

Weigh the aff against the K. That is, the aff is the disad to the K.

Prioritize this ROTB for two reasons:

- a) Fairness — they can thwart the entire debate since we now have 4 minutes of wasting time, this is a 13:9 time skew
- b) Education
 - i) More clash — now we have to interact with our links, it's education for both of us and only fair because they can't attack the affs mindset without attacking the specific advocacies
 - ii) Policy — pitting the K against specific policies forces it to interact with the links, that's the best path toward specific policy reform with the education we take out of this space.
- c) **Arbitrary roles jettison the resolutorial stasis point and shift goalposts, decking competitive equity.** Fairness ow — they presume their arguments will be read fairly when reading the K

3. Alt fails without concrete policy

Bryant '12 (EDITED FOR GENDERED LANGUAGE – the author said “she” and it was replaced with the word “to” – Levi Bryant is currently a Professor of Philosophy at Collin College. In addition to working as a professor, Bryant has also served as a Lacanian psychoanalyst. He received his Ph.D. from Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois, where he originally studied 'disclosedness' with the Heidegger scholar Thomas Sheehan. Bryant later changed his dissertation topic to the transcendental empiricism of Gilles Deleuze, “Critique of the Academic Left”, <http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/>)

I must be in a mood today— half irritated, half amused —because I find myself ranting. Of course, that’s not entirely unusual. So this afternoon I came across a post by a friend quoting something discussing the environmental movement that pushed all the right button. As the post read, For mainstream environmentalism— conservationism, green consumerism, and resource management —humans are conceptually separated out of nature and mythically placed in privileged positions of authority and control over ecological communities and their nonhuman constituents. What emerges is the fiction of a marketplace of ‘raw materials’ and ‘resources’ through which human-centered wants, constructed as needs, might be satisfied. The mainstream narratives are replete with such metaphors [carbon trading!]. Natural complexity,, mutuality, and diversity are rendered virtually meaningless given discursive parameters that reduce nature to discrete units of exchange measuring extractive capacities. Jeff Shantz, “Green Syndicalism” While finding elements this description perplexing— I can’t say that I see many environmentalists treating nature and culture as distinct or suggesting that we’re sovereigns of nature —I do agree that we conceive much of our relationship to the natural world in economic terms (not a surprise that capitalism is today a universal). This, however, is not what bothers me about this passage. What I wonder is just what we’re supposed to do even if all of this is true? What, given existing conditions, are we to do if all of this is right? At least green consumerism, conservation, resource management, and things like carbon trading are

engaging in activities that are making real differences. From this passage— and maybe the entire text would disabuse me of this conclusion— it sounds like we are to reject all of these interventions because they remain tied to a capitalist model of production that the author (and myself) find abhorrent. The idea seems to be that if we endorse these things we are tainting our hands and would therefore do well to reject them altogether. The problem as I see it is that this is the worst sort of abstraction (in the Marxist sense) and wishful thinking. Within a Marxo-Hegelian context, a thought is abstract when it ignores all of the mediations in which a thing is embedded. For example, I understand a robust tree abstractly when I attribute its robustness, say, to its genetics alone, ignoring the complex relations to its soil, the air, sunshine, rainfall, etc., that also allowed it to grow robustly in this way. This is the sort of critique we're always leveling against the neoliberals. They are abstract thinkers. In their doxa that individuals are entirely responsible for themselves and that they completely make themselves by pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, neoliberals ignore all the mediations belonging to the social and material context in which human beings develop that play a role in determining the vectors of their life. They ignore, for example, that George W. Bush grew up in a family that was highly connected to the world of business and government and that this gave him opportunities that someone living in a remote region of Alaska in a very different material infrastructure and set of family relations does not have. To think concretely is to engage in a cartography of these mediations, a mapping of these networks, from circumstance to circumstance (what I call an "onto-cartography"). It is to map assemblages, networks, or ecologies in the constitution of entities. Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It's good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignoring how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I'm reminded by the "underpants gnomes" depicted in South Park: The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this: Phase 1: Collect Underpants Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Profit! They even have a catchy song to go with their work: Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows: Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation! Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD's in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don't have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn't make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing? But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don't embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of "revolutionary" is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done! But this isn't where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, and when we do, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these

things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc. What are your proposals? How will you meet these problems? How will you navigate the existing mediations or semiotic and material features of infrastructure? Marx and Lenin had proposals. Do you? Have you even explored the cartography of the problem? Today we are so intellectually bankrupt on these points that we even have theorists speaking of events and acts and talking about a return to the old socialist party systems, ignoring the horror they generated, their failures, and not even proposing ways of avoiding the repetition of these horrors in a new system of organization. Who among our critical theorists is thinking seriously about how to build a distribution and production system that is responsive to the needs of global consumption, avoiding the problems of planned economy, i.e., who is doing this in a way that gets notice in our circles? Who is addressing the problems of micro-fascism that arise with party systems (there's a reason that it was the Negri & Hardt contingent, not the Badiou contingent that has been the heart of the occupy movement). At least the ecologists are thinking about these things in these terms because, well, they think ecologically. Sadly we need something more, a melding of the ecologists, the Marxists, and the anarchists. We're not getting it yet though, as far as I can tell. Indeed, folks seem attracted to yet another critical paradigm, Laruelle. I would love, just for a moment, to hear a radical environmentalist talk about his ideal high school that would be academically sound. How would he provide for the energy needs of that school? How would he meet building codes in an environmentally sound way? How would she provide food for the students? What would be her plan for waste disposal? And most importantly, how would (to) she navigate the school board, the state legislature, the federal government, and all the families of these students? What is your plan? What is your alternative? I think there are alternatives. I saw one that approached an alternative in Rotterdam. If you want to make a revolutionary contribution, this is where you should start. Why should anyone even bother listening to you if you aren't proposing real plans? But we haven't even gotten to that point. Instead we're like underpants gnomes, saying "revolution is the answer!" without addressing any of the infrastructural questions of just how revolution is to be produced, what alternatives it would offer, and how we would concretely go about building those alternatives. Masturbation. "Underpants gnome" deserves to be a category in critical theory; a sort of synonym for self-congratulatory masturbation. We need less critique not because critique isn't important or necessary— it is —but because we know the critiques, we know the problems. We're intoxicated with critique because it's easy and safe. We best every opponent with critique. We occupy a position of moral superiority with critique. But do we really do anything with critique? What we need today, more than ever, is composition or carpentry. Everyone knows something is wrong. Everyone knows this system is destructive and stacked against them. Even the Tea Party knows something is wrong with the economic system, despite having the wrong economic theory. None of us, however, are proposing alternatives. Instead we prefer to shout and denounce. Good luck with that.

Capitalist growth is overwhelmingly sustainable---the data is clear.

