

Affirmative Speaker 2 (4 minute-speech; first points with evidence)

My partners and I stand firmly in support of the resolution that **it is the responsibility of countries to help with the Syrian Refugee Crisis.**

Our first point is that screening to accept refugees is extremely extensive, and that when accepting the refugees, money is not the problem.

This argument is supported by the following pieces of evidence:

1. Number one, according to Amy Pope from the official white house website, for refugees to be allowed into the US, each has to pass strict screening, which includes nine long steps, and usually takes 18 months to complete. Also, in 2015, Owen Daniels in the Huffington Post says that due to the intensive screening, “the US has resettled nearly 800,000 refugees since September 11, 2001, and only three have been arrested for activities related to terrorism.” The US is helping the Syrian refugees, while still protecting the inhabitants of our country. The 9 steps clearly pay off, due to how over the past 15 years, only a 4 one hundred thousandth of a percent of the refugees have been arrested because of terrorism.

2. Secondly, Owen Daniels, of the Huffington Post, and Sheila Kugel in the Jewish Journal both state that it is much more effective for terrorists to sneak into our country as a tourist as opposed to as a refugee. Additionally, terrorism that starts inside the country is more prevalent than the terrorism that comes in from the outside.

Two of the most recent attacks, in San Bernardino, California and in the nightclub in Orlando, Florida, along with several others, were perpetrated by US citizens. Therefore, today, homegrown terrorism is of much more concern than terrorism from the outside.

3. Lastly, according to Benjamin Studebaker, refugees only cost a very small fraction of many countries’ budget. In 2015, the US government budget was \$3.688 trillion, and the cost for taking in refugees was only \$40 million, making up only one ten thousandth of the American budget.

Saving thousands of lives is worth much more than that tiny fraction.

Our second main point is that the war in Syria is becoming more dangerous by the day, and if refugees are not taken into countries, they will be killed.

This argument can be supported with the following pieces of evidence:

1. First, since the war began, Claire Berlinski from Ricochet noted that, “More than 240,000 Syrians have been killed, including 12,000 children. A million more have been wounded or permanently disabled.”

With that many people dying every day, the world cannot stand idly by, but must help as much as possible. If we turn our backs on the refugees, and leave them in their home country, they will likely be killed by bombs, poison gas, and other horrible means.

2. Second, not many countries want to take in refugees because they think the refugees may overpopulate the country, and then they would not have enough resources for all of the citizens. In that same Ricochet article Berlinski writes that “Fewer than 2,200 Syrian refugees have been admitted to the U.S. since the war broke out in 2011.”

Even though the US has donated a substantial amount of money to the UNHCR to help refugee settlement in non-permanent camp within countries bordering Syria, refugees cannot survive long-term in these camps even with food and water. The refugees need actual homes, which can be granted through asylum.

3. To conclude, one of the biggest challenges for refugees is just escaping the country, and some people do not even come that far. Tonya Somanader states on the official white house website that “Since 2011, almost 12 million people, equivalent to half of the Syrian population, have been displaced by the conflict, including 7.6 million displaced inside Syria.”

About half of the citizens of Syria have had to run away from their country due to what Assad has done to them. If we do not step up and admit them into our country, or help them out with what we can, they will die. It is no longer a couple hundred thousand people fleeing the country, but it is now about half of the country's whole population.

Having presented our first 2 points and three pieces of evidence to prove that countries should be taking responsibility to help out the Syrian refugees, we submit that the judges should vote affirmative. Thank you.

Negative Speaker 2 (4 minute-speech; first points with evidence)

My partners and I stand firmly in support of the resolution: That **it should indeed not be the responsibility of other countries to help out more with the refugee crisis.**

Our first main point is, refugees have a negative impact on the economy of many countries. This argument can be supported with the following pieces of evidence: Every single Syrian refugee has an impact on the country that they're in. A study by the Confederation of Turkish Employers' Unions stated at least 300,000 Syrians have entered the Turkish labor market. Based on this, Syrians added 1 percent to the jobless rate. This piece of evidence is from a U.S News article titled "Syrian refugees boost the Turkish economy, but for how long?" dated April 7th 2016. It shouldn't be other countries responsibilities to take in more refugees when not only can their presence have a negative effect on the country they are ins economy and growth, but the refugees are not guaranteed to have a successful life, and could potentially increase the labor market. This worsens the unemployment rate which can lessen the chance of the people who are already jobless in that country to ever get a job, worsening the economy even further than before.

