
West Coast Publishing

Immigration 2018 Negative

Edited by Jim Hanson

Researchers

Angie Tinker, Duncan Stewart, Eric Robinson, Jonathan Shane,
Kinny Torre, Matt Gomez, Matt Stannard, Shelby Pryor, William James Taylor

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone
outside of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.
We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.

Contact us at jim@wcdebate.com

www.wcdebate.com

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.

NEGATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO

IMMIGRATION 2018-2019 WEST COAST NEGATIVE

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.

Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible. You'll find scenario/impacts, affirmatives, disadvantages, counterplans, and kritiks listed alphabetically in their categories.

Using the Arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH. Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files--build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

Copying and Sharing West Coast Evidence?

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- **You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.**

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com and seek our consent.

Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at www.wcdebate.com
2. E-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2018. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

Visit our web page!
www.wcdebate.com

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States. 2

NEGATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 4

Debating on the Negative 15

Definitions..... 19

Restrictions 20

Legal Immigration 21

Immigration..... 23

Topicality Arguments 24

T-Substantial Means 90%..... 25

T-Restrict (Eligibility Affs)..... 26

T-Immigration (Authorization)..... 27

T-Immigration (Courts/Executive Affs) 28

T-Immigration (Temporary) 29

T-Immigration (Refugees) 30

Neg vs DACA Dreamers Case 31

Dreamers won't be deported 32

Dreamers won't take scholarships..... 36

DREAM hurts the economy..... 37

No labor shortage 40

DREAM Act is bad for military..... 41

Military readiness is not a problem 44

Chain Migration DA..... 48

Chain Migration Extension..... 52

Comprehensive DA 55

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Politics Link..... 57

Imperialism K 59

Nationalism K 62

Neoliberalism K 64

Executive Order CP 65

States CP 66

Neg vs H1B Visas Case..... 68

Abolish H1B Visa System CP..... 69

Abolish H1B Visa System CP – 1NC 70

Abolish H1B Visa System CP – Extension/Solvency 71

Answers to Advantages..... 72

A2: Economy Adv. – Not increase jobs 73

A2: Economy Adv. – Not increase jobs 75

A2: Economy Adv. – Not key to trade / competitiveness 76

A2: Economy Adv. – Military / Hegemony Turns 77

A2: Science Advantage 78

A2: Science Advantage 79

Solvency Answers..... 80

No Solvency – Trump’s immigration policies / racism deter 81

Outsourcing Turns..... 82

Outsourcing Turns..... 83

Outsourcing Turns..... 85

Outsourcing Turns..... 87

Outsourcing Turns..... 89

Brain Drain Turn 90

Brain Drain Turns 91

Kritik of H1B Visas 92

Kritik of H1B Visas – 1NC..... 93

Kritik of H1B Visas – 1NC..... 94

Kritik of H1B Visas – Link Extension 95

Kritik of H1B Visas – Link Extension 96

Kritik of H1B Visas – Alternative Extension..... 97

Neg vs Open Borders Case 98

Effects Topicality 99

Nativism Disadvantage..... 100

Nativism Links 101

Nativism Impacts..... 102

Nativism Impacts..... 103

General Case Negative 104

General Case Negative 105

General Case Negative 106

General Case Negative..... 107

Answers to Human Rights 108

Answers to Human Rights 109

Answers to Ethics 110

Answers to Ethics 111

Population Disadvantage 112

Population Disadvantage 113

Population Uniqueness 114

Immigration Increases Terrorism..... 115

Terrorism Impacts..... 116

Neg Refugees 117

T-Immigration 118

AT: Structural Adv 121

AT: Human Rights Cred Adv 124

Terrorism DA 126

Terrorism DA 1NC 127

Terrorism DA 2NC – Links 129

Terrorism DA 2NC – AT: Risk Small	133
Terrorism DA 2NC – AT: No Terrorism Impact.....	134
Aid CP	137
Aid CP 1NC	138
Aid CP Net Benefit – Brain Drain 1NC	140
Aid CP Net Benefit – Brain Drain 2NC	141
Aid CP Solvency – Brain Drain	142
Aid CP Solvency – Refugee Flows.....	143
Aid CP Solvency – Follow On.....	145
Politics	146
Neg vs Wet Foot Dry Foot Case	147
Kritiks	148
China Reps K.....	149
Disadvantages	152
Cuban Relations DA.....	153
Case Neg.....	156
Human Rights.....	157
Hegemony.....	159
Solvency	165
Turns	167
Humanitarian Aid CP	169
CP Solvency	170
Disad Alt Right Xenophobia DA.....	171
1NC.....	172
Uniqueness.....	174
Leadership Crisis	175
Infighting	176
Charlottesville	177
Antifa.....	179

Links	180
Refugees.....	181
DACA	183
General.....	185
Impact	188
Domestic Terrorism	189
Racism	192
Overton Window.....	195
Mental Health	198
International Modeling	199
Disad Brain Drain DA.....	200
Explanation	201
Brain Drain 1NC.....	202
Africa Module.....	207
India Module	213
Russia Module.....	219
2NC Extensions.....	223
Brain drain is checked now	224
Africa Extensions.....	226
India Extensions	230
Generic Brain Drain Bad.....	233
Policy and Restrictions Key	237
AT Remittances	240
Disad Economy DA	243
Disad Overview	244
1NC Shell	245
1NC—Uniqueness	246
1NC—Link.....	247
1NC—Brink.....	248

1NC—Internal Link	250
1NC—Impact	252
UNIQUENESS	253
UQ – US Econ High Now	254
UQ – US Econ High Now	255
UQ – US Econ High Now	256
UQ – Wages Increasing Now	257
UQ – Wages Increasing Now	258
UQ – Unemployment Low Now	259
UQ – Unemployment Low Now	260
UQ – Consumer Confidence High Now	261
UQ – Consumer Confidence High Now	262
Hegemony Good—UQ—High Now	263
Hegemony Good—UQ—High Now	264
A/T China Econ	265
A/T H-1B Workers Now	266
A/T Wages Low Now	267
LINKS	268
H1-B Link – H1-B Visas Depress Wages	269
H1-B Link – H1-B Visas Depress Wages	270
H-1B Link—Depress Wages/Unemployment	271
H-1B Link—History Proves	272
H-1B Link—Best Research	273
Open Borders Link – Perception	274
Amnesty Link – Crushes Economy	275
Amnesty Link—New Wave	276
Amnesty Link—Retirement Boom	277
Amnesty Link—A/T “Boosts Tax Base”	278
Low Skill Link—Low Skilled Immigration Suppresses Wages	279

