

We negate the resolution.

Historically, border surveillance has never solved the border's problems.

Madan 24—Monique O. **Madan** [Monique investigates tech at the intersection of criminal justice, social justice, government accountability and immigration. Her work has also appeared in The New York Times, The Boston Globe, the Boston Herald, The Dallas Morning News, and El Nuevo Herald. Monique is a graduate of Harvard University, Emerson College, and The Honors College at Miami Dade College. She's based in Florida.], 3-22-2024, "The Future of Border Patrol: AI Is Always Watching – The Markup", No Publication, <https://themarkup.org/news/2024/03/22/the-future-of-border-patrol-ai-is-always-watching//FK>

Since at least **2019, DHS has been** gradually and **increasingly integrating AI** and other advanced machine learning **into its operations**, including border security, cybersecurity, threat detection, and disaster response, according to the department's AI Inventory. Some specific uses include image generation and detection, geospatial imagery, identity verification, border trade tracking, biometrics, asylum fraud detection, mobile device data extractions, development of risk assessments, in addition to more than four dozen other tools. **"For 20-plus years, there was this idea that unattended ground sensors were going to trigger an RVSS camera to point in that direction, but the technology never seemed to work."** Dave Maass, Director of Investigations at the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF), an international nonprofit digital rights and research group, told The Markup. "More recently, Anduril [a defense technology company] came in with 'autonomous surveillance towers' that were controlled by an AI system that would not only point the camera but also use computer vision to detect, identify, and track objects. All the other vendors have been trying to catch up with similar capabilities," Maass added, referencing how the slide shows an unattended ground sensor going off and alerting a tower, then the tower AI does all the work of identifying, classifying and tracking the system, before handing it off to humans. "To realize this increased level of autonomy throughout all surveillance and intelligence systems, USBP must leverage advances in AI, machine learning, and commercial sensors designed for an ever-evolving, autonomous world," CBP said in a presentation, led by Julie Koo, the director of CBP's industry partnership and outreach program. But using AI and machine learning may come with ethical, legal, privacy, and human rights implications, experts say. Among the main concerns: the perpetuation of biases that may lead to discriminatory outcomes. Eliza Aspen, a researcher on technology and inequality with Amnesty International, said advocates are "gravely concerned" about the proliferation of AI-enabled police and surveillance technologies at borders around the world, and its potential impact on borderland communities and asylum-seekers. "These technologies are vulnerable to bias and errors, and may lead to the storage, collection, and use of information that threatens the right to privacy, non-discrimination, and other human rights," Aspen said. "We've called on states to conduct human rights impact assessments and data impact assessments in the deployment of digital technologies at the border, including AI-enabled tools, as well as for states to address the risk that these tools may facilitate discrimination and other human rights violations against racial minorities, people living in poverty, and other marginalized populations." Mizue Aizeki, the executive director of The Surveillance Resistance Lab, said it's important to digest the role that tech and AI is playing "in depriving rights and making it more difficult for people to access the very little rights that they have. "One of the things that we're very concerned about is how ... the nature of the ability to give consent to give all this data is ... almost meaningless because your ability to be seen as a person or to access any level of rights requires that you give up so much of your information," she said. "One of the things that becomes extremely difficult when you have these systems that are so obscured is how we can challenge them legally, especially in the context when people's rights—the rights of people on the move and people migrating—become increasingly limited." Border Patrol had nearly 250,000 encounters with migrants crossing into the U.S. from Mexico in December 2023, the most recent month for which data is available. That was the highest monthly total on record, easily eclipsing the previous peak of about 224,000 encounters in May 2022. Colleen Putzel-Kavanaugh, an associate policy analyst at the Migration Policy Institute, a research organization, called the growing tech arena "a double-edged sword." "On the one hand, advances in automation are really helpful for certain aspects of what happens at the southern border. I think it's been extremely helpful, especially when migrants are stuck in perilous situations, if they've been hurt, if a member of their group is dehydrated or ill or something like that. There are different ways that, whether it's via a cellphone or via some sort of remote tower or via something, Border Patrol has been able to do search and rescue missions," she said. **"But there are still similar problems that Border Patrol has been facing for the last several years, like what happens after someone is apprehended and processed. That requires resources. It's unclear**

if automation will provide that piece,” she said. Though migration patterns have historically shifted as technology has advanced, Putzel-Kavanaugh said it’s too soon to tell if fully automated surveillance would scare migrants into taking on more dangerous journeys. “I think that people have continued to migrate regardless of increased surveillance. AI could push people to take more perilous routes, or it could encourage people to just show up to one of the towers and say, ‘Hey, I’m here, come get me.’” Samuel Chambers, a border researcher who’s been analyzing surveillance infrastructure and migration for years, said surveillance tech increases harm and has not made anything safer. “My research has shown that the more surveillance there is, the riskier that the situation is to migrants,” Chambers said. “It is shown that it increases the amount of time, energy, and water used for a person to traverse the borderlands, so it increases the chances of things like hyperthermia, dehydration, exhaustion, kidney injuries, and ultimately death.” During his State of the Union address this month, President Joe Biden touched on his administration’s plan to solve the border crisis: 5,800 new border and immigration security officers, a new \$4.7 billion “Southwest Border Contingency Fund,” and more authority for the president’s office to shut down the border. Maass of the EFF told The Markup he’s reviewed Industry Day documents going back decades. **“It’s the same problems over and over and over again,”** he said. “History repeats every five to 10 years. You look at the newest version of Industry Day, and they’ve got fancier graphics in their presentation. But [the issues they describe are] the same issues they’ve been talking about for, gosh, like 30 years now,” Maass said. **“For 30 years, they’ve been complaining about problems at the border—and for 30 years, surveillance has been touted as the answer. It’s been 30 years of nobody saying that it’s had any impact. Do they think that now these wonders could become a reality because of the rise of AI?”**

Historically,

Koshgarian 23 --- (Lindsay Koshgarian, 3-13-2023, "After 20 Years, the DHS Is a Money-Guzzling Failure",

