

# Constructive CI

**America's falling behind the tech race now**

Carley **Welch 24**, 6/13/2024, US falls further behind in AI race, could make conflict with China 'unwinnable': Report,

<https://breakingdefense.com/2024/06/us-falls-further-behind-in-ai-race-could-make-conflict-with-china-unwinnable-report/> // JZ

**The US is quickly falling behind China in development of artificial intelligence**, according to a report released today by data analytics firm Govini, **making it nearly impossible for the US to win a war against the PLA if a conflict were to break out between the two global superpowers**. Govini releases annual reports measuring the performance of the federal government, **looking at 15 top critical national security technologies through the lens of** acquisition, procurement, supply chain, foreign **influence and** adversarial **capital** and **science** and **technology**. Per this year's report, **the US is under-investing in practical, valuable AI capabilities** while also becoming stagnant in the research and development stage. When looking at AI, machine learning and natural language processing, nine out of the 12 areas studied in the report still had over 65 percent of their funding tied up in R&D in 2023 — making the minority of these vital programs production-ready. "Despite the fact that artificial intelligence is an incredibly, highly visible, arguably the most transformational technology that matters in the critical tech competition, not just for the United States, but around the world, the Department of Defense is still primarily attacking this as a research and development effort," Govini CEO Tara Murphy Dougherty said during a briefing Wednesday. **"While there is more to do in R&D for artificial intelligence, it is well past time for DoD to stop treating AI like it is just a science project,"** she added. Last year's report revealed that **the US was at risk of "weakness and dependence" as it falls behind China in the technology race**. Similarly, the 2022 report found that the US wasn't investing enough money in AI and ML to win the technological race against China. **"If you add in an AI advantage that the United States doesn't have, it potentially tips the war into unwinnable [for the US],"** Dougherty said **of a potential US-China conflict**. She added that the ways China can weaponize AI don't have to be kinetic, it can look like hacking into the US's energy grid which would have a major impact on the warfighter. **While the DoD may not be moving fast enough in developments of AI and ML**, Dougherty said **the capabilities to do so are there**. **"The AI aspects of our spending being so R&D focused**, it

tells me that **we're not actually moving this into** the weapons systems and **platforms that we're deploying today**, obviously, appropriately so given that it's artificial intelligence. But, I believe that **the department has a great**

**framework to govern that and make sure that AI is used appropriately in a military context. So let's get going on it,"** she said. The report also found that China has more patents than the US in 13 of 15 critical technology areas, further demonstrating how the US is falling behind in AI development. China sped up its patent grants over the past several years following its "14th Five Year Plan for Informatization Development," Dougherty said.

## Thankfully, affirming increases application and investment of AI

Aaron J. **Avila ND**, xx/xx/xxxx, A digital designer, social media marketer, and security professional with ENS Security, The Virtual Border Wall:

Increased Surveillance at U.S./Mexico Border,

<https://enssecurity.com/the-virtual-border-wall-increased-surveillance-at-u-s-mexico-border/>

The United States southern border has been a topic of controversy for many years, with debates raging about immigration policies and national security. Stemming large and often uncontrollable waves of immigrants has been a fiercely contested issue that has never resulted in a comprehensive resolution. In recent years, however, there has been a significant increase in digital **surveillance technologies being deployed to monitor** and potentially deter migrants from entering the country illegally. The Electronic

Frontier Foundation, a non-profit organization focusing on digital privacy and free speech concerns, has recently documented the locations of **300 existing surveillance**

**towers** and 50 planned installations along the US and Mexico border. This strengthening of a **"virtual wall" along the border** is intended to dissuade migrants

from crossing in high traffic areas where the towers are clearly visible. But **what else are these cameras for**, and what has their effect been so far? Automated

Defenses While in the past, **surveillance units** had to be monitored by human border agents to be effective, we **now have artificial intelligence to**

**scan footage and track valuable data. Tech companies** like Anduril and Google **have received major commissions**

**from the US government to automate** these **surveillance** systems, which have been in use since the year

**2000.** The **watchtowers operate 24/7**, have a 360 field of view, **and utilize human/vehicle recognition software to**

**detect targets** that can be seen from almost 2 miles away. When a valid target is detected, it sends an alert to border patrol agents who can investigate further. License plate

readers, **facial recognition cameras, and even iris and fingerprint scanners are also used by border patrol to**

**track and monitor the movement of individuals and groups** across the border.

It'll be a boon for the entire tech industry

Dave **Maass**, 7-8-20**24**, "Hundreds of Tech Companies Want to Cash In on Homeland Security Funding. Here's Who They Are and What They're Selling.", Electronic Frontier Foundation,

<https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2024/06/hundreds-tech-companies-want-cash-border-security-funding-heres-who-they-are-and>

//nw//RecutEEdoa09/05/24

Whenever government officials generate fear about **the U.S.-Mexico border and immigration**, they also **generate**

**dollars—hundreds of millions of dollars—for tech** conglomerates and **start-ups**. The Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) today has

released the U.S. Border-Homeland Security Technology Dataset, a multilayered dataset of the vendors who supply or market the technology for **the U.S. government's**

**increasingly AI-powered homeland security efforts**, including the so-called "virtual wall" of surveillance along the southern border with

Mexico. The four-part dataset **include**s a hand-curated directory that profiles **more than 230 companies that manufacture, market**

**or sell technology products and services, including DNA-testing, ground sensors, and**

**counter-drone systems, to U.S. Department of Homeland Security** (DHS) components engaged in border security and

immigration enforcement. Vendors on this list are either verified federal contract holders, or have sought to do business with immigration/border authorities or local law enforcement along the border, through activities such as advertising homeland security products on their websites and exhibiting at border security conferences. It features companies often in the spotlight, including Elbit Systems and Anduril Industries, but also lesser-known contractors, such as surveillance vendors Will-Burt Company and Benchmark. Many companies also supply the U.S. Department of Defense as part of the pipeline from battlefields to the borderlands. The spreadsheet includes a separate list of 463 companies that have registered for Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement "Industry Day" events and a roster of 134 members of the DHS-founded Homeland Security Technology Consortium. Researchers will also find a compilation of the annual Top 100 contractors to DHS and its components dating back to 2006. **Border security and surveillance is a rapidly**

**growing industry, fueled by** the potential of massive congressional appropriations and

**accelerated by the promise of artificial intelligence.** Of the 233 companies included in our initial survey, two-thirds promoted artificial

intelligence, machine learning, or autonomous technology in their public-facing materials. Federal spending on homeland security has increased year over year, creating a lucrative market

which has attracted **investment from** big tech and **venture capital**. Just last month, U.S. Rep. Mark Amodei, Chair of the House Appropriations Homeland

Security Subcommittee, defended a funding package that included a "record-level" \$300 million in funding for border security technology, including "autonomous surveillance towers; mobile surveillance platforms; counter-tunnel equipment, and a significant investment in counter-drone capability."

