



PF Topic Analysis November 2015

Our second Public Forum topic for 2015 is **Resolved: In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.** This topic will be somewhat challenging due to it being about a current, ongoing crisis. Although I always recommend staying informed, keeping up-to-date on the news regarding this issue will be especially key for debating this resolution effectively.

A quick tip: use Google News' "personalize" feature to automatically receive constantly-updating news about whatever words/phrases you want. For instance, you could set up several: "refugee crisis," "migrant crisis," etc. Then, look at it every day, and cut cards where necessary. This is remarkably helpful for staying up-to-date, and it is so easy.

You should observe from the beginning that this paper was written under the assumption that the vast majority of pros will defend some sort of physical housing of refugees (whether that be granting them citizenship, temporary work permits, etc.) If the refugees physically come into the nation in question, that counts. For pros that will only defend other, narrower types of assistance, some of the below will be useful, but some will not. Keep that in mind as you harvest evidence from this guide.

We'll now move on to a quick discussion of the words in the resolution.



In response to is obvious. “In response to” refers to a reaction to a particular event or situation. The only thing you really need to know is that the pro needs to defend government action for refugees as a method to deal with the specific situation of the current refugee crisis.

Speaking of...

Current crisis, theoretically, could mean any large problem that has to do with refugees and is ongoing now. It may be fair game for pros to talk about, for example, the number of South American migrants coming North to flee the violence of drug cartels and crippling poverty. Of course, you would have to win that these people are truly refugees—more on that later.

There’s also probably a debate to be had about what makes an issue “current.” Does it mean literally now, or does the very recent past suffice? Etc. I’m not going to go there in this paper, though.

It is obvious that the topic committee intended for this topic to discuss the migrant crisis caused by civil war and brutal violence in Syria and Iraq. This is the major news story you’ll see when you research refugees, and it’s a tremendous problem that the entire world is struggling to grapple with. It is this situation, therefore, that can be considered the “core” of the topic.

If you aren’t familiar with the factors causing the refugee crisis, you should probably stop reading this right now and go to some research. There are many groups and events that played their part in causing the current chaos, and the causes of such turmoil is complex. However, you should strive to at least know the main dynamics experts say underlie the crisis. I am not going to cover this here in the interest



of time and space, but you should absolutely research it on your own until you feel like you have an at least decent grasp.

Government is another obvious one. The only important thing to point out here is that the resolution does not refer to any specific government. The pro might argue that helping refugees is a moral obligation for any nation, or they may choose to focus on only wealthy/powerful countries, or perhaps just Europe. Be aware of this, and remember that the pro isn't necessarily obligated to defend action from any specific government(s), nor are they *banned* from referring to any specific government.

Should, as we all know, is similar to "ought," although ought is typically interpreted as weightier; if you "should" do something, this usually refers to advice on what is the best course of action. If you "ought" to do something, there is an element of moral obligation involved.

Clearly, the framers chose "should" instead of "ought" deliberately. The reason is presumably that "ought" potentially ties the debate to conversations centered entirely around morality, while "should" allows more room for debaters to pursue their own frameworks.

Anyway, "should" is referring to a suggestion on what action (or inaction) is considered most desirable. The *reason why* an action is desirable, though, is up to you.

Prioritize means to rank above another interest, when one is unable to pursue them both equally at the same time. It does *not* mean that the secondary interest is "bad," or inherently incompatible with the first interest. Nor does it imply that the secondary goal is unimportant. For example, I might say "I



prioritize breathing over eating”—this is because not breathing will kill me *sooner*, not because starvation can’t kill me.

In other words, pros and cons have quite a bit of room to try to “drink each others’ milkshakes” on the impact level. More on this later.

Humanitarian needs is a tricky one, because it does not have any stable definition within the law—international or otherwise. This can actually be considered a solvency problem, and has a deep literature base within the humanitarian community.

Because I am a nerd who thinks semantic shenanigans are fun, I will be releasing an entire file on this question very soon. (I didn’t want to further delay the release of this guide as I cut a million cards about definitions!)

You could also just define “humanitarian” and “need” separately, according to regular dictionary definitions. This doesn’t really help the core issue much— we still lack any system for determining when something becomes a “need.”

Regardless, most teams probably won’t want to mess with this (unless they download my forthcoming file! 😊) so don’t worry about it too much. For the purposes of most substantive debate, the “common sense” interpretation will be sufficient.



Refugees is probably the most important word in this resolution, and it is also the one that has the strictest interpretation. Refugee is a *term of art* within international relations; in other words, it has a stable definition within that particular discipline. In this case, it was defined by the United Nations. Given that the UN is considered literally the global leader on these sorts of issues, I would suggest not straying outside of this interpretation if you are trying to approach the topic traditionally.

Under international law, Art. 1 A (2) Refugee Convention defines the notion 'refugee' as a person who,

owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.

Although central to the refugee definition, '**persecution**' itself **is** not **defined in** the 1951 Convention. **Articles 31 and 33** refer to threats to life or freedom, so clearly **it includes** the **threat of death**, or the threat of **torture, or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment**. A comprehensive analysis requires the general notion to be related to developments within the broad field of human rights,⁶ and the recognition that fear of persecution and lack of protection are themselves interrelated elements. The persecuted do not enjoy the protection of their country of origin, while evidence of the lack of protection on either the internal or external level may create a presumption as to the (p. 39) likelihood of persecution and to the well-foundedness of any fear. However, there is no necessary linkage between persecution and government authority. A Convention refugee, by definition, must be unable or unwilling to avail him- or herself of the protection of the state or government, and the notion of inability to secure the protection of the state is broad enough to include a situation where the authorities cannot or will not provide protection, for example, against persecution by non-state actors.



Here is a lengthier excerpt which clearly spells out which “refugee-ish” groups *do not* actually qualify as refugees. You might want to pay particular attention to the part that says mass migrations caused by war are *not* refugees:

(Sharon Stanton Russell, former senior research scholar at the Center for International Studies at MIT + director of the Mellon-MIT Inter-University Program on Non-Governmental Organizations and Forced Migration + chair of the Steering Group of the Inter-University Committee on International Migration + member of two United Nations Expert Groups on international migration, “Refugees: risks and challenges worldwide,” Migration Policy Institute, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/refugees-risks-and-challenges-worldwide>, November 1 2002)

Understanding the problems confronting refugees — and those striving to protect them — **depends on grasping precise legal definitions. These definitions determine who qualifies for the protections, both legal and physical**, that national and international bodies have developed to deal with people pushed across borders by conflict and persecution. They also play a critical role in efforts to collect and interpret refugee statistics.

The core definition of a "refugee" is contained in the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, which define a refugee as an individual who: "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable or — unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country."



Recognizing that **this definition** of so-called "statutory refugees" **did not cover situations of mass flight from war**, regional bodies such as the Organization for African Unity developed agreements like the OAU Convention of 1969. These expanded the definition of refugees to include not only individuals subject to persecution, but also every person who — in the words of the OAU Convention — "owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination, or events seriously disturbing the public order...is compelled to leave...to seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality." The Cartagena Declaration, adopted in 1984 by a group of Latin American states, added massive human rights violations to this list. Though it is not a treaty, the declaration carries considerable moral force in the region and beyond.

On this basis, people who move as a group across international boundaries to escape war or civil conflict are also generally recognized as refugees on a group or prima facie basis in Africa and Latin America, and frequently in Asia and the Middle East as well. Poorer countries in these regions use the broader definition of refugees in part because they lack the administrative capacity to determine whether or not each individual meets the criteria for refugee status. **Those in mass flight** in industrial regions, however, are not automatically recognized as refugees, and instead may be subject to "individual status determination" using the narrower statutory (Convention) definition of a refugee.

The concept of refugees as people fleeing persecution is central to efforts to aid and protect them. However, debates exist about what constitutes "persecution." Some **parties ask whether the persecution must be state-sponsored** and focused on individuals, **or whether widespread social practices and attitudes also qualify** as grounds for persecution. **Further arguments surround what constitutes a human rights abuse and what is a "cultural practice."**

Such questions arise particularly in gender-related cases; for example, women subjected to female genital cutting, women under the Taliban regime whose education was blocked, or gays and lesbians from countries where their sexual orientation is prohibited by law and subject to severe punishment. Gender-based factors have, on a case-by-case basis, been recognized as grounds for granting asylum and refugee status to individuals, but there remains no international consensus or standard for doing so.

Who Is Not a Refugee?



In its narrow usage, **the term "refugee" does not apply to a number of groups. This may have profound implications** for everything from their mobility to their survival.

The term "people in refugee-like situations" is used to describe those — such as the Bedouin in Kuwait or Iraq, and Burmese in Thailand or Malaysia — **who are stateless or denied the protection of the government in their countries of citizenship or habitual residence, but who have not been recognized as refugees.** Centuries or even decades ago, when borders were less secure or mapped out, their lack of status meant less. In an era when "security" is of mounting importance, however, many such people find their situation increasingly precarious. Two conventions on statelessness supervised by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) have done little to alleviate their plight.

The term "internally displaced people" (IDPs) is used in reference to those who may have moved for the same reasons as refugees but have not crossed an international boundary. There is no single agency charged with looking out for IDPs, but upon request, the UNHCR may take responsibility for them, in which case they are included in statistics on "people of concern to UNHCR."

The international legal definition of the term "refugee" **also excludes those who move** not as a result of persecution, but **as a consequence of natural disasters** (such as drought, floods, or earthquakes), **environmental factors, or famine.** They are excluded even though they may need international protection and assistance because their home country cannot or will not provide these things. The terms "forced migrants" or "forced displacement" are used to describe people in these circumstances.

Similarly, **the term "refugees" also excludes people who move primarily for economic reasons.** **Even when they are leaving conditions of extreme poverty,** they fall under the rubric of "economic migrants."

One final group is "asylum seekers." These are persons who have arrived in a country seeking to be recognized as refugees. If, when adjudicated, **their claim is found to be legitimate, they are**



granted refugee status. If the circumstances of their movement are judged **not** to conform to the definition of a refugee, **their claim is denied** and they become "rejected asylum seekers."

Over links back to "prioritize"—it designates the secondary concern that should be deprioritized relative to the first.

Its is possessive, and refers to "government." It means you need to be talking about the pros and cons of helping refugees from the standpoint of a country (or countries). The pro should not be advocating action from individuals, NGOs, private companies, etc.

National interest is a phrase that **is used in a number of ways** throughout relevant literature.

Sometimes, people use it to discuss anything that would be beneficial for the state. If you can argue that a course of action would have utility for a particular nation, then it can be reasonable to argue that such action is in the "national interest."

However, "national interest" is also often used within international relations theory to refer specifically to the goals/priorities of **realists**. These are things like power, hegemony, sovereignty, and control of valuable resources, shipping routes, etc. Using this interpretation, the national interest is amount maintaining power on the world stage, to dissuade other countries from "messing with you." You can probably see why this results in nations seeing themselves as, at some level, constant adversaries. World power is a zero-sum game (say the realists), so one country cannot gain power without some other country losing it. No one wants to be the loser. Therein the "national interest."



Here is a piece of **evidence** from former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, which suggests America's national interests lie in a *blend* of realism and idealism focused on supporting democracy and human rights:

(Condoleezza Rice, former Secretary of State under Bush, "Rethinking the National Interest," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2008-06-01/rethinking-national-interest>, July/August 2008)

What has changed is, most broadly, how we view the relationship between the dynamics within states and the distribution of power among them. As globalization strengthens some states, it exposes and exacerbates the failings of many others -- those too weak or poorly governed to address challenges within their borders and prevent them from spilling out and destabilizing the international order. In this strategic environment, it is vital to our national security that states be willing and able to meet the full range of their sovereign responsibilities, both beyond their borders and within them. This new reality has led us to some significant changes in our policy. We recognize that **democratic state building is now an urgent component of our national interest**. And in the broader Middle East, we recognize that **freedom and democracy are the only ideas that can**, over time, **lead to** just and **lasting stability**, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq.

As in the past, **our policy has been sustained not just by our strength but also by our values. The United States has long tried to marry power and principle** -- realism and idealism. At times, there have been short-term tensions between them. But **we have always known where our long-term interests lie**. Thus, **the United States has not been neutral about the importance of human rights or** the superiority of **democracy** as a form of government, both in principle and in practice. This uniquely American realism has guided us over the past eight years, and it must guide us over the years to come.

GREAT POWER, OLD AND NEW

By necessity, our relationships with Russia and China have been rooted more in common interests than common values. With Russia, we have found common ground, as evidenced by the "strategic framework" agreement that President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin signed in Sochi in March of this year. Our relationship with Russia has been sorely tested by Moscow's rhetoric, by its tendency to treat its neighbors as lost "spheres of influence," and by its energy policies that have a distinct political tinge. And Russia's internal course has been a source of considerable disappointment, especially because in 2000 we hoped that it was moving closer to us in terms of values. Yet it is useful to remember that Russia is not the Soviet Union. It is neither a permanent enemy nor a strategic threat. Russians now enjoy greater opportunity and, yes, personal freedom than at almost any other time in their country's history. But that alone is not the standard to which Russians themselves want to be held. Russia is not just a great power; it is also the land and culture of a great people. And in the twenty-first century, greatness is increasingly defined by the technological and economic development that flows naturally in open and free societies. That is why the full development both of Russia and of our relationship with it still hangs in the balance as the country's internal transformation unfolds.



The last eight years have also challenged us to deal with rising Chinese influence, something we have no reason to fear if that power is used responsibly. We have stressed to Beijing that with China's full membership in the international community comes responsibilities, whether in the conduct of its economic and trade policy, its approach to energy and the environment, or its policies in the developing world. China's leaders increasingly realize this, and they are moving, albeit slowly, to a more cooperative approach on a range of problems. For instance, on Darfur, after years of unequivocally supporting Khartoum, China endorsed the UN Security Council resolution authorizing the deployment of a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force and dispatched an engineering battalion to pave the way for those peacekeepers. China needs to do much more on issues such as Darfur, Burma, and Tibet, but we sustain an active and candid dialogue with China's leaders on these challenges.

