The Rise and Fall of US Diplomacy on Refugees and Migrants:
Inside Recent History

Remarks by Anne C. Richard at Kaldor Centre Conference 2018

Thank you for the warm welcome. I am so happy to be in Australia! It is my first time here, although I've met and worked with and learned from many smart and caring Australians over the years.

Before launching into my remarks, I would like to thank several people. The invitation to speak today came from the much-respected Guy Goodwin-Gill: it is wonderful to come to Sydney to see him and Kaldor Centre Director Jane McAdam on their home turf. Of course, without the Kaldors there would be no Kaldor Centre to issue an invitation and celebrate a fifth anniversary, so thank you to Renata and Andrew. Frances Voon, Kelly Newell and Lauren Martin helped in myriad ways to ensure I was able to accept the invitation, get here and talk to some journalists in advance; thanks also to The Ian Potter Foundation for its support of my visit. Finally, I believe the idea for the theme for this conference came from a discussion with Claire Higgins at Georgetown University. Thank you, Claire; you make a splendid and informative citizen-diplomat abroad for Australia.

I'm also very pleased to see some of the Australians who were leaders on humanitarian issues in Geneva, like Erika Feller and John Quinn.

I do need to offer an apology to Lauren Martin. She asked for an advance copy of the speech and I kept assuring her she'd have it soon, even as I raved about my visit to the Sydney Opera House, shared photos from the top of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, and shook the Bondi beach sand out of my bathing suit! But this keynote <u>is</u> my top priority during this visit to Australia, so, without further delay, let me commence by saying:

This is an odd time in the United States.

I realize this is stating the obvious, but for those of us who work on refugee and migration issues, the world as we know it has completely changed. Aiding the world's refugees was a priority in the Obama Administration, particularly in response to record-setting levels of displacement around the world. The pro-refugee policies of the Obama Administration have come under attack by Donald Trump – first during his campaign for the Presidency and, coming up on two years now, during President Trump's Administration. So, I'd like to share with you a summary of what we did, and tried to do, to help refugees in the Obama Administration and

then discuss what has happened with President Trump. And, with you, I'd like to consider the role Australia and other leading nations play in all of this.

Barack Obama Administration

As a starting point, let me note that for decades in the United States we've had bipartisan support for helping refugees. Certainly within the Obama Administration, and throughout the foreign policy and national security team, there was strong support for doing more for refugees.

Early on, my predecessor Eric Schwartz, today the head of Refugees International, took steps to upgrade the US refugee resettlement program and put it on a sounder financial footing, so it could better weather changes like those spawned by the economic downturn in 2008 and increases in the cost of housing. In 2011, leaders in the Administration responded to the FBI's arrest on terrorism charges of two Iraqi refugee plotters in Bowling Green, Kentucky, by temporarily suspending the flow of refugees from Baghdad and undertaking a thorough scrub of the refugee vetting process. White House officials held frequent meetings with law enforcement, intelligence, and national security agencies to ensure that all the pieces in the process fit together and that our partners at the Department of Homeland Security ran the names and biometric data of refugee applicants through all relevant national security databases before accepting anyone for resettlement.

When I took office in early April 2012, my priorities included convincing Congress to maintain robust funding levels for refugee aid and to expand the number of refugees coming to the United States. We put a greater focus on helping refugee women and girls, built bridges with counterparts at USAID to ensure US humanitarian policy was aligned, and worked constructively with leaders heading up UN humanitarian agencies and well-regarded non-governmental organizations. Congress appropriated nearly $7 billion per year for humanitarian assistance, and the bureau I led was responsible for $3.4 billion, or nearly half of that – the rest went to disaster and food aid accounts of the US Agency for International Development. The United States, I liked to say, provided the backbone of the international humanitarian system, serving as the top funder of the UNHCR, UNICEF, the World Food Program, UNRWA (which is the UN Relief Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East), the International Organization for Migration and the International Committee of the Red Cross. With the exception of the Swiss-run ICRC, an American traditionally ran or was the #2 at all of these organizations.