**That's crucial for global norm-setting**

**Horowitz 21** [Michael C. Horowitz, American IR scholar serving as U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Development and

Emerging Capabilities in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, 03-19-2021, "Leading in Artificial Intelligence through

Confidence Building Measures", Taylor & Francis,

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.2018794?scroll=top&needAccess=true>] JZ

Leveraging US Leadership **Advances in artificial intelligence, driven by machine learning methods and related approaches, are already reshaping international politics.** Economics, societies, and now **militaries are adapting, with various degrees of speed.** As it is early in the age of AI, there is still significant uncertainty about the specific ways that AI and machine learning will impact military behavior and the future of war. One **significant concern involves the potential for AI-enabled military applications to increase the risk of accidents, unintentional conflict, and inadvertent escalation. Poorly programmed, trained, or deployed algorithms could be subject to accidents and their uses could be misinterpreted by adversaries. Even if algorithms work as intended and give militaries an advantage, the increase in the speed of warfare from their use could create pressure for escalation in a crisis or early in a conflict.**

**In the midst of competition** with China and Russia, **the United States can** simultaneously **benefit** and be at risk from military applications of AI. **Given its economic, military, and scientific leadership, the United States has a unique opportunity to shape the global AI landscape through the promotion of norms** and CBMs **that could decrease the risk of unintentional conflict and escalation. Only the United States has the convening power to bring allies and adversaries to the table,** whether **bilaterally or multilaterally, for dialogue around areas of shared interests**—the areas most likely to be building blocks for cooperation. **Key areas for potential cooperation include AI safety standards, dialogue on AI and strategic stability,** commitments to keep humans in the loop for the use of nuclear weapons, and an Autonomous Incidents Agreement. All require further conversation. Through proposals that involve shared commitments to standards and policies that the United States would be willing to pursue unilaterally, **the United States can increase global AI safety without revealing information that would compromise US capabilities** or undermine US military adoption of AI. **The United States can therefore leverage AI to ensure future military superiority and simultaneously decrease the risk that military uses of AI will have disastrous unintended consequences.**

**Absent action, losing the race emboldens China**

**Kroenig** and Gopalaswamy **18** — Matthew Kroenig is Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the

Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. His most recent book is The Logic of American Nuclear Strategy. Bharath Gopalaswamy is the director of the South Asia Center at the Atlantic Council. He holds a PhD in mechanical engineering with a specialization in numerical acoustics from Trinity College, Dublin. ("Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?" Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, November 12, 2019. <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/>)

Recently, analysts have argued that **emerging technologies** with military applications may **undermine nuclear stability** (see [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)),

but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why **new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by**

**upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states**. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and

demands an immediate policy response. For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and **many** attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. **In situations**

**of** mutually assured destruction, **(MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict** because doing so will only result in its own annihilation.

The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack.

Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China's nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China's nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China's ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched. If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called "use 'em or lose 'em" problem. According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities. This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is **open to question**. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly. Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant **theory of**

the **causes of war** in the academy **is the "bargaining model of war."** This theory identifies rapid shifts in the

**balance of power as a primary cause of conflict**. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful

bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. **Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they**

**undermine effective bargaining**. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military

balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But **shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of**

**which states have the advantage**. You may see where this is going. **New technologies threaten to create** potentially

**destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been**

**supported by US military power. In recent** years, however, **the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as**

**China has increased its military capabilities**. Already, **Beijing has become more assertive in the region**.

**claiming contested territory in the South China Sea.** And the results of Russia's military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, "Whoever leads in AI will rule the world." If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. **If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing** than previously **to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And** if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either **scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or** simple **accident or inadvertent escalation.** This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. **When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge.** Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but **the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.**

## Extinction

**PND 16.** Internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock's 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans' International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016.  
<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf>

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine moreover, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation t lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in 'Self Assured Destruction', in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. "A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furtho reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about 20 percent for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade." 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans' ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

## C2

### Terrorists are re-grouping now

**SOAA June** (Special Operations Association of America (SOAA) represents thousands of Army Rangers and Green Berets, Navy SEALs, Marine Raiders, Air Force Air Commandos, and other special operators who have fought and currently serve on behalf of our nation) Special Operations Association of America, 06/25/2024, "An Open Letter of Concern"

<https://soaa.org/wp-content/uploads/SOAA-Open-Letter-Final.pdf> //jjoy

We are gravely concerned by the current heightened risk of terrorist attacks against targets inside the United States and both U.S. and allied interests abroad. Our complete withdrawal from Afghanistan, without a viable stay-behind or over-the-horizon counterterrorism and intelligence capability to suppress threats, has created a vacuum in the region in which anti-American terrorist groups, such as al-Qaeda and the Islamic State, are flourishing once again. The United States has lost significant intelligence collection capabilities in the region, leaving federal authorities blind and deaf to emerging threats emanating from the region. The creation of new and reestablishment of previous terrorist training camps within Afghanistan has led to successful, deadly attacks by the Islamic State's regional branch against targets in Iran and Russia and elsewhere, adding further credence to the notion that the U.S. is at risk.

This heightened risk has been verified by multiple departments and agencies of the federal government, mainstream journalists and publications, former senior officials from both parties, and from former allies with whom we maintain communication. This risk is compounded by developments in the Middle East and the porous, unsecured southern border through which we have seen numerous instances of individuals on terrorist watchlists and others from adversarial countries attempt to enter the U.S. – and those are the ones we know about only because they were detected. We do not know how many other terrorists are already currently inside the U.S. At the same time, the U.S. has continued to send the Taliban millions of dollars for "counterterrorism cooperation", which has proved to be only marginally successful given developments on the ground in Afghanistan. Millions more in aid that is being repurposed by the Taliban to suit its own purposes. As former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency Mike Morell recently wrote, The Terrorism warning lights are blinking red again – echoes of the run-up to 9/11. Time is not on our side and urgent executive action is needed to address this ever-increasing threat to U.S. national security, our families, our allies, and our homeland.

**Mitchell 24** (Ellen Mitchell is the senior defense reporter for The Hill) The Hill, 04/01/2024, "Retired general says US 'target No. 1' for ISIS-K after Moscow attack" <https://thehill.com/policy/defense/4568198-us-target-isis-k-moscow-attack/>



**ISIS-K**, the Central Asian offshoot of the Islamic State (ISIS) terror group that carried out the deadly Moscow concert hall attack last month, badly **wants to target the United States, two**

**former U.S. Central Command leaders are warning.** Retired Gen. Frank McKenzie, former CENTCOM head, said Sunday that the group has a "strong desire" to attack the

U.S. and Biden administration officials should "believe them when they say that." **"I think the threat is growing,"** McKenzie told ABC News's **"This**

**Week,"** noting that it began to grow after U.S. forces left Afghanistan in August 2021, which took

**pressure off ISIS-K.** He also pointed to the March 22 attack on Crocus City Hall theater in Moscow, where at least 143 people were killed and more than 100 others were injured by four gunmen, as an

indication **"we should expect further attempts of this nature against the United States as well as our partners**

**and other nations abroad. I think this is inevitable"** And retired Army Maj. Gen. Mark Quantock, who oversaw intelligence operations for CENTCOM, told USA Today that

**the U.S. "remains target No. 1 for ISIS-K." "They clearly would like to strike the homeland, but their**

**challenge is penetrating our security, which has proven to be quite resilient in recent years,"** Quantock said. Created in

2014, ISIS-K seeks to form a caliphate across Afghanistan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan and is known for its extreme brutality. Following the Moscow attack, experts have warned that ISIS-K, whose plots were

once largely confined to Afghanistan, has been picking up speed in the size and scope of its attacks. **The current U.S. Central Command leader, Gen. Michael**

**Kurilla, last March warned Congress that ISIS-K was rapidly building up its ability to conduct "external**

**operations" in Europe and Asia and could even be able to hit U.S. and Western interests outside**

**Afghanistan "in as little as six months and with little to no warning."** McKenzie, who was head of CENTCOM during the U.S. withdrawal from

Afghanistan, has long argued that the U.S. should have kept a small troop presence in Afghanistan, and without one Washington has "almost no ability to see into that country and almost no ability to strike into that country."

