

Constructive

CI

Companies' profit-driven incentives lead them to not focus on catching actual criminals

Todd **Miller**, 09-16-20**19**, "More Than A Wall", Transnational Institute, <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/more-than-a-wall-0> // RB

Focusing in on **CBP contracts** – the largest government contractor in border and immigration control – the report identifies 14 companies

that **are giants in the border security business. These are Accenture, Boeing, Elbit, Flir Systems, G4S,**

General Atomics, General Dynamics, IBM, L3 Technologies, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, PAE,

Raytheon, UNISYS, among several other top firms we list in the report that are receiving contracts. They

include technology and security firms, but **are clearly dominated by the same global arms firms that reap rewards**

from high levels of US military spending. In addition, **it also profiles, private prison companies** CoreCivic and

Geo Group who along with G4S **are major players in providing immigration detention services.** **The volume and**

value of CBP contracts has grown to the point that in 2009, Lockheed Martin landed a contract potentially worth more than \$945

million for maintenance and upkeep of 16 P-3 surveillance planes equipped with airborne and surface-to-radar systems. This one contract was

equal to the total entire border and immigration enforcement budgets from 1975 to 1978 (around \$923 million). Similarly, the contract to the

San Diego-based General Atomics, worth \$276 million in 2016 for the operational maintenance of the Predator B drone systems, almost exceeds any of the INS annual budgets in the 1970s.

That justifies biased technology

Nicol Turner Lee, Caitlin Chin-Rothmann, 04-12-2022, "Police surveillance and facial recognition: Why data privacy is imperative for

communities of color", Brookings,

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/police-surveillance-and-facial-recognition-why-data-privacy-is-an-imperative-for-communities-of-color/> //

TT

Since historically biased policing patterns have contributed to their higher rates of interrogation and arrest, **communities of color are**

often **overrepresented in law enforcement databases** compared to the overall U.S. population.^[42] The National Association

for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) reports that Black individuals are five times more likely than white individuals to be stopped by

police officers in the United States, and that Black and Latino individuals comprise 56% of the U.S. incarcerated population but only 32% of the

overall U.S. population.^[43] This means that **not only are police officers more likely to employ surveillance or facial**

recognition programs to compare images of Black and Latino individuals, but that mugshot **images** or arrest

records of Black and Latino individuals **are more likely to be stored in these databases in the first place**—two distinct

problems that, when aligned, will **exacerbate existing patterns of** racial inequity in **policing**.^[44] Apart from the dual challenges

of accuracy and transparency, there remains an ethical question of if or when it is appropriate to use facial recognition to address legitimate

security concerns, regardless of its accuracy. **even if facial recognition hypothetically could improve to a point**

where the technology itself has near-perfect accuracy rates **across all demographic groups, it would still**

be possible for law enforcement officers to apply it in ways that replicate existing racial disparities in

their outcomes.

Post—aff,

Jack **Corrigan**, 05-30-20**19**, "CBP's Airport Facial Recognition 'Is Not a Surveillance Program'", Nextgov,

<https://www.nextgov.com/emerging-tech/2019/05/cbps-airport-facial-recognition-not-surveillance-program/157373/> // RB, brackets in og

Jeramie Scott, director of the Domestic **Surveillance Project** at the Electronic Privacy Information Center, said he worries **CBP** and other

federal agencies **start using the systems deployed** in airports **for other purposes, like identifying people who**

committed petty crimes. Today, there are no federal laws regulating agencies' use of facial recognition, and without those restrictions,

government officials and vendors **have incentives to expand the scope of the program,** Scott told Nextgov. "It's just

a powerful **surveillance** tool ... with no rules in place," he said. "There is **potential for abuse because there's not really**

the rules in place to make sure [the program] remains narrow." During last week's hearing, Giuliani also said that

without more regulations in place, she feared the **program could expand into something far more intrusive than**

identifying travelers. While face scans are optional for U.S. citizens today, Scott worries CBP could eventually make it de facto mandatory

for people to use the system, either by making alternative ID checks more laborious or explicitly requiring it for international travelers. Already,

the Transportation Security Administration is planning to build off CBP's work and [stand up its own biometrics program](#) for domestic travelers,

and as the public gets more exposure to the tech, the agencies could continue expanding its reach in the name of safety, according to Scott.

