International Journal of Advanced Research in Commerce, Management &Social Science (IJARCMSS)
(An International Quarterly Multidisciplinary Double Blind Open Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal)
ISSN :2581-7930 (Online), Impact Factor (Cosmos): 7.270& PIF (I2OR): 5.010, Volume 09, No. 02(II), April-June, 2026, pp 163-170

Between Promise and Practice: Human Rights Failures and the Global Refugee Crisis

Raman Deep Singh[1] | Prof. Vandana Sharma[2] | Prof. Manmeet Kaur[3*]

[1]Research Scholar, Bareilly College, Bareilly.
[2]Vice Principal, Bareilly College, Bareilly.
[3]Department of Political Science, Bareilly College, Bareilly.

[*]Corresponding Author: manmeet.bly@gmail.com

Citation: *Singh, R., Sharma, V. & Kaur, M. (2026). Between Promise and Practice: Human Rights Failures and the Global Refugee Crisis. International Journal of Advanced Research in Commerce, Management & Social Science, 09(02(II)), 163–170. https://doi.org/10.62823/IJARCMSS/9.2(II).8977*

ABSTRACT

Each year, millions of people are torn from everything they know — their homes, their communities, their sense of belonging — by forces they did not choose and cannot control. Wars erupt. Governments turn on their own people. Climates shift beneath the feet of farmers and fishermen. And when these people seek safety beyond their borders, the world that promised to protect them often fails to do so. This paper is about that failure — not as an abstract policy problem, but as a lived human reality with moral weight and legal consequence. It argues that the global refugee crisis is, fundamentally, a crisis of broken promises: promises encoded in international law, declared in solemn conventions, and enshrined in the language of universal human rights. The paper traces how those promises are routinely broken through illegal pushbacks, punitive detention, denial of basic services, and the political scapegoating of displaced people. It examines who suffers most — women fleeing gender-based violence, children who have never known a classroom, stateless communities stripped of legal identity — and why the burden of hosting the world's displaced falls so disproportionately on the nations least equipped to bear it. Drawing on a range of scholarly sources in the literature review, the paper then constructs an original argument for a fundamentally reformed approach: one grounded not in managed deterrence but in genuine solidarity, not in the language of burden but in the ethics of shared humanity.

Keywords: *Human Rights, Refugee Crisis, Forced Displacement, Non-Refoulement, Statelessness, Burden-Sharing, Asylum, Climate Refugees, International Law.*

Introduction

There is a photograph that many people have seen and few can forget. A small boy, face down on a beach. He had a name, a family, a future that the sea swallowed whole. He was three years old. That image — and the countless untaken photographs of the thousands of others who have drowned, suffocated, starved, or been beaten back across borders — is what this paper is really about. Not statistics. Not treaty clauses. People.

And yet numbers matter too, because they reveal the scale of what is happening. As of 2023, more than 117 million people have been forced from their homes — a figure that has more than doubled over the past decade. More people are displaced today than at any point since the systematic measurement of this crisis began. If they were a country, they would be among the largest nations on earth. Instead, they are among the most invisible.

This paper is concerned with the space between what the world has promised these people and what it has actually delivered. That space is enormous. On paper, the international human rights

framework is comprehensive: states have agreed not to return refugees to danger, to treat asylum seekers with dignity, to recognise their right to work, to educate their children, to grant them legal identity. In practice, borders are sealed with razor wire. Boats are pushed back into open water. People are locked in detention centres for years without charge. Families are forbidden from working and left entirely dependent on shrinking aid budgets.

The argument of this paper is simple, though its implications are demanding. The global refugee crisis is not a problem of capacity — the world has the resources to do far better. It is a problem of political will, of structural incentives that reward restriction over welcome, and of an international system that allocates responsibility in ways that are both unjust and unsustainable. Addressing it requires not just policy reform but a fundamental shift in how we think about displacement, sovereignty, and our obligations to one another as human beings.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 presents a literature review drawing on key scholarship in the field. Section 3 examines the historical development of the international refugee protection framework. Section 4 analyses the core human rights violations that displaced people face. Section 5 focuses on the groups most acutely affected. Section 6 addresses the inequity of the burden-sharing system. Section 7 explores two emerging challenges — climate displacement and digital rights. Section 8 proposes a reform framework. The paper concludes with a reflection on what genuine solidarity might look like.

