NEGATIVE: Rohingya

By Katherine Baker

***Resolved:* *The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.***

Case Summary: The Rohingya are an ethnic and religious minority group living in a region of Myanmar (also known as Burma). Affirmative argues that resettlement in safe places, like the US, is the only workable solution to the Rohingyas' plight, since their own country rejects them, and neighboring countries cannot care for them. This brief argues that there are other alternatives that are better and would avoid the disadvantages.
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Negative: Rohingyas

COUNTERPLAN

1. Congress and the President impose sanctions on Myanmar’s trade, investments, and key government and military figures, only to be lifted when Myanmar agrees to protect the Rohingya and grant them citizenship rights. And the President and Secretary of State advocate for US allies to join.
2. All sanctions will be reimposed if Myanmar is found to be violating their agreement.
3. US will increases aid to nations hosting Rohingya to $1 million per year for the next 5 years, earmarked for helping Rohingyas assimilate into host countries
4. Enforcement through existing agencies and existing means
5. Funding from the General Federal Revenue
6. Plan takes effect one month after affirmative ballot

JUSTIFICATIONS

1. Sanctions needed.

Link: Most sanctions against Myanmar have been dropped

Jonah Blank and Shelly Culbertson, 2018. (Jonah Blank is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation. Shelly Culbertson is a senior policy researcher at RAND.) “How the U.S. Can Help Resolve the Rohingya Crisis” January 5, 2018. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/01/how-the-us-can-help-resolve-the-rohingya-crisis.html>

The United States is the most important player here. During the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama, Washington led the international community in welcoming Myanmar out of a self-imposed exile that had lasted since a military coup in 1962. In 2012, after Myanmar's first free election in over 20 years, Obama restored diplomatic relations and sealed the new relationship with a personal visit; in 2016, he dropped most remaining U.S. sanctions. Perhaps the United States moved too quickly—but it should consider making clear to Myanmar's leadership that this move is not irreversible. The leverage that helped push the Myanmar military to accept limited democratization—the United States' pivotal role in either facilitating or complicating Myanmar's entry into the global economic order—is still available for use. The sanctions on trade and investment, which Obama eliminated by executive order, could be reimposed: some by presidential action alone, others with the cooperation of Congress; sanctions on individuals within the Myanmar military and civilian leadership could be greatly expanded; while the United States is not itself a supplier of military hardware to Myanmar, it could press its security partners (including Israel, India, France, and Germany, all of which have sold arms to Myanmar in the past decade) to shut down cooperation. Some analysts argue that China remains Myanmar's largest investor and security partner and that Beijing would gladly serve as Myanmar's international sponsor without any consideration of human rights. This is true—but it was also true before the Saffron Revolution of 2007, which set the wheels of democratization in motion. Myanmar's leaders, and more importantly, the country's population, have already proven that they do not want to remain pawns of China.

Link: Current response to Burma’s atrocities is a joke

Tom Rogan, 2017. (Commentary Writer who specializes in foreign policy.) “Why and how the US must confront Burma's Rohingya genocide” October 05, 2017. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/why-and-how-the-us-must-confront-burmas-rohingya-genocide>

First, the U.S. should lead a global diplomatic effort to sanction Burma. At present, the only serious reprisal Burma's government has faced for its genocide is the announcement that Aung San Suu Kyi will be stripped of the freedom of Oxford. That's a very unfunny joke. Considering the scale of this crisis, the Trump administration should immediately call for wide spectrum economic sanctions on the Burmese government and its financial industries. The need for this leadership is even more urgent in the context of reporting by The Guardian, Thursday, that the United Nations has suppressed evidence of its failure to plan and respond to Rohingya refugee needs.