<https://www.newsweek.com/after-20-years-department-homeland-security-money-guzzling-failure-opinion-1786484>) //EC

Since its founding in 2003, **the U.S. has spent \$1.4 trillion on** the agency. That’s more than seven times what the government spent over the same period on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), including the CDC’s COVID-19 pandemic response—and more than five times more than on the Environmental Protection Agency. COVID-19 is now responsible for more than 1 million deaths in this country. Meanwhile the EPA is struggling to respond to the train derailment and subsequent toxic chemical burn-off that has threatened the very existence of an Ohio town and put communities as far as 1,300 miles away at risk. Clearly, we’ve been budgeting poorly when it comes to protecting our homeland. The militarization of immigration policy may even be creating new threats, including the rapid rise of a far-right extremist fringe both outside and inside the department. Nearly 10,000 DHS and ICE agents belonged to a private Facebook group that shared extremist content before it was revealed in 2019 Yet DHS funding, especially for immigration enforcement, keeps going up. Annual spending on ICE and **CBP** has more than doubled since the agencies were created, accounting for more than \$442 billion over the past 20 years.

The opportunity costs are only compounding. **Annual spending on the**se two **agencies would be enough to provide early childhood education for half a million kids**—a step proven to give kids a better start in life, with long-term outcomes like higher incomes, lower rates of incarceration, and better health. **Or we could use that money to hire 230,000 nurses, easing the dire nursing shortages that are threatening patients' health across the country.** Either would do more to protect the health and safety of Americans than deporting otherwise innocent people who are active members of their families and communities.

This is because of two reasons → the first is contracting

large corporations lobby the government to get contracts to build surveillance.

Beaumont 22—Hilary **Beaumont** [Hilary Beaumont is an investigative journalist who covers the intersection of climate change, Indigenous rights and immigration. Follow her on Twitter @hilarybeaumont], 9-16-**2022**, "'Never sleeps, never even blinks': the hi-tech Anduril towers spreading along the US border", Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/sep/16/anduril-towers-surveillance-us-mexico-border-migrants> //FK

But the new tech is big business. The border security market, globally, is now worth \$45bn, according to a recent report by the market research company IMARC Group, as countries, not least the US, invest more in unmanned border security in response to global conflict, climate breakdown and displacement. In the US, tech companies lobby heavily for these government contracts. Anduril, for example, has spent \$520,000 so far this year and \$930,000 last year on lobbying the US Senate, the House of Representatives and the DHS on budget decisions. "Migrants don't have paid lobbyists in DC, but these military tech corporations do," said Julie Mao, co-founder and deputy director of Just Futures Law, an immigration law project. "That is why the 'smart wall' messaging and border surveillance money is growing at such a high rate."

After receiving contracts, corporations intentionally produce ineffective tech.

Phippen 21; J. Weston Phippen [J. Weston Phippen is a writer and editor based in Santa Fe, New Mexico.], 12-10-**2021**, "'A \$10-Million Scarecrow': The Quest for the Perfect 'Smart Wall'", POLITICO, <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2021/12/10/us-mexico-border-smart-wall-politics-artificial-intelligence-523918> //FK

At the moment, this high-tech capacity will come from Anduril, which has a contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars to place 200 sentry towers along the border in Texas, New Mexico and California. Luckey's last enterprise was a success — he sold Oculus to Facebook for \$2 billion — but the history of America's quest for the smart wall has been, to say the least, underwhelming. Over the past couple decades, the U.S. has sunk billions of dollars into towers 30-feet, even 160-feet tall, towers that are topped with radar, with night vision or thermal vision, and were built by the world's mightiest defense contractors. Often, these systems ended with laughable results. They looked everywhere but down, so migrants and smugglers hid beneath them. The software, designed to detect humans, falsely dispatched agents to apprehend grazing cattle. And sometimes the hardware simply succumbed to the punishing sun, wind and rain of the Southwest. Despite this record of failure, both Democrats and Republicans have clung to the dream. Even Donald Trump was smitten. As he publicly campaigned for his "big, beautiful wall," his administration quietly signed the deal with Anduril. Only a smart wall, Democratic House Majority Whip James E. Clyburn wrote approvingly, "can result in immigration and border security practices that advance justice and mercy everywhere." Biden needs to get the border right. A majority of voters believed Trump's wall was foolish. But the majority of voters under Biden now believe the border is in a state of crisis that requires immediate attention. So Biden has left in place Title 42, a 1944 public health law that Trump seized upon during the pandemic to turn away asylum seekers. He has half-heartedly fought Trump's Remain in Mexico policy and, also like Trump, has pressured the Mexican government to deploy its military to catch migrants who cross north through the country to the U.S. These strategies have managed to both repel his progressive base and overwhelm those who believe he's too soft on the border. Biden must appear, simultaneously, tough yet humane. So like presidents before him he has reached for the smart wall. But if history could speak, it might temper Biden's hopes. "This dream of constant surveillance," says Geoff Alan Boyce, an Arizona-based director of the Earlham College Border Studies Program, "is informed by the technophiliacs in the security world who really believe that, essentially, the border can be approached like an engineering problem." The

companies who profit from government contracts, he said, “are perfectly happy to make all these operational promises of what they can deliver. But **the history of technologies on the border is rather less impressive.”** Not only is Anduril’s system relatively unproven, after 15 years Customs and Border Protection, the parent agency of Border Patrol, **hasn’t figured out how to measure what success looks like.** Defense companies, Democrats and President Biden will also say a smart wall is a humane alternative to a physical wall. But those who’ve studied these systems believe the opposite: that they have helped to drive migrant deaths to historical highs. That outcome, critics say, is a feature of the smart wall, regardless of whether it’s equipped with the latest cameras, radar or artificial intelligence. In the end, the possibility remains that Anduril will deliver a product that’s all it’s cracked up to be — innovative and technologically sound. But this doesn’t mean it will achieve the ambitious results that policymakers and politicians have long demanded. **“They try to present what they do as very different from everything that has been done before,”** says Iván Chaar López, who studies border technology at the University of Texas at Austin. **But it’s “not that different from what all these older systems did.”**

Ineffective technology doesn’t solve the border problems, allowing them to continue. Accordingly, the cycle of lobbying, contracts, and bad tech continues.