Zitlmann '23 [Rainer; March 7; world-renowned author, successful businessman and real estate investor, with two doctorates, one in history and political science at the Technical University of Darmstadt, and doctorate in sociology at Potsdam, began his career lecturing history at the Freie Universität Berlin from 1987 to 1992, then became chief editor at one of the leading and most prestigious publishing houses in Germany, Ullstein-Propyläen, then founded a company, Dr. ZitlmannPB. GmbH, which he ran from 2000 to 2016, establishing it as by far the leading PR consultancy for the German real estate industry; In Defense of Capitalism, Chapter 9, published in the United States by Republic Book Publishers]

For more than 20 years, researchers at Yale University have been publishing the Environmental Performance Index (EPI), which ranks countries according to their environmental health and ecosystem vitality. The EPI uses a total of 32 performance indicators in eleven categories:¹⁴⁷

1. Air Quality
2. Sanitation and Drinking Water
3. Heavy Metals
4. Waste Management
5. Biodiversity and Habitat
6. Ecosystem Services
7. Fisheries
8. Climate Change
9. Pollution Emissions
10. Water Resources
11. Agriculture

According to Yale University's analyses, Denmark, Luxembourg, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and France are the highest-ranked countries, followed by Austria, Finland, Sweden, Norway and Germany. The 2020 report states, "One of the consistent lessons of the EPI is that achieving sustainability requires sufficient economic prosperity to fund public health and environmental infrastructure."

The researchers find that there is a clear positive correlation between environmental performance and per capita GDP.¹⁴⁸

<<TEXT CONDENSED NONE OMITTED>>

An interesting comparison can be made between the EPI and the Heritage Foundation's Index of Economic Freedom, which has been measuring economic freedom around the globe since 1995. The Index, which is also referred to as the capitalism index by the sociologist Erich Weede,¹⁴⁹ analyzes the level of economic freedom in 178 countries and applies twelve criteria, all of which are weighted equally: 1. Property Rights 2. Judicial Effectiveness 3. Government Integrity 4. Tax Burden 5. Government Spending 6. Fiscal Health 7. Business Freedom 8. Labor Freedom 9. Monetary Freedom 10. Trade Freedom 11. Investment Freedom 12. Financial Freedom. The ten most economically free countries in the world in the 2021 Index are: 1. Singapore 2. New Zealand 3. Australia 4. Switzerland 5. Ireland 6. Taiwan 7. United Kingdom 8. Estonia 9. Canada 10. Denmark

<<PARAGRAPH BREAKS CONTINUE>>

According to the 2021 Index, the countries with the lowest levels of economic freedom are North Korea, Venezuela, Cuba, Sudan and Zimbabwe. The 178 countries are all grouped into five categories: "Free," "Mostly Free," "Moderately Free," "Mostly Unfree" and "Repressed." The Heritage Foundation's researchers compared the two indices—Yale University's Environmental Performance Index and their own Index of Economic Freedom—for the year 2020 and found that the countries with the highest levels of economic freedom also had the highest EPI scores, averaging 76.1, while the "Mostly Free" countries averaged 70.2. There is then a big gap to the "Moderately Free" countries, which were rated much lower (59.6 points) for their environmental performance. The "Mostly Unfree" and "Repressed" countries registered by far the worst environmental performance (46.7 and 50.3 points in the EPI, respectively).¹⁵⁰

To smooth out the dynamic developments in the Index of Economic Freedom, it makes sense to take each country's average score over the 15 years from 2006 to 2020. This compensates for the kind of one-off effects that can result from short-term policy measures. These averages can then be compared with the Environmental Performance Index scores from 2020. The data reveal a clear positive correlation (the correlation coefficient is 0.67). A regression analysis also

confirms that for every **one-point** increase in the Economic Freedom Index, there is a **1.06-point** increase in the Environmental Performance Index. Such a **high coefficient**, combined with the **very strong correlation** between the indexes, **suggests a clear statistical relationship**. This **correlation** can be **explained by** the **causality** between increased **capitalism** and **greater technological progress and prosperity**.

The economist Daniel Fernández Méndez addressed **the potential objection** that countries with greater economic freedom “are ‘**exporting**’ their polluting industries to the less free **third world**,” while keeping non-polluting industries in their country.”¹⁵¹ However, this is **clearly not the case**. His analysis of the **investments** made by countries **with high** environmental **standards reveals** that **only 0.1 percent of** their foreign investments flow to countries with **low** environmental **standards**. Méndez’s conclusions are **clear**: “With the **data** analyzed, we can see that **capitalism suits the environment**. The greater the economic freedom, the **better** the environmental quality indexes. The ‘cleaner’ countries **do not export** their pollution by relocating companies.”¹⁵²

Armed opposition to the state fails.

DeBoer ’16 [Fredrik; March 15th; Ph.D. from Purdue University; Fredrikdeboer, “c’mon, guys,” <http://fredrikdeboer.com/2016/03/15/cmon-guys/>; GR]

I could be wrong about the short-term dangers, and the stakes are incredibly high. But in the end we’re left with the same old question: **what tactics will actually work to secure a better world?**

In a sharp, sober piece about the meaning of left-wing political violence in the 1970s, Tim Barker writes “If you can’t acknowledge radical violence, radicals are reduced to mere victims of repression, rather than political actors who made definite tactical choices under given political circumstances.” The problem, as Barker goes on to imply, is those tactical choices: **in today’s America** they will essentially **never** break on the side of **armed opposition against the state**. The government knows everything about you, I’m sorry to say, your movements and your associations and the books you read and the things you buy and what you’re saying to the people you communicate with. That’s simply on the level of information before we even get to the state’s incredible capacity to inflict violence.

Look, the world has changed. The relative military capacity of regular people compared to establishment governments has changed, especially in fully developed, technology-enabled countries like the United States. The Czar had his armies, yes, but the Czar’s armies depended on manpower above and beyond everything else. The fighting was still mostly different groups of people with rifles shooting at each other. **If tomorrow you could rally as many people as the Bolsheviks** had at their revolutionary peak, **you’re still left in a world of F-15s, drones, and cluster bombs**. And that’s to say nothing of the fact that establishment governments in the developed world can rely on the numbing agents of capitalist luxuries and the American dream to dampen revolutionary enthusiasm even among the many millions who have been marginalized and impoverished. **This just isn’t 1950s Cuba**, guys. It’s just not. In a very real way, **modern technology effectively lowers the odds of armed political revolution** in a country like the United States **to zero** and so much the worse for us.

This isn’t fatalism. It doesn’t mean there’s no hope. **It means that there is little alternative to** organization, to changing minds through **committed political action** and using the available nonviolent means to create change: a concert of grassroots organizing, labor tactics, and partisan politics. Those things aren’t exactly likely to work, either, but they’re a hell of a lot more plausible than us dweebs taking the Pentagon. Bernie Sanders isn’t really a socialist, but he’s a social democrat that moves the conversation to the left, and if people are dedicated and committed to organizing, the local, state, and national candidates he inspires will move it further to the left still. You got any better suggestions?