Solvency: Sanctions have worked, and can be used again

Jonah Blank and Shelly Culbertson, 2018. (Jonah Blank is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation. Shelly Culbertson is a senior policy researcher at RAND.) “How the U.S. Can Help Resolve the Rohingya Crisis” January 5, 2018. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/01/how-the-us-can-help-resolve-the-rohingya-crisis.html>

The United States is the most important player here. During the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama, Washington led the international community in welcoming Myanmar out of a self-imposed exile that had lasted since a military coup in 1962. In 2012, after Myanmar's first free election in over 20 years, Obama restored diplomatic relations and sealed the new relationship with a personal visit; in 2016, he dropped most remaining U.S. sanctions. Perhaps the United States moved too quickly—but it should consider making clear to Myanmar's leadership that this move is not irreversible. The leverage that helped push the Myanmar military to accept limited democratization—the United States' pivotal role in either facilitating or complicating Myanmar's entry into the global economic order—is still available for use. The sanctions on trade and investment, which Obama eliminated by executive order, could be reimposed: some by presidential action alone, others with the cooperation of Congress; sanctions on individuals within the Myanmar military and civilian leadership could be greatly expanded; while the United States is not itself a supplier of military hardware to Myanmar, it could press its security partners (including Israel, India, France, and Germany, all of which have sold arms to Myanmar in the past decade) to shut down cooperation. Some analysts argue that China remains Myanmar's largest investor and security partner and that Beijing would gladly serve as Myanmar's international sponsor without any consideration of human rights. This is true—but it was also true before the Saffron Revolution of 2007, which set the wheels of democratization in motion. Myanmar's leaders, and more importantly, the country's population, have already proven that they do not want to remain pawns of China.

Wide spectrum sanctions on Burma are the right response to the crisis

Tom Rogan, 2017. (Commentary Writer who specializes in foreign policy.) “Why and how the US must confront Burma's Rohingya genocide” October 05, 2017. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/why-and-how-the-us-must-confront-burmas-rohingya-genocide>

First, the U.S. should lead a global diplomatic effort to sanction Burma. At present, the only serious reprisal Burma's government has faced for its genocide is the announcement that Aung San Suu Kyi will be stripped of the freedom of Oxford. That's a very unfunny joke. Considering the scale of this crisis, the Trump administration should immediately call for wide spectrum economic sanctions on the Burmese government and its financial industries. The need for this leadership is even more urgent in the context of reporting by The Guardian, Thursday, that the United Nations has suppressed evidence of its failure to plan and respond to Rohingya refugee needs.

Advocacy: Sanction Burma

Jeremy Konyndyk, 2017. (senior policy fellow at the Center for Global Development. His research focuses on humanitarian response, USAID policy reform, and global outbreak preparedness. He previously served in the Obama Administration from 2013-2017 as the director of USAID’s Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), where he led the US government’s response to international disasters.) “How Should the United States Respond to the Rohingya Refugee Crisis?” 10/3/17. <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/how-should-united-states-respond-rohingya-refugee-crisis>

The United States should consider targeted sanctions against senior regime officials in Burma, signaling to the government that the United States will fundamentally reevaluate the constructive relationship we’ve built with them over the past few years. We need to make clear to the Burmese regime what they are putting at stake by doing this.

Advocacy: US demands should include citizen rights and safety

Jonah Blank and Shelly Culbertson, 2018. (Jonah Blank is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation. Shelly Culbertson is a senior policy researcher at RAND.) “How the U.S. Can Help Resolve the Rohingya Crisis” January 5, 2018. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/01/how-the-us-can-help-resolve-the-rohingya-crisis.html>

U.S. demands on Myanmar—backed up by key players including the European Union, India, Japan, and South Korea—should be focused not merely on accepting the Rohingya back but on granting them the safety and citizenship rights enjoyed by all other ethnic minorities. The alternative is creation of a million-strong population of stateless people: whether living in refugee camps in Bangladesh or in Myanmar, they would likely become a breeding ground for extremism and instability.

Not a complicated issue: why keep Burma happy?

Tom Rogan, 2017. (Commentary Writer who specializes in foreign policy.) “Why and how the US must confront Burma's Rohingya genocide” October 05, 2017. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/why-and-how-the-us-must-confront-burmas-rohingya-genocide>

Ultimately, this isn't that complicated a foreign policy issue. America doesn't need to keep the Burmese government happy, but we must confront this human suffering.

