A Rational Case for a Robust Asylum Vetting System

24 May 2025

National Audit Office (NAO) Report: According to a report by the NAO, the cost of housing asylum seekers is projected to reach £15.3 billion over a decade, tripling the original estimate of £4.5 billion. This significant increase is largely attributed to the extensive use of hotels for accommodation, which, as of early 2025, accounted for 76% of the annual cost while housing only 35% of asylum seekers.

It's become almost predictable. The same lines are repeated online with metronomic regularity:

> *"Asylum seekers can't claim benefits. You need an NI number. Asylum seekers can't work. They only get £49.18 a week. Could you live on that?"*

This refrain, often delivered with theatrical moral certainty, is supposed to shut down all argument. But what it really does is obscure the full truth.

Let's take a clear, comprehensive look at the material support asylum seekers *do* receive:

 Accommodation: Fully funded housing is provided. This includes utilities, council tax, and other associated costs. In many cases, this means hotel accommodation costing hundreds of pounds per week per individual or family.

 Cash Support: £49.18 per week is provided for essentials, regardless of need. Additional allowances are paid for children, pregnancy, or dietary requirements. This is not means-tested.

 Healthcare: Full access to NHS services, including GPs, hospitals, and maternity care.

 Legal Aid: Taxpayer-funded legal representation to pursue asylum claims and appeals.

 Education: Free schooling for children, including transport assistance and

support services.

 Council Tax and Rent Exemptions: Asylum seekers do not pay council tax or rent.

So yes, asylum seekers may not technically claim *benefits* under the DWP definition, but they are still in receipt of a wide range of publicly funded support. To pretend otherwise is disingenuous.

Why This Matters

The question is not whether we should offer sanctuary to those genuinely fleeing mortal danger. The UK has a proud tradition of this. The question is how to ensure the system is not exploited by those who are not.

Because the hard truth is this: many arriving by irregular means are not fleeing war zones or persecution. They are economic migrants seeking a better life. That does not make them evil, but it *does* mean they are not eligible for asylum under international law.

This distinction is critical. Asylum seekers are people fleeing genuine danger; economic migrants are seeking opportunity. Both may be sympathetic causes, but they are not the same — and conflating the two, as many on the liberal left do, fatally undermines public support for the system as a whole.

We've all seen the TV interviews: a discussion on immigration's economic impact suddenly pivots to a tearful appeal for those "fleeing danger." Except that wasn't the group being discussed. This confusion is not just sloppy — it's destructive.

Furthermore, the issue isn't only one of principle — it's about *economic sustainability*. The cost of housing, feeding, and supporting tens of thousands of people whose identities cannot be fully verified is immense. In many cases, the Home Office simply does not know who these people really are. That raises real risks — and not just budgetary ones.

There have been credible reports of individuals with terrorist links exploiting irregular migration routes to enter the UK and other European countries. Border

control exists not to be unkind, but to protect national security. A system that waves everyone through is not compassion — it is negligence.

How Should a Proper Vetting System Work?

Here's a rational outline of how a credible and fair asylum system could function:

 External Application Only: All asylum applications should be made *outside* the UK, via embassies, consulates, or designated overseas centres. Arriving illegally must not be rewarded with preferential access to the system.

 Identification Requirement: The applicant must be able to demonstrate who they were and what their circumstances were *before* they left their home country. Without this, a fair and accurate assessment of their need for protection cannot be made. That means retaining and producing as much identification and supporting documentation as possible. Any applications judged not to be supported in this way should be **automatically rejected**, as the necessary evidentiary basis for evaluation is absent. The applicant must be able to demonstrate who they were and what their circumstances were *before* they left their home country. Without this, a fair and accurate assessment of their need for protection cannot be made. That means retaining and producing as much identification and supporting documentation as possible.

 Assessment Based on Pre-Departure Circumstances: The vetting must assess *who the individual was before leaving their home country*. Claims based on post-arrival changes (e.g., converting religion, adopting a sexuality, or political activity engaged in while abroad) must be disregarded. These can be strategic, self-inflicted and often bogus grounds for claiming danger.