Miller 21 — [Todd **Miller** is an author and independent journalist. His works include *Storming the Wall: Climate Change, Migration, and Homeland Security* and *Border Patrol Nation: Dispatches from the Front Lines of Homeland Security.*] 4-19-**2021**. “A lucrative border-industrial complex keeps the US border in constant ‘crisis’”. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/apr/19/a-lucrative-border-industrial-complex-keeps-the-us-border-in-constant-crisis> //FK

When I think of the “border crisis”, I think of Giovanni’s gashed feet. **Stories of death and near death, of pain and immense suffering like this, happen every single day. This displacement crisis is not temporary; it is perpetual.**

This is something that I’ve witnessed in my own reporting for more than two decades. **The border by its very design creates crisis. This design has been developed and fortified over the span of many administrations from both political parties in the United States, and now involves the significant participation of private industry.** **The border-industrial complex and its consequences** is one of the reasons that I argue in my new book *Build Bridges, Not Walls: A Journey to a World Without Borders* that if people honestly want a humane response to border and immigration issues we have to confront something much bigger than the Trump legacy, and begin to imagine and work towards something new. Across the line from where I sat looking at Giovanni’s feet was one of the most fortified and surveilled borders on planet Earth. **An array of armed border patrol agents, walls, surveillance towers, implanted motion sensors and Predator B drones were deployed specifically to force people like Giovanni (and the group of five people he was with) into desolate, deadly regions.** Like many, **he walked a full day through a rugged mountain range until his feet became too wounded and his shins started to give out. He also ran out of water.** What happened to Giovanni is part of the design of what the US border patrol calls “prevention through deterrence”. By blockading traditional crossing areas in border cities, a 1994 border patrol strategic memo notes, the desert would put people in “mortal danger”. At the beginning of this strategy, **in 1994** under the Bill Clinton administration, **the annual border** and immigration **budget was \$1.5bn**, through the Immigration and Naturalization Service. **In 2020, the** combined **budget** of its superseding agencies, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (Ice), **exceeded \$25bn.** That is **a 16-fold increase.** Another way to look at the scope of this money juggernaut are the 105,000 contracts, totaling \$55bn, that CBP and Ice have given private industry – **including Northrop Grumman, General Atomics, G4S, Deloitte and CoreCivic, among others – to develop the border and immigration enforcement apparatus.** That is worth more than the total cumulative number of

border and immigration budgets from 1975 to 2003. That's 28 years combined amounting to \$52bn. The companies can also give campaign contributions to key politicians and lobby during budget debates. And so we have the formula of a perpetual "border crisis": the bigger the crisis, the more need for border infrastructure, generating more revenue. One result? Since the 1990s, nearly 8,000 human remains have been found in the US borderlands. The number of actual deaths is almost certainly much higher. Families of migrants continued to search for lost loved ones. In this sense, Giovanni was lucky. He decided he could go no further and left his group. He was disoriented when he turned around. The high desert landscape of mesquite and grasslands all blended together. Luckily, he found a puddle from a rain storm, which likely saved his life from death by dehydration. By the time I saw him, Giovanni's feet were a disaster, but that wasn't the disaster that brought him to the border. As the EMT applied antibiotic cream so that his discolored feet glistened, he spoke to me at length about the fact that it hadn't rained in his community for 40 days; the crops wilted, and the harvest never came. He lived in the "dry corridor", he told me. The term describes a huge swath of territory running from Guatemala to Nicaragua that is getting dryer and dryer as a direct result of global warming. According to an estimate from the World Food Programme, this has left 1.4 million farmers in severe crisis. In that sense, Giovanni was, like many others coming from Central America, driven by the climate crisis. The back-to-back hurricanes in late 2020, in particular, displaced countless people. Since the United States has produced nearly 700 times more carbon emissions than El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras combined since 1900, you might think it would be ethically obligated to help undo the damage. Instead, as with other large historic greenhouse gas emitters, it is at the global forefront of militarizing its borders. As the Zapatistas say, Basta Ya. There has to be another way to imagine the world. Yet instead of truly confronting the problems that we face as a globe – such as climate change, endemic inequalities in which 2,000 billionaires have more wealth than 4.6 billion people, and runaway pandemics where the health of people and peoples across borders become intimately interconnected – the solution somehow always becomes more border walls, more surveillance technologies and more suffering. In 1989, when the Berlin Wall fell, there were 15 border walls worldwide. Now there are 70, two-thirds created since 9/11. Clearly the time has arrived for new questions to be asked. When geographer Ruth Wilson Gilmore discusses the abolition of prisons, she talks about presence. "Abolition is about presence," Gilmore has said, "not absence. It's about building life-affirming institutions." Gilmore stresses that abolition today is not just about ending incarceration, but also about "abolishing the conditions under which prisons became solutions to problems". This approach also applies to borders: how do we shift the conditions under which borders and walls became acceptable solutions to problems? Perhaps the answer lies not in the impossible task of building a humane border, but rather a more humane world in which concepts such as borders and prisons are seen as outmoded, unjust ways of relating to one another. Maybe the biggest impediment to this is the global border-industrial complex. Joe Biden's 2020 presidential campaign received three times more campaign contributions from the border industry than did Donald Trump's. While the president has called for a reversal of Trumpian policies, he is far from challenging a border-industrial complex that leaves people like Giovanni with ravaged feet and near death in the Sonoran desert. The border is designed to be in a perpetual crisis, but we can stop this by shifting to something new. Abolition is not about destruction, but about restoring who we can be. It's time to build bridges, not walls.

On top of surveillance being ineffective, it also causes two key harms.

The first is immigration

Immigration will always continue, however the legal immigration system is clogged.