This harms women

Rebecca **Chowdhury**, 06-02-20**22**, "High-Tech Surveillance Could Track Abortion-Seekers in U.S.", TIME,

<https://time.com/6184111/abortion-surveillance-tech-tracking/> // TT

According to [ICE's](#) website, these data sharing programs enable the agency to work with "law enforcement partners in the shared responsibility

for ensuring the safety of our communities" by **"using biometrics to identify foreign-born individuals** arrested for criminal

offenses." This data collection could affect citizens and non-citizens, alike, organizers say—whether or not people have interacted with police.

The Center on Privacy and Technology at Georgetown Law, a Washington, D.C. think tank, [released a major report on ICE in May](#). It claims that

ICE can access the driver's license data of 74% of adults. The agency has already used **facial recognition technology** to search the

driver's license photographs of 32% of adults in the US, according to the report. Advocates say these ongoing **surveillance tactics**

could be directed against abortion seekers or providers in states that restrict or criminalize abortion. In

a new [report](#), the Surveillance Technology Oversight Project predicts that **state officials will “turn to the surveillance tools**

that have become so central to American policing, using technology to peer into the most intimate aspects of our lives.”

Across the nation, surveillance creeps in

Hannah **Tyler**, 02-02-20**22**, "The Increasing Use of Artificial Intelligence in Border Zones Prompts Privacy Questions", Migration Policy

Institute, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/artificial-intelligence-border-zones-privacy> // TT

Critics warn that **the use of this technology could lead to endless surveillance and a vast, ever-growing**

dragnet, as technology that is deployed to patrol the border is also used by local police miles in the

U.S. interior. Local police in border communities—and those far from the border—have been revealed to use facial recognition technology,

cellphone tracking “stingray” systems, license-plate cameras, drones, and spy planes, with **immigration authorities** sometimes

sharing information with law enforcement for non-immigration purposes. CBP flew nearly 700

surveillance missions between 2010 and 2012 **on behalf of other law enforcement agencies** according to flight

logs, some of which were not directly related to border protection. During Black Lives Matter protests in Minneapolis in 2020 following the

murder of George Floyd, a CBP Predator drone flew over the city and provided live video to authorities on the ground. Similar operations

involving helicopters, airplanes, and drones also took place in 14 other cities, broadcasting about 270 hours of footage live to CBP control rooms.

Critics' concerns about the creep of these kinds of technologies from the border into the interior of the country have escalated in recent years, as their use has become more widespread.

The result is a chilling effect, surveillance is used to identify and arrest abortion seekers

Li **Zhou** and Youyou **Zhou**, 07-01-20**22**, "Who overturning Roe hurts most, explained in 7 charts", Vox,

<https://www.vox.com/2022/7/1/23180626/roe-dobbs-charts-impact-abortion-women-rights>

"The US already has higher maternal mortality than many countries. This will exacerbate that. The US already has

higher child poverty than many countries. This will exacerbate that." The data, ultimately, backs up Raifman's assertion. Missouri is one of nine

states where a ban or near ban on abortion was set to go into effect since Roe was overturned, and as many as 17 other states could soon follow

suit. (Notably, several bans have been put on hold because of legal challenges that have been filed.) **About 33.7 million women**, or

about half of reproductive-age women (defined as those between 15 and 44, in this analysis) **in the US, live in states where there**

are poised to be new restrictions. Research has shown that **losing access to legal abortion means that more**

women will die, that more families will live in poverty, and that society will bear larger consequences in the decades to

come... **women who were denied an abortion** were three times more likely to be unemployed than women who were able to

access an abortion. After a year, they were less likely to have aspirational future plans. By the fifth year, they **were four times more likely to live in poverty.**

C2

Although fragile, an economic recovery is on the way

Fortinsky Sarah, 9-19-20**24**, "Yellen on 'soft landing' prediction: 'I believe that's exactly what we're seeing in the economy'," Hill//vivyells, <https://thehill.com/business/economy/4888824-yellen-soft-landing-us-economy/>

Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen said Thursday she believes **the U.S. economy is making** the **"soft landing"** that she predicted two years ago, when inflation

soared after the pandemic. In a live interview during the Atlantic Festival 2024, journalist Ron Brownstein recalled their interview in 2022, when, he said, **"there was a great**

deal of apprehension about the economy, about the Biden administration's management of the

economy." "Well, here we are now, two years later: unemployment 4.2, inflation under 3 percent, Fed finally, cutting interest rates," he said. "I know Taylor Swift has been in the news

a lot lately, so let me ask you: Are we out of the woods?" **Yellen cautioned against overconfidence, since "there are always risks**

to the economy" but she said today's economy is exhibiting key markers of a soft landing, as she outlined them two years ago. "When we spoke two years ago, what I said was, I

believe that **there was a path to bring inflation down, in the context of a strong job market, and if the Fed**

and the administration's policies could succeed in accomplishing that, we'd call that a soft landing,"

Yellen said. "And I believe that's exactly what we're seeing in the economy," she continued. **the Federal Reserve** on Wednesday **cut interest rates** by 50

basis points, in its first rate reduction after a two-and-a-half-year crusade against inflation. The new federal funds rate is 4.75-5 percent. The Fed incrementally increased interest

rates from near zero in March 2022 to a range of 5.25-5.5 percent last July as it battled rising inflation, which peaked at 9.1 percent in June 2022. **While rate hikes fueled**

recession concerns and layoff fears, the unemployment rate maintained its lowest sub-4 percent

streak since the 1960s. Yellen said she wouldn't comment on the decision to cut rates by the Federal Reserve, which she previously chaired, but said the decision is "**a**

very positive sign for where the U.S. economy is." Yellen said **the labor market remains "strong,"** despite

having cooled significantly. "It's not as hot as the labor market was a year and a half or two years ago,

when firms were utterly struggling to hire back employees that they had laid off during the pandemic,

and there had been huge shifts in demand, wages were rising very rapidly." Yellen said she believes the U.S. economy can

continue down this path, which **would be "an excellent outcome."**

Affirming quashes our soft landing

1. Reducing migrant inflows

Kevin Appleby, Center For Migration Studies, 09-02-2024, "The Importance of Immigrant Labor to the US Economy", Center for Migration

Studies of New York (CMS), <https://cmsny.org/importance-of-immigrant-labor-to-us-economy/> // RB

Despite calls to deport all undocumented persons in our nation, such an operation would cause a severe strain on US citizens, as labor

shortages would accrue and inflation would rise. Moreover, federal, state, and local budgets would be reduced, as taxes paid by undocumented

workers would be lost, including their contributions to the Social Security and Medicare systems. The following offers a profile of immigrant laborers in the US economy and

measures their economic and fiscal contributions to the United States. It also argues that legalizing the undocumented workforce, instead of deporting them, and creating legal avenues for immigrant workers would serve the best interest of the United States and the US citizenry. Immigrants in the Labor Force. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2023, foreign-born workers, including the undocumented, accounted for 18.6 percent, or 29.1 million, of the US labor force, up from 18.1 percent in 2022. The labor force participation rate of the foreign-born increased to 66.6 percent, almost five percent higher than the native-born population (61.8 percent). Foreign-born workers were mainly employed in service occupations, construction, transportation, and material moving occupations, with native-born workers employed in management, professional, and sales and office occupations, making their roles in the labor force largely complementary. Almost half (47.6 percent) of the foreign-born workforce was Hispanic, with about a quarter (25.1 percent) being Asian. According to estimates from the Center for Migration Studies of New York (CMS) and other groups, as many as **8.3 million undocumented immigrants work in the US economy**, or

5.2 percent of the workforce. They work in construction (1.5 million), restaurants (1 million), agriculture and farms (320,000), landscaping (300,000), and food

processing and manufacturing (200,000), among other occupations. [1] Unauthorized workers hail from Mexico (30 percent), Central and South America (20 percent),

and Central and Eastern Asia (15 percent). Occupations which will continue to demand undocumented workers over the next decade include cooks, home health/personal care aides, delivery

and taxi drivers, and medical/therapy assistants. In New York State, CMS estimates a total of 470,100 undocumented workers, with 56 percent coming from six countries: Mexico, Ecuador,

Guatemala, El Salvador, China, and the Dominican Republic. They work as construction workers (29, 500), maids/housekeepers (20,900), cooks (16,800), home and personal care aides (16,800),

janitors (13,600), and delivery drivers (13,400), among other occupations. Potential Labor Shortages. In order to grow, the US economy will continue to need immigrant workers in certain

industries. A Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas study found that immigrant **laborers have helped grow the post-pandemic economy.**

spurring job growth while also keeping down inflation.

