical and biomolecular engineering at Ohio State University, also points to the connection between research and teaching at U.S. colleges. “**There is a synergy. To get tenure and perform research, professors require a significant number of graduate students and there are not enough domestic students alone in certain fields,**” said Professor Cooper. “**The advances made by professors and graduate students, including international students and postdocs, provide new knowledge and benefits to society.**”⁸

Without the ability to perform high-level research at U.S. universities, many talented individuals would not take or seek faculty positions, leaving U.S. schools far weaker and unable to educate U.S. students in important fields. Graduate students also directly support the educational mission for undergraduates by serving as teaching assistants. Their duties include conducting study sessions and grading, which “**takes some of the burden off the faculty**” to focus on teaching, according to Cooper.⁹

Fourth, innovation from university based research is vital to long term economic growth. It creates jobs, increases wages, and cannot be replaced by private sector investment.

ATKINSON and STEWART ’11 (Dr. Robert D.; Information Technology and Innovation Foundation – author, researcher and one of the country’s foremost thinkers on innovation and economics AND Luke A.; conducts economic analyses on domestic and international innovation policies for the ITIF, “University Research Funding: The United States is Behind and Falling,” May, <http://www.itif.org/files/2011-university-research-funding.pdf>)

In developed, knowledge-based economies, innovation powers long-run economic growth.

For example, two-thirds of UK private-sector productivity growth between 2000 and 2007 was a

result of innovation.⁵ Klenow and Rodríguez-Clare decomposed the cross-country differences in income per-worker into shares that could be attributed to physical capital, human capital, and total factor productivity, and they found that **more than 90 percent of the variation in the growth of income per worker was a result of** how effectively capital is used (that is, **innovation**), **with differences in the actual amount of human and physical capital accounting for just 9 percent.**⁶

Innovation is also positively correlated to job growth in the mid- to long-term.⁷ Innovation leads to job growth in three fundamental ways. First, **innovation gives a nation's firms a first-mover advantage in new products and services, expanding exports and creating expansionary employment effects in the short term.** In fact, **in the United States, growth in exports leads to twice as many jobs as an equivalent expansion of sales domestically.**⁸ Second, **innovation's expansionary effects lead to a virtuous cycle of expanding employment.** For example, in the early- to mid-1990s, the emergence of information technology as a general purpose technology drove broad-based economic growth, creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs, which, in turn, led to additional job growth in supporting industries. Finally, **when innovation leads to higher productivity, it also leads to increased wages and lower prices, both of which expand domestic economic activity and create jobs.**⁹

Research performed outside the private sector is essential to the U.S. innovation system. Even with robust corporate R&D investment, the private sector alone does not provide the level of innovative activity that society needs, because firms do not capture all of the benefits of innovation. A plethora of studies have found that **the rate of return to society from corporate R&D and innovation activities is at least twice the estimated returns that a company itself receives.**¹⁰ For example, Tewksbury, Crandall and Crane examine the rate of return from twenty prominent innovations and find a median private rate of return of 27 percent but a median social rate of return of a whopping 99 percent, almost four times higher.¹¹ Nordhaus estimates that **inventors capture just 4 percent of the total social gains from their innovations; the rest spill over to other companies and to society as a whole.**¹² In other words, **the private sector under-invests in innovation and thus, without public investment, the rates of economic growth, job creation and living standard improvement are all lower than their potential. The university system, therefore, plays a key role in filling in this gap in order to provide innovation at the social optimum.**

Recently, universities have taken on an even greater role in the American innovation system. Over the last three decades, many large corporations have shut down or repurposed central research laboratories that used to conduct R&D. For example, since its founding in 1925, Bell Labs (until 1995, a subsidiary of AT&T) made seminal scientific discoveries, created powerful new technologies, and built the world's most advanced and reliable telecommunications networks. Because so much of these results spilled over to other firms (not just AT&T) and industries, the incentive to perform this kind of foundational, generic research was based on

the fact that AT&T had significant market power and was a regulated monopoly. But with the introduction of competition to the telecommunications industry in the 1980s and 1990s, Bell Labs was restructured to focus more on incremental technology improvements with shorter-term payoffs. **This is reflective of an overall shift in corporate R&D, with companies in the United States expanding their investments in laterstage applied research and development much more quickly than their investments in basic, early-stage research.** From 1991 to 2008, basic research as a share of total corporate R&D funding conducted in the United States fell by 3.2 percentage points, while applied research fell by 3.7 percentage points. In contrast, development's share increased by 6.9 percentage points.¹⁴

This shift to shorter-term, less fundamental R&D risks a shrinking of the knowledge pool from which firms draw the ideas and information necessary to conduct later-stage R&D and to bring innovations to the market. As U.S. companies have shifted their R&D activities upstream, universities have taken on a larger role in the innovation system. Today, universities perform 56 percent of all basic research, compared to 38 percent in 1960.¹⁵ **Moreover, universities are increasingly passing on these results to the private sector:** Between 1991 and 2009, the number of patent applications filed by universities increased from 14 per institution to 68 per institution; licensing income increased from \$1.9 million per institution to \$13 million per institution; and new start-ups formed as a result of university research increased from 212 in 1994 to 685 in 2009.¹⁶

Overall, **university research has large impacts on U.S. economic growth.** In terms of its impact on product and process development in U.S. firms, Mansfield finds the social rate of return from investment in academic research to be at least 40 percent.¹⁷ And a study by the Science Coalition found that **"companies spun out of research universities have a far greater success rate than other companies."**¹⁸ Indeed, **university research gave the United States breakthrough companies such as Google, Medtronic and iRobot.**¹⁹

Fifth, Economic Growth is slowing. Only technological innovation from research universities can allow room for necessary reforms. Failure risks an ever expanding debt-to-GDP ratio.

DREZNER '16 (Daniel W.; nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, "Five Known Unknowns about the Next Generation Global Political Economy," May, http://www.anamnesis.info/sites/default/files/D_Drezner_2016.pdf)ww

Perhaps the best long-range economic forecast ever made was John Maynard Keynes' statement at the start of the Great Depression in 1930 that "the standard of life in progressive countries one hundred years hence will be between four and eight times as high as it is

today.”⁶⁹ That prediction has turned out to be true—because of the rapid rate of postwar economic growth.

While Keynes proved to be correct, it is nonetheless true that **the last two centuries of rapid growth are the exception and not the rule in human history**. One economic historian estimates that England’s per capita GDP in 500 B.C. was roughly what it was in 1800 A.D. Over the next two hundred years, however, GDP per capital increased twelve-fold.⁷⁰ Economists agree that with the start of the Industrial Revolution, economic growth and prosperity radiated outwards from Great Britain to the rest of the developed world.⁷¹ **The Industrial Revolution directly contributed to economic growth through innovation, but it also indirectly contributed to economic growth through trade and demographic drivers**.⁷² **The development and spread of general purpose technologies in manufacturing directly contributed to faster economic growth through increases in labor productivity. New technological advances in transportation and communication rapidly lowered the barriers to trade and exchange across borders, thereby spurring greater growth through globalization. Advances in health and medicine also enabled and enhanced a significant demographic explosion, another key mechanism to increase economic growth.**

In recent years, however, the rate of per capita income economic growth in the developed world has slowed down considerably. If one compares the U.S. economy since 1971 to the Bretton Woods era, **there is no denying that**, with one brief exception in the late 1990s, **there has been a slowdown in per capita income growth**. According to Northwestern University economist Robert Gordon, at the peak of the twentieth century U.S. boom, real GDP per capita increased by 2.5 percent per year. In the 21st century, that figure has been less than 1.4 percent.⁷³ **A concomitant slowdown has occurred in U.S. productivity**. During the heyday of the 1960s, labor productivity increased by more than three percent a year. Over the past five years, annual U.S. productivity growth has fallen to an average of 0.9 percent. Indeed, in the last quarter of 2014 and the first quarter of 2015, productivity contracted by 2.6 percent.⁷⁴ **The slowdowns in income and productivity are not only true of the United States—they apply to the rest of the advanced industrialized democracies as well.**

Gordon speculates that by the year 2100, growth in GDP per capita could fall to pre-1800 levels. **This is because**, as Tyler Cowen has argued, **many of the drivers of economic growth in the developed world for the past two centuries are now close to being tapped out**: “We’re trying to eke out gains from marginal improvements in how we’ve done things for quite a few decades. That kind of process isn’t going to yield massive improvements in our living standards.”⁷⁵ **The “low-hanging fruit” of demographic and trade expansions will not play much of a role in boosting economic growth in the developed world. All of the demographic evidence shows a decline of working-age population in the OECD economies**. Japan is projected to lose over a quarter of its labor force; Germany, Portugal and South Korea are projected to lose close to twenty percent.⁷⁶ **Trade will also be less of a driver of economic growth for these economies**. Further trade liberalization is certainly possible, as demonstrated

by the ongoing negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Still, estimates of these agreements' effect on economic growth pale beside the estimates of past trade liberalization on economic growth.⁷⁷

The erosion of the trade and demographic drivers puts even more pressure on technological innovation to be the engine of economic growth in the developed world. As one McKinsey analysis concluded, **“For economic growth to match its historical rates, virtually all of it must come from increases in labor productivity.”**⁷⁸ **Growth in labor productivity is partially a function of capital investment, but mostly a function of technological innovation.** **The key question is whether the pace of technological innovation will sustain itself.**

This remains a known unknown. The pace of innovation relative to global population has slowed dramatically over the past fifty years.⁷⁹ Consider that the developed world still relies on the same general purpose technologies of modern society that were originally invented 50-100 years ago: the automobile, airplane, telephone, refrigerator, and computer. To be sure, all of these technologies have improved in recent decades, in some cases dramatically. But nothing new has replaced them. And even these improvements have not necessarily had dramatic systemic effects. For example, the average speed on a passenger aircraft has actually fallen since the introduction of the Boeing 707 in 1958, because of the need to conserve fuel. **For all of the talk of “disruptive innovations,” the effect of these disruptions on both the business world and aggregate economic growth have been exaggerated.**⁸⁰

At present, many of the fields that seem promising for innovation—nanotechnology, green energy, and so forth—**require massive fixed investments.** **Only large institutions, like research universities,** multinational corporations and government entities, **can play in that kind of game.** Joseph Schumpeter warned that once large organizations became the primary engine of innovation, the pace of change would naturally slow down. Because large organizations are inherently bureaucratic and conservative, they will be less able to imagine radical innovations.⁸¹ What if the “secular stagnation” debate is really just a harbinger of a deeper debate about a return to pre-19th century growth levels?