In addition to deep involvement in humanitarian policy development and allocation of aid, I undertook a number of efforts related to diplomacy on broader international migration issues. For example, I joined with the Permanent Representative of Mexico to the UN in New York, Luis

Alfonso de Alba, to discuss migration in New York to a UN audience – attendees were amazed the US and Mexico could appear together amicably to discuss these topics. This joint appearance was in the run-up to the Secretary General's High-Level Dialogue on Migration in October 2013. I led the US delegation to the High-Level Dialogue and also led interagency US delegations to meetings of the Global Forum for Migration and Development held in subsequent years in Sweden, Turkey and Bangladesh. I conspired with then-IOM head Bill Swing and UN leaders, who sought to secure US support for adding the International Organization for Migration to the UN family of agencies. With other countries, we developed and promoted voluntary guidelines to help migrants who were caught in countries that erupted in crisis or were crippled by natural disasters, and we were somewhat amazed when these received wide support. Many of these efforts related to global migration went unnoticed by the US press. Nonetheless, I thought they were important to do, knowing that the President wanted the US to engage through multilateral mechanisms and believing that the United States had a very good story to tell about how we ourselves treated refugees and migrants.

Most of my time, however, was devoted to shaping the US humanitarian response to too-many crises taking place around the world. Syria was chief among these, producing millions of refugees and internally displaced persons and savage attacks against innocent civilians in Syrian cities. Administration foreign policy leaders and Middle East experts devoted thousands of hours in pursuit of peace but were defeated time and again. Stymied on the diplomatic front, more pressure was placed on humanitarian efforts to succeed. At times, humanitarian efforts were the only topic on which the US had anything positive to say. ISIS evolved and rampaged and sent Iraqis fleeing for their lives. During this time, South Sudan fell into civil war, and, once again, people there ran to neighboring countries. I traveled to Northern Rakhine state in Myanmar and to Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh and wrestled with concerns for the Rohingya. The situation in Somalia that sent refugees fleeing to Kenya and across to Yemen was then complicated joined by a horrible crisis in Yemen that continues to this day.

I also tried to bring attention to neglected crises, traveling to a remote region of Burkina Faso to meet refugees from Mali with then-High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres, and later traveling with the EU Commissioner for Humanitarian Affairs, Christos Stylianides of Cyprus, to countries in Africa where Nigerians fleeing Boko Haram were sheltered. And I looked for those rare opportunities to celebrate victories – from prospects to peace in Colombia, to much smaller successes in building permanent homes for refugees displaced years before in the Balkans.

One of the things that helped me do my job was the fact that there were no serious divisions on humanitarian policy within the Administration. Everyone – from the President and First Lady, Vice President and Dr. Biden, the National Security Advisers, Secretaries of State Clinton and

Kerry, their deputies and other senior Administration officials – cared and wanted the Administration to succeed in doing more. So, asking Cabinet officers to raise humanitarian issues on their travels was not hard. This, too, is what we meant by the term "humanitarian diplomacy" – that humanitarian concerns were folded into messages to be delivered to foreign counterparts by American diplomats, up to and including the President.

In the summer of 2015, the massive number of refugees and migrants seen traveling by leaky rafts across the Mediterranean and by foot through Europe *en route* to Austria, Germany and Sweden captured high-level White House and public attention.

There are two dates from 2015 burned into my memory. On September 3rd, the photo of little toddler Alan Kurdi's body washed up on the beach in Turkey went viral. We were promptly inundated with calls from those demanding that the Obama Administration do more to help the refugees, and our friends on the political left insisted we move faster to bring more Syrian refugees to America. And, at the same time, we heard from many conservatives who cautioned us against bringing more Muslim refugees to the US, out of fear that these refugees would import sharia law and terrorism into the United States. These concerns exploded after the Paris attacks of Friday night, November 13th — the second date I remember well. Suddenly every member of Congress wanted to know if terrorist refugees were headed to the United States. Even those who supported the refugee program demanded guarantees that the resettlement program could keep out bad guys. I said we were doing everything humanly possible to screen out liars, criminals and would-be terrorists.

Two New York Summits in September 2016

In response to all these events – record levels of refugees, waves of migrants reaching Europe and drowning in the Mediterranean, and exaggerated fears of terrorists disguised as refugees, the UN decided to hold a major meeting in New York on refugees and migrants. This took place on September 19, 2016. A second international meeting was held on September 20, the next day. It was spearheaded by President Obama and aimed to increase support for refugees.

