Negative: Family Reunification Time Limit Repeal

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

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

Abolish Time Limits on Family Reunification Applications. Some EU countries require the refugee to apply for his family to get admission within 3 months of his admission. Plan says EU member states will no longer apply a time limit on family reunification applications unless families are first granted provisional entry (that’s where they are let in without all the paperwork being done, and they can finish it later, as long as they started filling it out within 3 months). It’s designed to make it easier for a refugee who is admitted into the EU to then get his family admitted later.

Negative: Family Reunification Time Limit Repeal 3

INHERENCY 3

1. EU countries that want to, already admit families easily and the trend is increasing 3

Affirmative advocate UNHCR admits that some EU countries already have overcome hurdles like the time limit, and are admitting lots of refugee families 3

Time limits already waived in 7 countries [would be 8 but UK isn’t in EU any more], plus Germany has special rules to work around it 3

2. Not blocked from immigrating 3

Affirmative advocate UNHCR admits in 2019 that 1) the family members can still immigrate after 3 months, they just have to meet more criteria; 2) some EU countries don’t even require the additional criteria and treat them the same as the original refugee 3

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE 4

1. UNHCR is a poor standard of human rights 4

Link: AFF says the “right” to expect the government to bring the asylum seeker’s family is a “right” because the UN High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) said so 4

Link: UNHCR also says migrants have a “right” to government-paid abortion services 4

Impact: No rights violation at all 4

2. No right to family reunification “anywhere you choose” 4

Affirmative advocate UNHCR admits: 1) NO, you don’t have the right to family reunification in any country you choose; and 2) EU law already upholds refugee’s right to bring family members 4

3. No EU responsibility to aid foreign job seekers 5

If they were genuine asylum seekers, they would have claimed asylum in the first safe country, rather than passing through several other countries so they could then go to Europe 5

They’re coming to Europe looking for better jobs 5

No moral or legal duty: Job seekers don’t qualify for protection under the 1951 Refugee Convention, nor any who aren’t fleeing specific persecution 5

Most of them are economic migrants (not “refugees”) 6

DISADVANTAGES 7

1. Mistaken ideas about “rights” 7

Link: Affirmative’s entire position in the round depends on accepting their argument that migrants have a “right” to taxpayers’ money to pay for their family to immigrate 7

Link: UNHCR (the Affirmative’s standard of “rights”) says migrants have “rights” to things you must pay for, including “Continuous improvement of living conditions” 7

Link: Ever-expanding list of things the government has to give people (labeled as "rights") conflicts with individual liberty and freedom 7

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 8

Link: AFF plan triggers this in 2 ways 8

Impact: All other vital human rights disappear when property rights are lost 8

Impact: Human rights violation, corruption and injustice abound when we give people "rights" to someone else's money 8

2. Sovereign debt crisis 9

Link: “Rights” standards require taxpayers paying for migrants to have an "adequate standard of living" 9

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) 9

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 9

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 9

Impact: Astronomical bailout costs and devastating economic impacts for the EU and global economy 10

3. Chain Migration and political backlash 10

Link: If the plan works, it leads to a big increase in immigration into the EU. Past increases in “family reunification” did so – because of “chain migration” 10

Link: Family reunification = chain migration = expanded immigration. Forget about limits 10

Link: Threat of uncontrolled migrants will increase the power of right-wing anti-immigration parties 11

Link: Anti-immigration parties, when elected, make social conflict worse 11

Impact: Turn the harms. Treatment o f migrants gets worse after an AFF ballot. More anti-immigrant policies will be enacted from the political backlash 11

BIG LINKS TO DISADVANTAGES 4-7 🡪 Plan leads to fracturing/dissolving the EU 12

Link: Numerous members of the EU will not accept any plan that has them taking more migrants 12

Big Fracture Brink: EU is already on the brink of disintegration over immigration issues 12

4. Reduced world stability from fracturing the EU 13

Example: Disagreement over immigration policy was a major reason Britain left the EU 13

Brink: EU faces an uncertain future with multiple crises threatening unity and increasing division 13

Link: EU stability promotes US ability to maintain global security and stability 13

Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk without US influence. US hegemony is key to global peace & prosperity 14

5. Populism and Authoritarian Government 15

Link: AFF plan weakens / fractures the EU 15

Link: Fear, anxiety and skepticism about the EU leads to the rise of populist authoritarian figures 15

Brink & Example: Hungary now has authoritarian government, putting EU at high risk right now 15

Link & Impact: Weak EU leads to rise of dictatorship and loss of freedom for millions more 15