An obvious counter to this argument is that the pace of technological innovation in laptops, smart phones, tablets, and the Internet of things **has accelerated. This is undeniably true—but the problem is that the gains in utility have not been, strictly speaking, economic.** Most of the important innovations that we think about with respect to the Internet—Facebook, Twitter, Wikipedia, YouTube and so forth—are free technologies for consumers. As Tyler Cowen argues, “The big technological gains are coming in revenue-deficient sectors.”⁸² They generate lots of enjoyment but little employment. The largest and most dynamic information technology firms, like Google and Apple, hire only a fraction of the people who worked for General Motors in its heyday. At the same time, Internet-based content has eroded the financial viability of other parts of the economy. Content-providing sectors—such as music, entertainment, and journalism—have suffered directly. The growth of “sharing economy” firms like Uber and

Airbnb that develop peer-to-peer markets are causing similar levels of creative disruption to the travel and tourism sectors.⁸³ The rapid acceleration of automation is also leading to debates about whether the “lump of labor” fallacy remains a fallacy—in other words, whether displaced workers will be able to find new employment.⁸⁴

A slow-growth economic trajectory also creates policy problems that increase the likelihood of even slower growth. Higher growth is a political palliative that makes structural reforms easier. For example, Germany prides itself on the “Hartz reforms” to its labor markets last decade, and has advocated similar policies for the rest of the Eurozone since the start of the 2008 financial crisis. But the Hartz reforms were accomplished during a global economic upswing, boosting German exports and cushioning the shortterm cost of the reforms themselves. **In a low-growth world, other economies will be understandably reluctant to engage in such reforms.**

It is possible that concerns about a radical growth slowdown are exaggerated. In 1987, Robert Solow famously said, “You can see the computer age everywhere but in the productivity statistics.”⁸⁵ A decade later, the late 1990s productivity surge was in full bloom. Economists are furiously debating whether the visible innovations in the information sector are leading to productivity advances that are simply going undetected in the current productivity statistics.⁸⁶ Google’s chief economist Hal Varian, echoing Solow from a generation ago, asserts that “there is a lack of appreciation for what’s happening in Silicon Valley, because we don’t have a good way to measure it.”⁸⁷ It is also possible that current innovations will only lead to gains in labor productivity a decade from now. The OECD argues that the productivity problem resides in firms far from the leading edge failing to adopt new technologies and systems.⁸⁸ **There are plenty of sectors, such as health or education, in which technological innovations can yield significant productivity gains. It would foolhardy to predict the end of radical innovations.**

But the possibility of a technological slowdown is a significant “known unknown.” And if such a slowdown occurs, it would have catastrophic effects on the public finances of the OECD economies. Most of the developed world will have to support disproportionately large numbers of pensioners by 2036; slower-growing economies will worsen the debt-to-GDP ratios of most of these economies, causing further macroeconomic stresses—and, potentially, political unrest from increasingly stringent budget constraints.⁸⁹

Finally, Slow Growth exacerbates all of the world’s problems and risks extinction.

HAASS ’13 (Richard N.; President of the Council on Foreign Relations, previously served as Director of Policy Planning for the US State Department, “The World Without America,” 4/30, <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass>)ww

Let me posit a radical idea: **The most critical threat facing the United States now and for the foreseeable future is not a rising China, a reckless North Korea, a nuclear Iran, modern terrorism, or climate change. Although all of these constitute potential or actual threats, the biggest challenges facing the US are its burgeoning debt, crumbling infrastructure, second-rate primary and secondary schools, outdated immigration system, and slow economic growth** – in short, the domestic foundations of American power.

Readers in other countries may be tempted to react to this judgment with a dose of schadenfreude, finding more than a little satisfaction in America's difficulties. Such a response should not be surprising. The US and those representing it have been guilty of hubris (the US may often be the indispensable nation, but it would be better if others pointed this out), and examples of inconsistency between America's practices and its principles understandably provoke charges of hypocrisy. When America does not adhere to the principles that it preaches to others, it breeds resentment.

But, like most temptations, the urge to gloat at America's imperfections and struggles ought to be resisted. People around the globe should be careful what they wish for. **America's failure to deal with its internal challenges would come at a steep price.** Indeed, the rest of the world's stake in American success is nearly as large as that of the US itself.

Part of the reason is economic. **The US economy still accounts for about one-quarter of global output. If US growth accelerates, America's capacity to consume other countries' goods and services will increase, thereby boosting growth around the world. At a time when Europe is drifting and Asia is slowing, only the US** (or, more broadly, North America) **has the potential to drive global economic recovery.**²

The US remains a unique source of innovation. Most of the world's citizens communicate with mobile devices based on technology developed in Silicon Valley; likewise, the Internet was made in America. More recently, new technologies developed in the US greatly increase the ability to extract oil and natural gas from underground formations. **This technology is now making its way around the globe,** allowing other societies to increase their energy production and decrease both their reliance on costly imports and their carbon emissions.

The US is also an invaluable source of ideas. Its world-class universities educate a significant percentage of future world leaders. More fundamentally, the US has long been a leading example of what market economies and democratic politics can accomplish. People and governments around the world are far more likely to become more open if the American model is perceived to be succeeding.

Finally, **the world faces many serious challenges, ranging from the need to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, fight climate change, and maintain a functioning world economic order that promotes trade and investment to regulating practices in cyberspace,**

improving global health, and preventing armed conflicts. These problems will not simply go away or sort themselves out.

While Adam Smith's "invisible hand" may ensure the success of free markets, it is powerless in the world of geopolitics. Order requires the visible hand of leadership to formulate and realize global responses to global challenges.¹

Don't get me wrong: None of this is meant to suggest that the US can deal effectively with the world's problems on its own. Unilateralism rarely works. It is not just that the US lacks the means; the very nature of contemporary global problems suggests that only collective responses stand a good chance of succeeding.

But multilateralism is much easier to advocate than to design and implement. Right now there is only one candidate for this role: the US. No other country has the necessary combination of capability and outlook.

This brings me back to the argument that the US must put its house in order – economically, physically, socially, and politically – if it is to have the resources needed to promote order in the world. Everyone should hope that it does: The alternative to a world led by the US is not a world led by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, India, or any other country, but rather a world that is not led at all. Such a world would almost certainly be characterized by chronic crisis and conflict. That would be bad not just for Americans, but for the vast majority of the planet's inhabitants.

1AC — Plan

The United States federal government should substantially raise the annual limit for employment-based immigrants, eliminate the per-country limits for employment-based immigrants, and exempt the dependents of sponsored immigrants and individuals with graduate degrees in science and engineering fields from the numerical limit.

1AC — Solvency

Contention 2 is Solvency.

The Plan sends a signal to potential foreign students that resolves uncertainty.

NFAP, 7 (May 2007, National Foundation for American Policy - 501(c)(3) non-profit, non-partisan public policy research organization based in Arlington, Virginia focusing on trade, immigration and related issues, “U.S.GREEN CARD DELAYS WORSEN FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS: OPTIONS AVAILABLE FOR CONGRESS TO FIX THE PROBLEM,”

<http://www.nfap.com/pdf/0507brief-greencard-backlog.pdf>, accessed on 6/7/18, JMP)

BACKGROUND

Today, **many of the world’s most talented people come to America**, wish to join our society, **and are told to wait five years or more for a green card** (permanent residence). **This sends a signal to many international students and other outstanding individuals that America may not be the place to build your career or raise your family. Given the importance of foreign-born scientists and engineers to the U.S. economy, failure to solve this problem threatens the level of innovation that takes place in America and the competitiveness of many U.S. companies.**

Patricia McDermott, a manager at Keane, Inc., which has an estimated 225 sponsored employees “in limbo” waiting for employment-based green cards, says **the waits inflict an enormous “human cost” on individuals and their families.**¹ These individuals and others like them were generally first hired on H-1B temporary visas, which are good for only two three-year periods but can be extended if a green card application is pending. **For H-1B professionals to stay in the country permanently they must be sponsored for permanent residence (green card) by an employer.** (Some foreign nationals may qualify in categories that do not require employer sponsorship.)