The UN-organized meeting produced the New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants. The New York Declaration, in turn, launched two processes, to develop a Global Compact (or voluntary agreement) on refugees and a second Global Compact on Migrants. These were the subjects of last year's Kaldor Centre Conference. Drafts of the two documents were released in June and July this year [2018]; these processes are coming to their conclusion right now, and I look forward to the panel that will discuss the Global Compacts later today.

President Obama's Leaders' Summit in September 20th was modeled on a meeting a year before to boost support for UN peacekeeping. At that earlier meeting, governments were invited to attend if they committed to contribute more money, troops and/or equipment for

peacekeeping. For the Leaders' Summit on Refugees, countries that wanted to attend again had to "earn" an invitation by making commitments in advance. Wealthy countries were asked to provide more to humanitarian assistance and to accept more refugees for resettlement. Countries that hosted refugees were also asked to do more, by permitting refugees to work legally and allowing refugee children to go to school.

The diplomatic outreach around this Summit was tricky. White House officials and Cabinet officers divvied up a list of foreign leaders to contact and encourage to participate. Several countries very swiftly stepped forward to co-sponsor the event, and the number of Western European co-sponsors had to be limited – while finding refugee-hosting countries willing to co-sponsor was a challenge. The list of co-sponsors ended up being the UN Secretary General, Canada, Ethiopia, Germany, Jordan, Mexico and Sweden.

Staff at the National Security Council, Ambassador Samantha Power's office in New York, and the State Department's Bureau for International Organizations played major roles in putting the Summit together. My staff was asked to focus particularly on coming up with ways that refugee-hosting countries could be asked to do more, and to review the political situation and economic and humanitarian context for each of these countries. This was a particularly delicate matter, as many of these countries had hosted large refugee populations for decades with limited resources, little recognition and minimal thanks from rich countries. I encouraged some of the poorest countries to make new commitments and earn an invitation. Some were shocked to discover that invitations were not automatic and called the system "pay to play", or what one outraged diplomat called "the most undiplomatic request" he'd ever encountered. I also frankly acknowledged that their doing more should be contingent on getting help from the US and other major donor countries. And we all agreed that increased aid flows for education and skills-building should benefit not just the refugees but also local populations.

Australia pledged an increase in aid, especially in response to the Syria crisis, and to maintain a generous resettlement program. Altogether, some 49 countries attended, in addition to the UN and World Bank leaders. The World Bank used the opportunity to announce its Global Crisis Response Platform, a new financing mechanism for low- and middle-income countries hosting refugees. UNHCR and IOM announced a joint mechanism to help countries start new or expand existing refugee resettlement programs. President Obama also addressed a group of business leaders in a smaller side meeting, to encourage more aid to refugees from the private sector, something that then and now remains a work in progress.

The desire of Europeans to see US leadership on these issues was satisfied. The conference was deemed a success in nearly every aspect, save one: would there be follow up? Had Hillary Clinton been elected President, which was then the expectation, I believe her Administration would have championed strong diplomatic follow-through on the list of commitments.

Needless to say, there has been no top-level push from the Trump White House. No single country chose to reconvene the participants for a second Summit. However, UNHCR and the World Bank have used the very detailed list of commitments to engage the various participating countries, and as a basis for continued dialogue.

The Australia-US deal

During that whirlwind week in New York, in the midst of these important September 19th and 20th meetings, I met up with Rachel Noble, the then-Deputy Secretary Policy Group in Australia's Immigration and Border Protection Department. Today I understand she is Deputy Secretary of the Home Affairs Implementation Team in that same department. We met in a small, windowless conference room at the US Mission to the United Nations. There, with little fanfare and few witnesses, we signed the Australia-US deal on Refugees, which had been negotiated over the previous months.

I had played a leading role in the negotiations, but I was part of a team of State Department negotiators and resettlement experts under the overall guidance of the Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, Heather Higginbottom, and with the full backing of Secretary Kerry. We agreed with Australia not to publicize the deal until after the US election, to avoid it adding fuel to the anti-refugee rhetoric that was already churning – not, let me make clear, to help Hillary Clinton win, as that was a foregone conclusion in Washington, but to keep this diplomatic arrangement from getting caught up in, and tarnished by, the vitriol and misinformation that was then swirling and, at that time, considered temporary.

There is no truth to the rumor that President Obama cooked up the deal after the election in November 2017 to annoy the Trump Administration. In fact, the negotiations proceeded at the State Department over months without much direct involvement from the White House, although we certainly stayed in touch with colleagues there at every step and had President Obama's overall support and guidance for increasing the numbers of refugees admitted to the US. I will return to the topic of the Australia-US deal in a moment.

