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Introduction

Unbeknownst to Gary Johnson, Aleppo is a city where life has been reduced to rubble. The Syrian civil war has ravaged Syria, leading to a massive outpouring of refugees. Still, over 95% of the refugees are held within the borders of five countries. War crimes are committed, but most “civilized” countries refuse to house its victims because they fear damage to their wallets, culture, and national security. Few suggest that we should do nothing, but the spectrum of aid leaves much room for improvement. Five million Syrians have been externally displaced, but protests have broken out over the European Union’s decision to redistribute 160,000 refugees from one part of Europe to another. Some insist that the answer to the refugee crisis is to prevent these catastrophic events in the first place. Others insist that while refugees themselves mean no harm, we just currently do not have the capacity to accept that many immigrants. Divisive research by Seung-Whan Choi and Idean Salehyan proves that problems like terrorism often follow refugees. Besides, even with the best intentions, resettling refugees is no small task. The current count estimates 11 million people were displaced by the Syrian civil war. Host countries would be accepting a lot of risks unto themselves. Non-interventionist policies that work toward self-sufficiency in the Middle East seem like a much easier investment than resettlement. But while the horror stories of France are still fresh in our minds, I reject the notion that host countries are damaged by refugees.
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Never once in the history of any country has immigration been well-received. Yet, each time, these unwelcome occupants bring great assets to their new homes. Very few would argue against the benefits of diversity and immigration, but Islamophobia and poorly implemented assimilation programs have hardened the public’s heart towards resettlement. In this paper, I will argue that the long-term benefits of resettlement are well worth the short-term costs. The successes we have achieved with previous immigrant groups justify resettlement of these Syrian refugees. We have an unmatched opportunity to make the best of a humanitarian disaster both economically and politically. However, there are some that would argue that certain costs, like increased risk of terrorism and decreased national security, are unjustifiable. World leaders will undoubtedly push for the option that best mitigates damage. So before advocating for resettlement, I must first address non-interventionism. Monetary aid and investment in Middle-Eastern infrastructure may seem like the easiest option for host countries, unwilling to get their hands dirty, but a laissez-faire approach could create an even bigger mess. Anti-immigration policies do nothing to prevent terrorism and protect national security, but do everything to promote chaos in internally displaced populations, resulting in a need for an alternative solution. Developed nations may find it not only morally responsible but strategically wise to accept fleeing Middle-Eastern refugees, as long as there is a balance kept between assimilation and acceptance.

**The Argument Against Non-Interventionism**

Non-interventionism argues against the urgency of resettlement and advocates for the least-invasive actions to be taken. It stems from a deep concern that refugee resettlement will allow terrorists to penetrate host countries and will subvert the natural order of things. It
promotes self-sufficiency in the Middle East as a means to prevent the next catastrophe. To address the current crisis, non-interventionism focuses on monetary aid and enabling Syria’s neighbors to take a bigger role. These policies, while certainly logical, should be implemented going forward, but they ignore the true needs of current refugees out of misplaced fear. In this section, I will first examine noninterventionist policies and scrutinize their possible impact on the current situation. The policies of nonintervention, like the promotion of self-sufficiency and monetary aid, look nice on paper, but do little to temper the coming storm. Secondly, I will refute the association of Syrian refugees with terrorism and examine the motivations behind the increasing terror attacks in France, a major point of contention in the resettlement debate. Finally, I will explore the strategic benefits of accepting Syrian refugees for the sake of national security. The “vetting” of migrants already in place is more than satisfactory, but thinly veiled efforts to keep refugees out of the country will cause increased hostility and undermine goals of assimilation. If the policies are reasoning that fall under the non-interventionist umbrella can be condemned, then the alternative must be considered.