But surveillance would scare civilians from crossing, creating massive labor shortages

Historically

Stephen **Devadoss**, 06-28-20**11**, "IMPLICATIONS OF IMMIGRATION POLICIES FOR THE U.S. FARM SECTOR AND WORKFORCE", Wiley Online

Library, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1465-7295.2010.00300.x>

Consequently, the U.S. Congress attempted to address the immigration problems by enacting the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). The goals of IRCA were to eliminate the stock of undocumented workers through amnesty² and domestic enforcement of employer sanctions and curb the influx of [REDACTED] [undocumented] immigrants by increasing the border surveillance.

Amnesty failed to eliminate the stock of [REDACTED] [undocumented] immigrants because only about half of the [REDACTED] [undocumented] immigrants filed for citizenship, and it created future expectation of amnesty and more [REDACTED] [undocumented] unauthorized entry. Furthermore, domestic sanctions on employers of undocumented workers and deportation of these workers were scantily enforced. **To stop the influx of immigrants, IRCA focused heavily on tightening border control. The IRCA**

also legislated the H-2A program, which allowed agricultural employers to bring in guest workers during seasonal operations (ERS 2007). However, farmers complained that the cumbersome paperwork of H-2A and bureaucratic delay were not conducive to procure seasonal laborers at the time of peak farm operations such as vegetable and fruit picking.³ In spite of IRCA's amnesty provision and strengthened control

measures, [undocumented] immigration continued to rise—about 12 million unauthorized immigrants resided in the United States in 2007 (Martin 2007) which is reaffirmed by many popular press reports—leading to an extended congressional debate that began at the start of this decade to solve the [undocumented] immigration problem. Several bills were proposed by the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the White House, addressing issues related to increased domestic and border enforcements,⁴ paths to citizenship, and guest-worker programs (Montgomery 2006). These bills were not passed because of major disagreements among lawmakers over providing citizenship and guest-worker programs. As a result of the failed legislations and the September 11 attack, the government primarily focused on border security. Accordingly, funding for border enforcement has steadily increased,⁵ and resources were diverted from domestic to border enforcement. However, Boucher and Taylor (2007) documented that increased funding to secure the border did not deter undocumented workers from crossing the border because determined immigrants eventually find a way to enter the country by repeated attempts. Following September 11, 2001, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) further decreased the number of human hours devoted to worksite inspection because monitoring critical infrastructure took priority (GAO 2005). For example, from 1999 to 2003, the number of human hours for domestic enforcement decreased from 480,000 to 18,000.^{6,7} But, by late 2005, the U.S. government started to intensify domestic surveillance. For example, only 25 criminal arrests relating to [undocumented] immigration occurred in 2002, but increased to 716 by 2006 and 1,103 by 2008 (U.S. Department of Homeland Security 2008c). Domestic surveillance has further intensified under the current administration (Meyer and Gorman 2009). According to Passel (2008), a decreasing trend in the unauthorized immigrant population is recently occurring.⁸ This is largely due to worksite and border enforcements and the recent U.S. economic recession. These enforcements have exacerbated U.S. agricultural labor shortages before the 2008/2009 economic crisis. According to the National Agricultural Worker Survey, 80% of the newly

hired farm labor force is from Mexico, of which 96% are unauthorized (U.S. Department of Labor 2005). Therefore, as

border and domestic enforcements intensified, entry of undocumented immigrants into the U.S. farm labor

force was thwarted, which led to an acute labor scarcity. For example, the Wall Street Journal (2007) reported that in 2006, about

20% of agricultural products were not harvested nationwide. Furthermore, the Rural Migration News (2007) provides a detailed and

specific list of these shortages and the adverse effect on crucial cultivational operations which resulted in heavy losses. As a result, farm groups are one of the strongest allies of overhauling the

current guest-worker program to bring immigrants to legally work in U.S. agriculture. For the last several decades, immigrants played a crucial role in the

development and competitiveness of U.S. agricultural production (Torok and Huffman 1986). For example, Devadoss and Luckstead