Link - Catch All.....	280
INTERNAL LINKS	282
Internal Link—Wages Key to Economy	283
Internal Link—Wages Key to Economy	284
Internal Link—Employment Key to Economy	285
Internal Link—Spending/Consumer Confidence Key to Economy.....	286
Internal Link—Global Economy Lacks Resiliency	287
Internal Link—Econ Key to Hegemony	288
IMPACTS	289
Econ Impact—Causes War	290
Impact—Econ Collapse Causes War	291
Impact—Econ Collapse Causes War	292
Impact—Econ Collapse Causes Nuclear War	293
Answers To	294
A/T “They’ll Get Better Jobs”	295
A/T “Amnesty Helps Immigrants Wages”	296
A/T “Immigrants Boost Tax Base”	297
A/T “Immigrants Boost Tax Base”	298
2NC—Our Scholarship/Method Good	299
Disad Wages DA	300
1NC.....	301
Wages are high now.....	306
Link Extension	310
Link—H1-B/Tech Workers.....	312
Link—H2-A/Farm Workers.....	318
Link—H2-B/Low-Skilled Workers	322
Link—Family Visas.....	326
Link—Amnesty	327
Answer to Immigration improves wages	330

Answer to Immigration is good for the economy	334
Answer to Tech worker shortage	335
Answer to General labor shortage	336
Impact Extension.....	337
Impact—Economic Inequality.....	339
Impact—Protectionism	341
Answer to Wage growth causes inflation	343
Counterplan Executive Order CP	344
1NC.....	345
Solvency: Immigration	349
Pres Powers.....	353
Links	354
XO Solvency: Efficient	357
AT: Perm.....	359
AT: Politics Links.....	360
4 AT: Congressional Rollback	362
AT: Judicial Rollback.....	364
AT: No Solvency without Funding.....	365
AT: Inter-Branch Conflict.....	366
AT: XO Bad: Tyranny	368
Counterplan States CP	372
1NC.....	373
2NC/1NR Extension.....	376
States solve guest workers	379
States solve immigrant rights	384
Federalism is key to policy success.....	385
Federalism impact.....	389
US federalism is modeled	392
Federalism is on the brink.....	393

Courts can use Lopez to devolve	395
Answer to Permutation.....	398
Answer to Immigration federalism enables restrictions	402
Answer to States can't legislate immigration	404
Answer to States are limited to enforcement	407
Kritik Capitalism K	408
1NC.....	409
Link Extension	414
Link – Tech workers	416
Link – H1-B Visa.....	417
Link – Asylum/Refugees.....	419
Link – Low-skilled immigration	420
Link – Family visas.....	423
Link – Expanding visa eligibility.....	424
Impact Extension.....	425
Impact – Militarization.....	428
Impact – Security	430
Answer to Alternative is utopian	433
Answer to Permutation.....	434
Answer to Opposition to immigration leads to outsourcing	436
Answer to Immigrants strengthen worker movements	437
Answer to Social justice more important	438
Answer to They have a better life here	441
Answer to Derrida/infinite obligation to the other	442
Kritik Immigration Hospitality Levinas Derrida K	444
K Overview/Explanation.....	445
1NC—Link.....	446
1NC—Impact.....	447
1NC—Alternative	448

1NC Alternative Solves.....	449
1NC Framework	450
Immigration Hospitality K	451
Link—Conditions	452
Link—Conditions	453
Link—Conditions	454
Link – Skilled Workers	455
Link—Militarized Hospitality.....	456
Link—Visas (Biopolitics)	457
Link – Visas H2B	458
Link – Nativism	459
Link – Conditions/Assimilation.....	460
Link—Economy	461
Link—“Illegal Immigrant”	463
Impact—Biopower War/Violence.....	464
Impact—Biopower War/Violence.....	465
Impact—Biopower War	466
Impact—Border Violence.....	467
Impact—Borders Violence	468
Impact—Borders Structural Violence	469
Alt Solves—Micro Politics	470
Alt Solves—Ethics.....	471
Alt Solves—Racism/Root Cause	472
Alt Solves—Solves the Aff	473
Framework—Ethics First	474
Framework—Alt is Political.....	475
Framework—Morality Key to Immigration Policy	476
A/T Perm—Still Links—State.....	477
A/T Perm—Still Links.....	478

A/T Perm—Still Link 479

A/T Perm—Still Links..... 480

Security Bad—Cycle of Violence 481

Border Security Bad—Violence..... 482

Border Security Bad—Falsified Claims..... 483

Borders Bad – Racism 484

Security Bad—General..... 485

Security Bad—General..... 486

A/T Aff Solves..... 487

A/T Secure the Border Disad..... 488

A/T Levinas/ Derrida Indicts..... 489

Kritik Intersectionality K..... 490

1NC..... 491

Links – Immigration (general) 493

Links – Immigrant Women/Gender 494

Links – Immigrant Women of Color 496

Links – African Immigrants..... 497

Links – H1B Workers 498

Links – H1B Workers 499

Links – H1B Workers 500

Links – Same-Sex Couples / “Family” Preferences..... 501

Links – Same-Sex Couples / “Family” Preferences..... 503

Links – LGBTQ+ Immigrants 504

Links – Focus on Black Identities in Immigration 505

Links – Single Axis / Issue 506

Links – Single Axis / Issue 507

Links – Methodology (Immigration)..... 508

Links – Methodology (Heteronormativity) 509

Methodology Impacts..... 510

Alternative Extension – Solvency (general) 511

Alternative Extension – Solvency (general) 512

Alternative Extension – Solvency (immigration)..... 513

Alternative Extension – Solvency (immigration)..... 515

Alternative Extension – Solvency (power relations)..... 516

Alternative Extension – Solvency (single axis) 517

Alternative Extension – Solvency (coalitions/activism) 519

A2: Permutations 520

A2: Permutations (Pragmatism Fails) 522

A2: Identity Politics Bad 523

A2: (Post)Colonialism 525

A2: Black Female Essentialism 526

Debating on the Negative

This section will detail a wide variety of negative arguments that can be pursued outside of the obvious topicality procedurals, as a few examples of those will be provided later.

