Negative Brief: Mavrovouni Lead Poisoning

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

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

Test the migrants previously housed at Moria camp (Greece) for lead poisoning at the new camp facility Mavrovouni (located on the site of an old military firing range – lots of bullets and stuff in the soil). If the soil tests positive for lead contamination, those migrants will be treated by EU and sent to the mainland camps. Big problem: Status Quo is already moving them ALL to the mainland, so AFF does less than Status Quo does. And no part of their plan requires affirming the resolution. And by the way, as of January 2021, the soil was already tested. If anything further needs to be done, the Greek government should do it, not the EU.
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Negative: Mavrovouni Lead Poisoning

TOPICALITY

The Negative philosophy in this round is simple. Even if the Affirmative succeeds at justifying doing something about lead poisoning, that’s not enough for them to win this debate round. In Judge training you were told that the Affirmative has to prove and uphold the resolution to win this debate, and if they fail at that, then you should vote Negative. The Affirmative has to prove that doing a substantial reform to EU immigration policy is either the best or the only way to prevent lead poisoning. Just saying “we save lives” or “we care about the children” doesn’t get them an Affirmative ballot. This debate will in large part be about whether you need to affirm this resolution to solve this problem. If you don’t need the resolution to solve the problem, then vote Negative. Even if you think their plan is a wonderful idea, you can still write on the ballot that you think it’s a wonderful idea while awarding a Negative ballot because they didn’t uphold the resolution. There are 3 reasons why you should do this.

1. They’re Not Changing an “Immigration” Policy

A. Our definition: The only practical definition involves looking at the objectives of the policy

Dr. Mathias Czaika and Dr. Hein De Haas 2013. (Czaika – PhD in political economy and Senior Research Officer at the International Migration Institute, University of Oxford. De Haas – PhD in social sciences; co-director of the [International Migration Institute](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Migration_Institute) at [Oxford University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oxford_University) ) The Effectiveness of Immigration Policies https://heindehaas.files.wordpress.com/2015/05/2013-the-effectiveness-of-immigration-policies.pdf

The only practical yardstick to define immigration policy is by the mostly implicitly stated objectives of policies on paper. Bearing this consideration in mind, we can say that international migration policies are rules (i.e., laws, regulations, and measures) that national states define and implement with the (often only implicitly stated) objective of affecting the volume, origin, direction, and internal composition of immigration flows.

B. Even the Affirmative’s definition of immigration policy would be a problem for them.

**The part they read vaguely defines it as anything affecting the movement of people. That could include just about anything, so it’s way too vague for a standard in policy debate. But their evidence narrows it down in the second sentence, which the Affirmative didn’t read to you.**

Affirmative’s evidence from Eva Hill 2019

The definition of migration policy given by the IOM's Migration Governance Framework is defined as "law and policy affecting the movement of people" which includes policy surrounding economic migrants, asylum seekers, family reunion, et cetera (IOM 2017). Immigration policy is defined as the incorporation of migrants into a society, in other words, what rights they possess, vis-à-vis the citizen population (Hammar 1985).

C. The simple Topicality test: Could we do the Plan without affirming the resolution?

We need to test every mandate of the plan against the definition and ask whether each mandate affects the volume, origin, direction or internal composition of immigration flows into the European Union. If it would be possible to do any of the Plan mandates without affirming the resolution, then those mandates are extra-topical and should be dropped from the round. If all the mandates can be done without affirming the resolution, then the entire plan fails on Topicality and should be rejected before we even begin debating it.

D. Multiple “non-immigration policy” mandates in the Affirmative plan

You can test soil for lead without changing immigration policy. You can test people for lead poisoning without changing immigration policy. You can give medical treatment for lead poisoning without changing immigration policy. And you can move immigrants from one camp to another one without changing immigration policy – people get moved between camps all the time, but policies don’t change all the time.

E. Impact: Resolution is not upheld, so a Negative ballot is required

Since they haven’t proven that you need the resolution to solve the problem, they haven’t proven it to be true. If the resolution is not proven true, and the Affirmative had the burden of proof, then a Negative ballot is required.