6. Economic recession (from weakening / fracturing the EU) 16

Link: AFF plan weakens / fractures the EU with greater division 16

Link: EU unity is necessary for beneficial trade deals 16

Brink: Cracks already being seen in EU unity, and even partial non-cooperation will eventually bleed it to death 16

Impact: Devastating economic impact. Financial recession 16

Past precedent: Brexit caused serious economic damage 17

7. Russia gains influence 18

Link: AFF divides / weakens the EU 18

Link: Russia uses EU division to advance its agenda and gain influence to accomplish bad things 18

Impact: Russian influence damages democracy, promotes authoritarian rule 18

Negative: Family Reunification Time Limit Repeal

INHERENCY

1. EU countries that want to, already admit families easily and the trend is increasing

Affirmative advocate UNHCR admits that some EU countries already have overcome hurdles like the time limit, and are admitting lots of refugee families

UNHCR 2019. (the UN human rights agency) FAMILIES TOGETHER FAMILY REUNIFICATION FOR REFUGEES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, Feb 2019 https://www.unhcr.org/uk/5f5743f84.pdf

The number of family members of refugees and other international protection beneficiaries granted permits for family reunification purposes varies significantly across Europe. In some countries, fewer than 20 people over a two-year period from 2016 to 2017 were granted permission to join family members already in the country with an international protection status. In others, such as in Belgium, in the same period over 12,500 persons were granted permission to join family members. In 2017 alone, France issued over 23,200 permits for family reunification with people with refugee or subsidiary protection status (compared to just under 2,400 in 2016). Similarly, in 2017, Germany issued more than 54,000 visas for family members of individuals with international protection as well as over 32,000 visas in 2018. There are positive experiences from across Europe in terms of some States being able to successfully process larger numbers of applications enabling more families to reunite as well as adopting flexible approaches to overcome some of the hurdles outlined in this report that many experience.

Time limits already waived in 7 countries [would be 8 but UK isn’t in EU any more], plus Germany has special rules to work around it

UNHCR 2019. (the UN human rights agency) FAMILIES TOGETHER FAMILY REUNIFICATION FOR REFUGEES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, Feb 2019 https://www.unhcr.org/uk/5f5743f84.pdf

Bulgaria, France, Iceland, Italy, Portugal, Romania, Spain, and the United Kingdom do not apply the limited time frames in which refugees must apply for family reunification. Whilst Germany applies the three-month limit in order for applicants to benefit from the preferential terms, it has also developed an online mechanism for sponsors to register within this period while waiting for their embassy appointments. In addition, persons seeking reunification to Germany can file their notification with an embassy or at a Foreigners’ Office in Germany. As long as the notification is filed within the three-month period, the family reunification application does not have to be completed in this period to benefit from the preferential terms.

2. Not blocked from immigrating

Affirmative advocate UNHCR admits in 2019 that 1) the family members can still immigrate after 3 months, they just have to meet more criteria; 2) some EU countries don’t even require the additional criteria and treat them the same as the original refugee

UNHCR 2019. (the UN human rights agency) FAMILIES TOGETHER FAMILY REUNIFICATION FOR REFUGEES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, Feb 2019 https://www.unhcr.org/uk/5f5743f84.pdf

While third country nationals seeking to bring family members to the EU will normally have to meet several criteria, including a regular income or being independent of social welfare, have sufficient accommodation, health insurance and having good integration prospects, these requirements do not apply to refugees if the application for family reunification is submitted within three months from the date refugee status was granted. In some States, refugees will have to meet these additional criteria if the application is submitted later than this. EU legislation on family reunification does not apply specifically to beneficiaries of subsidiary protection, but in practice a number of EU Member States provide the same favourable conditions as for refugees.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. UNHCR is a poor standard of human rights

Link: AFF says the “right” to expect the government to bring the asylum seeker’s family is a “right” because the UN High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) said so

It’s in their evidence. That’s their standard for determining “rights.”

Link: UNHCR also says migrants have a “right” to government-paid abortion services

UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner and the Global Migration Group (which includes UNHCR) 2017. (Members of the Global Migration Group Working Group on Migration, Human Rights and Gender include ILO, IOM, OHCHR, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, UNU, UN Women and WHO.) Principles and Guidelines- migrants in vulnerable situations (ethical note: The article is undated but references material published in 2017 and none later) https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Migration/PrinciplesAndGuidelines.pdf

Provide access to comprehensive human rights-based sexual and reproductive health information and services. These should include, inter alia: menstrual hygiene products; safe and modern methods of contraception; emergency contraception; maternal health care, including emergency obstetric services and pre- and postnatal care; safe, legal and accessible abortion care; prevention and treatment of sexually transmitted infections (including HIV), and associated care and support; and specialized care for survivors of sexual violence and abuse.