No accountability

Amanda Catanzano and Nazanin Ash, 2017. (Amanda Catanzano is the International Rescue Committee's senior director for international programs policy and advocacy, and Nazanin Ash is the vice president of public policy and advocacy.) “The US must take a lead in the Rohingya crisis” November 20, 2017 <https://www.cnn.com/2017/11/20/opinions/us-needs-to-lead-on-rohingya-crisis-opinion/index.html>

To reverse this course, first the United States must spearhead an international effort to ensure accountability for violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. There has been no accountability for the persecution and violence that the Rohingya people have faced for generations. In a rush to normalize relations and declare the success of one of Asia's newest democracies, the United States ignored accountability for Myanmar's treatment of minorities, particularly the Rohingya.

“Sanctioning Burma will hurt our relationship with China” RESPONSE: Not a reason to support a genocidal regime

Tom Rogan, 2017. (Commentary Writer who specializes in foreign policy.) “Why and how the US must confront Burma's Rohingya genocide” October 05, 2017. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/why-and-how-the-us-must-confront-burmas-rohingya-genocide>

Here, it won't be enough to simply sanction a few random Burmese officials, the U.S. must bring the diplomatic heat. If tough sanctions push Burma into the hands of the Chinese government, so be it. America should seek good relations and strong economic ties with all nations that share our values or support a realist U.S. foreign policy. But at present, Burma offers neither of those things. Incidentally, it says much about the nature of Xi Jinping's foreign policy vision that he is willing to align himself with a genocidal regime.

“China won’t cooperate” RESPONSE: Doesn’t matter. Historical precedence proves China is not necessary

Jonah Blank and Shelly Culbertson, 2018. (Jonah Blank is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation. Shelly Culbertson is a senior policy researcher at RAND.) “How the U.S. Can Help Resolve the Rohingya Crisis” January 5, 2018. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/01/how-the-us-can-help-resolve-the-rohingya-crisis.html>

Some analysts argue that China remains Myanmar's largest investor and security partner and that Beijing would gladly serve as Myanmar's international sponsor without any consideration of human rights. This is true—but it was also true before the Saffron Revolution of 2007, which set the wheels of democratization in motion. Myanmar's leaders, and more importantly, the country's population, have already proven that they do not want to remain pawns of China.

1. Additional aid needed

Refugee Aid and diplomatic push needed

Jeremy Konyndyk, 2017. (senior policy fellow at the Center for Global Development. His research focuses on humanitarian response, USAID policy reform, and global outbreak preparedness. He previously served in the Obama Administration from 2013-2017 as the director of USAID’s Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance.) “How Should the United States Respond to the Rohingya Refugee Crisis?” 10/3/17. <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/how-should-united-states-respond-rohingya-refugee-crisis>

It goes without saying that the United States must sustain robust and sufficient aid to stabilize the refugee population. But that needs to be paired with a strong diplomatic push, engaging China and other regional powers to pressure the Burmese regime to stop this concerted mass violence. It’s good to see that the United States is speaking up at the United Nations Security Council, but the question is if that will translate to diplomatic action. Unfortunately, with most senior positions at the State Department still vacant, it remains to be seen whether the Trump Administration has the bandwidth to take this on.

Aid should shift to giving refugees job opportunities and public services

Jonah Blank and Shelly Culbertson, 2018. (Jonah Blank is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation. Shelly Culbertson is a senior policy researcher at RAND.) “How the U.S. Can Help Resolve the Rohingya Crisis” January 5, 2018. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/01/how-the-us-can-help-resolve-the-rohingya-crisis.html>

Our RAND study on prolonged refugee situations in the Middle East found that humanitarian responses run by the international aid community for large displaced populations are insufficient in situations of medium- or long-term displacement. Expecting the Rohingya to remain in the camps creates both human rights and security risks, and assistance will be needed to help Bangladesh manage public services (including education and health care) for the new population. When populations remain displaced for lengthy periods of time, we found that aid should shift to enabling the host country to provide public services and to expand job opportunities. While pressing Myanmar to assure the safe return of the Rohingya to their villages, the world community could simultaneously help Bangladesh integrate the thousands (perhaps hundreds of thousands) who may not be able to return to their place of origin.