2. Not reforming a “European Union” policy

A. Their own evidence source says this is a policy of the Greek government, not the EU, and recommended the Greek government fix it

AFFIRMATIVE SOURCE - Human Rights Watch 2020. (international human rights advocacy NGO) Greece: Lead Poisoning Concerns in New Migrant Camp, 8 Dec 2020 https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/12/08/greece-lead-poisoning-concerns-new-migrant-camp

Thousands of asylum seekers, aid workers, United Nations, and Greek and European Union employees may be at risk of lead poisoning in a new migrant camp that [Greek](https://www.hrw.org/europe/central-asia/greece) authorities have built on a repurposed military firing range on the island of Lesbos, Human Rights Watch said today. Firing ranges are commonly contaminated with lead from munitions, nevertheless the authorities did not conduct comprehensive lead testing or soil remediation before moving migrants to the site in September 2020. Evidence collected by migrants moved to the site also indicated that authorities have also failed to clear all unexploded mortar projectiles and live small arms ammunition, which could injure or kill if disturbed or handled. “Putting thousands of migrant adults and children, along with aid workers, on top of a former firing range without taking the necessary steps to guarantee they would not be exposed to toxic lead is unconscionable,” said [Belkis Wille](https://www.hrw.org/about/people/belkis-wille), senior crisis and conflict researcher at Human Rights Watch. “The Greek authorities should promptly conduct a comprehensive site assessment of soil lead levels and release the results.”

**END QUOTE. Perhaps they should. We’ll even stipulate as the Negative team that the Greek government should do exactly that, and if you sign a Negative ballot, that will be our policy. But you don’t need to affirm the resolution to have the Greek government do something. The Negative team can advocate that the Greek government should do something too, because it’s outside the resolution.**

B. Reforming Greek government policies is extra-topical

The resolution says the EU should reform, not the Greek government. The Affirmative cannot fiat that the Greek government accepts their plan or cooperates with it. The only way you can get the Greek government to test the soil for lead and release the results is with a Negative ballot. We can tell the Greek government to do that because we aren’t bound by the resolution.

C. Impact: Better results by respecting the resolution and the Affirmative’s own evidence and voting Negative

Voting Negative and denying the resolution gets you better results. With the Affirmative, all they can do is have the EU suggest that the Greek government do something. They can’t make them do it. When you deny that the EU should reform its immigration policy, as we do, you are then free to advocate that the Greek government must test the soil and release the results, as their own Affirmative experts recommended.

3. Not changing any “Policy”

A. If the Status Quo is already doing the plan, then there’s no policy change

B. Later in this speech, I’ll prove the Status Quo is already testing for lead and already moving migrants to the mainland

C. Impact: No Affirmative team means Negative ballot

If there’s no substantial policy reform in the Affirmative plan, then they didn’t uphold the resolution. In that case there’s no one affirming the resolution in today’s debate. So, no matter who wins, you should vote Negative.

INHERENCY – More reasons you don’t need the resolution to solve, because the Status Quo already has programs that are solving

1. “Contaminated dust blowing around” is being solved in Status Quo

**Affirmative is worried about possibly lead-contaminated dust blowing in their tents. But Status Quo is already solving by building sturdier housing**

UNHCR is upgrading migrant housing at Mavrovouni to solid, durable structures

UNHCR Regional Bureau for Europe 2020. (The UN Refugee Agency) 4 Dec 2020 “Greece Update #1 – Lesvos” https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/RBE%20Greece%20UPDATE%202020%20No%2011.pdf

For these large-scale upgrades, the 7,300 people living in Mavrovouni will need to be progressively and temporarily relocated to designated, partitioned Rubb Halls within the site to allow for groundwork to take place. Five more Rubb Halls were set up to be used as temporary accommodation for families, including four provided by IOM and one by UNHCR. In addition, UNHCR is providing a Rubb Hall to cover increased storage needs. UNHCR supported the authorities in preparing social media messaging to inform site residents about the construction work and shelter rearrangements. UNHCR also presented the plan to representatives of the site’s refugee communities, inviting them to share concerns and ideas. By now, all tents in the site are reinforced with wood flooring and insulation. This will help in the short-term against worsening weather, while more durable site improvements are underway.

What’s a “Rubb Hall”? Way better than a tent. It’s a steel structure made by “Rubb Building Systems” in Britain

Rubb Building Systems copyright 2020. (manufacturer of Rubb Halls) “Rubb Halls” https://www.rubbuk.com/rubb-fabric-structures-range/rubb-hall-standard-building-range/

The steel structure is hot dip galvanized after production to ensure minimal maintenance, and very low life-cycle costs. Translucent cladding on standard buildings provide high levels of natural light inside, promotes safety and productivity. PVC coated membrane cladding is fully fire tested and approved. Insulated Thermohall provides high levels of insulation value without loss of portability. High vertical walls and no internal columns optimize usable space. Fast delivery and full demountable. This gives great flexibility to the needs around logistics for the customer.

2. Already moving migrants to the mainland

As of Dec 2020, 3000 had already been moved off, and more transfers continue

UNHCR Regional Bureau for Europe 2020. (The UN Refugee Agency) 4 Dec 2020 “Greece Update #1 – Lesvos” https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/RBE%20Greece%20UPDATE%202020%20No%2011.pdf

UNHCR complements the efforts of the authorities and other actors by systematically replacing core relief items, such as tarpaulins and blankets, monitoring tents for damage and identifying asylum seekers’ needs. Meanwhile, organized transfers from Lesvos to the mainland continue, freeing up much needed space in the site. Since the fires, some 3,000 people have been moved out of the island (as of 4 December). Of those, 509 moved into ESTIA apartments with UNHCR support.

