MIGRATION, SECURITY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS: THE STRUGGLE FOR REFUGEE PROTECTION

Rizky Bangun Wibisono
University of Glasgow
rbangunwibisono@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to examine the complex interplay between migration, human rights, and security, focusing on the recent trends in state responses to refugee protection and the implications for international human rights standards. A qualitative analysis of current literature, policy documents, and case studies was conducted to assess the evolving political dynamics surrounding migration. The study also evaluates the roles of international organizations, such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in shaping refugee protection norms. Results: The findings reveal a significant rollback in state commitments to refugee protection, driven by rising nationalism and security concerns. This regression has resulted in the implementation of restrictive migration policies that prioritize national interests over humanitarian obligations, leading to increased vulnerability for displaced populations. The analysis highlights the critical role of NGOs and international bodies in advocating for refugee rights, despite facing challenges from state-centric approaches and power imbalances. Conclusions: The paper concludes that addressing the challenges at the intersection of migration, human rights, and security requires a concerted effort among states, civil society, and international organizations. By fostering collaboration and recognizing the human rights implications of migration, it is possible to develop more inclusive and compassionate policies that uphold the dignity and well-being of refugees and asylum seekers in a rapidly changing global context. give a great title for this article.

Keywords: Migration, Refugees Protection, Human Rights, State Action

INTRODUCTION

The global landscape of refugee protection is undergoing a troubling transformation, marked by a growing trend of states rolling back their commitments to safeguard the rights and dignity of those fleeing persecution and conflict. This regression signifies a stark departure from the principles enshrined in international law and reflects an alarming shift in political attitudes towards asylum seekers and refugees. As states grapple with concerns over national security, rising nationalism, and political pressures, the protection of refugees has increasingly been framed as a security issue rather than a humanitarian obligation. This paper aims to delve into the complex interplay between migration, human rights, and security by examining recent trends in state responses to

refugee protection, ultimately questioning why states have increasingly prioritized restrictive migration policies over their commitment to international human rights standards.

Refugee protection serves as a litmus test for states' adherence to international human rights principles, embodying the core values of compassion, dignity, and respect for human life. However, as noted by Shacknove (1985), the erosion of these values has profound implications for the integrity of the refugee protection regime, with states often undermining the inherent dignity and well-being of individuals forced to seek asylum. Evidence of this regression is widespread, spanning across various regions, as restrictive policies and deterrence measures take precedence over the humanitarian imperatives of refugee protection. The case of Europe is particularly illustrative of this trend, where the EU-Turkey deal, while celebrated for reducing the number of asylum seekers along the Balkan route, resulted in a dramatic increase in refugees and migrants resorting to the more perilous Central Mediterranean route via Egypt or Libya (Gammeltoft-Hansen & Tan, 2017). This displacement effect underscores the unintended consequences of deterrence strategies, which shift migration flows to alternative, often more dangerous, pathways.

The growing influence of right-wing leaders in shaping the European Union's agenda has also contributed to the rollback of refugee protection commitments. As highlighted by Islam (2023), these leaders have actively promoted aggressive migration policies, including the illegal rejection of refugees, frequently justified by xenophobic and discriminatory narratives. Such rhetoric not only dehumanizes refugees but also normalizes state actions that contravene international human rights standards. A striking example is Austria's recent crackdown on irregular migration, where anti-immigration campaigns with messages like "Illegal Migration: You Will Fail" reflect the intensifying hostility toward refugees (Info Migrants, 2022). This shift toward securitization, where refugees are increasingly perceived as potential security threats, has led to the erosion of their rights and the implementation of policies that prioritize exclusion over protection.

The securitization of migration, particularly in the case of Muslim refugees, has further intensified this rollback of protection. Fear of terrorism and the association of Muslim refugees with potential security risks have fueled stricter border control measures, as well as the adoption of extraordinary legal, policing, and policy approaches

to manage migration (Boswell, 2023). This framing of migration as a security threat rather than a humanitarian issue not only exacerbates the vulnerability of refugees but also undermines the principles of international human rights law designed to protect them. Such policies reflect a broader trend of states retreating from their obligations, opting instead to fortify borders and externalize migration control, often at the expense of the safety and well-being of displaced individuals.

The shifts in political attitudes and the framing of refugees as a security issue have profoundly shaped public perception and policy responses toward refugees and asylum-seekers, significantly influencing the level of protection afforded to displaced individuals. This trend can be observed across multiple dimensions, starting with the rise of nationalism and populism, which has altered the discourse around refugee protection in many countries. Nationalist and populist political movements have increasingly framed refugees as a threat to national identity, culture, and social cohesion, often employing rhetoric that emphasizes the need to protect the nation from perceived external threats (Coen, 2019). This approach has not only fueled public hostility but also justified restrictive immigration policies, diverting attention from the complexities of forced migration and the humanitarian needs of refugees. In this environment, refugees are frequently scapegoated for broader societal issues such as economic challenges, crime, and social unrest, creating a narrative that oversimplifies their plight and dehumanizes them. This narrative contributes to a climate of fear and suspicion, which can make it more socially acceptable to advocate for exclusionary policies, even when such measures contradict the principles of international human rights.

