Economic expansion. All sorts of areas of human consumption and travel and resource use increasing very significantly. And this has had a significant effect on greenhouse gas emissions, particularly over the past 70 years. So I like this chart which shows global primary energy consumption since 1800. And you can see historically humans typically relied on traditional biogas, wood, cow dung, resources directly available for energy production and we’ve had this shift over the past century plus toward particularly fossil fuels. But what I think is interesting is that even as we’ve had rapid developments of technologies for green and sustainable energy use, we haven’t seen the shift in our actual consumption relying on those as primary sources of energy. We’re still very dependent on the early sources of energy, and then we’ve had the more recent development of natural gas. But we can see that we have a long way to go
in terms of shifting toward energy that will be sustainable.
So thinking about the scenario that has resulted from greenhouse gas consumption,
climate change is contributing to desertification,
sea level rise, resource scarcity, and increased frequency
of extreme weather events particularly in low latitude areas forcing people from their homes.
In 2020, weather related hazards such as storms and floods triggered 30.1 million displacement worldwide.
The sea level is rising 12 millimeters a year in the western Pacific and has already submerged eight islands.
By 2100 is estimated that 48 islands will be lost to the rising ocean.
Countries such as Tuvalu, Kiribati and the Marshall Islands already experience ocean flooding that washes salt water
onto agricultural lands and inundates drinking water sources.
So it’s quite likely that some islands will lose fresh water long before land is lost.
Vulnerable communities are experiencing forced migration already throughout the world.
So Pacific islands are having coastal erosion forcing residents
to leave displacement in Asian countries is occurring due to severe storms. Climate impacts on rural livelihoods are forcing central agents to migrate to urban areas for survival. Less African coastal fishing villages are leaving due to the depletion of fish resources caused by ocean acidification as you see in this image here. Latin American droughts are forcing both internal and international migration. And the future of climate migration is looking to expand significantly. So the world bank estimates that three regions, Latin America, sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia will generate 143 million more climate migrants by the year 2050. This is a map from the International Organization for Migration. They have regional maps for all of the major regions of the world that are experiencing climate related migration as a result of climate change. So I’d like to highlight on this map a couple of the key causes. So you have some climate change hotspots and you have risk of desertification.
lower precipitation in some areas leading to floods
that are preventing reliable growing of crops as populations have in the past relied upon.
We also have some areas with less precipitation, again, impacting food production.
We have negative agricultural changes, ecosystem changes, reduced water availability, depletion of fisheries, melting of glaciers which is leading to sedimentation and affecting again, water and crop supplies, there's impacts on mountain regions, coral bleaching, and of course sea level rise concerns. So I think this is a nice way just in one region to see the numerous ways in which climate change is affecting migration patterns and disrupting pre-existing reliable structures of assessments. We’ve also seen a trend historically documented in the scientific literature and increasingly in the defense department regarding the real human toll of disrupting reliable sources of water and of the impact of drought on leading to higher likelihood of conflict and conflict ultimately leading to migration changes as well. So we have the sort of natural effects that are occurring with humans having limited resources.
But then of course there’s a psychological and social dynamics that complicate and multiply the existing natural dynamics as individuals are competing for scarce resources, which historically has never led to a positive outcome.

So how can we think about all of this ethically? I think what is really challenging on topics such as this, that involve marginalized global populations that tend to be invisible in society such as ours in our typical power structures, we need to try to think very objectively in ethics.

So first being reasonable not doctrinaire, listening actively to the voices, particularly the voices of those who don’t have a powerful position in the world community, letting the best reasons determine judgments versus economics politics or other competing interests, remaining common optimistic in the face of controversy, but at the same time, being realistic about the situations and choices...
that we face and understanding that we don’t necessarily have silver bullets here. And this is a problem that is going to require some level of active engagement in serious work. And also considering critically the approaches of different cultures, understanding that solutions to our existing climate crisis, ideally should be coming out of an open and sincere engagement with different cultural, ethical responses and implications of those ethical responses. Because we have a certain environment in which the industrialized nations are operating under social and cultural assumptions of how we should engage with the planet and the economic system in which we engage with the planet. And there are certainly other approaches from other cultures that are much more sustainable and from an ethical perspective, we have an obligation to be open and to consider the variety of approaches that could potentially lead to a more sustainable and effective and fair future for all populations around the planet. So there are some key ethical principles primary to climate change and health.
And this is the concept of honesty and truth telling. And I think this is a critical point to emphasize because oftentimes particularly in climate discussions, there is misinformation a whole host of industries promoting alternative pseudo-science. But we also have a tendency to avoid the gravity of the problem and to try to not deal with it because of the severity of the challenges that humanity faces. So there’s an ethical value of telling the truth and being explicit about the reality that we are facing and to ensure that what we are sharing is unbiased and reflecting, not the cultural objectives of one specific environment, but the actual scientific scenario that the entire world is facing right now. The next core principle that I think is crucial here and that has been typically put forth in the literature on climate change and public health ethics is the concept of justice. And this is that public health professionals should highlight differences that affect health status unfairly,
and that we should emphasize basic human rights