(2008) provide evidence of the importance of immigrant farm workers to vegetable production which is highly labor intensive. The United States has a great land endowment and ideal growing

conditions; however, without immigrant labor who perform the back-breaking labor-intensive operations that

U.S. low-skilled workers are unwilling to perform, agricultural productivity and total production would

decline. Consequently, costs to U.S. consumers of agricultural products would increase and net exports

would also decrease. In recent years, Mexican immigrant labor contributed significantly to the expansion of U.S. agricultural exports, particularly between the United States

and Mexico. For example, between 1994 and 2008, net U.S. exports to the world and to Mexico increased by 82% and 200%, respectively (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2008f). Devoid of

these laborers, this dramatic increase would not have been possible.

2. Increasing migrant outflows

Avi Asher-Schapiro, 07-20-2024, "Trump, armed with tech, could supercharge deportations", No Publication,

<https://www.context.news/ai/trump-armed-with-tech-could-supercharge-deportations>. //brask

Surveillance and AI could speed Trump's promise to deport millions of immigrants. Immigrants brace for crackdown post-election AI and surveillance

bolster US borders LOS ANGELES - Maru Mora-Villalpando had been living in the United States for 21 years when a letter arrived at her door with a deportation notice. It was 11 months into

Donald Trump's presidency, and Mora-Villalpando thought she had taken all the necessary steps to keep her address hidden from authorities. But she did not realise that immigration officials

could track her whereabouts using basic information she had assumed was private, such as her car registration or utility bills. "I didn't know all this data was being packaged up and given to

authorities," said Mora-Villalpando, a community organiser who works with immigrant and undocumented communities in Seattle, Washington. "People would see ICE (Immigration and

Customs Enforcement) agents outside their homes, and we didn't know how they would find us - well now we know." The Trump campaign and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) did not respond to requests for comment. High-tech enterprise Immigration enforcement is increasingly a high-tech enterprise. Authorities can track migrants using data brokers that create detailed profiles of immigrants based on thousands of data points, as well as other state-of-the-art **surveillance tools including** facial recognition and licence plate

readers. Algorithms can help decide an immigrant's fate on a range of issues, from whether they should wear an ankle monitor to whether an asylum case is flagged as suspicious. Authorities are also using ever more artificial intelligence (**AI**), which campaigners worry **could generate target lists for deportation or automatically**

reject asylum applicants **en masse**. With Trump leading in the polls, many organizations that work with immigrant communities worry these **tools could be**

used to speedily target then **deport** some of the **more than 11 million undocumented people** who are estimated to live in the U.S.

"There's a huge tech infrastructure ready to do just that," said Jacinta Gonzalez, field director of Mijente, a grassroots organisation that works on immigration issues. In a memo released in 2023, the DHS, which oversees immigration enforcement, said it would "not use AI technology to enable improper systemic, indiscriminate, or large-scale monitoring, surveillance or tracking of individuals." Undocumented immigrants always have risked deportation - even those who came as children or who are near-lifelong U.S. residents. Despite more than two decades of trying, Congress has never been able to pass a law that would normalise their status.

The impact is recession

Austin **Denean**, Fri, September 20th 20**24**, "Fed turns focus toward bolstering economy with obstacles ahead", WLOS,

<https://wlos.com/news/nation-world/fed-turns-focus-toward-bolstering-economy-with-obstacles-ahead-inflation-unemployment-jobs-interest-rates-consumer-spending-soft-landing-jerome-powell-federal-reserve>