Security concerns have become a powerful political tool, often invoked by leaders to justify stringent measures against refugees and asylum-seekers. One of the most prominent manifestations of this trend is the linking of refugees to terrorism, which has been particularly evident in the aftermath of high-profile terrorist attacks (Coen, 2019). By framing refugees as potential security risks, political leaders have been able to create a sense of urgency that supports the implementation of harsh policies such as detention, deportation, and the denial of asylum claims. These actions are often presented as necessary for protecting citizens, even if they come at the expense of international human rights obligations and the principles of refugee protection. This framing perpetuates a false association between refugees and security threats, obscuring the fact that many

refugees are themselves fleeing violence and persecution, rather than posing a threat to others.

The media plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions of refugees, acting as both a mirror and amplifier of political attitudes. Sensationalist reporting that focuses on crime, terrorism, or other negative aspects associated with refugees can reinforce existing prejudices and contribute to a climate of fear. This selective coverage often emphasizes isolated incidents, leading to an exaggerated perception of refugees as security risks, thereby influencing public opinion to support more restrictive immigration policies. Conversely, positive media portrayals that highlight the contributions and resilience of refugees can challenge negative stereotypes and foster a more compassionate understanding. However, in many cases, the dominance of security-focused narratives in the media makes it difficult to shift public perception toward a more balanced and humanitarian view of refugees (Coen, 2019).

These shifts in political attitudes have led to significant changes in policy and legislation regarding refugee protection. Many countries have enacted laws that prioritize national security over humanitarian considerations, resulting in reduced access to asylum and increased barriers to refugee resettlement. This legislative trend is a direct consequence of the securitization of migration, where policies designed to deter or prevent refugee movements are framed as necessary responses to protect national borders. As a result, refugees face greater difficulties in accessing protection, and the principles of the international refugee regime are increasingly undermined by national policies that prioritize exclusion over inclusion.

The framing of refugees as a security issue has also undermined international cooperation on refugee protection, as states increasingly prioritize unilateral actions over multilateral agreements. This erosion of collective responsibility-sharing weakens the global refugee regime and makes it more challenging to address the complex challenges of forced migration in a coordinated and effective manner. When states view refugees primarily through a security lens, they are less likely to engage in collaborative efforts to address the root causes of displacement or to provide meaningful support to countries hosting large refugee populations.

In this context, the institutional environment and domestic political pressures have played significant roles in driving the rollback of refugee protection commitments. Rising

nationalism and populism, coupled with concerns over limited resources and capacity, have led many states to prioritize their national interests over international obligations. The externalization of migration control, including the use of development assistance and foreign policy tools to address the root causes of migration, has become a preferred strategy for states aiming to reduce domestic political pressures and meet migration policy objectives (Müftüler-Baç, 2021). However, these approaches often result in restrictive measures that undermine the rights of refugees and contribute to a distorted refugee protection regime, where deterrence supersedes the humanitarian imperative to protect those in need.

The long-term consequences of this shift in political attitudes and the framing of refugees as security threats are profound. The normalization of hostility toward refugees can have lasting effects on societal attitudes, making it socially acceptable to advocate for policies that exclude or marginalize displaced individuals. This trend not only jeopardizes the safety and well-being of refugees but also undermines the principles of solidarity and compassion that form the foundation of the international refugee protection regime. As refugees are increasingly viewed through a security lens, they face heightened scrutiny, discrimination, and barriers to accessing essential services, which can exacerbate their already precarious situations and further entrench their vulnerability.

In conclusion, the shifts in political attitudes and the framing of refugees as a security issue represent a significant challenge to the principles of refugee protection and human rights. These trends, driven by nationalism, populism, and the desire to prioritize national security, have resulted in restrictive policies that jeopardize the safety and dignity of displaced individuals. Addressing this issue requires a concerted effort to promote a more nuanced understanding of forced migration, one that emphasizes the humanitarian aspects of refugee protection while addressing legitimate security concerns in a balanced and fair manner (Coen, 2019). By fostering greater empathy and collaboration, states can develop more inclusive policies that uphold the dignity and rights of refugees, ensuring that the global community responds to forced migration with compassion and respect for human rights