Listen, commie nerds. My people. I love you guys. I really do. And I want to build a better world. Not incrementally, either, but with the kind of sweeping and transformative change that is required to fix a world of such deep injustice. But **seriously: none of us are ever going to take to the barricades**. And it’s a good thing, too, because we’d probably find a way to shoot in the wrong direction. I can’t dribble a

basketball without falling down. American socialism is largely made up of bookish dreamers. I love those people but they're not for fighting. And even if you have a particular talent for combat, you're looking at fighting the combined forces of Google, Goldman Sachs, and the defense industry. Violence is hard. Soldiering is hard. In an era of the NSA and military robots, it's really, really hard. "Should we condone revolutionary violence?" is dorm room, pass-the-bong conversation fodder, of precisely the moral and intellectual weight of "should we torture a guy if we know there's a bomb and we know he knows where it is and we know we can stop it if we do?" It's built on absurd hypotheticals, propped up by the power of anxious machismo, and undertaken to no practical political end. It's understandable. I get it, I really do. But it's got nothing to do with us. The only way forward is the grubby, unsexy work of building coalitions and asking people to climb on board.

C1: Cartels

Cartels will take over Mexico in 3 years. Caralle 23:

Katelyn Caralle, 7-2-2023, Sen. Vance backs DeSantis' proposal to use deadly force at the border, Mail Online,
<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-12256121/Pro-Trump-Ohio-Sen-JD-Vance-backs-Ron-DeSantis-proposal-use-deadly-force-border.html> Recut //MVSG (the bracketing is from the original source)

Ohio Sen. J.D. Vance said he wants to see military force used against drug cartels at the southern border as fentanyl continues to flow in the U.S. It comes the same week the Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis proposed the use of 'deadly force' against drug cartels and smugglers – but Vance's office told DailyMail.com that the comments are not connected. The massive spike in fentanyl overdoses and deaths in recent years is not only an issue that hits close to home with Vance's constituents, but also his own family, a spokesperson for the senator said when noting that his comments were pre-recorded on June 22 – four days before DeSantis' remarks. Vance has long called for more forceful action at the border and is supporting former President Donald Trump's third White House bid. The pro-Trump senator said during an interview with NBC's Meet the Press on Sunday morning that he would want to 'empower' the president, whoever that may be, to use the U.S. military to target drug cartels and smugglers at the southern border. 'You think the fentanyl problem is bad now, what about three years from now when the Mexican drug cartels are more powerful than the Mexican state itself?' Vance questioned when speaking with host Chuck Todd. Presidential hopeful DeSantis said Monday while unveiling his proposal to tackle the southern border crisis from Eagle Pass, Texas that he would use 'deadly force' to combat the flow of drugs into the U.S. from Mexico. DeSantis has repeatedly taken aim at former President Donald Trump for failing to deliver on promises he made while campaigning when he got into office – like constructing a wall along the entire southern border. 'I would empower the President of the United States – whether that's a Republican or a Democrat – to use the power of the U.S. Military to go after these drug cartels,' he said. He also warned that if the drug crisis continued on the current track, Mexico could become a 'failed state' – like what happened in Colombia. [Cartel] revenue per year has gone up 14 fold just in the last couple of years, Vance said. That shows you, I think, what bad border policies can do.' The Mexican government is being, in a lot of ways, destabilized by the constant flow of fentanyl.' DeSantis said Monday that the best way to deter cartels is by taking down coyotes and smugglers and making it clear they will be met with force from border enforcement if they break U.S. laws. 'If you drop a couple of these cartel operatives, they'll stop coming,' DeSantis said at a press conference in front of the Rio Grande River in Eagle Pass, Texas last week.

The aff solves in two ways

First is anti corruption

Corrupt officials uniquely enable smuggling, lack of oversight the is the problem, Lasusa 16

Mike Lasusa, "How Mexico Cartels Corrupt US Border Agents", January 19, 2016, Insight Crime,

<https://insightcrime.org/news/analysis/mexico-cartels-us-border-patrol-corruption/>

//MVSG

An investigative report by the Texas Observer last month revived longstanding concerns about US Customs and Border Protection (CBP), calling into question whether the nation's largest law enforcement agency is effectively combating corruption and infiltration by criminal organizations. In a 7000-word exposé, reporters Melissa del Bosque and Patrick Michels chronicled various instances of misbehavior by agents at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), including purchasing weapons for criminal groups, abusing confidential informants, and taking bribes to allow human smugglers and drug traffickers to cross the US-Mexico border. Furthermore, the Texas Observer investigation indicated that corruption at CBP frequently went unpunished. According to the article, the department in charge of overseeing CBP "became known for hoarding cases and then leaving them uninvestigated," and "the office often refused offers of help from the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation] and other law enforcement agencies that also keep watch over customs officers and Border Patrol agents." James Tomsheck, the former head of CBP's internal affairs division from 2006 to 2014, told the reporters, "It was very clear to me...that DHS was attempting to hide corruption, and was attempting to control the number of arrests [of CBP personnel on corruption charges] so as not to create a political liability for DHS." Del Bosque and Michels focused closely on a few particularly egregious examples, but they also cited a recent report by an advisory panel appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, which found that "true levels of corruption within CBP are not known." The panel also stated that CBP "remains vulnerable to corruption that threatens its effectiveness and [US] national security." InSight Crime Analysis For Mexican organized crime groups, del Bosque told InSight Crime, attempting to **corrupt law enforcement agencies** working on the border **is "part of their business model."** And she said that contrary to what one might expect, those most susceptible to corruption are "not people who have just joined the agency. It's usually long-time agents who are more vulnerable." Del Bosque said that corrupt relationships often start off with agents taking small bribes for small favors. Over time, these connections can escalate into more serious affairs. "People get closer to retirement and feel like they haven't been compensated for their work," del Bosque explained. "There's a longer period of time for people to develop relationships." An analysis by the Center for Investigative Reporting appears to bear out this conclusion. Of the 153 cases of CBP corruption reviewed by the organization, 52 of the accused agents had between one and five years of service, 47 had between six and ten years, and only three had less than one year of service at the time of their arrest. Many agents hail from border regions, and have family or friendly ties with people in those communities. Del Bosque said that it's not unusual for people who get involved in criminal activities to attempt to recruit acquaintances working for law enforcement. "Whichever **cartel** controls that territory, they **re all involved in corrupting agents**," she said. SEE ALSO: Coverage of the US-Mexico Border In 2010, while he was still in charge of CBP internal affairs, Tomsheck warned the Senate Homeland Security subcommittee, "There is a concerted effort on the part of transnational criminal organizations to infiltrate, through hiring initiatives, and to compromise our existing agents and officers." One example, reported by Andrew Becker for Mother Jones magazine, is the case of Margarita Crispin, who joined CBP in El Paso, Texas in 2003. Becker wrote that "investigators from the Department of Homeland Security suspect she'd been recruited by a friend with ties to the Juárez cartel before she took the job. Almost immediately after completing her training and putting on her badge, she began to help traffickers 'cross loads'... By the time she was arrested in July 2007, Crispin is thought to have let more than 2,200 pounds of marijuana into the United States." A more recent example is the case of Joel Luna, a six-year Border Patrol veteran working in Brownsville, Texas, who was recently charged in connection with an apparent cartel-related murder in the area. According to the Los Angeles Times, investigators in the case suspect Luna may have been tied to the Gulf Cartel through his brothers. **The huge size of CBP and its relative lack of oversight personnel make the agency especially susceptible to corruption.** With roughly 60,000 agents, officers and specialists, CBP employs more law enforcement officers than the New York Police Department (34,500) and the Los Angeles Police Department (10,000) combined. In addition, the number of border agents has been growing at a breakneck pace, nearly doubling over the past decade. However, as del Bosque and Michels reported, CBP for many years had no criminal investigators who could investigate corruption and other abuse within its ranks. Instead, some 200 investigators from the DHS Office of Inspector General

