Negative Brief: International Migrant Bill of Rights – bad idea

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

***Resolved: The European Union should substantially reform its immigration policy.***

Plan has the EU adopt the International Migrant Bill of Rights. This is a proposal written at Georgetown Univ. law school a few years ago. It restates and clarifies a number of existing rules that countries are pretty much already supposed to be following, with the hope that enacting another version of the same rules will get them to comply with it this time, instead of ignoring them like they sometimes do. IMBR is not a treaty, it's just a non-binding statement of good intentions. Although, as we see in our Disadvantages, some of them might not be so good…
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Negative: Migrant Bill of Rights – bad idea

TOPICALITY

1. Not substantial reform – according to Affirmative's own plan advocate

AFF Plan advocate Ian Kysel admits it wouldn't be a substantial change of policy in Europe

**In 2016, Affirmative source Professor Ian Kysel, who they quoted in their 1AC, said the EU was already working on implementing the same recommendations he wanted. And he said it would be nice if they added IMBR because it would "help promote compliance with existing law" in Europe**

Prof. Ian Kysel 2016 (currently professor at Cornell Univ.; at the time this was written, he was at Oxford Univ. ) " Promoting the Recognition and Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Using a Soft-Law International Migrants Bill of Rights" JOURNAL ON MIGRATION and HUMAN SECURITY https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/233150241600400201

In recent years, there have been calls for states to better respond to situations of migrants caught in countries in crisis. In this context, a small working group of states that includes the Philippines, the United States, Australia, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, and the European Commission, has launched an initiative (the previously mentioned Migrants in Countries in Crisis Initiative, or MICIC) with a mandate to develop a set of principles and guidelines along with a set of effective practices to inform the “role and responsibilities” of states and other stakeholders to “prepare for, respond to, and address” crises (including natural disasters and conflicts or civil unrest) before, during, and after an emergency (MICIC 2016; see also MICIC 2014). Inclusion of the IMBR — and affirming that ensuring protection of the rights of all migrants in ordinary times is essential to safeguarding those rights during crisis — would similarly be a useful way for the MICIC Initiative to ground its work in and help promote compliance with existing law.

Violation: Help promote compliance with existing EU law

When you hear those words quoted again, I almost don't have to make the argument, do I? If the resolution had said Resolved, that the EU should help promote compliance with existing immigration law, this would be a great case. But instead, it told us that Affirmative teams had to substantially reform immigration policy. There's a world of difference between "help promote compliance with existing law" and "substantial reform."

Impact: No Affirmative team

No one showed up in this debate to Affirm substantial reform of anything. Since there's no Affirmative team, no matter who wins, you should vote Negative.

DISADVANTAGES

1. IMBR violates human rights

Link: IMBR says migrants have a "right to an adequate standard of living"

Affirmative expert Prof. Ian Kysel quoting the text of IMBR in 2016 (currently professor at Cornell Univ.; at the time this was written, he was at Oxford Univ. ) " Promoting the Recognition and Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Using a Soft-Law International Migrants Bill of Rights" JOURNAL ON MIGRATION and HUMAN SECURITY https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/233150241600400201

 

Link: Ever-expanding list of things the government has to give people (labeled as "rights") conflicts with individual liberty and freedom

Prof. Philipp Bagus 2008. (professor at Rey Juan Carlos University) 13 Oct 2008 Human Rights Inflation and Property Rights Devaluation <https://www.independent.org/students/essay/essay.asp?id=2341> (accessed 9 Feb 2021)

The continuously expanding list of human rights is especially alarming from a classical liberal perspective as represented by Smith (1776), Bastiat (1850), Mises (1927) and Hayek (1960), in that it causes a devaluing of important human rights. More precisely, these more recent human rights deal mainly with social welfare, entailing positive duties for the government, requiring its expansion. These more recent human rights stand in contrast to individual liberty and progressively undermine property rights and freedom.

Link: Taking property away from one to give to another to meet some "right" they claim but cannot afford, violates property rights and no offsetting worthy goal can justify it

Prof. Philipp Bagus 2008. (professor at Rey Juan Carlos University) 13 Oct 2008 Human Rights Inflation and Property Rights Devaluation <https://www.independent.org/students/essay/essay.asp?id=2341> (accessed 9 Feb 2021)

Second-generation rights require providing a service to those who cannot afford that service. If no one is willing to voluntarily finance these services, second-generation rights imply the use of coercion in order to provide such services. In such cases, second-generation rights violate property rights, as it is impossible to honor both of them at the same time. It should be added, that property rights are not prima facie rights that can be restricted or balanced at discretion against some important goal, be it equality, “dignity,” or citizenship. Property rights are natural rights. They restrain the justifiable use of force in society. Their infringement would violate the self-ownership or the homesteading principle and as such stand against human nature. These violations are unjustifiable independent of any noble goals sought to be achieved by them.

