

Prof. Falcis

English 1 - 72076

11/25/2020

Global Migration Crisis Response Strategy

Taking into consideration the many millions of lives affected on a multinational level reaching past the political boundaries of any one country, the refugee crisis must be treated as the international human rights crisis it is instead of any country's political one. Although some feel this a political issue isolated to the countries refugees flee, it seems apparent to those who see the bigger picture, the only course of action is to treat this as an international crisis with state actors providing the U.N. the appropriate power and resources necessary to *mediate, manage, and facilitate* the entire migration process. The UNHCR (UN Refugee Agency) already maintains the proper infrastructure of manpower and know how necessary to execute and deliver this strategy with flawless efficacy. Member countries of the U.N. must recognize the vital importance of setting aside debate on, and attempted flight from, sharing responsibilities and burdens in effectively prescribing treatment to the global migration crisis affecting close to 80 million refugees or 1% of the population world-wide (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). We cannot allow countries to subscribe to delusions of reaching any *lasting* success battling the crisis through *limited* political actions that do not reach beyond their own sphere of influence. To move towards building a more *permanent* solution, member countries of the U.N., especially countries affected, must collectively empower the UNHCR with the necessary financial and political capital necessary to transform from the current supporting role into actively overseeing the entire diplomatic response. Understandably, the first major hurdle to cross will be finding the

immense resources required to implement this strategy and the other will be overcoming charges of “Globalism” from member states fearing this a step towards the erosion of their sovereignty. Through the works of Eoin Colfer and Andrew Donkin in *Illegal* and Valeria Luiselli in *Tell Me How It Ends: An Essay In Forty Questions* we intimately learn the underlying reasons as to why people would choose to illegally immigrate despite the dangers faced on the “journey”. From this analysis the necessity of a large-scale response led by the U.N. but in concert with those parties affected will become increasingly apparent.

There is no way one country can address an international crisis that affects so many beyond its scope of authority. Stop-

want to recruit minors, they carry out extortion, kidnapping, sexually abusing girls,” says Francesca Fontanini, spokesperson for the UNHCR in the Americas (Grillo). Simply, the only way to properly address an international issue is with an international response and no other organization in the world is better prepared to administer that response than the UNHCR. We must advocate the state actors involved in migration crises to acquiesce to a U.N. led response to the various international humanitarian crisis’ affecting millions world-wide in many different nations currently with no solution or end in sight.

The U.N. should be used to create measures cohesively agreed upon and strategically coordinated by member states to be made immediately applicable and deployed to the source country(s) of each humanitarian migration crisis. A diplomatic response led by affected countries together in choir with representatives of the recent dislocated populations carefully choreographed and executed by the U.N. on their behalf, but with their support, seems the optimal path to permanently solving migration crisis’ worldwide. Currently, the UNHCR ideally works to protect the rights and liberties of these displaced refugees however lacks the diplomatic assignment of power required to effectively implement this strategy. The UNHCR has been around since 1950 and currently employs 17,324 personnel in 135 countries worldwide with an annual budget of \$8.6 billion as of 2019 clearly representing the type of infrastructure necessary to viably carry out the prescribed remedy (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). Lack of unity and bipartisanship in creating suitable action plans the core resistance reported to withhold the progress of the UNHCR, “The absence of binding obligations on States to share the costs and consequences associated with the provision of asylum is widely recognized as a significant weakness in the international refugee protection regime. Whereas the

principle of burden- and responsibility-sharing has met with broad acceptance, it has not yet been matched by international practice”(United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). Words and good intentions alone, absent any mutually agreed upon diplomatic action, leave many poor refugees like Ebo in *Illegal* to take matters in their own hands via *illegal immigration*, despite the many explicit dangers involved (Colfer & Donkin). While member states remain with locked horns over how to handle the migration crisis a political minefield surrounds the refugees leaving many stuck in *legal limbo* like Wasil and other refugees from the “Jungle” waiting for their asylum applications to be reviewed (Collins). Only through U.N. member states cooperating and exercising their authority to delegate the powers necessary to the UNHCR to spearhead an international response appropriate to the size of the crisis’ will we see a long-term effect.