and define activities and legal conditions to ensure the achievement of basic right and a decent life

for all people regardless of their location of birth.

And the third principle is the concept ethically of welfare.

And this is the principle that every person’s happiness counts, regardless of their location.

All individuals around the world have an equal human right for their happiness to be considered.

So the challenge of climate migration ethics is that, many of the migrating populations most affected by rising sea levels, drought and extreme heat are also populations that have had smaller carbon footprints.

So this is a real justice question.

Looking at our own population here in the United States, US populations have not been severely displaced by rising sea levels, drought and heat.

We’ve had over a million individuals in the past affected by these issues, but we’ve also had substantial resources and abilities to respond to this challenge.

But looking at a global scale,
we are not the populations that are experiencing the effects of greenhouse gas consumption at the levels that others are with regard to displacement on account of rising sea level, drought, heat, and other anomalous weather disasters. However, we’ve contributed much more carbon per capita than most of the populations that are now having to relocate due in part to the climate effects of US carbon consumption. And so this is a nice map looking at 2020 internally displaced populations from the Internal Displacement Monitoring Center. And so you can see that this is a problem that we feel, but again, given the economic capacities that we have to rebound from climate anomalies, we’re not feeling the effects as severely as individuals with less resources available to them. But also we’re simply not feeling looking at the map, the effects as severely as some parts of the world. So it’s a real problem of creating a problem without feeling and seeing the consequences of our actions directly in our day to day lives the extent that other individual
So thinking about the ethical value of scientific integrity, 700 million people are in the most vulnerable countries to climate change, including Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Kiribati, Madagascar, the Maldives, Nepal, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and Vietnam. While these countries are most at risk, they are among the lowest contributors of greenhouse gases that are primarily responsible for human cause climate change. So it’s not just an ethical challenge, it’s almost an irony, almost an ethical irony. But the individuals who are hardest hit by the effects of climate change are also those who are contributing least to the problem. These countries are also burdened with the double stress as they work to tackle internal climate related hazards, including displacement. They also serve as receiving countries to growing numbers of refugees. So again, thinking about the ethical value
of scientific integrity as a way to frame our conversation and have an accurate understanding of the data upon which we can build an ethical argument for what should be done.

The top three resource of greenhouse gas emissions are China, the United States and the European Union. And you can see in this chart, we're looking at tons per person of carbon consumption. And so the United States has the highest per capita greenhouse gas emissions. And we also need to think about what is being covered in these types of measurements. Because this is looking at per capita consumption and we have typical dependence in the US on industries that are recorded typically in per capita consumption.