Impact: All other vital human rights disappear when property rights are lost

Prof. Philipp Bagus 2008. (professor at Rey Juan Carlos University) 13 Oct 2008 Human Rights Inflation and Property Rights Devaluation <https://www.independent.org/students/essay/essay.asp?id=2341> (accessed 9 Feb 2021)

Before turning to second-generation human rights, we can state that property rights do imply many of the first-generation human rights, like security of life, freedom of association, and freedom of speech. In fact, these rights are not separable from property rights. Furthermore, when property rights are infringed upon, these human rights disappear along with them.

Impact: Human rights violation, corruption and injustice abound when we give people "rights" to someone else's money

Prof. Philipp Bagus 2008. (professor at Rey Juan Carlos University) 13 Oct 2008 Human Rights Inflation and Property Rights Devaluation <https://www.independent.org/students/essay/essay.asp?id=2341> (accessed 9 Feb 2021)

Consequently, property rights imply equality before the law. In contrast, pseudo human rights imply certain redistribution from the rich to those who cannot afford the alleged rights. Someone has to provide a service to those who cannot afford the right. Therefore, pseudo human rights demand an unequal treatment before the law. Some are taxed in order to pay for the welfare of others. The interpretation of the particular situation and person gives the government discretion. The specific circumstances of a person call for a different treatment. Individuals make use of the coercive measures of the state to improve their welfare. The particular legislation and vague definitions give room for discretion by the government and violates, consequently, the rule of law. By violating the rule of law, the traditional sense of justice in the population is perverted. As a consequence, corruption flourishes and the population no longer follows universal rules but tries to gain advantages by demanding and interpreting pseudo human rights.

2. Sovereign debt crisis

Link: IMBR requires guaranteeing migrants an "adequate standard of living"

Cross apply the link card in DA 1.

Link: Dilemma. If very few migrants would be affected, the plan is untopical (not substantial reform) and insignificant (not worth 2 hours of time to debate)

If they want to argue that very little would change after their plan, we'll be glad to drop this Disadvantage.

Link: If a lot of changes would be enacted, and a lot of people affected, the cost will skyrocket – because government providing an "adequate standard of living" is very expensive

Prof. Arturo C. Porzecanski 2017. (prof. of economics, American University) 1 May 2017 Human Rights and Sovereign Debts in the Context of Property and Creditor Rights http://auapps.american.edu/aporzeca/www/Human%20Rights%20and%20Sovereign%20Debts%20SIS%20Working%20Paper.pdf



Link & Brink: EU member governments can't afford it – they're already massively in debt. Euro currency union is on the brink of breakup over government debt

Policy Department for Economic, Scientific and Quality of Life, Policies Directorate-General for Internal Policies 2020 (agency of the EU Parliament) November 2020 “Monetary-Fiscal Nexus After the Crisis” [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/658202/IPOL\_STU(2020)658202\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/658202/IPOL_STU%282020%29658202_EN.pdf)

The COVID-19 crisis brought back fears of a possible breakup of the currency union. Italy, which was hit first and quite substantially by the first wave of the pandemic in late February, was soon considered a question mark in its ability to manage a crisis of this magnitude on its own. Moreover, for political considerations it appeared unlikely that Italy would request financial assistance from fellow governments via the rescue mechanism ESM and would agree on a macroeconomic adjustment programme linked to that. Against this backdrop there was a growing nervousness in financial markets, manifesting in soaring spreads on the returns of Italian government bonds in early March. Noteworthy, intra-euro area spreads generally increased at that time, not only for Italian bonds, but also for countries deemed invulnerable like France and the Netherlands (Figure 5). This points to a common risk factor among euro area Member States, which was absent for non-euro area EU members like Poland and Sweden. The common risk factor can be interpreted as breakup risk of the currency union.