Impact: No rights violation at all

Migrants are not having their “rights” violated if a government tells them their family can’t immigrate, any more than their rights are violated if we tell them they can’t have a taxpayer funded abortion. The UNHCR’s list of “rights” isn’t binding on you, Judge. If it is, get your wallet out and be prepared to write checks to abortion clinics.

2. No right to family reunification “anywhere you choose”

Affirmative advocate UNHCR admits: 1) NO, you don’t have the right to family reunification in any country you choose; and 2) EU law already upholds refugee’s right to bring family members

UNHCR 2019. (the UN human rights agency) FAMILIES TOGETHER FAMILY REUNIFICATION FOR REFUGEES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, Feb 2019 https://www.unhcr.org/uk/5f5743f84.pdf

The right to family life and family unity under international and regional law applies to all, including refugees, but does not necessarily entail the right to family reunification in a chosen country. However, in light of the particular situation of refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection or other forms of complementary protection, who are unable to return to their country of origin, under EU law, persons granted refugee status in an EU Member State have the right to bring members of their nuclear family to join them while Member States can also allow family members of those with subsidiary protection to join them. While third country nationals seeking to bring family members to the EU will normally have to meet several criteria, including a regular income or being independent of social welfare, have sufficient accommodation, health insurance and having good integration prospects, these requirements do not apply to refugees if the application for family reunification is submitted within three months from the date refugee status was granted.

3. No EU responsibility to aid foreign job seekers

If they were genuine asylum seekers, they would have claimed asylum in the first safe country, rather than passing through several other countries so they could then go to Europe

NBC News 2019 (journalist Saphora Smith) 2 Feb 2019 “Europe grapples with distinction between refugees and economic migrants” <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/europe-grapples-distinction-between-refugees-economic-migrants-n965161> (brackets added)

“There is more and more emphasis that those who travel to Europe are economic migrants, as if they were real asylum-seekers they would have stayed in the conflict region and claimed asylum” in the first safe country they arrived in, [Univ. of Birmingham migration researcher Nando] Sigona said. According to the United Nations, a refugee is someone who is “unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a [well-founded fear of being persecuted](https://www.unhcr.org/uk/what-is-a-refugee.html)” and has the right to asylum in another country. An economic migrant is generally considered to be someone who leaves their country in search of work or a higher standard of living, not to flee persecution.

They’re coming to Europe looking for better jobs

Jesper Bjarnesen 2015 (Senior Researcher at the Nordic Africa Institute) Sept 2015 “Rethinking the Mediterranean crisis: Advice for policy makers facing a humanitarian catastrophe” https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/194142/FULLTEXT01.pdf

It is evident that a considerable number of those arriving as refugees begin their journeys as aspiring labour migrants in Sub-Saharan Africa. Most labour migrants travel from Africa to Europe by air and possess enough resources to settle. Those who cross the sea generally have fewer options, but it is not the poorest or least educated who leave home. A known labour migration strategy consists of a family or a group of families pooling their resources to finance one person, who is selected on the premise that he or she has the best capabilities for succeeding

No moral or legal duty: Job seekers don’t qualify for protection under the 1951 Refugee Convention, nor any who aren’t fleeing specific persecution

Ionel Zamfir 2015 (with European Parliamentary Research Service) 27 Oct 2015 “Refugee Status Under International Law” https://epthinktank.eu/2015/10/27/refugee-status-under-international-law/

Refugees are a special class of migrants who under international law deserve specific protection by their host state. According to Article 1 of the 1951 UN Convention, as modified by the 1967 Protocol, a refugee is defined as a person who ‘owing to 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.’ This definition implies that several qualifying conditions apply to be considered a refugee: (1) **presence** **outside home country**; (2) **well-founded fear of persecution** (being at risk of harm is insufficient reason in the absence of discriminatory persecution); (3) **incapacity to enjoy the protection of one’s own state** from the persecution feared. The definition of refugees was actually **intended to exclude** internally displaced persons, economic migrants, victims of natural disasters, and persons fleeing violent conflict but not subject to discrimination amounting to persecution.

