

Constructive

See R6 UKSO OS.

Rebuttal

Costs millions and suffers delays

CPI '08 [Center for Public Integrity, 12-10-2008, "\$30 billion virtual border fence faces problems", Center for Public Integrity, <https://publicintegrity.org/politics/30-billion-virtual-border-fence-faces-problems/>]
//leon

In 2006, U.S. Customs and Border Protection decided to **outdo the border walls** of the past and **build a great barrier of data** – a system of **ground sensors**, remote-control **cameras**, and **radars** that **transmit real-time data to border agents** – along the U.S.–Mexican border. But as of late 2008, only **28 miles of the “virtual” fence**, known officially as the Secure Border Initiative Network, or **SBI**net, are up and running. The **finished job** is expected to run **6,000 miles** along the northern and southern borders of the United States at a **cost of \$30 billion**. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) awarded the initial **\$2 billion contract** for the project to Boeing, which promised to have **large sections of the fence** up and running by 2008. The **first phase ran six months late** and used commercially-available technology that was replaced almost immediately with **fancier gadgets**. In theory, **border agents can use the information to intercept illegal transit**, but after taking the pilot project for a test-run, border agents told the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that it was **“not an optimal system”** for their needs. From the program’s inception, the GAO warned about the **vagueness of the requirements** set out in the contracting order, a problem that **plagued two predecessors**, the Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System and America’s Shield Initiative. Now **land-management issues have delayed the project**. A September 2008 agreement with the Department of the Interior over DHS’s use of government land should have come through last July, but DHS failed to file the necessary paperwork. The department also will have to grab private property from some border land owners by eminent domain. Testifying before Congress in September, Randolph C. Hite, the GAO’s director of information technology architecture and systems, put the problem bluntly: **“Important aspects of SBI**net **remain ambiguous and in a continued state of flux**, making it unclear and uncertain **what technology capabilities will be delivered and when, where, and how they will be delivered.**”

Attempts to deter spark hardliner views in both countries, resulting in escalation

Elbaum, Max. “Climate Change. War. Poverty. How the U.S.-China Relationship Will Shape Humanity’s Path” Portside. April 4, 20**19**//AB
Max Elbaum is author of Revolution in the Air, recently reissued by Verso Books, and an editor of Organizing Upgrade

<https://portside.org/2019-04-04/climate-change-war-poverty-how-us-china-relationship-will-shape-humanitys-path>

Dangers and prospects To say all this is dangerous is an understatement. The costs of a ramped-up trade war would fall hardest on the working classes in both U.S. and China—and if it leads to a global downturn, on workers and the poor across the globe. **Calls to “get tough on China”** are, at bottom, ways of shifting blame for people's economic woes away from the U.S. corporate elite. As Tobita Chow explained in July for In These Times, they tap into and **reinforce the anti-Chinese racism long present in U.S. politics and marginalize even the idea of solidarity between workers in both countries.** And **the multi-front Cold War** described by Michael Klare **means constant tension**, with the very real danger that **an initially small flashpoint conflict could escalate into full-scale, even nuclear, war.** Short of short open conflict, **constant tension between Washington and Beijing increases the influence of nationalism, militarism and authoritarianism in both countries, which almost inevitably translates into increases in domestic repression of popular movements, as well as austerity.** What does all this mean for the left? There are important debates on the nature of China's social system and the impact of its geopolitical and global economic strategies. But regardless of one's position in those debates, the U.S. left has a critical role to play in galvanizing opposition to the growing clamor for confrontation in U.S.-China relations. We can do this. But we need a vision and practice that speaks to both humanity's common interest in sheer survival and the global working class' interest in a just and non-exploitative society. We should prioritize the fight for a 180-degree turnaround in the U.S. stance toward China, demanding that diplomacy and negotiation replace trade wars and military encirclement.

Harris has nothing to gain

Stokes 23 [Sarah Sherman-Stokes, associate director of the Immigrants' Rights and Human Trafficking Program, 5-8-2023, Being 'anti-immigrant' is not a winning strategy for Biden in 2024, WBUR, <https://www.wbur.org/cognoscenti/2023/05/08/biden-2024-campaign-immigration-policy-sarah-sherman-stokes>] BZ

The Act restores vital due process protections that will help keep families and communities together. The bill also ends the harmful practice of local police collaboration with federal immigration officials, ensuring that victims and witnesses — regardless of their immigration status — feel safe to report crime. Broadly speaking, the bill aims to remedy the criminalization and racial profiling that has been a hallmark of our immigration system, instead advancing values of compassion, fairness and due process for all. Whoever the Republican candidate is in November, immigration — along with its bedfellows, racism and xenophobia — will also be on the ballot. **Make no mistake, anti-immigrant zealots will never support President Biden. He hasn't won their votes by continuing construction on the border wall, maintaining illegal Title 42 restrictions at the border or massively expanding the surveillance of noncitizens. Politically, Biden stands to gain little, if anything, by continuing his move to the right on immigration; if he further panders to the anti-immigrant agenda in 2024, he risks losing both Democratic votes, and his integrity.** Instead, **now is the time for the kind of bold, progressive leadership on immigration** that President Biden once promised, but has yet to deliver.