Nonintervention is No Longer a Practical Approach

Nonintervention advocates against resettlement but champions Middle-Eastern self-sufficiency. After all, resettling entails uncertain risks for host countries. At the very best, refugees will place an enormous burden on host countries requiring immediate housing, education, and food. At worst, they pose an enormous health risk. A paper featured in Conflict and Health describes how in Jordan, tuberculosis rates among displaced persons are quite high and greatly increase the chance of transmission. It seems wiser to minimize the risks to host
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countries, provide monetary aid, and help the Middle-Eastern region to become more self-sufficient. One passionate European Policy Centre commentary asserts that the European Union first and foremost needs to see the bigger picture, focusing on their relationships with third world countries and mobilizing resources⁵. Many potential host countries were involved in the destabilization of the Middle East. For example, writers like Clement Moore Henry assert that Western intervention in Iraq put a strategic target on the region⁶. Some books like All the Shah’s Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror by Stephen Kinzer cite the American coup in Iran as a major destabilizer of the Middle East⁷. Perhaps this is the chance to put an end to Western countries’ “white savior complex”; we should seek to support Syria’s neighbors and create a regional, reusable, network of aid.

However, Syria’s neighbors are already taking the reins on the refugee crisis - but we’re hardly supporting them. The five countries surrounding Syria (Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Egypt) hold 95% of the refugees. As mentioned previously, a mere plan to redistribute some of the refugees already in Europe has sparked massive outcry. In terms of monetary aid, the UN has only met 63% of its fundraising goal⁹. Some might argue that a lack of funding does not imply a failed strategy, but it does speak of the nature of global commitment to the Syrian Refugee Crisis. As an article in the Lancelet asserts, even with increased funding, aid isn’t enough¹⁰. Countries like Lebanon and Jordan initially offered refugees outstanding access to education and public health care, but due to overwhelming demand, they have repealed many of their programs in the interest of their own citizens. From an alternative perspective, in “Doing
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Harm by Doing Good?”, Reed Wood suggests that aid alone may encourage rebel violence and bring new harm to its recipients\textsuperscript{11}. Initially, this aid may seem low-risk, but long-term, it is effectively useless to those displaced by the rubble of Aleppo and may cause further challenges.

Ideally, a sustainable regional network of aid would be sufficient to manage this crisis, but right now, the direct involvement of developed countries is desperately needed. Sustainability is a noble goal, but third-world countries do not currently have the infrastructure to manage such a large humanitarian crisis. Rich, developed nations need to fulfil their obligations to take on refugees. Excluding Germany and Sweden, the EU has cumulatively pledged to host 0.7% of the refugees requiring resettlement\textsuperscript{14}. While Syria’s neighbors are doing more than their share, countries like Jordan and Lebanon do not have the infrastructure to permanently support five million refugees. On the other hand, “The Health of the Newest Americans: How U.S. Public Health Systems Can Support Refugees” details innovative ways for the United States to manage healthcare for incoming refugees and an already generous social welfare system in Europe has the ability to expand its coverage\textsuperscript{15}. At reasonably low risk to themselves, developed countries need to admit refugees or risk disrupting global stability. If Jordan and Lebanon crumble under the burden of these refugees, the Syrian refugee crisis’s effects would multiply. More governments would be destabilized, political unrest would grow, and more people would be displaced. This would harm the global economy and international relations and could also become a threat to national security, as I will later address. Global instability carries much greater risk than resettlement – as long as terrorism isn’t a deciding factor.
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Syrian Refugees Are Not Likely Terrorists