Donald Trump Administration

Candidate Trump made immigration a top issue of his campaign and, in hindsight, I see that it helped him win votes from his core supporters. It all started with Donald Trump's June 2015 announcement that he was running for President. At Trump Tower, after arriving via escalator, he delivered remarks that included his vow to "build a wall" make Mexico pay for it, and he accused Mexico of sending north drug smugglers, criminals and rapists. Not only was this a horrible insult against Mexicans, it also was out-of-date regarding flows across the Southwest border, where in recent years the number of Mexican workers coming north decreased

significantly. Instead, large number of children and families fleeing crime, violence and insecurity in Central America were arriving.

When Donald Trump won the November 2016 election, my hope was that we could meet with his transition team in December and early January and explain to them the importance of these programs. But the Trump team was very slow to come together and not much happened at the State Department before the inauguration in January. I met only once with two or three people representing the new Administration, but these individuals did not stay long at the Department and were not involved in briefing the incoming Secretary, Rex Tillerson. During the entire two-and-a-half-months-long transition period, there was no organized hand-off to a new set of decision-makers. This was unusual for any Administration, Democratic or Republican.

So, I left office on January 19, 2017, not knowing who would be coming in and, in the 22 months since I left office, no one has replaced me. The position of Assistant Secretary, as well as the post of Under Secretary, to whom I reported, and other key jobs and ambassadorships at the State Department remain unfilled. The office of the Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources that Heather Higginbottom filled has been eliminated, at least for the time being. A man named Ronald Mortensen has had his name put forward by the White House to take my old job. He has a background in the logistics of disaster response overseas, but he is not an expert on refugees or migrants, and he has written essays that are anti-immigrant, accusing the Dreamers – undocumented youth who came to the US as children – of felonies. His nomination has not been acted on by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, although the leadership of that Committee is changing with the new Senate, so perhaps he will one day get a hearing.

A new Assistant Secretary never arrived, but the bureau has been receiving guidance directly from the White House, beginning with the surprise of the travel ban. Seven days into the new Administration, the travel ban was launched as an executive order and without careful review. It stopped refugee travelers in their tracks with zero warning, which was not only a bad management move, it was cruel to do to people who had waited so long and sold many of their possessions in order to make the trip. Career staff in the Department immediately sought a waiver to allow refugees who had commenced their travel to the United States to complete it. Meanwhile, the international arrivals area of major airports were thronged with ordinary Americans protesting the travel ban, condemning it as a ban on Muslim travelers to the United States.

Today, 22 months later, the White House has slashed the number of refugees being resettled in the United States from nearly 85,000 arrivals in the last full fiscal year of the Obama Administration to 22,491 in the fiscal year that ended September 30th. The nine faith-based and non-profit networks that resettle refugees in cities and towns across the United States have

been forced to close offices, and the State Department announced this past Spring that it will trim the list of nine to a smaller number of partners that carry out this work. This means fewer cities will be involved in the US Refugee Admissions programs, the staff and volunteers who help the refugees will lose their jobs and roles, and the highly successful public-private partnership that has been built up over years – with years of connections to and relationships with landlords and employers and synagogues and churches and schools – will be lost.

The Trump Administration has done more than drop the numbers of refugees arriving in the US. It has stopped a program to unify Central American children with parents that are lawfully present in the United States, as refugees or by granting them humanitarian parole that was started under the Obama Administration with the aim of reducing the number of children making the dangerous trip north from Central America. It has threatened to end Temporary Protective Status (or "TPS") for people who came to the US years ago but have been unable to return home because the crisis or conditions that originally prevented them from returning home have not improved.

It has stopped funding UNRWA, the UN Relief Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, which provides education and healthcare and other services to five million Palestinian refugees. It has predictably stopped funding the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) which, in addition to other programs, provides reproductive health services to women in crisis zones, improving survival rates for mothers and babies. It nominated an American to lead the International Organization for Migration who was found to have sent a series of anti-Muslim tweets. He lost his election and America lost the leadership of that organization.