Bier 24 --- (David J. Bier, 5-8-2024, "The Cost of the Border Crisis", <https://www.cato.org/testimony/cost-border-crisis>) //EC

Unfortunately, the United States is benefiting from immigration despite its outdated and dysfunctional immigration system. Congress has not updated this system in over three decades. To briefly review the main permanent immigration options available for immigrants abroad: Refugee Program: The global population of displaced people reached 114 million in 2023,³⁹ and the United States accepted barely 60,000 through its refugee program—a mere 0.05 percent.⁴⁰ Family-sponsored Immigration: The capped family-sponsored system currently has a backlog of over 8.3 million,⁴¹ and alarmingly, 1.6 million of these applicants currently waiting will likely be dead before they can receive a green card.⁴² Employer-sponsored Immigration: Annually capped at just 140,000 green cards, this category currently has a backlog of over 1.8 million.⁴³ The country-based caps mean that wait times for Indian workers with a master's degree will be longer than the average lifespan. Employer-sponsored green cards are close to impossible to obtain for those without very high wage offers and a work visa, and the main work visa—the H-1B—is capped at 25 percent of demand.⁴⁴ For those coming temporarily, the H-2B seasonal worker program for nonagricultural jobs is the only path for most U.S. seasonal low-skilled jobs, and it has an annual cap of 66,000. Although Congress temporarily doubled this cap, that level was only about half the level required to meet the number of positions requested.⁴⁵ Diversity Lottery: The diversity green card lottery is available to immigrants only if they are not from legal immigrants' main origin countries and have a high school degree or experience in a skilled job, and it offers entrants just a 0.2 percent chance of receiving a green card.⁴⁶ **In 2023, about 34 million people entered a legal process to try to obtain a green card**, yet barely more than **1 million will succeed** and receive legal permanent residence—just 3 percent of applicants.⁴⁷ This massive disparity between the number of green cards issued and those requested is **a consequence of decades of unnecessarily low green card caps, leaving millions without a viable way to enter legally.** From 1848 to 1914, the annual number of people receiving green cards hit one percent of the U.S. population 22 times. Since the Immigration Act of 1924, this rate has never been achieved again, and only once has it even hit half that rate, when Congress waived the caps on behalf of 3 million illegal immigrants in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Today, one percent of the U.S. population would be nearly 3.4 million people,⁴⁸ yet the number of green cards issued in 2022 was just 1 million.⁴⁹ Immigration policy is also restrictive compared to our peer nations. Less than 15 percent of the U.S. population was born outside the United States. This ranks 56th worldwide,⁵⁰ in the bottom third of wealthy countries. For perspective, to catch up to Canada (21.4 percent), nearly 30 million immigrants would have to arrive this year. To reach the immigrant share in Australia (30.3 percent), the number grows to 76.4 million. To hit Hong Kong's percentage (39.2 percent), it would have to exceed 140 million. These totals are unfathomable, but they illustrate just how much flexibility the United States has to adjust its immigration policy and remain well within the norms for the wealthy world. Furthermore, the United States ranks 57th globally for refugees and asylum seekers per capita.⁵¹ In contrast, other countries are taking in staggering numbers of refugees and asylum seekers: 3.8 million in Turkey, 3.4 million in Iran, 2.3 million in Germany, and 1 million in Poland, with a population about a tenth of the size of the United States. Seven percent of Jordan and 15 percent of Lebanon are now refugees or asylum seekers. These comparisons underscore the capacity for the United States to significantly expand its role in global refugee assistance and admission.

Because legal immigration is out of the picture - Surveillance increasing harm in 2 ways - The first is riskier routes

Launius 19—Geoffrey Alan Boyce, Samuel N. Chambers and Sarah **Launius**, Opinion Contributors, 2-11-**2019**, "Democrats' 'smart border' technology is not a 'humane' alternative to Trump's wall", Hill, <https://thehill.com/opinion/immigration/429454-democrats-smart-border-technology-is-not-a-humane-alternative-to-trumps/?rl=1>, Accessed 9-15-2024//EC

These deaths are the result of many factors. But our research shows that significant among these has been **the expansion of border surveillance technology**. Using Geographic Information Science, we analyzed the mapped location of human remains pre- and post-SBInet. We then plotted the visual range of the SBInet system using publicly-available information on the location of the towers and the operational reach of their various components. Next, we **created a** model using variables like vegetation, slope and terrain to measure the physiological difficulty associated with pedestrian transit along different routes of travel. We found a meaningful and measurable **shift in the** location of human remains toward **routes of travel** outside

the visual range of the SBInet system, routes **that** simultaneously **required much greater physical exertion, thus increasing peoples' vulnerability to injury, isolation, dehydration, hyperthermia and exhaustion.** move are entitled to."

The numbers reflect these trends.

Valle 24—Gaby Del **Valle**, A Policy Reporter. Her Past Work Has Focused On Immigration Politics, Border Surveillance Technologies, and The Rise Of The New Right., 3-20-**2024**, "Surveillance has a body count", **Verge**,
<https://www.theverge.com/2024/3/20/24106098/cbp-migrant-deaths-border-surveillance//EC>

The vast **surveillance apparatus at the border is driving desperate people into more dangerous terrain, resulting in a 57 percent increase in recorded deaths at the US-Mexico border.** **CBP's network of surveillance towers, hidden cameras, aerial drones, and overhead sensors** is the result of an enforcement strategy called "prevention through deterrence." The policy, which was implemented in the mid-1990s, was initially to build up manpower in highly trafficked areas of the border. At the time, most migrants entered the US through cities — they'd scale the fence that divided Tijuana and Ciudad Juárez, for example. In response, Border Patrol flooded cities along the border with agents to dissuade migrants from crossing. Those who attempted would be pushed onto "more hostile terrain, less suited for crossing and more suited for enforcement," Border Patrol's 1994 strategic plan read. Thirty years later, **the plan** has borne out, though it **hasn't actually reduced migration. Instead,** as the 1994 plan predicted, **it just shifted the location of crossings.** Surveillance tools allow Border Patrol to track migrants through vast expanses of the border without actually having to be there — the agency considers them a "force multiplier." But the expansion of CBP's surveillance apparatus has come at a significant human cost. **A 2019 study by researchers at the University of Arizona found a "significant correlation between the location of border surveillance technology, the routes taken by migrants, and the locations of recovered human remains in the southern Arizona desert."**