Counterplan is the right answer: Political solution and support for host-nations are the answers

Jonah Blank and Shelly Culbertson, 2018. (Jonah Blank is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation. Shelly Culbertson is a senior policy researcher at RAND.) “How the U.S. Can Help Resolve the Rohingya Crisis” January 5, 2018. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/01/how-the-us-can-help-resolve-the-rohingya-crisis.html>

A pragmatic multipronged approach is needed here, one that involves brokering a political solution, creating conditions in Myanmar that can help the Rohingya return home, and helping Bangladesh cope with the presence of what is likely to be a new long-term population. If the United States wants this to happen, it could place its full weight behind these approaches.

Strengthen aid to Bangladesh

Tom Rogan, 2017. (Commentary Writer who specializes in foreign policy.) “Why and how the US must confront Burma's Rohingya genocide” October 05, 2017. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/why-and-how-the-us-must-confront-burmas-rohingya-genocide>

Second, the U.S. should strengthen its aid to Bangladesh as that nation saves those civilians the Burmese Army has failed to kill. To do so, Secretaries Mattis and Tillerson should send the head of Pacific Command, Admiral Harris, and the State Department's relevant Assistant Secretary, Alice Wells, to visit Dhaka and meet with top Bangladeshi officials. This would consolidate Bangladesh in the knowledge that its humanitarian efforts have not gone unnoticed in Washington. Bangladesh is often low-down in the U.S. foreign policy priority list, but that must now change.

Push other governments to increase aid to the Rohingya

Tom Rogan, 2017. (Commentary Writer who specializes in foreign policy.) “Why and how the US must confront Burma's Rohingya genocide” October 05, 2017. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/why-and-how-the-us-must-confront-burmas-rohingya-genocide>

More broadly, President Trump should prioritize the Rohingya in the same way that he has pushed Venezuela's situation up the international agenda. Utilizing his good will with the Sunni-Arab monarchies and recognizing Saudi Arabia's evolving interest in humanitarian issues, Trump should push those governments to increase their aid to the Rohingya (many of whom are Muslim). Additional funds are specifically needed in order to provide the Rohingya with longer-term shelter in Bangladesh. Kerr notes that one need in the camps is a "nighttime service for pregnant women and those in labor, because at the moment, the NGOs only offer treatment during the day."

1. Comparative Counterplan advantages over the AFF plan

More effective and economical alternative to resettling refugees in US

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

America is currently faced with massive budget deficits, a tense global security climate, and an economy that, while improving, is still experiencing growing pains. Accordingly, government policy should shift away from relocating refugees to the United States. The costs, both fiscal and social, outweigh the benefits provided to a relatively small portion of the overall refugee population in the world. Instead, the U.S. should begin using its considerable economic, diplomatic and military influence to de-escalate the conflicts that give rise to refugees. In situations where de-escalation is not possible, the U.S. should provide direct assistance to refugees within, or nearby, their country of origin, rather than relocating them to the United States. These alternatives are both more cost-effective – up to 10 times cheaper – and safer for the American public, than resettling refugees in the United States. They would also allow the United States to compassionately help hundreds of thousands more refugees on an annual basis, without continuing to add to the already high costs of immigration currently being borne by American taxpayers.