Counterplans:

Actors: Topic literature and the overview thus far have revealed that authority over immigration policy is hotly contested. Congressional statutes, executive orders, and agency decisions are all different avenues that can establish immigration policy and thus provide a double-edged sword where affirmatives can specify an agent but smart negative teams can pursue alternative actor counterplans

Because immigration policy is largely controlled via statute or executive authority, courts can be used to invalidate certain restrictions as an alternative to establishing a new policy while avoiding politics links. Similarly, if this topic sees a large shift towards court affirmatives, negative teams can read the congress counterplan while avoiding court capital or other court-based disadvantages

Advantage: Because immigration policy will likely access very large impacts that aren't necessarily intrinsic to actually increasing the amount of immigrants that the United States accepts, having a large folder for advantage counterplans will be invaluable. For example, while accepting refugees might assist in the Syria crisis, so could increasing humanitarian aid or increasing UN involvement. Similarly, while refugees can be good for the economy, it won't necessarily collapse without them. So negative teams can pursue technological fixes or changes in taxing and monetary policy as an advantage counterplan while avoiding immigration-based disadvantages

International: Sort-of a fusion between advantage and actor counterplans, international actors can also fill in for the US absence in international refugee and immigration crises. Having the United Nations, European countries, and even China, can be a way to resolve advantages that are not intrinsic to United States immigration policy while avoiding US specific disadvantages.

Disadvantages:

Politics: Often considered a third-rail in American politics, particularly with a republican controlled house and senate, the agenda disadvantage is looking at a strong year ahead of itself. Negative teams will be able to win a large degree of republican backlash to so called "softer" immigration policy. Especially given President Trump's apparent willingness to make deals despite his hardline nativist rhetoric, it should not be too difficult to win that he would take the plan for affirmative plans.

Elections: Beginning with the midterms disad leading into November, with control of the house and possibly the senate up for grabs, and following into a 2020 presidential election disad, the immigration topic is looking at a good year for the election disadvantage. Trump made hardline immigration as key point of his agenda and for years the GOP has owned the more restrictive immigration stance. Negative teams can argue that the plan is perceived as the GOP and Trump changing course and win over key undecided voters who have reservations over such hardline stances. Or they can argue that Trump would blame democrats for the plan and that it would motivate rural trump voters who are anti-immigration to show up to the polls when they otherwise wouldn't in a non-presidential election year.

Economy: From the amount of government assistance that refugees receive, to foreign workers driving down wages, or even business perception based arguments, the economy disadvantage has a lot of links to work with on this topic, though it might need to be deployed more often as a link turn to economy advantages.

Foreign Economy: Similar to the Brain Drain disadvantage, this position would argue that foreign economies are reliant on their native workers, and that if the United States were to become more open to immigrants, they would lose that labor base which would undermine their fragile economies

Terrorism: A very common objection to more lenient immigration policy is the security concern that terrorist groups might try to exploit refugee flows or lax immigration policy to infiltrate and carry out an attack on the United States homeland. Indeed, ISIS has at several times made the claim that it would try to do just that. While affirmative teams can point to evidence at the relatively small number of terrorist attacks actually carried out, negative teams have a dearth of evidence they can access.

Brain Drain: Brain Drain argues that immigration policy can have detrimental effects on the home countries of immigrants. This can be seen in Syria, where many of the individuals who would be needed to rebuild the country have already left. It can also lead to economy or stability based impacts in other immigrant heavy countries.

Kritiks:

Pessimism: In a country where systemic and institutional racism plagues people of color, in particular black individuals, immigration policy can easily be tied to the way we treat minorities in the United States. From its historic roots in the decision to forcibly enslave an entire continent as a means of not deterring immigrants from Europe, to its modern day racial discrimination in immigration policy, teams will be able to draw ample criticism from afro-pessimist literature. Affirmative teams can argue that despite these problematic attachments, improving the standard of living of individuals who want to live in this country is something that should be valued while negative teams can argue that this is a ruse of choice and take a hard line alternative to refuse to participate in such forced choices.

Colonialism: The United States is often referred to as a nation of immigrants. This obscures the reason why we are a nation of immigrants is the forced clearing of natives from the land that now makes up the United States of America, which forms the basis of this foundational criticism. Affirmative teams can argue in a similar vein to pessimism based on the choice theory argument as well as argue that land-based claims are bad and result in xenophobia. The permutation is certainly an uphill battle and negative teams should focus on the prior question of the United States as a legitimate actor at all.

Gender: The particular requirements of family-based immigration, the common practice of “green-card” marriages, and the sexual violence faced by immigrants upon entry into the country can form the basis of a criticism of immigration policy as a public-private distinction that paves over the personal plights faced by female, trans, and non-gender conforming individuals. Affirmative teams should focus on winning permutation arguments against these kritiks but advocating for increased scrutiny of gendered aspects of immigration law while attempting to weigh the impacts of harsh conservative immigration policy against the alternative.

Capitalism: Immigration and the exploitation of foreign workers provides ample ground for negative teams to win links to the capitalism kritik. The global flow of capital is reliant upon the exploitation of these workers and capitalist nations like the United States have a long history of underpaying immigrant workers while subjecting them to terrible working conditions. In addition, open immigration policy is a cornerstone of international free-trade and by extension a pillar of global capitalism. Affirmative teams can take a link turn strategy by arguing that increased immigration breaks down the exploitative parts of illegal immigration practices or pursue an impact turn strategy by arguing that capitalist immigration policies generally improve standards of living for millions and lead to positive improvements for the environment and countries of origin. Negative teams should find ample link ground on this topic and can choose from a range of alternatives such as Marxism, anarcho-capitalism, or pursuing a large framework push to prevent affirmative teams from weighing their plan.