The United States, along with many other countries, remains concerned about China's rapid development of high-tech weapons systems. We understand that as countries develop, they will modernize their armed forces. But China's lack of transparency about its military spending and doctrine and its strategic goals increases mistrust and suspicion. Although Beijing has agreed to take incremental steps to deepen U.S.-Chinese military-to-military exchanges, it needs to move beyond the rhetoric of peaceful intentions toward true engagement in order to reassure the international community.

Our relationships with Russia and China are complex and characterized simultaneously by competition and cooperation. But in the absence of workable relations with both of these states, diplomatic solutions to many international problems would be elusive.

Transnational terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, climate change and instability stemming from poverty and disease -- these are dangers to all successful states,

including those that might in another time have been violent rivals. It is incumbent on **the United States** to find areas of cooperation and strategic agreement with Russia and China, even when there are significant differences.

Obviously, Russia and China carry special responsibility and weight as fellow permanent members of the UN Security Council, but this has not been the only forum in which we have worked together. Another example has emerged in Northeast Asia with the six-party framework. The North Korean nuclear issue could have led to conflict among the states of Northeast Asia, or to the isolation of the United States, given the varied and vital interests of China, Japan, Russia, South Korea, and the United States. Instead, it has become an opportunity for cooperation and coordination as the efforts toward verifiable denuclearization proceed. And when North Korea tested a nuclear device last year, the five other parties already were an established coalition and went quickly to the Security Council for a Chapter 7 resolution. That, in turn, put considerable pressure on North Korea to return to the six-party talks and to shut down and begin disabling its Yongbyon reactor. The parties intend to institutionalize these habits of cooperation through the establishment of a Northeast Asian Peace and Security Mechanism -- a first step toward a security forum in the region.

The importance of strong relations with global players extends to those that are emerging. With those, particularly India and Brazil, the United States has built deeper and broader ties. India stands on the front lines of globalization. This democratic nation promises to become a global power and an ally in shaping **an international order rooted in freedom and the rule of**

law. Brazil's success at using democracy and markets **to address** centuries of pernicious **social inequality has global resonance.** Today, India and Brazil look outward as never before, secure in their ability to compete and succeed in the global

economy. In both countries, **national interests are** being redefined as Indians and Brazilians realize their direct stake **in a democratic, secure, and open international order** -- and their commensurate responsibilities for strengthening it and defending it against the major transnational challenges of our era. **We have a vital interest in the success and**

prosperity of these and other large multiethnic **democracies** with global reach, such as Indonesia and South Africa. And as these emerging powers change the geopolitical landscape, it will be important that international institutions also change to reflect this reality. This is why President Bush has made clear his support for a reasonable expansion of the UN Security Council.



Now that we've covered definitions, we'll discuss some options for both pro and con arguments.

The most obvious pro argument on this topic is probably human rights. It is indisputable that people are suffering horrific violations of their human rights in Syria and Iraq, so it makes sense for the pro to focus heavily here.

A number of cards I will provide below also provide an internal link into things like human rights credibility and soft power—if the U.S./Europe/etc. don't "put their money where their mouth is" when it comes to refugees, they will lose credibility to lecture other nations on HR abuses down the line. If that happens, we lose a significant weapon against future crimes against humanity.

First, here is some pro **evidence** that makes moral the case for granting refugees asylum. (Obviously, this is only useful if you'll defend asylum; if it's just aid or something, this doesn't apply to you.)

(Michael Blake, professor of Philosophy and Public Affairs at University of Washington & Director of UW's Program on Values in Society, reviewing "Debating the Ethics of Immigration: is there a right to exclude?" by Christopher Wellman and Phillip Cole, Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews Journal, <https://ndpr.nd.edu/news/32280-debating-the-ethics-of-immigration-is-there-a-right-to-exclude/>, original book published by Oxford University Press in 2011, article published July 2012)

Wellman's argument begins with three simple premises: **first, legitimate states are entitled to self-determination; second, self-determination includes freedom of association; and, third, freedom of association includes the right not to associate** (13). **These three are** developed into **an argument for a deontic right to close the borders against even the most needy would-be immigrant**: if a state has adequately pursued its obligations under international justice, it can -- simply by citing its self-determination -- refuse to allow any would-be immigrant to cross into its territory.



Wellman's argument begins, then, with the idea of self-determination. **Legitimate states are, he asserts, entitled to their own authority over self-regarding affairs; a country that has a less-than-optimal system of criminal law is not, in virtue of that, subject to being taken over** or otherwise controlled by some outside agency (17). **(If the criminal law becomes bad enough, of course, the human rights of the individuals in question might be violated -- in which case, the state is no longer legitimate.) The country would be wronged if we were to annex it, even in the admittedly rare circumstance that we were doing so in the name of its inhabitants, could actually run the criminal law better** than the current institutional agents were doing, **and were actually committed to democratic governance within the** new country created by our **annexation**.

This wrong, though, seems to involve the right of a country to be free from unwanted alteration in the membership of that country. **We wrong the country by denying it self-determination, and our insistence on annexing it denies it self-determination by denying it the right to control who shall be a part of that country**. If this is right, though, **the right of political self-determination includes the right to exclude unwanted changes in the membership of polity. This, however, entails a right to keep out** unwanted would-be **immigrants: the right to self-determination demands that legitimate states not be subjected to the wishes of others in determining the membership of that state.**

Wellman's argument thereby defends the right of a country to exclude non-members **-- even if the needs of these non-members are exceptionally great**. While wealthy countries have obligations to help the members of illegitimate regimes, and the inhabitants of poorer countries, these obligations do not rise to **an obligation to admit** these **people** to membership. Instead, Wellman argues that the obligations of the wealthier countries of the world are disjunctive in form: help prevent the circumstances giving rise to such would-be immigrants through intervention and institution-building, or admit such would-be immigrants to some form of membership within one's own borders (117-124). The importance of self-determination **entails** the right of legitimate states to be free from unwanted members, even when those members would be benefitted enormously by membership in such a society.

Wellman's contribution includes a response to several theorists defending more open borders, a brief discussion of exit rights and the obligations of countries admitting highly skilled immigrants from developing countries, and an analysis of the **moral wrongness** of guest worker programs. Throughout, however, Wellman's contention is unchanged: a legitimate country may have many obligations to the global poor -- but the obligation to allow them to immigrate is not one of them.



Here is another piece of pro **evidence** premised on ethical philosophy:

(Steven Wilson, former Dean of Liberal Arts at Tulsa CC, Review of Wellman, Christopher Heath; Cole, Phillip, Debating the Ethics of Immigration: Is There a Right to Exclude?. H-Law, H-Net Reviews, <https://networks.h-net.org/node/16794/reviews/17289/wilson-wellman-and-cole-debating-ethics-immigration-there-right-exclude>, December 2013)

The uncontrolled transit of unauthorized peoples across international boundaries is a source of controversy not only in the United States, with its long southern border with Mexico, but in the countries of the European Union, the destination of choice from such hotspots as northern Africa and the Middle East, and in other nations that are relatively prosperous and peaceful. Would-be host countries face the practical questions of how many immigrants, if any, to accept; under what circumstances; for how long; and to what end--commerce, or citizenship? States usually choose one immigration policy over another after making pragmatic political, demographic, or economic calculations. Sensitivity to human rights issues may inform the thought of some leaders of those nations on the receiving end of substantial migrations (**we** are considering voluntary movement, not illicit human trafficking), but it is probably safe to assume that few of them will **ponder the strictly ethical implications** arising from their decisions either to allow or to interdict immigrants. The authors of *Debating the Ethics of Immigration*, philosophers Christopher Heath Wellman of Washington University in St. Louis and Phillip Cole of The University of Wales in Newport, do this pondering for them. Despite the main title, this book is not the record of a debate so much as an exercise in comparative essaying on the subject in the subtitle: is there a right to exclude?

Although Wellman and Cole also examine such related topics as the ethics of "guest" worker programs, the lingering impact of past colonialism on present-day international borders, and the moral status of (and potential legal obligations owed to) refugees, **the main task** at hand for both **is to** offer their best arguments that answer to the **question of whether states are acting ethically if they exclude hopeful foreigners**. Each author takes roughly half of the volume to lay out their respective positions--Wellman in the affirmative, then Cole offering **the negative**. Wellman argues that "legitimate" states have the right to regulate their memberships and populations, and that this right includes the exclusion of new members and would-be immigrants (chapter 1, "In Defense of the Right to Exclude"). Wellman bases his argument on three stacked premises: first, legitimate states have a right to self-determination; second, freedom of association is an essential part of self-determination; and, third, freedom of association implies freedom not to associate with others not of one's choosing. What are the marks of "legitimacy"? In Wellman's opinion, a legitimate state is one that "adequately protects the human rights of its constituents and respects the rights of all others" (p. 16).

That bare definition might provoke either nodding or shaking of the reader's head, but it will not persuade many to reconsider their existing positions. A proponent of open borders will not see a policy of exclusion as "adequate" protection of rights, and hence never as a legitimate act. Cole, for example, essentially **takes** these **three premises** as self-evident: **first, the central principles of liberalism are equality and universality; second, inequality is** presumptively **unjust when it is** an artifact **produced by morally arbitrary differences** between persons; **and, third, is it not**



“morally arbitrary” (basically, an accident of history) that an individual was born in one country and not another? And **this is a key problem with a philosophical debate that pits politics against ethics.** Instead of “legitimate,” one side could argue variously that a policy of exclusion is legal, constitutional, customary, the mark of a sovereign power, expedient, or merely rational, and the other side will object to the premises and definitions. A simple historian may find this impasse frustrating; but, scoring the exchange on practical points alone, non-philosophers who pick up this book will probably award the cup to Wellman. Nevertheless, **the full arguments** are worth grappling with, as thought experiments that test our liberal assumptions.

Through a series of topical chapters, Wellman methodically examines “cases **for open borders,**” and **finds** each case wanting. He considers **four possible justifications** for open borders which he calls the **democratic, libertarian, egalitarian, and utilitarian** arguments. The **first** argument is as follows: **democracy gives people a voice** in framing the coercive laws to which they are subject; **foreigners wishing to enter a new country will be subject to that country’s laws; therefore, the democratic principle requires** that prospective **immigrants participate in the framing of** those **immigration laws.** Wellman sees this as impractical: if a poor state’s citizens can vote themselves the right to move to a rich welfare state, what will prevent every poor group choosing the same country? This reviewer judges it confused: will democratic principles prevail in all cases but one--namely, the right to exclude? “Open borders” loses this round. The **second**, libertarian case emphasizes **property rights of natives.** For example, **a business owner has a right to maximize profit by** importing and **employing cheap foreign labor.** Wellman finds that a nation’s rights, to stability and prosperity, should outweigh the owner’s right, because supporting immigrants may impose costs on the rest of society (a balance, of course, is found through political processes, so the libertarian case relates to the democratic).

The **third**, egalitarian argument for open borders **is a call to rebalance the unfair** distribution of the world’s wealth. Wellman claims to be sympathetic to the idea that the sad **history** of Western colonialism may **require[s] the prosperous nations to compensate the plundered, colonized peoples.** Even while acquiescing to the principle, however he does not offer details on how the reparations would be calculated. This case conflates economic history with demographic determinism, which is perhaps inevitable. But, the conflation begs the following question: if someone in a poor, war-torn country expresses a desire to immigrate to a peaceful, prosperous part of the world, would a fat check actually suffice to keep them where they are? The **fourth** and final case **is utilitarian. A cost-benefits analysis suggests that opening the borders would cost** affluent **nations less than it would help** poor would-be **immigrants. Moreover, free movement would allow for greater labor efficiencies. Finally, open borders would undercut political oppression, by enabling refugees to escape** from tyrannical regimes. On the latter point, Wellman reiterates his idea that, under the rights of self-determination, a legitimate state “can entirely fulfill its responsibilities to persecuted refugees without allowing them to immigrate into its political community” (p. 123).

Cole follows Wellman to propose **“an ethical defense” of open borders.** His view of the human right to free mobility across boundaries **is based on the idea that there is or ought to be a symmetry between exit and entry. Hence, the right to immigrate has a strong moral claim,** to be curtailed only in exceptional



circumstances. In most cases, **the right to free movement trumps sovereignty**. Cole surveys various **rationales** advanced **for rejecting** potential **immigrants**, and asks if any of these **are morally legitimate**, or defensible within any coherent version of liberalism. Because Cole takes **the** liberal commitment to human equality and freedom to its radical conclusion, his **answer is no**. Cole's uncompromising position seems to be **counter to current international law** (or at least centuries of practice), but this is his point: **what may be considered strictly legal is not therefore ethical**, and Cole decries a "compromise" solution on exclusion (p. 162). Cole also insists that, **when debating of borders** and exclusion, **arguments from analogy** may be attractive but **are morally misleading**. Wellman, **for example**, likens **membership in a club** to membership in a state: **exclusivity is part of the institution's nature**. Wellman suggests in **another** passage **that the right to exit a country is analogous to the right to be married**--although a human right, it can still be restricted in various legitimate ways (you cannot marry someone who does not wish to be your spouse). **Cole disputes that state membership is analogous to** marriage, or other **voluntary statuses**. He notes that **while a person can survive single, it is perilous to be stateless** (p. 204).

The second thread of Cole's side of the debate is rooted in history. He asserts that the **borders** that now divide rich and poor peoples **were**, in large part, **created by the powerful** and wealthy, **and are** still **maintained for their benefit**. Colonial **powers** long felt (and still **feel**) **comfortable with** the results of **their exploitation** (and enslavement) **of others, and continue to enforce rules that profit them** (p. 220). This leads to the third line of Cole's attack on closed borders. **Arguments against the right of the poor to cross borders not of their making are unjust and so illiberal**. **They are also often steeped in** barely concealed **racism**. **Closed borders** simply **violate** the **egalitarianism** that is **at the heart of** the liberal ideal, and are contrary to **liberal universalism**. Cole then examines--and rejects--common objections about the practicability of open borders, and concludes by speculating about what a regime of open borders might look like in practice.



