

For the Motion:

(1) Vernon Briggs:

1. oversupply of unqualified workers → illegal immigrants constitute an **economic** problem
2. there is an oversupply of unqualified workers (90 million Americans)

3. illegal immigrants constitute an economic problem

1. illegal immigrants are preferred workers → American workers are at a disadvantage
2. illegal immigrants are always preferred workers (e.g. economic disparities/standards of living)

3. American workers are at a disadvantage (implied “always”)

(2) Mark Kirkorian:

1. There are two ways of enforcing immigration law: roundups or blocking “welcome policies”
2. roundups are ineffective ($\sim R$)

3. “welcome policies” must be stopped (“attrition policy”)

(3) Heather MacDonald:

1. “Respect for the Rule of Law”
 - a. $(x)(Lx \rightarrow Ex)$
 - b. L_i

 - c. E_i

2. A sense of “entitlement” (rhetorical use that appeals to Republicans)
3. Argument from Analogy:
 - a. Deporting illegal Pakistanis after 9/11 (minimal effort, maximal effect)
 - b. Deporting illegal Latinos

 - c. Deporting illegal Latinos too will entail minimal effort, maximal effect

Against the Motion:

(1) Daniel Griswold:

1. A loaded question: “legal immigration”
 - a. Red herring? After all, that’s a different issue.
2. Opposing **economic** argument (contra Briggs):
 - a. Demand, education levels, circular migration
 - b. Who is correct on the economic argument? (e.g. whose statistics are correct?)
3. Is the discussion of 9/11 and national security a Red Herring?

(2) Enrique Morones:

1. A clear Appeal to Pity (mother dying with their children in the desert)
 - a. “pity the illegals” ... “the law that drove them there is morally wrong”
 - b. “Why are they in the desert in the first place?”
 - c. Should we pity them all?

(3) Karen Narasaki:

1. Blaming Immigrants for the Effects of Globalization (“isolationism”)
 - a. outsourcing/job loss → find a controllable solution (e.g. immigration reform)