Impact: Astronomical bailout costs and devastating economic impacts for the EU and global economy

[Max Bergmann](https://www.americanprogress.org/about/staff/bergmann-max/bio/), [Siena Cicarelli](https://www.americanprogress.org/about/staff/cicarelli-siena/bio/), and [James Lamond](https://www.americanprogress.org/about/staff/lamond-james/bio/) 2020 (*Max Bergmann is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress. Siena Cicarelli is a research assistant at the Center. James Lamond is a senior policy adviser at the Center*) Coronavirus May Be the EU’s Hardest Test Yet 18 March 2020 https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2020/03/18/481862/coronavirus-may-eus-hardest-test-yet/

A repeat of the drawn-out Greek debt crisis would be disastrous for all of the EU. Italy’s GDP is nearly 10 times bigger than Greece’s. Its economic collapse would threaten the survivability of the euro, as the cost for a bailout would be astronomical. The ramifications of such a collapse would be devastating for the entire EU and the global economy.

3. Gay / Transgendered Rights Agenda

Link: The official IMBR handbook says you have to uphold gay rights and transgendered "identity" rights to do IMBR properly

Georgetown University Law Center, Handbook for Applying the International Migrants Bill of Rights 2015. (ethical disclosure: The article is undated, but the date of 26 June 2015 is shown in the properties of the PDF as its creation date) https://www.law.georgetown.edu/human-rights-institute/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/08/IMBRhandbook2015.pdf

The IMBR applies in its entirety to all migrants. Migrants face discriminatory treatment in many contexts. Yet, they are entitled to equal and effective protection against discrimination on all grounds, including sex, race, color, language, religion or conviction, political or other opinion, national, ethnic, or social origin, nationality, property, marital status, disability, birth, gender, sexual orientation; gender identity; or other status. Discrimination against citizens cannot justify discrimination against migrants.

Link: Official IMBR handbook says the government (i.e. you, the taxpayer) must pay for gender transition medical stuff to comply with IMBR

Georgetown University Law Center, Handbook for Applying the International Migrants Bill of Rights 2015. (ethical disclosure: The article is undated, but the date of 26 June 2015 is shown in the properties of the PDF as its creation date) https://www.law.georgetown.edu/human-rights-institute/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/08/IMBRhandbook2015.pdf

Transgender migrants may lack access to gender-appropriate identity documents, require medical care unique to the transition from their birth-assigned gender to their self-identified gender, or, in the exceptional case when such migrants are lawfully detained, may require housing arrangements in accordance with their self-identified gender. Because not every group with a potential vulnerability is defined in the IMBR, the IMBR seeks to provide a framework for articulating how international human rights law protects migrants who become particularly vulnerable during the migration process.

Impact: Consider when voting

We don't know the religious background of the Judge or what's in your conscience. If it wouldn't bother you, then you can disregard this disadvantage and vote on something else. But if supporting the gay or transgendered rights movement would bother you, or if it would bother you for your tax money to pay for someone else's transgendered treatments, then definitely an Affirmative ballot should bother you.

BIG LINKS TO DISADVANTAGES 4-7 🡪 Plan leads to fracturing/dissolving the EU

Big Fracture Link: Plan claims to substantially increase rights of migrants in the EU

If it doesn't, then it would fail on solvency and should be rejected for that reason,

Big Fracture Brink: EU is already on the brink of disintegration over immigration issues

Bodo Weber 2020 (senior associate of the [Democratization Policy Council](http://www.democratizationpolicy.org/), based in Berlin) 9 March 2020 “Threat to EU on Greece-Turkey border is EU-made” <https://euobserver.com/opinion/147672> (the “Visegrad” countries are: Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic and Slovakia)

The current narrative's complete avoidance of core questions is astounding. Reasoned, rational discussion seems to now be a collective pan-European taboo. EU leaders evidently fear that just by opening up such discussion, the Union would disintegrate. In September 2015, when some of the Visegrád countries declared they would not implement the EU's legally-binding relocation scheme, the Union collapsed as a legal entity in the area of asylum and migration.

4. Reduced world stability from fracturing the EU

Example: Disagreement over immigration policy was a major reason Britain left the EU

Max Boot 2016 (leading military historian and foreign policy analyst. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York) July 2016 “Brexit: Isolationism or Atlanticism?”  <https://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/issues/resources/strategika_issue_33_web.pdf>

Britons might never have voted to leave the European Union had it not been for the refugee crisis that hit Europe as a result of the Syrian civil war. Even though Britain has accepted only some 5,000 Syrian refugees, German premier Angela Merkel agreed to take in 800,000, thus fueling fears across the continent of an influx of possible terrorists. Those fears were exploited by elements of the “Leave” campaign, principally Nigel Farage and the UK Independence Party, and no doubt contributed crucial momentum to the final outcome.