Most of them are economic migrants (not “refugees”)

**(And no, fleeing Boko Haram doesn’t qualify as “refugee” either. See the last sentence in the card above.)**

Louise Hunt 2019 (journalist) 30 July 2019 “Salvini’s Crackdown on Migrants in Italy Is Creating a Crisis, Not Solving One” https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/insights/28080/salvini-s-crackdown-on-migrants-in-italy-is-creating-a-crisis-not-solving-one

Grinding poverty is the main push factor for migration from West Africa, although some people are also fleeing conflicts, such as the fight against Boko Haram, a terrorist group active across the northern regions of Nigeria, Chad and Cameroon.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Mistaken ideas about “rights”

Link: Affirmative’s entire position in the round depends on accepting their argument that migrants have a “right” to taxpayers’ money to pay for their family to immigrate

**[Note: we’re not necessarily talking about travel cost to get to the EU. We’re talking about social welfare costs once the entire family arrives.]**

There’s some shifting of terminology going on here that you need to notice. Political rights are normally freedoms to do things without government interference. The right to freedom of speech means you can broadcast speeches expressing your opinion and the government can’t stop you. It does NOT mean, however, that the government has to buy you a radio station at taxpayer expense if you cannot afford one, so you can broadcast your message. The right to freedom of religion means the government cannot stop you from practicing your religion. It does NOT mean you have a right to demand that the government pay the salary of your minister if you can’t afford to pay him.

Link: UNHCR (the Affirmative’s standard of “rights”) says migrants have “rights” to things you must pay for, including “Continuous improvement of living conditions”

UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner and the Global Migration Group (which includes UNHCR) 2017. (Members of the Global Migration Group Working Group on Migration, Human Rights and Gender include ILO, IOM, OHCHR, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, UNU, UN Women and WHO.) Principles and Guidelines- migrants in vulnerable situations (ethical note: The article is undated but references material published in 2017 and none later) https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Migration/PrinciplesAndGuidelines.pdf

Article 25 (1) of UDHR affirms: “Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.” Article 22 affirms: “Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.” X Article 11 (1) of ICESCR affirms: “The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions.

**END QUOTE**. Judge, these are rights you don’t even have today. Where would you go to claim your right that someone else pay for you to have an “adequate standard of living” ? And migrants not only have that “right” but it has to be a continuously improving standard of living! If you don’t perceive that taxpayers owe you as a matter of “right” a continuously improving standard of living, keep listening and I’ll show you why these “rights” to someone else’s money are in fact a violation of human rights…

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.

Link: AFF plan triggers this in 2 ways

One – when they use “rights” terminology to advocate voting for their plan, they justify and encourage this mentality, and their case should be rejected for this reason alone. Their idea of rights is that someone else has a “right” to the money in your wallet. But…  
Two – Their plan triggers an influx of new migrants, if the plan works, since its goal is to make it easier for more to come. That influx will arrive expecting these “rights” to other people’s money, since the Affirmative and the European Union both say that’s what they should have. Every one that arrives will increase the problem of this disadvantage. We shouldn’t be increasing immigration into the EU until their “rights” terminology and welfare policies are reformed to stop violating property rights.

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: “Rights” standards require taxpayers paying for migrants to have an "adequate standard of living"


Cross apply the links 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>

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. Chain Migration and political backlash

Link: If the plan works, it leads to a big increase in immigration into the EU. Past increases in “family reunification” did so – because of “chain migration”

**[Analysis: “Chain migration” happens because when the refugee arrives, he applies for his family. When they come, one or more of them apply for their relatives (e.g., his wife applies for her sister). When the relatives arrive, some of them apply for more of their relatives (the sister applies for her husband and their kids; then her husband applies for his mom and dad, dad applies for his brother, the brother applies for his kids…). The total immigration numbers are ultimately way more than just the refugee’s wife and kids.]**

Prof. M. M. Suarez-Orozco 2001. (professor of education at Harvard Graduate School of Educaiton) [Immigration and Migration: Cultural Concerns](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B0080430767046040) https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/family-reunification

In the aftermath of World War II, many of the major Northwestern European democracies such as Germany and Belgium developed ‘guest worker programs’ to recruit foreign workers—initially in southern Europe, and subsequently in the Maghreb region of North Africa and in Turkey (Suárez-Orozco 1994). These programs came to an end in the early 1970s. Yet family reunification and chain migration continued to bring immigrants from North Africa into Europe for years.

Link: Family reunification = chain migration = expanded immigration. Forget about limits

Dara Lind 2017 (journalist) “What “chain migration” really means — and why Donald Trump hates it so much” published Dec 2017, updated 30 Jan 2018 <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/12/29/16504272/chain-migration-family-how-trump-end>

One upshot of chain migration: Any policies that made it easier for immigrants to bring their relatives would allow migration chains to form, thus expanding immigration into the country. “Family reunification systems,” Massey wrote, “work at crosspurposes with the limitation of immigration.”