Biopower: The very concept of immigration policy requires a strict government control over the eligibility criteria, requirements on citizenship, and control over the lives of who is and isn't considered a citizen. The control of in-group/out-group politics and regulation of life choices such as work and personal living is grounded in a biopolitical structure of governance that gives the sovereign state the ability to control population groups and mobilize them for any number of purposes. Foucauldian scholars offer a rich source of criticism for immigration policy and allow negative teams to pursue alternatives such as specific intellectual criticism and utilizing academic spaces to break down reliance on such biopolitical policy mechanisms.

Schmitt: Essentially operating as an impact turn to open immigration, Schmitt argues the closed borders and hostile lines in the sand are good for nation-states as it prevents them from blurring the lines between sovereignty and justifying imperial incursions. Negative teams would win links to the empathy of affirmative teams and argue for a state of absolute enmity, where

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

we draw a line in the sand and accept harsh immigration restrictions. Affirmative teams can argue that Schmitt's alternative have empirically resulted in racial zones of exception where particular population groups are targeted and eradicated while negative teams should win claims about human nature and the larger scale consequences of breaking down lines of national sovereignty.

Definitions

Restrictions

Restrict means to keep within limits of space, action, choice, or quantity

Dictionary.com, 2015

"Restrict," Dictionary.com, <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/restrict> (accessed 5/25/2015)

to confine or keep within limits, as of space, action, choice, intensity, or quantity.

Restrictions are population caps, visa restrictions, and eligibility requirements

David **Bier** and Stuart **Anderson**, immigration policy analyst at the Cato Institute's Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity, 1-22-**2018**, "House GOP Proposes Largest Restriction on Legal Immigrants Since the 1920s," Cato Institute, <https://www.cato.org/blog/house-gop-proposes-largest-restriction-legal-immigrants-1920s> (accessed 5/27/18)

key House Republicans with the support of the White House have introduced the Securing America's Future Act (H.R. 4760) as their solution to the immigration impasse in Congress. But the bill would have far-reaching negative effects on economic and labor force growth in the United States, instituting the most severe restriction on legal immigrants since the 1920s. H.R. 4760 would reduce the number of legal immigrants by more than 420,000, or 38 percent, in 2019. This is far larger than the 260,000, or 25 percent, cut advertised by the bill's authors. In fact, the bill has far more in common with a Trump-endorsed bill in the Senate—the RAISE Act (S. 1720)—that would reduce the entry of legal immigrants by more than 470,000, or 43 percent, in 2019. Each would further reduce legal immigration over time. Both bills would end the diversity green card lottery and ban the entry of all legal immigrants sponsored by U.S. family members, except for spouses and minor children of U.S. citizens. The RAISE Act would also reduce the age at which U.S. citizens can sponsor minor children from 21 to 18, while the House bill would, in effect, roughly halve the number of asylees. The House bill modestly increases the employment-based quota. Shockingly, both bills immediately cancel applications for millions of people who have waited years to become legal immigrants.

Restrictions are bans or prohibitions on certain types of immigrants

Pew Research Center, September **2015** "Chapter 1: The Nation's Immigration Laws, 1920 to Today," <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/28/chapter-1-the-nations-immigration-laws-1920-to-today/> (accessed 5/25/18)

Fifty years ago, the U.S. enacted a sweeping immigration law, the Immigration and Nationality Act, which replaced longstanding national origin quotas that favored Northern Europe with a new system allocating more visas to people from other countries around the world and giving increased priority to close relatives of U.S. residents. Just prior to passage of the 1965 law, residents of only three countries—Ireland, Germany and the United Kingdom—were entitled to nearly 70% of the quota visas available to enter the U.S. (U.S. Department of Justice, 1965).⁴ Today, immigration to the U.S. is dominated by people born in Asia and Latin America, with immigrants from all of Europe accounting for only 10% of recent arrivals. The 1965 law undid national origin quotas enacted in the 1920s, which were written into laws that imposed the first numerical limits on immigration. Those laws were the culmination of steadily tightening federal restrictions on immigration that began in the late 1800s with prohibitions or restrictions on certain types of immigrants, such as convicts, in addition to a ban on Chinese migrants and later virtually all Asian migrants. This chapter explores the history of immigration law in the U.S., focusing on provisions of major legislation from the 20th century onward. Accompanying this chapter is an interactive timeline (below) of U.S. immigration legislation since the 1790s.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Legal Immigration

Legal immigration includes all persons granted permanent residence, granted asylee status, admitted as refugees, or admitted as nonimmigrants for a temporary stay

DHS, Department of Homeland Security, March **2017**, "What Is Legal Immigration?," No Publication, <https://immigration.procon.org/view.answers.php?questionID=000759> (accessed 5/21/18)

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in a Feb. 2011 release, "Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2010," available at dhs.gov, stated: "The legally resident immigrant population as defined for these estimates includes all persons who were granted lawful permanent residence; granted asylee status; admitted as refugees; or admitted as nonimmigrants for a temporary stay in the United States and not required to leave by January 1, 2010. Nonimmigrant residents refer to certain aliens who were legally admitted temporarily to the United States for specified time periods such as students and temporary workers."

Legal immigration deals with lawful permanent residents

DHS, Department of Homeland Security, March **2017**, "What Is Legal Immigration?," No Publication, https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/data-standards-and-definitions/definition-terms#permanent_resident_alien (accessed 5/21/18)

Permanent Resident Alien - An alien admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident. Permanent residents are also commonly referred to as immigrants; however, the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) broadly defines an immigrant as any alien in the United States, except one legally admitted under specific nonimmigrant categories (INA section 101(a)(15)). An illegal alien who entered the United States without inspection, for example, would be strictly defined as an immigrant under the INA but is not a permanent resident alien. Lawful permanent residents are legally accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the United States. They may be issued immigrant visas by the Department of State overseas or adjusted to permanent resident status by the Department of Homeland Security in the United States.