Those waiting for their green cards cannot travel freely nor, in most cases, can they transfer positions or have their spouses work.² **This also harms innovation, as those with new ideas cannot go on to start new companies or gain venture capital**, as in the past. A study released by the National Venture Capital Association found that since 1990 one in four (25 percent) of America’s publicly traded venture-backed companies had at least one immigrant founder.³ **Individuals are often hesitant to change jobs, since that would often trigger the start of a new application and waiting period.**

WAIT TIMES FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS

By law, the current annual limit on employment-based immigrant visas (green cards) is 140,000. This has demonstrated to be well below demand, creating backlogs of 5 years or more in key categories. Such wait times make it virtually impossible for individuals to be hired directly on green cards. (The 140,000 figure includes spouses and minor children of the sponsored

immigrant.) The wait times do not include “labor certification” processing at the U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 1 represents NFAP’s current estimates of likely wait times. In certain categories, the unavailability of green cards has worsened significantly in the past two years. An employment-based immigrant in the Skilled Workers and Professionals category (3rd preference) can expect to wait at least 5 years for a green card from most countries but 6 years from India, which is longer than the wait projected last year for potential immigrants from India. These wait times are likely to worsen further absent legislative changes by Congress. The wait times for Priority Workers (1st preference) and Advanced Degree Holders and Persons of Exceptional Ability from China and India range from 1 to 3 years.⁴

Wait times are based on “cut-off dates.” To stay within the numerical limits, after estimating the demand in a category, the State Department assigns a “cut-off” date that leads to processing only applications filed prior to that date. Per-country limits for employment-based immigrants are generally set at 7% of the 140,000 annual limit, though they can exceed 7% if visa slots would otherwise be left unused for skilled workers.⁵

[table omitted]

THE CURRENT BACKLOG

In this NFAP analysis, by “backlog” we refer to a long list of applicants registered on immigrant visa waiting lists whose turn cannot be reached because of the annual numerical limitations on immigration. By definition, an alien cannot be registered on an immigrant visa waiting list until the petition filed on his/her behalf has been approved by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

The information on the current wait times for employment-based immigrant visas in Table 1 is based on the U.S. Department of State Visa Bulletin (May 2007). As one can see, for most countries the wait in the third preference (the most common skilled employment-based category) is 5 years or more. But it’s possible that even these estimates understate the true eventual waiting times, since, as GAO has pointed out, “The availability of visas issued by the Department of State will not affect the backlog as defined by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) because USCIS excludes from its count of backlog those cases for which a visa is not available.”⁶

A key reason for this is the existence of “per country” limits. As GAO explains: There are also annual numerical limitations on the number of visas that can be allocated per country under each of the preference categories. Thus, **even if the annual limit for a preference category has not been exceeded, visas may not be available to immigrants from countries with high rates of immigration to the United States, such as China and India, because of the per country limits.”⁷**

While we do not know the precise extent of the State Department backlog of employment-based immigrant cases (and the number cases not yet adjudicated at USCIS), it is fair to assume it is quite large by examining a few facts. 1) Approximately 120,000 individuals a year have received new approved H-1B petitions for initial employment in each of the past 6 years, according to the Department of Homeland Security.⁸ 2) It is estimated that half or more of these individuals have been (or will be) sponsored for a green card by their employers. 3) There are no per country limits on H-1B visas and, logically, the bulk of these temporary visas go to nationals from countries with large populations and sound technical educational systems. Many such individuals come to the United States first as international students before being recruiting on campuses after graduation. India has accounted for approximately half of H-1B professionals each year. In FY 2005, approximately 57,000 H-1B petitions were approved for initial employment for professionals from India and about 11,000 for those from China. 4) H-1B petitions do not count spouses or children, which when counted for immigration estimates usually are calculated as 1.2 dependents per principal immigrant.

Adding these factors together, it is not unreasonable to assume **there could be as many as 150,000 to 200,000 Indian nationals in the United States waiting for an employment-based green card**. Nationals from China and Mexico are more likely to be backlogged in the tens of thousands. These figures could be higher for a number of reasons, since individuals could also be in the United States on other visa types (L-1 or J-1) and be sponsored for a green card.

Given that under the current employment-based green card quotas and per country limits as few as 1,275 professionals from India or China may end up receiving a green card in a preference category in a given year (2,803 counting dependents), it's clear that absent significant Congressional action the wait for individuals from particular countries will be extremely long indeed.

UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF PER COUNTRY AND ANNUAL LIMITS

In 1990 the existing system of separate ceilings on “family-based” and “employment-based” immigration was established, with the per country ceiling applicable across both systems.

Currently, the overall annual limitation on family-based immigration is 226,000 and, as noted, 140,000 for employment-based immigration. Each preference is assigned a percentage of the overall total. Within those totals, there is a limit (the per country ceiling) of 7% on immigration by natives of any single foreign state. The per country ceiling is pro-rated among the preferences, so that in each preference under both overall limitations natives of any single foreign state are limited to 7% of the visa numbers available for that preference.

In the 109th Congress the Senate considered and passed **S. 2611**, an omnibus immigration bill that **included large increases in the annual numerical limitations on immigration**, primarily designed to address the significant backlogs on family and employment-based immigration. (In addition, the bill also included provisions expanding classes of employment-based immigrants

exempt from the annual numerical limitations.) S. 2611 never became law, since the House and the Senate never held a conference to reconcile S. 2611 with a House-passed omnibus immigration bill.⁹

S. 2611 has not been reintroduced in the current Congress, but a similar (but not identical) bill, H.R. 1645 (the STRIVE Act), has been introduced in the House and it is expected that there will be further debate and consideration of omnibus immigration legislation before the 110th Congress ends, including consideration of portions of S. 2611.

Currently, the annual overall limitation on employment-based immigration of 140,000 is apportioned among five preference classes. The first three are reserved for needed workers and their spouses and children.

Some argue that even proposed major increases in employment-based immigration will not totally eliminate the current backlogs in the first three employment-based preferences since the per country ceiling will prevent natives of selected foreign states from benefiting from the increases. The foreign states involved are China, India, Mexico and the Philippines. All are countries from which demand for immigration across both limitations exceeds the current per country ceiling.

Under the current system the per country ceiling on the first three employment-based preference is 2,803 per preference, a total of 8,409. Using the State Department's estimate that a worker in those three preferences has an average of 1.2 dependents (spouse & children), roughly 1,275 actual needed workers in each preference from each of the four foreign states concerned become permanent residents, a total of 3,825.

Under S. 2611, the per country ceiling would be increased from 7 percent of the overall limitation to 10 percent. Because of the major increase in the overall employment-based limitation and changes in the apportionment of the limitation among the preferences, the new total for each of the four foreign states would be 6,750 each for the first two preferences and 15,750 for the third preference, a total of 29,250.

More important, under S. 2611, **the spouses and children of employment-based immigrants would be exempt from both the overall employment-based limitation and the per country ceiling.** Thus, the number of actual needed workers from each of the four foreign states will increase from roughly 3,825 to 29,250, approximately a seven-fold increase.

In addition, a separate provision of S. 2611 will exempt some of the needed second and third preference workers themselves from all numerical limitations for a ten-year period.¹⁰ However, the bill also put in place a 650,000 ceiling on all employment-based immigrants, regardless of whether they are exempt from other numerical limitations.¹¹

The STRIVE Act increases the limits on employment-based immigration and includes exemptions from the cap. But it is not clear how extensive some of the exemptions will be used initially, given their specificity. For individuals not exempt from the new annual employment

limit, the STRIVE Act allows the per country limit to rise from 7 percent to 10 percent. Like S. 2611, the STRIVE Act also puts in place a 650,000 ceiling on all employment-based immigrants, regardless of whether they are exempt from other numerical limitations.

BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

Despite the employment-based immigration increases proposed in S. 2611 and the STRIVE Act, it does not appear the backlogs for nationals from certain high volume countries will be eliminated in the near term due to the impact of the per country limits. It also appears that with the new increases in numbers we may have a situation where, for example, a Moroccan computer professional might receive his green card in one year, while an Indian engineer might wait four years. In essence, the Indian would be penalized for having been born in a country with a large population.

Given what we know about the possible extent of the employment-based backlogs and the likely impact of the per country limits in preventing timely elimination of those backlogs, it may be time to consider eliminating the per country limits for employment-based immigrants.

THE CASE FOR MAINTAINING THE CURRENT PER COUNTRY LIMITS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS

One could argue that individuals from some countries should not represent an overwhelming number of the nation's immigrants in a category, in this case, the employment-based category. It could also be argued that if we are going to maintain the per country limits for family immigration, then we should keep them for employment-based immigration as well. Finally, one could state that Congress established per country limits for a reason and may not want to jettison something that has been a part of the law for many years.

THE CASE FOR ELIMINATING PER COUNTRY LIMITS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS

Counterbalancing the tendency of Congress to want to maintain provisions that have existed in law for many years, **there is a compelling case to be made for simply eliminating the per country limits for employment-based immigrants.** First, back in 2000, Congress made the per country limits moot or inoperable in any year when utilizing the per country limits would result in employment-based visas going unused. This was done because in some years, only 90,000 of the 140,000 employment-based limit would be used, while would-be immigrants from India and China were unable to obtain green cards even though 50,000 visa slots would simply go unused.¹²

Second, in addition to a policy of not applying the per country limits when employment-based green cards would go unused, **Congress already permits hiring on H-1B temporary visas to be made without regard to nation of origin.** It is not surprising that nationals of countries with large populations are among the most numerous recipients of U.S. company job offers and H-1B visas. **Since so many H-1B professionals are later sponsored for green cards by employers**

there is a disconnect in U.S. policy between the start of the path to permanent residence (H-1B temporary visas that include no per country limits) and the path's final destination (green card quotas with strict per country limits).