Choi and Salehyan conclude in “No Good Deed Goes Unpunished: Refugees, Terrorism, and Humanitarian Aid” that terrorism is more likely to occur in countries with refugees\textsuperscript{17}. Their research is very compelling, showing a practically undeniable correlation between refugees and terrorism. Therefore, resettlement is an unconvincing argument to those who would reject immigration on national security grounds. If terrorism increases and the host country is put in danger, a greater number of areas would require assistance, leading to both a major problem and a poor allocation of resources. In this case, mass resettlement would not be worth it. However, while their study shows that countries with many refugees are more likely to experience terrorism, this is a classic case of correlation, not causation. Choi and Salehyan themselves admit it is possible that “more populous countries simply tend to experience more terrorism (in absolute numbers) because they harbor more terrorists and provide more targets than small countries.” While this is just one possible explanation, it is a likely one, especially when coupled with other data showing the low likelihood of resettled refugees becoming a source of terrorism. In fact, refugees can provide their host countries with unique valuable intel, as occurred recently in Leipzig, Germany. A major terrorist attack was averted when a group of refugees nabbed and held a would-be terrorist in their homes and called the authorities\textsuperscript{18}. Immigrants, as a whole, are grateful for a new start and want to keep their new home safe.

The extensive vetting process currently in place practically eliminates the chance of extremist refugees entering the United States. Refugees are thoroughly screened by the U.N. High Commission for Refugees National Counterterrorism Center, the FBI’s Terrorist Screening
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Center, and the Departments of State, Defense and Homeland Security. The process takes 18-24 months, requires biometrics, interviews, and background checks – yet it still turns most refugees away. No system is bulletproof, so of course some miscreants will slip through, but that is a statistical inevitability. According to the Migration Policy Institute, out of 784,000 refugees resettled in the United States since 9/11, only three resettled refugees have been arrested for planning terrorist activities. We regularly endure levels of uncertainty much higher than that. We drive cars even though there’s a high chance of accident and go outside even when there’s a good chance of catching a cold. Readily, we accept a small amount of risk for a necessary cause and there is no better cause than resettlement.

Danger arises when harsh vetting policies are being called for not to improve the process, but to reject refugees – especially on the basis of religion. A study by the PEW research center shows that a majority of people in European countries believe both that refugees pose an increased risk of terrorism and that the Muslims already in their countries are prone to extremism. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, from 1980-2005, Islamic extremists only carried out 6% of terrorist attacks on U.S. soil as compared to 42% from Latinos and 24% from extreme left wing groups. If the concern is not that these refugees are religious moderates but that they are radicals following the teachings of ISIS, a new AP investigation shows that 70% of ISIS recruits have no more than a basic knowledge of Islam. To blame Islam for terrorists is to blame Christianity for Jeffrey Dahmer.
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Unfortunately, that still leaves one elephant in the room. If Islamic migrants pose no additional risk of terrorism, why has France experienced so much radical Islamic terrorism? A quick look at the terror attacks of France reveals 11 attacks since 2015\textsuperscript{25}. ISIS is clearly able to influence a vast amount of French Muslims. Inevitably, religion is at the root of the problem, but not in the way you might expect. Ryan Shaffer in his article, "Jihad and Counter-Jihad in Europe: Islamic Radicals, Right-Wing Extremists, and Counter-Terrorism Responses," suggests that France’s extreme-counter terrorism and anti-Islamic policies have inadvertently contributed to radicalization\textsuperscript{26}. France has had historic difficulty managing religious groups. While freedom of religion is woven into the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, separation of church and state is also a foundational French value. Increasing secularism led to the ban of crosses and hijabs in public schools, as well as any other conspicuous displays of politics or religion\textsuperscript{27}. Recently, Cannes instituted a burkini ban that has garnered international outrage. Dr. Farish Noor, a scholar at Nanyang Technological Institute, argues that the burkini ban violates not only individual rights but triggers dark memories of colonialism and cultural oppression\textsuperscript{28}. By forcing Muslims to abandon any sense of their religious and cultural identity, it makes it harder for them to adopt the identity of their host country and more likely to act in retaliation. With its Islamophobic policies, France has forced its Muslim residents to choose between France and Islam, and while most remain dutiful French citizens, a small but vocal minority have retaliated in a disproportionately violent way. This is not particularly condemning evidence against refugees, but it does emphasize a need for delicate assimilation.
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Accepting Refugees in the Interest of National Security

Thomas Mockaitis highlights the importance of winning hearts and minds to the American military strategy in his article, “Winning Hearts and Minds in the ‘War on Terrorism’”\(^\text{29}\). When our enemies are mostly angry young insurgents, brewing fondness for the West is viable and valuable military goal. Mockaitis outlines the difficulties of identifying and gathering the support of influential populations, even with extensive campaigns. Host countries have the perfect opportunity to curb future terrorism from washing up on their shores. The best strategy to garner real support for the West is not donating books or building wells, but by providing permanent aid to a people in desperate need. This is also a way the strategy of resettlement can complement the strategy of prevention. Settling an internally displaced population improves the state of international relations all around.