Literature Review

The scholarly literature on refugee protection spans international law, political science, sociology, and human geography, reflecting the inherently interdisciplinary nature of forced displacement. Several foundational works and key debates shape the intellectual terrain of this field.

The legal foundation of refugee protection is best understood through Goodwin-Gill and McAdam (2007), whose comprehensive treatise The Refugee in International Law remains the authoritative account of how the 1951 Refugee Convention operates in practice and theory. They demonstrate that the Convention's definition of a refugee, centred on a well-founded fear of persecution for five specific reasons, was a product of its Cold War moment and carries with it conceptual limits that the modern displacement landscape has thoroughly outgrown. Their analysis of non-refoulement as a peremptory norm — binding on all states — provides the legal backbone against which contemporary state practices must be judged.

Hathaway (2005), in The Rights of Refugees Under International Law, offers a meticulous survey of the substantive rights that the Convention confers on refugees, from the right to identity documents to freedom of movement and access to courts. His systematic deconstruction of state compliance failures is a sobering account of how legal rights can be formally acknowledged while being practically denied. Hathaway's later work with Gammeltoft-Hansen (2015) on the concept of 'non-refoulement by proxy' — where states outsource deterrence to third countries to circumvent their own obligations — identified a trend that has since become one of the defining features of European, Australian, and American migration policy.

On the political dimensions of the crisis, Castles, de Haas and Miller (2014) in The Age of Migration provide essential context for understanding forced displacement not as an exceptional emergency but as a structural feature of the global political economy. Their analysis challenges the common framing of refugee flows as sudden crises requiring emergency responses, arguing instead that displacement is produced by predictable and preventable political failures, from armed conflict to economic collapse. This reframing shifts moral responsibility significantly toward the states and systems that produce displacement in the first place.

The particular vulnerabilities of women in forced displacement contexts have been documented and theorised by Edwards (2010), whose work on feminist engagement with refugee law traces how the refugee definition systematically undervalues gender-based persecution. Her argument that gender-based violence — including domestic abuse, forced marriage, and female genital mutilation — has been historically excluded from the Convention's protected grounds because it was considered private rather than political provides an important critique of the formal neutrality of refugee law. This literature informs Section 5 of this paper, which examines the disproportionate vulnerabilities of women and girls among displaced populations.

The issue of statelessness has been addressed most comprehensively by Blitz and Lynch (2011) in Statelessness and Citizenship, which examines how the denial of nationality creates compounded vulnerability for affected populations. Their comparative analysis across different regional contexts — including the Rohingya of Myanmar, the Bidun of the Gulf states, and stateless communities in Eastern Europe — reveals the systematic ways in which citizenship exclusion is used as a tool of ethnic and political discrimination. The book's argument that statelessness is not an administrative oversight but a deliberate political construction has important implications for how we understand the duty of states under international law.

On the question of burden-sharing — arguably the most politically charged issue in contemporary refugee policy — Thielemann (2018) provides a rigorous analysis of why international efforts to distribute responsibility more equitably have consistently failed. His political economy framework identifies the structural incentives that lead states to defect from burden-sharing arrangements, including the political costs of hosting large refugee populations and the ease with which the costs of non-compliance can be externalised. His work provides the analytical grounding for Section 6 of this paper.

The emerging literature on climate displacement has been shaped most decisively by McAdam (2012) in Climate Change, Forced Migration and International Law, which remains the foundational legal text on a challenge that the existing refugee regime is entirely unprepared for. McAdam's argument that the doctrinal categories of refugee law are conceptually unable to accommodate climate-displaced persons — because climate change does not produce the kind of individualised, state-directed persecution the Convention requires — is a devastating critique of the adequacy of current international protection. Her proposed legal innovations, including the concept of 'safe haven' obligations and the development of a new treaty instrument, have shaped subsequent policy debates.

Finally, the human rights implications of biometric data collection and digital surveillance in humanitarian contexts have been critically examined by Jacobsen (2017) and, more recently, by Molnar (2019), who documents how algorithmic decision-making tools are being deployed in asylum systems in ways that discriminate against applicants on the basis of nationality, language, and demographic profile. This scholarship reveals a troubling paradox: the same technologies that are presented as making protection more efficient may in fact be making it less fair.