The **Federal Reserve is moving onto its next mission after [the first rate cut](#)** since ratcheting them up to tame the rate of price increases

earlier this week marked a symbolic **end to its fight with inflation** and the beginning of a new phase **to steer the economy into a soft**

landing. Keeping the labor market intact is one of the chief challenges for the Fed to navigate as it

eases interest rates to a more neutral level where they do not spur or slow economic activity. Signals that the

employment situation in the U.S. is declining have grown more prominent in recent months. Unemployment rose to 4.2% last month compared to 3.7% in January and the rate at which

businesses have added jobs has also declined. Labor data is still strong to solid compared to historical averages but is significantly weaker than it was in the peak of the post-pandemic

resurgence of the economy. Policymakers' projections showed they are predicting unemployment to continue to climb modestly through the end of the year to 4.4% and stay there by the end

of 2025. That is an increase of 4% this year and 4.2% for 2025. Powell said on Wednesday that the **labor market is no longer causing inflationary**

pressure through a labor shortage that caused wages to rise rapidly and was passed onto consumers in

the form of higher prices. They are now turning their focus to the maximum employment side of their dual mandate of overseeing the economy. **Economists**

also noted that Powell was very clear about further weakening in the labor market being an

unwelcome development. The other big challenge facing the central bank is determining what its benchmark interest rate needs to be to have a neutral effect on the

economy, meaning that it would neither spur growth nor weaken activity. There is some debate among economists as to exactly what that range is, and Powell signed governors are also unsure

but that it is higher than it was prior to the pandemic.

Absent a soft landing

Boston University, 11-01-20**13**, "The Financial Crisis and The Great Recession," Boston University.

https://www.bu.edu/eci/files/2019/06/MAC_2e_Chapter_15.pdf recut Aaron

The financial crisis that commenced in 2007 and its aftermath have been widely referred to as the “Great **Recession**”—and with good reason. From its beginning until its nadir in 2009,

it was **responsible for the destruction of** nearly **\$20 trillion worth of financial assets owned by U.S.**

households. During this time, the **U.S. unemployment rate rose from 4.7 percent to 10 percent** (not counting the discouraged and

marginally attached workers discussed in Chapter 7). By 2010, college graduates fortunate enough to find a job were, on average, earning 17.5 percent less than their counterparts before the

crisis—and experts were predicting that such **a decline in earnings would persist for more than a decade**. The **crisis also spread**

beyond U.S. borders. **As consumption and income decline[s]d in the United States**, many countries

experienced a significant reduction in exports as well as a decline in the investments that they held in the United States. As a result, **global GDP**

declined by 2 percent in 2009. It has been estimated that between 50 million and **100 million people** around the world either **fell into**

or were prevented from escaping, extreme **poverty** due to the crisis. Why did this happen?

C3

Cybersecurity’s on the chopping block

David **Jones**, 11-10-20**23**, “As Congress weighs budget priorities, top cyber execs urge CISA funding support”, Cybersecurity Dive,

<https://www.cybersecuritydive.com/news/congress-budget-cyber-execs-cisa-funding/699461/> // TT

CISA has faced rising backlash from Republican House members in recent months **related to the agency's**

work to combat disinformation related to election security. A failed amendment to the House

Homeland Security Appropriations bill included language to slash the CISA budget by 25% and was

supported by 108 Republican House members. "We have heard there may still be calls for significant cuts to CISA and we remain concerned that

cuts like these could undermine CISA's network defense and critical infrastructure coordination mission," Tenable officials said via email. Eric

Goldstein, CISA's executive assistant director for cybersecurity, told a House Homeland Security Committee hearing that the **proposed cuts**

would greatly harm CISA's ability to monitor threats against federal networks. "We would not be able to sustain

that visibility **with that significant of a budget cut,** and **our adversaries would unequivocally exploit those**

gaps," Goldstein said.

Affirming is the nail in the coffin

Katz 24 [Eric Katz, 2-13-2024, DHS to slash operations, reshuffle workforce without additional funds, agency warns, Government Executive,

<https://www.govexec.com/management/2024/02/dhs-slash-operations-and-reshuffle-workforce-without-additional-funds-agency-warns/39419>

[0/\]](#) // MVSG

The **Homeland Security** Department **is preparing to potentially move some employees from their**

primary functions and reprogram funds to address a budget shortfall, the agency said on Wednesday, sending out a

warning to lawmakers that their **inaction could harm national security.** The Biden administration is imploring Congress to provide

more funds throughout DHS to avoid the slashing of operations. Among the expected cut backs would be upgrades to ports of entry and border surveillance technology, shelter services for migrant arrivals, deportation rates and asylum processing. “The administration has

repeatedly requested additional resources for DHS’ vital missions on the southwest border and Congress

has chronically underfunded them,” a department spokesperson said. “Most recently, Congress rejected the bipartisan

national security bill out of hand, which will put at risk DHS’s current removal operations, put further

strain on our already overtaxed workforce and make it harder to catch fentanyl at ports of entry.” The