The above two cards engage in some lengthy, theoretical discussion of values, which maybe isn't your "cup of tea." Don't worry—we've also got some "moral obligation" evidence that is a bit more straightforward. Here is one piece of **evidence**:

(David Wolpe, Max Webb Senior Rabbi of Sinai Temple in Los Angeles, "The U.S. Has a Moral Obligation to Help Syrian Refugees," Time, <http://time.com/4024901/the-u-s-has-a-moral-obligation-to-help-syrian-refugees/>, Sept 9 2015)

Moral clarity is important because **moral decisions are** often **difficult**. The easy choices that pose no risk—one should contribute to charity, help old people across the street, and be kind to children—these are not moral dilemmas. **Today, with** an estimated 4 million Syrian **refugees** streaming across the globe, **we see a genuine moral crisis** in the capitals of the West.

What makes this a moral dilemma is not only a claim on resources. It is also the lurking suspicion that we might be admitting people who, arriving from a region where terrorism and anti-Western feeling is rife, will end up causing harm.

We need to remind ourselves that this is not primarily a problem for the Western world. The countries that have the most refugees per capita are Lebanon, followed by Jordan. **Countries** including Chad and Turkey have a higher per capita refugee population than Germany or the U.S. The Western country with the highest per capita refugee population is Sweden.

The U.S. has admitted some 1,500 Syrian refugees. **With** our **resources**, we **can devote more time and energy to** the **vetting** process involved when admitting. Will we ever get it wrong? Of course. But **the U.S. standard has been to admit those with a well founded fear of persecution, a criteria more than amply met by those fleeing the conflict in Syria.**

There is a temptation for everyone who has made it safely to the shore of a secure nation to roll up the drawbridge behind them. Those who come after may spoil it for those who are already here.

But **America was founded on the ideal of refuge. Indifference is a betrayal of its founding mission. The words on the Statue of Liberty cannot be an empty promise if we are to remain the great nation we have been for close to 250 years.**



More **evidence**:

(Tré Goins-Phillips assistant editor at TheBlaze, “The US Has a Moral Obligation to Address the Syrian Refugee Crisis,” <http://www.theblaze.com/contributions/the-us-has-a-moral-obligation-to-address-the-syrian-refugee-crisis/>, Sept 8 2015)

Headlines and front-page photos of 3-year-old Aylan Kurdi’s body washed up on the Turkish peninsula rocked the world last week, unequivocally beckoning to humanity that **more than 200,000 dead Syrians and 11 million displaced refugees is not acceptable.**

Kurdi — along with his 5-year-old brother and mother — drowned shortly into their journey from persecution to asylum when their boat capsized

This civil war is nothing new for Syria, but jarring images of a facedown, lifeless child floating to shore like debris has finally revealed to the West that **this refugee emergency is not a policy issue, but a crisis of humanity.**

For generations, the United States has been heralded as a hero of humanitarian aid, but the efforts of our European counterparts has severely dwarfed the role our government has played in addressing this crisis.

For example, German Chancellor Angela Merkel says her country plans to take in at least 800,000 asylum seekers this year alone and United Kingdom Prime Minister David Cameron says the U.K. plans to accept thousands more refugees along with investing £100 million in humanitarian aid to camps in Syria, Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan.

All this compared to the measly 1,500 refugees the U.S. has admitted into its borders since the start of the Syrian civil war in 2011.

“It is reprehensible that our own country is refusing to take in those who are being persecuted by [Islamic State] or have been left homeless from the civil war in Syria,” Vernon Brewer, founder and CEO of

World Help and author of the new booklet “Hope for Iraq,” told me. **“Given our role in Iraq and the [surrounding] region, America has a responsibility not just to send aid, but take in the Syrian[s] Christians and Muslims who are being persecuted in the midst of this brutal war.”**

As The Week’s Ryan Cooper wrote last week, this crisis offers the United States the opportunity to do an “uncommon amount of good.” By the way, the U.S. is much larger and wealthier than any of the European nations currently aiding the Syrian refugees. Even as immigration reform rhetoric ramps up on the 2016 presidential campaign trail, the United States still remains among the most open of nations. In fact, Glenn Beck recently voiced plans to walk thousands of displaced Muslims and Christians across the open U.S.-Mexico border in lieu of the State Department’s inaction.

For years, the United States has engaged the Middle East on its home turf and now, as the Islamic State spreads from Iraq and further into Syria, seeking a global caliphate, our government has turned a blind eye. President Barack Obama and his administration have downplayed the Islamic State since the U.S. troops’ withdrawal in 2011, when he and Vice President Joe Biden gushed about a “stable” and “self-reliant” Iraq. In addition, the president refuses to call Islamic State what it is, a radical Islamic terror group, downgrading the gravity of its mission.

“We have to recognize that we are in a struggle with radical Islam that is seeking to purify the region of both Christians and Muslims who refuse to accept their brand of radical Islam,” Brewer told me.



Brewer went on to say Christians in America must educate themselves on the severity of the situation, coming to the realization that “these are children of God who deserve our help.”

The United States has a moral obligation to follow the lead of our European allies and help

these Syrian **refugees** and the Christian Church has a spiritual duty to band together with our persecuted brothers and sisters. Pope Francis has declared the coming year the “Holy Year of Mercy” and called on European Catholic parishes to house refugee families. The U.S. needs to play its part in extending mercy to the persecuted Muslims and Christians seeking refuge from their war-torn home.

“[We should] use [the pope’s] declaration as inspiration to help those coming from Syria who have been left homeless as a result of this conflict,” Brewer said.

We cannot continue to wake up to read headlines of lives just like Kurdi’s lost in search of safety. **The time is now and the need is great. The United States must rise to the occasion and stand by its humanitarian legacy** today just as it did in generations gone by.

Even more **evidence**- this one makes a slightly more nuanced argument by suggesting nations are morally obligated to help refugees *insofar as they are able*. Different countries can (and must) play different roles:

(Sultan Barakat & Steven A. Zyck, director of research at the Brookings Doha Center and a senior fellow in the Center for Middle East Policy & Research Associate at the Overseas Development Institute, “The Syrian refugee crisis and the erosion of Europe’s moral authority,” Brookings, <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/order-from-chaos/posts/2015/09/15-syrian-refugee-crisis-european-moral-authority-barakat-zyck>, Sept 15 3025)

Half of Syria’s population has been forced to flee its homes and **is displaced** either within Syria’s war-ravaged territory or abroad. As is now widely acknowledged, **Europe shamefully attempted—after spending decades**

lecturing countries in the Middle East **on** refugee **rights—to shirk its responsibility to help** those refugees even once they arrived tired, hungry, and scared.

But thanks to pressure from social media, the press, celebrities, and aid agencies, that situation has begun to change. The European Commission is proposing to accept 120,000 Syrian refugees over the coming two years, with most going to places like Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Truthfully, Europe will probably need to quietly take far more refugees than that in the coming months and years.

It will be critical for the EU—and other **refugee-accepting countries** like the United States, Canada, and Australia—not only **to pay attention to** the numbers of refugees but also to **their needs and** varied

circumstances. After all, many of those reaching Europe are destitute and weary, but so are the hundreds of thousands of sick and elderly refugees in places like Jordan and Lebanon who are unable to make the journey and whose suffering goes unheralded by the media and celebrity YouTube videos.



Specific provisions must be put in place to help refugees with chronic health conditions and those requiring major medical treatments to reach Europe and gain the help they need. The United Nations, in partnership with **refugee-accepting nations, should** step in to **ensure that refugee families headed by women with large numbers of young children**—which also may be unable to make it to Europe—**are also enabled to reach more prosperous host countries.**

Not a beautiful day in the neighborhood

Of course all of this attention to refugees in Europe must not distract from a more basic fact: that **nearly all Syrian refugees** are not in Hungary or Germany but, instead, **are in countries that neighbor Syria. Many** aid workers and refugees **are concerned that the renewed focus on Europe will pull attention and resources away from countries like Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan, which** together **host more than 4 million** displaced Syrians.

If **this** were to happen, it **would only exacerbate mounting funding problems** for the refugee response. The United Nations has only received 37 percent of the funds needed to support Syrian refugees in 2015. This has real, tangible effects.

The value of food vouchers the World Food Programme provides to each Syrian refugee in Lebanon each month, for instance, **has fallen** from \$30 to only \$13.50, despite the fact that each refugee needs roughly \$50 worth of food per month to get by. The aid cuts are also evident in Jordan and across the region.

These aid shortfalls mean that families will go hungry, that young children will be forced to leave school and take menial **jobs**, that **young girls will be pressured into “early marriages,”** and that spending on health and education will fall by the wayside. More Syrian refugees will, as a result of inadequate assistance in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and elsewhere, head for Europe. Supporting Syrian refugees in the Middle East—and supporting the host communities and governments in Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon, in particular—cannot become a second-tier priority. If anything, **donor governments around the world need to do far more to finance food,**

healthcare, education, and shelter for refugees in these countries, and for those Syrians who remain in Syria.

This is one area where the oil-rich Gulf states have a major role to play.

While all able countries, including Israel, have a moral obligation to support refugees and those affected by global catastrophes, **all countries do not necessarily have to contribute in the same way.** In the case of **the Gulf states,** they **have opted to provide large-scale humanitarian contributions in lieu of**

hosting refugees. **This** not only **represents political and security realities in the region** (as discussed below) but also the basic fact that Syrian refugees have demonstrated little interest in heading southward down the Arabian Peninsula.

Countries like Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are unwilling to accept more than a token number of refugees beyond those that they have already let in as part of their support to the Syrian opposition. These countries' tiny populations renders them uncomfortable about hosting large numbers of inevitably long-term refugees, particularly given their already sky-high levels of unemployment (e.g., at 29 percent in Saudi Arabia) and their direct involvement in the conflict. There is little to gain in chastising them for this basic political reality. Instead, the media and international community must push the Arab Gulf to continue supporting assistance to Syrian refugees elsewhere in the region.

Since 2012, the United Nations reports that the tiny nation of **Kuwait has provided** nearly **\$1 billion in**

humanitarian aid to Syria and the main refugee-hosting countries. **Saudi Arabia** (with \$586 million), the **United Arab Emirates** (\$405 million), **and Qatar** (\$236 million) **have** likewise **contributed.** Those **are huge sums relative to the size of population** in these countries **and their economies. It will be important that they maintain and, wherever possible, increase these contributions.**



This **evidence** refutes the con claim that nations ought to focus on solving the root cause (war, terrorism, instability) of the crisis, rather than absorbing more and more refugees. It argues that this is a moral emergency akin to the Holocaust:

(David Bier is an immigration policy analyst at the Niskanen Center, drafted immigration legislation as senior policy advisor for Congressman Raúl Labrador, a member of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security, former immigration policy analyst at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "Taking In Syrian Refugees Is a Moral Duty," Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/taking-syrian-refugees-moral-duty-375672>, Sept 23 2015)

According to Bobby Jindal, "the answer [to the Syrian refugee crisis] is not to...allow even more people to come into America." That would be merely "to put a Band-Aid" on the problem, said the Louisiana governor at the early debate between also-ran GOP presidential candidates on September 16.

"Simply allowing more people into our country doesn't solve this problem," Jindal said. "The way **to solve** this problem **is** for us **to** be clear to our friends and allies that we are going to **replace** [Bashar] **Assad**, we're going to hunt down **and destroy ISIS."**

According to Jindal's reasoning, Americans should have turned away European Jews fleeing the Holocaust because taking them in wouldn't have ended the Third Reich.

As it happens, our government did turn back ships loaded with Jewish refugees trying to escape Hitler. Americans came to regret this shameful chapter of our history and vowed never to allow it to happen again. Making good on **this** promise **is the reason America created its** refugee and **asylum laws.**

Jindal is guilty of **equivocating between two different problems: the refugee crisis and the civil war** that caused it. **If the point of accepting refugees is to solve the problems they are fleeing, we would never accept any refugees. Opening your home to a neighbor whose house has burned down won't turn back time and stop the fire from starting.**

But of course that's not the point. Likewise, **providing a haven for refugees** won't solve the root problem of the Syrian crisis. But it **does solve the immediate problems facing refugees: homelessness, fear of death, persecution and violence. That is why we give them shelter.** Because they need it.

Jindal prefaced his remarks by asserting that America is "the most compassionate country in the entire world." That's true, if we measure compassion in terms of money donated to needy people around the world.

But extending compassion to refugees means opening our doors and offering a safe place out from harm's way. The U.S. will allow at most 85,000 refugees into America next year. Around 10,000 of those will come from Syria.

This year, Germany will admit nearly 10 times America's total refugee intake from Syria alone. Many Americans would love to give help to Syrian refugees, to open their homes and help them resettle here, yet our government's stingy refugee quota (and lack of imagination in refugee policy) stands in the way.



America obviously can't help every Syrian refugee. But if Germany, a country with a third of America's population, can help 800,000 people, America can do more.

To argue that it's pointless to help more refugees, because it won't stop the war they're fleeing, is worse than illogical. It's callousness disguised as pragmatism.

America's monstrously cold-hearted failure of hospitality during World War II seemed sensible at the time. Arguments like Jindal's are a way of rationalizing the same sort of fear, prejudice and selfishness that led to that failure of compassion—and to the regret that led us to pledge "never again."

This next piece of **evidence** puts a different spin on the issue, suggesting that the U.S. *specifically* has a moral obligation in this situation, because we are partly culpable for creating the environment that led to the instability and violence:

(Mario T. García, Professor of History and Chicano Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara, "We have a moral obligation to take in Syrian refugees," National Catholic Reporter news source, <http://ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today/we-have-moral-obligation-take-syrian-refugees>, Sept 15 2015)

The tragic story of the thousands of **refugees** from Syria and other troubled Middle Eastern countries experiencing horrific civil wars and religious persecution **has confronted** the receiving European **countries with both a legal and moral implications. The legal ones have to do with whether to consider these people as legitimate** political **refugees** under international law, standards that define a refugee as someone who, if returned to his or her home country, would be likely to face persecution, including torture and death.