## **Advanced technology promotes deterrence and improves our ability to respond**

**Heyman 08** [Josiah Heyman (professor of anthropology and chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of

Texas at El Paso), Autumn 2008, "Constructing a Virtual Wall: Race and Citizenship in U.S.–Mexico Border Policing," Journal of the Southwest,

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40170393>] // sumzom

Border inspectors vary in how carefully they examine documents and ask questions, however, and they often do not or cannot enter

computer-readable documents into databases, meaning that watch lists are not checked and entry registration does not occur. Second, ports are

being **equipped with advanced detection technologies. Radiation detection devices, chemical**

**signature "sniffers," and activated neutron scanners can potentially detect both terrorist**

**materials** and (infinitely more frequently) **smuggled drugs. Such devices are,** however,

**inconsistently deployed** and most commercial cargoes are **not inspected** with or without

**advanced detection technologies.** The volume of border commerce is simply too great and the time required for inspection,

even with such devices, too long for each and every shipment to be examined without bringing cross-border trade to a halt. Another development is separate ports for privileged border crossers (both commercial shippers and noncommercial vehicles). To be predesignated as trusted, the border crosser registers with the U.S. and Mexican governments, pays substantial fees, passes a background check, and, in the case of shippers, follows security procedures in documentation, warehousing, loading, and trucking. In turn, the trusted entrant can go through special lanes with faster transit times, while the U.S. government can dedicate less effort to examining such entrants, shifting resources to scrutinize nontrusted entrants. Most non-borderlanders think of the border as those segments that are fenced or otherwise closed off, however, and not as open places of interchange. It is illegal to cross the border outside the ports of entry, and the Border Patrol works to detect and interdict such entries, including unauthorized migrants and drugs. **The Border Patrol can either deter crossings by**

**making the entrance too risky, or apprehend law violators, seizing contraband and returning**

**or deporting migrants.** The land border between ports can be roughly divided into two tactical zones: in or near densely populated

areas and away from such areas. In the former, such as the boundary in San Diego County from the Pacific Ocean to the Otay Mountains; at and near Nogales and Douglas, Arizona; and so forth, the government has already implanted walls of solid iron plates or razor wire-topped chain-link fence, accompanied by high-intensity outdoor lighting and constant air surveillance. Since late 1993 in these locales the Border Patrol has stationed units in close proximity to the boundary Constructing a Virtual Wall ❖ 309 and in tight spacing relative to one another, which has had the effect of discouraging most unauthorized crossers from entering there. This has not, however, stopped or slowed the flow of undocumented migrants, but rather has displaced that flow along the border to more remote desert and mountain crossing areas. The concomitant rise in injuries, deaths, and smuggling costs will be discussed shortly. **The remote border areas have long been**

**prime locations for drug smuggling, although most drugs probably pass through commercial**

**corridors.** After the change in migration policing tactics in late 1993, undocumented human crossing also rose dramatically in those areas.

The government raced to catch up by deploying large numbers of patrol officers and extensive surveillance systems into the expanses of rural border. **Such areas are too large for massed policing, however; urban deterrence strategies do not**

**work in rural areas.** Rather, people cross the boundary in these areas and move northward,

**while the Border Patrol attempts to detect their movement at or shortly after entrance, cut off**

**southward escape routes, trap them, and effect arrests and seizures.** This takes place over wide swaths of

small settlements, farms, and deserts (including badlands and mountains), usually shot through with roads and trails. **Walls and fences**

may be constructed but are constantly being cut, climbed over, or otherwise bypassed, and cannot in themselves constitute meaningful barriers without the activity of Border Patrol officers. It is to this situation that the high-technology, virtual wall responds for the most part.<sup>2</sup>

For decades, the Border Patrol has used fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters to monitor border areas from the air (as well as for other needs, such as emergency evacuation). Likewise, since the Vietnam War era the Border Patrol has used electronic motion detectors. Beginning in the late 1980s, heavily instrumented balloons and airplanes monitored the airspace over the border. The virtual wall, in part, involves increasing the density of and upgrading these existing technologies—to take just one example, by deploying unmanned aerial vehicles (“drones”) to carry surveillance cameras over the boundary. The application of new detection technologies forms a parallel development. They widen the ranges of electromagnetic radiation used in surveillance, deploy near-ground radar, place high-resolution visual cameras on high towers, and possibly use the satellites of the military or the National Security Administration.

**Heyman 08** [Josiah Heyman (professor of anthropology and chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Texas at El Paso), Autumn 2008, "Constructing a Virtual Wall: Race and Citizenship in U.S.–Mexico Border Policing," Journal of the Southwest, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40170393>] // sumzom

In turn, deterrence is enabled by information about movement through the border area; that is, by comprehensive intelligence, surveillance, and assignment of police resources to prevention and interdiction. At the same time, the virtual wall must apply only to illegal flows, and must not misidentify or impede legal flows. This means that the virtual wall must also include an effective means of identifying and selecting those people and goods to be trusted as they cross the border or

move near the border, versus those to be distrusted and targeted for law-enforcement

operations. Again, deterrence is key: legitimate movers are not to be deterred, and illegitimate ones are. The Ideal of a Virtual Wall The

ideal virtual wall would be smart and secure in several senses. **Through advanced technology and tactics, the government would have the ability to sense and respond to almost all unauthorized incursions.**

The border would thus function as a hermetic seal against “bad forces” coming into the home space. Also, ports would intelligently and efficiently distinguish among people, vehicles, and shipments to sort out the law breakers, or at least those meriting close scrutiny, from

trustworthy entrants. In other words, the border would be smart enough to deliver security to the United States while at the same time not impeding the cross-border flows crucial to Mexico’s serving as a low-wage export platform for U.S., Asian, and European corporations. The home space would thus be open to “good,” or at least profitable, outside forces. The ideal border would be a powerful and intelligent filter. An underlying ideal of the smart and secure border sharpens the distinction between legal and illegal. The ideal situation is that people with legal and trusted status would be able to move about near or across the border without inappropriate stops, detention, and arrest, because of highly effective systems of surveillance and identification. U.S. citizens and legal immigrants would have nothing to fear, as stated so often in the current immigration debate, because they would not have broken the law. Privileged cross-border commuters and commercial shippers would actually move faster and with less scrutiny and inconvenience because of their high value, command of resources (ability to pay the costs of the program), and trusted status with the government. **Only lawbreakers would have reason to fear surveillance,**

**detention, interrogation, and arrest by the border-enforcement apparatus.** 314 ❖ Journal of the

Southwest With respect to illegality, the smart and secure border would largely resolve three major societal problems: terrorism, psychotropic drug use, and unauthorized migration. This assumption posits that such problems come from outside the national territory. Hence, they would decline or disappear were they prevented from entering the home space. **Unauthorized migrants, for example, would be so discouraged by the difficulty of crossing the boundary that they would quit coming in**

**meaningful numbers.** The United States would be saved from the illegal immigrant “problem.” The assumption states that the United States itself is not involved in the creation and perpetuation of these three issues—for example, that the U.S. domestic economy is not really involved in the employment, housing, and so forth of undocumented immigrants, and that the North American economy does not mobilize them from their homes in Mexico and Central America. **Rather, bad actors from outside who penetrate an**

insecure boundary are entirely to **blame**, and the solution is having a **comprehensively smart and secure border**.

## C3

Irene **Mia**, 03-27-20**24**, "Haiti's collapse reveals the governance crisis in Latin America",

<https://www.iiss.org/en/online-analysis/online-analysis/2024/03/haitis-collapse-reveals-the-governance-crisis-in-latin-america/> // RB

**The ongoing unrest in Haiti is unique in contemporary Latin America** for the dramatic extent of its **institutional collapse, escalating** armed violence and lawlessness. It is also the result – and culmination – of the country's very specific internal dynamics. Since the overthrow of the almost three-decade-long Duvalier dictatorship in 1986, the country has been grappling with political instability and insecurity, widespread corruption, and criminal infiltration and capture of state institutions. The assassination of President Jovenel Moïse in July 2021 served as a pivotal moment in Haiti's recent history, **bringing** these enduring institutional, economic and security challenges to the fore. **The rise of criminal governance** amid corrupt or **absent state institutions is a growing trend across the region**. Over the past few decades, non-state armed groups (NSAGs) have significantly expanded their influence, wealth and reach across Latin America. **Fuelled by the large profits generated by various illicit activities, they have increasingly challenged the state's** monopoly of force and governance. The International Committee of the Red Cross **counts** close to **70 armed groups operating in Latin America, with just over 33 million people living under their full or partial control**. Most of these groups provide some essential public services such as security, healthcare and education, and some collect taxes from the population in their areas of influence.