Brink: EU faces an uncertain future with multiple crises threatening unity and increasing division

Meagan Araki, Annie Chang, Troy Lindell, Alison Wendler 2017. (members of the “Challenges to European Unity Task Force” at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, Univ. of Washington) March 2017 CHALLENGES TO EUROPEAN UNITY: OPTIONS FOR U.S. POLICYMAKERS <https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Task-Force-J-Report-2017_Lorenz.pdf>

Today, Europe faces an uncertain future. The migration crisis, rise in terrorism, economic downturn, mounting external pressures and a responsive populist movement, have threatened the basis of European stability. The major influx of refugees into Europe has placed immense pressure on the EU’s infrastructure and capacity to integrate refugees into the European identity. Europe has experienced a growing number of terrorist attacks, leading to nationalist and xenophobic policies. Additionally, Russia’s encroachment into Eastern Europe has strained Russia and Europe’s relationship. The Euro crisis has furthered the divide between the core and peripheral EU countries, revealing the inequality between European citizens and growing stagnant employment and growth opportunities.

Link: EU stability promotes US ability to maintain global security and stability

Meagan Araki, Annie Chang, Troy Lindell, Alison Wendler 2017. (members of the “Challenges to European Unity Task Force” at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, Univ. of Washington) March 2017 CHALLENGES TO EUROPEAN UNITY: OPTIONS FOR U.S. POLICYMAKERS <https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Task-Force-J-Report-2017_Lorenz.pdf>

Policies that encourage the unity between EU member states should be strongly supported. It is significant that the United States demonstrate support in this ongoing migration crisis, as it will help relieve the pressures member states are experiencing, as well as help mend existing tensions. The cohesion, stability, and cooperation of European Union serve a key interests of the United States. With these aspects, a more unified European Union can strengthen its position as a global actor, as well as strengthen its existing relations with the United States. This can further United States’ objectives of security and stability throughout the international community.

Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk without US influence. US hegemony is key to global peace & prosperity

Capt. M. V. Prato 2009 (United States Marine Corps,Command and Staff College, Marine Corps Combat Development Command,Marine Corps University) “The Need for American Hegemony” Feb 2009 http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a508040.pdf

The world witnessed a vast shift in the polarity of geopolitics after the Cold War. The United States became the world’s greatest hegemon with an unequalled ability to globally project cultural, political, economic, and military power in a manner not seen since the days of the Roman Empire. Coined the “unipolar moment” by syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer, the disparity of power between the U.S. and all other nations allows the U.S. to influence the world for the mutual benefit of all responsible states. Unfortunately, the United States is increasingly forced to act unilaterally as a result of both foreign and domestic resentment to U.S. dominance and the rise of liberal internationalism. The United States must exercise benevolent global hegemony, unilaterally if necessary, to ensure its security and maintain global peace and prosperity.

5. Populism and Authoritarian Government

Link: AFF plan weakens / fractures the EU

Cross apply the BIG LINK.

Link: Fear, anxiety and skepticism about the EU leads to the rise of populist authoritarian figures

Meagan Araki, Annie Chang, Troy Lindell, Alison Wendler 2017. (members of the “Challenges to European Unity Task Force” at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, Univ. of Washington) March 2017 CHALLENGES TO EUROPEAN UNITY: OPTIONS FOR U.S. POLICYMAKERS <https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Task-Force-J-Report-2017_Lorenz.pdf>

Additionally, the complications surrounding EU accession and instability in Turkey and the Balkans present unique challenges to the dynamic of the EU. These real and perceived threats have induced fear and anxiety into the European public. As these security threats have worsened with little to no progress made, Euroscepticism has grown and enabled the populist movement. By capitalizing on this sentiment, populist parties have gained increasing support throughout Europe. Populists promise to take back power from the corrupt and inefficient political elite, and give it back to the general public. Europeans have increasingly turned to strongman figures who value strength and security over tolerance and unity.