Legal immigration includes family-based, employment-based, humanitarian, or visa lottery

Jennifer **Kenny**, contributor to EdHelper, a teaching resource website, **No Date** "Legal Immigration vs. Illegal Immigration," No Publication, https://www.edhelper.com/ReadingComprehension_54_184.html (accessed 5/28/18)

1 Immigrants are people who come from one country to live permanently in another country. Looking at the history of the United States, it is easy to see the millions of immigrants who have called the United States their home throughout the years. So what's all the talk about immigrants in modern times? Well, those debating the issue are usually distinguishing between legal immigrants and illegal immigrants. 2 Unfortunately, people tend to stereotype immigrants and group them together into one category. The reality is that some immigrants are here legally and some immigrants are not. What's the difference? 3 Put quite simply, legal immigrants are here legally. The United States admits between 700,000 to 900,000 legal immigrants each year. Legal immigrants have the proper, legal documentation to live and work in the country. They applied for the appropriate visa. They were accepted for one of the reasons needed to enter: family (they are spouses, parents, or minor children of U.S. citizens), employment (priority workers, unskilled, religious workers, or investors), humanitarian (refugees, those seeking asylum, or those who might have been removed), or visa lottery. They prove they have money, a job offer, or plan to study. They receive a temporary visa or apply permanently, obtain a green card, and become citizens. They often wait a long time to go through the legal process. They agree to follow the laws of the country, and they are here because the government approved them to be here. They follow the legal road to become citizens, so they pay taxes, they can vote, and they have a social security number.

Legal immigration requires official authorization

Oxford Dictionary, 2017 "legal immigration"

https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/legal_immigration (accessed 5/28/18)

Immigration which is officially authorized; opposed to illegal immigration.

Immigration

Immigrants are any person who is not a citizen residing in the U.S. under legally recognized and lawfully recorded permanent residence

CIS, Center for Immigration Studies, May 17, **2018**, "Topic Page: Legal Permanent Residence (LPR) (Green Cards)," Center for Immigration Studies, <https://cis.org/LegalPermanentResidence-GreenCard> (accessed 5/20/18)

"A Green Card holder (permanent resident) is someone who has been granted authorization to live and work in the United States on a permanent basis. . . You can become a permanent resident several different ways. Most individuals are sponsored by a family member or employer in the United States. Other individuals may become permanent residents through refugee or asylee status or other humanitarian programs. In some cases, you may be eligible to file for yourself...Any person not a citizen of the United States who is residing the in the U.S. under legally recognized and lawfully recorded permanent residence as an immigrant. Also known as "Permanent Resident Alien," "Resident Alien Permit Holder," and "Green Card Holder."

Immigration requires congress

Legal Information Institute, an open access wing of Cornell Law School, June **2016**, "Immigration Law: An Overview" <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/immigration> (accessed 5/25/18)

Congress has complete authority over immigration. Presidential power does not extend beyond refugee policy. Except for questions regarding aliens' constitutional rights, the courts have generally found the immigration issue as nonjusticiable.

Immigration requires coming to a country permanently

Oxford Dictionary No Date <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/immigration> (accessed 5/12/18)

Immigration The action of coming to live permanently in a foreign country. 'a barrier to control illegal immigration from Mexico'

Neg vs DACA Dreamers Case

Dreamers won't be deported

There won't be mass deportations—court challenges and congress protect dreamers

Carlos Ballesteros. Writer at Newsweek. January 16, 2018. WHAT HAPPENS IF DACA ENDS?

DEPORTING DREAMERS WON'T BE A PRIORITY, HOMELAND SECURITY SECRETARY SAYS.

<http://www.newsweek.com/what-happens-if-daca-ends-dreamers-deported-homeland-782290>

(Accessed 4/30/2018)

Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen insisted Tuesday that federal agencies will not prioritize deporting immigrants brought illegally into the United States as children if Congress and the White House don't reach a deal to keep their protected status. "It's not going to be a priority of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement to prioritize their removal. I've said that before. That's not the policy of DHS," Nielsen told CBS This Morning. Nielsen added that these immigrants will remain a low priority "in perpetuity," but noted that if any of them commit a crime, "we will enforce the law." The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, enacted by President Barack Obama in 2012, allowed immigrants who illegally entered the country as minors to receive a renewable two-year stay from deportation. In September 2017, the Trump administration announced its plan to phase out DACA by March 2018 unless Congress could rescue it with new immigration legislation. By then, nearly 800,000 "Dreamers" depended on DACA to legally remain in the U.S. Congress has spent months trying to reach a deal that redefines and cements Dreamers' legal status while assuring tough immigration measures. But negotiations have stalled as Republicans and Trump insist that any deal to protect Dreamers must include funding for a Mexican border wall and other security measures. Democrats have balked at the GOP's proposals, arguing that Dreamers should not be used as "bargaining chips." Congress has until January 19 to reach a deal as part of negotiations that could lead to a government shutdown if no agreements are reached. Nielsen said federal immigration authorities will not seek to immediately deport Dreamers if the deadline is missed. Last week, U.S. District Judge William Alsup in San Francisco ruled that the Trump administration cannot end the DACA program until challenges to the Department of Homeland Security brought by the University of California system, 16 state attorneys general, and a DACA participant are fully litigated. On Saturday, immigration authorities announced they would accept DACA renewals, per Alsup's ruling. Immigrant rights' groups have raised concerns over Dreamers facing deportation since Trump's decision to curtail DACA. The U.S. Customs and Immigration Services (USCIS), which processes DACA applications, has repeatedly said it will not "proactively" share applicants' information with ICE.

Dreamers won't be deported—Trump and GOP don't have the capital or desire to make it happen

Eric Levitz. Writer at New York Magazine. December 29, 2017. Trump: Give Me a Border Wall or I'll Deport the Dreamers. <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/12/trump-give-me-a-border-wall-or-ill-deport-the-dreamers.html> (Accessed 4/30/2018)