Overall,

HRW 24—**Human Rights Watch**, 6-26-**2024**, "US: Border Deterrence Leads to Deaths, Disappearances",
<https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/06/26/us-border-deterrence-leads-deaths-disappearances>

(Mexico City) — **Border deterrence policies are driving increased deaths** and disappearances of people migrating to the United States, said Human Rights Watch and the Colibrí Center for Human Rights in a web feature published today. The web feature, "Nothing but Bones: 30 Years of Deadly **Deterrence at the US-Mexico Border**," features the stories of nine people who died or disappeared while trying to cross the southern US border and of their surviving family members. **US Border Patrol has reported** about **10,000 deaths**, when Prevention Through Deterrence was first implemented, **but** local rights **groups at the border believe the number could be up to 80,000, with thousands more disappeared.** Most of those dead are **Indigenous, Brown, and Black people.** "The number of deaths is shocking, but each death represents a human being, a family, a community," said Ari Sawyer, US border researcher at Human Rights Watch. "The US government should end deadly border deterrence policies and enact policies that protect human life."

The second is deportations

Migrants are stuck in a losing battle → They can either go through risky routes or get deported.

Waggoner 23 --- (Jennifer Waggoner, xx-xx-2023, "As More Migrants Forced to Enter U.S. Through Dangerous Routes, Border Patrol Takes up Life-Saving Role",

<https://www.singhahluwalia.com/as-more-migrants-forced-to-enter-u-s-through-dangerous-routes-border-patrol-takes-up-life-saving-role/>) //EC

But when more-restrictive border policies were passed, including Title 42, these individuals now face a high chance of being expelled right back at the border without any hope of a screening or hearing for their asylum request. The solution, then, is to get caught deeper into U.S. territory. Since being immediately turned away at the border foregoes any sort of due process for removal,

those caught at official checkpoints **essentially have no way to claim asylum as a defense against deportation.**

By being caught actually well within U.S. borders, the individuals must then be formally considered for prosecution — and, thereby, asylum. **It's a catch-22 that has led to a brutal**

situation, with a record number of deaths of those trying to enter the U.S. in recent years. Over 800 deaths were reported over the fiscal year 2022, and more are expected this year as Title 42 is set to expire, which is predicted to trigger a new wave of asylum seekers at the border. The biggest source of pressure to flee one's country and seek asylum in the U.S. include political persecution, threats of violence from gangs, and exploitation. Many are members of vulnerable groups escaping from assaults they have already dealt with because of their religion, gender, or sexual orientation. Increasingly, though, many in South and Central America are fleeing economic devastation.

Deportations are terrible

Adames 18 --- (Adames, H. Y., 7-31-2018, "American Journal of Community Psychology", <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ajcp.12256>) //EC

Deportation has numerous detrimental impacts on individuals who are deported, and on the families and communities they are forced to leave behind. This policy statement reviews the empirical literature to describe the effects of deportation on the individual, families, and the broader community, in order to inform policy and practice recommendations. Deportations have markedly increased in the US in the past three decades, with 340,056 people being deported from the country in 2017 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017). Most people who are deported have lived in the country for over a decade and many are parents or caregivers of US citizens (Brabeck, Lykes, & Hershberg, 2012; Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012; TRAC Immigration, 2006). Approximately, 5.9 million US citizen children (and at least three million more children who are in the US without authorization) have at least one caregiver who does not have authorization to reside in the United States (Mathema, 2017; Zayas & Cook Heffron, 2016). Immigration policies have moved away from the goal of family reunification, and have the potential to harm US citizens by separating families—including children—from their parents. For example, the hardship exemption of the Immigration and Nationality Act limits exemptions of deportation to parents, children, and spouses. Consequently, extended family caregivers, such as grandparents, are ineligible for the exemption in spite of any undue hardship caused to their US citizen family members from their deportation (Zug, 2009). The effects of deportation are felt by individuals, families, and communities. Nearly four in five families screened in family detention centers have a "credible fear" of persecution should they be forced to return to the countries from which they migrated (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2016). **Many of those deported are**

forced to return to dangerous, turbulent environments, and deportations

have resulted in kidnapping, torture, rape, and murder (Stillman, 2018). Deported individuals often find it challenging to support their families, and coupled with the trauma and stigma of the deportation, may find it difficult to

maintain contact with family members; this often leads to severed relationships (Dreby, 2012; Hagan, Castro, & Rodriguez, 2010; Zayas & Bradlee, 2014; Zayas & Cook Heffron, 2016). Family members left behind suffer multiple psychosocial consequences.

Separation of a child from a parent due to deportation is associated with economic hardship, housing instability, and food insecurity

(Capps et al., 2015; Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012). Family members are often forced to take on new roles to make ends meet: the remaining caregiver(s) must often work longer hours, leaving little time for contact with children; older children often become primary caregivers of younger siblings and/or must work to support the family, impacting school performance and retention (Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012). Following deportation of a family member, children demonstrate numerous emotional and behavioral challenges, such as eating and sleeping changes, anxiety, sadness, anger, and withdrawal. Even if the family is ultimately reunited, the consequences of their forced family separation often remain (Brabeck et al., 2012; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010). Moreover, the broader community suffers negative consequences of deportation regardless of first-hand experience. Following immigration raids and deportations, community members are often more fearful and mistrustful of public institutions, less likely to participate in churches, schools, health clinics, cultural activities, and social services, and more reluctant to report crime to the police (Capps, Rosenblum, Chishti, & Rodríguez, 2011; Hagan, Rodriguez, & Castro, 2011; Hagan et al., 2010; Sládková, Mangado, & Quinteros, 2012; Vargas, 2015). Studies have also demonstrated that immigrant adults are emotionally taxed following deportations and the threat of deportations in their communities; associated anxiety and psychological stress has been linked to cardiovascular risk factors (Brabeck et al., 2012; Martinez, Ruelas, & Granger, 2017; Torres et al., 2018). Immigrant children living in communities where immigration raids have taken place feel abandoned, isolated, fearful, traumatized, and depressed (Adames & Chavez-Dueñas, 2017; Capps, Castañeda, Chaudry, & Santos, 2007). Moreover, children—regardless of immigration status—experience fear and shame regarding deportation, which impacts their sense of self and well-being (Dreby, 2012).