Together, these works map a landscape in which the legal promises made to displaced people are consistently undermined by political failure, structural inequality, and conceptual inadequacy. The original analysis developed in the remainder of this paper builds on these foundations while extending the argument in new directions.

The Architecture of Promise: How the Refugee Protection Framework Was Built

To understand why the current system fails so often, it helps to understand why and how it was built. The 1951 Refugee Convention did not emerge from a principled philosophical commitment to universal human rights. It emerged from the specific and bounded catastrophe of post-war Europe, where millions of displaced persons — primarily from countries now under Soviet influence — needed legal status and protection. The Cold War shaped everything: who counted as a refugee was defined, implicitly but unmistakably, by the politics of the moment.

The Convention's definition — a person with a well-founded fear of persecution on grounds of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership of a particular social group — was a product of that context. It captures the person fleeing a government that wants to harm them for who they are or what they believe. It does not capture the person fleeing a civil war where no government controls anything. It does not capture the person whose village was burned by a militia with no identifiable political agenda. It does not capture the person whose island is disappearing into the ocean.

Over the decades, the framework was extended and elaborated. The 1967 Protocol removed the original geographic and temporal limitations, making the Convention universal in scope. Regional instruments — the 1969 Organisation of African Unity Convention, the 1984 Cartagena Declaration — broadened the definition to include persons fleeing generalised violence and events seriously disturbing public order. These were significant expansions, but they remained geographically limited and, crucially, non-universal.

What has never been built is a genuinely binding global system for sharing the responsibility of protection. The Convention tells states what rights to grant refugees once they arrive. It does not tell states how many refugees to accept, how to distribute arrivals equitably, or what consequences follow when they refuse. This structural gap — between rights guaranteed and responsibilities allocated — is the central weakness of the entire framework, and it is the gap through which millions of people fall every year.

The Reality Behind the Rights: Systematic Human Rights Failures

- **Pushbacks and the Erosion of Non-Refoulement**

The principle of non-refoulement — the obligation not to return a person to a territory where they face serious harm — is the cornerstone of the entire refugee protection edifice. It is also the principle most visibly and repeatedly violated by states that claim to uphold international law. What has happened at the borders of Europe, the United States, Australia, and dozens of other countries is not a series of individual errors or exceptional circumstances. It is systematic, deliberate, and documented.

Pushbacks happen when coast guards turn boats around before anyone can claim asylum. They happen when land border patrols beat people back across fences without taking their names. They happen when bilateral agreements are struck with authoritarian governments to intercept migrants before they reach the territory of the state that has obligations to protect them. The legal argument offered is almost always the same: territorial jurisdiction. If you have not set foot on our soil, we owe you nothing. International law does not support this argument the obligations of non-refoulement attach to effective control, not physical presence — but it is made repeatedly and with confidence, because the institutions capable of challenging it lack enforcement power.

What makes this particularly troubling is not just the direct harm caused to individual asylum seekers — though that harm is real, serious, and sometimes fatal. It is the message it sends about the nature of international law itself. When the states most vocal about human rights are among those most actively violating their refugee protection obligations, the entire system of international human rights accountability is degraded.

- **Detention as Deterrence**

Across the world, people who have committed no crime — who have done nothing more than arrive in a country and ask for protection — are being locked up. Not for days. Not while their identity is checked or their case is reviewed. For months. For years. Indefinitely, in some cases. In conditions that would not be acceptable for convicted criminals in many of the same countries.

The purpose of this detention is not administrative. If it were administrative, it would be brief and would cease once the necessary checks were completed. Its purpose is deterrence: to make the experience of seeking asylum sufficiently painful and humiliating that people stop trying. It is a policy of calculated suffering. And it works, in the narrow sense that suffering imposed on one group of people does affect the decisions of others in similar circumstances who receive word of what awaits them.

But deterrence-through-detention is a human rights violation dressed up as migration management. The right to liberty is not a privilege for citizens. The right to be free from cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment does not expire at the border. The psychological harm caused by prolonged detention — particularly to survivors of torture, imprisonment, or state violence, and most acutely to children — is well-documented and devastating. The fact that it is inflicted deliberately, as a matter of policy, does not make it more acceptable. It makes it worse.