In the development of products, say in China that are then shipped to the United States for consumption. So we're also needing to be aware of the ways other parts of the world are producing emissions in part to reflect our demand for consumption. So thinking about climate change ethics at a global scale,
nations that contributed leads to climate change will be suffering the worst consequences. So this is a map that is adjusted on the top for billions of tons of carbon produced and the nations are inflated to show carbon production. And then on the bottom we’re looking at the mortality per million in the population as a result of the effects of climate change. And you can see that particularly for sub-Saharan Africa, these are pretty severely disproportionate, so that they’re facing the consequences of pre-assumption, that we are not facing the consequences of while at the same time, they’re not causing the problem that they are dealing with. Similarly, you see this happening in South Asia. And if we are looking at the areas of the world that are going to be particularly vulnerable to sea level rise, a lot of that is in the Pacific region. And we also need to recognize that within countries, poor and marginalized populations are at greater risk, although we will all be vulnerable. So this is to say that what we’ve seen in the on climate change and health outcomes,
is that impoverished individuals are more susceptible to keep related illness as a result of occupational exposure, more likely lower income individuals are going to be working outdoors than higher income individuals. And they’re more likely to lose income as a result of days of not being able to work, but also working under stress conditions that are putting their bodies at higher risk of early morbidity and mortality due to worse elemental exposure. And then we also see individuals who are lower income having less access to cooling facilities, less access to personal air conditioning, and particularly in regions of the world but are low and middle income countries access to cooling facilities is not always readily available for all individuals who need it. And so this is also contributing to earlier morbidity and mortality. But at a global level we see this and within countries, individuals at the earlier and later ends of the life spectrum tend to be more vulnerable physiologically.
Which is also to say that we all, as we age will be more vulnerable to the experiences of particularly heat exposures, something to consider as well. So the principle of justice is the next ethical concept that is really critical to thinking about the ethics of climate migration. According to the principle of justice, populations that produce greenhouse gases are responsible for the consequences of our actions. This is just as fair as the same sort of justice principle that we see in our typical civil society laws where you break it and you buy it. You violate the policy of society, you use fee, you get a ticket. It’s just a basic principle that we are responsible for the consequences of our own behaviors and our consumption. Climate migrants are without homes as a result of global carbon consumption. And so in a perfectly fair world, each population that is not itself displaced by climate change would be responsible for accommodating climate migrants in a ratio commensurate to that nation’s responsibility for causing.
the climate refugee crisis. That is, nations would be held accountable for the human consequences of their greenhouse gas consumption. And the principle of fairness justifies policies in which producers of vast quantities of greenhouse gases welcome large numbers of refugees. Further the industrialized world has created climate changes displacing populations and forcing those individuals into migrant status. So the source of the problem is global and therefore, the response to this problem should equally be at a global level. We also have the ethical concept of human rights. So according to Article 25 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and wellbeing of him or herself and of his or her family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care. All industrialized nations have agreed to the universal declaration of human rights and should endeavor therefore to achieve these rights for all global populations.
We know that human rights are aspirational and some nations have accomplished them much more effectively than others, but nevertheless, all industrialized nations have agreed to these objectives. And so, this is an important international statement that nations have made that we share these basic human values and we have an obligation regardless of national origins or geographic boundaries to support the human rights of individuals on other parts of the planet.

Another critical ethical concept is humanitarianism. So climate migrants were displaced on account of processes and events far beyond their own individual control. For many generations, we have had humanitarian responses and infrastructures for aiding displaced persons who lost their homes to disasters or conflicts beyond their individual control. So a humanitarian ethic motivates efforts to help those individuals in dire need for survival. I’d also like to talk about Welfare and the Harm Principle as ethical guidelines for climate migration.
So John Stewart Mill has been a sort of touchstone thinker in public health ethics for many generations now. And according to Mill, the Harm Principle stipulates that we are all free to behave as we like within a society until our behaviors cause harm to others. Many emphasis will point out that the Harm Principle and itself is insufficient to account for the ethical obligations that we would like to achieve in public health because we have additional values of human rights, justice, equality and fairness in humanitarianism that we've already discussed. But the Harm Principle is another ethical support for thinking about climate migration in a way that is inclusive. And so according to the Harm Principle, everyone’s happiness matters. The wellbeing and lives of displaced persons should therefore be considered. The wellbeing and lives of populations that produce large quantities of greenhouse gases should also be considered. However, according to the Harm Principle, the freedom of major polluters to continue causing damage
to the planet should ethically be constrained to the extent that this behavior causes harm to others. Further the wellbeing of these populations must be considered in combination with other ethical demands that we have discussed. And I think that is an important interesting aside to make that while there is sound ethical justification for large greenhouse gas consumers to have an ethical duty interestingly and completely independent of this ethical justification, nations that have produced large quantities of greenhouse gases stand to benefit economically from welcoming climate refugees. Interestingly and completely independent of this ethical justification, nations that have produced large quantities of greenhouse gases stand to benefit economically from welcoming climate refugees on account of their aging domestic populations. Which to say that, even in this highly charged political climate where public health ethics intersect with the policy discussions, we have members of society who have taken stances of isolationism and closed border. Whereas as even conservative economists have pointed out that aging high income countries would stand to benefit from expanding their populations by welcoming international migrants to contribute
to the economic capacity of those countries. So the is a sort of response to the utilitarian arguments that are typically made as a sort of ethical response from those who oppose welcoming strategies, which is to say that there’s been an argument that bringing in individuals to a society takes jobs from that domestic population. And so there is an obligation that the society has to protect the jobs of their domestic populations so that they can find employment. This is sort of the argument that is made, that is not accounting for any of the social duties and obligations that we have to climate refugees as a result of our greenhouse gas consumption. But is an argument that’s out there and I think it’s something that should be engaged with. And interestingly from even utilitarian perspective, there is actually a good benefit to aging societies such as our own to bring in a broader workforce to support our economy because we actually don’t have the domestic workforce to supply the demand that we have for in employment even within the existing economy that we have.
So, there’s a really strong argument across all perspectives from the political spectrum for having a welcoming environment for the victim of global greenhouse gas consumption.