The moral considerations have to do with a sense of humanity in helping out fellow human beings who are in dire need, including families and children. The morality in the case of Europe is based on Christian and Jewish traditions of supporting the children of God. **In the case of the current wave of refugees, there is little question that they are legitimate political refugees** given the untenable conditions in Syria, for example, with the country torn apart by the varied warring factions. Having said that, **some of the eastern and southern European countries** such as Hungary **are challenging the legitimacy of the refugees by countering that that they are attempting to go** to the more developed countries such as Germany primarily **for economic reasons and not because they face oppression at home.**

Under this argument, these countries feel no moral incentive to help the refugees. These divided feelings are not only shared by some European governments but also by some of their people. **Fortunately, most European countries,** led by examples of Germany and Sweden, are doing the right thing. They **recognize the** Syrians and others as legitimate **refugees and have expressed a moral incentive for helping** them. The same is true for



many Europeans throughout the European Union. It is gratifying to see Germany, for example, committing itself to accepting as many as 800,000 of these refugees **because it is the legal and moral thing to do.** What Germany and most of the European Union is doing contrasts with how the United States has reacted in its more recent history to similar situations; it has been found wanting. I'm thinking of how **in the 1980s,** the **Reagan** administration **refused to** recognize and **accept** thousands of **refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala fleeing** their own civil wars and the repression, **torture and killings by the** military and **death squads in their countries.** The Reagan administration refused to recognize the Central Americans as legitimate refugees under both international and U.S. laws **by arguing that these people were** just more **"illegal aliens" trying to come** into the United States **for** solely **economic purposes.**

Almost every country in the world recognized the Central Americans as legitimate political refugees, except the United States. Why? Because the Reagan administration supported politically and militarily the repressive governments in El Salvador and Guatemala. These were client states of the U.S. who in Cold War terms were anti-Communist and therefore had to be supported, even if these governments were anti-democratic and authoritarian. The recognition of the people fleeing these countries as legitimate refugees would be a criticism of the very governments that the U.S. supported, and the Reagan administration was not going to do this. Reagan, in a sense, was following President Franklin Roosevelt, who unfortunately in the 1930s supported some of these dictatorships in Central America such as that of Anastasio Somoza García in Nicaragua. Of Somoza, Roosevelt said: "He may be a son of a bitch, but he's our son of a bitch."

The attitude and policies of the Reagan administration **was a shameful** rebuff of international law on refugees as well as an **expression of immorality.** It was what Catholic liberationists would call a **"social sin."** Like the Syrians and other refugees flowing into Europe today, the Central Americans without question were legitimate refugees, and the political and moral reaction by the U.S. government in the 1980s should have been to accept and support them. Regrettably, Ronald Reagan was not Angela Merkel. Fortunately, many other Americans, especially in their churches and synagogues, politically and morally did the right thing and assisted the almost one million Central American refugees by coming to their support in what came to be known as the sanctuary movement. Many Protestant, Catholic and Jewish congregations defied the Reagan administration and provided shelter and assistance to the Central Americans. They criticized the Reagan administration for in effect breaking the law by not applying the 1980 Refugee Act passed by the U.S. Congress that defined political refugees under international law. Under this refugee law, it was clear that the Central Americans were legitimate political refugees. The sanctuary movement also addressed the moral issue by in effect saying "there is a higher law that we are accepting and that is God's law" with respect to the refugees. In Los Angeles, where by the mid-1980s close to half a million Central American refugees relocated, the sanctuary movement was led by a charismatic and committed Catholic priest by the name of Fr. Luis Olivares (whose biography I'm writing). As pastor of what was popularly referred to as La Placita Church in downtown L.A., Olivares in 1985 proclaimed his church as the first and only Catholic church in Los Angeles as a sanctuary church. Unlike most other churches and religious congregations affiliated with the sanctuary movement, La Placita Church actually allowed the refugees to sleep in the church and in its hall overnight in addition to feeding and clothing them. Moreover, Olivares and his staff, including Fr. Michael Kennedy, provided medical care and attempted to find work for the refugees. Although La Placita could only help a small percentage of the refugees, still it was a remarkable display of Christian love and fulfillment of the meaning of the Gospel. La Placita and the sanctuary movement were doing what the Reagan administration should have done and what, to their credit, many in the European Union are doing now with the Middle Eastern refugees. The **Obama** administration **should emulate** not only this history of the sanctuary movement, but also **what** Germany and the other **European countries are doing to fulfill international law on refugees and the humane, moral thing to do.** Beginning with the Bush's administration unjust and unnecessary war in Iraq, **the U.S. laid the groundwork for this refugee crisis, and the U.S. today has a responsibility to address a refugee problem that it helped to create.**



Here is one more piece of **evidence** that draws on a different refugee crisis as a historical example, and concludes that ignoring the refugee crisis is tantamount to abandoning European values:

(Slobodan Djinnovic, chairman & exec. Director of CANVAS (nonprofit org advocating nonviolent democratic movements formed by former members of Serbian youth resistance movement, “The little country leading the way in Europe’s Refugee Crisis,” Slate, http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/foreigners/2015/11/serbia_is_leading_the_way_in_europe_s_refugee_crisis_it_knows_what_is_needed.html, Nov 10 2015)

It’s not often that we **Serbs get to** be the good guys. Historically, whenever our name is mentioned, it’s usually in relation to accusations of causing World War I or Slobodan Milosevic and the four bloody wars he fomented in the mid-’90s. But ever since refugees from Syria, Iraq, and elsewhere started fleeing their homelands and crashing on Europe’s shores, with more than 200,000 refugees passing through Serbian territory this year, our countrymen have **set an example for the rest of the continent, teaching our neighbors, even the larger and wealthier among them, a lesson not only in compassion but also in good policy.** Whether it is **the** Serbian government offering temporary housing, numerous nongovernmental organizations helping people in need, or individuals, neighborhoods, and businesses organizing efforts to collect warm clothes, water, and food, our little **country has responded to this crisis with an admirable mix of dignity and efficiency.**

In part, **our ability to offer** kindness and **help** where other nations offer xenophobia **comes from experience.** **Milosevic’s wars flooded our region with** 500,000 Bosnian and Kosovar **refugees**, as well as another 250,000 Serbs expelled from Croatia. We learned a lot during those dark days, and **the lessons we took with us are the same ones other European nations—as well as the United States**, a likely destination for a growing number of refugees—**must** now **grasp.**

What, then, do we Serbs have to teach the rest of the world about trying to address the refugee problem? First, and at the risk of sounding naïve, we know **that the old adage about never having a second chance to make a first impression is as true with nations as it is with people.** Even though the hardships of absorbing such massive numbers of immigrants are real and not to be belittled, there’s no reason not to greet these poor souls with dignity and kindness. Instead of sending policemen with guns, send schoolchildren with homemade signs of welcome. Instead of setting up barbed-wired camps, find more hospitable temporary housing. **Those of us who were** unfortunate enough to experience the burden of being **driven from our homeland know the importance of** these small **gestures.** Whatever relationship Europe is going to have with these refugees, it will begin not with some sweeping political measure but with a simple human gesture, the sort each one of us could easily make.

That brings us to the second stage of the migration crisis, namely the clash of values being exhibited by a disunited European Union. **The EU**, long serving as a “lighthouse of tolerance, open thought, and good organization,” **has reacted** to the incoming refugees **with** confusion and **disarray.** From the clean, cool, and orderly response of some countries like Germany or France to the terrifying, xenophobic, and almost racist statements coming from Hungary, Croatia, or Slovakia, Europe is obviously struggling to find its voice in this crisis. Though **the actual number of asylum seekers accounts for less than 0.5**



percent of the overall European population—around 700,000 applicants this year out of an EU population of 503 million—it seems “Old Lady Europe” isn’t ready for the influx. Will other Europeans follow the organized Austrians or Germans, who greeted the first trains of Syrian asylum seekers with flowers and offers of citizenship, or **will we be seeing more walls**, the suspension of the Schengen free-travel agreement **and closed borders** like in Croatia or Hungary? **Will this be followed by placing refugees in facilities** frighteningly **reminiscent of concentration camps**? **Europe’s** collective **answer to this** refugee **crisis will tell us** a great deal **about its future and the sustainability of its values**. Hopefully the EU errs on the side of kindness.

It might seem obvious that the pro has the issue of ethics on lockdown, but the con actually *does* have some room here to directly challenge the pro on this question, if they want to.

The **evidence** below suggests that humanitarianism is actively unethical, due to the possibility of making *everyone* worse off:

(Garrett Hardin, doctorate in biology from Stanford & expert on human ecology, “Lifeboat Ethics,” Psychology Today, <http://web.ntpu.edu.tw/~language/course/research/lifeboat.pdf>, September 1974)

Environmentalists use the metaphor of the earth as a “spaceship” in trying **to persuade** countries, industries and **people to stop wasting** and polluting our natural **resources**. Since we all share life on this planet, they argue, no single person or institution has the right to destroy, waste, or use more than a fair share of its resources. **But does everyone on earth have an equal right to an equal share of its resources? The spaceship metaphor can be dangerous when used by misguided idealists to justify suicidal policies for sharing** our **resources through uncontrolled immigration and foreign aid. In their enthusiastic but unrealistic generosity, they confuse the ethics of a spaceship with those of a lifeboat. A true spaceship would** have to **be under the control of a captain**, since no ship could possibly survive if its course were determined by committee. **Spaceship Earth certainly has no captain; the United Nations is** merely a **toothless tiger**, with little power to enforce any policy upon its bickering members. **If we divide the world crudely into rich nations and poor nations, two thirds** of them **are** desperately **poor, and only one third comparatively**



rich, with the United States the wealthiest of all. Metaphorically each rich nation can be seen as a lifeboat full of comparatively rich people. In the ocean outside each lifeboat swim the poor of the world, who would like to get in, or at least to share some of the wealth. What should the lifeboat passengers do? First, we must recognize the limited capacity of any lifeboat. For example, a nation's land has a limited capacity to support a population and as the current energy crisis has shown us, in some ways we have already exceeded the carrying capacity of our land. So here we sit, say 50 people in our lifeboat. To be generous, let us assume it has room for 10 more, making a total capacity of 60. Suppose the 50 of us in the [we] lifeboat see 100 others swimming in the water outside, begging for admission to our boat or for handouts. We have several options: we may be tempted to try to live by the Christian ideal of being "our brother's keeper," or by the Marxist ideal of "to each according to his needs." Since the needs of all in the water are the same, and since they can all be seen as our "brothers," we could take them all into our boat, making a total of 150 in a boat designed for 60. The boat swamps; everyone drowns. Complete justice, complete catastrophe. Since the boat has an unused excess capacity of 10 more passengers, we could admit just 10 more to it. But which 10 do we let in? How do we choose? Do we pick the best 10, the neediest 10, "first come, first served"? And what do we say to the 90 we exclude? If we do let an extra 10 into our lifeboat, we will have lost our "safety factor," an engineering principle of critical importance. For example, if we don't leave room for excess capacity as a safety factor in our country's agriculture, a new plant disease or a bad change in the weather could have disastrous consequences. Suppose we decide to preserve our small safety factor and admit no more to the lifeboat. Our survival is then possible, although we shall have to be constantly on guard against boarding parties. While this last solution clearly offers the only means of our survival, it is morally abhorrent to many people. Some say they feel guilty about their good luck. My reply is simple: "Get out and yield your place to others." This may solve the problem of the guilt-ridden person's conscience, but it does not change the ethics of the lifeboat. The needy person to whom the guilt-ridden person yields his place will not himself feel guilty about his good luck. If he did, he would not climb aboard. The net result of conscience-stricken people giving up their unjustly held seats is the elimination of that sort of conscience from the lifeboat. This is the basic metaphor within which we must work out our solutions. Let us now enrich the image, step by step, with substantive additions from the real world, a world that must solve real and pressing problems of overpopulation and hunger. The harsh ethics of the lifeboat become even harsher when we consider the reproductive differences between the rich nations and the poor nations. The people inside the lifeboats are doubling in numbers every 87 years; those swimming around outside are doubling, on the average, every 35 years, more than twice as fast as the rich. And since the world's resources are dwindling, the difference in prosperity between the rich and the poor can only increase. As of 1973, the U.S. had a population of 210 million people, who were



increasing by 0.8 percent per year. **Outside our lifeboat**, let us imagine another 210 million people (say the combined populations of Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Morocco, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines), increasing at a rate of 3.3 percent per year. Put differently, **the doubling time for this aggregate population was 21 years, compared to 87 years for the U. S.** Now **suppose the U.S. agreed to pool its resources** with those seven countries, **with everyone receiving an equal share. Initially the ratio of Americans to non-Americans in this model would be one-to-one. But** consider what the ratio would be **after 87 years**, by which time **the Americans would have doubled to** a population of **420 million. By then**, doubling every 21 years, **the other group would have swollen to 354 billion. Each American would have to share the available resources with more than eight people.** But, one could argue, this discussion assumes that current population trends will continue, and they may not. Quite so. Most likely the rate of population increase will decline much faster in the U.S. than it will in the other countries, and there does not seem to be much we can do about it. **In sharing** with “each according to his needs,” **we must recognize that needs are determined by population size, which is determined by** the rate of **reproduction, which** at present **is** regarded as **a sovereign right of every nation**, poor or not. **This being so, the philanthropic load created by the sharing ethic of the spaceship can only increase. The fundamental error of spaceship ethics**, and the sharing it requires, **is that it leads to** what I call **“the tragedy of the commons.” Under a system of private property, people who own property recognize their responsibility to care for it, for if they don’t they will eventually suffer. A farmer, for instance, will allow no more cattle in a pasture than its carrying capacity justifies. If he overloads it, erosion sets in, weeds take over, and he loses the use of the pasture. If a pasture becomes a commons open to all, the right of each to use it may not be matched by a corresponding responsibility to protect it. Asking everyone to use it with discretion will hardly do, for the considerate herdsman who refrains from overloading the commons suffers more than a selfish one who says his needs are greater.** If everyone would restrain himself, all would be well; but it takes only one less than everyone to ruin a system of voluntary restraint. **In a crowded world** of less than perfect human beings, **mutual ruin is inevitable if there are no controls. This is the tragedy of the commons.** One of the major tasks of education today should be the creation of such an acute awareness of the dangers of the commons that people will recognize its many varieties. For example, the air and water have become polluted because they are treated as commons. Further growth in the population or per-capita conversion of natural resources into pollutants will only make the problem worse. The same holds true for the fish of the oceans. Fishing fleets have nearly disappeared in many parts of the world; technological improvements in the art of fishing are hastening the day of complete ruin. Only the replacement of the system of the commons with a responsible system of control will save the land, air, water and oceanic fisheries. In recent years there has been a push to create a new commons called a World Food Bank, an international depository of food reserves to which nations would contribute according to their abilities and from which they would draw according to their needs. This humanitarian proposal received support from many liberal international groups, and from such prominent citizens as Margaret Mead, the U.N. Secretary General, and Senator Edward Kennedy. A world food bank appeals powerfully to our humanitarian impulses. But before we rush ahead with such a plan, let us ask if **such a program would** actually **do more** good than **harm**, not only **momentarily but also in the long run.** Those who propose a food bank usually refer to a current “emergency” or “crisis” in terms of world food supply. But what is an emergency? **Although they may be infrequent and sudden, everyone knows that emergencies will occur from time to time. A well-run family, company, organization or country prepares for the likelihood of accidents and emergencies.** It