**Center For Preventive Action**, 07-24-20**24**, "Criminal Violence in Mexico", Global Conflict Tracker,

<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/criminal-violence-mexico/> // TT

Claudia Sheinbaum, AMLO's chosen successor, has said she aims to strengthen AMLO's National Guard, hire more police investigators, and invest in more social programs for youth to address violence. Some critics argue that continuing AMLO's militarized approach will be insufficient to tackle Mexico's security issues. Meanwhile, **cartels have consolidated and expanded their control**, battling each other with

heavy weaponry and drones. **Kidnappings, killings, and** the **targeting** of journalists **remain prevalent**, and the state has struggled to deliver justice for victims of past crimes, particularly those committed by the military. After the kidnapping of four Americans in March 2023, some U.S. Republican lawmakers proposed sending a U.S. military force to Mexico. AMLO rejected the threat, calling it “irresponsible” and saying he would not permit an intervention. **As of May 2024, cartels controlled about one third of Mexico’s territory**, according to one estimate from the U.S. military. According to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency, the Sinaloa **and Jalisco cartels are responsible for the vast majority of drug trafficking in the United States**, supplying methamphetamines, cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and other drugs. An increasingly high quantity of fentanyl, the leading driver of drug overdoses in the United States, is also smuggled across the southern border by the Sinaloa and Jalisco cartels and their associates.

## **State collapse is disastrous in two ways**

### **First is trafficking**

Robert G. **Beard** Jr., 01-29-20**24**, “Fighting Human Trafficking and Battling Biden’s Open Border”, Jeffersonian Group,

<https://www.jeffersoniangroup.com/blog/2024/1/29/open-borders-and-the-rest-of-the-story> // TT

“Human trafficking—[slavery]—is a global business generating \$150 billion in illegal profits. It encompasses forced labor, sex trafficking, organ trafficking and more. **Human trafficking increased massively in the last fiscal year** [under the Biden

Administration]. **Arrests rose 50%; convictions soared by 80%. The vast majority, 72%, of those**

**trafficked in the U.S. are immigrants**. Most of them are here illegally.” Hannah Davis. Davis continued, **“Many are**

**women and children who are highly vulnerable to being smuggled and eventually trafficked”**

or sold into slavery. “A study from the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women estimated that **60% of unaccompanied alien**

**children**, or **JACs**, **are caught by cartels and exploited through child** pornography and drug **trafficking**.” Not

only is there a negative economic impact from an open border policy, along with a national security threat and concerns about potential social unrest and cultural clashes (e.g., support for Hamas/Palestine against Israel/Jews), the Biden Administration’s open border policy is also a “breeding ground” for the enslavement of women and children in the United States.

**However, current surveillance isn’t enough—corruption on the border is common.**

David **Jancsics**, 10-02-20**19**, "Law enforcement corruption along the U.S. borders", Security Journal,

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41284-019-00203-8> // TT

**Since CBP officers and agents deal most directly with people and goods entering the U.S. from a**

**foreign country, they are most prone to corruption**. However, it is important to note that border-related bribery extends

beyond these front-line officers. **Other government employees who** work away from the border but **have access to**

**sensitive agency information** (e.g., intelligence activity) **may be bribed by actors who are interested in illegal**

**movement of things between countries** (Frost 2010). CBP is the largest uniformed law enforcement agency of the United States

Department of Homeland Security. It is a relatively young organization, created in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attack as part of the

homeland security restructuring process. CBP employed 59,178 men and women in 2017 (CBP 2018). It comprises two large operational units,

the Office of Field Operations (OFO) and United States Border Patrol (USBP). The main workforce within OFO constitutes 23,079 uniformed

customs officers. These customs officers are employees specific to the OFO subunit who are responsible for managing United States customs

operations. They wear blue uniforms and operate at all the country's official entry points. The largest workforce component in USBP, the other

main subunit within CBP, includes 19,437 border patrol agents whose mission is to detect and prevent illegal individuals and goods from

entering the United States. Border patrol agents wear green uniforms and typically operate between official entry points. While CBP's uniformed

customs officers are restricted to work in fixed locations, border patrol agents are mobile, patrolling across multiple places. Figure 1 presents the

basic organizational chart of CBP. One of the main goals of establishing CBP was to create a "one face" agency at all border areas and ports of

entry of the U.S., rather than having personnel from multiple separate agencies reporting to different government departments as was the case

before homeland security was reorganized (Homeland Security Advisory Council 2016). However, as a CBP Integrity Advisory Panel Report

claims, CBP has actually two, even plainly different, faces. Each of these law enforcement organizations brought its own unique culture with it to

CBP. It is a question of interest of this paper whether a difference in border corruption patterns can be found between these two main CBP

units. **Border corruption is a particularly important issue within the federal government system since**

**CBP "appears to have a corruption problem that is orders of magnitude bigger than other agencies"**

(Opening Statement of Senator Mark Pryor 2010). An estimate suggests that **over the last 10 years, workers of the**

**Department of Homeland Security have taken nearly \$15 million in bribes** while being paid to protect the nation's

borders and enforce immigration laws (Nixon 2016). In addition, border corruption may take forms other than cash bribes, such as sexual favors

and other gratuities in return for allowing contraband or border crossing of undocumented aliens (Testimony of Inspector General John Roth

2015). **CBP employees** have transactions with more people on a daily basis than employees of any other law enforcement organization.

They **interact with and clear into the United States over 1 million people, on average, every single day**

(Homeland Security Advisory Council 2016). **Such a dynamic environment provides especially high risk of**

**corruption**. Border patrol agents are more likely to be terminated for discipline or performance reasons than other law enforcement

officers, which may also suggest higher levels of corruption (Nowrasteh 2017). Border law enforcement expanded dramatically since the

establishment of the agency. Just between fiscal year 2006 and 2009, the USBP added approximately 8000 new agents (Heyman 2017). Experts

have had concerns about such rapid expansion without adequate vetting and training time (Turbiville 2011). The failure rate for job applicants'

polygraph interviews at CBP is around 65%, more than twice as high as at any other law enforcement agencies (Spagat 2017). **As the**

**border policing organization in the U.S. is becoming larger and more complex, the risk of corruption**

**grows further**. For example, President Donald Trump's commitment to swiftly increase the ranks of CBP by 5000 new officers and agents

will likely lower hiring standards (Budget of the U.S. Government 2018). A report on employee corruption and misconduct within CBP published

by the Government Accountability Office (GAO 2012) provides some insights into 144 cases, arrests of and allegations against CBP employees for

corruption or misconduct between 2005 and 2012.

## **Affirming solves**

Artificial Intelligence – a promising anti-corruption tool in development settings? U4 Anti-Corruption **Resource Centre**. Published 20**19**.

Accessed July 10, 2024.