INHERENCY

1. Bangladesh

Bangladesh is dealing with Rohingyas pretty well

Sabrina Karim, 2018. (Assistant Professor, Caplan Faculty Fellow, Cornell University) “I visited the Rohingya refugee camps and here is what Bangladesh is doing right” January 25, 2018. <http://theconversation.com/i-visited-the-rohingya-refugee-camps-and-here-is-what-bangladesh-is-doing-right-90513>

Bangladesh’s rapid response to the refugee crisis was possible due to country’s long-term experience with disaster management. After gaining independence in 1971, Bangladesh faced one of the worst famines in history because of flooding and chronic hunger, in which an estimated 300,000 to 1.5 million people died. This disaster was not, however, a one-off event. Each year, the country is plagued with rains and cyclones, that claim many lives and displace people. As a result, the government has had to come up with a long-term crises management plan. A vast network of local people who act as rapid first responders has helped decrease casualties, although a large number of deaths do occur every year. The same system was put to use during the refugee crisis. Furthermore, Bangladesh has been a part of the United Nations’ peacekeeping operations since 1988. This experience has allowed its military to understand how to manage a crisis where vulnerable populations are affected. Among other things, I observed how the military created “safe spaces” for women, children and the elderly in the camps.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Refugee camps not so bad

Camps good for Rohingya – they've got a lot of stuff Rohingyas never had before in "normal" life

Sabrina Karim, 2018. (Assistant Professor, Caplan Faculty Fellow, Cornell University) “I visited the Rohingya refugee camps and here is what Bangladesh is doing right” January 25, 2018. <http://theconversation.com/i-visited-the-rohingya-refugee-camps-and-here-is-what-bangladesh-is-doing-right-90513>

In the camps, they have food, shelter, schools, sanitation, and most importantly, peace. They are receiving goods and amenities that they have not seen before. This was also confirmed by aid workers, who told me that the refugees have come from such deprivation that, at times, they have to be told not to eat the soap that is given to them. Many have never seen daily toiletry items such as soap, toothpaste and moisturizers.

DISADVANTAGE

1. High Costs

Link: Cost of educating students high

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

In 2015, FAIR estimated that education costs for students with limited English proficiency (LEP) averaged out to $12,128 across the nation, compared to $10,763 for non-LEP students.Nearly 90 percent of all refugees and asylees who entered the United States in FY2011 were not fluent in English. That number improved to 58 percent by the end of FY2015, averaging out to approximately 75 percent throughout the FY2011 - FY2015 period.Based on immigration data from The Migration Policy Institute, and understanding that most (but not all) UAMs are covered by funding that is separate from the refugee program, it appears that approximately 10 percent of admitted refugees will enroll in a public school. Assuming the cost to educate LEP students in the United States remains mostly unchanged since 2015, that would make the cost of educating new refugees approximately $71,275,000 annually over their first five years in country.

Link: Refugee earnings low

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

According to ORR, refugee’s earnings are meager throughout their first five years in the United States, increasing from $10.22/hour to $10.86/ hour – only a 6.3 percent increase over five years, on average. This means they are unlikely to pay any federal income taxes, and could end up receiving a net credit from the federal government when programs like the Earned Income Tax Credit and Additional Child Tax Credit are considered. Furthermore, their state and local income tax contributions will be also negligible, after any returns. This is largely because approximately 15 percent of all recent refugees have been settled in states with no income tax, and more than half come from states where the state tax rate for low-income filers is 4.5 percent or lower, based on data from the Pew Research Center27 and the Tax Foundation.

Link: Heavy burden on government and taxpayers

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

While the United States certainly has an interest in assisting those who are truly in dire straights, it is now doing so in a manner that is increasing the already crushing burden that state, local and federal governments impose on American taxpayers. Most of the charitable ethnic and religious groups which once helped to assimilate refugees into our way of life have morphed into contractors who earn significant sums of money by billing the government for services provided to refugees. Therefore, these groups have a vested interest in keeping refugee numbers high. And taxpayers are footing the bill.