For example,

HRW 20 --- (Human Rights Watch, 2-5-2020, "Deported to Danger", <https://www.hrw.org/report/2020/02/05/deported-danger/united-states-deportation-policies-expose-salvadorans-death-and>) //EC

The US government has deported people to face abuse and even death in El

Salvador. The US is not solely responsible—Salvadoran gangs who prey on deportees and Salvadoran authorities who harm deportees or who do little or nothing to protect them bear direct responsibility—but in many cases the US is putting Salvadorans in harm's way in circumstances where it knows or should know that harm is likely.

Of the estimated 1.2 million Salvadorans living in the United States who are not US citizens, just under one-quarter are lawful permanent residents, with the remaining three-quarters lacking papers or holding a temporary or precarious legal status. While Salvadorans have asylum recognition rates as high as 75 percent in other Central American nations, and 36.5 percent in Mexico, the US recognized just 18.2 percent of Salvadorans as qualifying for asylum from 2014 to 2018. Between 2014-2018, the US and Mexico have deported about 213,000 Salvadorans (102,000 from Mexico and 111,000 from the United States). No government, UN agency, or nongovernmental organization has systematically monitored what happens to deported persons once back in El Salvador. This report begins to fill that gap. It shows that, as asylum and immigration policies tighten in the United States and dire security problems continue in El Salvador, the US is repeatedly violating its obligations to protect Salvadorans from return to serious risk of harm. Some deportees are killed following their return to El Salvador. In researching this report, we identified or investigated **138**

cases of **Salvadorans killed** since 2013 **after deportation from the US.** We found these cases by combing through press accounts and court files, and by interviewing surviving family members, community members, and officials.

There is no official tally, however, and our research suggests that **the number of those killed is likely greater.**

Though much harder to identify because they are almost never reported by the press or to authorities, we also identified or investigated over 70 instances in which deportees were subjected to sexual violence, torture, and other harm, usually at the hands of gangs, or who went missing following their return.

The second key harm is taking funding away from humanitarian aid.

The cost for border surveillance is massive.

Miller 19—Todd **Miller**, 9-16-**2019**, “More Than A Wall: Corporate Profiteering and the Militarization of US borders”, TNI, <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/more-than-a-wall-o>

One of the principal ways private corporations receive money for border security work is through contracts with the different immigration control agencies that includes Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), US Citizenship and Immigrant Services (USCIS), and the Coast Guard.

From around 2006 to 2018, ICE issued more than 35,000 contracts totaling \$18.2 billion⁹⁹, CBP more than 64,000¹⁰⁰ totaling \$27 billion, and the Coast Guard has more than 245,000¹⁰¹ totaling \$35.3 billion. During that same time period DHS awarded more than 488,000 contracts for a total of \$4.8 trillion. ¹⁰² In terms of overall budgets, CBP is the top recipient (more than \$16.3 billion in 2018), but part of an even bigger immigration enforcement and homeland security apparatus through which billions of additional dollars in contracts have been doled out. **For example in 2018, the ICE overall budget was nearly \$7.5 billion¹⁰³ and the Coast Guard \$10.5 billion.**¹⁰⁴ **This report focuses on CBP contracts to provide a glimpse of a vast homeland security apparatus.** exceeding the accumulated INS budgets from between 1975 and 1998 of approximately \$26.1 billion in total.¹⁰⁵ The money paid to corporations now dwarfs that given to charities. For example, in 2016 the Office for Refugee Resettlement designated \$14.9 million to nine non-profit agencies to help people resettle,¹⁰⁶ a mere fraction of the total contracts given to corporations to stop, monitor, arrest and deport people. The amount and value of contracts has grown so much that the military monolith Lockheed Martin landed a contract in 2009 potentially worth more than \$945 million¹⁰⁷ for maintenance and upkeep of 16 P-3 surveillance planes that are equipped with airborne and surface-to-radar systems. This **one contract was equal to the total entire border and immigration enforcement budgets from 1975 to 1978** (\$923 million approximately).¹⁰⁸ Similarly, the contract to the San Diego-based General Atomics worth \$276 million in 2016 for the operational maintenance of the Predator B drone systems¹⁰⁹ nearly tops any of the annual budgets for the INS in the 1970s. Companies are benefiting from a massive border and immigration enforcement system that in 2018 had an annual budget of more than \$23 billion, 126 times larger than it was in 1975 (\$181.3 million). Based on the list of CBP contracts, this report highlights 14 companies as **giants in border security business**. These are Accenture, Boeing, Elbit, Flir Systems, G4S, General Atomics, General Dynamics, IBM, L3 Technologies, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, PAE, Raytheon and UNISYS. Many of these companies have **reaped large contracts** directly from CBP. Others are highlighted because of other border and immigration enforcement contracts they have received. For example, while **Raytheon** has received a cumulative \$37 million from CBP since 2008, during that same period, the company **received more than a billion dollars through the** Defense Threat Reduction Agency (of the **Department of Defense**), with a substantial portion going to border enforcement building projects in places like Jordan and the Philippines. In another example, the company **General Dynamics not only has CBP contracts, but also a contract with Health and Human Services to provide “infrastructure services” for THE BIG CORPORATE PLAYERS** More Than a Wall ³¹ detained undocumented children that has earned the company millions. And **while Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman already rank among the top CBP contractors, both companies also received other major homeland security contracts such as \$11 billion from the Coast Guard** (shared by both) **to ‘modernize the Coast Guard’s Deepwater assets.’** The highlighted companies include technology and security firms, but are clearly dominated by the same global arms firms that reap rewards from high levels of US military spending. In addition, the report also profiles private prison companies CoreCivic and Geo Group who along with G4S are major players in providing immigration detention services and are the biggest winners of ICE contracts.