expects them, **it budgets for them**, it saves for them. **What happens if some** organizations or countries **budget for accidents and others do not? If each** country **is** solely **responsible for its own well-being, poorly managed ones will suffer. But they can learn from experience. They may mend their ways, and learn to budget for** infrequent but certain **emergencies**. For example, the weather varies from year to year, and periodic crop failures are certain. A wise and competent government saves out of the production of the good years in anticipation of bad years to come. Joseph taught this policy to Pharaoh in Egypt more than 2,000 years ago. Yet the great majority of the governments in the world today do not follow such a policy. They lack either the wisdom or the competence, or both. **Should those nations that do manage to put something aside be forced to come to the rescue each time an emergency occurs** among the poor nations? **“But it isn’t their fault!” some** kind-hearted **liberals argue. “How can we blame the poor people who are caught in an emergency?** Why must they suffer for the sins of their governments?” The concept of **blame is** simply **not relevant** here. **The real question is, what are the operational consequences** of establishing a world food bank? **If** it is open to every country **every time a need develops**, slovenly rulers will not be motivated to take Joseph’s advice. **Someone will** always **come to their aid**. **Some** countries will deposit food in the world food bank, and others will withdraw it. There will be almost no overlap. As a result of such solutions to food shortage emergencies, the poor **countries will not learn to mend their ways, and will suffer progressively greater emergencies as their populations grow**. On the average, poor countries undergo a 2.5 percent increase in population each year; rich countries, about 0.6 percent. Only rich countries have anything in the way of food reserves set aside, and even they do not have as much as they should. Poor countries have none. If poor countries received no food from the outside, the rate of their population growth would be periodically checked by crop failures and famines. But if they can always draw on a world food bank in time of need, their population can continue to grow unchecked, and so will their “need” for aid. In the short run, a world food bank may diminish that need, but in the long run it actually increases the need without limit. Without some system of worldwide food sharing, the proportion of people in the rich and poor nations might eventually stabilize. The overpopulated poor countries would decrease in numbers while the rich countries that had room for more people would increase. But with a well-meaning system of sharing, such as a world food bank, the growth differential between the rich and the poor countries will not only persist, it will increase. Because of the higher rate of population growth in the poor countries of the world, 88 percent of today’s children are born poor, and only 12 percent rich. Year by year the ratio becomes worse as the fast-reproducing poor outnumber the slow-reproducing rich. A world food bank is thus a commons in disguise. **People will have more motivation to draw** from it **than to add to any common store**. The less provident and less able will multiply at the expense of the abler and more provident, **bringing eventual ruin upon all who share in the commons. Besides, any** system of **“sharing”** that amounts to foreign aid **from the rich nations to the poor nations will carry the taint of charity, which will contribute little to the world peace** so devoutly desired by those who support the idea of a world food bank. **As past U.S. foreign-aid programs have** amply and depressingly **demonstrated, international charity frequently inspires mistrust and antagonism rather than gratitude on the part of the recipient** nation. The modern approach to foreign aid stresses the export of technology and advice, rather than money and food. As an ancient Chinese proverb goes: “Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day; teach him how to fish and he will eat for the rest of his days.” Acting on this advice, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations have financed a number of programs for improving agriculture in the hungry nations. Known as the “Green Revolution,” these programs have led to the development of “miracle rice” and “miracle wheat,” new strains that offer bigger harvests and greater resistance to crop damage. Whether or not the Green Revolution can increase food production as much as its champions claim is a debatable but possibly irrelevant point. Those who support this wellintended humanitarian effort should first consider some of the fundamentals of human ecology. Ironically, one man who did was the late Alan Gregg, a vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation. Two decades ago he expressed strong doubts about the wisdom of such attempts to increase food production. He likened the growth and spread of humanity over the surface of the earth to the spread of cancer in the human body, remarking that “cancerous growths demand food, but, as far as I know, they have never been cured by getting it.” Every human born constitutes a draft on all aspects of the environment: food, air, water, forests, beaches, wildlife, scenery and solitude. Food can, perhaps, be significantly increased to meet a growing demand. But what about clean beaches, unspoiled forests, and solitude? If we satisfy a growing population’s need for food, we necessarily decrease its per capita supply of the other resources needed by people. India, for example, now has a population of 600 million, which increases by 15 million each year. This population already puts a huge load on a relatively impoverished environment. The country’s forests are now only a small fraction of what they were three centuries ago, and floods and erosion continually destroy the insufficient farmland that remains. Every one of the 15 million new lives added to India’s



population puts an additional burden on the environment, and increases the economic and social costs of crowding. However humanitarian our intent, every Indian life saved through medical or nutritional assistance from abroad diminishes the quality of life for those who remain, and for subsequent generations. If rich countries make it possible, through foreign aid, for 600 million Indians to swell to 1.2 billion in a mere 28 years, as their current growth rate threatens, will future generations of Indians thank us for hastening the destruction of their environment? Will our good intentions be sufficient excuse for the consequences of our actions? Without a true world government to control reproduction and the use of available resources, the sharing ethic of the spaceship is impossible. **For the foreseeable future, our survival demands that we govern our actions by the ethics of a lifeboat, harsh though they may be.** Posterity will be satisfied with nothing less.

More morality **evidence** for the con, this time focusing on the right to self-determination:

(Michael Blake, professor of Philosophy and Public Affairs at University of Washington & Director of UW's Program on Values in Society, reviewing "Debating the Ethics of Immigration: is there a right to exclude?" by Christopher Wellman and Phillip Cole, Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews Journal, <https://ndpr.nd.edu/news/32280-debating-the-ethics-of-immigration-is-there-a-right-to-exclude/>, original book published by Oxford University Press in 2011, article published July 2012)

Wellman's argument begins with three simple premises: **first, legitimate states are entitled to self-determination; second, self-determination includes freedom of association; and, third, freedom of association includes the right not to associate** (13). **These three are** developed into **an argument for a deontic right to close the borders against even the most needy would-be immigrant**: if a state has adequately pursued its obligations under international justice, it can -- simply by citing its self-determination -- refuse to allow any would-be immigrant to cross into its territory.

Wellman's argument begins, then, with the idea of self-determination. **Legitimate states are**, he asserts, **entitled to their own authority over self-regarding affairs; a country that has a less-than-optimal system of criminal law is not, in virtue of that, subject to being taken over** or otherwise controlled by some outside agency (17). **(If the criminal law becomes bad enough**, of course, the **human rights** of the individuals in question **might be violated -- in which case, the state is no longer legitimate.)** **The country would be wronged if we were to annex it, even in the** admittedly rare **circumstance that we were doing so in the name of its inhabitants, could actually run the criminal law better** than the current institutional agents were doing, **and were actually committed to democratic governance within the** new country created by our **annexation.**

This wrong, though, seems to involve the right of a country to be free from unwanted alteration in the membership of that country. **We wrong the country by denying it self-determination, and our insistence on annexing it**



denies it self-determination by denying it the right to control who shall be a part of that country. If this is right, though, **the right of political self-determination includes the right to exclude unwanted changes in the membership of polity. This,** however, **entails a right to keep out** unwanted would-be **immigrants: the right to self-determination demands that legitimate states not be subjected to the wishes of others in determining the membership of that state.**

Wellman's argument thereby defends the right of a country to exclude non-members -- **even if the needs of these non-members are exceptionally great.** While wealthy countries have obligations to help the members of illegitimate

regimes, and the inhabitants of poorer countries, these obligations do not rise to **an obligation to admit** these **people** to membership. Instead, Wellman argues that the obligations of the wealthier countries of the world are disjunctive in form: help prevent the circumstances giving rise to such would-be immigrants through intervention and institution-building, or admit such would-be immigrants to some form of membership within one's own borders (117-124). The importance of self-determination **entails** the right of legitimate states to be free from unwanted members, even when those members would be benefitted enormously by membership in such a society.

Wellman's contribution includes a response to several theorists defending more open borders, a brief discussion of exit rights and the obligations of countries admitting highly skilled immigrants from developing countries, and an analysis of the **moral wrongness** of guest worker programs. Throughout, however, Wellman's contention is unchanged: a legitimate country may have many obligations to the global poor -- but the obligation to allow them to immigrate is not one of them.

Keep in mind, though, that the con doesn't really need to win the deontological question. Instead, they can just claim that utilitarianism (or whatever) is better and more moral than any other decision-making framework, and then weigh their material impacts as both practical *and* ethical concerns.

Swinging back to the pro side, another argument for aiding refugees is the risk of disintegration of the EU. According to this argument, turning away refugees undermines and erodes the core principles of Europe.



Here is **evidence** that says attempting to stem the inflow of refugees would collapse the Schengen free-travel zone, which is a defining feature of the EU:

(Brandon Conradis, journalist, quoting Luxembourg's Foreign Minister Jean Asselborn, "Luxembourg's FM Jean Asselborn warns of EU collapse due to refugee crisis," <http://www.dw.com/en/luxembourgs-fm-jean-asselborn-warns-of-eu-collapse-due-to-refugee-crisis/a-18836312>, Sept 11 2015)

Asselborn said on Monday **the EU might be heading toward a collapse, as member states struggle to cope with the influx of refugees** trying to reach Europe.

"**The European Union can break apart**," he said in an interview with the German news agency DPA. "**This can happen incredibly fast if the rule becomes to shut people out**, both internally and externally, **instead of** maintaining solidarity." His comments refer to the decision made by some member states to implement **stricter controls along their borders**, thereby forcing other countries to take on more of the burden of the refugee crisis. The politician said **it was possible member states would start shutting down borders completely, thereby putting an end to the Schengen free-travel zone that has been one of the defining freedoms offered to citizens of the EU. "We have perhaps only a few months time (before this happens)"**, Asselborn warned. He said while most member states have understood the importance of helping refugees, some member states "have not properly internalized the values of the EU, which are not just material values" - a veiled reference to countries like Hungary, which recently built a fence along its border to keep migrants out. **The EU is in a "very, very critical situation"**, he said.

Of course, to make this argument, you'll need an impact to Schengen Zone collapse. Here is one option. The **evidence** below says it would cause significant economic harm and undermine European values:

(Sputnik International News, "End of Schengen Zone Would Hurt EU Economy, Values," <http://sputniknews.com/europe/20151021/1028861349/hungarian-fm-schengen-zone.html#ixzz3rhSIX6wX>, October 21 2015)

An annulment of the Schengen Zone would be a significant blow to the economy of the European Union and European values, Hungarian Foreign Minister Peter Szijjarto said Wednesday.



Amid a major migrant crisis in Europe, **several EU states have erected border fences**. On Tuesday, **European Council Commissioner for Human Rights Nils Muiznieks said that erecting fences "kills" the 1985 Schengen Agreement, the convention that stipulates visa-free travel within continental Europe. "If the Schengen Zone stops existing, that would be a huge strike on the European economy, let alone European values that are currently undergoing the test," Szijarto said** in an interview on Russia's Rossiya-24 television channel. **Hungary**, used by thousands of migrants as a gateway to wealthier EU member states, **built a fence on its border** with Serbia in August. **Fences have also been built by Spain, Greece, and Bulgaria**. Hungary is among those EU states which has taken a harsh stance on refugees. Amid recent attempts to limit migration, Hungary last week closed its borders with Croatia, citing the need to protect EU frontiers.

The neg, on the other hand, is able to claim that it is precisely the massive influx of refugees that will destroy the EU.

One such argument is that the current crisis has created a climate of fear in Europe, due to the erosion of external borders, which will result in a collapse. Here is **evidence**:

(Christoph Hasselbach, "the refugee crisis is endangering the EU", DW (German news outlet), <http://www.dw.com/en/opinion-the-refugee-crisis-is-endangering-the-eu/a-18837640>, Sept 11 2015)

For one thing, he's wrong about what's causing the fear. **People in Europe are worried about the uncontrolled influx of refugees**, but not primarily **because** the population has suddenly become much more right wing.

Rather, European **citizens** are having to sit by and **watch how shockingly powerless their countries are in the face of this crisis**.

In Germany alone, thousands of people are freely entering the country each day, even after the government agreed on a range of measures to clamp down on such movement. **The authorities often don't know who the migrants are, where they've come from, and where they're currently staying**. And it's been this way for months. **A country that has no control over who is crossing its borders?** Of course, that **is unsettling and makes people anxious** and concerned.

The chancellor remains committed to her lenient refugee policy with no upper limit - and is trying to convince her European partners to do the same. She's long given the impression that the loss of control doesn't particularly bother her. It's no wonder that other governments aren't listening. Even in Germany, she's becoming increasingly isolated.



Tusk: 'Breeding ground of fear'

Asselborn is also wrong in his proposed solution. **You can't stop the collapse of Europe by declaring these fears to be baseless and appealing to people's better values.**

Rather, the mass influx into Europe needs to be slowed - and radically. But Asselborn doesn't want to hear about it. Even when it comes to the EU's outer borders, he is expressly against closing them off. The EU should only know "who is coming to us and why."

It's precisely this kind of morally embellished permissiveness that is endangering Europe. That's why right-wing radical parties are making gains in every election at the moment. Many governments feel they have no other choice but to help themselves by reintroducing border inspections or building fences along EU internal borders.

EU Council President Donald Tusk takes a more broad-sighted view of things. Commenting on the current situation in the EU, the usually restrained Pole said: **"A European Union without external borders will become a breeding ground for fear."** And that is exactly the problem!

Failed distribution

That's the reason why the distribution of refugees inside the EU has failed so spectacularly. As long as the influx of asylum seekers continues unabated, a fixed allocation scheme would be like a free pass to do nothing at the external borders. The people of Europe expect the EU to cooperate on slowing the influx, not just distribute it differently.