Impact: Net Cost of over $1 billion to house all US refugees

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

According to a new study released by FAIR, the annual cost to U.S. taxpayers is $1.8 billion and over five years, that financial burden skyrockets to $8.8 billion. Those figures are only estimates because refugees will access welfare and other government assistance at different rates and the number of refugees entering the U.S also changes from year-to-year. Using the most recent admissions figures, data on federal and state public assistance programs, and information from the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), our analysis found: •The cost per refugee to American taxpayers just under $79,600 every year in the first five years after a refugee is resettled in the U.S.; •In 2016, the State Department spent nearly $545 million to process and resettle refugees, including $140,389,177 on transportation costs; •Of the $1.8 billion in resettlement costs, $867 billion was spent on welfare alone; •In their first five years, approximately 54 percent of all refugees will hold jobs that pay less than $11 an hour; •$71 million will be spent to educate refugees and asylum-seekers, a majority of which will be paid by state and local governments. •Over five years, an estimated 15.7 percent of all refugees will need housing assistance, which is roughly $7,600 per household in 2014 dollars.

Impact: Net loss per refugee

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

Accordingly, we estimate that the average state and local income tax contribution per working refugee comes out to $843, annually, or just over $4,200 over five years. This totals roughly $215.4 million in state income tax payments overall. However, these relatively low payments do not cover the costs of cash programs and services received by refugees.

Impact: Straining small communities

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

In addition, refugees are often resettled in small to mid-sized communities without any attempt to consult with local political officials, educational administrators or public safety officers. This results in additional strains on already tight school, public health and social services budgets as communities attempt to cope with a rapid influx of individuals who may lack the language, cultural and job skills needed to integrate into the life of American cities and towns.

Impact: Costs outweigh benefits

Matthew O’Brien and Spencer Raley, 2018. (O’Brien joined FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform) in 2016; responsible for managing FAIR’s research activities; writes content for FAIR’s website and publications. ; former Chief of the National Security Division at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Spencer joined the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 2015. He conducts research and writes content for FAIR’s publications and website; B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. “The Fiscal Cost of Resettling Refugees in the United States” February 5, 2018. <http://www.fairus.org/issue/legal-immigration/fiscal-cost-resettling-refugees-united-states>

America is currently faced with massive budget deficits, a tense global security climate, and an economy that, while improving, is still experiencing growing pains. Accordingly, government policy should shift away from relocating refugees to the United States. The costs, both fiscal and social, outweigh the benefits provided to a relatively small portion of the overall refugee population in the world. Instead, the U.S. should begin using its considerable economic, diplomatic and military influence to de-escalate the conflicts that give rise to refugees. In situations where de-escalation is not possible, the U.S. should provide direct assistance to refugees within, or nearby, their country of origin, rather than relocating them to the United States. These alternatives are both more cost-effective – up to 10 times cheaper – and safer for the American public, than resettling refugees in the United States. They would also allow the United States to compassionately help hundreds of thousands more refugees on an annual basis, without continuing to add to the already high costs of immigration currently being borne by American taxpayers.

Impact: Nine ignored for every one resettled

The cost if resettling one refugee in the US could assist more than ten in their home region

Colum Lynch, 2017. (Colum Lynch is Foreign Policy’s award-winning U.N.-based senior diplomatic reporter.) “Trump to Cut Number of Refugees in U.S. by More Than Half” September 26, 2017. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/09/26/trump-to-cut-number-of-refugees-in-u-s-by-more-than-half/>

“For the cost of resettling one refugee in the United States, we can assist more than 10 in their home region,” Trump told the gathering in remarks that were overshadowed by the president’s threat to destroy North Korea and his criticism of the Iran nuclear deal.

1. Terrorism Risk

Link: Rohingya don’t question radical ARSA

Financial Times, 2017. (Sara Perria) “Rohingya plight in Bangladesh raises fears of radicalization” December 6, 2017. <https://www.ft.com/content/eef90090-d95a-11e7-a039-c64b1c09b482>

Yet there is little criticism or resentment in the camps of the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army, the radical militant group blamed by the Myanmar government and local Buddhists for sparking Asia’s worst refugee crisis for decades. It was Arsa’s crude August attacks on Myanmar security forces that prompted the brutal crackdown, but among those languishing in the overcrowded camps rage is directed squarely at the Myanmar military. Not one of the dozens of refugees interviewed by the Financial Times questioned the legitimacy of the insurgency carried out by ARSA, which is now seeking to regroup.