Few scholars are completely against resettlement, but are genuinely concerned that host countries do not have the resources to manage such a massive migration. They worry that attempting to do so could jeopardize domestic policy. It’s hard to create concrete economic projections proving that Syrian migrants will not deplete host countries in any way. Host countries may initially struggle to integrate refugees into the labor force and their communities. However, the central benefit that resettlement provides to host countries is global stability. Currently, the bulk of Syrian refugees are hosted by Egypt, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq and Jordan. Refugees amount to 10% of Lebanon’s population, and 5% of Jordan’s\(^\text{30}\). Developed countries may struggle a little to provide for refugees, but these small Middle-Eastern countries would have much more difficulty, which becomes an international problem. Choi and Salehyan also
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assert that strong states are well-equipped to settle refugees, but weak states pose a major risk because they are unable to provide security and stability.\textsuperscript{31} If developed countries allow countries like Jordan, a country with a GDP of 42.3 billion\textsuperscript{32}, to shoulder the refugee burden, they are setting themselves up for failure. Since the monetary need is unmet, those five countries are receiving just 70 cents a day to resettle these refugees.\textsuperscript{33} If these states abandon their commitments to refugees, they risk hordes of angry, desperate people within their borders.

According to scholars, Choi and Piazza, internally displaced populations are at a much higher risk for terrorism.\textsuperscript{34} Currently, the situation in Jordan, according to a European University Institute policy brief, could best be described as unsustainable.\textsuperscript{35} While Jordan was initially lauded for its humanitarian efforts in accepting refugees, Jordanians have become hostile as they’ve noticed housing costs and job competition increase as a result of the large Syrian presence. Jordan has managed to cut costs by cutting refugee benefits (as previously mentioned), but this is hardly a cold-hearted decision considering the position better-endowed countries have put them in. If developed countries are truly as concerned about terrorism as they claim, resettlement is a small price to pay in the way of national security. Terrorism is no longer local: insurgents brewing hatred of the West in the Middle East is just as much America and Europe’s problem as was ISIS and Al-Qaeda. America has thus far spent $1.7 trillion in the War on Terror, so a resettlement-based hearts and minds operation is definitely worth considering.\textsuperscript{36}
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The Argument for Resettlement

Resettlement is an imperfect solution that paves the way for self-sufficiency and prevention in the future. Right now, five million people need a permanent home. Host countries have the opportunity to welcome refugees not as visitors, but as citizens. This paper will first argue that Syrian refugees have the potential to grow their host countries’ economies as high-capital immigrants and will weigh the benefits of resettlement, even presuming that Syrian refugees will generate economic difficulties during the transition period. Secondly, I will apply the classic argument for immigration to the mass migration of Syrian refugees with highly-conservative societal values. Here, I will grapple with unsuccessful assimilation programs in Europe and advocate for a multicultural integration. Finally, I will discuss the political benefits of naturalization for the sake of international relations. An arbitrary closed-borders policy will be ineffective at keeping five million people out. Naturalization and resettlement provides a way for host countries to control the influx of migrants to their advantage.