The Trump Administration has proposed deep cuts in the budgets of the State Department and USAID, cuts that, fortunately, have been overturned by Congress. It has succeeded in driving some of the most seasoned diplomats into retirement. The staff in my former bureau has twice had to fight off proposals to have the bureau eliminated, which has been a major distraction and has sapped morale. The Trump Administration has walked away from the Global Compact on Migration and encouraged other countries to do the same.

Recently, then-Attorney General Sessions issued guidance that judges should no longer grant asylum to survivors of domestic violence or to people fleeing criminal gangs, arguing that these situations do not fit within the legal definition of a refugee.

The list of missteps, mistakes, and cruel measures to hurt immigrants and other foreign-born people is much longer than what I've outlined here. The most notable move was to cruelly separate children from their parents at the border, and this received national attention and condemnation.

Historic levels of displacement

To put it succinctly: the US Administration has turned its back on the world's refugees at a time of historic levels of displacement. Twenty-five million people are refugees, and another three million people are asylum applicants around the world; more than 40 million people are displaced within their own home countries and called "internally displaced persons" or IDPs.

The Obama Administration and allies had tried to rally the world to do more. But some governments have moved in a different direction entirely. In addition to the about-face toward refugees in the White House, we see countries in Eastern Europe led by anti-migrant politicians; populism and nationalism are on the rise throughout Europe. While Germany marshaled its resources to deal with the influx of migrants and refugees in the summer of 2015, the EU was initially unable to come together to address the situation, was slow to institute proper screening programs, and a workable relocation scheme did not receive support from many EU member states. Instead, walls sprang up and stopped the flow from Greece. Subsequently Brussels focused on paying off Turkey and other countries of transit, and European donors are, belatedly, investing more aid in countries of origin, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Such investment is a very good thing to do for several reasons, but it may not stop people from wanting to move to find better opportunities.

I am very happy that the Australia-US deal has survived changes at the top in both of our governments. Refugees continue to be screened and moved from these two offshore sites to the United States, albeit in small numbers and very slowly. And, regrettably, the Trump Administration is allowing only miniscule numbers of Syrians, Iranians and other Muslims from certain countries to be brought in.

Incidentally, I believe the transcript of the Turnbull-Trump phone conversation from January 2017 is the best summary of the US-Australia deal you will find. Much of the details of the deal are still classified. Without revealing classified material, I have tried to inform journalists that the initial coverage of the deal was wrong: this is not a one-for-one swap of refugees, and there is no magic number or mathematical formula to determine whether and when Australia fulfills its side of the deal. With regard to refugees, in return for taking up to 1200 refugees from Manus and Nauru, America asked Australia to do more to help refugees from regions beyond South and Southeast Asia, such as Africa and Central America.

My own involvement in and support for the deal – and I know former Deputy Secretary Higginbottom would say the same --was prompted by concern for the refugee themselves. Like I said, this is my first trip to this part of the world and I have visited neither Nauru nor Papua New Guinea. But the reports we had read about the conditions for the refugees were very worrying.

This fact was reinforced by several of the refugees who have been resettled from Nauru in the United States, when we met recently. I also spoke by phone with a refugee resettled from Manus. They described a hellacious environment. Men slept in bunk beds, 40 men to a tent or several families to a tent, and for three years the tents did not have fans. Meanwhile, the heat was oppressive. The tents also failed to keep out rain. They told me the food was bad, the staff treated them as if they were criminals, and the local people were hostile, too, and stole their mobile phones. They had nothing to do but spend day after day after day waiting. They watched movies. Many took the initiative to learn English. They waited six or seven hours for a one-hour turn to use the Internet over a very slow connection. One day a week they were allowed to visit a gym – for one hour.

The heat made it impossible to nap or sleep during the day, and this was a particular burden on families with small children. One said, "I watched an Iranian set himself on fire and small children go crazy."

One of the refugees from Nauru was smart, friendly, and particularly bitter. He said he lost six years of his life that he would never get back. He had harsh words even for visits from well-intentioned representatives of aid agencies and rights groups. "They took lots of notes," he said, "but they could do nothing to help us leave Nauru." He wondered if they had written everything down only to put these reports in the trash. "We were like animals in a zoo," he said.