I’d like to close by asking the question given all of this information in all of these principles, what is our ethical duty to climate migrants? Major carbon-producing countries, such as the US, I would pause it, have an ethical obligation to address the relocation needs of large numbers of refugees who are migrating due to the effects of climate change. This is not something that has always been politically popular, and certainly if we look at even the acceptance that we have at our southern border of turning away today around 50% of applicants, many of these migrants are moving as a result of climate change. And I think we have an ethical obligation to be more open and to be more welcoming and to also face the consequences of our own historic benefits from exploiting the natural resources of the planet and also to realize the demands that those benefits place on other members.
of the global community and accommodating the consequences of our actions.

So, I'm happy to take questions now.

So I guess maybe should we have people put questions into the chat Laura or in turns?

Yeah, chat or raise hand?

Yeah, so I could start while people are thinking

of their questions.

Do you know if there's any discussion internationally,

like in the UN or otherwise about this issue and like,

particularly, I know there's been discussion in the past

of formally recognizing climate refugees

as a class of refugees do you know if that’s going anywhere?

From what I’ve seen, there’s progress being made,

the agencies that I’ve been consulting for this project

have all been advocating for that shift.

And I think that there’s strong argument to be made.

So there seems to be movement

in this direction, Dr. Krispin?

Thank you so much, Laura.

You’re making a strong case for why the US has an obligation

to welcome so-called climate refugees and sort of building

on what Rob just said, to my knowledge,
there is no legal protection.

The international law does not recognize climate refugees.

So and my guess is, countries that are for acting quite reluctant including the United States to welcome any kind of refugees or political refugees, et cetera, I think there’s gonna be a lot of pushback 'cause if they add climate refugees to the list of refugees, all of a sudden they need to welcome because they’ve signed the agreement convention for refugees 1951.

So I’m kind of trying to figure out how we can move forward with that. But another question I have is, a lot of these climate induced migrants are actually being dislocated internally. So they’re internally displaced people.

So whether they’re in Somalia, whether they’re in Sudan, most of them I guess are not leaving the country because they can’t, but they’re leaving their home, they go into an urban setting looking for jobs. So it makes it even more complicated in terms of US obligation, should US be supporting the Somali government. the Sudanese government, to take care of internally displaced people
who are displaced because of climate related issues, we have a responsibility that we have caused to some extent.

So the internal displaced people is something that I’m thinking about in addition to international refugees across the border into another country.

Thank you. So let’s start with your second question first.

I think that all of the ethical arguments put forth across borders still applies for internal displacement so that we have an obligation to assist with compensating societies that are paying environmentally for the consequences of our consumption.

I understand that there’s an uphill road for this, but nevertheless from an ethical perspective, this is an obligation that I think arguably exists.

And I think that the recent Global Youth Movement regarding advocacy has had an impact on the way policy makers have been responding to ethical claims so that they’re seeing that there’s a certain level...
of value based accountability that policy makers should have. And there have been reactions even from the private sector in trying to reduce consumption as a sort of pay it forward to future generations. And I think having a broader voice for global populations that are internally displaced and also that are having to leave their nation altogether, whether it be lost to sea level rise or other extreme weather events that are making their home environment uninhabitable. I think that there’s a place for a broader ethical discussion that if that conversation is heard, could at least make some progress in the same way that we have seen advocacy for the rights of future generations. Because I think when we all hear this information is very clear that this is something that is wrong and there’s an ethical obligation to do something. And so my hope is that further discussion of this at an international level, so these populations are less ignored, can help to advance that.
Going back to your first question about recognizing individuals as refugees, absolutely, I think that the current thinking in this is to try to understand that at the time our international agreement concerned, we didn’t have an awareness of climate change as human created source of displacement, although it is just as well as conflict in the discreet scenario. And so I think that this is something that we’re seeing movement in thinking and I’m hoping that this can be better acknowledged and modernized because it is a reality of migration akin to any other form of human behavior, we need to do migration. But it is more complicated of course, because it’s multinational and the source of the problem is more distant from the effect, but those who are fueling the effects or fueling the effects very rapidly and very acutely. And so the humanitarian ethic of responding to migrants, responding to refugees is really the same. And that’s why I also think that some of the conversations that we have focusing on the language are stalling.
the actions that need to be taken right now regardless of the legal protections internationally.