<https://www.u4.no/publications/artificial-intelligence-a-promising-anti-corruption-tool-in-development-settings/fullversion#uncovering-corruption-and-fraud-with-artificial-intelligence//JN>

Feedback from the sessions and individual meetings are to a certain extent included in the following sections. Uncovering corruption and fraud with artificial intelligence Oxford Insights lists

**Artificial intelligence as 'the next frontier in anti-corruption,' partly due to its ability to reveal patterns in**

**datasets too large for humans to manage. Applying AI to detect elements of interest, humans can**

**focus on details and follow up on suspected misuse, fraud, or corruption**. Mexico is an example of an economy

where AI tools alone might not be sufficient to win the battle. During the last decade several reforms in Mexico have been carried out to

stimulate economic growth and address high levels of corruption. **The Tax Administration Services of Mexico piloted a**

**project to detect fraudulent operations among taxpaying companies using AI algorithms and analysis**

**tools. 'Within three months of a six months pilot scheme, 1200 fraudulent companies were detected,**

**and 3500 fraudulent transactions identified**. The identification and analysis of these irregular activities **would have**

**taken an estimated 18 months of work without the use of AI**' says the report Towards and AI Strategy in Mexico,

authored by Oxford Insights and C-Minds and initiated by the British Embassy. Many areas of the Mexican economy have seen progress,



including the telecoms sector. Telecom was previously dominated by one player and is now open for competition. This has led to a significant reduction of connectivity cost, and the country is now preparing for its highest investment ever. The goal there is to deliver 4G mobile connectivity to more than 90% of the population within 2024. Affordable connectivity is key in a society working towards digital government services. The next step is to develop an AI strategy for the country. Suggestions such as working towards AI-based solutions to deliver government services for less or to introduce AI driven smart procurement will be included in the forthcoming national AI strategy. In short, Mexico has ambitions to be among the first ten countries in the world to commit to a national strategy for AI. Digital tools and artificial intelligence have also been applied in pilot projects to uncover fraud and tax evasion in public procurement. **The Mexican Institute for Competitiveness (IMCO), together with Participatory intelligence (OPI) used automated queries (AI) on millions of data records to analyse the government's contracting procedures to identify corruption risks.** The dataset covered public procurement from 2012 to 2017 and contained 6 million data lines, with 230 million cells from 9 different sources. Using the evidence from that project, they built a Corruption Risk Index, identifying risk in the more than 1500 buying units studied.

**Empirically,**

Edward **Graham**, 07-09-20**24**, "AI can enhance border security but won't close workforce gap, lawmakers say", Nextgov, <https://www.nextgov.com/artificial-intelligence/2024/07/ai-can-enhance-border-security-wont-close-workforce-gap-lawmakers-say/397943/> // RB

Lawmakers did, however, express strong support for **the federal government to work more closely with private sector firms** to acquire and field new capabilities that could empower CBP and Border Patrol agents to more effectively police the border. Despite not being a silver bullet on their own, emerging technologies were seen as a necessity for combating threats posed by cartels, including their increasing reliance on drones. Dan Bishop, R-N.C. — chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations and Accountability — said “using artificial intelligence can help alleviate the manpower issue” and added that these tools are bolstering border security as **“cartel tactics and use of technology have become increasingly advanced.”** Federal officials have touted the benefits of **enhanced tools** and their **ability to identify more illicit contraband.** CBP said its use of **non-intrusive inspection systems** in fiscal year 2022, for instance, **resulted in “the interdiction of more than 100,000 pounds of narcotics, approximately \$2 million of undeclared U.S. currency and the identification of 86 illegal travelers.”** **While** Bishop said **these tools** — including the use of more AI technologies — **could not replace the work of**

**border agents**, he cited their ability to **ease some of the pressure on personnel and allow them to focus other enforcement activities**. **“Enabling surveillance and processing tools to operate with greater autonomy can reserve time for agents to review the most imminent threats,”** he said. “Automating previously labor-intensive tasks also helps free Border Patrol agents to be back out in the field to safeguard the homeland.”

## **Border technology identifies traffickers, finds victims, and streamlines data sharing.**

Adam **Zivo**, 02-04-20**19**, "Biometrics Are The Future of Anti-Trafficking", Nato Association of Canada,

<https://natoassociation.ca/biometrics-are-the-future-of-anti-trafficking/> // TT

In the past few years, biometrics companies have been exploring how **technology can be used to track victims and break apart trafficking networks**. While new, the **biometric technology** has a number of potential applications here.

Biometric tracking **could be used to prevent the cross-border transportation of victims, since traffickers aren't able to easily forge new identities like** they currently do **with physical paperwork**.

**Families who have had a child abducted, but for whom they lack documentation, may be able**

**to provide photographs** of their children's faces for analysis. **Investigators can use** these photographs to create **a**

**biometric file**, at least a partially complete one, that they can use **to eventually identify and rescue the victim**.

Biometric data can be hashed, meaning that it can be **encrypted** via being converted into a string of numbers. This allows this **data to**

**be shared more easily between different investigative teams across various jurisdictions**. Once

hashed into a number-string, the data becomes unintelligible and therefore doesn't disclose any private information. This not only protects the

privacy of the system's participants, it also means that the **hashed data doesn't count as personal information**,

**making it much easier to legally share across borders**. If the hashed data of a victim matches a hashed profile in a

tracking system, investigators can then secure subpoenas to move forward with un-hashed data. Systems like this are just entering their testing

stage. In 2018, the Attorneys General from the US and Mexico unveiled a facial recognition system that is currently being trialed in Guanajuato

and New Mexico. The system allows families to upload photos of missing persons, which is then cross-referenced with photos of victims from

surveillance feeds. The use of hashing has been particularly useful, given that information sharing between American and Mexican authorities

has been a longstanding obstacle. The underlying technology was developed for the commercial market, particularly for the financial services

sector, with a focus on privacy and encryption of facial data. Its use of data gathered from selfies means that it may be possible to imagine a future where having an active social media profile is sufficient to enrol someone into a tracking system. This could be particularly useful for rescuing youth who come from troubled family background, and who may not have relatives who can proactively provide the photos needed to build a biometric profile. While this pilot project focusses on identifying specific victims, other projects are looking at integrating anti-human trafficking measures into larger biometric systems. India, for example, is engaging in an ambitious project to collect biometric data on all of its 1.3 billion citizens, and Australia is using biometric data in its passports. Introducing human trafficking checks into these emerging, multi-purpose biometric systems may allow for large-scale, passive protection of victims. **As biometric systems become more pervasive, human traffickers will find it harder to transport victims. With these new obstacles in place, this may have the potential to make human trafficking riskier and more expensive, increasing the disincentives for traffickers to engage in this business and thereby reducing the sum of human trafficking.**

**Otherwise, trafficking exacerbates health complications, causing death.**

**Shelley 10** Louise Shelley is the Omer L. and Nancy Hirst Endowed Chair for civic intellectual as well as a University Professor in the Schar School of Policy and Government and the founder and Director of the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center (TraCCC) at George Mason University, "Human Trafficking: A Global Perspective," Page 72-76, [http://demografi.bps.go.id/phpfiletree/bahan/kumpulan\\_tugas\\_mobilitas\\_pak\\_chotib/Kelompok\\_7/Human\\_Trafficking\\_a\\_global\\_perspektif\\_\(Shelley\).pdf](http://demografi.bps.go.id/phpfiletree/bahan/kumpulan_tugas_mobilitas_pak_chotib/Kelompok_7/Human_Trafficking_a_global_perspektif_(Shelley).pdf), ag