Many countries would likely want to know where the money comes from to establish and maintain such a bold international diplomatic policy. Other countries would misguidedly cite “Globalism” and encroachment on individual sovereignty as the real reason policymakers are proposing this resolution. “These have generated considerable debate about how the costs and broader impact of refugees on host communities could be assessed, taking into account the many variables that typically characterize refugee situations” (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). Opposition to migration crisis relief measures have made interpretation of who qualifies as “refugee status” strictly bound to proven religious and government persecution not allowing for any other exceptions such as gang or cartel violence,

non-profits such as ICARE have had to mobilize coordinated efforts to provide “relief” to largely failing immigration policies world-wide directly leaving many refugees abandoned and dislocated (Luiselli 40). If you don’t have to erect and maintain detention centers for refugees in Europe or the U.S, you could take that money and in turn put it into a large pool of resources to be further expanded upon by nonprofits and the UN alike. From these economic budget maneuvers and nonprofit partnerships coupled with the immense reduction in immigration enforcement’s necessary overhead, we clearly start to see the funding necessary emerge. Policy makers need to work in a spirit of “cooperation” to form internationally recognized diplomatic action plans to fully engage and support these displaced populations enduring a humanitarian crisis. If all diplomatic efforts are exhausted without avail, there exists soft power reserved and routinely exercised by the 5 permanent U.N. members (China, France, Russia, the United

Commissioner for Refugees). Life dangers refugees are met with during the “journey” sometimes worse than the reasons they originally left as seen in the works of Luiselli and Colfer/Donklin. Only by reimagining the process to include the U.N., representatives of the refugee’s and the countries affected in concert coupled with strategically changing the *locations* we establish to “host” the crisis to be geographically closer to the source, will we find a *permanent* solution. I certainly believe if we separated the responsibilities of traditional immigration and *forced* migration between state actors and the U.N., we could stop the problem in its tracks. For example, for the traditional immigration one would follow and adhere strictly to

thousands of lives if not more. This process would appeal to both sides of the table gaining wide-spread bipartisan effort because it appeals to everyone's interest by first taking care of the refugees needs as humans (youth and disadvantaged first of course), but also by removing the countless problems that arise from the "journey".

In closing, we can now vividly see the crisis' affecting the refugees worldwide is not solvable by any one country acting alone through limited political measures but a global humanitarian crisis affecting millions of people requiring an equal international response. We understand the strongest opposition to its realization will be meeting the resources needed and acquiring enough diplomatic agreement to assign enough power to the UNHCR to upgrade its role to hands-on management. We also now know how we can overcome those challenges through budget maneuvers and the incredible savings this brings the host countries coupled promoting a spirit of cooperation to form cohesive strategy to be implemented by the U.N., on their behalf. The dangers that Colfer and Donkin's Ebo, the children in *Tell Me How It Ends*, and Wasil in *Europe's Child- Refugee Crisis* face on the "journey" paint a dark and dismal picture of a journey filled with tragedy, grief, and sacrifice in an effort to hopefully reach what they can only dream to be a better life. Sadly, after so much pain and loss intertwining each of the journey's here the children are still met with unacceptance and unwelcome tones reverberated through their entire asylum/immigration process. Now we know that this whole migration process can be reimagined to combat the crisis head on with the U.N. hosting the event near the epicenter of the problem making such a "journey" needless. This strategy, implemented globally, would eventually work to completely end mass migration issues world-wide *permanently* and provide a consistent, equal, fair, and thorough process to *uplift, empower, and protect* those refugees in need. Imagine how hard human traffickers, gangsters, and drug cartels

that is pushing many to leave the Northern Triangle of Central America” as well as the arguments on the other side trying to push back on these refugees. It briefly touches on why

support my argument for a globalist strategy to solve the crisis as well as to illustrate the counter arguments to using such an agency to execute migration strategy.