Republicans will twist the narrative

Kennedy 24 [Thomas Kennedy, 03-04-2024, Democrats Are Embracing Border Policies They Repeatedly Condemned Under Trump, Truthout, <https://truthout.org/articles/democrats-are-embracing-border-policies-they-repeatedly-condemned-under-trump/>] BZ

A recent PBS poll found that 41 percent of **respondents** said that the Republican Party is better at handling issues of immigration, compared to 29 percent who said the same for Democrats. **Most polls show a double-digit margin favoring Republicans on the handling of immigration. Instead of taking a proactive stance on the issue and presenting a clear message to voters that is based on ethical values and presents the benefits of immigrants to our culture and economy, Democrats are attempting to outflank Republicans by taking a right-wing position. The problem is that Republican politicians and talking heads will just lie and say they didn't support the bill because it amounted to open borders. The right-wing echo chamber will propagate this narrative, and the corporate media will be unable or unwilling to counter it, muddling the issue in the minds of voters. It's a risky move for Democrats to continue alienating their base of supporters** while taking the position of an opposition party that hates democracy.

Empirics

Nathan J. **Robinson**, 2-18-2021, "How Centrism Loses, Even When It Wins: A Mathematical Model", Current Affairs,

<https://www.currentaffairs.org/news/2021/02/how-centrism-loses-even-when-it-wins-a-mathematical-model> //AC

Here, we have **a center left party** and a far right party. As you can see, even though the left party wins initially, the right party's more extreme position means they have a larger ideological pull than the center left. After a handful of elections, the far right party eventually wins, and even more concerning, they pull the electorate right with them. Next, let's add in some triangulation. **In this model, the left party looks for the average voter's ideology and shifts slowly towards that position. As you can see, this strategy is disastrous. It not only loses more elections than a static center left party, but drives that party rightward in the process.** As the left party gets closer to the center every cycle, it stops pulling the electorate left and, in fact, aids the right party ideologically. Eventually the voters move so far right that the triangulating left party cannot meet their ideology, and government control flips to the far right. **This might be a decent reflection of the Clinton presidency.** Though the triangulation strategy won Democrats the White House, **Clinton's support for the crime bill, NAFTA, soft-opposition to abortion, and conservative foreign policy brought the electorate closer to the Republicans' position—a mistake that would lead to two terms of far right George W. Bush.** To make matters worse for the advocates of triangulation, the tilt toward extremes that it causes can even overcome "natural" shifts in the opposite direction. Below is a model of a triangulating center left party running against a far right party in a country experiencing an ideological shift to the left for any number of reasons (every voter moves .01 ideology points left per cycle).

Human intervention driven by the desire to protect species hinders evolution

Dodds 07 [Donald J Dodds, M.S. P.E. President @ North Pacific Research. "The Myth of Biodiversity."] JB

Geologic history has repeatedly shown that species that become overspecialized are ripe for extinction. A classic example of overspecialization is the Kola bears, which can only eat the leaves from a single eucalyptus tree. But because they are soft and furry, look like a teddy bear and have big brown eyes, humans are artificially keeping them alive. Humans do not have the stomach or the brain for controlling evolution. **Evolution is a simple process** or it wouldn't function. Evolution works because it follows the simple law: what works—works, what doesn't work—goes away. There is no legislation, no regulations, no arbitration, no lawyers, scientists or politicians. Mother Nature has no preference, no prejudices, no emotions and no ulterior motives. Humans have all of those traits. **Humans are working against nature when they try to prevent extinctions and freeze biodiversity.** Examine the curve in figure one, **at no time since the origin of life has biodiversity been constant. If this principal has worked for 550 million years** on this planet, and science is supposed to find truth in nature, **by what twisted reasoning can fixing biodiversity be** considered science? Let alone **good for the environment**

We control the offense bc humans will survive collapse

Powers 02 (Lawrence, Professor of Natural Sciences, Oregon Institute of Technology, The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 9),

****ellipsis in original****

Mass extinctions appear to result from major climatic changes or catastrophes, such as asteroid impacts. As far as we know, none has resulted from the activities of a species, regardless of predatory voracity, pathogenicity, or any other interactive attribute. We are the first species with the potential to manipulate global climates and to destroy habitats, perhaps even ecosystems -- therefore setting the stage for a sixth mass extinction. According to Boulter, this event will be an inevitable consequence of a "self-organized Earth-life system." This Gaia-like proposal might account for many of the processes exhibited by biological evolution before man's technological intervention, but ... the rules are now dramatically different. ... **Many species may vanish, ... but that doesn't guarantee, that we will be among the missing. While other species go bang in the night, humanity will technologically isolate itself** further from the natural world and will rationalize the decrease in biodiversity in the same manner as we have done so far. I fear, that like the fabled cockroaches of the atomic age, **we**

may be one of the last life-forms to succumb, long after the "vast tracts of beauty" that Boulter mourns we will no longer behold vanish before our distant descendants' eyes.

Rest were analytics.