Health Consequences **Trafficking victims die, become seriously ill, or are injured in many locales around the world each year as a result of the hazardous work conditions in which they labor, the abuse of their traffickers and their clients, and their sheer physical exhaustion. For many who are impaired, there are no effective treatments, as they are psychologically damaged for life,** suffering frequent nightmares and flashbacks and manifesting suicidal tendencies.<sup>42</sup> The constant abuse, violence, and intimidation they have suffered make it nearly impossible for them to return to normal lives. As one official at the International Organization for Migration in Moldova explained, they can repair the broken jaws and bones but they cannot mend the often irreparable psychological effects.<sup>43</sup> Research in Great Britain reveals that women who had stopped engaging in prostitution had the same levels of mental health problems (40 percent) and drug addiction (73 percent) as those who remained in the sex industry. This is consistent with posttraumatic stress disorder. These data affirm the insight of the IOM official in Moldova that the

damage may be permanent, even in a society such as the United Kingdom, where those engaged in prostitution would have greater access to medical care than most trafficked into the sex industry.<sup>44</sup> Addiction to alcohol and drugs, sometimes imposed on the victim by the trafficker, impairs and shortens their lives. These conditions contribute to the untimely demise of youthful U.S. trafficking victims, who often survive only seven years after they have been trafficked into prostitution.<sup>45</sup> Hundreds of victims die annually of dehydration **while attempting to cross the deserts from Mexico into the United States**. Others die in transit, as previously mentioned, in overcrowded vans or unseaworthy boats before they reach their destinations. **Every year young women who resist their traffickers die**, such as the Afghan girls who jump into wells rather than be trafficked.<sup>46</sup> Others die from HIV contracted through unprotected sex, as victims have no possibility to protect themselves in their sexual encounters, or access to life-prolonging drugs. **In the trafficking culture, their lives are cheaper than the cost of medication**. An unknown number of sex trafficking victims are killed by their customers. Limited research has been done of the longevity of trafficking victims. But research conducted in the United States on mortality of prostitutes reveals a high likelihood of premature death. As researchers explained, To our knowledge, no population of women studied previously has had a crude mortality rate, standardized mortality ratio, or percentage of deaths due to murder even approximating those observed in our cohort. The workplace homicide rate for prostitutes (204 per 100,000) is many times higher than that for women and men in the standard occupations that had the highest workplace homicide rates in the United States during the 1980s (4 per 100,000 for female liquor store workers and 29 per 100,000 for male taxicab drivers).<sup>47</sup> This fate is hardly unique. **One can presume that the rates of mortality are higher among trafficking victims** than those among all prostitutes, as trafficking victims have the least control over their fates and are harmed regularly by both their traffickers and their customers

**Crime also decks the power of governments, causing state instability.**

**Babatunde 14** — Abosede Omowumi Babatunde, lectures at the Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies, University of Ilorin, Nigeria,

PhD in Peace and Conflict Studies from the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, “Human Trafficking and Transnational Organized Crime: Implications for Security in Nigeria,” The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies Volume 46, Number 1 (2014), JSTOR

**Human trafficking also threatens national security in its link to transnational organized crime**, for in many states, including Nigeria, international criminal networks that support mafia-like organizations undermine the states sovereignty over particular areas. A growing realisation through the 1980s and 1990s was that the rise of transnational organized crime is closely connected with the weakness of states and their inability to control their territorial borders.<sup>54</sup> **The uncontrolled flow of** illegal **migrants** and refugees across porous borders heightens competition over scarce resources, exacerbates ethnic and sectarian tensions, and **adds stress on** already **weak state institutions**.

David **Petigo**, xx-xx-20**12**, "The Drug War and State Failure in Mexico", Beloit College,

<https://www.monmouthcollege.edu/live/files/721-mjur-i02-2012-8-pedigopdf> // TT

This paper first analyzes some of the literature that currently exists on Mexico's drug war, as well as the international war on drugs in general. In doing so, it draws on some of the prior observations that have been made in order to construct a theory that explains the causes of state failure in Mexico. Through the identification of these causes, the paper renders policy suggestions that may serve to reverse the process. This paper ultimately concludes that **the key threat of state failure in Mexico is caused by the power of drug cartels**, which have undermined the state's monopoly on the legitimate use of force. **Any policy that does not address the cartel's ability to undermine the state's security apparatus will fail to effectively stop Mexico's descent into state failure.**

## Second is brain drain

**IMF** "Migration and Remittances in Latin America and the Caribbean: Brain Drain Versus Economic Stabilization"

[<https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2017/06/29/migrationandremittancesinlatinamericaandthecaribbeanbraindrainsversuseconomicstabilization>] //Accessed 7/24/24 // Ethan

**Many people from Latin America and the Caribbean live and work abroad. Migrants have been motivated to leave their home country in search of better job opportunities** and, in some cases, a more secure environment. Their families at home often benefit from the remittances migrants send home, which help improve their standard of living, health care, and education. Remittances also provide financial resources for trade and investment, which helps boost the country's growth. **However**, in some cases, **the impact on the others in home countries may be negative, because migrants are often young and may be high-skilled (such as doctors, nurses, or engineers), and their departure reduces the country's economic potential**. Our most recent Regional Economic Outlook finds that outward migration and remittances together have had a small and negative effect on real per capita growth for large parts of the region, although the effect varies across subregions. On the positive side, remittances have beneficial effects for stability. Patterns of migration and remittances Outward migration (or emigration) has been an important phenomenon for countries in the region, particularly for the Caribbean; Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic; and Mexico. In these countries, emigrants account for close to 10 percent of the population—compared

with about 2 percent, on average, worldwide for emerging market and developing economies. They send substantial sums of money, averaging about 6 percent of GDP, to support family members back home. In contrast, while some South American countries such as Paraguay and Uruguay have sizable emigrant populations, even in these countries, the receipt of remittances is dwarfed by those to their Central American and Caribbean neighbors. The United States is by far the most important destination for Latin American and Caribbean migrants, with about two thirds of them living and working in the United States. This high dependence on a single destination country makes the economic fortunes of the region's migrants—and the remittances they send back home—susceptible to the economic ups and downs and immigration policy changes in the United States. Who are these emigrants? Emigrants from Mexico and Central America tend to be younger (on average, about 20 years old) and have lower levels of education compared with those from South America and the Caribbean. Of the latter groups, about 40 percent have attended college (or beyond). With a high share of skilled workers leaving their home countries, the Caribbean in particular has been suffering from "brain drain." With lower levels of education, emigrants from Mexico and Central America tend to work in lower-skilled occupations and have lower wages, but they also send a higher share of their income back to their families. Effects on growth The departure of people of working age reduces the labor force and weakens the growth of the home country, and this effect is likely to be strongest for countries facing a brain drain. But the money migrants send home brings a number of benefits to their families and provides financial resources for trade and investment.

### **Affirming solves by quelling migrant inflows**

**DHS 20** [U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 10-29-2020, The Border Wall System is Deployed, Effective, and Disrupting Criminals and Smugglers,

<https://www.dhs.gov/news/2020/10/29/border-wall-system-deployed-effective-and-disrupting-criminals-and-smugglers>, accessed 7-5-2024] // AZ+BZ

Effective physical infrastructure works to secure our Southwest Border. Since the U.S. Border Patrol began constructing border barriers nearly 30 years ago, these barriers have proved to be a critical component in gaining operational control of the border. Deploying the wall system in high priority areas—particularly urban areas where illegal border crossers can quickly vanish into the surrounding community—allows the USBP to decide where border crossings take place, not smugglers, and the USBP can deploy personnel and technology in complement to the border barrier. In 2006, the U.S. Senate voted in a bipartisan 80 to 19 majority to pass the Secure Fence Act, which authorized construction of physical infrastructure to secure the border. Securing our Southwest Border was once a bipartisan issue. Neglected, easily compromised, and sparsely constructed, the border fence concept needed a reinvestment in 2017. From day one, President Trump prudently recognized that America must have an effective border wall system that delivers first-of-its kind capabilities to the men and women of the USBP. Today, **CBP** is constructing a **border wall system** which **includes a combination of various types of infrastructure including:** Internally hardened steel-bollard barriers from 18' to 30' high New and improved all-weather access roads

Perimeter lighting Enforcement cameras Other related technology The border wall system deploys the right mix of personnel.

technology, and infrastructure to meet the challenges of a dynamic border threat environment and ultimately achieve

operational control of the border.