Third, the purpose of the per country limits for family-based limits seem different than those for employment. In the family categories the purpose is to prevent one or a few countries from crowding out individuals from other countries. In the employment-based categories, U.S. employers are hiring based on merit, without regard to race, religion or nationality. In fact, it is a moral and legal hallmark in America that hiring be accomplished without regard to such factors. Ironically, if U.S. companies decided among themselves to offer green cards to only a certain number of Indians or Chinese in a given year, then they would face both public and legal scorn. However, in essence, the U.S. government is mandating such a policy for U.S. companies.

Fourth, there is a practical issue with regards to what is the intent of U.S. policy or new legislation. **If the intent is to eliminate or significantly reduce the employment-based backlog, then that goal may be incompatible with maintaining per country limits for employment-based immigration at 7 percent or even 10 percent.**

POLICY OPTIONS

1) Maintain the Status Quo. Congress could decide to maintain the status quo and not increase employment-based green card quotas, add new exemptions from the quotas, or raise the per country limits. Such a policy will allow current backlogs to worsen and likely lead to more professionals and researchers leaving the United States out of frustration or deciding not to come to America in the first place.

2) Raise Quotas and Add Exemptions But Change Per Country Limits Minimally. This is the approach taken in S. 2611 and the STRIVE Act. It is not clear whether increasing the per country limit from only 7 to 10 percent was made because the two bills' authors thought this would be sufficient to eliminate the backlogs or for other reasons. Analysis shows that raising the per country limit only to 10 percent, despite the other quota increases and exemptions added to the law, may still result in significant wait times for a number of years for engineers and scientists from India and possibly China and other countries. Such a policy would likely have an effect similar to that mentioned above but much less so given the quota increases and exemptions.

3) Clear the Employment-Based Backlog by Declaring Current Registrants Non-Quota. C.D. Scully, a former high ranking State Department official in the Visa Office, notes that a proposal to declare current registrants "non-quota" (to exempt them from numerical limitations on immigration) coupled with more modest increase in the employment-based immigration system might prove less contentious than the increases proposed in S.2611 or even in H.R. 1645 (the current bill). Such a proposal could be limited to registrants physically present in the United States on a specified date, which would likely include almost all backlogged applicants in the first three employment-based preferences, as well as a substantial number of those

backlogged in the family-based preferences.¹³ Whether or not this proves less contentious politically is for elected officials to decide but it is offered here as a policy option.

4) Raise Quotas and Add Exemptions and Eliminate Per Limits for Employment-Based Immigration. If the goal is to come close to making employment-based green card categories current by substantially reducing or doing away with the current employment-based green card backlogs, then eliminating the per country limits for skilled employment-based immigrants is likely the best alternative to achieve that result. As discussed above, Congress already has a partial policy, particularly on H-1B visas, of taking no stand on the country of origin of the skilled foreign nationals hired by U.S. employers. **Eliminating the per country limits would make the policy consistent with H-1B visas and would also establish a policy going forward that is unlikely to result in employees from large countries experiencing longer waits for green cards than individuals from small nations. Making employment-based green card categories current for skilled immigrants could provide important competitive advantages** for U.S. employers battling for talent against foreign competitors.

Innovation Advantage (General)

They Say: “Economy Growing Now”

1NC # ___ — They Say “Economy Growing Now,” but that growth is unsustainable without long-term increases in labor productivity, which requires innovation. That’s Drezner.

Prefer Our Evidence — it cites long term trends that ensure economic decline, not a single moment snapshot.

[Read more evidence only if you have time.]

Even if the economy is doing fine now – it’s not sustainable without increased immigration.

COLVIN ’18 (Geoff; Fortune, “The End is Near for the Economic Boom,” 7/19, <http://fortune.com/longform/economic-expansion-end-is-near/>)ww

THE OPTIMISM IS BEAMING like the summer sun. America’s big-company CEOs are bursting with confidence, in June expecting to take in even more revenue and make bigger investments than they foresaw in March, when they were more confident than ever before in the 15 years the Business Roundtable has been surveying them. CFOs are just as ebullient. Their perception of the North American economy was recently the highest in the eight years Deloitte had been asking about it. Leaders of small businesses also are brimming with optimism—more than at any time in the past 30 years, reports the National Federation of Independent Business. At least figuratively, confetti is flying, disco balls are spinning, and Champagne corks are popping across the length and breadth of American business.

It seems a shame to pull the plug on the dance music, so we won’t, exactly. As of mid-July, forecasters were expecting the announcement of a knockout GDP growth number for the second quarter, and it wouldn’t be surprising if the U.S. economy continued to grow impressively for at least a few quarters more. Unemployment is near historic lows, and better job prospects are drawing more workers back into the labor force. No wonder business leaders are confident.

Yet all these signs of economic strength mask fundamental realities that won’t fade away and mustn’t be ignored. The current economic expansion is much nearer its end than its beginning, as accumulating hints suggest—including the stagnating stock market, about which we’ll say more in a bit. Already the concerns are pushing up long-term interest rates, which is bad for asset values. Uncertainty about the effects of a trade war is causing many companies to postpone action, dampening potential investment. Indeed, look past those disco balls and you’ll see economic warning signs everywhere. A significant slowdown or even recession is coming sooner or later, and it’s probably coming sooner than you think. It always does.

A Seasonal Change is Coming

LET'S START WITH THE OBVIOUS: **Economies follow cycles**. Unlike with seasons or the moon or the ocean tides, the timing of the business cycle is never easy to predict. But at some point, economic activity reaches a temporal peak, then begins to contract until eventually it bottoms out and starts growing once more. **A familiar sign that we're in the waning stage of the growing season**, ironically, **is that the economy overheats**—think of it as an Indian summer: Companies push factories to produce more than their long-term sustainable output, pushing employees to work more overtime. Demand is so strong that inflation starts to increase, leading central bankers to raise interest rates, which causes asset values, including stock prices, to level off or fall. Ray Dalio, CEO of the world's largest hedge fund, Bridgewater Associates, writes, "That is why it is not unusual to see strong economies accompanied by falling stock and other asset prices."

All of that is happening now. The Congressional Budget Office finds that this year, **the economy has begun overheating in just this way, producing more than its sustainable longterm potential**. The CBO predicted in May that as wages rose, more people who had left the labor force would come back to work, and, yes, that's just what happened in June. **The labor market continues to be tight, with workers so confident that they're voluntarily quitting their jobs at the highest rate in 17 years. Meanwhile, employers will likely have to bid up wages in order to attract and keep good workers, hitting corporate earnings directly.**

Inflation and interest rates are rising and will likely continue to do so, forecasts the CBO. With all those factors combining, says Dalio, "We know that we are in the 'late-cycle' part" of the business cycle.

It is somewhat remarkable, historically speaking, that it has taken this long to get here. America's current expansion is 110 months old (including the recovery period after the last recession), which makes it a marvel of longevity—the economic equivalent of a supercentenarian. The current growth run is the second longest in the 164 years for which the National Bureau of Economic Research has done the analysis; the average expansion has run a mere 39 months. The only one that outlasted this one lived to be 120 months old (1991–2001).

Old age isn't by necessity a death knell for an expansion—but then, there is something that tends to accompany it: When things start to break down, they break down en masse. Gerontologists call these tandem and often interlinked pathologies "comorbidities." And in this economy, just under the skin, there seem to be plenty of them.

We Don't Have Enough Workers

ECONOMIC OUTPUT is pretty straightforward in concept: It's a function of labor, capital, and productivity. The simple fact is, it's hard for an economy to grow very fast if the labor force is growing very slowly, as the U.S. labor force is doing. In the 1970s, it increased at a 2.6% annual rate; now the rate is about 0.2%. **One reason for this is that for many decades, Americans**

have been having fewer and fewer babies (the U.S. fertility rate dropped to a new all-time low last year). **As the baby-boom generation continues to age and exit the workforce, the number of American-born workers will sharply decline.** This past October, the Bureau of Labor Statistics projected that over the period of 2016 to 2026, there will be 11.5 million jobs created and a million fewer people in the workforce to fill them.

To counter that demographic drag, American companies have relied on an influx of people from outside the country. Immigrants accounted for 17.1% of the U.S. workforce in 2017, a percentage that has been rising for years. **This critical labor force infusion, in fact, has been “as close to a free lunch as there is for America,”** as Neel Kashkari, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, put it earlier this year in an op-ed for the Wall Street Journal.

What’s less widely understood is that there has actually been a global competition for this supplementary workforce. That’s right: Other developed nations with declining birthrates likewise need new workers to help offset their armies of retirees—and America has been winning this battle, luring not just low-wage workers to fill jobs that native-born Americans aren’t rushing to do but also scientists and entrepreneurs. (Witness the Silicon Valley billboards, bought by the government of America’s northern neighbor, imploring techies with visa troubles to “Pivot to Canada.”) **That’s why President Trump’s immigrant-hostile policy isn’t just a political stance, it’s also an economic one—and one that’s almost sure to limit the ability of U.S. companies to grow.**

So far, America’s immigration crackdown has not significantly reduced net in-migration, but it’s a compounding risk that could have far-reaching consequences for American businesses large and small.