The consequences are not pleasant, but they are necessary. If we want to save the EU, then we have to ensure that the EU regains control over immigration. This doesn't mean that the EU would no longer accept asylum-seekers, but it would do so with clear limitations.

Here is more **evidence**, this time focused on the weakening of market integration:

(PressTV, "Europe integration threatened by potential Brexit, refugee crisis: IMF," <http://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2015/11/11/437152/IMF-Europe-refugee-crisis-Britain-Maurice-Obstfeld-EU>, Nov 11 2015)

The influx of refugees into Europe and the possibility of Britain's exit from the European Union (EU) – "Brexit" – **are threatening economic integration in the continent, the** International Monetary Fund (IMF) **warns.**

"I worry a lot about the strong trend in Europe to pull back from market integration," Maurice Obstfeld, the IMF's new chief economist, **told AFP in a Tuesday interview.**

Obstfeld said **one of the main factors** exacerbating the trend **is "the refugee crisis, where there's a lot of pressure on open borders and workers' mobility."**



Europe is facing record refugee arrivals. Thousands of asylum seekers, many of whom from war-ravaged Syria, travel from Turkey to Greece by boat. They then transit from Greece through Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia to Austria, with the ultimate goal of reaching Germany and other wealthy Western European states.

According to the latest figures released by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), 773,244 refugees have reached Europe's shores so far this year while a total of 3,423 people have either died or gone missing in their perilous journey to the continent.

Continuing our discussion of con arguments, let's move into the most common one: threats to national security and the risk of terrorism.

Here is one piece of **evidence**, which is particularly useful because it actually makes a *comparative* claim. It argues that while humanitarian work is good, national security must come first:

(Tyler O'Neil, political commentator who has written for The National Review, Washington Free Beacon, etc, "U.S. Should Not Take Syrian Refugees, Lebanese American Says," <http://pjmedia.com/blog/u-s-should-not-take-syrian-refugees-lebanese-american-says/>, Sept 28 2015)

WASHINGTON – **It is vital for American national security not to accept the huge influx of Syrian refugees because the Islamic State terrorist group (ISIS) has infiltrated them,** according to Brigitte Gabriel, founder and president of ACT for America, the largest grassroots national security organization. "We know ISIS infiltrated them, **they were coming here under the disguise of refugees, but they are actually ISIS recruiters** and ISIS sympathizers," Gabriel told PJ Media in an interview at the Values Voter Summit on Saturday. She added that the refugees "are making up names — they can tell us anything, and **there is nothing we can do to check it.**"

The refugee crisis has become a huge issue following the viral photo of a drowned Syrian toddler, Aylan Kurdi. Members of the European Union have clashed on a plan to accept 120,000 refugees from the Middle East and Africa. Secretary of State John Kerry has announced that the United States will accept 85,000 refugees this year, up from the previous cap of 70,000, and an additional 100,000 next year. Gabriel did not deny the charitable impulse of helping people in need. "**We can still do humanitarian work, but we need to make sure we are protected first,**" she declared. In February, Michael Steinbach, assistant director of the FBI's Counterterrorism Division, testified that **the U.S. government has no way to vet the refugees pouring in** from Middle Eastern countries. "We don't have it under control," Steinbach admitted.



“These people don’t have passports. We don’t even know if the name they give is their real name,”

Gabriel explained. The refugees also are not just coming from embattled countries like Syria and Iraq, she argued. They also come from Tunisia, Libya, Eritrea, Djibouti and Afghanistan — migrants fleeing poor countries to go to rich countries.

Gabriel argued that the refugees must have a reason for going further west, as opposed to other countries in the Middle East. “These refugees can go to any country in the region, where they speak the Arabic language, where their children can assimilate and continue in their schooling with Arabic schools. Why are they coming to Europe?”

One reason, she alleged, is that “the word got out that if you want a freebie, this is the opportunity to come to Europe and live off the government.”

Perhaps more importantly, however, many Middle Eastern countries would turn the migrants away. “Saudi Arabia is a very wealthy country and a very big country — they have a lot of space,” Gabriel noted. **She explained that Saudi Arabia, Dubai, the United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi and**

Kuwait are refusing to accept these refugees because “they are a national security threat.” When

Arabic countries suspect terror activity from the refugees, why should we overlook it?

“If Saudi Arabia is refusing to accept them because they are a national security threat, why are we accepting them?” Gabriel asked.

“Are we that dumb?”

“I Have Lost My Country”

Gabriel, a Christian born and raised in Lebanon, explained that her **history** made her passionate about this issue. “I lost my country of birth to radical Islam — I do not want to lose my adopted country, America,” she declared.

Lebanon was once known as “the Paris of the Middle East.” It was the banking capital and the only majority Christian country in the region (70 percent Christian in the 1940s). “We had the best economy in the Middle East, even though we didn’t have any oil,”

Gabriel explained. In 1965, National Geographic called Lebanon “**the Eden of the Middle East.**”

“We had an open border policy — we welcomed everybody into our country because we wanted to share with them the westernization we had created in the heart of the Middle East,” she explained. Sadly, that westernization was not to endure. Muslims started coming to Lebanon so their children could study at the country’s universities. They also stayed to work in their economy. **“We built refugee camps** for them in Lebanon, **we** took them in because we **wanted to take care of them, but** these **people turned against us, and** they **destroyed our country.**” Gabriel recalled, bitterly.

She said the tipping point was when Muslims became the majority population.

“Lebanon went from being ‘the Eden of the Middle East’ to being the terrorist pit of the Middle

East,” she declared. **The country is run by a terrorist organization, and has no rule of law.** Currently, there is not even a president in Lebanon, as none has been elected. “They are drowning in their own garbage, the government is falling apart.” **“This is what happens when you import people into your country that do not share your**

values — that do not share your idea of freedom or democracy, your idea of tolerance.” Gabriel explained.



More **evidence**, which uses historical examples to argue that the difficulty of assimilating into a new society makes refugees extremely vulnerable to radicalization. The conclusion, then, is that people who are not currently terrorists become terrorists—the aid *makes more terrorists*:

(Daniel Byman, research director and senior fellow at the Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, professor at Georgetown University's Security Studies Program, served as a staff member on the 9/11 Commission and worked for the U.S. government, "Do Syrian Refugees Pose a Terrorism Threat?," Lawfare, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/do-syrian-refugees-pose-terrorism-threat>, Oct 25 2015)

Syrians and Iraqis have been fleeing their countries' civil wars for years, but the refugee crisis grabbed international headlines last month when it forced itself on the European scene. Over 500,000 Syrian asylum seekers and thousands of Iraqis have gone to Europe as of September 2015, and that number is expected to climb dramatically. Some European governments reacted harshly, barring refugees from entering and restricting their transit, while others, notably Germany, are welcoming them with open arms – at least for now.

Debate about the refugees, both in Europe and the United States, **often focuses on the question of terrorism**: with the Islamic State raping and beheading with numbing regularity in Iraq and Syria, **the fear is that admitting refugees from this part of the world will open the door to more terrorism and violence** in Europe. Conservative voices in Europe have invoked the specter of Europe being flooded with "half a million" Islamic State fighters, while humanitarians dismiss predictions of a terrorism epidemic.

Both sides have it wrong. **Concerns about terrorism** and the refugees **are legitimate**, but the fears being voiced are usually exaggerated and the concerns raised often the wrong ones.

Terrorism and refugees share a long and painful history. Important **terrorist groups like Fatah, Hamas, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestinian (PFLP) grew out of the Palestinian refugee crisis** of 1948. It took years, decades even, but eventually frustrated and politicized **refugees, who had few opportunities to integrate into their host societies, joined militant groups promising a chance at liberation. The Afghan refugee community in Pakistan produced the Taliban. Somali refugees aided the terrorist group al-Shabaab. The list goes on.**

Because the refugees are from Syria and Iraq, where the Islamic State is based, it is easy to conjure up fears that the jihadi group has inserted sleeper agents among the refugees who will burrow into host societies and then spring their trap. But the Islamic State doesn't work that way. In its online magazine Dabiq and other propaganda organs, it stresses the ingathering of Muslims, though it does toss the occasional rhetorical bomb calling for Muslims already in the land of the infidels to "attack, kill, and terrorize the crusaders on their own streets and in their own homes." However, the Islamic State argues most "good Muslims" should travel to Iraq and Syria to fight on behalf of the Islamic State against its local enemies, not the other way around. (In contrast, Inspire, the English-language online magazine of al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, stresses launching terrorist attacks in one's home country.) The Islamic State might call for attacks in the West, but it has focused its own money, fighters, and suicide bombers on defeating its enemies in the Middle East. The refugees themselves, fleeing war and extremism, are not strong supporters of the most violent groups: if they were, they would have stayed in Iraq or Syria.

But **Europe already has a terrorism problem**, and **the bigger danger is that radicalized European Muslims will transform the Syrian refugee community into a more violent one over time.**

Thousands of Europeans have gone to fight with the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, and al-Qaida has long had a presence in Europe. **These volunteers are sustained by radical preachers** who condemn European ideals and



support the idea of Muslims taking up arms. **In addition, many European Muslims are alienated from their governments and societies**, believing that as Muslims they never truly will, or should, belong.

If the refugees are treated as a short-term humanitarian problem rather than as a long-term integration challenge, then we are likely to see this problem worsen. **Radicals will be among those who provide the religious, educational, and social support for the refugees – creating a problem where none existed**. Indeed, the refugees need a comprehensive and long-term package that includes political rights, educational support, and economic assistance as well as immediate humanitarian aid, particularly if they are admitted in large numbers. If they cannot be integrated into local communities, then they risk perpetuating, or even exacerbating, the tensions between Muslim and non-Muslim communities in Europe. **Despite their current gratitude for sanctuary in Europe, over time the refugees may be disenfranchised and become alienated. We've seen this movie before, where anger and disaffection fester, creating "suspect communities" that do not cooperate with law enforcement and security agencies and allow terrorists to recruit and operate with little interference.** The actual security risks now are low, but the potential ones are considerable if the refugee crisis is handled poorly. Policing, service provision, and local governance in general need to be provided for the long term. **The worst thing European countries could do would be to invite in hundreds of thousands of refugees in a fit of sympathy and then lose interest** or become hostile, starving them of support and vilifying them politically, **creating a self-fulfilling prophecy**

Another potential national security issue the con might want to bring up (if the debate involves the U.S.), is that America lacks the means to vet refugees, making it impossible to be sure we know who we're letting in. Here is **evidence** on that:

(Katie Pavlich, Editor at Townhall & New York Times Best Selling author, "Terror Concerns: Homeland Security Chair Urges Caution On Bringing Syrian Refugees to U.S.," Townhall, <http://townhall.com/tipsheet/katiepavlich/2015/09/08/homeland-security-chair-urges-caution-on-bringing-syrian-refugees-to-us-n2049277>, Sept 8 2015)

As **the refugee crisis** in Europe **gets worse by the day**, pressure is mounting on the United States to host those fleeing Syria and other parts of the Middle East.

But House Homeland Security Chairman Michael McCaul is urging caution here at home when it comes to dealing with the crisis, **reminding** lawmakers and Americans **about the national security threat** the situation presents to the U.S. **Al Qaeda has exploited similar crises in the past and ISIS plans to do the same now.**



“We’re a compassionate nation and this is a tragic situation but I also have to be concerned as Chairman of Homeland Security about the safety of Americans in this country and **the concern that I have and that the FBI testified to is that we don’t really have the proper databases on these individuals to vet them** passed and **to assure we’re not allowing terrorists** to come **in** to this country and until I have that assurance, I cannot support a program that could potentially bring jihadists into the United States,” Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee Michael McCaul said in an interview with Fox News Monday. **“We don’t know who these people are and** I think that’s the bottom line here and **until we know** who they are, **we cannot responsibly bring them in** to the United States.”
"Both the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI have told me privately that they don't support bringing in Syrian refugees because of the threat they pose to Americans," McCaul continued.

The pro, of course, will rebut these types of arguments by claiming that refugees do not bring significant national security risks. Here is a piece of **evidence**, which is valuable due to the significant credentials of its author:

(Anne Speckhard, adjunct associate professor of psychiatry at Georgetown University in the School of Medicine and of security studies in the School of Foreign Service, served with her husband, U.S. Ambassador to Greece, Daniel Speckhard from 2007-2010 during which time a large influx of refugees made their way from Turkey to Greece, “Taking in Refugees Is Not a Risk to National Security,” <http://time.com/4024473/taking-in-refugees-is-not-a-risk-to-national-security/>, Sept 9 2015)

The image of the body of 3-year-old Aylan Kurdi lying facedown on a Turkish beach has the world reeling in horror. Aylan’s journey ended in death amid a growing crisis in Europe surrounding the plight of refugees pouring in from Syria. **Countries** across Europe **are** at long last **stepping up to receive desperate refugees**. The U.S. should do more to help.

The U.S. has resettled only about 1,500 Syrian refugees since the crisis began in 2011. Congressional **opponents** opposed to taking in more **often cite security concerns**. Republican presidential candidate Carly Fiorina said Sunday that the U.S. should be “very careful about who we let enter this country from these war torn regions to ensure that terrorists are not coming here.”

But as a national security expert who has spent more than 20 years working alongside government defense and security experts, I know that the majority of Syrian **refugees** fleeing war **are not using the opportunity** of refugee status **to embed themselves as terrorists** in the West. **The[y]**



majority **are trying to escape** barrel bombs, chemical attacks, and **barbaric violence**, caught between the violence of a dictatorial regime and that carried out by terrorists.

They are, for the most part, **much less likely to have been involved in terrorism than to have been the victims of it. In fact, refugees who become terrorists are extremely rare. There are only a small number of cases of refugees admitted into the U.S. who have been arrested on terrorism charges—the actual data show**s that this is a rare phenomenon.

Refugees from Syria **will be carefully vetted, and those with terrorist ties refused. Security concerns should not be a reason to turn away** desperate doctors, teachers, nurses, engineers and salt-of-the-earth laborers who simply want to escape a horrific humanitarian crisis alongside their **innocent children**.

The world is experiencing the largest refugee population since World War II. Yet the portion of the U.S. budget going to help refugees has remained flat-lined. The entire U.S. foreign assistance budget makes up less than 1% of the federal budget and is stretched thin across a range of life-changing programs addressing issues including maternal and child health, water and sanitation development, vaccines, medicines and disease prevention, farming assistance, and children's education. Only about an estimated 12% of the foreign assistance budget goes to humanitarian support for refugees caught in the crosshairs of war. The U.S. can do better.