DEPLOYED: As of October 23, 2020, construction of the wall system breaks down as follows:

FUNDED: 738 miles COMPLETED CONSTRUCTION: 386 miles UNDER CONSTRUCTION: 195 miles PRE-CONSTRUCTION PHASE: 157 miles Bottom

line: The Trump administration is well on its way to meet the goal of having 450 miles of new border wall system deployed by December 31,

2020. EFFECTIVE – DISRUPTING CRIMINALS AND SMUGGLERS The results speak for themselves: illegal drug, border crossings, and

human smuggling activities have decreased in areas where barriers are deployed. For example: San Diego Sector: In one

short 12 mile section in the San Diego Sector, the wall reduced CBP manpower requirements by 150 agents every 24 hours. That is

approximately a \$28 million return on investment per year in salaries and benefits. These agents were redeployed to fill resource gaps in other

areas of the border -- further improving our security. CBP's San Diego Field Office continues to be a significant source of narcotics seizures. From

FY 19 to FY 20, seizures of fentanyl, marijuana, and methamphetamine all increased, with meth seizures jumping at alarming rates in the past

several years – demonstrating that the border wall is forcing drug smugglers to where we are best prepared to catch them – our ports of entry.

Yuma Sector: Illegal entries in areas with new border wall system plummeted over 87% in FY 20 compared

to FY 19. In FY 19, CBP deployed a temporary barrier, which it has replaced with a permanent system, at the Sanchez Canal, which resulted in

illegal entries decreasing in this area by more than 1,000 per month. In FY 19, in areas of older existing border fencing or barriers, Yuma Sector

apprehended 12 large groups (over a 100 persons) compared to zero large groups in FY 20 with new border wall system. Family Unit entries have

decreased over 95% FY 19: 51,961 vs. FY 20: 2,940 RGV Sector: In a section of RGV (Zone 1) apprehensions have decreased since the

construction of the border wall system. This is a location that has never had any border infrastructure. CBP has seen 79% decrease in

apprehensions in this area (Zone 1) since the completion of border wall system. CBP has seen a 26% decrease in narcotics seizures since the

completion of border wall system in this area. In another section of RGV, prior to construction of the border wall system it was common to see

illegal aliens running across a heavily traveled road, putting themselves and members of the community at risk. Smugglers are now forced to

take their groups further west into areas that are less dense with brush and easier for CBP surveillance cameras to detect illicit activity. El Paso

Sector: El Paso Sector has experienced a significant reduction in drug and smuggling activities in areas where the new border wall system was

built. Most notably, in Zones 14 and 15 of the Santa Teresa (STN) AOR where apprehensions have decreased by 60% and 81% respectively when

comparing the last half of fiscal year FY 20 to the first half of FY 20. El Paso Station has experienced similar results from the new border wall in

Zones 20 – 23, with a reduction in apprehensions of 70% during the same timeframe.

## **The impact is poverty**

Zovanga L. Kone and Caglar Ozden 17 – Kone: Researcher at the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford.

Özden is Lead Economist, Development Research Group, World Bank. "Brain Drain, Gain, and Circulation" Global Knowledge Partnership on

Migration and Development. March 2017.

[https://www.knomad.org/sites/default/files/2017-04/KNOMAD%20WP19 Brain%20Drain%20gain%20and%20circulation.pdf](https://www.knomad.org/sites/default/files/2017-04/KNOMAD%20WP19%20Brain%20Drain%20gain%20and%20circulation.pdf) // RP

Despite the evidence, high-skilled immigration flows are controlled by many restrictive policies. Examples include the point-based systems in Australia and the United Kingdom and the H1B visa in the United States. The scarce literature examining the role of host countries' immigration policies on the skill composition of their immigrants, provides mixed findings. While some studies have suggested that skills-based selective immigration policies raise the skill composition of immigrants (see Green and Green 1995; Aydemir 2011; Czaika and Parsons 2017), others conclude these policies may not necessarily lead to much increase in the skill level of immigrants (Duleep and Regets 1996; Antecol, Cobb-Clark, and Trejo 2003), but instead will alter the origin countries (see Borjas 1993) or that geographical proximity plays a more important role (Jasso and Rosenzweig 2009). Docquier and Machado (2015), on the other hand, postulate that liberalizing skilled migration, that is, getting rid of entry visas, would lead to an increase in human capital (measured by the share of tertiary educated in the labor force) in EU15 countries by up to 10.2 percent and by up to 6.2 percent in the United States. Wages in EU15 countries could increase by up to 12 percent, depending on the policy pursued by other developed countries. **The**se

**benefits to developed countries would,** however, **occur at a cost for developing countries** because their losses would

outweigh their gains; they could **experience a drop in income of up to 2.5 percent.** Therefore, policies would be required for fair redistribution of the gains.

**In these countries,**

Peter **Strukelj**, xx-xx-20**12**, "Why Globally GDP, Trade, Profits, Wages, Employment Decrease and Why Poverty Increases?", University of

Primorska, [https://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/issn/1854-4231/7\\_091-110.pdf](https://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/issn/1854-4231/7_091-110.pdf) // TT

Developing countries have recently also experienced food and fuel crises which have caused millions of people to be in poverty and hunger –

between 130 and 155 million people are in extreme poverty, according to the World Bank's estimates. Another 44 million children are

malnourished. **Decrease in** credits and **gdp growth will decrease government revenues and their investments**

**into education, health and gender goals, as well as** the **infrastructure expenditures** needed to increase gdp

growth. **Each 1% decrease in gdp** growth **could trap another 20 million people in poverty** (The World Bank 2009b).

## **Rebuttal**

**No cuts to spending and financial gains means the aff pays back for itself**

**Degeurin 22** [Mack is a reporter at Gizmodo. "Why Emerging Tech's Partly to Blame for a Record \$2.1 Trillion Military Spending Last Year," Gizmodo. 4-26-22.

<https://gizmodo.com/why-emerging-techs-partly-to-blame-for-a-record-2-1-tr-1848844170>]

//PLS



2021 saw the Biden administration complete the U.S. military's withdrawal out of Afghanistan, drawing a symbolic end to more than two decades worth of large-scale fighting in the Middle East. The country's military spending hasn't reduced in kind to reflect that change, a disparity driven partly by defense industry leaders' eager interest in new, and often extremely expensive, cutting edge tech technologies. While traditional spending on weapons and other arms procurements decreased by 6.4% between 2012-2021, U.S. spending on research and development actually increased by 24%.

"The increase in R&D spending over the decade 2012–21 suggests that the United States is focusing more on next-generation technologies," SIPRI Military Expenditure and Arms Production Programme Researcher Alexandra Marksteiner said in a statement. "The US Government has repeatedly stressed the need to preserve the US military's technological edge over strategic competitors."

That "technological edge," includes numerous pricey contracts with Silicon Valley for shiny new toys. Just last year, the U.S. Army entered into a major contract with Microsoft, reportedly worth up to \$21.9 billion, to bring its HoloLens augmented reality headsets to soldiers. The army believes the soldiers will strap on the headsets to "fight, rehearse, and train" using a single integrated system and use AR and VR to, "enable a life-like mixed reality training environment." Actual deployment of those goggles has already faced delays.

The military's ties with Big Tech aren't just limited to Microsoft either. A report published last year by by advocates and researchers at Little Sis, Action Center for Race and the Economy (ACRE), and MPower Change, estimates the Pentagon and The Department of Homeland Security spent over \$44 billion on services from Amazon, Google, Microsoft, Facebook, and Twitter since 2004.