By all accounts, Trump was reluctant to cancel the Obama-era program that provided Dreamers with work visas, in the first place. It took intense lobbying by Attorney General Jeff Sessions to get the president to end DACA. And even then, Trump immediately called on Congress to grant its beneficiaries some form of protection from deportation — and suggested that if Congress failed to do so, then he might protect them, himself, through executive action. This history strongly suggests that Trump does not see legal status for Dreamers as a painful concession to his enemies, but rather, as a good in and of itself. Or, at least, that he sees it that way some of the time. And Democrats have cause for believing that the GOP leadership sees it that way, too. Enthusiasm for deporting Dreamers isolates the GOP's activist base from the rest of the country, including the Republican rank and file. A Morning Consult poll in September found that 69 percent of Republicans — and two-thirds of Trump voters — want undocumented immigrants who meet DACA's requirements to be given either citizenship or legal status. And the GOP's corporate donors — who just amply demonstrated their capacity to dictate terms to Capitol Hill — have little interest in deporting Dreamers, restricting legal immigration, or building border walls. If Paul Ryan respects Breitbart's red lines, his party will have a steep price to pay. There is no precedent for stripping legal status from a group of people this numerous, let alone a group so deeply integrated into American society. Dreamers have allies in corporate America, churches, unions, colleges, and countless local and state governments. The backlash to their dispossession will be huge and unrelenting. Republicans are already poised for a historic rebuke next November. Letting DACA expire without a replacement could turn a wave election into a tsunami. Granted, Democrats are facing far more direct pressure from their constituents to reach a DACA deal than Republicans are. But the progressive grassroots' opposition to the border wall and ending family reunification are nearly as fierce.

Dreamers won't be deported—moderate Republicans will stop it

Avery Miller. Writer at ABC News. January 24, 2018. GOP Sen. Gardner's message to 'Dreamers:' There won't be 'mass deportations' <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/gop-sen-gardners-message-dreamers-mass-deportations/story?id=52587989> (Accessed 5/1/2018)

Sen. Cory Gardner, R-Colorado, who has been on the frontlines in the battle to hammer out an immigration deal, wants to reassure "Dreamers" they will not be deported. "I don't believe anybody is going to be deported," Gardner told ABC News' Chief White House Correspondent Jonathan Karl and Political Director Rick Klein on the "Powerhouse Politics" podcast, of the formerly-protected undocumented immigrants brought to the U.S. as youths. "There's not going to be this mass deportation on this. That's first and foremost. Please know that Congress is working very hard to solve this." Gardner worries about the 800,000 people that are in the midst of turmoil and fear because their legal status is set to run out on March 5. The Trump administration has announced the U.S. would end in March the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival which would bring an end to the temporary protection extended to these undocumented migrants. Gardner joked that the number of senators at the negotiating table keeps changing so it should be called the "Gangs of Prime Numbers." And despite the polarizing nature of the immigration reform and border security, Gardener said, "I believe there are good-faith people on both sides of the aisle who are going to get this done." Even though Gardner is known for his optimistic outlook — an "over-caffeinated hamster," is how he jokingly described himself — he will cross swords when necessary. In November, Gardner was one of the first GOP senators to speak out against embattled Alabama Senate nominee Roy Moore, and supported a move in the Senate to expel Moore if he won. As the National Republican Senate Committee Chair, Gardner held firm, but the Republican National Committee followed Trump's lead and funded Moore's campaign in the final stretch, despite the cloud of scandal.

Military dreamers won't be deported

Richard Gonzalez. Writer at National Public Radio. February 8, 2018. Mattis: 'DREAMers' In The Military Won't Be Deported <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2018/02/08/584424541/mattis-dreamers-in-the-military-won-t-be-deported> (Accessed 5/1/2018)

Defense Secretary James Mattis says young immigrants who came to the U.S. as children as children and enlisted in the armed forces will not be deported even if their legal protections expire. There are about 850 young immigrants who are currently serving in the military or waiting to be shipped to training. They joined the armed forces under a program called Military Accessions to the Vital National Interest, or MAVNI. The program, created in the late stages of the administration of George W. Bush, was designed to recruit noncitizens with specialized medical training or critical language skills, such as Russian or Arabic. The deal they were offered was a fast track to citizenship in exchange for their military service. The MAVNI program was suspended in 2016 amid security concerns. Now the military careers of thousands of young immigrants are on hold as they are subject to intensive background checks. Some who joined the MAVNI program while under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, fear that their protections could expire before they get a chance to serve. But Secretary Mattis told reporters that, consulting with the Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen, he was assured they will not be deported. "They will not be subject to any kind of deportation," Mattis told reporters as quoted by the Associated Press. "In terms of the DACA situation ... it's clarified they are not in any kind of jeopardy." That also applies to any honorably discharged veterans, he said. However, Mattis said the protection doesn't include someone who commits a serious felony or who has been ordered deported by a federal judge. "That would be a judicial action that obviously we obey in the court system. We don't have veto authority over a court," said Mattis as quoted by the Hill. The announcement comes as the fate of DACA recipients is under discussion in Congress. President Trump rescinded the DACA program and said it would expire by March 5 unless Congress intervenes. But a federal court blocked Trump's decision and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services said it would again accept DACA renewal requests. Mattis' announcement was welcomed by the founder of the MAVNI program, retired Army Lt. Col. Margaret Stock. "It's a positive development," said Stock in an interview with NPR. "It was the Trump administration that has been threatening to deport all of these folks and I think it's wonderful that they've decided not to deport them."

Dreamers won't take scholarships

Dreamers don't take the scholarships—California proves

Larry Gordan. Writer at Ed Source. May 30, 2016. Many Dream Act scholarships for undocumented students go unused. <https://edsources.org/2016/many-dream-act-scholarships-for-undocumented-immigrants-go-unused/564127> (Accessed 4/30/2018)