were tasked with overseeing all 220,000 DHS employees — a ratio of around one investigator for every 1,000 workers. “In comparison,” the reporters wrote, “the FBI has 250 internal affairs investigators for its 13,000 agents” — a ratio of about one for every 50 officers. Only recently did CBP receive its own investigators, but it still doesn’t have enough to effectively fight corruption, according to the panel appointed to study CBP. Del Bosque told InSight Crime that hiring more internal investigators and performing more thorough background checks on new recruits could help stem corruption and infiltration at CBP. She also suggested that rotating agents through different posts on the border might prevent the development of corrupt relationships between agents and criminals. But perhaps the most effective means of reducing corruption would be to continue efforts to investigate and prosecute officers already under suspicion or working with criminal groups. Not only would this send a message that official misbehavior will not be tolerated, it would also allow CBP to get a better handle on the effects corruption has on the agency’s operations. “That’s part of the problem,” del Bosque said, “we don’t know exactly how widespread it is.”

The aff solves, increased surveillance increase accountability, Baumann 21’

Kathrin Baumann, 2021 "THE USE OF VIDEO SURVEILLANCE FOR POLICE

ACCOUNTABILITY: BENEFITS, LIMITATIONS, AND CONSIDERATIONS," DCAF,

https://www.dcaf.ch/sites/default/files/publications/documents/DCAF_ECA_PP_Video_Surveillance_Paper_FINAL_v20210811_0.pdf.

Surveillance tools are installed with the intention of preventing and deterring crime, collecting evidence for investigations and prosecutions, and providing virtual guarding (Vigne et al., 2011). Moreover, **surveillance** is said to **increase police accountability and transparency**, reduce police use of force, **and provide an “objective” account of events** (Hedberg et al., 2017). It is assumed that surveillance improves civilian-police relations: if the police are perceived as more legitimate due to their greater competence or procedural justice, citizens should be more cooperative and trusting (Hedberg et al., 2017).

The second way is guns.

Most guns trafficked to Mexico originate from the United States: Kohrman 22 explains

Miles Kohrman, 10-20-2022, "Guns Recovered by Mexico's Military Come Mostly From U.S. Makers," Trace,

<https://www.thetrace.org/2022/10/how-many-american-guns-mexican-cartels/>, accessed 8-25-2024 //MVAT

On September 30, a federal judge dismissed a groundbreaking legal challenge to the gun industry filed by the government of Mexico. The suit laid out an argument that major U.S. gunmakers have knowingly facilitated more than a decade of deadly cartel violence across the southern border. They have done this, Mexico argued, by marketing weapons in a way that attracts criminals and turning a blind eye to those weapons’ diversion into trafficking routes. The judge dismissed the claim on account of a special legal shield enjoyed by the gun industry. To date, data underlying Mexico’s dramatic pronouncements — that **as much as 90 percent of all guns** recovered **on Mexican soil originate in the U.S.**; that **as many as 597,000 weapons slip over the border each year, most from American gun manufacturers** — has only been shared in aggregate form by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. But data obtained from Mexico’s Secretariat of National Defense provides a detailed look at the specific manufacturers who produce **weapons commonly used in cartel violence**. The data details every firearm recovered by the Mexican military between 2010 and May of 2020 — almost 125,000 weapons, including machine guns, grenade launchers, and tens of thousands of pistols and rifles. Taken together, **the numbers tell a damning story of iconic American**

gunmakers' involvement in a decade of Mexican bloodshed. U.S. gun manufacturers make up seven out of the top 10 companies whose guns are most frequently seized by the Mexican military. Colt Manufacturing, based in Hartford, Connecticut, led the list, with more than 8,500 firearms — 6.8 percent of all guns recovered in Mexico over the 10-year span. Winchester Repeating Arms, based in New Haven, Connecticut, followed in second place with over 4,000 weapons recovered. Major gunmakers including Smith & Wesson, Remington, Ruger, and Browning, also appear in the top 10. Altogether, U.S. weapons manufacturers accounted for at least 30 percent of guns in the dataset, according to a Trace analysis. Another 61,000 guns — roughly half of all the weapons recovered — either had no identifiable manufacturing marks, or had their manufacturer information left out during data entry. It's possible many of these guns originated in the U.S., but had identifying characteristics scratched away by their owners in attempts to evade tracking by authorities. (Like U.S. police agencies, the Mexican government traces firearms with the ATF.) It is also possible that many of the guns manufactured by foreign-based gun companies originated in the U.S. Glock, an Austrian company, has a separate operation headquartered in Georgia. Sig Sauer, a German company, has headquarters in New Hampshire. These companies, along with several others, manufacture and sell millions of guns domestically every year. The Mexican military's data shows that 970 Glock firearms were recovered in the country between 2010 and 2020. But because the data does not specify the country in which each gun was manufactured, guns produced by foreign companies were excluded from The Trace's estimates of U.S.-made guns. ATF trace data, which may include some subset of these firearms, as well as recoveries made by law enforcement authorities other than the Mexican military, shows that more than 70,000 guns made their way from the U.S. to Mexico between 2015 and 2020. Mexico enforces extremely stringent gun laws. There is only one gun store in the entire country, and it's located behind fortified walls on a military base. Anybody interested in purchasing a gun from this store must undergo months of background scrutiny. Law enforcement and border security experts have long recognized that these restrictions — paired with a thriving array of cartels warring for regional power — make Mexico a hot destination for trafficked firearms. The country's proximity to the U.S. and the sheer abundance of guns in circulation here make the U.S. a natural source. "We produce some of the best firearms in the world," said David Shirk, a professor of political science at the University of San Diego who specializes in U.S.-Mexico relations. "Some of the people who are most interested in obtaining firearms and with the most financial resources to do so are Mexican drug trafficking and criminal organizations." The human cost of this black market transaction is extraordinary: The Mexican government claims that more than 180,000 people were killed in violent gun crimes between 2007 and 2019, spinning an unfathomable web of grief and forcing many to flee their homes. The violence in certain areas is so extreme that the U.S. Department of State has advised travelers to avoid them. This death toll has become a political sticking point for the administration of Mexico's current president, Andrés Manuel López Obrador. Where previous administrations have tried to snuff out cartel activity by force, Obrador has tried to shift some of this focus to root causes: socioeconomic struggles that make cartel involvement appealing to young men, and arms trafficked over the country's northern border. It was in step with this strategy that Mexico launched its lawsuit against U.S. gun companies in 2021. "[The manufacturers] should make necessary changes so they are not appealing to narcos," said Alejandro Celorio Alcántara, a legal advisor for Mexico's Foreign Ministry who was intimately involved with the country's lawsuit. "They have access to trace information." Domestically, countering arms trafficked from the U.S. has been of second mind to policy makers, who have tended instead to focus on drugs and people being trafficked north. But some efforts to clamp down on southbound gun trafficking routes have picked up steam in Congress. Most recently, in June, the U.S. Congress passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which makes straw purchasing and gun trafficking federal crimes. Law enforcement experts say **it's dangerous to underestimate the integral role firearms play in driving both drugs and people north**. "Tens of thousands of people are dying from fentanyl overdoses every year in the U.S., and most of that fentanyl these days is coming directly from Mexico, from the cartels," said Joseph Lestrangle, a retired Homeland Security Investigations division chief, who is now a security consultant, adding that **U.S. guns arm most of the cartels sending these drugs north**. "**[Gun trafficking] fuels** and facilitates the **continued expansion of criminal enterprises** in Mexico that are feeding this demand."