Tech focused R&D spending in the military may swell even further in the next decade as the Pentagon ramps up its already brewing technological arms race with China, particularly around artificial intelligence. Speaking at an event organized by the United Nations last year, U.S. Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin said the U.S. would dish out nearly \$1.5 billion on AI research and development in the next five years to compete with China, which he claims is developing the tech for, "a range of missions, from surveillance to cyberattacks to autonomous weapons."

Part of that effort to ramp up the military's AI presence traces back to former Google CEO and President Obama tech whisperer Eric Schmidt. As head of the National Security Commission on AI, Schmidt and other defense minded thinkers published a report pushing back against international calls for bans on AI-assisted weapons systems and forcefully advocated for increased cooperation between private industry and military. Not long after Schmidt co-authored The Age of AI, with former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger where he warned of a coming AI Cold War.

President Biden, who faced criticism from some conservatives and interventionists over the U.S.' response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine doesn't seem interested in cutting back on military spending anytime soon. Earlier this month, the president released his annual budget proposal which sought to provide the military with a record \$813 billion in funding over a year, a 4% increase from the previous. Even if Biden's unlikely to secure that exact amount in funding, the proposal provides a glimpse into the President's priorities. Those figures drew the ire of progressive lawmakers like Washington

state congresswoman Pramila Jayapal and Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders who slammed the proposal for prioritizing military spending above needed social services.

### **No structural challenge to U.S. research and defense spending**

**Gholz and Sapolsky '21** [Eugene Gholz and Harvey M. Sapolsky. Department of Political Science, University of Notre Dame. "The defense innovation machine: Why the U.S. will remain on the cutting edge," 6-24-21. Taylor & Francis.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390.2021.1917392>] //PLS

Here we examine these concerns that the American military advantage in the Post-Cold War era has dissipated in large part because the Defense Department lags behind in developing advanced technologies. Our judgment is that the American defense research and development system, as honed during the Cold War and expanded since, is fully capable of handling any military challenge. It is a gigantic technology-generating, innovation-producing, war-fighting machine. U.S. 'hard' innovation capabilities – input and infrastructure factors' like R&D facilities, human capital, access to foreign technology, and availability of funding – far outstrip those of its potential rivals, even though those factors are the ones often thought of as easier for catch-up countries to obtain.<sup>3</sup> Despite warnings that the United States no longer spends enough on R&D and that Chinese R&D spending is surging, the reality is that the United States dramatically leads in military innovation investment. In functional terms, the United States dominates all other countries, including China, in 'input factors,' starting with resource allocations to defense research and development.

### **Trump would overturn the election if he lost, so their impact materializes either way**

Maegan **Vasquez 2024** – (Political reporter, The Washington Post, Echoing 2020, Trump won't commit to accepting 2024 election results

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/elections/2024/05/02/trump-accept-2024-election-results/>)//AT

Former president **Donald Trump is** taking a familiar tack: **preemptively questioning the integrity of another election** in which he's competing before ballots are cast. In recent media interviews, **Trump declined to commit to accepting the 2024 presidential election results**, a posture that drew a sharp rebuke Thursday from the Biden campaign, which said the former president is a "danger to the Constitution." **Trump [said]** told the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel in an interview Wednesday **that he would** accept a loss in Wisconsin in November "if everything's honest." "If everything's honest, I'd gladly accept the results," said Trump, who was in Wisconsin for a rally. "If it's not, you have to fight for the right of the country." Trump also told the Journal Sentinel that he

anticipates that the state's 2024 elections will be honest, adding that "a lot of changes have been made over the last few years." The former president said he would "let it be known" if he thought something was wrong with the election results.

**UnidosUS 24** (UnidosUS, the nation's largest Latino civil rights and advocacy organization.

6-25-2024, "AZ, NV, PA Latino Voters on Immigration and the Southern Border", UnidosUS,

<https://unidosus.org/press-releases/az-nv-pa-latino-voters-on-immigration-and-the-southern-border/>

,

DOA: 8/30/24) RWC

The poll, conducted by Lake Research Partners and The Tarrance Group, reveals that while economic concerns such as inflation and the cost of living continue to be the highest priorities for Latino voters, immigration is rising. Where immigration is concerned, **respondents in all three states had similar immigration, border and asylum policy priorities**, especially when it came to providing protection for the long-residing undocumented, **cracking down on drug and human smugglers and working with other countries to protect asylum seekers**. Arizona: Immigration and the border rank significantly higher in Arizona, almost tying with inflation and the cost of living as top issues. On immigration overall, Arizona voters prioritized providing a path to citizenship to long-residing undocumented individuals (50%) and to Dreamers (45%) and increasing legal immigration (30%). Regarding the border specifically, Arizona voters prioritized cracking down on human traffickers and drug smugglers (84%), expanding funding for border security (51%) and providing a path to citizenship for the long-residing undocumented (49%). On asylum policies, the priorities are partnering with other countries to help asylum seekers find protection elsewhere (38%), allowing asylum seekers to apply for asylum in the U.S. from other countries (20%) and requiring asylum seekers to wait in Mexico while they wait for a hearing on their application (20%). Nevada: The economy, especially inflation and the cost of living, is the highest concern. On immigration overall, Nevada voters prioritized providing a path to citizenship to long-residing undocumented individuals (44%) and to Dreamers (36%) and cracking down on human smugglers (28%). Regarding the border specifically, Pennsylvanian voters prioritized cracking down on human traffickers and drug smugglers (73%), providing a path to citizenship for the long-residing undocumented (56%) and expanding funding for border security (45%). On asylum policies, the priorities are allowing asylum seekers to apply for asylum in the U.S. from other countries (40%), partnering with other countries to help asylum seekers find protection elsewhere (30%) and requiring asylum seekers to wait in Mexico while they wait for a hearing on their application (20%). Pennsylvania: **Immigration and the border are also major concerns**, ranking just below economic issues. On immigration overall, Pennsylvania Latino voters prioritized providing a path to citizenship to long-residing undocumented individuals (48%) and Dreamers (35%) while cracking down on human smugglers (35%). Regarding the border specifically, **Pennsylvania Latino voters prioritized cracking down on human traffickers and drug smugglers (81%), providing a path to citizenship for the long-residing undocumented (51%) and expanding funding for border security (41%)**. On asylum policies, the top priorities are partnering with other countries to help asylum seekers find protection elsewhere (43%), requiring asylum seekers to wait in Mexico while they wait for a hearing on their application (30%) and allowing asylum seekers to apply for asylum in the U.S. from other countries (29%). Cris Ramón, Senior Advisor on Immigration at UnidosUS stated, **"These findings provide a roadmap for taking on our challenges at the U.S./Mexico border that reflects the values of Latino voters. Tackling pressing security issues, providing a pathway to relief for the long-residing undocumented, and working with other countries to address the reception of asylum seekers form the core of a pragmatic, principled**

**and forward-thinking border policy.”** David Mermin, Partner at Lake Research Partners said, “As in our national data, these poll findings in three critical swing states show the importance of economic issues to Latino/a voters, as well as a strong desire for action on immigration policy. Latinos in Arizona, Nevada and Pennsylvania want to see a path to citizenship for undocumented long-term residents and Dreamers, increased legal immigration through family and employment-based visas and border security. And they will be paying close attention to these issues when they vote in November.” Brian Nienaber, Vice President of The Tarrance Group also stated, **“This survey finds that Hispanic GOP voters hold views similar to those of their GOP counterparts of other races on the issue of immigration, including a strong interest in Congressional action on immigration as well as support for more restrictive immigration policies like increased border security and higher levels of deportation.”**

Rest were analytics.