- **The Right to a Life, Not Just Safety**

Even where physical safety is formally guaranteed, the lives that refugees are permitted to live are often a kind of supervised poverty, stripped of autonomy and dignity. The right to work is denied in country after country, leaving families entirely dependent on shrinking humanitarian budgets and the goodwill of donor governments whose attention shifts with each news cycle. The right to move — to travel, to settle, to make choices about where to build alife — is constrained by bureaucratic systems that require papers that refugees often cannot obtain.

Children are perhaps most visibly harmed by these restrictions. A child who spends three, five, or ten years in a refugee camp or an urban slum without access to formal education does not simply lose years of schooling. They lose the developmental experiences, the social relationships, the confidence and capability that education builds. They enter adulthood without the tools that their peers in more fortunate circumstances take for granted. This is not a natural consequence of displacement. It is a consequence of political decisions about who deserves investment and who does not.

Those Who Bear the Most

- **Women and Girls**

To be a woman in forced displacement is to carry a double burden. The first is shared with all displaced people: the loss of home, community, legal status, and the ordinary fabric of life. The second is gendered: the heightened exposure to sexual violence in conflict zones and transit routes; the particular vulnerability that comes from depending on male relatives for documentation and legal status; the asylum systems that historically demanded evidence of persecution in public and political spaces while discounting violence that happened inside homes and relationships.

Women who have been raped, trafficked, subjected to female genital mutilation, or forced into marriage may have entirely legitimate claims to refugee protection. But making those claims requires articulating intimate and traumatic experiences to strangers, often male, in a language that is not their own, within a system that was not designed with them in mind. Many do not try. Many who try are not believed. The protection system's failure to genuinely protect women is not incidental — it reflects deep structural assumptions about what counts as persecution and who deserves protection.

- **Children Without Childhoods**

There are children today who have never known anything but the camp. Born in displacement. Growing up in displacement. Reaching adulthood without having lived a single year in a place they could truly call home. These children are not statistics. They are people with specific names, faces, and futures — futures that are being shaped, often permanently, by decisions made in capitals far from where they sleep.

The most acutely vulnerable are those who arrive alone. Unaccompanied minors children who have been separated from their families or who set out alone in search of safety face risks that most adults cannot fully imagine. They are vulnerable to exploitation by smugglers and traffickers, to recruitment by armed groups, to sexual abuse by the adults who should be protecting them. And in many countries, despite clear obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, they are treated by migration authorities not as children in need of protection but as migration risks to be managed.

- **The Stateless: Invisible in Plain Sight**

Statelessness is one of the most severe forms of legal vulnerability a human being can experience, and it is one of the least visible to the outside world. To have no nationality — to belong, in law, to no country — is to lack the most basic form of legal recognition that modern societies provide. Without a nationality, you cannot obtain a passport. Without a passport, you cannot travel legally. Without documentation, you cannot access services, register births, enroll children in school, or prove you exist as a rights-bearing person.

Statelessness is not an administrative accident. It is, in most cases, the product of deliberate exclusion — of laws designed to deny citizenship to particular ethnic, religious, or political groups. The communities affected are among the world's most persecuted. They are displaced not only from their homes but from legal existence itself. And the international system's response to statelessness has been, to put it plainly, inadequate. The 1954 and 1961 Conventions on Statelessness have far fewer state parties than the Refugee Convention, and their provisions are rarely enforced.

- **Who Bears the Weight: The Injustice of Global Burden-Sharing**

There is a story that is often told about the refugee crisis, particularly in European and North American political discourse. It is a story about an overwhelmed developed world, struggling under the weight of mass arrivals, doing its best but unable to absorb any more. It is almost entirely false. The countries that host the largest numbers of refugees — Turkey, Pakistan, Uganda, Bangladesh, Ethiopia — are not wealthy countries. They are countries that are themselves grappling with poverty, infrastructure deficits, and political instability. They are absorbing millions of displaced people not because of generous policies but because they happen to share borders with conflict zones.

This geographic accident distributes the burdens of the global refugee crisis in a way that is both deeply unjust and practically unsustainable. The wealthy states that have the greatest capacity to share this responsibility are also the states furthest from the points of displacement, with the greatest ability to construct legal and physical barriers to keep refugees away. They fund some humanitarian

assistance — though rarely enough — and in exchange expect the poorer countries that do the actual hosting to continue absorbing millions of people indefinitely.

