



Toolkit - Activity 6 Teacher Guide

1. Debate Rules & Timing Sheet

Debate Title:

Should countries accept more climate migrants?

Purpose:

To discuss multiple perspectives on climate migration and practice evidence-based argumentation.

1. Structure (45-minute test version)

- 1. Introduction – 5 min (Moderator explains ground rules & context)
- 2. Preparation – 5 min (Teams build 2 key arguments)
- 3. Debate – 20 min (2 rounds + openings + closings)
- 4. Feedback – 10 min (Observers give scores & comments)
- 5. Reflection – 5 min (Participants write short reflection)

2. Ground Rules

- Respect all speakers — no interruptions.
- Base arguments on data, facts, and logic, not personal opinions.
- Speak clearly and concisely.
- Listen actively to the other team's points.
- Moderator/timekeeper decisions are final.

3. Debate Flow

- Opening statements: PRO 2 min, CON 2 min
- Round 1: PRO 3 min → CON 3 min → 30 sec rebuttals each
- Round 2: CON 3 min → PRO 3 min → 30 sec rebuttals each
- Closing statements: PRO 1 min → CON 1 min

2. FACT PACK – PRO Position

Claim: Countries should accept more climate migrants.

Key Arguments

1. Humanitarian Responsibility: Climate change disproportionately affects poorer countries that contributed least to emissions. Example: Pacific islands (Tuvalu, Kiribati) risk total submersion.
2. Global Justice: Developed nations owe a climate debt for their historical emissions. Accepting migrants is part of fair burden-sharing.
3. Economic Benefits: Migrants can fill labour gaps in ageing societies. Studies show migrants often contribute more in taxes than they receive in benefits over time.
4. Moral & Legal Evolution: The 1951 Refugee Convention is outdated. Some countries (e.g., New Zealand) already test humanitarian visas for environmental displacement.

Key Data

- 43.1 million people displaced by disasters in 2022 (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, by Norwegian refugee center).
- 216 million internal climate migrants projected by 2050 (World Bank).
- Only 0.4% of international protection cases in the EU mention environmental or climate reasons (EUAA, 2023).

(European Union Agency for Asylum – Analysis of asylum decisions, 2023)

Useful Quotes

“Climate justice is not charity; it is a responsibility.” – António Guterres

“Without protection, millions displaced by climate impacts fall through legal cracks.” – IOM (2023)

3. FACT PACK – CON Position

Claim: Countries should not accept more climate migrants.

Key Arguments

5. Limited Capacity & Social Cohesion: Many countries already face housing, job, and integration challenges. Large inflows risk political backlash and instability.
6. Adaptation in Place: Prioritize local resilience and climate adaptation where people live. Relocation should be a last resort.
7. Legal Ambiguity: 'Climate refugees' are not recognized under the 1951 Refugee Convention. Expanding definitions could undermine existing asylum systems.
8. National Sovereignty & Security: States must control borders and migration volumes. New categories could be misused and hard to verify.

Key Data

- Up to 1.8 billion people could live in heat-stressed zones by 2070 (PNAS, 2020).
- Only ~2% of migration policies explicitly mention climate displacement (IOM, 2023).
- In 2023, over 1.1 million asylum applications were lodged in the EU — the highest since 2016 (EUAA, 2024).

Useful Quotes

The EU cannot overcome the challenge of climate-driven migration acting alone.”, (*European Parliament, “The future of climate migration” (2022)*)

“Human mobility linked to climate impacts should be addressed through prevention and adaptation measures at home whenever possible.”(*European Commission Communication on Climate Adaptation (COM/2021/82)*)

4. OBSERVER SCORE CARD

Debate Topic: Should countries accept more climate migrants?

Observer Name: _____

Evaluation Criteria (1–5)

Criterion	Description	Score (1–5)
Clarity	Were arguments logical and easy to follow?	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence	Did speakers use reliable data and examples?	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevance	Were arguments directly related to the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Respect	Did participants listen, stay polite, avoid personal attacks?	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Persuasiveness	Did the team convince you overall?	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Best argument heard: _____

Most convincing data or example: _____

Advice for improvement: _____

5. REFLECTION SHEET (Individual)

Debate Topic: Should countries accept more climate migrants?

Participant Name: _____

After the Debate

1. My position (now):

2. The two most convincing arguments or data were:

3. My team could improve by:

4. What did I learn about debating or evidence-based communication?