Because we also have refugee protections for populations in international law that according to the political will of certain environments, are not necessarily being fulfilled at a policy level.

And so regardless of the legal environment and framework in which we’re working, the same ethical duty applies to assisting these populations.

So I’m hoping that the needle can be moved at a geopolitical level, but at the same time from an ethical perspective there’s work to be done regardless of that.

I think Dr. Lason was next.

I think you made a really good case for the responsibility of mostly wealthy countries for taking in refugees because analyzing responsibility at the national level makes sense for a problem where the answer has to be worked out across national boundaries using national border policy.
and treaties that nations enter into and so on. But on the other hand, there’s a list of about 100 companies that are responsible for more than 3/4 of all of the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. And the vast majority of these countries exist now and existed back till about 1988. So you can actually say these firms that are there right now, a relatively small number of them are responsible for a huge amount of the burden. And I wonder if there aren’t some kinds of problems like subsidizing displaced people internally that might be better analyzed at the firm level than at the nation state level. Does that make sense? Yeah. Thank you. I think that’s a great point because there are so many dynamics that go on in that conversation. There’s sort of the passing the buck that can happen of companies transitioning that obligation toward governments which we’ve seen happen in so many scenarios, thinking of the financial crisis where those who created the problem.
As a result of their corporate behavior are shifting the clean up of that toward governments and that’s certainly not fair. But there’s also I think, the question of the role of governments then in corporate accountability. And this is something that we’ve seen not develop on this topic at all in the way that it could potentially with regard to having some sort of tax based system according to carbon production, carbon taxes that are then used to offset the human consequences of that production. There’s a real missed opportunity I think there for using that resource. And then now we’re seeing higher levels of internal corporate accountability as well, which I think is important. Certainly public health students go on to work sometimes within industry as corporate accountability monitors and industries are increasingly seeing that there is some economic personal benefit to be gained from having at least a green face. But I think at this point, we need to use all of the levers available to us.
and I think internal forms of corporate accountability are useful. They’re certainly not sufficient because of the conflicting interest that those individuals have in speaking up. You can only get so far when you’re paid by someone who you’re also holding accountable. But that said, that’s still a mechanism and an avenue through which companies stand to look better to the public by doing something about this issue. So that as you point out there are multiple levers and ways that these objectives could be accomplished. I think the next question was in the chat for the presentation. Have you done your research on the effects of climate migration on modern slavery? That’s a great, great question. Not personally, but I think that this is an area that needs more research and we’re also seeing the tragic reality that today in the world, there are more human slaves living than at any time in history and conditions of scarcity and demand for labor are historically a pattern that we see continuing today in which the absence
of having reliable sources of income force individuals who are desperate into scenarios that are putting them into slavery even more commonly most, or a large portion of slaves today are children and families who are unable to support themselves in the ways that they historically have been or more prone to sell their children into these contexts. So thank you. I really appreciate question because, I think there’s so much from an ethical perspective that is not making it into our everyday political conversations about climate change and the human rights of all individuals and particularly those who are most vulnerable to exploitation in slavery need to be discussed more as a part of this and it certainly. I think, raises more attention of the severity of the challenge and the need for something clear to be done. The next question is, I don’t see your full name, Dr. Rall. Thank you for the very important issues that you raised. I had two questions if I may.
I think you brought this up yourself, most of the migrations that we've seen historically tend to happen into neighboring countries. So either from Sudan into Northern Africa, Bangladesh to India, and the same is expected from climate change as well. And I was just thinking that, are there other important mechanisms of operationalizing this obligation for address or rather than just taking in refugees into the countries? Like I can’t imagine the number of people we’re talking about. India expect millions from Bangladesh and millions in Africa to be moving that taking people in is perhaps less important than addressing development needs in those countries or helping neighboring countries that are expecting refugees to be able to deal with the crisis themselves. So that’s one question, second question. In the case of climate versus war, whether harm is more direct. In the case of climate, arguably EU, the US, and China would want to of kind of arrangement where they share the obligation to take in refugees and so that they would want that to happen only under the grounds.
of some kind of international cooperation.