Brink & Example: Hungary now has authoritarian government, putting EU at high risk right now

Philippe Dam 2020 (master’s degree in international administration; Human Rights Watch’s advocacy director for Europe and Central Asia) 1 Apr 2020 “Hungary’s Authoritarian Takeover Puts European Union at Risk” <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/04/01/hungarys-authoritarian-takeover-puts-european-union-risk>

On Monday, under the pretext of addressing the COVID-19 public health emergency, [Hungary's](https://www.hrw.org/europe/central-asia/hungary) parliament gave [green light to the Orban-led government](https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/03/23/hungarys-orban-uses-pandemic-seize-unlimited-power) to rule with unlimited power for an indefinite time. Prime Minister Viktor Orban can now suspend any existing law and implement others by decree, without parliamentary or judicial scrutiny. Elections have been suspended. The law allows for new criminal penalties of five years in prison for publishing vaguely defined “false” or “distorted” facts – another blow to media freedom in the country. With this law, Hungary becomes the first country in the European Union to virtually abolish all democratic checks-and-balances. How has it come to this? In the past [10 years](https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/05/16/wrong-direction-rights/assessing-impact-hungarys-new-constitution-and-laws), the government has spared no efforts to [curb judicial independence](https://www.hrw.org/europe/central-asia/hungary), restrict [civil society](https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/07/17/hungary-determined-silence-any-critics-left-standing) activities, and gain near full [control over the media](https://www.euronews.com/2019/06/12/don-t-be-fooled-hungary-s-government-remains-a-threat-to-european-values-view). Having repeatedly failed to appreciate the gravity of the situation, EU institutions risk making the same mistake again.

Link & Impact: Weak EU leads to rise of dictatorship and loss of freedom for millions more

Kenneth Roth 2020 (executive director of Human Rights Watch, one of the world's leading international human rights organizations; former federal prosecutor in New York; graduate of Yale Law School) 27 Apr 2020 “Stopping the Authoritarian Rot in Europe” [https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/04/27/stopping-authoritarian-rot-europe#](https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/04/27/stopping-authoritarian-rot-europe)

Rot tends to spread when it encounters no resistance. Dictator wannabes prey upon weakness. EU and member state leaders now need to ask themselves: is the EU only a trading bloc or also a club of democracies? The answer to that question used to be obvious. Sadly, it no longer is. Ten million EU citizens now live under authoritarian rule. How many millions more will have to suffer the loss of their freedoms before Europe’s leaders draw the line?

6. Economic recession (from weakening / fracturing the EU)

Link: AFF plan weakens / fractures the EU with greater division

Cross-apply the BIG LINK.

Link: EU unity is necessary for beneficial trade deals

Julian Bonte-Friedheim 2020 (head writer at The Perspective) “IS THE EU BETTER OFF DIVIDED OR TOGETHER?” (month not given in the published article)  <https://www.theperspective.com/debates/businessandtechnology/is-the-eu-better-off-divided-or-together/>

Better trade deals can be negotiated from within the EU. For any European nation, negotiating trade deals with other countries is much more advantageous as part of the EU rather than as an independent economy. As one of the world’s [biggest economic unions](https://www.thebalance.com/world-s-largest-economy-3306044), the EU has a lot more leverage when brokering a deal with China or India. Being able to offer (or withhold) access to its many consumers is a strong bargaining tool. Additionally, there is [free trading](https://www.ft.com/content/1688d0e4-15ef-11e6-b197-a4af20d5575e) between members of the EU, as it is a customs union. Individual countries, while able to create their own terms, are unlikely to reach deals as beneficial as the EU does on its own.

Brink: Cracks already being seen in EU unity, and even partial non-cooperation will eventually bleed it to death

Hans Vollaard 2020 ( Lecturer in Dutch and European Politics at Utrecht University, the Netherlands.) “One down, many to go? European disintegration after Brexit” 23 March 2020  <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2020/03/23/one-down-many-to-go-european-disintegration-after-brexit/>

Even though there may not be other instances of European disintegration like Brexit, dissatisfaction may lead to other forms of disintegration. Not by countries leaving the EU entirely, but only partially. These partial exits involve member states not complying with the EU rules, for instance with respect to public finances in the Eurozone (Italy), or the Schengen rules, many member states have introduced “temporary” national border surveillance since the migration crisis of 2015. Another partial exit is the desire to pay less money to ‘Brussels’, such as expressed by the so-called Hanseatic group of EU member states led by the Netherlands. Disintegration can also occur involuntarily, when one member state wants to exclude another member state, such as the calls to push Greece out of the euro or the Schengen area. These partial forms of disintegration undermine the functioning of the EU. Its rules are less respected, and it gets fewer resources to function properly. In such a scenario, the EU would gradually ‘bleed to death’.