Host Countries Are Well-Equipped to Accept Both High and Low Human Capital

From an economic standpoint, mass resettlement has the potential to expedite growth in prosperous nations. The Journal of Economic Perspectives states, “If immigrants have little human capital, their impact is akin to that of faster population growth in slowing per capita growth. If immigrant human capital levels are higher than natives' by a sufficient amount, growth will be speeded up”37. Some may see this as a strong argument against resettlement. However, Syria is not only losing its poor and it’s uneducated – it’s losing everybody. Resettlement could spell disaster for host countries ill-equipped to handle it, but could bring further growth to
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already on a prosperous tract. The migrants that have traversed the European continent by foot
definitely have the necessary ambition to thrive in local economies. Those determined enough to
walk for thousands of miles are the kind of workers we want in our businesses and the kind of
citizens we want in our countries. Refaai Hamo, a Syrian refugee and scientist, reported not only
the devastation of losing his wife, but devastation of being refused work at a university that
teaches with his book.\textsuperscript{38} Hamo was profiled by \textit{Humans of New York} and was eventually invited
to the last State of the Union dinner by President Obama. He is quoted in USA Today saying, “I
am so proud and honored to be in this country and look forward to one day becoming an
American citizen so that we can be part of making America a strong and great country”\textsuperscript{39}. Hamdi
Ulukaya, founder and owner of Chobani yogurt, is offering massive employment plans to
incoming Syrian refugees, helping them to train and prepare for the job force\textsuperscript{40}. A Turkish
refugee himself, Mr. Ulukaya is well-aware of the obstacles facing refugees looking to settle in
this country. Unfortunately, he is facing protests from consumers threatening to boycott his
product, while conspiracy theorists insist that he is trying to turn the country Muslim. We cannot
allow those who perpetrate such falsities to determine our immigration policies. Developed
countries have so much to gain from accepting these high human capital refugees.

The world is better off when great minds are cultivated. The Middle East is facing one of
their greatest brain drains and American universities are already preparing for the flow.
Dartmouth College for instance, has opened up a scholarship for migrating Syrian refugees\textsuperscript{42}. In
this mass migration, Syria has lost its next generation of doctors, lawyers, businessmen and
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scientists. Resettlement and education are the best way to handle this brain drain, regardless of the refugees’ eventual residency. If Syrian refugees are one day able to leave, they will be better prepared to mend Syria and help it to stand on its own. Our investment will contribute to global stability and improved international relations. If they stay in their host countries, they will become productive new citizens that pay taxes, stimulate growth, and create new ideas. America is no stranger to this concept, but Europe has historically had difficulty attracting skilled labor, though not for lack of effort\textsuperscript{43}. For Europe, Syrian refugee crisis presents an unprecedented opportunity.

Unfortunately, not everyone agrees with this logic. For instance, some scholars agree with Friedburg and Hunt, but they feel that immigrants do not have enough high human capital to offer. After all, the majority of immigrants will need job training and language classes. According to "The Economic Impact of Syrian Refugees on Host Countries: Quasi-experimental Evidence from Turkey", accepting refugees will prompt moderate losses in low-level employment and will cause slight increases in rent housing units\textsuperscript{44}. While the author does not view his predictions as concrete, at the very least, mass resettlement could be expensive in the short run. But even if this mass migration indeed proves costly for developing countries, it would be better for those citizens to pay a little more in taxes than for markets to crash because of failing states. If nothing else, the migration equation should always be balanced against the cost of a failing state. This is an overwhelming amount of migrants, but are they really better off clustered in Jordan, Lebanon, and Egypt? We accept far more economic danger by choosing global instability, as I addressed earlier in this paper. Instability puts emerging stock markets in
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jeopardy; an increased risk of terrorism by poorly managed internally displaced populations takes a huge chunk out of developed nations’ defense budgets.

*The Same Argument for Immigration Applies to Syrian Refugees*

To the critics’ credit, however, not every refugee is as ready to integrate as Hamo or Ulukaya. These immigrants are coming from an extremely oppressive regimes and a strictly conservative culture, so we cannot expect immediate assimilation. Europe has struggled with this dynamic more than anywhere else. Germany has charitably accepted many refugees, but cultural disputes about gender separation in public areas have led to women being forced out of public transportation and swimming pools. France has issues ranging from spikes in terror to highly secluded Muslim communities. A paper from the Pew Research Center suggests that an overwhelming majority of European countries are unhappy with the way the European Union has managed the refugee crisis, going as far as to cite that mismanagement as a major motivator of Brexit\(^45\). Is it inevitable for host countries to experience this level of tension in their communities? And if so, is resettlement worth it?