They Say: “Trade Wars Hurt Economy”

1NC # ___ — They Say “Trade Wars Hurt Economy,” but innovation and increased labor pools provide stability. Trade wars are a short term problem — the plan ensures long-term growth. That’s Drezner, Atkinson and Stewart.

[Read more evidence only if you have time.]

Trade disputes aren’t harming the economy

CAIVANO ’18 (Victor; Associated Press, “Mnuchin: Overall US economy not harmed by trade battles,” 7/21, <https://abc6onyourside.com/news/nation-world/mnuchin-overall-us-economy-not-harmed-by-trade-battles>)ww

U.S. Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin said Saturday that **the overall U.S. economy has not been harmed by the trade battles set off by President Donald Trump's get-tough policies** although some individual sectors have been hurt. He said the administration was exploring ways to help farmers and other specific industries that have been affected.

Mnuchin spoke to reporters on the sidelines of meetings of finance ministers and central bank presidents from the Group of 20 nations, composed of traditional economic powers such as the United States, Japan and Germany and emerging economic powers including China, Brazil, India and Argentina.

Mnuchin said that there had not been an adverse effect on overall growth from the tariffs but that **certain industries were being harmed because other countries were retaliating by targeting specific industries.**

"Certain countries have targeted very specific levels of things that are not coincidental," Mnuchin told reporters. "So if you are looking at lobsters in Maine or you are looking at bourbon in Kentucky or you are looking at soybeans, there are clearly markets being followed."

Mnuchin said that the administration would be "looking at different opportunities to help the farmers" and provide assistance to other sectors being "unfairly targeted" by tariffs from other nations.

"**But I still think from a macro basis, we do not see yet any impact on what's a very positive growth" performance for the U.S. economy this year,** Mnuchin said.

At a briefing before the G-20 meetings began, U.S. Treasury officials told reporters that Mnuchin would be prepared to respond to concerns being raised by other countries about the Trump administration's trade policies.

They Say: “Economic Decline Not Cause War”

1NC # ___ — They Say “Economic Decline Doesn’t Cause War,” but growth is essential to solve all of the world’s problems — WMD, climate change, trade, investment, health, conflicts. 2008 was a short-term blip — without innovation, the US won’t have long-term economic growth. That’s Haass.

[Read more evidence only if you have time.]

Economic decline risks nuclear conflict.

Mann 14 — Eric Mann, special agent with a United States federal agency, with significant domestic and international counterintelligence and counter-terrorism experience, former special assistant for a U.S. Senator and served as a presidential appointee for the U.S. Congress, BA from U of South Carolina, MA in Security Studies from Georgetown, 2014 (“Austerity, Economic Decline, and Financial Weapons Of War: A New Paradigm For Global Security,” Graduate Thesis submitted to Johns Hopkins University for MA in Global Security Studies, May, Available Online at <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf>, Accessed 08-08-2018)

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states. The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system. The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the

global financial markets will provide terrorists' organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, **with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America's status.** A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.

They Say: “US Leadership Unnecessary”

1NC # ___ — They Say “US Leadership Unnecessary,” but Ikenbery assumes the maintenance of economic rules and order. They collapse absent the plan. That’s Drezner and Haass.

[Read more evidence only if you have time.]

Economic growth is key to US leadership and preventing conflict.

Lieberthal and O'Hanlon 12 (Kenneth and Michael, Senior Fellows in Foreign Policy @

Brookings, "The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt,"

<http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon>, ENDI)

Lastly, American economic weakness undercuts U.S. leadership abroad. Other countries sense our weakness and wonder about our purported decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future. Allies and friends will doubt our commitment and may pursue nuclear weapons for their own security, for example; adversaries will sense opportunity and be less restrained in throwing around their weight in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become less stable. Major war will become more likely. When running for president last time, Obama eloquently articulated big foreign policy visions: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global climate change, dramatically curbing global poverty through development aid, moving toward a world free of nuclear weapons. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. However, for Obama or his successor, there is now a much more urgent big-picture issue: restoring U.S. economic strength. Nothing else is really possible if that fundamental prerequisite to effective foreign policy is not reestablished.

They Say: “Other Causes of Low Enrollment”

1NC # ___ — They Say “Other Causes of Low Enrollment,” but immigration policy is the primary factor. The plan also solves those other factors — US universities stay great as long as international students can come and stay. That’s Klimaviciute and NFAP.

[Read more evidence only if you have time.]

Uncertain and cumbersome visa policies are the main deterrent for international students’.

Xueying, 15 --- Postdoctoral Scholar of Nanotechnology at UC Santa Barbara (4/1/15, Han, “How to make overseas STEM students stay in the US,” <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/04/how-to-make-overseas-stem-students-stay-in-the-us/>, accessed on 6/25/18, JMP)

Science, technology, engineering and math **(STEM) disciplines in the US have come to heavily rely on international students**, who constitute about a third of all STEM graduate students in the US.

So what makes these individuals stay in the US upon graduation? This has come to be an important question considering that for science and engineering, **40% of US doctorates awarded today are to people from abroad. Understanding why international students may or may not want to leave the US and where they choose to work after they graduate is crucial for future immigration policies.**

As a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for Nanotechnology in Society at the University of California, Santa Barbara, I am part of an interdisciplinary research group headed by Richard Appelbaum that investigated international students’ career choices and found that those interested in becoming entrepreneurs were most inclined to stay after graduation.

US still a magnet for the entrepreneurial

Among multiple factors, the choice of career plays a key role in students deciding to stay or leave the US upon graduation. Our study found **those who wanted to work with business groups, or start their own business, or work for a non-governmental organization had a 90% likelihood of wanting to stay** in the US.

This suggests to us that **the US continues to be viewed as a hub for innovation and research.**

However, for those wanting a career in academia or a governmental agency, the choice is more complicated and depends on a combination of social, professional and personal reasons.

They come but they are going back in higher numbers

Perceived as a global leader in STEM innovation, the US remains the most popular destination in the world for international students.

International students are also more likely to earn a doctorate in a STEM related field than their American counterparts. From 2001 to 2011, 84% of doctorate degrees earned by international students were in STEM compared to only 63% by US citizens and permanent residents.

However, given the importance of STEM research, increasingly many countries have come up with policies and programs to encourage individuals who studied abroad to return to their home countries.

From technological advancements in fully autonomous vehicles to medical breakthroughs in targeted drug delivery, STEM disciplines offer exciting possibilities of research with significant economic and global impact.

A 2011 study focusing only on foreign STEM doctoral recipients in the US has found that the percentage of individuals who stay long-term after graduation has steadily decreased.

At the same time, studies by Brookings, Harvard, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and the Institute of International Education have highlighted that international students are important contributors to the US economy and are integral to the future economic success of the country.

Immigration policies deter many from staying on

Our study also looked at current immigration policies and whether they acted as a possible barrier in retaining the best talent.

An Optional Practical Training (OPT) period allows individuals to stay and work in the US in a job related to their field of study for 12 months following graduation. Qualified STEM degree holders are then eligible to apply for an additional 17-month OPT extension. But to stay past their OPT period, international students must find a business willing to sponsor them for an H-1B visa.

Respondents in our study were forthright on how frustrating they found the H-1B visa process.

Students say visa issues are a major deterrent

For instance, a graduate student in electrical and computer engineering said:

“The H-1B visa makes you get a sponsor for five years or so and you are bound to that employer and that is not very attractive. If the US wants to retain talent, people need freedom to pursue what they want to research.”

Another graduate student in mechanical engineering voiced a similar sentiment:

“The fact that you don’t have a green card at the end of your PhD – it’s a nightmare. For international students, not having a green card – it impacts the job search...everything.”

For policymakers in the US, such a large pool of STEM students raises crucial questions about the direction of future policies. Do we want to retain international STEM graduates? And if so, how do we go about easing immigration policies restrictions so as to encourage those most likely to contribute to the American economy?

Green Cards are essential to attract and retain international students.

HAN et al '15 (Xueying; Center for Nanotechnology in Society – University of California-Santa Barbara, “Will They Stay or Will They Go? International Graduate Students and Their Decisions to Stay or Leave the U.S. upon Graduation,” 3/11, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0118183>)ww

The predominant method for foreign citizens to remain and work in the U.S. currently is through the H-1B visa program, in which foreign workers are sponsored by U.S. businesses. The H-1B visa has been widely criticized for having high rejection rates, low caps, and contributing to the large exodus of highly skilled immigrant workers leaving the U.S. [5]. For the H-1B fiscal year (FY) 2015 “cap season,” which began on April 1, 2014, a regular cap of 65,000 H-1B visas, and an exemption of 20,000 H-1B visas for individuals who have obtained a U.S. master’s degree or higher, were mandated [39]. For the FY 2014 cap season, the H-1B visas were capped at 65,000 visas total, with no exemptions for higher degree recipients. The FY 2014 cap filled within the first week of the filing period. During this time, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services office received approximately 124,000 H-1B petitions [39].

Students recognize the limitations imposed by these policies. “The H-1 visa makes you get a sponsor for 5 years or so and you are bound to that employer and that is not very attractive. If the U.S. wants to retain talent, people need freedom to pursue what they want to research,” stated an Electrical and Computer Engineering graduate student. A Mechanical Engineering graduate student from a country with poor relations with the U.S. stated the frustration felt by many international students: “The fact that you don’t have a green card at the end of your PhD—it’s a nightmare. For international students, not having a green card, it impacts the job search, everything. The U.S. is welcoming to graduate students to come and study but there doesn’t seem to be a plan for after students graduate. Students settle for jobs that are below them because they work for companies that will provide them with a green card.”

