

To what extent are migrants a threat to a country in today's world?

Ryan Ch'ng Wei Han (16S47)

One of the worst things a migrant can hear is "Go home!" Indeed, for someone who has travelled a long way from where they grew up, who has made the sacrifice of leaving their community and comfort zone, perhaps to eke out a living or just to escape the harsh conditions of their home, it would be heartbreaking to face an unwelcoming local population. However, this is a reality for many migrants in today's globalised and competitive world as they are often deemed a threat to countries. This view means that regardless of class or purpose of migration, anyone who travels to another country with the intent of residence will bring about more potential harm than good. Some will disagree because migrants can bring economic and cultural benefits to the countries they migrate to. However, I believe that as the migrants' allegiance to the country they move to is an issue, and that their presence may tear the social fabric and pose outright danger to the society, it is reasonable to regard migrants a threat to a country in today's world.

Those who wholeheartedly welcome migrants with open arms point to the economic benefits that migrants, usually migrant workers, bring. Generally, migrant workers alleviate the shortage in the labour supply. In many developed countries, migrant workers abound in the service industry as well as other labour-intensive industries, taking up jobs which the vast majority of educated individuals choose not to take up. Migrants from the Philippines travel all over the world to work in customer service while migrants from India and Bangladesh find work in the construction sector. They offer a cheap source of labour that allows companies to cut costs, bringing great economic benefit to a country that cannot be overlooked. Should these migrants no longer be allowed to work in these industries, costs would skyrocket, impacting not only companies but the general public who have to pay higher prices. Thus, migrants bring economic benefit to a country. In addition, there are those who say that migrants introduce cultural diversity into a country. By introducing yet another "ingredient" into the "melting pot", migrants enrich the culture of a country and provide more eye-opening experiences. Food is a classic example, as when many migrants congregate in an area, some can start food establishments that cater to their countrymen. If not for the waves of Turkish migration to the UK, we would not have the myriad restaurants serving Turkish cuisine, and the same is seen in other cultures. Thus, a country can benefit from added cultural diversity, not just in food but in all walks of life where culture is evident. This cultural diversity helps us cultivate a global mindset and increase our exposure, thus benefiting the country. In the light of the aforementioned economic and cultural benefits migrants bring, it can be understood why some vehemently deny that migrants are a threat to a country in today's world.

- *Good hook to show how migrants can be treated with hostility in their adoptive country.*

- *Duality of stance shown.*

- *Clear identification of the problem raised in this topic and a definite stand.*

- *Clear topic sentence on why migrants are welcomed from an economic perspective.*

- *To avoid making sweeping generalisations, it might be better to qualify e.g. It is common to see migrants from the Philippines ...*

- *thorough elaboration of the counter-argument.*

- *Writer provided clear signposting to indicate the*

However, upon examination, it is still reasonable to believe that migrants are indeed a threat to a country in today's world as the aforementioned benefits often do not accrue to countries. One reason for this is increasing disloyalty, or a lack of integration. This refers to migrants who do not feel loyal to their adopted country and thus return home, in effect taking more than they give. While it is perfectly logical behaviour on the migrant's part, as he can earn his money and then retire at home where the cost of living is lower, it denies his host country of the long-term benefits of his presence. The makeup of migrants has changed in today's world; when we previously had migrants who settled and acquired citizenship, we now have more transient migrants, because the very same globalisation that brought them into a country makes it easier for them to go back home. Many South Koreans move to Singapore or other places to let their children study English and Mandarin, and then return to Korea with their children equipped with valuable skills, but no longer benefiting Singapore. Even if they do not pack their bags and return to where they came from, they tend to form enclaves and mix with their fellow countrymen instead of integrating with the local people. This heavily compromises the chances of cultural diversity, resulting in clear demarcations between locals and foreigners instead. If restaurants of a particular foreign ethnic group are established, but they are concentrated within an enclave that locals rarely visit, then the 'ingredients' have not truly melted into the 'melting pot', as the many Hispanic enclaves in the USA would attest. Thus, cultural diversity is compromised. The benefits of migrants are less available to a country, replaced by the harm of migrants using resources but not giving back.

Thus it is fair to say that migrants pose a threat to a country today.