However, Congress has limited spending power.

Bergmann 23—(Max Bergmann; NATO expert & director of the Europe Program and the Stuart Center in Euro-Atlantic and Northern European Studies @ Center for Strategic and International Studies, formerly @ Secretary of State policy planning staff, master's degree in comparative politics, bachelor's degree in political science; 3-3-**2023**; "U.S. Security Assistance to Ukraine is Going to Get Complicated;" War on the Rocks;

<https://warontherocks.com/2023/03/u-s-security-assistance-to-ukraine-is-going-to-get-complicated/> //EE

Congressional gridlock in the United States will require the Biden administration to get creative in how it provides military support to Ukraine. The absence of a supplemental appropriation **will not end** the Biden administration's ability to support Ukraine, but it will make it more bureaucratically challenging to keep doing so. **It will** also **require the administration to** make tough tradeoffs, something it has not yet had to do when considering how to fund the transfer of

U.S. weapons to Ukraine. The administration will need to **reallocate funding**, use obscure authorities, and work creatively with Congress. This will also demand the Biden administration not just prioritize Ukraine but also politically assert itself to break through bureaucratic barriers and disputes. There will inevitably be issues that cause delays and place greater limitations on what the United States can provide. However, there are six potential options that the Biden administration could consider: should current funding for U.S. assistance end. These six options will also require more European support, and a creative approach to asking for and then allocating monies in the U.S. defense budget. State of Play Unless there is a collapse in Russian forces or a change in regime in Moscow, Ukraine will need to keep arming itself — either to maintain the current fight or to recapitalize and modernize its military to prepare for potential future Russian aggression. Not only will Ukraine continuously need to be resupplied with ammunition, but Ukraine will need to continuously recapitalize its forces with Western equipment — the Western tanks that are sent to Ukraine will experience losses and will need to be replaced. This cycle requires constant U.S. involvement and resupply. The United States has allocated more than \$48 billion in supplemental appropriations for security assistance for Ukraine since the war began in February 2022. This includes more than \$20 billion as part of the \$45 billion appropriation that was completed by Congress in December 2022. This funding gives the administration a good runway to continue providing weapons to Ukraine. But it is unclear how long the funding will last. At some point, likely before the fiscal year ends on Oct. 1, 2023, the administration will need more security assistance funding for Ukraine. Congress up until now has stepped in to pass supplemental spending bills to support Ukraine. However, these requests came at a time of single-party Democrat rule in the United States. This has changed, with the Republicans taking control of the House of Representatives following the November 2022 mid-term election. The next time the administration runs out of funding and requests more from Congress, McCarthy may choose not to bring a new Ukraine supplemental spending bill to the House floor. The legislation could divide his caucus and could prompt funding opponents to challenge his

speakership, replaying his tortuous week-long election to the position in early January. This raises the potential for a potential lapse in funding for security assistance. **Funding for the**

Ukrainian government at this point has not demanded any tough bureaucratic tradeoffs between funding priorities. The funding has been all additive, as the administration has been extensively using its presidential drawdown authority. This

authority allows the president to take equipment directly from U.S. forces or Department of Defense stocks and send it to foreign partners. This authority was normally capped at \$100 million worth of equipment per year. But in response to the war in Ukraine, Congress increased the limit to \$14.5 billion for this fiscal year. The supplemental appropriations thus gave the Department of Defense funds to backfill equipment sent to Ukraine in order to make it "whole" after drawing down stocks. Thus, the U.S. military could ship out older equipment and put in orders to replace it with brand-new equipment (although this will take time to contract for and build). The appropriations also gave the Defense Department's Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative and the State Department's Foreign Military Financing more funding, but this aid must be

used to buy equipment from U.S. defense companies and is therefore often slower. In other words, the **funding thus far has not required**

balancing needs for Ukraine against domestic spending. It hasn't required reducing security assistance for the Indo-Pacific.

It did not require shifting funding from weapons procurement. Instead, the funding enabled the U.S. military to buy new weapons systems to replace those sent to Ukraine. The one "cost" from the Department of Defense's perspective was that supporting Ukraine depletes equipment stockpiles, which could impact U.S. military readiness if the defense industry is unable to deliver in a timely fashion. That is a risk, but a

manageable one, especially given the strategic importance of Ukraine aid. **Without a specific Ukraine appropriation, the administration will likely have to redirect or reallocate money from within the Department of Defense or State Department.** This will require congressional approval. However, this does not require a full vote of the House.

The leadership of congressional committees — on foreign affairs, armed services, and appropriations — all must give their approval to the potential reallocation of funding. The new Republican heads of these committees will play a critical role. Foreign Affairs Committee chair Michael McCaul favors heavily arming Ukraine, but with oversight. Kay Granger of the Appropriations Committee is a Ukraine supporter and a defense hawk. Mike Rogers, who will chair the Armed Services Committee, is also a Ukraine supporter. Should the administration get their approval (as well as that of their corresponding committees in the Senate) to redirect funds to Ukraine, the House or Senate could vote to block funding. But it is highly unlikely that opponents would have the majority needed to override, as Congress has never passed a joint resolution of disapproval to block an arms transfer advocated by the executive branch. Options to Keep Security Aid Flowing There are a number of ways in which the U.S. government can keep providing significant support to Ukraine without a specific appropriation. To do so, the Biden administration should begin contingency planning now. First, the administration could keep using presidential drawdown authority to take equipment from Department of Defense stocks and send it to Ukraine. But instead of ensuring that there is funding available to replenish this equipment, the president could simply move ahead and instruct the Department of Defense to send it. The president and the military could then approach Congress and ask for additional funding to replace equipment already given to Ukraine. There are several complications with this approach. First, there is a \$14.5 billion limit on how much equipment can be given away per fiscal year — a limit that the administration is fast approaching. Second, the U.S. military may be more hesitant to cede equipment to Ukraine without knowing it has the funds to replace its stockpiles. While the president can overrule these concerns, this would create significant bureaucratic opposition and resistance, particularly from the impacted military services. Furthermore, if Congress refuses to appropriate additional funds to replace equipment sent to Ukraine, the U.S. military could face shortfalls that impact the readiness of the force. Second, the Biden administration could redirect some of the Department of Defense's \$816.7 billion defense budget toward Ukraine. The most recent defense budget was plussed up by an additional \$45 billion above the administration's request. The Department of Defense could likely find \$10–20 billion to reallocate to fill gaps created by sending equipment to Ukraine. This is, after all,

how European countries are aiding Ukraine, through their regular defense budgets. **While most program retransfers within the**

department are fairly routine, finding funds of this magnitude would require hard tradeoffs.