Surveillance would solve through better tracking of trafficking. Quinn 23

Melissa Quinn, E.D. Cauchi, 11-14-2023, "Rep. Dan Goldman introduces bill to curb trafficking of guns from the U.S. into Mexico," No Publication, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/gun-trafficking-bill-us-mexico-dan-goldman/>, accessed 8-25-2024 //MVAT

Washington — Rep. Dan Goldman, a Democrat from New York, is introducing Tuesday a new bill that aims to strengthen border security by curbing the trafficking of guns and ammunition made in the United States across the southern border into Mexico. Called the Disarming Cartels Act, Goldman's bill directs the Department of Homeland Security to enhance collaboration among federal immigration agencies and other partners to "identify, target, disrupt and dismantle" transnational criminal groups behind the exporting of firearms and other weapons across the U.S.-Mexico border. Democratic Reps. Mike Thompson of California and Joaquin Castro of Texas are joining Goldman in introducing the measure. "Democrats and Republicans alike recognize the devastating threat posed by the fentanyl trade and human smuggling and trafficking, all of which are predominantly controlled by Mexican drug cartels at our southern border," Goldman, a member of the House Homeland Security Committee, said in a statement. "But Republicans simply ignore that the source of the cartels' power is the hundreds of thousands of American-manufactured weapons of war that flow out of the United States and into the hands of the cartels. If we want to address crime across our southern border, then we must address the exportation of American guns across the border." Castro said in a statement that through more **collaboration among federal agencies and** coordination with **Mexican partners**, the proposal **will** help to **disrupt weapons trafficking across the U.S.-Mexico border**. "For years, American guns have fueled violence, instability, and forced migration across the Western Hemisphere," he said. "The United States can — and must — do more to stop the weapons we manufacture from landing in the hands of criminal organizations." Thompson, chair of the Gun Violence Prevention task force, said that in addition to addressing the firearms trafficked into Mexico, the bill will help secure the southern border and stem the flow of fentanyl into the U.S. "Firearms purchased in the United States are being illegally trafficked to Mexico, arming the cartels and fueling the fentanyl epidemic," he said in a statement. "Going after the bad actors that facilitate the exchange of guns for fentanyl will help us crack down on illegal drug trade while preventing firearms from getting into the hands of cartels and other criminal organizations." The legislation would require **Homeland Security** Investigations — the investigative arm of Immigration and Customs Enforcement — to **establish a system for sharing information about gun interdictions with federal partners**. Goldman's bill **would** also **expand efforts** within Homeland Security Investigations **to collect and analyze information about guns** found at crime scenes in Mexico in order **to better track down U.S.-based weapons traffickers, and boost the D**epartment of **H**omeland **S**ecurity's **coordination with Mexican government agencies to increase** **inspections** by Customs and Border Protection **on the** southern **border**. The measure focusing on the trafficking of guns from the U.S. into Mexico joins other legislative efforts to curtail the flow of firearms across the border. A group of six Democratic senators introduced a bill in September that aims to address firearms trafficking, and Sen. Chuck Grassley, a Republican, pushed the Biden administration last month for more information on the steps it's taking on the matter. Grassley's letter came after a CBS Reports investigation exposed how Americans are helping Mexican drug cartels smuggle weapons, including military-grade firearms, out of the U.S. and across the southern border. Once the guns are bought by straw purchasers in the U.S., a network of brokers and couriers transport them across the border and into Mexico. U.S. intelligence documents and interviews with current and former federal officials revealed that the federal government has known about the weapons trafficking by drug cartels for years, but has done little to stop the networks operating in the U.S. CBS News reported that these networks move up to 1 million firearms across the U.S.-Mexico border each year. The Government Accountability Office said in a 2021 report the trafficking of U.S.-sourced guns into Mexico is a national security threat, and suggested **more data and analysis could better U.S. efforts to disrupt gun smuggling into Mexico**. To identify and dismantle drug cartels' weapons supply chains in the U.S., the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives established Project Thor, an interagency effort to address gun trafficking networks, in 2018. The initiative, however, was denied funding for fiscal year 2022.

Empirically this has succeeded, Arunachalam 21'

Karthick Arunachalam et al., "Cardinal Policy Group Report on US Gun Trafficking", July 2021, Cardinal Policy Group,

<https://www.cardinalpolicygroup.com/assets/reports/CPG%20Report%20on%20US%20Gun%20Trafficking.pdf> //MVSG

With one of the nation's most comprehensive gun-sense frameworks, California is on the front lines of the fight against gun violence. As previously mentioned, California is home to some of the lowest firearm export and gun violence rates in the country. However, guns are still trafficked from California across the border to Mexico and beyond. Below, we have outlined an array of slightly more nuanced gun-sense policies to help California law enforcement combat firearm trafficking: Firearm Tracing Patterns Analysis (FTPA) The FTPA is a software-based tool that uses AI (artificial intelligence) to identify gun tracing patterns and minimize the expertise required to obtain this information.¹⁰³ In hopes of utilizing the technological resources the state has, one policy recommendation is to use FTPA (Firearm Tracing Patterns Analysis) to track gun purchases within California to abate gun trafficking and better regulate the industry by discouraging straw purchasing. With California being a hotspot for straw purchasers because of its strict gun laws, it makes sense to crack down on the traces of often small batch or individual gun purchases that both leave California and enter

California. Without technology, this task becomes almost impossible. **By using technological analysis,**

California can better monitor and track gun flow, especially in regards to the migration of arms to unlicensed users. There was a case study conducted in Los Angeles, which happens to

be the biggest source of straw purchasing in California.¹⁰⁴ **Through the use of this technology, the government was able to not only track the various migration and trafficking of guns within the region of Southern California,** but also **captured data that helped reveal** general **trafficking patterns** that could be applied

The impact is two fold.