When I asked Imran, the Rohingya refugee who'd spent time on Manus, how he felt when he heard that some might go to America, he told me he did not believe it. He said that he did not trust <u>any</u> of the information provided by officials about options for the refugees, such as resettlement in Cambodia or Central Asia. Still, he has great warmth and affection for the Australian couple Sandra and Len Fulham, from Mount Isa in Queensland, who connected with him and a second detainee via Facebook in 2015, and who have since visited the two young men in the United States. The refugees who had been on Nauru were very grateful to their English teachers and have remained in touch with them, even though one was dismissed after giving them a gift of chewing gum. To them and to other caring Australians, the Rohingya refugee asked me to deliver a message: "Thank you… We could not have survived without you."

The "offshore processing model" succeeded in keeping refugees arriving by boat from reaching Australia's shores, but it has extracted a heavy human toll from the refuges themselves. Of particular concern to all of us is the serious harm that has come to children and some of the refugees who were attacked in Manus or were so driven to despair that they committed suicide; but all of them deserve our attention and help. I know that what I am saying is not news here in Australia.

So how are they faring in the United States? I spoke to Sri Lankan parents with three children – one of the children is a baby, born under difficult circumstances in Nauru – who were happy that their children would receive an education, have a good future, and experience freedom in the United States. The father, however, also felt stressed; the earnings from his job at an Indian restaurant were not sufficient to pay the rent for a two-bedroom apartment and other bills.

Several young men from Pakistan are now working in jobs at the bottom of the economic ladder. One was working the graveyard shift at the 7-11 convenience store and another, who had earlier studied medicine, was now a landscaper. Still in their early 20s, they are eager to earn high school equivalency degrees and then continue their educations. Another, who earlier in life was an artist, is now a 38-year-old chef cooking Mexican food and remains separated from his wife and child left behind in Pakistan. The refugee from Manus is now working and attending school. They mentioned that one big change is that local people are not nasty to them when they hear they are refugees. They also try to stay in touch with those still on Manus and Nauru.

All the refugees I met from Nauru completely rejected the idea that many of those who've been resettled now want to return. The Rohingya refugee in Chicago, who had been on Manus, thought that, at most, one or two might want to return to be reunited with people they care very much about, or because starting life over again in America, while the fervent wish of many, is very, very challenging even to refugees who've been sufficiently resilient to survive displacement, the dangerous journey across countries, and the years of stultifying life on the islands.

I hesitate to say more, in part because among you are the real experts about Australian policies and in part because I do not want to do anything to undermine this deal. Instead, let's look at the global phenomenon we see of hostility to refugees and asylum-seekers. With the notable exception of Canada, many countries seem to be turning their backs on refugees.

In the US, at our Southwest border, the Administration has sought to dismiss the asylum claims of migrants who crossed the border away from official checkpoints.

I am so glad that a federal judge just this past week temporarily blocked the Administration from denying asylum to those who enter the United States this way.

But I remain extremely worried about the global prospects for the "Right to Asylum." In the United States during the Cold War, it was well understood that visiting Russian ballet dancers or Cuban baseball players or Chinese musicians might leave their groups and claim asylum. And providing them this asylum, so that they could stay in the land of the free, was seen as a logical thing to do, and the right thing to do.

Of course, there have also been periods in US history where those whose families arrived earlier tried to keep out new arrivals – from the Chinese exclusion laws, to the way the *St. Louis* and its Jewish refugees from Europe were turned away in 1939, to concerns about the trustworthiness of people fleeing Communist Eastern Europe and Vietnam in later decades.

Today, we not only see that people fleeing for their lives from the Northern Triangle countries of Central America, or from the war in Syria, do not automatically receive sympathy from a segment of American society; we also see them described as dangerous gang members and criminals and terrorists by President Trump. They are, in fact, the victims of gangs and criminals and terrorists. American leaders in positions of responsibility used to calm unreasonable fears and provide needed perspective to our citizenry. We now have senior government leaders involved in fear-mongering, vilifying some of the most vulnerable people on earth.

Let me know if any of this sounds familiar to you here in Australia.

I believe our two countries, and other countries that in the past were leaders in responding to crises and providing humanitarian leadership, must work together to find new ways, creative ways, bold and daring ways, to help refugees and other displaced people. We ought to stop the fear-mongering and blame-shifting and responsibility-shirking and instead devote our energies and resources to resolving crises, promoting peace and stability, and collectively doing more to rescue people in jeopardy and to take actions so that people do not need to flee their homes in the first place.

Thank you, again, to the Kaldor Centre for inviting me today, and thank you all for listening.