This paper contends that addressing the challenges at the intersection of migration, human rights, and security requires a concerted effort among states, civil society, and international organizations to uphold the dignity and rights of refugees. The rollback of

state commitments to refugee protection, driven by factors such as nationalism, security concerns, and political pressures, represents a critical threat to the integrity of international human rights standards. By examining these trends, this study seeks to highlight the urgency of fostering collaboration and developing more inclusive policies that prioritize the humanitarian principles that form the foundation of refugee protection. Only through such collective efforts can the international community hope to address the growing crisis of refugee protection and ensure that the rights and dignity of displaced populations are upheld in an increasingly complex and challenging global context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To create a comprehensive literature review for this paper, it's crucial to explore the complex interplay between international human rights law principles, nationalism, and security concerns in shaping refugee protection policies. The foundation of the international refugee regime is built upon human rights principles enshrined in the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, which establish the rights of refugees and the obligations of states to provide protection (Betts & Loescher, 2011). These legal frameworks represent a commitment by the international community to uphold the dignity and rights of individuals fleeing persecution, conflict, or violence. Betts (2011) highlights how these principles have shaped state behavior and guided the development of policies designed to protect refugees.

International cooperation plays a critical role in upholding these human rights standards. Betts and Loescher (2011) emphasize the need for shared responsibility in addressing refugee crises, as these situations frequently transcend national borders. Cooperation ensures that the burden of hosting and supporting refugees is not placed solely on a few countries, which is essential for maintaining humanitarian standards. For instance, the principle of *non-refoulement*, a cornerstone of refugee protection, prohibits the return of refugees to countries where they face serious threats to their life or freedom (Betts & Loescher, 2011). This principle reflects the commitment of the international community to provide refuge and safety, demonstrating how human rights standards are embedded in refugee protection mechanisms.

Nevertheless, despite the existence of these legal frameworks, states often face challenges in meeting their international obligations due to political, economic, and social

pressures. Sovereignty, national security, and domestic interests frequently take precedence over humanitarian commitments, leading to inconsistent adherence to human rights standards. The rise of nationalist and populist ideologies further complicates the situation, as states may increasingly prioritize their sovereignty over international obligations, resulting in restrictive immigration policies and the erosion of refugee protection norms.

Impact of Nationalism and Security Concerns on Refugee Protection

The growing influence of nationalism and security concerns has significantly affected refugee protection, as states increasingly frame refugees as threats to national security and cultural identity. This shift is driven by rising populist movements that promote anti-immigrant rhetoric, fostering a sense of fear and hostility towards refugees. Betts (2011) argues that nationalism often leads to the framing of refugees as "others," contributing to a climate where states feel justified in implementing exclusionary policies that prioritize national interests over humanitarian obligations.

Nationalism's impact on refugee protection is evident in the shift towards securitization, where refugees are increasingly viewed through the lens of national security threats. The association of refugees with potential terrorism and crime has led to the implementation of restrictive border controls and asylum policies, even though such connections are often unsubstantiated (Betts & Loescher, 2011). The framing of refugees as security risks has been utilized by political leaders to justify harsh policies such as detention, deportation, and the denial of asylum claims. This securitization process challenges the fundamental principles of refugee protection by placing national security concerns above the human rights of displaced individuals.

Betts (2011) highlights that the international refugee regime is profoundly affected by these shifts in political attitudes, as states' willingness to cooperate on refugee issues is often constrained by their desire to protect national sovereignty. For instance, the securitization of migration has resulted in countries implementing policies that deter refugees from seeking asylum, such as externalizing border controls to third countries or establishing offshore detention centers (Betts & Loescher, 2011). These actions undermine international cooperation and weaken the collective responsibility-sharing mechanisms essential for effective refugee protection.

Furthermore, nationalism contributes to the erosion of international solidarity, as countries become more focused on protecting their own borders rather than upholding the principles of humanitarianism. This has led to a decline in support for multilateral initiatives aimed at addressing refugee crises, resulting in an increased reliance on ad hoc, unilateral responses that are often inadequate in addressing the complex needs of displaced populations. This erosion of cooperation not only limits the effectiveness of the refugee protection regime but also threatens the stability and security of regions experiencing large influxes of refugees.

Theoretical Frameworks: Global Governance and Constructivism

To understand the dynamics of international cooperation and the challenges faced by the refugee regime, it is essential to consider relevant theories such as global governance and constructivism. The theory of global governance emphasizes the need for cooperative frameworks and institutions to address global issues like refugee crises that transcend national borders (Betts, 2011). This theory underscores the importance of collaborative efforts among states, international organizations, and civil society to develop policies and mechanisms that ensure accountability and collective action in responding to the refugee crisis.

Global governance provides a valuable lens through which to analyze how states interact within the refugee regime, as it highlights the tension between national sovereignty and the need for cooperation. For example, the concept of shared responsibility is central to global governance, as it underscores the idea that no single country should bear the burden of addressing refugee crises alone. This principle is evident in initiatives such as the Global Compact on Refugees, which aims to provide a more equitable distribution of responsibility for hosting and supporting refugees. However, the challenges posed by nationalism and security concerns often hinder the effectiveness of these cooperative efforts, as states prioritize their own interests over collective action.