Furthermore, migrants can cause more obvious and outright harm, thus posing a threat to a country, by rending the social fabric. Many migrants behave as if they were still in their home countries and act according to their countries' established social norms. Where these norms clash with their host country's norms, as is wont to happen, the local population's way of life will be irreversibly changed. Chinese migrants have drawn flak overseas, even in Hong Kong, for letting their children defecate openly, as it is not acceptable behaviour there. Migrants also take issue with activities locals do, which further upsets them, as in the case where a migrant in Singapore complained about the smell of his neighbour's home-cooked curry. However, the worst cases are where migrants cause genuine inconvenience to locals by interfering with markets. In New Zealand, property prices have been inflated by high demand from migrants, causing a very visible inconvenience to locals. The impact did not stop there, however; honesty-box payment was common at farms where produce was left in roadside baskets and customers merely left payment in the baskets by an honour system. This, however, has stopped as migrants mistook it for free food, necessitating a cashier to man the booths. This example illustrates vividly how the presence of migrants in the society has forced local farmers to abandon their long-held traditions out of necessity. We can see that migrants have caused significant and irreversible change to the

direction of argument from a counter-argument to the points he chose to argue for.

-This sentence "Thus the cultural diversity is compromised" is unclear as the main point is about the economic impact.

lifestyles of the locals, fomenting a culture of distrust rather than honour, perpetuating fear of the unknown. The social contract is violated and the social fabric is ripped apart. If the country is not prepared to handle these changes, the people will resent the migrants' presence as their society has been changed due to the migrants. Thus, migrants are a threat to a country in today's world.

Most damning of all, migrants certainly pose a threat to a country in today's world as they bring a clear and present danger, having the propensity to engage in crime and other acts. This point is often hijacked and relentlessly abused by right-wing politicians stoking inflammatory sentiment, as they put it down to certain races or religions being inclined to violence or crime. This is by no means true in any way. A more probable reason why migrants may be inclined to dangerous activities lies in the same human nature that belies all of us. Alone in a foreign land, with no family and no support, stress on a migrant would be very high and he would have no one to turn to. For this reason, it is apt to draw parallels between the Chinese triads and Islamic extremist terrorist groups. Both prey on the vulnerable migrants who, under the extreme duress of migrant life, may be more easily tempted into a life of crime in exchange for the support and kinship they need the most. This is the reason why migrants, by their very nature are more susceptible to engaging in activities that bring danger, and not their race or culture. We hear of shootouts between gangs in the USA, and lone wolf terrorist attacks in Europe where terrorists use vehicles as weapons. At this point it must be made clear that not all migrants should be tarred with this brush. Indeed, the majority of migrants are law abiding and generally sane. However, as long as there is any possibility of migrants engaging in crime, this must be addressed. The Singaporean government encourages the population to watch for "self-radicalised" individuals and has arrested radicalised migrants, thus showing their commitment to ensuring safety, while still allowing migrants in. Thus, migrants are by no means "bad hombres", the term American president Donald Trump used to imply that Mexican migrants engaged routinely in crime, but a possibility of them turning to crime exists and must be addressed. Thus, it is fair to say that migrants bring potential harm and thus pose a threat to a country in today's world.

In conclusion, migrants do indeed pose a threat to a country in today's world. However, we must be very careful with this conclusion. Discourse on migrants often spirals into racism, vitriol and hate, and regrettably, concluding that migrants are a threat can push a discussion in that direction. We must therefore draw the right lessons from this conclusion. Migrants, and then not even all migrants, are a threat only because they have the potential to cause harm such as upsetting the society and bringing danger. Ironically, it falls to the country itself to ensure migrants are not a threat. The harm that migrants bring are often actually caused by an unwelcoming country, leading to a vicious cycle of intolerant society and "misbehaving" migrants. We must break that cycle. Countries should welcome migrants more, while migrants should adapt to life

- A claim that needs to be supported which comes later in the paragraph when there is a clear evaluation of why migrants may have a propensity to commit crimes.

-Timely reminder that one cannot generalise.

-Clear link to the topic sentence.

- A measured view that cautions against the stereotyping of migrants.

- A recommendation of what a society needs to do to address the issue of migration which is inevitable in our world today. A good point to feature in the conclusion.

in countries they move to, while ensuring that they contribute meaningfully to the countries that have taken them in. It takes two hands to clap; if this can be done, the harm that migrants bring will diminish, and migrants and locals alike can reap the benefits of a diverse society. If this can be achieved, migrants can be construed as no longer a threat after all in tomorrow's world.

Comments:

A beautifully written piece with depth, insight and tactfulness on a sensitive issue. You covered each argument well and provided sound examples. The conclusion also included a fresh take on the dilemma. It would have been good to discuss what governments can do to mitigate the problems, for a more rounded essay. Language-wise, the essay employed an engaging hook and a wide range of vocabulary. It was, overall, an enjoyable read indeed.