First is a failed state,

Cartels create a failed mexican state

Grinberg 19

Grinberg 19 [Alexander Grinberg is an officer in the U.S. Army, B.A. in Defense Policy and Strategy] "Is Mexico a Failing State?"

RealClearDefense, Feb 7, 2019,

https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2019/02/07/is_mexico_a_failing_state_114170.html TG Recut //MVSG

Mexico is a fragile state, and without action, **faces the risk of becoming** a failing, or worse, **a failed state.** The

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development defines a fragile state as one that is "unable or unwilling to perform the functions necessary for poverty reduction, the promotion of development, protection of the population and the observance of human rights." In 2009, U.S. Joint Forces Command released a statement expressing concerns over Mexico, highlighting the potential even then for a total collapse. At the time, then-President Felipe Calderón responded to the report, stating it was entirely false; allegedly, he even wanted President Obama to release a statement to that effect.

In August 2018, the State Department released a do-not-travel warning for five of the thirty-two Mexican states. Many other states are still considered dangerous, and the U.S. State Department has advised American tourists caution if not total reconsideration. The warning indicates a lack of stability and control on the government's part in the region. **The** Mexic[o]an **government is in** a prolonged state of **civil war with**

various cartels and the state is losing. Rampant corruption from the local to federal level breaks down the fundamental principal-agent relationship between the government and its population, encouraging locals to turn to militias for protection. The militias are, in part, a result of

widespread corruption as well as the Mexican military's deterioration. **Mexico's military faces large numbers of**

desertions, while measures to provide security for its population continue to fail. The United States should continue to treat Mexico as a welcome economic partner but accept that Mexico is a fragile state, and thus a serious security risk. The drug war in Mexico is escalating, and it is creating a spillover effect in the United States. In the United States, the majority of the concern from the Mexican drug war focuses on its impact on the opioid epidemic, a growing topic in both countries. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, the total economic burden for opioid misuse,

often leading to heroin abuse, is \$78.5 billion a year. CNN reported that from 2002 to 2016 the number of heroin users increased from 404,000 to 948,000, a 135% increase. The opioid epidemic is part of the drug war in Mexico, where violence spills over. Demand in the United States for narcotics profit drug trafficking organizations and money is then laundered back to the cartels who use these funds to purchase weapons in order to take more territory or assert control in Mexico. The spillover effect is hurting both the United States and Mexico. Assistant Secretary Brownfield, representing the State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, noted in a 2017 teleconference that an estimate of 90-94% of all "heroin consumed in the U.S. comes from Mexico." While 90% of cocaine samples seized in the U.S. in 2015 originated from Columbia, the cartels smuggle them through Mexico to the U.S. While drugs flow into the U.S. from Mexico, illegal arms are trafficked back into Mexico, fueling the violence. A 2009 report from the U.S. Government Accountability Office noted that approximately 87% of firearms seized in Mexico over the past five years could be traced back to the United States. Stratfor disputes this claim, arguing the number of weapons in the figure were those submitted by Mexican authorities to the ATF and successfully traced. The figure did not include the total number of weapons seized. Even if Stratfor's claim is true and the actual percentage is less than 12%, it is still a concerning number, indicating American arms and associated illegal arms trafficking contribute to the violence and corruption in Mexico. Corruption in Mexico affects public services and industry, negatively impacting the economic well-being of its citizens. A 2016 World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Report noted bribery and corruption could increase business costs in Mexico by 10%. Even tax administration is affected, and a 2014 Reuter's report states that Mexico has one of the weakest tax revenues in the 34-nation Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. According to the report, "Crime, corruption and tax evasion drained \$462 billion from Mexico's economy in 2011, trailing only China and Russia." Corrupted tax revenue creates a cyclical effect where the government cannot afford to pay for necessary services or even its military. Corruption increases the cost for basic necessities and thus further incentivizing farmers and other vulnerable populations to support the narco-economy. Kleptocracy creates an environment that economically incentivizes farmers to support illegal economies and allows these farmers to fall victim to the cartels. A December 2018 New York Times article covering the trial of Joaquín "El Chapo" Guzmán's trial discussed various testimonies in the courtroom that highlighted Mexican corruption at very high levels of office. Mr. Guzmán's testimony supported other reports of widespread corruption throughout Mexico's government at both state and federal levels. Rural farmers fall victim to cartels, because the Mexican government cannot protect them. Stuart Ramsay, a correspondent for Sky News, traveled to Mexico to report on Mexico's continuing drug war. Many of the interviewed farmers admitted that economic incentives to support a narco-economy, in conjunction with death threats, overruled legal crop farming. Krishnan Guru-Murthy, a British journalist for Channel 4 News, traveled to Cancun to discuss the current state of Mexico's drug war. Part of his report showcased the cartel's ability to murder with near impunity farmers who resisted. The inability of the police to combat this form of terror explains

why farmers tend not to resist. **Farmers** who do **resist**, typically **through** an ad hoc **militia**, **add further chaos into an already unstable situation.** Max Weber theorized on the state's monopoly on legitimate violence as a fundamental tenet of the modern state, and **militias challenge this legitimacy—they degrade the state's ability to maintain order, and they disrupt the basis of a social contract between the state and its society.** These militias are a symbol in that they challenge the state as the sole entity with the monopoly on the legitimate use of force. The rise of militias and Mexico's inability to make gains in securing territory against the cartels suggest the Mexican government is no longer in control over parts of its country. One might consider the growth of local militias within Mexico's rural areas as a way forward, but they are dangerous and indicate the Mexican government cannot defend its citizens. Mexican **militias operate outside of the law**, and many create their own rules on how to protect their towns. While **some** militias work with their communities and achieve some

level of peace, others **act with** more **questionable methods.** In a 2016 Al Jazeera report, journalists recorded militias who patrolled towns and even stopped Mexican police at gunpoint. The police did not resist as they were ordered to present documentation, weapon serial numbers, and a reason for movement. The power dynamic changed. Along with the militias, the Mexican government is struggling to sustain its armed forces. One of the reasons Mexico cannot gain ground over the cartels is because its military is deteriorating through ineffective leadership. The first indicator of the military's breakdown is the deterioration of discipline where there is a growing number of unlawful killings and human rights violations. Human Rights Watch reported that by 2016, the National Human Rights Commission received almost 10,000 complaints, and more than a 100 cases were considered as "serious human rights violations." Of those abuses investigated from 2012 to 2016, only 3.2% reached a conviction. Instead of cracking down on these abuses, President Nieto expanded military participation in policing. As the drug war continues, and the federal government does not crack down on the human rights violations, the Mexican military will further deteriorate. The Mexican military leadership's lack of control over the behavior of their forces indicates an erosion in the chain of command and the respect for their Code of Military Justice, and it suggests further corruption. **Mexican cartels provide financial incentives for members of Mexico's**