After the fall of Saigon, President Gerald Ford set up an interagency task force that in one year resettled 130,000 Vietnamese refugees. In response to news reports that women and children were dying on overcrowded boats, President Carter made refugee resettlement a priority. These weren't popular decisions, but these presidents showed moral leadership.

There has been a collective failure to halt the war in Syria. Resettlement is not the only solution, but it is a critical way the U.S. can support countries like Lebanon, Turkey,

Jordan and our European allies that are hosting millions of Syrian refugees. **No parent should be faced with packing their family on a clandestine journey that ends in drowning** as Aylan's did.

More pro **evidence**, disputing the idea that refugees will act as secret terrorist sleeper cells:

(Daniel Byman, research director and senior fellow at the Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, professor at Georgetown University's Security Studies Program, served as a staff member on the 9/11 Commission and worked for the U.S. government, "Do Syrian Refugees Pose a Terrorism Threat?," Lawfare, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/do-syrian-refugees-pose-terrorism-threat>, Oct 25 2015)

Debate about the **refugees**, both in Europe and the United States, often **focuses on** the question of **terrorism**: with the Islamic State raping and beheading with numbing regularity in Iraq and Syria, **the fear is that admitting refugees** from this part of the world **will open the door to** more **terrorism** and violence in Europe. Conservative voices in Europe have invoked the specter of Europe being flooded with "half a million" Islamic State fighters, while humanitarians dismiss predictions of a terrorism epidemic.

Both sides have it wrong. Concerns about terrorism and the refugees are legitimate, but **the fears being voiced are** usually **exaggerated and the concerns raised** often **the wrong ones**.

Terrorism and refugees share a long and painful history. Important terrorist groups like Fatah, Hamas, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestinian (PFLP) grew out of the Palestinian refugee crisis of 1948. It took years, decades even, but eventually frustrated and politicized refugees, who had few opportunities to integrate into their host



societies, joined militant groups promising a chance at liberation. The Afghan refugee community in Pakistan produced the Taliban. Somali refugees aided the terrorist group al-Shabaab. The list goes on.

Because the refugees are from Syria and Iraq, where the Islamic State is based, it is easy to conjure up fears that the jihadi group has inserted sleeper agents among the refugees who will burrow into host societies and then spring their trap. But the Islamic State doesn't work that way. In its online magazine Dabiq and other propaganda organs, it stresses the ingathering of Muslims, though it does toss the occasional rhetorical bomb **calling for** Muslims already in the land of the infidels to “attack, kill, and terrorize the crusaders on their own streets and in their own homes.”

However, the Islamic State argues most “good Muslims” should **travel to Iraq and Syria to fight on behalf of the Islamic State** against its local enemies, **not the other way around**. (In contrast, Inspire, the English-language online magazine of al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, stresses launching terrorist attacks in one's home country.) The **Islamic State might call for attacks in the West, but it has focused its own money, fighters, and suicide bombers on defeating its enemies in the Middle East. The refugees themselves, fleeing war and extremism, are not strong supporters of the most violent groups: if they were, they would have stayed** in Iraq or Syria.

But Europe already has a terrorism problem, and the bigger danger is that radicalized European Muslims will transform the Syrian refugee community into a more violent one over time. Thousands of Europeans have gone to fight with the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, and al-Qaida has long had a presence in Europe. These volunteers are sustained by radical preachers who condemn European ideals and support the idea of Muslims taking up arms. In addition, many European Muslims are alienated from their governments and societies, believing that as Muslims they never truly will, or should, belong.

If the refugees are treated as a short-term humanitarian problem rather than as a long-term integration challenge, then we are likely to see this problem worsen. Radicals will be among those who provide the religious, educational, and social support for the refugees – creating a problem where none existed. Indeed, **the refugees need a comprehensive and long-term package that includes political rights, educational support, and economic assistance as well as immediate humanitarian aid,** particularly if they are admitted in large numbers. **If they cannot be integrated** into local communities, then they risk perpetuating, or even exacerbating, the tensions between Muslim and non-Muslim communities in Europe. Despite their current gratitude for sanctuary in Europe, **over time the refugees may be disenfranchised and become alienated.** We've seen this movie before, where anger and disaffection fester, creating “suspect communities” that do not cooperate with law enforcement and security agencies and allow terrorists to recruit and operate with little interference. **The actual security risks now are low, but the potential ones are considerable if the refugee crisis is handled poorly.** Policing, **service provision, and local governance** in general **need to be provided for the long term. The worst thing European countries could do would be to invite in hundreds of thousands of refugees in a fit of sympathy and then lose interest or become hostile, starving them of support and vilifying them politically, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy.**

Another national interest your debates on this topic might explore is economic interest.



For the con side, one argument is that refugees create downward pressure on wages for low-skilled citizens, leaving them worse off. Recently, there was study out of Harvard, in which Cuban refugees are empirically shown to have hurt wages for high school dropouts in Miami. It is important to realize with this argument that “regular” immigrants and refugees have different effects on economies. While “regular” immigrants often come seeking better economic opportunities, refugees come to escape political violence. This means refugees are much more likely to be unskilled workers, causing them to directly compete with the native population of low-skilled workers. Since these are often the most vulnerable people in society, this is cause for some concern. The **evidence** below makes this point:

(Sam Bowman, Deputy Director of the Adam Smith Institute, “Maybe Cuban refugees did hurt unskilled Miamians after all,” The Adam Smith Institute, <http://www.adamsmith.org/blog/economics/maybe-cuban-refugees-did-hurt-unskilled-miamians-after-all/>, Sept 18 2015)

How do refugees affect the wages of natives in the places they settle? I’ve written on the (few) studies of this effect that I’ve seen, but a new paper contradicts one of them.

David Card’s 1990 study of the Mariel Boatlift, where 125,000 Cubans fled the Castro regime to settle mostly in Miami, found that there was no negative effect for unskilled natives. Card’s results suggested that the city’s existing garment and agricultural industries absorbed the extra workers and the influx did not cause downward pressure on the wages of unskilled workers already in Miami.

But **a new working paper by Harvard’s George Borjas** seems to undermine Card’s conclusions. Borjas **looks at** a particular sub-section of Miami’s unskilled workforce, high school dropouts, and compares **Miami** to a different set of cities to Card which, says Borjas, were more like Miami in terms of employment growth before the Boatlift took place.

When you do that, **the Boatlift seems to have affected high school dropouts’ earnings very badly: they fell by between 10 and 30 percent**, relative to the wages of high school graduates and college graduates. **The gap between white and black workers’ wages grew substantially too** – black workers’ wages fell by 20 percentage points.

The chart below shows the percentage difference in high school dropouts’ wages relative to college graduates’ wages during this period – the different ‘placebos’ show how dropouts’ wages performed in other samples of cities over the same period.

Borjas concludes that the Boatlift put significant downward pressure on the wages of natives with skills similar to those of the migrants, which may also be the case with other similar influxes of immigrants.

It’s an important paper for anybody interested in the immigration debate. But there are also some important things that should make us cautious about extrapolating too much from this.

Most notably, the relative wages of high school dropouts recover entirely by 1990 – the effect Borjas has found only holds in the short-run. And Borjas’s study shows that the impact was negative for people at the bottom, but Card’s conclusions about the impact on native workers more generally still seem reasonably solid.



The Mariel immigrants were 'exogenous' to Miami's economy – they did not come primarily to get jobs, but to escape Cuba. So the effect might not apply at all to economic migrants from other EU countries who are coming to the UK to work. But for refugees fleeing war, Borjas's findings might well be repeated.

The con might also suggest that rising political instability, coupled with the immediate monetary costs of housing refugees, could harm the European economy. Here's some **evidence**:

(Slovenia Times, "IMF sees economic burden of refugee crisis as manageable," <http://www.sloveniatimes.com/imf-sees-economic-burden-of-refugee-crisis-as-manageable-for-slovenia>, Nov 13 2015)

The refugee crisis has increased economic risks in the region, stemming mostly from a rise in political instability and the financial burden on transit countries, the report states, adding that the response so far has been strong.

The key economic priorities for Slovenia in the near run remain fiscal consolidation and business restructuring, **the IMF states** in the report. The Bank Asset Management Company (BAMC) plays a central role in pursuing the second priority. For this reason the bad bank must be shielded from political interference, **deputy director for Europe at the IMF Johannes Wiegand said** in presenting the report in Ljubljana on Thursday. According to Wiegand, Slovenia still needs structural reforms which would make its pension system sustainable in the long term and measures to increase efficiency in public spending.

With the refugee crisis dominating the headlines and **increasing economic risks in the affected countries**, Wiegand said **that transit countries** such as Slovenia **have** so far **handled the crisis "quite impressively"**. **For these countries, the crisis carries** temporary **fiscal and social burdens**, while the overall effect on the economy remains unclear. Although **the crisis** may end up bolstering growth, it **could** also **increase political instability and thus hurt growth, Wiegand said.**



Some pros may not suggest that countries should house/provide citizenship for refugees, but rather that they should contribute some type of aid. Here is **evidence** arguing that this sort of aid hurts economies:

(The Economist, “Hard-nosed compassion,” print ed., <http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21666232-cash-transfers-rather-handouts-kind-would-help-aid-refugees-go>, September 26 2015)

The question of cash v handouts **sparks macroeconomic debate**, too. **One concern relates to “Dutch disease”, a term coined** by The Economist in 1977, **to denote an influx of foreign money that leads to an appreciation of the receiving country’s currency. That**, in turn, **makes exports less competitive**. In a paper published in 2009, Arvind Subramanian and Raghuram Rajan, both then of **the IMF, found that** in the 1980s and 1990s **the more aid a country received, the less growth it saw in export-oriented industries. The inflation** sparked by the influx of cash **can also push the price of basic goods**—food and rent, for instance—**out of the reach of the host country’s host population, fostering discontent**.

But giving cash to refugees need not lead to Dutch disease. First, the number of refugees in most countries is tiny relative to the host population. Even in places with lots of them—in Lebanon, about one person in four is a Syrian refugee—an influx of foreign money is unlikely to be a disaster. From 2011 to 2014 humanitarian aid to Lebanon (in cash and in kind) was equivalent to just 1.3% of Lebanese GDP, estimate Mr Barder and Theodore Talbot, also of the CGD. Although an influx of cash may lift inflation, it may also create jobs and growth in the receiving economy.

Second, **the alternative—aid in kind—has its own macroeconomic consequences. As goods and services flood in from abroad, local businesses may suffer. One paper**, from three wonks at the University of San Francisco, **looked at TOMS**, a firm that gives a free pair of shoes to a poor child for every pair sold to those of greater means. Those who received shoes from TOMS, naturally enough, were less likely to buy a pair of their own, **harming the local shoemaking industry**. Other studies suggest that **food aid reduces local commodity prices, to the detriment of domestic food producers**. (Procuring handouts locally gets around this problem: of the \$1.1 billion-worth of food bought by the WFP in 2012, three-quarters came from developing countries.)

On the other hand, the pro has some pretty good arguments supporting the idea that granting asylum to refugees actually boosts a nation’s economy, because they participate in the market (buy stuff), pay taxes, etc. Here is **evidence**:

(Elizabeth Matsangou, political analyst with an MS in international relations, “Refugees are an economic benefit, not burden, to Europe,” World Finance,



<http://www.worldfinance.com/infrastructure-investment/government-policy/refugees-are-an-economic-benefit-not-burden-to-europe>, Nov 2 2015)

As Europe grapples with an unprecedented humanitarian crisis, Elizabeth Matsangou argues that **extending** a hand of **asylum** **is not just morally correct, but economically beneficial**

Over the past year or so, Europe has witnessed the most pressing refugee crisis since the Second World War. Hundreds of thousands of people have fled from the brutality of the so-called Islamic State (IS) and persecution in Syria to seek asylum in Europe's strongest economies where they desperately hope to start anew (see Fig. 1). Not limited to Syria, among the crowds knocking at the EU's gates are refugees from Somalia, Afghanistan and Eritrea. Also in the mix are economic refugees from countries such as Albania and Kosovo. Throughout the widespread media coverage of the refugee crisis, the fears of both policymakers and the public have been voiced. **It is commonly**

believed that refugees are harmful to host nations **and drain** precious state **resources**, as those seeking salvation require accommodation, healthcare, basic supplies, food and clothing. **Another presumption is that** the provision of employment to **refugees takes jobs away from residents and drive wages down**, **while** the inflow of **thousands of children places pressure on a country's education system**. **Yet there are various theories** and examples **that argue the contrary**.

At present, Europe has an impending problem on its hands **that could have disastrous repercussions – an ageing labour force and a declining birth rate**. In order **to maintain** Europe's economic **growth and** industrial **output, an injection of young workers is desperately needed**.

According to the OECD, to avoid stagnation, it is imperative that the EU adds 50 million people to its workforce by 2060 (see Fig. 2). **Such** a demographic **shift is also necessary to fund the pensions of Europe's expanding elderly population**. **An influx of people is what the region needs** right now – and that is exactly what is currently being offered through unfortunate circumstances.

The common misconception that refugees are a burden to host states **is a dangerous** facet in dealing with Europe's present refugee crisis. It distorts the realities of the situation, while promoting both disdain and inaction. "These arguments are often advanced without recourse to evidence. Indeed, few economists have worked on refugees and forced migration, and governments do not have disaggregated immigration data that can show the economic impact of hosting refugees", Professor Alexander Betts, Director of the Refugee Studies Centre at Oxford University told World Finance.

In Betts' 2014 **study**, titled **Refugee Economies: Rethinking Popular Assumptions, it was found that the presence of refugees boosts a local economy significantly as a result of additional purchasing power, the creation of employment and the provision of human capital**. **"Refugees** around the world **engage with markets. Even in the most restricted circumstances of closed refugee camps and without the right to work, economic activity can be observed. Refugees engage in consumption, production, exchange, entrepreneurship and the development of capital**

markets. Much of our research suggests that whether refugees are a benefit or a burden depends not just on who the refugees are, but also on the policies of the host states. When they are given the right to work, access to capital, and educational opportunities, they are likely to have the greatest impact", Betts explained.