Numbers keep increasing: As of January 2021, 5000 had been transferred to the mainland

Helena Smith 2021. (journalist) 27 Jan 2021 “Lesbos refugee site is contaminated with lead, says Human Rights Watch” https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/27/lesbos-refugee-site-is-contaminated-by-lead-says-human-rights-watch

According to the United Nations’ refugee agency, the UNHCR, 7,165 men, women and children live in the Mavrovouni camp, a rudimentary facility of tents overlooking the sea. It was constructed [in a matter of days](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/sep/17/greek-police-move-people-lesbos-migrant-tent-camp-fire) after fires gutted Moria, the island’s holding centre, displacing about 12,500 people overnight. Since the blazes, more than 5,000 asylum seekers have been transferred to the mainland.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Tests show lead levels at Mavrovouni aren’t a problem as of Jan. 2021

Tests have been completed: Only 1 out of 12 sites had elevated lead levels, and the Greek government is fixing it

Helena Smith 2021. (journalist) 27 Jan 2021 “Lesbos refugee site is contaminated with lead, says Human Rights Watch” https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/27/lesbos-refugee-site-is-contaminated-by-lead-says-human-rights-watch

Responding to the claims, Athens’ migration ministry said the camp extended across an area of 341,000 sq metres, and only about 21,000 sq metres had ever been used as a shooting range. But it admitted over the weekend that out of 12 soil samples taken from the site, one “had lead levels that exceeded the acceptable limit”. In light of the findings, it pledged to bring in new soil and gravel and construct a cement base under larger tents, known as rub halls, and administrative and registration areas “that will further eliminate risk”. It said: “So far, we are confident that our detailed evaluation of lead presence in the camp has not revealed levels that require special intervention or the revision of the construction plan. Onsite community engagement to reassure both refugees and workers will also be conducted.”

2. 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

**[Example: Our inherency evidence said a large number of the migrants on the island were Afghans. How many countries did they have to pass through to get to Greece to claim they were seeking asylum?? When you’re fleeing for your life, you go to the first place where no one is shooting at you. When you’re looking for a job or welfare benefits, you go to wherever on the globe those can be found.]**

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.

MINOR REPAIR – Greek government does it themselves, without the EU

Affirmative’s evidence advocates the Minor Repair

Cross-apply Topicality 2A card, where Human Rights Watch, an Affirmative evidence source, said the Greek government should do it.

They’re already testing for lead and moving migrants to the mainland. If more is needed, they can fund it themselves. The Greek government will have over 3 billion more euros in revenue in 2021 than they had last year

Keep Talking Greece 2020. (Greek news in English, journalism site) 21 Nov 2020 “Greece’s state budget 2021 sees recession of 10.5% for 2020” https://www.keeptalkinggreece.com/2020/11/21/greece-state-budget-recession-2020/

Tax revenues are projected to grow to 47.8 billion euros in 2021 after shrinking to 44.2 billion this year, while budget spending will remain at very high levels (67.2 billion euros) in 2021 from 69.3 billion this year.

SOLVENCY

1. Can’t go any faster

We can’t move migrants to the mainland any faster than Status Quo is doing -- there’s not enough housing

**[And the AFF plan doesn’t construct any more housing. And if they wanted to, it would have to be done by the Greek government, as this evidence says, which they can’t put as an actor in their plan, since they are not the EU.]**

Human Rights Watch 2020. (international NGO human rights advocacy group probably quoted by the Affirmative) https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/09/09/greece-transfer-refugees-and-asylum-seekers-safety-mainland

Moving people from Lesbos to mainland Greece requires finding urgent solutions to address the fact that many current housing facilities for refugees and asylum seekers are at full capacity. We urge the Greek authorities to work on a coherent plan that maximizes all available resources, including those from the European Union, and we renew our call to European leaders to share the responsibility for the reception and support of asylum seekers now more than ever.