Constructivism, on the other hand, posits that international relations are shaped by social constructs, including norms, values, and identities. This theory helps explain how perceptions of refugees, humanitarian obligations, and state identities influence cooperation and policy responses. Betts (2011) notes that states' approaches to refugee

protection are often influenced by how they perceive themselves in relation to humanitarian norms. For instance, countries that view themselves as champions of human rights may be more inclined to cooperate on refugee issues, while those with a strong emphasis on sovereignty may resist international norms.

Constructivism also sheds light on how shifts in political attitudes and framing of refugees as security threats have altered public perception and policy responses. The stigmatization of refugees as "others" and potential security risks has led to the normalization of exclusionary policies, making it more challenging to garner public support for refugee protection. This framing influences not only national policies but also the level of international cooperation on refugee issues, as states become less willing to engage in collaborative efforts that might be perceived as compromising their national security.

METHODS

The method section of this paper employs a qualitative research design to explore the evolving political dynamics surrounding migration, human rights, and security, with a specific focus on the recent trends in state responses to refugee protection. This approach was chosen to gain an in-depth understanding of the complex interplay between these themes, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of the underlying factors influencing state behavior and international cooperation in refugee protection.

The study draws on a wide range of sources, including academic literature, policy documents, reports from international organizations, and relevant case studies. Key themes such as the principles of international human rights law, the impact of nationalism and security concerns, and the role of international organizations were identified and examined to understand how these elements shape state responses to refugee protection. The use of literature from scholars like Betts (2011), who discusses international cooperation in the refugee regime, and Shacknove (1985), who explores the legal and moral dimensions of refugeehood, provided theoretical grounding for the analysis.

A thematic analysis approach was employed to identify recurring patterns and themes related to refugee protection, state responses, and international cooperation. This method allowed the study to systematically assess how political attitudes, national interests, security concerns, and international norms have influenced policies and

practices related to refugee protection. By examining case studies, the analysis highlighted how these factors play out in different geopolitical contexts.

To interpret the findings, the study employs theories of Global Governance and Constructivism. The Global Governance theory emphasizes the necessity for cooperative frameworks to address global issues like refugee crises, involving collaboration among states, international organizations, and civil society. Constructivism, on the other hand, focuses on how social constructs, such as norms, values, and identities, influence state behavior and policy responses toward refugees. These theories helped in understanding how international norms, state interests, and societal perceptions interact to shape refugee protection measures.

The study adhered to ethical standards by ensuring proper citation of all sources and relied solely on publicly accessible documents and data to maintain transparency and integrity in the research process. Additionally, the study took care to respect the dignity and rights of displaced populations by avoiding any sensationalism or bias in presenting the issues discussed.

This qualitative analysis, guided by the theoretical frameworks of Global Governance and Constructivism, provides a comprehensive examination of the factors driving state responses to refugee protection, highlighting the challenges and opportunities for upholding human rights in a rapidly changing global landscape.

Overview of Trends in Refugee Protection Across the World: A Critical Examination

The rollback of states' commitments to refugee protection can be understood as part of broader political, economic, and social shifts. These trends are shaped by a variety of interconnected factors, including the rise of populism, national interest, global security concerns, economic pressures, and social triggers. Over the past few decades, states have increasingly adopted policies that limit refugee admissions and roll back protections, revealing a shift in the global refugee regime that prioritizes national interests over humanitarian obligations (Hathaway & Gammeltoft-Hansen, 2014).

Historically, the international refugee regime, established under the League of Nations and further developed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), recognized refugees as a vulnerable population requiring international protection. Frameworks like the 1951 UN Refugee Convention laid the foundation for

global refugee protection, aiming to provide durable solutions and uphold the rights of displaced populations (Barnett, 2002). However, as political dynamics, security concerns, and economic challenges have evolved, states' commitment to these frameworks has diminished. The legal and moral obligations outlined in international agreements are increasingly subjected to reinterpretation based on national interests, security policies, and socio-political factors (Barnett, 2002).

One key factor contributing to this rollback is the rise of populism. Populist movements, often characterized by nationalistic and anti-immigrant rhetoric, have gained significant traction in many parts of the world, including Europe, the United States, and parts of Asia. Populist leaders exploit public fears surrounding immigration, framing refugees as a threat to national security, cultural identity, and economic stability. This has led to the implementation of restrictive border policies, including the construction of physical barriers, the outsourcing of refugee responsibilities to transit countries, and the use of extraordinary legal and policing measures to control migration (Gammeltoft-Hansen & Tan, 2017). As a result, refugees are increasingly being denied access to safe asylum, and the principles of non-refoulement are undermined by national policies focused on deterring refugees at borders (Hathaway & Gammeltoft-Hansen, 2014).