Additionally, in the end of things, Syrians' negative impact on the economy will be a lasting one. Stanley economist Ercan En Guzel wrote that the Syrian refugees impact on the economy will be negative in the coming period. "Barring a new migration wave in the long run, the Syrians' impact on growth will not be a durable one. It will even reverse if returns begin," he said estimating that Turkey's economic growth would downturn to 3% this year. This piece of evidence was also found from a U.S News article titled "Syrian refugees boost the Turkish economy, but for how long?" dated April 7th 2016. It shouldn't be the responsibility of other countries to take in Syrian refugees because it can and will worsen multiple countries' economies in terms of unemployment. In some countries like the U.S, unemployment is already something that we are struggling with. Letting in more refugees can worsen that problem, and this could be true in multiple different countries. And while Syrian refugee's impact on countries seems bad now, it will worsen countries economies even further.

Additionally, the mass amount of refugees entering Jordan has a negative impact on employment rate. Jordan hosts more than 630,000 Syrian refugees, on top of Iraqi and Palestinian ones. An ILO (International Labor Organization) study shows that unemployment has significantly increased in Jordan since Syrian refugees began to arrive in 2011. This piece of evidence is from a Brookings article titled "Why 100,000s of Syrian refugees are fleeing to Europe" dated September 3, 2015. Because of the increasing amounts of refugees and unemployment, making it a responsibility, and forcing countries to take in more refugees, would not be fair. It would ultimately weaken them in terms of their economy and unemployment rate, putting other people in more danger than before.

Our second main point is that when refugees come into countries, they are taking away important resources from the citizens who are already living there. For

example, Jordan is one of the driest countries in the world, and refugees are making a large negative impact on water usage. Quick population growth has caused the amount of fresh water available to the average Jordanian to lessen to less than 158 cubic meters per year, 10 times less than the average U.S. citizen consumes. This piece of evidence is from a Brookings article titled "Why 100,000s of Syrian refugees are fleeing to Europe" dated September 3, 2015. Water is an essential resource in human life. If it was a dry country's responsibility to take in refugees, then the amount of this resource would decline not only for the people already living there, but for the refugees coming in as well. Both would suffer, and a new crisis would be born.

Also, Germany, which took in over a million refugees last year, is struggling to meet the needs of all of the refugees they've let in. This piece of evidence was found from a USA today article titled "Germany strains under the weight of migrant crisis" dated October 29, 2016. Germany is feeling a lot of pressure since they have so many refugees and not enough resources for them. If countries were forced to take in refugees, then the resources in which they have in supply for the people of their own country would diminish, due to the immense amount of resources needed for refugees. This could end in both refugees and citizens alike being put into a situation that negatively impacts both groups of people.

Additionally, There are about 57,000 refugees in Greece right now, and Greece cannot provide for all of the refugees while still providing for their own citizens. "Boatloads of migrants arriving every day has triggered a "humanitarian crisis within the economic crisis," Greek Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras said after a meeting with ministers.... "The immigrant flow to Greece is beyond of what our state infrastructure can handle," he said. "We have significant problems to face and that's why we have asked help from EU." The country, stuck in a seven-year financial crisis, has returned to recession again and narrowly averted bankruptcy this year by agreeing a bailout deal." Greece has already been in a financial crisis, and the mass numbers of refugees are putting them further in a crisis, and they aren't even able to provide for those newcomers, let alone their own citizens. Countries shouldn't be forced to take in refugees when their own success and country's well being could be at risk.

Having presented our main 2 points and six pieces of evidence to prove that it should not be the responsibility of other countries to help out more with the refugee crisis, we submit that the judges should vote negative. Thank you.