DISADVANTAGES

1. AFF Plan treats migrants worse than Status Quo policy

Link: Status Quo policy is that ALL migrants on the island will soon be evacuated to the mainland

Cross apply under Inherency: the problem will be 100% solved in Status Quo

Paul Antonopoulos 2020. (journalist) 16 Sept 2020 “[Lesvos to be cleared of illegal immigrants by Easter 2021](https://greekcitytimes.com/2020/09/16/lesvos-to-be-cleared-of-illegal-immigrants-by-easter-2021/)” https://greekcitytimes.com/2020/09/16/lesvos-to-be-cleared-of-illegal-immigrants-by-easter-2021/

All the illegal immigrants who are in Lesvos today will have left by Easter 2021, Greek Minister of Civil Protection Michalis Chrysochoidis told [The Guardian](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/sep/15/after-fire-greece-vows-to-empty-lesbos-of-all-refugees-by-easter). “They will all leave. Of the roughly 12,000 refugees here currently, I foresee 6,000 being transferred to the mainland by Christmas and the rest by Easter. The people of this island have gone through a lot. They’ve been very patient,” Chrysochoidis said from Lesvos to the correspondent of the British newspaper. The minister added that about 70% of asylum seekers in Lesvos are Afghans who will receive refugee status and travel documents.

Link: AFF Plan only evacuates them if the soil tests positive for lead poisoning

It’s in their mandates.

Impact: Migrants are better off with Status Quo evacuation plan than the Affirmative’s plan

They’ll get off the island faster under Status Quo policy than if we do the AFF plan and wait for all the lead testing to be done and the results to come back. And they might not get off at all, if the tests are negative.

2. EU action legitimizes Greek misbehavior

Link: AFF says Greece is bad for mistreating migrants.

If that’s true, we certainly wouldn’t want to make it worse.

Link: Affirmative’s EU financial aid to Greece legitimizes Greek maltreatment of refugees

[Daphne Panayotatos](https://www.refugeesinternational.org/reports?author=5d1535e5c621440001d3c550) 2020. (program officer and advocate at Refugees International; MA in International Relations and International Economics )  [November 24, 2020](https://www.refugeesinternational.org/reports/2020/11/20/blocked-at-every-pass-how-greeces-policy-of-exclusion-harms-asylum-seekers-and-refugees) “Blocked at Every Pass: How Greece’s Policy of Exclusion Harms Asylum Seekers and Refugees” <https://www.refugeesinternational.org/reports/2020/11/20/blocked-at-every-pass-how-greeces-policy-of-exclusion-harms-asylum-seekers-and-refugees>

First, Greek authorities have maneuvered to physically keep people away from Greece's shores. Second, the government has adopted laws and policies that undermine protections owed to asylum seekers. Third, it has withheld adequate integration support from those to whom it grants refugee status. At every phase, government measures to stymie civil society efforts hinder asylum seekers' and refugees' access to essential support. In these ways, the government has created a patchwork of laws, policies, and practices that systematically close the space for asylum and refuge. Now, the EU's more active role and continued financial and technical support to Greece risks legitimizing these harms.

Impact: Migrants treated worse

Turn the harms. If it’s bad to mistreat migrants, then long term it gets worse after an AFF plan that provides funding to a government that is mistreating them. The Negative philosophy of telling the Greek government to fix it themselves is much better.

3. Human rights violations. Affirmative’s evidence and political agenda promote violation of human rights

 Link: Affirmative evidence claims illegal immigrants are entitled to your money to pay for things you don’t have.

Affirmative evidence from Carly Krakow in 2020 quotes the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights claiming they have a “right to the highest attainable standard of health.” And of course in context, that means they have a right to expect that the government must pay to provide them the highest attainable standard of health. Judge, if the government isn’t paying for you to have, at no expense, the highest attainable standard of health, then you are being told as a taxpayer to pay for illegal immigrants to have things that you do not have and are not entitled to. In addition to the unfairness, if you don’t pay, the government will ultimately send armed law enforcement with guns to collect the money from you in taxes to pay for these “rights” that they dreamed up involving other people’s claims on your money. That leads to the next…

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.

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

Big Fracture Link: Poorer EU countries are upset about paying for expansion of EU immigration programs

FAISAL AL YAFAI 2019 (Faisal al Yafai is an award-winning journalist and commentator) The EU’s new migration policy is a gift to the far-right 10 April 2019 <https://www.euractiv.com/section/justice-home-affairs/opinion/the-eus-new-migration-policy-is-a-gift-to-the-far-right/>

That will infuriate the eastern bloc, which sees migration as an issue of identity and sovereignty. For them, it is more straightforward: they do not want African and Middle Eastern migrants. They do not believe in the liberal values that offer refuge to such large numbers of them. Not only that, they feel that they, the poorer nations of the EU, are being forced to pay for the liberalism they do not espouse. And if Paris and Rome won’t take the migrants in, why should Budapest or Warsaw?

Analysis: Affirmative dilemma

If they try to beat this disadvantage by arguing their plan is just a tiny insignificant plan that won’t cost the EU very much, then you can vote Negative on topicality, since it’s not a substantial reform. But if the plan is a substantial reform, then they have to accept the consequences of the political backlash within the EU after their plan is enacted. In addition, if you accept the Negative’s Minor Repair of simply having the Greek government fund it instead of the EU, you completely avoid all of this.

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.