Studies have shown that foreign scientists and entrepreneurs play an important role in the U.S. economy because they not only help create new businesses and jobs, but are also a key source of American innovation: foreign-born scientists and engineers contribute to more than half of the international patents filed by U.S. based multinational corporations (for a review, see [5]). Our study suggests that changes in the current U.S. immigration policy regarding PhD

graduates in STEM fields are needed if the U.S. wants to retain the talent that it has helped create. American policymakers are aware of the importance in retaining foreign scientists who have been trained in the U.S. Most recently, U.S. lawmakers proposed legislation known as the 'Stopping Trained in America PhDs from Leaving the Economy Act of 2011' (i.e., STAPLE Act) to exempt PhD STEM degree holders who graduated from a U.S. institution of higher education from the numerical limitations of the H-1B visa and to be admitted for permanent residence (i.e., green card) went before Congress in January 2011 [40]. The act did not pass the 112th Congress (2011–2012) and was reintroduced on March 2013 to the 113th Congress (2013–2014) [41]. The bill, if passed, would exempt foreign-born individuals who have a U.S. STEM PhD diploma from the H-1B numerical limitations. The potential economic impact that foreign-born, U.S. trained scientists can have on a country has been recognized by many source countries (Table 1). These countries have created incentive programs in the hopes of luring highly skilled students who have been educated abroad back to their home countries. The effectiveness of these programs, however, is unclear.

America is leading now, but changes to immigration are necessary to prevent decline.

HAN et al '15 (Xueying; Center for Nanotechnology in Society – University of California-Santa Barbara, "Will They Stay or Will They Go? International Graduate Students and Their Decisions to Stay or Leave the U.S. upon Graduation," 3/11, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0118183>)ww

Overall, our survey and interviews suggest that **the American university system is still viewed as a world-class destination for international students** to train and gain experience in graduate level science and engineering. As a result, the American university system continues to attract some of the world's top technical talent, thus remaining a beneficiary of the high level of skills and unique perspective offered by the world's top international students. While our study was performed at a single institution, we received a clear impression that the international graduate student population is composed of a highly motivated and talented group of individuals that are adding substantial value to the university environment, both through providing the local academic community with valuable direct connections to international professional networks as well as bringing different viewpoints to bear on complex problems.

We conclude that a major reason the U.S. academic system remains at the forefront of the world's scientific communities is because the U.S. system remains so inclusive to the diverse, talented international students who are seeking to pursue educational opportunities outside of their home countries. The United States was home to 28% of all globally mobile students in 2001 and 19% of all globally mobile students in 2012 [48]. **The decline in percent share of globally mobile students coming to the U.S. is likely due to** multitude of reasons not limited to increased effort put into recruiting foreign students by key competitive nations, **immigration-friendly visa policies** by other countries, and **hesitancy of applying to U.S. institutions due to**

changing **governmental regulations** [49, 50]. Despite the decrease in the global share of international students, the U.S. remains the number one destination for students [48]. We therefore find it important to conclude by noting that our interviews brought up two recurring themes that may have direct relevance to the continued excellence of the U.S. university system:

Many **students expressed concern about** ways in which **the complex nature of America's immigration policies** hinders their ability to succeed. In particular, **uncertainties about obtaining green cards** following graduation **were** listed as **a deterrent for choosing to study in the U.S.** and attempting to stay following graduation.

Many students also noted that the U.S. is no longer an automatic choice for obtaining the best PhD education in science and engineering. In particular, **Europe was listed as becoming increasingly competitive choice** for many students and their undergraduate colleagues. **One cause** of this **is the EU's relaxed immigration policies**, under which students from EU Member States have the opportunity to study at institutions in other EU countries. With cost and proximity so important to students from Asia, why go all the way the U.S.?

Both of these themes show that **policy makers can no longer safely assume that the U.S. university system will attract the world's top talent** simply by the virtue of being the world's most highly desired academic destination. If the U.S. wishes to continue to both attract and keep the world's best young scientific minds, **policy makers must make changes to the current immigration policies regarding advanced degree STEM holders**. Universities in other countries are seen as increasing in scientific competitiveness, and as a result the U.S. may lose out to other regions in attracting scientists in the global talent pool. This, in turn, could compromise America's leading position in research and innovation.

US leading now, but it's in jeopardy.

HAN et al '15 (Xueying; Center for Nanotechnology in Society – University of California-Santa Barbara, "Will They Stay or Will They Go? International Graduate Students and Their Decisions to Stay or Leave the U.S. upon Graduation," 3/11, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0118183>)ww

In the American context, **many of the most innovative scientists and engineers migrated to the United States to pursue an education** [3, 11]. In fact, approximately 40% of science and engineering post-graduate students in the United States are foreign-born, **yet this rate is dropping as** the combination of **stricter immigration laws** and the maturation of university systems abroad **have lured students elsewhere** [3, 21]. The largest source country is China, while the United States is the most popular destination country [11].

They Say: “Brain Circulation Solves”

1NC # ___ — They Say “Brain Circulation Solves,” but that assumes that the students come to the US in the first place. Absent changes in immigration policies, international students will attend college elsewhere — the US will get no benefit from those students. That’s Saul and Klimaviciute.

[Read more evidence only if you have time.]

The benefits from returnees don’t offset the direct loss of talent.

HAN et al ’15 (Xueying; Center for Nanotechnology in Society – University of California-Santa Barbara, “Will They Stay or Will They Go? International Graduate Students and Their Decisions to Stay or Leave the U.S. upon Graduation,” 3/11, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0118183>)ww

Today, with the rise of China, India, and other emerging economies, **there is growing concern in policy circles that the U.S. may be losing its competitive edge** [51–57]. Our research strongly suggests that **the U.S. is losing out in terms of retaining talented foreign students**, in large part **because U.S. immigration policies make it difficult for the best and the brightest to remain after graduating**, even though the large majority would prefer to do so. **While some returnees may retain their ties with former U.S. professors** and colleagues, **it is a matter of debate whether this offsets the direct loss of talent through repatriation**. We argue that **by reworking immigration policies** and thereby making the environment more appealing for the most talented international students to stay for the early portion of their careers, **the U.S. would benefit greatly**.

Returning students undermine US innovation.

HAN et al ’15 (Xueying; Center for Nanotechnology in Society – University of California-Santa Barbara, “Will They Stay or Will They Go? International Graduate Students and Their Decisions to Stay or Leave the U.S. upon Graduation,” 3/11, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0118183>)ww

Yet this concern obscures many of the global educational and regulatory trends that are re-shaping innovation in high-tech industries like nanotechnology. Approximately one third of science and engineering post-graduate students in the United States are foreign-born, with particular concentrations in computer science and physics [2]. These numbers dropped precipitously after 9/11, as American immigration policy shifted to be more restrictive and other countries improved their university systems [3], although this trend seems to have leveled off since 2010 [2]. Moreover, **upon graduation, many students are drawn back to their birth countries**, which seek to offset ‘brain drain’ problems through encouraging expats—

particularly those in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) fields—to return. **A decline in the number of foreign-born students, scientists and engineers can hamper the United States' innovation capacity** [4, 5].

Internal Brain Drain Turn Answers

They Say: “Internal Brain Drain Turn”

1NC # ___ — They Say “Internal Brain Drain,” but data is on our side — every 10% increase in international students results in a 6.8% increase in patents that are essential for innovation. That’s Klimaviciute.

And, the US simply doesn’t have enough students on its own. That’s Anderson.

Native enrollment decline inevitable — international students key to university funding.

HEGARTY ’14 (Niall; Assistant Professor in the department of Management at the Tobin College of Business at St. John's University, “Where We Are Now –The Presence and Importance of International Students to Universities in the United States,” Journal of International Students, v. 4, i. 3, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054975.pdf>)ww

The number of international students present at a university makes a significant contribution to the “personality” of that institution, and also **to its financial well-being**. **With the majority of international students paying full tuition** the importance of their presence in American academic life **cannot be underscored**. The Student Exchange and Visitor Program (SEVP) which falls under Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) reports that the University of Southern California has 9,329; Purdue University has 8,863, and the University of Illinois has 8,320 international students enrolled. These are the three universities with the highest enrollment of foreign students. International students make up approximately one-eighth of Purdue’s total university population and anywhere from 50% to 60% are enrolled in masters or doctoral programs. While the majority of students study engineering, management, and life sciences at Purdue, it also boasts the highest enrollment of any U.S. college of international students studying visual and performing arts (Schoettle, 2008). What sets Purdue apart is its commitment to aggressively recruit and retain international students by spending many thousands of dollars to cater to their needs. Obviously, from the figures of each of the top enrolled universities it becomes clear that the vast majority of international students must be located in smaller and mid-sized universities. Indeed only 144 colleges can boast international student populations of 1,000 or more. Consequently, what these enrollment numbers emphasize is the relevance of this body of full tuition paying students.