The political consequences of this arrangement are predictable. Host governments face mounting pressure from their own populations to restrict refugees' freedoms and reduce services. The international funding that was promised rarely arrives in full or on time. The result is a cycle in which the most vulnerable people in the world are used as a bargaining chip in negotiations between governments that have fundamentally different levels of power and self-interest.

Reform of the burden-sharing system is not just a matter of fairness, though it is certainly that. It is a matter of practical necessity. A system that asks the least-resourced countries to do the most cannot produce the outcomes the international community claims to want. It produces warehoused populations, restricted rights, and mounting resentment — on all sides. A genuinely shared responsibility framework, with binding commitments, predictable financing, and real consequences for non-compliance, would not only be more just. It would work better.

New Horizons of Crisis: Challenges the Framework Was Not Built For

- **Climate Displacement and the Legal Vacuum**

Imagine a family in coastal Bangladesh. Their land, farmed for three generations, has been swallowed by rising salt water. Their crops fail. Their home floods twice a year. They move inland. Then inland is not safe either. Eventually they cross a border. They reach a country where they ask for protection. What are they? Under current international law, they are nothing. They are not refugees. They are not officially stateless. They fall into a legal category that does not exist — and the law's silence about them is not an oversight. It is a choice.

Climate change is already displacing millions of people and will displace hundreds of millions more before the century is over. The communities most acutely affected are overwhelmingly those that contributed least to the problem: small island states in the Pacific, pastoral communities in the Sahel, coastal settlements in South and Southeast Asia. These communities are paying the price for carbon emissions they did not generate, experiencing displacement they did not choose, and finding that the international legal framework offers them nothing.

There is a moral argument here that goes beyond law. The countries that produced the emissions that are now destabilising the climate of others bear a responsibility that international law has not yet found a way to capture or enforce. Developing a legal framework for climate displacement is not merely a technical legal exercise. It is an act of long-overdue accountability.

- **The Digital Dimension: Data, Surveillance, and Rights**

The refugee registration and assistance system is increasingly digital. Biometric data fingerprints, iris scans, facial geometry — is collected from refugees as a condition of receiving food, healthcare, and other assistance. This data is stored in large centralised databases managed by international agencies and, in many cases, shared with national governments. The rationale is efficiency and fraud prevention. The risks are considerably more complex.

Refugees are, by definition, people who have reason to fear governments — often including the governments of the countries they are in. A Syrian refugee whose biometric data is stored in a system accessible to Syrian intelligence services faces a risk that extends beyond borders. A Rohingya refugee registered in Bangladesh whose data is shared with Myanmar authorities faces existential danger. The promise of digital humanitarianism — more efficient, more targeted, more effective protection — can only be kept if the rights of the people being registered are treated as seriously as the administrative goals of the agencies collecting the data. The right to privacy does not disappear upon displacement. The principle of informed consent does not disappear when people are hungry or frightened. The fact that refugees often have no realistic choice but to register — because their survival depends on access to the services tied to registration — makes truly voluntary consent impossible in any meaningful sense. The humanitarian system must grapple seriously with these tensions, not paper over them with procedural language about privacy policies that no one has the power to enforce.

What a Different World Might Look Like: A Reform Framework

It would be dishonest to offer easy solutions to a problem this complex and this politically entrenched. There are no easy solutions. But there are better choices — ones that the international community has consistently declined to make, for reasons that are political rather than practical.

The first and most fundamental change needed is a renewed commitment to legal obligations that already exist. Non-refoulement is not a new idea. It has been in international law for more than seventy years. What is needed is not a new legal instrument but a mechanism with genuine power to investigate violations, name the states responsible, and impose consequences that are more than reputational. The current system of voluntary compliance and diplomatic pressure has failed. Something with more teeth is required.

The second change is structural: the development of a binding framework for responsibility-sharing that replaces the current voluntary compact model. Such a framework would distribute the responsibility of hosting and supporting displaced people according to measurable indicators of capacity — national income, population, existing refugee numbers, available land — rather than geographic proximity to conflict. It would include mandatory financial contributions from wealthy states and legal pathways for refugees to access protection in countries beyond their immediate region. It would also include enforceable timelines and accountability mechanisms.

The third change is definitional: the refugee protection framework must be updated or supplemented to address climate displacement. This could take the form of a new protocol to the existing Convention, a standalone treaty, or the development of a binding soft-law instrument through the UN General Assembly. Whatever the legal form, the substance must include recognition of climate displacement as a category triggering protection obligation, and a mechanism for holding high-emission states accountable for the displacement their policies produce.

