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Resettlement of Syrian refugees is the most pressing foreign policy challenge of our time. As of February 2016, the Syrian Civil War had led to a death toll of 470,000, with 6.1 million internally displaced people and 4.8 million seeking refuge abroad (HRW 2016). Speedy and coordinated resettlement of Syrian refugees is pressing for three reasons. Firstly, the magnitude of human lives threatened by this conflict and the resulting exodus of refugees demand tremendous international humanitarian support. Secondly, the largest refugee-hosting countries are developing countries with few economic resources to effectively handle the influx of refugees. The continued pressure on developing countries around Syria will destabilize the region further and lead to more conflicts. Thirdly, rising right-wing xenophobic rhetoric from the West against refugee resettlement strengthens ISIS’s narrative of an evil West, leading to exacerbated domestic security threats.

The spread and intensification of the war has led to a dire humanitarian crisis. In November 2015, 13.5 million Syrians needed humanitarian aid, and almost 400,000 lived in besieged regions (Kerwin 2016). Many Syrians civilians are killed in crossfire between government and rebel forces. Remote bombings by the West also contribute to the death toll through collateral damage. Furthermore, ISIS soldiers regularly ransack villages and kill innocent civilians who oppose their reign. With a death toll of 500,000 directly from the war, and many more dying on their way fleeing the country, this humanitarian crisis is unrivaled in its human cost in recent history. As a result, it requires large-scale international cooperation to resettle Syrians fleeing the conflict and minimize the loss of human lives.

Developing countries around Syria have so far shouldered most of the burdens of resettling refugees, a situation that hinders effective humanitarian aid and poses additional security threats to a region with weak security measures. While Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq,
and Egypt have absorbed more than 4.5 million Syrian refugees, other countries around the world have offered to resettle less than 200,000 (Pan 2016). This can be problematic because these countries lack financial and institutional resources to adequately settle refugees and integrate refugees into their economy. Most of refugees in these countries live, at best, in a kind of holding pattern and, at worst, in survival mode (Kerwin 2016). Furthermore, the influx of Syrians can destabilize the region, which already struggles with weak security measures and infiltration of terrorist groups.

Various politicians in the West saw the large-scale migration and increasing terrorist attacks as an opportunity to gain influence, but their anti-Muslim rhetoric only exacerbates threats to domestic security. ISIS has incorporated footage of drowning and mistreated refugees into its propaganda to demonstrate that it is the true protector of the global Sunni Muslim community (Daniels 2015). This ISIS strategy has radicalized many marginalized youths in migrant communities in Europe. An international effort to welcome refugees can alleviate the PR damage of hateful speech by right-wing leaders and counter ISIS narratives for recruitment.

Global terrorism, with ISIS being the deadliest terrorist group, is another top foreign policy concern that may rival the urgency and significance of refugee resettlement. However, global terrorism is eclipsed by the strategic importance of refugee resettlement for two reasons. Firstly, it has led to comparatively low threats to human lives. Between 2002 and 2015, around 33,000 people died at the hands of ISIS and other organizations loyal to it (Glum 2016). ISIS-linked casualties are insignificant compared to 500,000 killed in the civil war. Secondly, the rise of ISIS can be largely attributed to the inadequate response to the Syrian refugee crisis, therefore making refugee resettlement an instrumental strategy to curb terrorism. ISIS propagandized the Western hostility toward Muslim refugees and has gained significant recruits from marginalized
Muslim communities in the West. Effective refugee resettlement will limit ISIS’s recruitment capability, and therefore greatly ameliorate security threats posed by ISIS.

The US should adopt a liberalist strategy in dealing with refugee resettlement through strengthening international institutions and global economy. Its priority should be revamping the current international institutions dealing with refugee crisis in three ways. Firstly, the UN with US leadership should dramatically increase support to refugee-hosting countries. Secondly, the private sector in the US and the World Bank should invest in or lend money to refugee-hosting countries to generate employment opportunities and promote integration of refugees into host country economies. Thirdly, the US should expand resettlement and pressure its economically developed allies into doing the same through UN treaties.

Increasing financial and technical support for major refugee-hosting countries will greatly improve the living condition of many refugees, most of whom reside in developing countries with poor accommodations. The UN should coordinate a global effort with American leadership to fundraise aggressively for an international refugee fund. It should train and dispatch experts to these countries to advise medical care and education program development. The UN should set measurable goals in these countries and ensure accountability in meeting those goals, which can include refugee income level and access to education (Albright 2016). Clearly-outlined objectives and more robust global cooperation help ensure that expanded support sent to these countries can be efficiently and effectively used.

The private sector in the US and worldwide should help generate business and employment opportunities in these developing countries with generous investment and relaxed interest rates. The increasingly globalized economy links every country closer than ever (Gov 5 lecture, 4/28). A weak economy in the Middle East limits potential growth for countries
elsewhere. By investing heavily in refugee-hosting countries, especially those in the Middle East, we would not only alleviate the migrant crisis through economic integration, but also open potential markets that can bring long term economic benefits.

The US must lead by examples by resettling more refugees and helping ease the burden of countries currently carrying a disproportionate responsibility. We should set up treaties with other countries, especially our wealthy allies, that demand a more balanced sharing of resettlement responsibility during refugee crises. Founded by immigrants, the US has very established institutions to help refugees assimilate and thrive. In 2015, 88 percent of refugees the US resettled enrolled in an employment program and were employed; and in 2009-2011, refugee men above the age of 16 were more likely to be working than their U.S.-born counterparts (Albright 2016). The US has the capacity to take in more Syrian refugees. We should also share our integration programming with other hosting countries, so that refugees everywhere can quickly move from aid dependency to economic contribution.

A realist approach would entail disengagement and rely on states making self-interested decisions to solve the refugee crisis. The US under a realist strategy would abandon resettlement because it sees refugees as security threats and holds a very insignificant economic stake in Syria. Even if countries including the US consider international image and long-term stability in the Middle East as its core interests, their humanitarian efforts would be ineffective due to a lack of coordination. Institutionalism offers issue linkage to expand the base of stakeholders in this crisis, and helps coordinate humanitarian aids to maximize their effectiveness and efficiency (Gov 5 lecture, 4/26). Security concerns will be ameliorated through our geographical remoteness, technological advantage (Gov 5 lecture, 4/10), and a comprehensive security screening process (Miliband 2016).
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