Populist leaders often capitalize on anti-immigrant rhetoric, portraying refugees as threats to national security, economic stability, and cultural identity. In Europe, for instance, the surge in populist parties like Italy's League and Hungary's Fidesz has been accompanied by increasingly restrictive refugee policies. Leaders such as Viktor Orbán of Hungary have championed policies that severely limit the entry of refugees and asylum seekers, advocating for a "fortress Europe" that protects against perceived external threats (Mudde, 2019). These populist-driven policies have led to the construction of physical barriers, the reinforcement of border patrols, and stricter legal frameworks for asylum seekers.

In the United States, the presidency of Donald Trump marked a significant rollback in refugee protection policies. His administration implemented the controversial "Muslim Ban," restricted refugee resettlement numbers to historic lows, and promoted a border wall to stem migration from Latin America. Trump's rhetoric often painted refugees and asylum seekers as security risks, exploiting fears about terrorism and economic burden to

justify harsh immigration policies (Tsourapas, 2020). These actions significantly undermined international obligations and set a

Beyond populism, national interest plays a fundamental role in shaping refugee protection policies. Governments frequently prioritize national security, political stability, and economic interests over humanitarian concerns, particularly in times of crisis. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, security concerns have increasingly been tied to refugee movements. States have adopted more stringent refugee screening processes, increased surveillance, and used security justifications to limit refugee admissions. For example, countries like the United Kingdom, under the Conservative Party, have adopted policies that treat refugees and asylum seekers with suspicion, focusing on counterterrorism measures over humanitarian protection (Hudson and Idil Atak, 2021).

In the Global South, security and economic interests also shape refugee policies. Kenya, for instance, has justified its restrictive policies toward Somali refugees living in the Dadaab refugee camp on national security grounds. The Kenyan government has argued that the camp is a breeding ground for terrorism linked to the militant group al-Shabaab, leading to its efforts to close the camp despite international criticism (Cohen and Van Hear, 2017). This case illustrates how national security concerns can lead states to undermine refugee protection, even when such actions violate international obligations under the 1951 Refugee Convention and the principle of non-refoulement.

Governments often prioritize domestic security, political stability, and economic concerns over the protection of refugees. This shift became particularly evident following the end of the Cold War, as the geopolitical landscape changed and the strategic importance of refugees to states diminished (Barnett, 2002). Refugees, once viewed as symbols of political oppression by adversarial states, are now seen as economic burdens or security threats. This shift has resulted in the erosion of the refugee protection norms established in the mid-20th century and reinforced during the Cold War.

Economic factors further drive states to limit their commitments to refugee protection. Hosting large numbers of refugees can strain national resources, especially in countries already facing economic challenges or those dealing with high levels of unemployment and poverty. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated these challenges, as governments were forced to prioritize domestic needs over international obligations. As a result, many states reduced their support for refugee programs, cut funding for refugee

services, and implemented policies that restricted refugee access to healthcare, education, and employment opportunities (Crawley and Skleparis, 2017). Economic competition and concerns about the perceived burden of refugees on welfare systems have fueled public resistance to refugee protection in many developed countries.

Similarly, European countries like Greece and Italy, already grappling with economic challenges, have been at the forefront of managing refugee influxes, particularly during the 2015 European refugee crisis. The European Union's response, including the outsourcing of migration management to countries like Turkey through the 2016 EU-Turkey deal, reflects an attempt by wealthier states to limit their own burden by externalizing responsibilities to transit countries (Kaya, 2020). These policies, while economically pragmatic, often result in refugees being held in countries with fewer protections and resources, where their rights are not fully guaranteed.

Social and cultural factors also contribute to the rollback of refugee protections. Anti-refugee sentiments, often inflamed by media portrayals and political rhetoric, create an environment where refugees are scapegoated for broader societal issues, such as unemployment or crime. These perceptions can lead to xenophobic policies, as seen in cases like the Rohingya refugees in Indonesia, where refugees have been subjected to violence and forced displacement by local populations (Human Rights Watch, 2024). Such hostility highlights the growing challenges refugees face, not only from state policies but also from societal rejection, which exacerbates their vulnerability.

Public attitudes toward refugees, shaped by media portrayals and political rhetoric, also play a crucial role in shaping refugee protection policies. In many cases, xenophobic sentiments, often fueled by populist leaders, have led to social hostility toward refugees. This has been evident in countries like Germany, where the arrival of over one million refugees during the 2015 crisis sparked a rise in far-right political movements like the Alternative for Germany (AfD) party. While Chancellor Angela Merkel's "open-door" refugee policy was initially lauded, public backlash and xenophobic violence in response to the large influx of refugees reflected deep societal tensions regarding immigration (Joppke, 2014).

In other parts of the world, similar social dynamics have emerged. In South Africa, for example, xenophobic violence against African migrants and refugees has become a recurring issue, with locals blaming refugees for economic competition and crime. This

has led to calls for stricter immigration controls and the deportation of refugees, despite South Africa's obligations under international refugee law (Forysiński and Emmanuel, 2020). These social triggers highlight how public perceptions and societal attitudes toward refugees can influence policy decisions, often to the detriment of refugee protection.