Brink: ARSA won’t struggle to recruit

Financial Times, 2017. (Sara Perria) “Rohingya plight in Bangladesh raises fears of radicalization” December 6, 2017. <https://www.ft.com/content/eef90090-d95a-11e7-a039-c64b1c09b482>

From remote camps to town bazaars, the Rohingya in south-east Bangladesh pin vague hopes on a UN-brokered solution to their plight. But observers say a swift outcome is unlikely, playing into ARSA’s efforts to recruit more people to its stated cause of defending the Rohingya from persecution. “Any long-term hopeless situation is very conducive for recruitment by radical groups who want to pursue their agenda,” says Richard Horsey, an independent analyst based in Myanmar. One ARSA imam, speaking on condition that neither his name nor location be revealed, says the group is biding its time. “We are keeping a low profile now, otherwise people will think we are terrorists,” he says. “ARSA is not dead. Hardly any of the hardliners and leadership were killed. Most of those killed and arrested didn’t even belong to ARSA. We wanted the world to know [about our persecution]. And now the world knows that we are refugees.” The imam, who taught at a madrassa in the Rohingya’s home state of Rakhine, opposes repatriation of refugees under current conditions and says ARSA is preparing new attacks pending the outcome of the international community’s deliberations. “ARSA will have no problem in identifying young people willing to join,” Mr Horsey says. He adds that now most of the Rohingya community is in Bangladesh, the group “will have to shift its modus operandi from attacks under the cover of the community to cross-border attacks — and that needs a very different type of training and weapons”.

RESPONSE: to “Muslim Immigrant’s don’t radicalize”: 1.5 generation

Olivia Enos, David Inserra and Joshua Meservey, 2017. (Olivia Enos is a Policy Analyst in the Asian Studies Center, of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy, at The Heritage Foundation. David Inserra is Policy Analyst for Homeland Security and Cyber Policy, in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy, of the Davis Institute. Joshua Meservey is Senior Policy Analyst for Africa and the Middle East, in the Allison Center.) “The U.S. Refugee Admissions Program: A Roadmap for Reform” July 5, 2017. <https://www.heritage.org/immigration/report/the-us-refugee-admissions-program-roadmap-reform>

The larger security challenge associated with resettling refugees is the heightened chance of Muslims in the “one-point-five” generation (those resettled to the U.S. at a young age) or the second generation radicalizing. Biographic data on people involved in extremist activities in the U.S. is patchy, so it is difficult to know how pronounced this phenomenon is. It exists, however, and fits with trends in Europe.

IMPACT: 142 deaths from terror attacks in 2016.

Peter Cluskey, 2017. (Peter Cluskey is a third-generation journalist and broadcaster based in The Hague, where he covers Dutch news, politics, and the work of organizations such as the International Criminal Court. He has reported extensively from the Middle East, particularly Israel and Lebanon, as well as from Belfast, London, France and Japan. Peter is an editorial consultant to UNESCO.) “Deaths from terrorism in Europe have spiked since 2014” Jun 16, 2017. <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/world/europe/deaths-from-terrorism-in-europe-have-spiked-since-2014-1.3122948>

A total of 142 people died in terror attacks across Europe in 2016, a death toll on a par with the 148 fatalities the previous year – but a striking increase on the four people who died in 2014, according to new figures from the EU’s law enforcement agency, Europol. The vast majority of the 2016 fatalities – 135 of the 142 – resulted from 13 separate jihadist attacks, six of which were linked to Islamic State, according to the annual Terrorism Situation and Trend report, which calls for closer cross-border co-operation on intelligence sharing.