Link: Threat of uncontrolled migrants will increase the power of right-wing anti-immigration parties

**[Note: Just the “threat” – even if it doesn’t happen – will trigger the political disadvantages here.]**

Jacob Kirkegaard 2020 (Senior Researcher at the Peterson Institute for International Economics) 5 March 2020 “The refugee crisis returns to Europe—or does it?” https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economic-issues-watch/refugee-crisis-returns-europe-or-does-it

A sudden renewed threat of uncontrolled large migrant inflows into the European Union is moreover not likely to make it easier to agree on common migration and especially asylum policies. Any proposals to redistribute migrants among EU countries will still be dead on arrival with most member states. Rather, the crystallization of the always latent threat of a neighboring country, in this case Turkey, strategically using the European Union’s porous external and open internal borders as a coercive lever against Europe, is likely to bolster the European Union’s focus on strengthening external borders as an immigration deterrent. The European Union has always had political aspirations to be a “normative power,” but it is clear that another migration crisis, which invariably in the short-term pushes it to adopt policies and measures favored by the far right, moves it in the opposite direction. Fortress Europe is coming a little closer.

Link: Anti-immigration parties, when elected, make social conflict worse

Dr. Francesco Campo , Dr. Sara Giunti , Dr. Mariapia Mendola 2020 (Campo – PhD economics. Giunti –PhD economics; **Postdoctoral research fellow** Department of Economics, Management and Statistics, University of Milano-Bicocca. Mendola – PhD economics; Professor of Economics at University of Milano Bicocca ) 7 Dec 2020 “The Political Impact of Refugee Migration: Evidence from the Italian Dispersal Policy” https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=503093087027109095110074068119022007021074046013037037027007065122089089069020013094022030063118118055022124015029028096090022023061039092033029022113126097013023028050077045092027024078094125120018021098121084115110066028105118095113100006086091096020&EXT=pdf&INDEX=TRUE

In fact, while far-right parties have gained significant electoral success in Europe in recent years, there is also evidence that they do not merely reflect, but also aggravate radicalization and social conflict – xenophobia in particular (see Bursztyn et al. 2019; Fletcher et al., 2020; Grosjean et al. 2020; Müller and Schwarz 2019; Romarri, 2020).

Impact: Turn the harms. Treatment o f migrants gets worse after an AFF ballot. More anti-immigrant policies will be enacted from the political backlash

Chris Horwood and William Powell 2019. (Horwood - senior adviser with the Mixed Migration Centre in Geneva. Powell (research consultant, Mixed Migration Center. Funded by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland) Mixed Migration Review 2019 (article doesn’t give an exact month of publication but references events in November 2019) https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Mixed-Migration-Review-2019.pdf

This disruption and distortion can be felt throughout the body politic. In Europe and Australia for example, right-wing parties have been so effective in exploiting the migration and refugee issue to beef up electoral support that mainstream parties adopted more restrictive and anti-migrant policies in order to compete.

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

Link: Numerous members of the EU will not accept any plan that has them taking more migrants

Voice of America News 2020 (journalist Jamie Dettmer; US government-funded news agency) 23 Sept 2020 “EU Migration Proposal Draws Ire of Central European States” https://www.voanews.com/europe/eu-migration-proposal-draws-ire-central-european-states

Numerous attempts to overhaul EU migration policy in the past have failed, largely because of resistance from a handful of member states mainly in central Europe to any compulsory distribution of asylum-seekers. EU Home Affairs Commissioner Ylva Johansson told reporters this week that she’s ready for tough resistance from Hungary, Poland and several rich northern European nations, but hopes to overcome opposition by providing the EU's 27 countries with “flexible options” for how to participate.   
**[END QUOTE]  
[THEY GO ON TO REPORT LATER IN THE SAME CONTEXT QUOTE:]**Hungarian leader Viktor Orban made clear this week that he has no intention of compromising and accepting relocated asylum-seekers. He doubled down on his disapproval in a combative essay for Magyar Nemzet, a right-wing Hungarian newspaper, in which he said there’s an impasse between conservative central and eastern Europe and the liberal western European states, one he can’t see can be overcome.  “Loopy liberals see no reason to fear even a flood of immigration,” he wrote. He added: “Central European countries have chosen a different future, free of immigration and migration.”

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.