armed forces to defect, a symptom of the Mexican military's weak state. A 2008 USA Today article noted that from January to September 2007 4,956 soldiers deserted, approximately 2.5% of the force. Fox News reported that by 2012 over 56,000 soldiers deserted. As of 2016, the total approximate number of deserters is around 150,000. PBS interviewed local reporters in Cancun and a former police officer, learning the cartels would offer payments of \$26,000 compared to the soldier's \$600 salary. Also, these underpaid officers were poorly trained and equipped, some to a point where an officer carried only six rounds of ammunition. The article also reported the cartels were waging a propaganda war against the military. They posted ads and offered better pay than the army. The cartels successfully recruit from the military, specifically even finding recruits from Mexican special forces communities. Many of these deserters end up working for the cartels as trained hitmen who comprehend Mexican military tactics. These trained ex-soldiers understand how to circumvent Mexican patrols, and have a basic understanding of how to effectively engage conventional military forces. The gradual comprehensive collapse of order in Mexico is unlikely to reverse even with the recent election of Andrés Manuel López Obrador. Obrador's counter-cartel policy platform of amnesty, as well as his aspirations for a military reformation, will only embolden the cartels. However, as he just took office, it is important to wait and see what he and his cabinet will pursue and the effectiveness of their policies.

Second is cartel deaths.

CFR 24 finds that

CFR, 8-5-2024, "Mexico's Long War: Drugs, Crime, and the Cartels," Council on Foreign Relations, <https://www.cfr.org/background/mexicos-long-war-drugs-crime-and-cartels>, accessed 9-8-2024

Introduction Mexican authorities have been waging a deadly battle against drug cartels for nearly two decades, but with limited success. Thousands of **Mexicans**—including politicians, students, and journalists—die in the conflict every year. The country **has seen more than 431,000 homicides since 2006**, when the government declared war on the cartels. The United States has partnered closely with its southern neighbor in this fight, providing Mexico with billions of dollars to modernize its security forces, reform its judicial system, and fund development projects aimed at curbing irregular migration. Washington has also sought to stem the flow of illegal drugs into the United States by bolstering security and monitoring operations along its border with Mexico. Under U.S. President Joe Biden, the two countries adopted a new framework to address insecurity in Mexico and the U.S. opioid crisis, though bilateral relations have become strained amid concerns over Mexican President Andrés Manuel López Obrador's alleged financial ties to cartels.

And with drug deaths, Office of new york 2022

Office of New York, "Continuing Crisis: Drug Overdose Deaths in New York", November 2022, Office of the New York State Comptroller,

<https://www.osc.ny.gov/reports/continuing-crisis-drug-overdose-deaths-new-york> //MVSG

Any death caused by misuse of legal or illicit drugs is a tragedy, depriving families of loved ones and damaging communities in countless ways. In October 2017, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services declared a public health emergency due to the consequences of the opioid crisis facing the nation. That year, more than 70,000 individuals nationally and nearly 4,000 New Yorkers lost their lives to a drug overdose. Since that time, fueled by the disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic, the crisis has grown substantially worse. In 2021, the number of **deaths surged to nearly 107,000 nationally** and more than 5,800 in New York. At the core of this crisis is a shocking rise in opioid-related deaths, which grew by almost 300 percent between 2010 and 2020 to comprise 85 percent of all drug overdose deaths in New York in 2020. In recent years, the increase has been spurred by a rise in fentanyl, a cheap and potent synthetic opioid that traffickers are mixing with other illegal drugs to drive addiction and increase their profits; users are often unaware they are taking fentanyl until it is too late. This dangerous combination of factors is leading to devastating results. This report outlines long-term trends and recent developments in the battle to save lives from being lost prematurely to substance use disorder. The data are clear: the battle against drug overdose deaths is more daunting than ever, and will require an ongoing commitment of public resources and the implementation of a broad range of innovative, effective and evidence-based solutions. Executive Summary After trending upwards for over 10 years, New York's drug overdose deaths and death rates started to decrease following the declaration of a public health emergency by the federal government in October 2017. However, fatalities surged during the pandemic due to a sharp increase in deaths from opioids, largely from illicit fentanyl and similar synthetic opioids. Federal research on comorbidities involving COVID-19 and substance use cites social isolation and stress, as well as decreased access to treatment and harm reduction services, as pandemic-related factors that likely worsened outcomes among vulnerable New Yorkers.

C2: Contact Tracing

Pandemics are becoming more frequent

Davies 20 (Sally Davies, former chief medical officer for England and master of Trinity College, Cambridge. "The next pandemic is on its way. Coronavirus must help us prepare for it", 9-26-2020,

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/sep/26/next-pandemic-coronavirus-prepare>)

//CChun (recut DHH –MSH) -- recut brask -- recut //SB

We are at a crossroads. As the impacts of Covid-19 continue the world over and the second wave moves through Europe, we have a choice to make. Will we simply respond to the here and now, or do we take a moment to stop, look up and see beyond the horizon of this pandemic towards the next one? Because there will be a next one. **Covid-19 is neither the first nor the last health emergency we will face.** My fellow **scientists estimate that we will face a pandemic** or health emergency **at least once every five years** from here on. There is a chance that this is the optimistic scenario. **The reality could be far worse.** Recognising this, we can, and must, say “never again”. **We must do better to identify the next health threat, respond to that threat before it becomes an epidemic or pandemic, and if it does, recover in a way that does not exacerbate health, economic and social inequalities.**

Luckily, increased surveillance through contact tracing can solve the problem as

Fox 21 writes that [Maggie Fox, 7-23-2021, "Why contact tracing was a missed opportunity to save lives in the US," CNN, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/23/health/covid-contact-tracing-missed-opportunity/index.html>, accessed 7-10-2024 //joshi]

It was supposed to have both prevented the worst ravages of the pandemic and given people in lockdown something to do. An army of contact tracers working the phones would find people exposed to the virus, warning them of the risks, giving them solid advice on how to quarantine and watch for symptoms, and prevent the further spread of disease. **It's the most basic of public health tools – a way to stop a disease before it can spread too far.** **Contact tracing stopped the first SARS, the outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome that ended in 2004 after about 8,000 people had been infected around the world. Only 800 died. Contact tracing, along with vaccination, eradicated smallpox from the planet. It's a simple idea: Find people who are infected, isolate them and find everyone they could have passed the disease to, and quarantine them before they can become contagious and infect anyone else.** Here's how coronavirus spread inside a government office in Florida -- and how one official says it stopped **When the novel coronavirus started to spread at the beginning of 2020, public health experts knew it was their best chance at stopping a pandemic.** **In South Korea, Vietnam, Taiwan and New Zealand, expert teams tracked almost every infection and helped people isolate and quarantine to interrupt the spread. But it never happened in the US** – at least not at a national level. **The US has more than 34 million diagnosed cases and 609,000 deaths from Covid-19, more than any other country in the world, even far more populous India.** And that's certainly an undercount, according to the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as well as outside researchers who are trying to keep tabs on cases, such as the University of Washington. **Because of a lack of testing and tracking, it's likely twice as many or more people have been infected with Covid-19, the CDC says.** Missed opportunity to save lives “We should have started earlier. We could have saved tons of lives,” said Dr. Joia Mukherjee, a professor of medicine in the Division of Global Health Equity at Brigham and Women's Hospital, and an associate professor of global health and social medicine at Harvard Medical School. “Contact tracing has saved people. It has saved families,” added Mukherjee, who is working with global nonprofit Partners in Health, which helped with a few contact tracing programs that did get off the ground in the US. The rare success stories give a tantalizing look at what might have been. San Francisco started a contact tracing program early in the pandemic, a collaboration between the San Francisco Department of Public Health and the University of California San Francisco. Experts say the US needs teams ready to hunt down new Covid-19 cases. But so far, there aren't nearly enough