The presence of such a large contingent of full tuition paying students has not gone unnoticed - The Institute of International Education reports that **almost 62% of institutions have increased recruitment efforts to ensure international student enrollment remains healthy** with 31% of institutions specifically focusing their efforts on China. For its part, China provides approximately 244,359 international students to the U.S., which can be seen in Table 1, and Asia in general enrolls over 437,000 students in the U.S. To this end, SUNY, for example, has

initiated a five year plan to increase enrollment by 14,000 international students (Lederman, 2011). This phenomenon of U.S. universities strategizing and actively seeking out new international students has been repeated all over the country. **Although many universities will tout the benefits of international students and the diversity they bring to campuses, there exists the underlying fact that in the future there will be a decline, demographically, in the number of U.S. domestic students** (Heckman & LaFontaine, 2010). **Universities are therefore seeking to offset this decline by exploring new geographic regions internationally to maintain enrollment and the inflow of tuition dollars.**

No tradeoff — Immigrants increase the quality of STEM programs — more domestic students join.

ORRENIUS and ZAVODNY '13 (Pia M.; Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas AND Madeline; Agnes Scott College, “Does Immigration Affect whether U.S. Natives Major in a STEM Field?” January, http://conference.iza.org/conference_files/AMM_2013/zavodny_m2692.pdf)

Alternatively, **immigrant inflows may boost the likelihood that natives major in a STEM field. Immigrant inflows, particularly of highly skilled immigrants, may put pressure on schools to increase educational resources in math and science.** Immigrants and their children may have positive peer effects on other natives. **Larger inflows of foreign students who study STEM fields may cause universities to increase the size or quality of their STEM programs, resulting in more natives majoring in those fields.**

Extend: “No Tradeoff”

No tradeoff — international students create funding for better STEM programs.

HEGARTY ’14 (Niall; Assistant Professor in the department of Management at the Tobin College of Business at St. John's University, “Where We Are Now –The Presence and Importance of International Students to Universities in the United States,” Journal of International Students, v. 4, i. 3, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054975.pdf>)ww

Since the 1970’s **doctoral programs have actually grown to accommodate the demand from international students. This is contrary to the belief that domestic students have lost places to international students.** Research by **Matloff** (2013) **indicates that international students in Ph.D. programs in technology do not outperform domestic students** in terms of dissertation awards and patent applications. **This brings attention to the fact that international students come to the U.S. to study with the best domestic minds rather than to replace domestic students in graduate programs. Consequently, it is because of the quality of domestic students that international students are attracted to U.S. universities. The addition of bright international students in advanced study both enhances a program and provides much needed funding.** **The vast majority of international students pay full tuition** and cannot gain entry into the country without proof of financial support for the duration of their studies. **Once a student is admitted this is a guaranteed revenue stream for a university** for at least two years; four years in the case of an undergraduate student.

Foreign students offset declines in education funding. Absent their presence, universities would be forced to raise tuition or decrease per student spending.

BOUND et al ’16 (John; Professor of Economics – University of Michigan, Research Professor – Population Studies Center, Faculty Associate – Survey Research Center, “A Passage to America: University Funding and International Students,” March, <https://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/pdf/rr16-859.pdf>)ww

The dramatic increase in foreign undergraduates at U.S. public research universities is closely coupled with institutional adjustments to changes in state appropriations. Overall, increases in foreign enrollment over the last decade are much larger in the public university sector than in other parts of the higher education market. The theoretical framework and evidence presented in this analysis suggests that **expanding foreign enrollment at the undergraduate level is an important channel through which public universities buffer changes in state appropriations.**

While we are not able to do a full welfare analysis, our results suggest that **while added foreign students do not fully offset the adverse consequences of declines in state appropriations they nonetheless do offset some of the losses from declines in state appropriations.** In turn,

additional foreign undergraduate students are, on average, associated with some decline in in-state enrollment.

The capacity of public universities to use this margin of adjustment depends critically on a supply of well-qualified potential undergraduates from abroad with the capacity to pay the tuition charged by U.S. universities. While this supply has been plentiful in the last decade, owing primarily to demographic and economic changes in countries like India and China, this reservoir of talent and resources did not emerge in full force until the millennium. What is more, the supply of such students to U.S. universities is not likely to remain constant in future decades. Growth in home-country institutions of close quality or negative shocks to home-country economies would likely drain this pool of students from abroad.

What also seems clear is that not all universities are in an equally good position to attract foreign students. In general, our results are consistent with the notion that more research-intensive universities have been better positioned to counter the impact of state budget cuts through increasing foreign undergraduate enrollment.

Beyond changes in the composition of undergraduate enrollment, changes in state appropriations are also associated with increase in in-state tuition levels. While added revenue from in-state tuition increases appears to count for the majority of additional tuition revenue generated between 2007 and 2012, research universities would have had to navigate reductions in resources per student or yet larger increases in in-state tuition in the absence of the large pool of foreign students.

International students are essential to program survival.

HEGARTY '14 (Niall; Assistant Professor in the department of Management at the Tobin College of Business at St. John's University, "Where We Are Now –The Presence and Importance of International Students to Universities in the United States," Journal of International Students, v. 4, i. 3, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054975.pdf>)ww

An area of study neglected for many years, it is now clear that **such a huge economic ingredient to both the U.S. economy and collegiate life needs immediate attention to ensure continued survival of educational programs, the continued international recognition of the U.S. university system, and a positive experience for those willing to choose U.S. universities. University administrators must recognize that international students do and will deliver large portions of tuition revenue and as such their needs must be addressed by colleges and universities. Failure to recognize or plan without this student population in mind may lead to diminished funding for colleges and program failures in certain academic disciplines.**

Immigration Good for Innovation

Any negative effect is small and optimizes innovation.

ORRENIUS and ZAVODNY '13 (Pia M.; Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas AND Madeline; Agnes Scott College, "Does Immigration Affect whether U.S. Natives Major in a STEM Field?" January, http://conference.iza.org/conference_files/AMM_2013/zavodny_m2692.pdf)ww

This study examined whether higher immigration reduces the probability that natives who graduated from college did so with a STEM major. **The results suggest that non-Hispanic whites are less likely to major in a STEM field the higher the immigrant share in their age cohort and in the labor force, although the estimated effects are small.** This negative result is driven by data from the year 2000, the culmination of a period of strong economic growth, changes in immigration policy, and an Internet boom that led to a surge in inflows of highly skilled immigrants. Higher immigrant shares also appear to discourage Asian women from STEM majors, but they are positively related to the probability that Hispanics major in a STEM field. The immigrant share of college students appears to have the most adverse effect on whether natives major in STEM, suggesting that foreign students crowd out some natives from STEM majors.

Although the results suggest that immigration makes some natives less willing to major in STEM disciplines, there are several caveats to this finding. First, we condition on being a college graduate. The fraction of the population that graduates from college has increased over time, and the selectivity of this pool may have changed. Immigration may affect whether or where natives choose to go to college and whether they ultimately graduate from college.

Immigration may raise the bar in STEM fields, increase the selectivity of natives into STEM majors, and ultimately have a positive effect on innovation.

Alternatively, if immigration drives down earnings in STEM fields, immigration may reduce selectivity into STEM majors; Lowell et al. (2009) and Bettinger (2010) note a trend of top U.S. students moving from STEM majors to other fields, notably accounting and finance, which pay more. Looking at whether immigration affects selectivity into STEM majors is an important area for future research. Finally, we do not examine whether immigration affects the career choices of STEM majors. Immigration may affect not only whether students choose to major in a STEM field but whether they pursue graduate studies and ultimately a career in STEM.

Even if immigration discourages natives from choosing STEM majors, we caution against

drawing policy implications. If foreign students are on average better at STEM fields and therefore more likely to major in those fields, this frees up natives to pursue other careers. To the extent that people choose a profession in accordance with their comparative advantage, the resultant distribution of majors by nativity is optimal.

Exceptions to this outcome might be situations where U.S. citizenship is a condition for STEM employment, such as in the defense industry and at national security agencies.

Foreign Students drive innovation.

HEGARTY '14 (Niall; Assistant Professor in the department of Management at the Tobin College of Business at St. John's University, "Where We Are Now –The Presence and Importance of International Students to Universities in the United States," Journal of International Students, v. 4, i. 3, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054975.pdf>)

Academically, international students are a vital component of research universities. Indeed they are considered to be highly important to U.S. innovation. According to Chellaraj et al., (2008) **a 10% increase in international graduate students correlates to a 4.5% increase in patent applications.** **With the United States secondary educational system considered by to be losing ground on the rest of the world the question then bodes how can its research and development still be competitive.** Obviously, if **international students** are **choosing to enroll in research universities** such as USC and Purdue then it becomes evident that international students **are picking up the mantle of innovation in the U.S. and are essential to these universities' research functions.**

Immigration Good for Economy

Foreign students boost local economies.

HEGARTY '14 (Niall; Assistant Professor in the department of Management at the Tobin College of Business at St. John's University, "Where We Are Now –The Presence and Importance of International Students to Universities in the United States," Journal of International Students, v. 4, i. 3, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054975.pdf>)

Thus far this paper has focused on the numbers of international students present in U.S. universities and their importance to university life. However, **the effect of international students studying in the U.S. can be felt beyond campus boundaries. The monetary strength of this population has forced not only universities but also local economies to become very sensitive to their presence.**

Injecting almost \$22 billion dollars into the U.S. economy each year international students are a vital source of revenue. From tuition and fees, to food, clothing, travel, and textbooks **almost every other industry within the U.S. benefits from their presence.** **The value of international students to the U.S. surpasses the gaming industry (\$18 billion), weight loss industry (\$20 billion), and the domestic music and movie industries combined (\$20 billion).** The state of Massachusetts alone with a dense number of colleges enjoys almost \$1.5 billion each year from educating and hosting these students (Schworm, 2008). In larger urban areas such as New York and California that figure rises to \$2.5 billion and \$3.2 billion respectively (Table 2).