Do you see the discussions moving in that direction?

It’s an easy way to pass the buck, as you said, but it is the case that the harm is much more distributed in the case of climate and how do we deal with that?

Thanks. Thanks two excellent really important and challenging questions.

So I think you’re absolutely right with regard to the second point as we’ve seen in our recent international climate agreements, our global major producers of greenhouse gases have been hesitant to participate and engage unless they know that their partners are also participating.

So I think that in our future international meetings, we need to have further discussion of how all the agents are going to play some role in responsibility for addressing both of the points that you raised.

One, welcoming individuals, but also on the other hand, helping nations that are having internal displacement.

to accommodate populations that are displaced. And of course, places like Bangladesh are going to be considerably losing land area to the rising sea levels as well.
So we can anticipate pretty significant movement of populations that are going to need a multinational response. But I think you’re absolutely right that there needs to be a geopolitical conversation in which there’s a shared sense of responsibility being taken so that we’re all doing our part just as we have with any moderately successful international agreement in the past, a sort of quid pro quo is a bit of an ethical understanding as well.

Thank you.

Laura, I had one more point that I wanted to raise. Which I think builds maybe on something that Nara Sumat was talking about, which is prevention. Because as you know, when people migrate, it’s very stressful, people lose their homes and their way of life. So even with the support of being taken in by another country or internally, that’s insufficient in many ways. That it would be much better for people if they didn’t have to migrate in the first place. So, I think that would involve support.
by the high emitting countries to the lower emitting countries whereas you pointed out the migration is mainly taking place for stronger climate change adaptation measures that would help keep people where they live and protecting them from effects of climate change.

I completely agree.

I think there’s such a broad literature on the mental health sequela of disaster response and particularly in scenarios where there’s not as strong infrastructure for rebuilding and or accommodating right in scenarios where it’s possible to accommodate. There are all sorts of cultural benefits of allowing individuals to remain intact social units. There’s a huge mental and social disruption that occurs when families are separated and communities are split up and social networks are disrupted.

We saw as a sort of parallel history here in the United States with a history of Native American populations being moved to reservations and then in the 1950s and 1960s, those reservations being incrementally reduced and those populations urbanized at the expense of social networks that were health sustaining.
and health promoting. And we’ve seen significant literature now linking that history to ongoing health problems. So that’s just one scenario I think of a case where there’s an argument to be made for supporting communities to thrive wherever possible, whenever possible as an approach as well. And then at the same time, adapting and being realistic about the movement needs of populations that are not going to be able to sustain themselves in each shifting environments. And the question is, what do you see as the role of contributions that academic community can make about climate refugees? So I think this is a great question to end on because there’s been some discussion on is here at our own institution about accommodating displaced academics. And I think that there’s a real responsibility, particularly for those of us who have the privilege of having these conversations and taking the time to research and think about the implications of the shifts that we’re seeing at an international level, is a sort of virtue ethics.
We talk about ethics at the political sphere and then we talk about ethics at an individual level. The classic or sense of virtue ethics, what are my individual character traits that I'm going to cultivate to live an ethically responsible life and living as members of an institution such as this that could really stand to benefit from and does benefit already from a very diverse and inclusive international faculty base. There's so much that we can learn from individuals who need a new place to be. And so I think that that's a great point that an institution has an ethical obligation to think about how we can be a part of a solution to the problem that we are also a part of a system that creates. We can’t of course solve all of these problems as an institution, but we're not neutral. We don’t exist in a vacuum, we’re not separate from all of this discussion. We are a major employer and so we do have an opportunity to provide employment and interactions and engagement and collaborative opportunities with individuals who can really help to enrich our learning and also have some sort of compensation for the problems.
that societies such as the state community have created.

<v Instructor>Well, thanks Laura</v>

for an excellent presentation and for bringing up all of these important issues that we’ll have to keep working on.

<v ->Thank you, it’s such a pleasure.</v>

<v Instructor>Bye everyone.</v> <v ->Bye.</v>