The research conducted by Betts and his team took place in Uganda, as the right to work and move around freely for refugees is markedly better there than in neighbouring countries. **"One of our most striking findings was the entrepreneurship of refugees. Faced with new markets, new social networks, and a new regulatory environment, people adapt even faced with significant constraints"**, said Betts. "In Kampala, the capital city, for instance, we found that 21 percent of the refugees have businesses that employ other people and 40 percent of those employees are citizens of the host country. **In other**



words, refugees were creating jobs. Many of the businesses were, even in refugee camps, highly innovative and networked into the structures of the global economy.”

A large number of Syrian refugees are headed towards Germany as the likelihood of employment there appears to be greater than elsewhere in Europe. Aside from a well-known record of accepting asylum seekers, in September, Chancellor Angela Merkel announced that Germany would open its arms to at least 800,000 refugees this year. There is, of course, the humanitarian element involved in this welcome, because helping those in dire need is 'the right thing to do'. There is also another angle, which has allowed Merkel to make the somewhat bold move; the influx of refugees can be extremely advantageous for Germany's matured economy.

A recent study conducted by Hamburg's World Economy Institute found that Germany's birth rate is now the lowest in the world and is declining faster than any other industrial country. While according to immigration researcher Herbert Brücker in an interview with Deutsche Welle in 2014, around 1.5 million skilled immigrants are needed to sustain Germany's state pension system; it is estimated that by 2060, two workers will be needed to support every retired person in Germany.

Obviously, simply opening national borders is not enough to successfully assimilate refugees into a society, helping them to earn a living is key, but not a simple undertaking. To facilitate, institutions such as The Confederation of German Employers' Associations (BDA), offer businesses assistance in order to integrate refugees into the market legally and effectively. Dr Carmen Bârsan, advisor for the Labour Market Department at the BDA, explained the complex and lengthy process; "First of all, we think it is very important to create effective labour market access for these people. Unrestricted labour market access means without a 'priority test' and without a work ban. On the grounds of toleration, asylum seekers should be allowed to stay a further six months after the permit of residence for German territory."

The "priority test" that Bârsan argues should be abolished only allows German companies to hire asylum seekers in the event that a suitable German resident is not available for employment.

"Another important point is that successful integration in the labour market requires acquisition of the requisite language skills", Bârsan told World Finance. "For this reason, elementary language learning should be open to all asylum seekers and tolerated residents; work related language learning should be further developed also." The third prong of BDA's proposal involves improved access to education and vocational training, but is not limited to the fulfilment of such exercises. "Following successful completion of company training or further vocational training, the residency of these young people should generally be secured for two years of practice in the profession. Those that cannot be retained directly by the business providing the training should be able to stay for at least one additional year, in order to search for a job during this period."

While such measures are a costly enterprise, particularly when factoring in millions of people, doing so is economically advantageous for the host nation. Contrary to common presumptions, refugees actually contribute more in taxes than they obtain in governmental support. A study by the ZEW economic institute found that on average in 2012, foreigners in Germany paid around €3,300 more in taxes than they received in state contributions – the total surplus amounted to €22bn.

There are further examples that illustrate that refugee workers actually increase wages for the local population. When Yugoslav refugees in Denmark began working in low-skilled jobs during the 1990s and the 2000s, rather than driving wages down as many expected, their presence made the economy more complex. Instead of filling such jobs, natives moved up the skills ladder to more specialised professions that were better paid and more productive. Then there is the case when Cuban refugees settled in Miami in 1980, they gave a major boost to the city's economy by providing unskilled labour in numerous industries, including hospitality, textile production and agriculture.

In order to successfully assimilate refugees into local populations, facilitating employment is absolutely crucial. As Bârsan explained, this requires easing labour market restrictions, together with training and language learning opportunities for asylum seekers. While access to capital will enable new nationals to seek their own enterprises, which, as evidenced by Betts' study, enables entrepreneurship among refugees. To secure the political will needed to conduct such exercises, locals must be ensured that they also stand to benefit. "Here, it is important that infrastructure and social services, from schools to hospitals to vocational training, are allocated to refugees and local populations simultaneously. Ensuring locals share in the benefits of service provision to refugees is as important in host countries in Africa and the Middle East as they are in Europe", Betts said. Public outrage across Europe has pressured governments to do more to help alleviate the crisis. Consequently, individual member states have promised to take in more refugees, while the EU has pledged to increase the humanitarian assistance it offers. Yet there is a vital piece of the puzzle missing; EU leaders are still struggling to organise a joint response, and only through collective action can such a large problem be solved. Doing so is also necessary to uphold the very principles upon which the EU is founded upon, a crucial aspect in keeping the fabric of the union intact, and one that must not be underestimated. And aside from the ideological reasoning for collective action, there is the pragmatic, as refugees are entering the union through multiple points. Turkey's inaction must also be addressed; as the gateway to Europe, it has the responsibility to coordinate with EU forces in order to control the flow of people and must also tackle the growing trend of trafficking along its coastline.

Undeniably, humanitarianism in the form of accepting refugees sparks fears in a populace – fears of the economic burden, as well as of cultural disconnection and the supposed threat of increased criminality. Yet, **as research and history shows, refugees are in fact highly adaptable, willing**

to work and offer a different set of skills and experience. When afforded the necessary opportunities to integrate into host labour markets, **the impact can not only be mutually beneficial, it can be**

extraordinary. It is thus imperative to educate the local populace and businesses on the benefits they stand to gain in helping those seeking asylum. Moreover, doing so seems to be the most feasible answer to an undeniable problem that is currently looming over Europe's future, or as Betts put it: "Europe should primarily be welcoming refugees because it is a humanitarian and ethical imperative, but it is also in our own economic self-interest."



Here is more **evidence**—this one discusses the role of refugees in driving inflation, which is badly needed in several European nations:

(Johan Carlstrom and Amanda Billner, "Sweden's Riksbank Says Refugee Crisis Has Policy Implications," Bloomberg Business, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-11-10/sweden-throws-refugee-crisis-into-central-bank-inflation-debate>, Nov 11 2015)

One of Europe's most generous countries in its treatment of refugees says **there may be some monetary policy perks to welcoming migrants**. Sweden's Riksbank now says its decisions "will not be unaffected" by the hundreds of thousands of asylum seekers entering the country. **As the government raises spending to accommodate the influx of refugees, the demand being created in the economy is set to help** the Riksbank reach an **inflation** goal it hasn't met for about four years. "If one looks strictly from an inflation point of view, **this is** definitely **good news** for the Riksbank, which is really keen to boost inflation," said Olle Holmgren, an analyst at SEB AB in Stockholm. "**The wave of refugees now** coming to Sweden is something that **will probably boost inflation**. How much is unclear, but we're not talking about a completely negligible effect, at least not in the short-term." **For a central bank whose efforts to stimulate price growth risk being drowned out by the European Central Bank's much bigger support program further south, any source of inflation is good news.**

One more piece of pro economy **evidence**:

(Benjamin Studebaker, PhD candidate in Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge, MA from the University of Chicago, "Do European States Have a Moral Duty to Accept Syrian Refugees?," <http://benjaminstudebaker.com/2015/09/08/do-european-states-have-a-moral-duty-to-accept-syrian-refugees/>, Sept 9 2015)

Europe is **in the** grip of an important **ethical debate concerning the** Syrian **refugee crisis**. 205,000 refugees have entered Greece this year. 69% are Syrian, 18% are Afghan, and the remainder are predominately Iraqi or Somali. Given Greece's economic difficulties, many of these refugees move on to other European countries. Thousands attempt to cross into the UK from France every year at Calais. **Should Europe accept these refugees?** Let's think about this. Before we begin, **let's bear in mind** just how **serious this issue is**. **If Europe does not accept these refugees, they might be killed in their countries** of origin **or die attempting** to enter Europe through **extra-legal means**. **Boats can sink, and** when that happens, **dead children can** and will **wash up on shore**: **At the same time**, it's also important to bear in mind that in theory, if a country accepts too many new immigrants too quickly, it can exceed its own supply of housing, food, and water and push itself into humanitarian crisis. For this



reason, there are theoretical limits to the duties states have to foreign refugees. During the 4th century, tens of thousands of displaced Goths requested asylum in the Roman Empire, fleeing the Huns. Emperor Valens permitted this and actively helped the Goths to cross into the Roman Empire. It quickly turned into a logistical nightmare—the Romans were unable to feed the Goths or quickly find them lands to settle, and a horrible nightmare scenario unfolded in which the Goths had to sell their children and young women into slavery in exchange for dog meat. Eventually the Goths revolted, and defeated the Romans in the Battle of Adrianople. The Emperor himself was killed in the battle, and the entire province of Thrace was plundered or forced to pay tribute to the Goths. Eventually the Romans pushed the Goths back, but the province and the empire as a whole never fully recovered, both in material prosperity and in reputation. 28 years later, the Goths sacked Rome. The History Channel did a great documentary on the whole thing: A single refugee family could be absorbed very easily. The entire population of Syria could not be absorbed easily at all. The number of refugees we are talking about lies somewhere between these two extremes. So the question is whether or not these refugees would place an undue strain on the infrastructure and logistical systems that keep Europe fed and functioning. If Europe can handle the immediate influx, it's highly likely that these refugees would contribute substantively and positively to the European economy. The Americans have done significant research on the economic effects of immigrants, and they conclude that even poor and low skilled immigrants are generally net positives for government revenue—they contribute more in taxes than they consume in benefits: They're also significantly less likely to commit crimes than native born citizens: For these reasons, it is generally a good thing to permit people to enter your country, provided your infrastructure and logistical systems can handle the load. In these respects many of the European countries have things a bit harder than the US. While both the US and the EU can feed the refugees, the US has low population density and plentiful housing relative to Europe: As a result, some European countries suffer from chronic housing shortages that price young and poor people out of the market and push down their living standards. The UK is a prime example of this—it needs to build 250,000 homes a year to keep up with population growth, but presently manages less than 150,000: This is unsustainable, and eventually the UK will have to relax its very strict planning laws, likely either permitting the construction of more high rise buildings or permitting further expansion into the greenbelts. In the meantime, the housing shortage makes it harder for the UK to take refugees without further burdening its extant population, leading to xenophobic tensions. However, many European countries' are not in the UK's situation. Indeed, many of them have shrinking populations: The pink countries are actually seeing the load on their infrastructure decrease every year. This means that they could take on refugees without straining housing. Germany's population is 1.7 million smaller than it was in 2003: This is why it makes more sense for countries like Germany to take refugees than it does for countries like Britain. Indeed, this is what is happening—Germany will take 800,000 asylum seekers this year in an effort to boost its own shrinking population and workforce. But while it makes sense for Germany to take many more refugees than Britain, the UK still takes far fewer than it could. Prime Minister David Cameron is promising to only take 20,000, a pitiful figure. It's important to remember that these people are potentially economically quite productive. if a country can accommodate refugees, it should, and if it can't, it should invest in its infrastructure until it can. Most western countries currently suffer from weak aggregate demand. Refugees can theoretically work, and even if countries don't put them to work, they



have to buy things. This means increased revenues for businesses and increased VAT revenue. All of **this stimulates the economy and potentially contributes to higher living standards** for the extant population.

What countries like Britain need is a dramatic increase in infrastructure spending to accommodate their growing populations. Governments have been unrealistic about the amount of housing, public transport, and other infrastructure spending that will be required if European citizens are going to avoid seeing their living standards fall over the next century. Governments need to make it easier for the private sector to build homes and they need to fund more public housing and transport infrastructure themselves. In the meantime, **governments should take as many immigrants and refugees as they can without exhausting their housing supplies. This will mean that in the short-term, countries like Germany will take many more refugees than countries like Britain, but countries like Britain should be trying to take as many as they can.** Leaders like David Cameron have been unnecessarily and wrongfully refusing to take refugees that could and should be accommodated, not merely for the benefit of those refugees but for the benefit of the British economy. This will further strain Britain's housing supply, but in so doing it will force this government or the next government to come to terms with the seriousness of the housing shortage and with the extent to which Britain's remaining infrastructure is woefully outdated. Eventually, governments will be forced to respond with vast transformative investments in housing and infrastructure that will shape what Europe is to become in the next hundred years. We can only hope that they will be sufficiently ambitious.

Rounding out the pro side of the debate, I'll pass along a quirky pro argument I came across during my research. Basically, the idea is that resettled refugees could tend to urban gardens, which would significantly improve food security. It might not be useful, but here is the **evidence** anyway:

(Gawain Kripke, director of policy and research at Oxfam America and has more than 20 years of experience working on public policy and advocacy issues, "Can an urban farm help solve the refugee crisis?," OxFam America, <http://politicsofpoverty.oxfamamerica.org/2015/11/can-an-urban-farm-help-solve-the-refugee-crisis/>, Nov 10 2015)

My worlds collided a bit during a recent visit to Cleveland. I was there to talk about Oxfam's awesome Female Food Hero project in Nigeria. But while there, we were invited to take a tour of **a unique urban farm** that **uses farm employment to help refugees resettle.** The farm is beautiful and sits under the Cleveland skyline in a hip neighborhood, a stone's throw from Great Lakes Brewing Company and the West Side Market which is the city's largest tourist attraction. (Take that, Rock & Roll Hall of Fame!)

Urban farming is a trending idea both in the USA and internationally. **Making productive use of underutilized urban** and peri-urban **land** is an important idea and **could make a major contribution to food security and developing resilient and localized food systems.**

But **this urban farm is also being used as an employer for newly resettled refugees** from around the world and an anchor for skills-building and education. The project is called Refugee Empowerment Agricultural Program (REAP) and is run by a local organization, The Refugee Response. REAP has community-supported agriculture and provides produce for a farm stand and supplies local restaurants (including the Great Lakes Brewing Company, which has been a supporter).



That is where we'll end. Hopefully, you now feel more prepared to tackle this constantly-developing resolution.

Remember, there are lots and lots of possible arguments we haven't covered. Particularly with a topic ripped from the headlines like this one, doing your own research and frequently checking the news will be extremely important.

And don't forget that you can always email completed cases to **Rachel.Stevens@NCPA.org** for a free, confidential case critique! We'll get them back to you, with personalized comments, as soon as we can.