Undocumented college students are leaving a wealth of unspent aid money on the table five years after the passage of the landmark California law that provides those immigrants grants for higher education. The California Dream Act made them eligible for several kinds of grants to attend community colleges, California State Universities, the University of California and some private campuses. But the euphoria among advocates that accompanied the law's passage has been dampened by the reality that the state-funded Cal Grant portion of the aid is reaching far fewer undocumented students than originally envisioned, particularly at community colleges. A variety of bureaucratic hurdles, along with students' personal money problems, confusion about rules and fears of government, are causing students to not tap their Dream Act Cal Grants, according to officials and students. About a third of the overall awards went unused last year, even after careful vetting of applicants for low income, high school grades and other eligibility factors. Making matters worse, nearly half of the Cal Grants awarded for community college costs were left on the table, as millions of state dollars earmarked for immigrant students went unspent. UC and CSU had better records. Lupita Cortez Alcalá, executive director of the California Student Aid Commission, said she was "not comfortable" with the participation rates in the Dreamer grants at community colleges in particular. "Of course we are concerned about those numbers," she said, "and we want more students who are awarded those grants to use them for their higher education." She said efforts are underway to reach out to more to students and community colleges to learn why young people — many of whom were brought to the U.S. as small children — are bypassing the aid. The agency, which administers Cal Grants, wants to solve any communication and payment problems, she said. One contributing factor is that these undocumented students are not eligible for federal grants and loans; so the California aid — even bolstered by waivers of community college fees and other grants for UC and Cal State students — may not be enough to cover total expenses including food, housing and books. As a result, some students abandon college and instead take full-time jobs, forgoing the Cal grants, which range for full-time students from \$1,656 a year at community colleges to \$12,240 at UC. A recent survey by the California Student Aid Commission found that some students who did not take the aid blamed high costs of living in the state. In other cases, the reason was less about hardship than communication: many students in the survey reported they had not known of the Cal Grant offers despite what commission officials say were numerous attempts to contact them. A significant number enrolled at community colleges anyway, getting fee waivers but not the Cal Grants, which require more information to qualify, such as high school grades. The colleges contend that shows that they are helping these students as much as possible and that the commission's statewide rules for verifying and distributing the Cal Grants are partly at fault for the low number of takers. Some students say some community colleges are themselves confused about how to administer the program, and put up needless barriers. Problems arise as schools seek to verify data in some applications as required by the aid commission.

DREAM hurts the economy

Dreamers cost the economy more than they create

Steven A Camarota. Writer at Center for Immigration Studies. November 30, 2010.

Estimating the Impact of the DREAM Act. <https://cis.org/Memorandum/Estimating-Impact-DREAM-Act> (Accessed 4/30/2018)

This Memorandum examines the costs and likely impact of the DREAM Act currently being considered by Congress. The act offers permanent legal status to illegal immigrants up to age 35 who arrived in the United States before age 16 provided they complete two years of college. Under the act, beneficiaries would receive in-state tuition. Given the low income of illegal immigrants, most can be expected to attend state schools, with a cost to taxpayers in the billions of dollars. As both funds and slots are limited at state universities and community colleges, the act may reduce the educational opportunities available to U.S. citizens. Among the findings: Assuming no fraud, we conservatively estimate that 1.03 million illegal immigrants will eventually enroll in public institutions (state universities or community colleges) as a result of the DREAM Act. That is, they meet the residence and age requirements of the act, have graduated high school, or will do so, and will come forward. On average, each illegal immigrant who attends a public institution will receive a tuition subsidy from taxpayers of nearly \$6,000 for each year he or she attends, for total cost of \$6.2 billion a year, not including other forms of financial assistance they may also receive. The above estimate is for the number who will enroll in public institutions. A large share of those who attend college may not complete the two full years necessary to receive permanent residence. The cost estimate assumes that the overwhelming majority will enroll in community colleges, which are much cheaper for students and taxpayers than state universities. The estimate is only for new students not yet enrolled. It does not include illegal immigrants currently enrolled at public institutions or those who have already completed two years of college. Moreover, it does not include the modest number of illegal immigrants who are expected to attend private institutions. The DREAM Act does not provide funding to states and counties to cover the costs it imposes. Since enrollment and funding are limited at public institutions, the act's passage will require some combination of tuition increases, tax increases to expand enrollment, or a reduction in spaces available for American citizens at these schools. Tuition hikes will be particularly difficult for students, as many Americans already find it difficult to pay for college. Research indicates that one out of three college students drops out before receiving a degree. Costs are a major reason for the high dropout rate. In 2009 there were 10.2 million U.S. citizens under age 35 who had dropped out of college without receiving a degree. There were an additional 15.2 million citizens under age 35 who had completed high school, but never attended college. Lawmakers need to consider the strains the DREAM Act will create and the impact of adding roughly one million students to state universities and community colleges on the educational opportunities available to American citizens. Providing state schools with added financial support to offset the costs of the DREAM Act would avoid the fiscal costs at the state and local level, but it would shift the costs to federal taxpayers. Advocates of the DREAM Act argue that it will significantly increase tax revenue, because with a college education, recipients will earn more and pay more in taxes over their lifetime. However, several factors need to be considered when evaluating this argument: Any hoped-for tax benefit is in the long-term, and will not help public institutions deal with the large influx of new students the act creates in the short-term. Given limited spaces at public institutions, there will almost certainly be some crowding out of U.S. citizens – reducing their lifetime earnings and tax payments. The DREAM Act only requires two years of college; no degree is necessary. The income gains for having some college, but no degree, are modest. Because college dropout rates are high, many illegal immigrants who enroll at public institutions will not complete the two years the act requires, so taxpayers will bear the expense without a long-term benefit.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

The DREAM Act is costly and hurts American workers

Human Events. September 21, 2010. DREAM Act a Nightmare for America.

<http://humanevents.com/2010/09/21/dream-act-a-nightmare-for-america/> (Accessed 5/1/2018)