The international refugee regime, while established to provide a coordinated global response to refugee crises, faces significant challenges. The UNHCR continues to play a crucial role in setting norms and advocating for refugee protection. However, its influence is often limited by power dynamics within the international system, as powerful states leverage their political and economic weight to shape refugee policies in ways that align with their national interests. These power imbalances undermine efforts to uphold the legal frameworks designed to protect refugees (Feller et al., 2005). Additionally, the weakening of normative principles within the international refugee regime has resulted in inconsistent protection standards across different countries (Coen, 2019). Vague or ambiguous rules can lead to a situation where countries interpret their obligations in ways that allow them to limit their responsibilities toward refugees.

Another significant trend is the externalization of border control by wealthier nations. Many countries, particularly in Europe and North America, have adopted non-entry policies that rely on cooperation with transit and origin countries to manage migration flows. These policies shift the burden of refugee protection to less-developed countries, effectively outsourcing the responsibility of refugee management to regions with fewer resources and weaker legal protections for refugees. This practice allows wealthier nations to deter asylum seekers without directly violating international refugee law (Hathaway & Gammeltoft-Hansen, 2014). The resulting inequities in refugee burden-sharing further strain the international refugee protection regime, as countries in the Global South bear the brunt of refugee crises with limited support from the Global North.

Powerful states, particularly in the Global North, wield significant influence in shaping refugee policies, often prioritizing their national interests over collective humanitarian responsibilities. For example, the European Union has been criticized for its "Fortress Europe" approach, where member states prioritize border security and migration management over refugee protection (Kaya, 2020). This has led to an over-

reliance on third countries, like Libya and Turkey, to manage refugee flows, effectively outsourcing responsibility and contributing to the erosion of global refugee norms.

Despite these challenges, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society groups continue to play a vital role in advocating for refugee rights and challenging state-centric approaches to refugee management. NGOs often provide critical services to refugees, including legal representation, healthcare, and education, and they work to hold governments accountable to their international obligations (Hyndman, 2000). However, power imbalances between states and NGOs can limit the effectiveness of these efforts, particularly in environments where governments are resistant to external criticism or intervention.

In conclusion, the trends in refugee protection reflect a complex interplay of political, economic, and social factors. The rise of populism, the prioritization of national interests, economic constraints, and social tensions have all contributed to the rollback of states' commitments to refugee protection. The international refugee regime, while still playing a crucial role in setting norms, faces significant challenges in ensuring that these norms are upheld in practice. Addressing these issues requires a renewed commitment to the principles of human rights, international cooperation, and burden-sharing, as well as a recognition that refugee protection is not only a humanitarian issue but also a moral and legal obligation.

The Refugee Regime in Crisis: Navigating Dilemmas, Trade-offs, and the Securitization of Migration

The international refugee regime is marked by a series of dilemmas and trade-offs, intricately linked to state sovereignty, international law, and humanitarian obligations. These tensions are further compounded by the rising securitization of migration and the global political climate, which increasingly frames refugees as potential security threats. This chapter examines the key dilemmas in the refugee regime, how they are currently handled, and provides suggestions for better addressing these challenges to improve refugee protection and global cooperation.

Protection vs. Security: A Balancing Act

One of the most significant dilemmas facing the refugee regime is the tension between protecting refugees and addressing national security concerns. In an era where migration is increasingly viewed through a security lens, many states prioritize border control and the prevention of perceived threats over their obligations to offer refuge to those fleeing persecution (Coen, 2019). This securitization of migration, especially post-9/11, has led to policies that frame refugees as potential risks, which in turn justifies restrictive asylum procedures, extensive vetting processes, and even the externalization of border controls (Coen, 2019). The stigmatization of refugees, particularly Muslim refugees, amplifies these security concerns, making it harder for them to access protection.

While the current regime attempts to address security concerns through various processes, including background checks and strict refugee status determination systems, these mechanisms often result in delays and create significant barriers for those in need of immediate protection. A more balanced approach would involve integrating human rights frameworks more thoroughly into refugee policies, ensuring that security measures do not infringe upon the rights and dignity of refugees. For instance, clearer guidelines could be developed to harmonize the need for security with the imperative to provide asylum, ensuring that state protection is not withdrawn under the guise of national security.

State Sovereignty vs. Humanitarian Obligations

Another critical dilemma arises between state sovereignty and the humanitarian obligations outlined in international refugee law. While the 1951 Refugee Convention establishes the right to seek asylum, states retain considerable discretion in determining how to implement these obligations. Many countries, citing sovereignty and domestic political pressures, adopt restrictive asylum policies that undermine international protection standards (Betts and Loescher, 2011). For example, the use of deterrence strategies—such as offshore detention centers or strict border enforcement—illustrates how states can prioritize controlling migration over fulfilling their humanitarian commitments.