The reaction is unlikely to be as negative as when the Trump administration reprogrammed \$3.8 billion from the Department of Defense to help pay for the border wall. But reprogramming this much funding will certainly create bureaucratic challengers that will push back strongly against how money is being spent. Congressional appropriators and Defense Department planners no doubt have designs on this funding, such as strengthening the U.S. military's force posture in Asia. This might lead to some further loss of support amongst China hawks in Congress. Nevertheless, as noted above, the leaders of key congressional committees are strong supporters of Ukraine and would likely support redirecting funds for military aid. Third, the administration

could reallocate funding **from other** U.S. security assistance **programs** in the State Department and the Department of Defense. **This may seem the most straightforward place to find funding but there are significant limitations. Most problematic, however, is there is just not that much funding in these accounts that's available or flexible enough to transfer to meet Ukraine's needs.** It is unlikely that key partners like Israel, which receives the largest portion of U.S. security assistance at \$3.3 billion, will be content with reductions and will make that known on Capitol Hill. While there have been significant increases in security assistance funding after the invasion of Ukraine, much of this funding is planned for other partners in Europe, with the United States helping to backfill countries that have aided Ukraine, such as by providing Soviet-era tanks. The United States could reallocate some of this funding to aid Ukraine directly. However, this will leave other partners in the lurch and reduce their incentives to support Ukraine.

Unfortunately, foreign aid would be the first sector cut.

Natsios 17—Andrew **Natsios**, 4-4-**2017**, "Why Trump's Proposed Cuts to the Foreign-Aid Budget Are Rattling U.S. Allies," Atlantic,

<https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:oAaQ62sUJqUJ:https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/04/what-trumps-foreign-aid-budget-means-to-the-rest-of-the-world/521553/&hl=en&gl=us>

In justifying the proposed cuts, the Trump administration has also argued that other wealthy countries should do more. During the campaign and into his early presidency, Trump has made a legitimate point, if inelegantly spoken, that most European states have left their defense to the United States. But using this rationale to explain cuts in the U.S. aid budget makes no sense, because the Europeans, Japanese, and Canadians already contribute much more aid than the United States does. For example, in 2015, the United States ranked 20th out of about 30 donor governments when it came to foreign aid as a percentage of gross domestic product. It is the United States that should be giving more. The real reason for the proposed aid cuts has to do with American politics. **When federal spending must be cut, the least painful reductions politically are in the foreign-affairs budget, because the immediate pain is felt by people who do not vote in American elections.** Yet a feast or famine approach to aid spending never lasts very long. When new threats confront the United States abroad, policymakers invariably turn to the State Department and USAID to confront them. Then, the foreign-aid and diplomacy infrastructure has to be rebuilt, a process that cannot happen overnight. All secretaries of defense since the 9/11 attacks have complained that they were fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan, and against international terrorist groups around the world, without enough diplomats and aid professionals to stand alongside them. During the Iraq War, in 2004, there was an inverse relationship between the density of USAID projects and casualty rates: the more USAID programs in an area, the fewer U.S. combat-troop casualties there were, according to U.S. military research. This is why 121 retired generals and admirals wrote to Congress, which will soon be crafting its own budget, urging the cuts be reversed. It's also why powerful Republican senators and a few House committee chairmen announced that the proposed aid cuts were, in the words of Senator Lindsey Graham, "dead on arrival."

Empirically,

Sanford 19—**Sanford** School Of Public Policy, 6-25-**2019**, "Could Foreign Aid Help Stop Central Americans From Coming to the U.S.?", Sanford School of Public Policy,

<https://sanford.duke.edu/story/could-foreign-aid-help-stop-central-americans-coming-us//EE>

On Monday, **the State Department** announced details of President Trump's **promised cuts to foreign aid** for the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, warning that future U.S. funding will require these countries to improve efforts to decrease migration. The announcement comes as the number of Central Americans crossing the southwest U.S. border continues **to increase**, with 144,000 migrants and asylum seekers taken into custody in May. **While cutting aid, the Trump administration has sought to stem migration by tightening the U.S. border and increasing pressure on Mexico.** Last week, a threat to implement new tariffs on Mexican goods was postponed after Mexico agreed to rein in "irregular migration." Critics of the aid cuts argue that they are counterproductive and that aid can be used to decrease the underlying conditions leading people to migrate. Why do the numbers continue to surge? Are there other potential solutions? Here are some answers.

Unfortunately, foreign aid is essential.

USAID, xx-xx-xxxx, "Humanitarian Assistance", U.S. Agency for International Development,
<https://www.usaid.gov/humanitarian-assistance>

USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance is the U.S. government lead for international disaster assistance, **reaching** **tens of millions of people around the world each year with life-saving aid.** **On average, we respond to 75 crises in 70 countries each year, providing food, water, shelter, health care, and other critical aid** to people who need it most. We work to ensure that this assistance reaches people affected by natural disasters—including hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanoes—as well as slow-onset crises, such as drought and conflict. Take a look at where we work. Not only do we save lives, we look to improve the lives of those vulnerable to or affected by crisis, unconditionally and impartially, so that all whom we serve are treated with dignity and respect. Read more about our early recovery, risk reduction, and resilience (ER4) work around the world.