And the effects aren't just domestic, effective US technology also spills over to other nations

Brady 19 [Aaron Brady interviewing Tod Miller, independent journalist and author of *Empire of Borders*. August 20, 2019. "How the US Exported Its Border Around the World". *The Nation*.

<https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/todd-miller-new-book-empire-of-borders-interview/>] doobz

Journalist Todd Miller's *Empire of Borders* is about how dramatically and completely this easy simplicity can mislead us about what the border really is, where it is, and where it is going. Borders aren't just there. Not only were they made (often arbitrarily and with great cruelty and violence), but the US border, in particular, extends far beyond the frontier line that separates one country from another, even far beyond the 100-mile range that Homeland Security considers the border zone. **The US border is a massive global apparatus, an**

interconnected network of partnerships, funding, multinational industries, and international agreements, **stretching across every continent** and **saturating the world**. Most important, **it's still growing**. With a climate-changed future on the horizon—and the **prospect of climate refugees from around the globe growing exponentially—walls and fences and towers are proliferating, as the global border security industrial complex accelerates its efforts**. From his home in Arizona, Miller tracks the border from

Guatemala and Honduras to the Caribbean, Israel, the Philippines, and Kenya, interviewing subjects on every side of that multidimensional line. I recently spoke with Miller about tracking the border and reporting on it. Our conversation has been edited for style and content. Todd Miller:

TM: The idea first occurred to me in 2012, when I was on the west coast of Puerto Rico, on a research trip for my book *Border Patrol Nation*. I saw the same green-striped Border Patrol vehicles roving the west coast as in southern Arizona, where I live. When I learned that Border Patrol could legally operate only 30 miles away from the Dominican coast—since the Mona Island was a US territory—I thought, "Wow, this thing, the border, is so much more extensive than I realized." Mind you, this was all happening a thousand miles from the US mainland. Then, when I went to the Dominican Republic to investigate US funding and training of the DR's border patrol, for the border with Haiti, I really began to see the multiple, widespread, programs that were, as officials would say, pushing out the border. AB: What does that mean, "pushing out the border"? TM: Well, the idea that the US border is just the boundary line with Mexico, for example, is not true. It's much bigger and more expansive. In 2004, [Customs and Border Protection] Commissioner Robert Bonner talked about "extending our zone of security where we can do so, beyond our physical borders—so that American borders are the last line of defense, not the first line of defense." And during his confirmation hearing to be secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Gen. John Kelly said that "border security cannot be attempted as an endless series of goal line stands on the one-foot line at the ports of entry or along the thousands of miles of border between this country and Mexico." "The defense of the southwest border," he said, "starts 1,500 miles to the south, with Peru." AB: But it also blurs borders into one another, into one single, continuous, global border regime. You write about the "Palestine-Mexico" border, for example, the way technologies, techniques, and even laws are being standardized across the world, the way border control is a kind of globalization. TM: **The Palestine example is a**

good one to demonstrate how this works. "Smart wall" technology gets **tested out in the occupied Palestinian territories** first, like the West Bank wall. "Smart wall" means walls that are either equipped with or reinforced by **sensor systems, cameras, radar systems, drones, and linked to command and control centers**. These are technologies of segregation, of apartheid. **But if a company can show that their technology is effective, like the Haifa-based company Elbit Systems claims in the West Bank, they can then sell it to other countries for their own border** and homeland security enforcement systems. It's **field-tested**. If it works in the occupation of Palestine, the argument goes, then it can work everywhere else. And that is exactly what is happening.

Ultimately, tracing the next pandemic is key as Martin 24

(Francisco Pozo-Martin, et al., 02-16-2024, "Comparative effectiveness of contact tracing interventions in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review," PubMed Central (PMC), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9932408/#CR55>, accessed 7-2-2024 //joshi)

Secondary contact tracing. Geffen et al. [64] found that with perfect isolation of infected and perfect tracing of first and secondary contacts the number of infections was reduced by 82%. Firth et al. [11] found that secondary manual contact tracing achieved a reduction in infections of 78%. Bhattacharya et al. [37] estimated that coupled with a moderate lockdown, secondary contact tracing may achieve a 99% reduction in recovered individuals. Immediate contact tracing from identification of index case (i.e. no delays in contact tracing). Quilty et al. [55] found that in a context with moderate/ high quarantine efficacy, a reduction in tracing delays from three to zero days could avert 58% of transmissions. Bidirectional contact tracing. Endo et al. [9] found that across a wide level of relevant infection- and policy-related parameters, bidirectional contact tracing could avert two or three times more cases than forward contact tracing alone

This would save millions as Fletcher 20 quantifies

(Martin Fletcher, Martin Fletcher is a former foreign editor of the Times and a New Statesman magazine contributing writer and online columnist, August 2020, "Why Stephen Emmott fears the next pandemic could kill a billion people," NewStatesmen, <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/environment/2020/08/why-stephen-emcott-fears-next-pandemic-could-kill-billion-people> , DOA: 12/30/20)EE6.6.

At the time the genial, unpretentious scientist was accused of scaremongering, exaggeration and scientific distortion, but one consequence of mankind's recklessness that Emmott predicted with absolute certainty was a global pandemic exactly like Covid-19. Indeed, he had collaborated with Neil Ferguson, the Imperial College epidemiologist, on developing the modelling framework for global pandemics that Ferguson would later use to persuade the government to order Britain's lockdown in March. A

coronavirus-type pandemic was inevitable, Emmott, presently professor of biological computation at University College London, tells me by telephone from his home in Camberwell, south-east London. "This one is a very small glimpse – thankfully not as severe as it could be – into a potential and likely future." The next pandemic could kill a billion people, he warns. "The population is set to increase from billion to at least ten billion, and possibly more, before the end of this century. Urbanisation is increasing rapidly. 'Wet markets' have proliferated over the past two decades. The proliferation of habitat destruction, forcing animals into direct contact with humans, is increasing rapidly," he says