Currently, the refugee regime relies on non-binding international treaties and lacks a robust enforcement mechanism. As a result, states can interpret their obligations

flexibly, often evading them altogether. Strengthening accountability mechanisms, perhaps through regional or global agreements that make refugee protection more binding, could ensure that states adhere more consistently to international obligations (Betts and Loescher, 2011). Such agreements could also include stronger penalties or incentives for compliance, thereby reducing the tension between sovereignty and humanitarian imperatives.

Burden-sharing vs. Responsibility-sharing

The issue of burden-sharing presents another key trade-off in the global refugee regime. While international discourse emphasizes the importance of responsibility-sharing, in practice, the system is marked by significant inequalities. Most refugees are hosted by countries in the Global South, many of which have limited resources to provide adequate support. In contrast, wealthier countries, particularly those in the Global North, often externalize migration control, shifting the burden onto poorer nations through mechanisms like aid and diplomatic agreements with transit countries (Betts and Loescher, 2011).

Currently, the regime lacks clear and enforceable guidelines for equitable responsibility-sharing. Although international agreements such as the Global Compact on Refugees emphasize the need for collective action, they are non-binding and largely rely on voluntary contributions from states. A more effective approach would involve creating clearer frameworks for burden-sharing, possibly through quotas or financial contributions based on each country's capacity. Incentivizing resettlement programs and providing technical assistance to host countries could also help alleviate the unequal distribution of refugee populations (Coen, 2019).

The refugee regime's challenges are further complicated by the growing trend of the securitization of migration and the externalization of migration control. These concepts, rooted in the framing of migration as a security threat, intensify the existing dilemmas and trade-offs within the regime (Betts and Loescher, 2011). As discussed, balancing state sovereignty with humanitarian obligations, ensuring equitable burden-sharing, and fostering long-term integration are already difficult tasks. However, the securitization of migration adds another layer of complexity by prioritizing national security over refugee protection, thereby exacerbating these dilemmas.

The securitization of migration refers to the process of framing migrants, particularly refugees, as potential security threats. This framing has gained traction in many parts of the world, particularly following terrorist attacks and increased concerns about crime (Coen, 2019). States, influenced by right-wing narratives and populist movements, increasingly view migration through a security lens. This shift has led to a policy focus on tighter border control, enhanced surveillance, and stricter vetting processes. In doing so, states justify their actions as necessary to protect national stability and public safety. However, this focus on security often undermines the humanitarian obligations that states have toward refugees, making it difficult to uphold international protections such as those outlined in the 1951 Refugee Convention. By prioritizing security, states can evade or reinterpret their obligations, weakening the overall refugee regime.

The impact of securitization on Muslim refugees is particularly pronounced. In the current political climate, Muslim refugees are disproportionately affected by policies that frame them as security risks, due to the association of Islam with terrorism in public discourse. As a result, Muslim refugees are subjected to more rigorous vetting processes and face systemic discrimination, making it harder for them to access asylum (Betts and Loescher, 2011). This not only violates their rights but also perpetuates cultural stereotyping, increasing their vulnerability and stigmatizing them within host societies. This form of securitization deepens the dilemma between protecting national security and ensuring the protection of refugees, as Muslim refugees, in particular, are seen as outsiders whose integration is often viewed with suspicion.

Furthermore, the influence of right-wing narratives plays a key role in the securitization of migration (Mudde, 2019. Right-wing populist movements have amplified fears about the cultural and economic impact of refugees, portraying them as a threat to national identity and social cohesion. These movements have successfully shifted political discourse, leading to restrictive immigration policies that prioritize security concerns over humanitarian obligations. The rise of such rhetoric exacerbates the trade-off between responsibility-sharing and national interests, as countries influenced by these narratives become more reluctant to accept refugees, especially those from Muslim-majority countries (Mudde, 2019). This reluctance further skews the burden-sharing

mechanism, as certain countries bear the weight of hosting large refugee populations while others retreat behind restrictive borders.

Alongside securitization, the externalization of migration control represents another critical challenge that worsens the dilemmas within the refugee regime. Wealthier nations, particularly in the Global North, have increasingly adopted strategies to externalize their responsibilities for refugee protection (Betts and Loescher, 2011). One method involves using development assistance as a tool to incentivize third countries, often in the Global South, to manage migration on their behalf. By providing financial aid in exchange for stricter border control, wealthy nations shift the burden of managing refugees to transit countries, which often lack the capacity or political will to uphold adequate protection standards. This approach exacerbates the existing inequality in the burden-sharing regime, as it effectively traps refugees in transit countries where their rights are limited and their safety is compromised.