Even non-traditional destinations such as the state of West Virginia earns close to \$60 million each year according to NAFSA. And with Toyota and other Japanese companies committed to the area, WVU has committed to making the university welcoming to international students (Slagle, 2006). However, it seems that the vast majority of universities and colleges are realizing that they can no longer rely solely on their web page and word of mouth in the recruitment of international students. Clearly, the U.S. marketing machine needs to concentrate more on attracting students in this lucrative market.

Espionage Turn Answers

They Say: “Espionage Turn”

1NC # ___ — They Say “China Espionage Turn,” but the benefits outweigh — without international students, the US doesn’t have the tech innovation at all. That’s Anderson.

Immigration not key — China has other means of espionage.

NEWMAN ’11 (Alex; Freelance Journalist, The Diplomat, “China's Growing Spy Threat,” 9/19, <https://thediplomat.com/2011/09/chinas-growing-spy-threat/?allpages=yes>)ww

And because the threat is continually evolving and comes from multiple directions, it’s difficult to deal with, experts say. China uses all known means of stealing information even as it develops ever more ingenious schemes.

Traditional methods, such as infiltrating companies and compromising existing employees, are still widely used. Academic and educational institutions play a crucial role as well—as do the regime’s ‘front companies’ set up in the United States, estimated to number in the thousands by the FBI. Foreign companies with operations in China are said to be particularly vulnerable to losing their secrets.

Meanwhile, more advanced tools like computer hacking are becoming an increasingly important weapon in the regime’s economic-spying arsenal. ‘Their cyber activities have increased in the last ten years quite significantly,’ says Juneau-Katsuya. ‘They are devoting university departments and entire sections of the (People’s Liberation Army) just to that.’

Another key but underestimated strategy employed in China’s quest for trade secrets—corporate acquisitions and joint ventures—makes use of the regime’s vast empire of well-funded, state-owned companies. By purchasing even a significant percentage of a firm, China often obtains important technological know-how. It also buys political influence.

‘China continues to leverage foreign investments, commercial joint ventures, academic exchanges, the experience of repatriated Chinese students and researchers, and state-sponsored industrial/technical espionage to increase the level of technologies and expertise available to support military research, development, and acquisition,’ notes a 2011 US Defense Department report to Congress on Chinese military and security developments.

Especially following the recent recession, the Chinese regime has been on a global shopping spree using its vast cash reserves—buying up all sorts of companies, from car manufacturers to technology enterprises. But countless examples of the use of this tactic have been documented for well over a decade.

Even more alarming for some: A secret 1997 investigation by CSIS and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police entitled ‘Sidewinder’ found that criminal networks affiliated with Chinese

intelligence were also intimately involved. The Canadian government essentially dismissed the report, but many analysts believe the collaboration has only grown since then.

In general, firms and universities are simply not doing enough to protect their secrets and technology from China, says Center for Intelligence Studies Chairman Charles Viar. ‘That said, the larger problem involves contractual agreements in which Western companies voluntarily transfer sensitive technologies—often illegally—in order to win contracts with China,’ he points out.

Fisher has similar concerns. He says firms and educational institutions around the world are not simply targets—in many cases they have become ‘compliant victims’ of Chinese intelligence agencies’ designs.

‘Companies and universities must first reach an understanding of how they are aiding and abetting the Chinese Communist dictatorship,’ says Fisher, noting that as long as they crave Chinese money, they will continue bending over backwards to satisfy the regime. ‘This scandal is compounded by the fact that Chinese allies in the capitals of most democracies are succeeding in avoiding or averting the level of critical review that would also lead to defensive action.’

Current safeguards solve.

SWANSON and BRADSHER ’18 (Ana and Keith; New York Times, “White House Considers Restricting Chinese Researchers Over Espionage Fears,” 4/30, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/30/us/politics/trump-china-researchers-espionage.html>)ww

The United States already restricts who can work on sensitive technology. Researchers on projects deemed classified are carefully vetted and must obtain security clearances. The next level down are research projects that are subject to so-called export controls — including many with potential military applications, such as computer programs and hardware that might be used to model nuclear explosions. Universities and companies working on this material need to obtain a special license from the government to employ foreign researchers.

These products do not need to leave the United States to fall under export rules. All it takes to trigger export controls is for citizens from certain countries — including China, Russia and many former Soviet republics — to be involved in almost any way. That ranges from physical possession of the product to written descriptions and even verbal discussions of it. The administration is considering broadening the range of goods and services traded with China that would be subject to these so-called deemed export rules.

This turn is racist — it relies on stereotypes of Chinese students as underhanded or sneaky.

Restricting talent makes the problem worse.

SWANSON and BRADSHER '18 (Ana and Keith; New York Times, “White House Considers Restricting Chinese Researchers Over Espionage Fears,” 4/30, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/30/us/politics/trump-china-researchers-espionage.html>)

Yet the academic community is likely to push back on the administration’s efforts over concerns that **tighter controls on Chinese nationals could hurt American universities’ ability to collaborate on cutting-edge research and wind up benefiting China even more.**

Many students at graduate programs in the United States in computer science, physics, chemistry and other sciences are from China. If the United States makes it harder for aerospace manufacturers, defense contractors and others to employ Chinese nationals, more of these recently trained Chinese graduate students may return to China, taking their skills with them.

Stephen A. Orlins, the president of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, said that **restricting Chinese researchers would be “tragic” for American universities.** “It’s important that we don’t let the security fears overwhelm what has made America great,” he said.

Even Mr. Smith said he did not support tougher restrictions on Chinese researchers. Instead, he said, universities should better educate researchers about existing rules and what to do in case of intellectual property theft.

“With reasonable safeguards I think we can manage it,” he said. **“If we were to overreact, I think it could be very damaging to our universities.”**

Extend: “Turn is Racist”

Chinese espionage arguments rely on racist stereotypes.

CHOW '18 (Tobita; Global Justice Organizer at The People’s Lobby, “With Anti-China Protectionism, the Left Is Aiding Trump’s Xenophobic Agenda,” 7/15, <https://truthout.org/articles/with-anti-china-protectionism-the-left-is-aiding-trumps-xenophobic-agenda/>)ww

These **political efforts to hedge against China are fueling anti-Chinese racism** within the United States. **The tenor of this racism**, and its grip in mainstream politics, **is expressed** well **by** Christian **Caryl**, an opinions editor at The Washington Post, **who warns that China has a “strategy to tap the huge ethnic Chinese diaspora in the United States and elsewhere as foot soldiers in China’s influence campaigns.” This image** of an entire “ethnic diaspora” as a potential fifth column within US society **recalls the internment of Japanese-Americans in WWII**.

This racist stereotype is reflected in recent policies and the statements of political leaders. According to a white paper published by the Committee of 100, there is evidence that the FBI engages in racial profiling against people of Chinese and other Asian descent in economic espionage cases. In two high-profile cases, naturalized Chinese-American citizens, Sherry Chen and Xiaoxing Xi, were falsely accused of being Chinese spies stealing intellectual property from the United States. In both cases, the charges were later dropped. Chen’s charges were dropped without explanation, while in Xi’s case the investigators admitted that they had simply misunderstood the technology that Xi works with. In February, Trump’s FBI Director Chris Wray confirmed this institutionalized racism when he declared in a hearing that “the Chinese threat” is “not just a whole of government threat, but a whole-of-society threat.”

More recently, **the Trump administration announced new restrictions on visas for people from China, including on international students** studying in some fields of science and technology. This is also meant to be a measure to counter “economic espionage” and the theft of intellectual property. **This policy** again **assumes everyone from China to be a potential threat** to the US economy and national security. Senator Marco Rubio welcomed this new policy, tweeting, “Imposing limits on some Chinese visas may seem harsh, but it’s necessary. #China poses unprecedented threat. Student & academic visas are another weapon they use against us in their campaign to steal & cheat their way to world dominance.” These visa restrictions have been criticized by university lobby groups, because tuition from Chinese international students has become a financial lifeline for many US universities in the face of reduced public funding for higher education. The restrictions, however, have been largely overlooked by the progressive movement—and the lack of resistance is an open invitation to escalation against this population.

These trends must be examined in light of long-standing racist stereotypes about Chinese people and other Asians. In the United States and much of the Western world, Asians are seen

as sources of pure labor power—maximally efficient workers in whom all human capacities that are useful for work (obedience, efficiency, self-discipline, self-denial, studiousness) are overdeveloped, while all other aspects of humanity that do not directly contribute to work (family life, play, creativity, emotion, friendship, autonomy) are degraded, underdeveloped or non-existent. This framework portrays Asians as a step removed from robots. This is especially true of East Asians, who are at the center of the ambiguous and inconsistent category of “Asian” in the US racial imagination.

These racist ideas show up throughout these anti-Chinese trends in both domestic and foreign policy. The racist image of Chinese people as a source of pure economic efficiency makes it easy to see them as little more than a competitive threat to other workers. **The racist assumption that Chinese people lack** capacities for **autonomy** or creativity **makes it easy to see them as** little more than **appendages of the Chinese government**. As we see in the quotes above, it is common to make Chinese people invisible as individuals, and to imagine them instead as parts of a faceless mass called “China.”