Examples include:

- "I can't return to Iran because I converted to Christianity *after* I got to the UK."
- "I'm now a vocal critic of my country online and would be in danger if returned."
- "I've come out as gay since arriving in Britain."

While these may indeed place someone at risk, it is not the UK's responsibility to offer refuge to those who *deliberately* put themselves in danger to game the system.

 Independent Expert Panel: Decisions must not rely solely on the applicant's account. A panel of independent country-specific experts should assess the credibility of claims, supported by intelligence and cultural knowledge.

 Extremely High Threshold: Asylum must be reserved for the truly desperate — people whose lives are in *immediate*, *mortal* danger and who have *no other recourse* to safety. It must be an emergency provision, not an immigration backdoor.

Asylum Is a Temporary Provision

Asylum is not a permanent immigration route. It is, by definition, a temporary provision of refuge intended to protect individuals until such time as it is safe to return to their country of origin. This must remain the guiding principle.

Alongside this, successful applicants may, after a prescribed number of years and only once safety concerns have subsided, apply for the right to remain in the UK. However, such an application would no longer fall under asylum provisions — it would need to be judged as an economic migration request and assessed according to the same criteria and thresholds as any other economic migrant.

What About Those Who Can't Provide Documentation?

A robust asylum system must also be humane. It's important to acknowledge that not everyone fleeing persecution or conflict will arrive with a passport, ID card, or a neatly documented history.

Some may have lost everything. War, state oppression, or the simple act of escaping in haste often means personal belongings — including identification —

are left behind or destroyed. Others, such as LGBTQ+ individuals from places like Uganda, may have been forced to conceal their identity to survive. It would be neither fair nor realistic to expect full disclosure or paperwork in such cases.

But that doesn't mean abandoning scrutiny altogether. It means we must create a process that can distinguish between the genuinely vulnerable and those seeking to exploit the system. That calls for a degree of flexibility within a framework that still emphasises integrity and control.

Such a system might include:

- Structured interviews with trained caseworkers
- Collaboration with trusted international organisations to verify claims
- Temporary protection where immediate evidence is lacking, subject to review
- Special considerations for those fleeing identity-based persecution

This isn't about demanding the impossible. It's about ensuring that compassion doesn't become a loophole — and that scrutiny doesn't become cruelty. It's about getting the balance right.

Common Challenges & Misconceptions Addressed

Throughout discussions on asylum policy, several recurring challenges and misconceptions arise. Addressing these directly ensures clarity and strengthens the case for a robust asylum vetting system.

1. "The cost is negligible compared to the total budget."

While £5.5 million per day may seem minor in the context of the UK's overall budget, this expenditure is significant when considering its impact on local communities and services. As of March 2025, over 38,000 asylum seekers were housed in hotels across the UK, costing the Home Office an estimated £5.5 million daily. The Times+2The Global Treasurer+2The Telegraph+2

2. "Asylum seekers are dispersed to areas with low housing pressure."

In theory, dispersal aims to allocate asylum seekers to areas with available

housing. However, in practice, placements often occur in regions with cheaper housing costs, which can coincide with areas already experiencing socioeconomic challenges. This can strain local resources and services.

3. **“Using AI tools like ChatGPT undermines authenticity.”**

Leveraging AI tools enhances the ability to present well-researched and coherent arguments. These tools assist in organizing thoughts and accessing information efficiently. The key is ensuring that the content reflects genuine beliefs and is factually accurate.

Final Thought

Britain has always been a place of refuge for those in genuine need — and it should remain so. But a sustainable asylum system must be both compassionate *and* credible. That means having the confidence to welcome those who truly need protection, while being firm with those who seek to abuse the system.

Robust vetting is not about hostility — it’s about fairness: to the genuine refugee, to the taxpayer, and to the integrity of the process itself. And yes, that process must also have the flexibility to account for exceptional cases — where documentation is missing, or identity has been concealed out of fear.

Striking that balance is difficult. But abandoning scrutiny in the name of compassion is no more just than abandoning compassion in the name of control. A system that does neither serves no one.

Border control isn’t racism — it’s responsibility.

(Revised: 26 May 2025)