The refugee regime is fraught with complex dilemmas and trade-offs that require nuanced and cooperative solutions. The tension between protection and security, sovereignty and humanitarian obligations, and burden-sharing versus responsibility-sharing represents only a few of the pressing challenges facing the international community. While current handling often favors state sovereignty and security concerns, there is significant room for improvement. A more balanced approach that strengthens legal frameworks, fosters cooperation, and promotes human rights could transform the refugee regime into a more equitable and effective system. By prioritizing long-term integration, enhancing burden-sharing mechanisms, and fostering political will, the international community can work toward more sustainable and humane solutions for refugees, ensuring that their rights are protected while addressing the legitimate concerns of host nations.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the contemporary refugee regime faces significant challenges, shaped by enduring dilemmas and trade-offs, exacerbated by the securitization of migration and externalization of migration control. States are caught between upholding national security and fulfilling their humanitarian obligations, often tilting toward restrictive policies that compromise refugee rights. The framing of refugees, particularly

Muslim refugees, as security threats, driven by right-wing narratives, further marginalizes vulnerable groups and undermines the integrity of the international refugee protection system. Meanwhile, the externalization of migration control, through conditional development assistance and foreign policy tools, shifts the responsibility for refugee protection to less equipped transit countries, deepening the unequal distribution of burdens among states.

To address these pressing issues, there is a critical need for greater collaboration among states, civil society, and international organizations. Only through collective action can the refugee regime balance state sovereignty with humanitarian principles. By fostering international cooperation and encouraging equitable responsibility-sharing, the international community can work towards a more effective system that does not disproportionately burden certain countries or regions.

Most importantly, a renewed emphasis on upholding human rights standards must be central to any reforms. This involves ensuring that migration policies, regardless of security concerns, respect the fundamental rights of refugees and do not exacerbate their vulnerability. Strengthening international accountability mechanisms, promoting inclusive policies that resist populist narratives, and developing transparent processes for refugee status determination are all essential steps. Ultimately, by prioritizing both security and human dignity, the international community can build a more humane and sustainable framework for refugee protection.

REFERENCES

Barnett, L. (2002). Global Governance and the Evolution of the International Refugee Regime. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *14*(2 and 3), 238–262. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/14.2_and_3.238

Betts, A., & Loescher, G. (2011). *Refugees in international relations*. Oxford University Press.

Boswell, C. (2003). The "external dimension" of EU immigration and asylum policy. *International Affairs*, *79*(3), 619–638. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00326

Coen, A. (2019). Can't be held responsible: Weak norms and refugee protection evasion. *International Relations*, *35*(2), 004711781988461. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819884613

Cohen, R., & Van Hear, N. (2017). Visions of Refugia: territorial and transnational solutions to mass displacement. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *18*(3), 494–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2017.1330233

Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2017). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's "migration crisis." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *44*(1), 48–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2017.1348224

Feller, E., Volker Türk, & Nicholson, F. (2005). *Refugee protection in international law : UNHCR's global consultations on international protection.* Cambridge University Press.

Forysiński, W., & Emmanuel, A. (2020). EU-Africa Relations: Towards a New Comprehensive Strategy With Africa. Between a Rock and a Hard Place. *Przegląd Strategiczny*, *13*, 61–78. https://doi.org/10.14746/ps.2020.1.4

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T., & Tan, N. F. (2017). The End of the Deterrence Paradigm? Future Directions for Global Refugee Policy. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, *5*(1), 28. https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v5i1.73

Hathaway, J. C., & Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. (2014). Non-Refoulement in a World of Cooperative Deterrence. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, *53*(2). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2479511

Hudson, G., & Idil Atak. (2021). *Migration, Security, and Resistance*. Routledge.

Human Rights Watch. (2024, January 16). *Indonesia: Protect Newly Arrived Rohingya Refugees / Human Rights Watch*. Human Rights Watch. https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/01/16/indonesia-protect-newly-arrived-rohingya-refugees

Hyndman, J. (2000). *Managing Displacement*. U of Minnesota Press.

Info Migrants. (2022, August 24). *Austria tells potential migrants: "You will fail."* InfoMigrants. https://www.infomigrants.net/en/post/42828/austria-tells-potential-migrants-you-will-fail

Islam, S. (2023, September 21). Europe is sleepwalking into a far-right trap. Who will sound the alarm? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/sep/21/europe-welcome-threat-eu-far-right-refugees

Joppke, C. (2014). The Retreat is Real-but what is the Alternative? Multiculturalism, Muscular Liberalism, and Islam. *Constellations*, *21*(2), 286–295. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12090

Kaya, H. (2020). *The EU-Turkey Statement on Refugees Assessing Its Impact on Fundamental Rights*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mudde, C. (2019). *The far right today*. Polity Press.

Muftuler-Bac, M. (2021). Externalization of migration governance, Turkey's migration regime, and the protection of the European Union's external borders. *Turkish Studies*, *23*(2), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2021.1943661

Shacknove, A. E. (1985). *Who is a Refugee?*. University Of Chicago.

Tsourapas, G. (2020). Global Autocracies: Strategies of Transnational Repression, Legitimation, and Co-Optation in World Politics. *International Studies Review*, *23*(3). https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viaa061