Senate rejected the bipartisan measure that took months to negotiate after former President Trump and House Republicans put pressure on the lawmakers to vote against the restrictive immigration reform and border security bill. The measure included \$18 billion for components

throughout DHS, including for the hiring of thousands of new employees. “Without adequate funding for CBP, ICE and

USCIS, the department will have to reprogram or pull resources from other efforts,” the DHS spokesperson said.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services would have to reassign hundreds of personnel from their normal duties to conduct initial screenings of new migrant arrivals, the spokesperson added. That would take them away from adjudicating green cards and addressing the asylum backlog,

leading to longer wait times for the applicants. USCIS just last week announced it had reduced its total backlog for the first time in a decade. It

completed 10 million cases in fiscal 2023, an all-time record, reducing its overall number of pending cases by 15%. USCIS is still struggling to dig

out from a hiring freeze it implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, when the agency threatened to furlough most of its workers as normal

funds collected through fees dried up. Congress eventually intervened, but not before a longstanding hiring pause depleted the agency. The

border measure would have provided USCIS with 4,300 asylum officers, quintupling that part of the agency’s workforce, while also adding new

responsibilities. Without an injection of funding, Immigration and Customs Enforcement would have to scale back its current pace of border

and removal operations. ICE in fiscal 2023 removed more than 140,000 individuals and turned away nearly 63,000 migrants when the Title 42

policy remained in effect, though a spokesperson said it would no longer be able to sustain that ramped-up operational capacity. Under the

bipartisan border deal, ICE would have received \$7.6 billion and 1,200 new employees. The Washington Post reported on Wednesday ICE is considering releasing thousands of detained immigrants as it can no longer afford to hold 38,000 individuals. “A reduction in ICE operations would significantly harm border security, national security and public safety,” the DHS spokesperson said. **Customs and Border**

Protection would repurpose funds away from “nonessential areas,” which DHS said would require

sacrifices to priority capital investments. Rep. Bennie Thompson, D-Miss., the top Democrat on the House Homeland Security

Committee, said Republicans were playing “political games” rather than addressing an urgent matter. “Because Republicans refuse to actually govern and have stated they won’t provide another dime to DHS, ICE will soon be forced to reduce operations and release significant numbers

of detainees,” Thompson said. “If it is a crisis at the border, then Republicans must agree to fix it now.” Rep. Mark Green, R-Tenn., who chairs

the panel and led the effort to impeach DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, called the administration’s warnings “absurd,” accusing ICE of letting

bed space for detained migrants go unused and noting the agency proposed cutting its detention capacity in its fiscal 2024 budget proposal.

“Instead of treating enforcement as a hostage negotiation—‘give us more money or else’—Secretary Mayorkas should just do his job and follow

the law,” Green said. **DHS, like all agencies, is currently operating under a continuing resolution that is**

funding it at fiscal 2023 levels. That is set to expire March 8 as lawmakers negotiate final appropriations bills, though **overall**

spending throughout government will stay flat. The Senate this week advanced a supplemental spending package that

stripped out all funding initially included for DHS. The department has become the latest of several in the Biden administration to warn the

uncertainty of the CR and expected flat funding environment is negatively impacting operations. Facilities throughout the Veterans Affairs

Department are restricting hiring as they deal with budget shortfalls. The Social Security Administration told Congress at the start of the fiscal

year it had to freeze hiring and overtime, with leaders noting the agency has been underresourced for a decade. Once Congress completes the

full-year appropriations process, agencies across government will be dealing with budget constraints due to a spending agreement originally

negotiated by the White House and House Republicans.

The impact is economic crisis

CISA's the pillar of our economy

Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, xx-xx-xxxx, "Financial Services Sector", Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency,

<https://www.cisa.gov/topics/critical-infrastructure-security-and-resilience/critical-infrastructure-sectors/financial-services-sector> // TT

The Financial Services Sector represents a vital component of our nation's critical infrastructure. Large-scale power outages, recent natural disasters, and an increase in the number and sophistication of cyberattacks demonstrate the wide range of potential risks facing the sector.