The fourth change is about participation. Refugees themselves must be genuinely involved in designing and evaluating the systems that govern their lives. This is not simply a matter of good practice or democratic principle, though it is both of those things. It is practically necessary: the people who live within protection systems have knowledge about what works and what fails that no outside agency can fully replicate. Meaningful participation requires funding, language access, safety guarantees, and a genuine willingness to let refugee voices change outcomes rather than merely be heard and noted.

Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, the reform that is needed is cultural and political rather than legal. The crisis of refugee protection is, at its root, a crisis of solidarity — a failure of enough people in enough influential countries to recognise their common humanity with those who happen to have been born in the wrong place at the wrong time. Laws and frameworks matter. But they are only as strong as the political will that enforces them. Building that will — through education, through honest public debate, through political leadership that refuses the easy populism of closed borders — is ultimately the work that no treaty can do alone.

Conclusion

This paper began with a child on a beach. It ends with a question: what does it mean to live in a world where that image was seen by hundreds of millions of people, generated weeks of political attention, and changed essentially nothing about the system that produced it?

The global refugee crisis is not a natural disaster. It is not an act of God or an inevitable consequence of geography. It is the product of specific political choices — choices about which wars to fund and which to end, about which borders to open and which to seal, about which children's lives are worth protecting and which can be safely ignored. Those choices can be made differently.

The legal architecture of refugee protection, for all its limitations, represents something genuinely valuable: a moment in history when the nations of the world looked at what they had just done to each other and to millions of ordinary people, and decided to write down their obligations in the language of binding law. That act was imperfect. The Convention has gaps, weaknesses, and blind spots that this paper has documented. But the impulse behind it — the recognition that forced displacement creates obligations of protection — was right, and it remains the foundation on which a better system must be built.

What is needed now is not a betrayal of that foundation but a deepening of it: a more honest reckoning with the ways the current system fails, a more equitable distribution of responsibilities, and a more genuine commitment to the dignity of every person — regardless of where they were born, what passport they carry, or whether the sea swallowed it along with everything else they owned.

The promise was made. It has not been kept. There is still time to keep it.

References

1. Blitz, B. K., & Lynch, M. (Eds.). (2011). Statelessness and citizenship: A comparative study on the benefits of nationality. Edward Elgar Publishing.
2. Castles, S., de Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world (5th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Edwards, A. (2010). Transitioning gender: Feminist engagement with international refugee law and policy 1950–2010. Refugee Survey Quarterly, 29(2), 21–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdq011
4. Gammeltoft-Hansen, T., & Hathaway, J. C. (2015). Non-refoulement in a world of cooperative deterrence. Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, 53(2), 235–284.
5. Goodwin-Gill, G. S., & McAdam, J. (2007). The refugee in international law (3rd ed.).
6. Oxford University Press.
7. Hathaway, J. C. (2005). The rights of refugees under international law. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614859
8. Jacobsen, K. (2017). Refugees and asylum seekers in protracted exile: Can self-reliance end warehousing? Journal of Human Rights Practice, 9(2), 230–247. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/hux020
9. McAdam, J. (2012). Climate change, forced migration, and international law. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199587087.001.0001
10. Molnar, P. (2019). Technological testing grounds: Migration management experiments and reflections from the ground up. European Digital Rights. https://edri.org/our-work/technologicaltestinggrounds/
11. Organisation of African Unity. (1969). Convention governing the specific aspects of refugee problems in Africa. OAU Doc. CAB/LEG/24.3.
12. Thielemann, E. (2018). Why refugee burden-sharing initiatives fail: Public goods, free-riding and symbolic solidarity in the EU. Journal of Common Market Studies, 56(1), 63–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12662
13. UN General Assembly. (1951). Convention relating to the status of refugees (189 U.N.T.S. 137). United Nations Treaty Collection.
14. UN General Assembly. (1967). Protocol relating to the status of refugees (606 U.N.T.S. 267).
15. United Nations Treaty Collection.
16. UNHCR. (2007). Advisory opinion on the extraterritorial application of non-refoulement obligations under the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
17. UNHCR. (2024). Global trends: Forced displacement in 2023. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends.

❑❑❑