The answer to both questions is yes. Syrian refugees are coming from a vastly different culture and will have inherently different values than their host countries. The two cannot live in synchronicity unless there is compromise. Earlier in this paper, I discussed the importance of multiculturalism to successful assimilation in France. Neither culture can swallow the other, as it is in Germany where hyper-conservative Islam dominates Germany’s liberal values or as it is in France, where obsessive separation of church and state limits inclusiveness by banning religious garb in public. America is known for its success with immigrants, but it is not without its
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intolerant history. Great stains on America’s record include the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, Anti-Semitic movements, and Japanese internment camps. All of these seemed like necessary measures to protect the well-being of citizens from outsiders, but they are now looked upon with great shame as immigrants are now known for flooding America with Nobel Prizes. The key to successful assimilation is patience and education, but the catalyst that seems to best improve the lot of both the refugees and the host country is education, as examined by Jonathan Sampson in his studies of refugee success in Australian youths.

Our rapid 24/7 news cycles are unable to portray the generational change that applies to any immigrant integration. Assimilation is unlikely to reach its peak until the second generation as Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation by Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut addresses. While second-generation immigrants also struggle with cultural identity, they are better guaranteed roots in their host countries. These second-generation Syrians could also boost the dangerously low fertility rate in many European countries, a major economic concern according to David Bloom’s paper, “The Cost of Low Fertility in Europe.” Wealthy countries have been introducing exorbitant programs to get their citizens to give birth.

Meanwhile, this refugee crisis is an opportunity for repopulation and literal diversification of the tax base. In an increasingly diverse world, bloodlines are mixed and skin tones are varied. The defining parameters of heritage can no longer rely on heredity. Immigrants may begin as outsiders and cluster in a culturally similar community, but they eventually contribute great
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labor, culture, ideas, and children to their host country. Unless we insist on a tyrannical cultural purity, Syrian refugees like any other immigrant group will be happy to add their contributions.

Still, some might argue that these Syrian refugees aren’t willing immigrants and are therefore guaranteed to be resistant to assimilation efforts. At no point did they specifically declare allegiance to their host country. After all, they didn’t make the choice start a new life. They were forced out due to disastrous circumstances, such as the implosion of one of their major cities. Concerns about motivations are reasonably, but let us not forget the motivations of past immigrants. After all, few immigrants traverse an ocean out of sheer curiosity. Catalysts for past emigrations were disastrous events like the Irish Potato Famine and the Holocaust. Syrian refugees are also resettling out of need and that need is very urgent. It is better to begin the process now than to breed hostility against the West for turning away millions even after the right to political asylum was so carefully cemented by the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, and the United States Refugee Act of 1980\(^5\). To reject resettlement is a direct repudiation of both cornerstone values and legal policy.

Refugees are an Advantage in a Globalized World

Beyond assimilation, I argue for naturalization. If we want migrants to feel true allegiance to their host countries, we should make them a permanent fixture. Restoring to them the full rights of a citizen can restore not only their dignity, but ensure their loyalty. A lot of the complaints regarding refugee resettlement (lack of record keeping, ties with criminal organizations, health concerns) are actually concerns that apply to illegal immigration. Although
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I must note that concerns about illegal immigration are probably overblown. According to the American Immigration Council, during 1990 and 2013, the immigrant population grew 5%, the number of illegal immigrants tripled, but violent crime declined by 48%. However, I must admit that this also could be a cause of correlation, not causation.