However, the DREAM Act is much more expansive than its supporters make it out to be, is filled with loopholes, and has a directly negative effect on young American citizens. Harry Reid said that the DREAM Act will “ensure that millions of children who grow up as Americans will be able to get the education they need to contribute to our economy.” DREAM Act advocates often claim the number of eligible illegal aliens would be a small fraction of this. Sen. Richard Durbin (D.-Ill.) claimed that only 38% of those eligible would get amnesty. In July, Sen. Chuck Grassley (R.-Iowa) discovered a memo from Denise Vanison, Obama’s chief of policy and strategy for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, entitled “Administrative Alternatives to Comprehensive Immigration Reform.” The memo discussed various ways the White House could enact an amnesty by Executive Order through “deferred action.” Vanison writes, “Rather than making deferred action widely available to hundreds of thousands and as a non-legislative version of ‘amnesty,’ USCIS could tailor the use of this discretionary option for particular groups such as individuals who would be eligible for relief under the DREAM Act (an estimated 50,000).” So how many people will get the DREAM Act? 50,000 children? Millions of children? Actually, it will be available to millions of adults. Approximately 50,000 to 70,000 illegal immigrants graduate from high school each year, and not all of them have been here for five years or would attend college. If the DREAM Act were limited to its supposed intended purpose, at most a few hundred thousand illegal aliens would be eligible. However, the DREAM Act is much more expansive than it appears. Anyone up to the age of 35 who claims they came here before age 16 can apply for amnesty. Because illegal aliens are, as the media likes to call them, “undocumented,” anyone can claim to have come here before they were 16 and we have no way to make sure they are telling the truth. In fact, illegal aliens do not need to attend college or join the military to receive legal status, they simply need to affirm that they intend to do so during the next six years. In order to receive legal status, they do not need to show they are of “good moral character” and can be convicted criminals. There are many other loopholes, invitations to fraud, and troublesome provisions hidden into the DREAM Act such as repealing the ban on in-state tuition for illegal aliens. Those who receive amnesty can sponsor their family members who brought them to this country illegally. Even if the DREAM Act were only applicable to truly college-bound illegal aliens, there are still many reasons to oppose it. The recession hit young Americans especially hard. Seventy percent of high school graduates from 2009 are currently enrolled in college, the highest level in history. With admissions becoming more competitive and tuition skyrocketing, the last thing we need is tens of thousands of illegal aliens applying for college—many of whom will be eligible for both affirmative action and in-state tuition. The high college enrollment rate is not necessarily cause for celebration because it is caused in part by the lack of jobs for high school graduates. Thirty percent of high school graduates not enrolled in college are out of the workforce. Illegal aliens amnestied under the DREAM Act will get work visas, not just education visas, so they will be competing directly against these Americans for the few jobs available to them. No one wants to punish children because their parents brought them to this country illegally. But this consideration does not give them a right to live in this country, compete with Americans for our limited jobs, and attend public colleges with in-state tuition.

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

The DREAM Act will require significant government spending**Marshall Kirby. Public Policy Analyst at Minorit Business and Economic Report.****January 5, 2011.** The Economic Consequences of the Dream Act.

<https://nprchamber.wordpress.com/2011/01/05/the-economic-consequences-of-the-dream-act/>
(Accessed 5/2/2018)

By allowing previously undocumented individuals a path to citizenship, it will allow them to gain lawful employment and have access [gradual in some circumstances] to government programs. Here is the main conundrum of the bill. Supporters of the bill claim that this will raise government revenues by \$1.7 billion over a ten year period. The discussion of revenue is the most disputed portion of the legislation considering the way it was scored by the CBO. In the scoring, the CBO has assumed that all affected by this bill would [1] gain immediate employment [given the currently high unemployment levels this is unlikely], [2] there would be no unemployment, disability, or entitlement claims by DREAMers, [3] there would be no claims for public healthcare programs, and [4] applications for student loans amongst those affected would be at 15% – currently one fifth of the rate for the population [and that none would default on their loans over a 10 year window] (Lies About the DREAM Act). Outside of the 10 year scoring window, estimates have shown that this bill is not even deficit neutral considering that there will be an increase of government services and program which those affected would be receiving and entitled to (Lies About the DREAM Act). It seems what has been missing in this discussion is what the DREAM Act means for Latinos who are already citizens or resident aliens of the United States. Without the data and resources available to do in-depth economic analysis, economic principles must suffice. The major negative issue associated for Latinos currently here is simply the monetary cost of this bill. As mentioned before, the bill is not deficit neutral in the long run and will increase the cost of government entitlements for years to come. In order to offset the costs, eventually taxes will need to be raised – on individuals and businesses.

No labor shortage

There is no labor shortage

Jeffrey Snider. Writer at Real Clear Markets. March 5, 2018. There's No Labor Shortage, Despite Fed Protests Otherwise.

https://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2018/03/05/theres_no_labor_shortage_despite_fed_protests_otherwise_103172.html (Accessed 4/30/2018)

For the sake of brevity, I'll highlight here just a few of the major series. The Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates that nominal hourly compensation, the metric right where wage acceleration due to a labor shortage would show up, expanded by a seasonally-adjusted annual rate of 1.8% in Q4 2017 (the latest estimates) over Q3. The less noisy 4-quarter average was 2.4%, compared to an average of 3.8% in Q2 2015 before all the "global turmoil" and 4.0% at the start of 2014. The results in "real" terms, meaning those adjusted for inflation as it is now, are much worse. Real hourly compensation was down 1.8% (annual) rate Q/Q in Q4, after growing by just 0.6% in each of the two previous quarters. The Bureau of Economic Analysis in its separate estimates on personal income and spending reports one version of the former called Real Personal Income excluding Transfer Receipts (RPIxTR). Transfer receipts refer to government payments like unemployment insurance and welfare, and their exclusion is an attempt to gain a purer sense of the private economy as it is without non-economic additions. This is one of the major economic data points that the NBER uses in determining the business cycle (FWIW). Between December 2013 and October 2015, RPIxTR grew by a seasonally-adjusted total of 8.7%, or an annual rate of 4.7%. In historical context, that wasn't very good at all, but better than the years before. If the labor shortage was real, and the unemployment rate indicative of anything meaningful, we should have expected personal income particularly in this view of it to accelerate by more than a little. After all, if there is so much demand for workers that businesses are competing more intensely for them, then that would mean not just wage growth but also the more important related component of hourly growth – as a business, if things are picking up and you have to compete for new workers you are going to use your existing labor to the max, too. Unsurprisingly, that's not at all what we find. Including the latest estimates for January 2018 released this week, RPIxTR since October 2015 has expanded by 2.3% total; not per year, total. On an annual basis, that works out to just barely 1% per year. The labor market over those two years and two months has only slowed and remained weak throughout. No matter how many times the Beige Book refers to a labor shortage, hourly compensation and overall personal income continues instead in a no-growth state (the 2014-15 estimates suggested a low-growth state). We don't know what the Greenbook has to say on the matter, though we don't really need to. It's in the anecdotes that are all over policymakers' speeches and testimonies. They say they expect a pickup in inflation fulfilling all their mandates on the strength of the labor market; but the labor market is not strong. That can only mean the Greenbook is projecting, any day now, this will change. This is, by the way, what the most recent inflation hysteria in mainstream commentary is predicated upon. There's an unapologetically crude joke to be made here about the Greenbook, the Beige Book, and the accidental contents of men's underwear.