Impact: Life-changing injury and death

Peter Cluskey, 2017. (Peter Cluskey is a third-generation journalist and broadcaster based in The Hague, where he covers Dutch news, politics, and the work of organizations such as the International Criminal Court. He has reported extensively from the Middle East, particularly Israel and Lebanon, as well as from Belfast, London, France and Japan. Peter is an editorial consultant to UNESCO.) “Deaths from terrorism in Europe have spiked since 2014” Jun 16, 2017. <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/world/europe/deaths-from-terrorism-in-europe-have-spiked-since-2014-1.3122948>

In each of those two years hundreds of victims were left with life-changing injuries. In 2015, says the report, 379 people were injured, many of them seriously – again, on a par with some 350 people who were hurt or badly hurt in 2015. The large increase in the numbers killed since 2014 reflects the elevated threat from jihadist groups such as Isis, and to a lesser extent a resurgent al-Qaeda, combined with the coming-of-age of radicalised young supporters “born and raised in the EU”.

3. U.S. Floodgates open

Where do you draw the line?

Sebastian Loh, 2015. (Sebastian Loh is a journalist with an interest in Malaysian politics, ASEAN, and international relations.) “Why taking in the Rohingya refugees is a terrible idea — Sebastian Loh” May 19, 2015. <http://m.themalaymailonline.com/what-you-think/article/why-taking-in-the-rohingya-refugees-is-a-terrible-ideasebastian-loh>

Many of them are right to point out the ghastly anti-immigrant prejudice and xenophobia behind much of the impetus to turn away these refugees. Those impulses are wrong and must be roundly rejected. Without question, immigrants continue to be a great boon to this nation — they contribute to our economy and the rich diversity of our society. And we must continue to be a nation open to legal immigrants who are willing to work hard and integrate with our norms and values. Yet, none of that detracts from the imperative that the government, any government, must have control over its borders and the influx of migrants. How do you run any sort of country by ignoring that principle? If we’re going to make an exception for this batch of refugees, where do we draw the line? How do we draw the line?

How many refugees are we willing to take?

Sebastian Loh, 2015. (Sebastian Loh is a journalist with an interest in Malaysian politics, ASEAN, and international relations.) “Why taking in the Rohingya refugees is a terrible idea — Sebastian Loh” May 19, 2015. <http://m.themalaymailonline.com/what-you-think/article/why-taking-in-the-rohingya-refugees-is-a-terrible-ideasebastian-loh>

There is no shortage of brutal regimes and civil wars in the world right now. And let’s be realistic — regardless of external pressure (either by us or the West), the persecution of Rohingyas in Myanmar isn’t likely to end in the foreseeable future. Are we prepared to take in more of these refugees? And how many more? And are we willing to bear the economic and social costs of such a policy? Placing your fingers in your ears and screaming “Let’s all forget politics for one sec and be HUMAAAN!” isn’t going to make these difficult questions go away.

Impact: Racist backlash. When refugee influx gets too high, racism and violence are the result. It happened in Sweden

Fraser Nelson 2015 (journalist) THE TELEGRAPH 12 Nov 2015 How Sweden, the most open country in the world, was overwhelmed by migrants <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/sweden/11992479/How-Sweden-the-most-open-country-in-the-world-was-overwhelmed-by-migrants.html>

If the finest political minds in Sweden had set out to incubate a far-Right backlash in the world’s most tolerant country, they could not have done better than what has happened over the last few years. First, run an open-door immigration policy making your country the top destination in the middle of a global migration crisis. Next denounce as “neo-fascist” anyone who raises objections. All of this has handed entire sections of the electorate on a plate to the Sweden Democrats.

**END QUOTE. Nelson goes on later in the same context to say QUOTE:**

[In Sweden, immigrants are twice as likely to be unemployed as natives](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/11822343/Mapped-Where-do-migrants-apply-for-asylum-in-Europe.html), one of the worst ratios in the developed world. Accepting immigration at such a level, while being unable to integrate it, is the recipe not just for a political crisis but a national identity crisis. A few weeks ago, a nursery near my wife’s family’s home announced that it would do its bit, by accommodating some asylum-seekers. The next night, it was set ablaze. Such stories would have seemed unthinkable only a few years ago. A surfeit of compassion is not the worst vice for a country to have – yet this has, now, ended up roiling far darker forces which it is struggling to contain. Sweden has spent almost 20 years being admired and imitated for reasons that are still valid. But in misjudging the immigration crisis, it now stands as a tragic example of what not to do.