Syrian refugees are far from criminals, but in places like the Greece, they are being criminalized. 12,000 are held in Nazi-like detention camps in Greece for the great crime of fleeing war. They are not terrorists or illegal immigrants, but an unhealthy obsession with bulletproof vetting and harsh naturalization policies could push needy people toward that direction. Emma Stewart and Gareth Mulvey’s research suggests that restrictive asylum policies both negatively impact upon refugees and their integration and serve to elevate fear and uncertainty. These people are fleeing airstrikes by their own cities only to be buried in either detention camps and mountains of paperwork. The naturalization process, even after vetting, is nearly impossible. In America, you are required to reside here for at least 5 years, submit another round of biometrics, take an interview, be proficient in English and pass a civics exam. It’s several forms and often several years in the making. Refugees are willingly subjecting themselves to registration and the vigorous vetting process demanded by the UNCHR. If we still refuse to let them in, can they be blamed for entering illegally? After all, when discussing the displacement of 11 million people, it’s naïve to believe that you will be able to keep them all out. Countless papers including "Does border enforcement protect US workers from illegal immigration?", conclude that border enforcement has a minimal effect on illegal immigration.
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Naturalization offers us a civil way to manage this influx of people in a way that closed borders will never be able to. The case study on the effect of Syrian refugees on Jordanian tuberculosis I presented earlier shows that active screening combined with sustainable funding can greatly reduce the risk of transmission\textsuperscript{58}. With resettlement, developed countries can get ahead of health and security risks. By legally welcoming refugees, host countries can rigorously vet refugees, vaccinate them, and draw power away the criminal organizations that could take advantage of them.

Naturalization also presents an opportunity to gain global influence. Taking point on the Syrian refugee crisis would show both foresight and leadership. It is a well-known fact that the Western World does not get along with Islamic countries. Previously, I briefly addressed some of America’s uncomfortable military interventions. The United Nations, the beacon for global cooperation, fails to seat even a single Islamic country on its security council, even though 23.2\% of the world’s population are Muslim. Muslims are an important demographic, they are predicted to be the world’s fastest growing religious group by the Pew Research Center, and are expected to overtake the Christian population by 2050.\textsuperscript{59} Resettling refugees could serve as a bridge across the hostility that has been festering over the course of many wars and coups. International relations pave the way not only for economic success, but as articles like “Beyond Bin Laden: Reshaping U.S. Foreign Policy” assert, international cooperation is essential to effectively combating terrorism\textsuperscript{60}. In the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, we struggle with challenges that reach
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across borders like climate change and terrorism. We need to be able to effectively communicate with one-fourth of the population.

**Conclusion**

The Syrian Refugee crisis is one we cannot avoid. Our solution must be well-considered, but effective immediately. Self-sufficiency is a noble goal, but without physically taking our share of the refugees, we are decreasing the chance that Middle-Eastern countries will one day be able to manage a crisis like this by themselves. It’s admittedly difficult to agree to resettlement with the risk of the Jordanian and Lebanese burden becoming our own. However, the global instability created by dumping five million refugees on states without the ability to manage them is a much worse price to pay. The basis for developed countries to accept refugees is that they have the resources to integrate the Syrian refugees into their ecosystem. The transition period before assimilation is not without difficulty, but developed countries have economies that can bounce back. Over the long-term, resettling Syrian refugees has the potential to bring in new tax revenue, new talent, and an expanded tax base.

For developed countries, accepting refugees is both the moral and strategic choice. Even France recently renewed their commitment to refugee resettlement after losing so many to terror attacks\(^1\). Amidst all of their religious tensions, they are reluctant to ignore the importance of providing refugees with a place to go. Accepting a large group of people into our closed societies is not without risk, but allowing refugees to make up one-tenth of Lebanon’s population is not an option. Any national security preserved by locking out needy families in fear of terrorism is undermined by threats of global instability and the likelihood that in our inaction we are
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cultivating the next generation of insurgents. Resettlement is by no means a perfect solution, but that doesn’t mean it isn’t our best solution.
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