Impact: Devastating economic impact. Financial recession

Mauro Guillen 2016 (holder of the Zandman Endowed Professorship in International Management at the Wharton School. He served as Director of the Lauder Institute of Management & International Studies between 2007 and 2019. PhD in sociology from Yale University and a Doctorate in political economy from the University of Oviedo in Spain.) 13 June 2016 “On the Brink: How a Brexit Could Fracture a Fragile Europe” <https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/on-the-brink-how-brexit-could-fracture-a-fragile-europe/>

The European Union is the largest economy in the world. It’s not as rich as the U.S., but it is bigger in terms of gross domestic product if you combine those 28 countries. If there is a crisis of confidence that undermines consumer spending and business confidence, then you are going to get into maybe even a third recession. That would be devastating for Europe itself, but it would be really bad for everybody else in the world that has business with Europe, including the United States. Exporters to Europe and American companies that have investments in Europe are going to suffer. Companies such as GE or GM or Boeing, 20% to 30% of their business is in Europe, so it could have a large impact.

Past precedent: Brexit caused serious economic damage

Kimberly Amadeo 2020 (over 20 years of senior-level corporate experience in economic analysis and business strategy. She is a U.S. Economy expert for The Balance and president of WorldMoneyWatch, which produces publications about the global economy) “Brexit Consequences for the U.K., the EU, and the United States”  last updated 14 Mar 2020 <https://www.thebalance.com/brexit-consequences-4062999>

The day after the Brexit vote, the currency markets were in turmoil. The [euro fell 2% to $1.11](https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-the-euro-to-dollar-conversion-its-history-3306091).﻿ The pound fell 8% to $1.36.﻿ Both increased the [value of the dollar](https://www.thebalance.com/value-of-us-dollar-3306268). That strength is not good for U.S. [stock markets](https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-the-stock-market-how-it-works-3305893). It makes American shares more expensive for foreign investors. A weak pound also makes U.S. exports to the U.K. more expensive. The United States has an $18.9 billion trade surplus with the U.K. In 2018, it exported $141 billion while importing $122 billion.﻿ Brexit could turn this surplus into a deficit if a weak pound makes U.K. imports more competitive. Brexit dampens business growth for companies that operate in Europe. U.S. companies invested $758 billion in the U.K. in 2018.﻿ Most of this was the finance sector with some manufacturing. These companies use the U.K. as the gateway to free trade with the EU nations. U.K. businesses invested $561 billion in the United States. Brexit puts at risk jobs in both countries. In addition, there were 716,000 U.K. immigrants in the United States and 215,000 U.S. immigrants in the U.K. in 2019.

7. Russia gains influence

Link: AFF divides / weakens the EU

Cross-apply the BIG LINK.

Link: Russia uses EU division to advance its agenda and gain influence to accomplish bad things

Ian Kearns 2018 (co-founder, former director and board member of the European Leadership Network, a pan-European group of senior political, military and diplomatic leaders. Former specialist advisor to the Joint House of Commons/House of Lords Committee on National Security Strategy. Former deputy chair and director of secretariat to former NATO Secretary General George Robertson) Collapse: Europe After The European Union (no month given in the published article) <https://books.google.com/books?id=ZVBSDwAAQBAJ&pg=PT223&lpg=PT223&dq=EU+immigration+reform+hopeless&source=bl&ots=79cHvPH2qu&sig=ACfU3U3diw6xbMj9V9bRAyJPoyV-5N1epA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjswYPI-ZrqAhWyneAKHfCQBCE4ChDoATAAegQIChAB#v=onepage&q=EU%20immigration%20reform%20hopeless&f=false>



Impact: Russian influence damages democracy, promotes authoritarian rule

Geir Hagen Karlsen 2019 (Lieutenant Colonel and Lecturer, Norwegian Defence University College) 8 Feb 2019 “Divide and rule: ten lessons about Russian political influence activities in Europe” <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0227-8>

Russia is an authoritarian and corrupt state that regards the EU and, more specifically, NATO, as a challenge, a competitor and a threat. Its influence activities are malicious, undermining alliances and creating distrust, weakening what Moscow sees as their opponents and thus ensuring the survival of this authoritarian regime. Their interference is worrisome at several levels. First, Russia is undermining core democratic processes, like elections, and trust in the political system and its institutions. Second, their disinformation and manipulation of media and social media is directly undermining the political discourse, essential to democracy. Third, this is further exacerbated by their malicious attacks on individuals, like the Finnish journalist Jessika Aro, who has been tracked and harassed systematically after exposing Russian trolling of social media (Aro, [2015](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0227-8#ref-CR3)). However, the overall Russian approach is simple, divide and rule.