Overview **The Financial Services Sector includes thousands of depository institutions, providers of**

investment products, insurance companies, other credit and financing organizations, and the providers of

the critical financial utilities and services that support these functions. Financial institutions vary widely in size and presence, ranging from

some of the world's largest global companies with thousands of employees and many billions of dollars in assets, to

community banks and credit unions with a small number of employees serving individual communities. Whether an individual

savings account, financial derivatives, credit extended to a large organization, or investments made to a foreign country, these products allow customers to: Deposit funds and make payments to other parties Provide credit and liquidity to customers Invest funds for both long and short periods Transfer financial risks between customers.

Absent adequate defense

Ronald **Orol**, 05-14-20**19**, "In Cyberspace, All Banks Are Vulnerable," Centre for International Governance Innovation,

<https://www.cigionline.org/articles/cyberspace-all-banks-are-vulnerable> // TT

According to a paper issued in March by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the hackers used a “hot patch” of the payments

system to bypass security features. They also built custom malware to carry out the attack, which the authors described as **an**

“unprecedented escalation” of cybercrime. Bankers, regulators and big investors continue to worry about another hack of the

SWIFT system. However, beyond **cyber heists**, policy makers now have a much bigger concern: **a future attack on the financial**

system's network infrastructure, or on a big bank, could trigger the next global economic crisis. “We are

all aware of what happened in the great financial crisis,” David Hunt, CEO of PGIM, Prudential Financial Inc.’s global investment management

business, told a confab of big investors and executives in April at the annual Milken Institute Global Conference in Beverly Hills, California. “But

the next crisis is likely to come from technology and cyber.”

The risk is uniquely high now

Hadley **Spadaccini**, 04-18-20**24**, "Risks are higher than ever for US- China cyber war", Responsible Statecraft,

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/us-china-cyberwar/> // TT

This announcement came on the heels of warnings from Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) Director Jen Easterly and

National Cyber Director Harry Coker that **Chinese hackers are making a strategic shift to target critical**

infrastructure, are likely able to launch cyberattacks that could cripple that infrastructure, and are

increasingly exploiting Americans' private information. It's apparent then that **a conflict between China and the United States**

would include disruptive, dangerous cyberwarfare. Indeed, as U.S.-China military-to-military communications restart,

cyber needs to become a key part of these conversations to develop bilateral crisis management

mechanisms. Unfortunately, cyber crisis management is still in its infancy. The United States and China have engaged in multiple bilateral

and multilateral dialogues on cyber-related issues in the past. For example, the 2015 summit between President Obama and Xi Jinping created a

series of agreements — tacit and explicit — on cyber espionage, the joint investigation of cybercrimes, and a process that eventually produced

the U.S.-China High-Level Joint Dialogue on Cybercrime and Related Issues. However, **direct U.S.-China official dialogues have**

not led to substantial cooperation. President Biden warned Xi during a recent call against China using cyberattacks to target

sensitive infrastructure, but no solutions nor potential dialogues appear to have been brought up. There is no dearth of unofficial dialogues, and

some have proposed discrete steps that would enhance U.S.-China cyber relations and crisis management mechanisms, such as coming to

mutual definitions of cyber terms, strengthening bilateral communications, and promoting restraint in cyber usage. Unfortunately, **despite**

the many attempts at facilitating U.S.-China cyber dialogues and improved relations, no concrete

standards or guidelines on cyber usage **in a potential conflict have been adopted**, nor have U.S.-China cyber relations

appeared to improve.

It's existential

Liu 18 [Qian Liu (Qian Liu is an economist and executive who frequently publishes in highly regarded academic journals and business outlets, and is frequently interviewed by news outlets), 11-13-2018,

“The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why,” World Economic Forum,

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-here-s-why/>]

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social,

political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality,

could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted

governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back

from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even

negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested

heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural

reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers

have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard's Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role

in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster.

Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other

factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a

record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising

nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future

crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support

are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world's unprecedented

interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump's

us – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against

this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a

large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington, considering such a scenario could help

us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have

long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well

be global conflagration.

Rebuttal

No ev. read.