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“Refugees have been deprived of their homes, but they must not be deprived of their futures.”
Ban Ki-moon (UN Secretary General)

In the past year, revolutions sweeping across the Arab World have allowed millions of people to look to the future with renewed hope; refugees of the Arab Spring, meanwhile, are still wondering if they have a future at all.

The individuals we call asylum seekers and refugees often find themselves moving from one circumstance of neglect to another. Their own country has failed in its duty to protect them from the gravest forms of violence and persecution, forcing them to flee their homes; in seeking safety abroad, they once again find their basic rights and dignity at risk in the country of asylum. In the Arab World, which hosts the largest portion of the world’s refugees, asylum seekers lack access to sufficient asylum procedures conforming to the standards of international law. Increasing economic and social pressures associated with supporting large refugee populations intensify the pattern of neglect. Meanwhile, political realities place the rights of some groups of refugees higher than others, contributing a final layer of neglect to those who do not receive first priority.

As we reach the first anniversary of the Arab Spring and the sixtieth anniversary of the landmark United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, it is clear that meeting the needs of refugees continues to be a cause of great urgency. Thus, this paper will serve several purposes (1) to review the relevant international legal structures for protecting refugee rights and the modern challenges faced by the
international refugee regime; (2) to examine regional approaches, including the situation of refugees in the
Arab World, and finally, (3) to draw attention to the fate of refugees during the Arab Spring and recommend
that this issue is given high priority on the agenda of regional reform.
Now is the moment to ensure that the uncertain hope of the Arab Spring does not translate into certain
neglect for its refugees.

(1) Legal Structure of Refugee Rights and Protections

International Law and Refugees

The displacement of people during times of conflict is an age-old phenomenon. After World War II, the
international community recognized the need to create a legal framework for the protection of these
individuals. The fundamental international conventions and treaties relating to refugees are now widely
accepted, establishing a standard of burden sharing among states.

Article 14(1) of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights grants that, “Everyone has the right to
seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.” Grounded in this statement, the 1951
Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees established what might be described as a “refugee bill of
rights.” It defines who can be considered a refugee, what rights asylum seekers and refugees are entitled
to, and how states are obligated to protect these rights within their own territories.

Refugees must abide by the laws and regulations of their country of asylum; in turn, each state is
responsible for protecting the rights of refugees without discrimination. At minimum, these include such
rights as freedom of religion, artistic rights, right of association, access to courts, wage earning
employment, self-employment, public education, and freedom of movement. States are encouraged to
broaden the rights offered in the 1951 Convention. Each state furthermore has the duty to fully cooperate
with UNHCR, the body responsible for overseeing implementation of the Convention. This
includes providing information on national legislation related to refugees.

The 1951 Convention grants one particularly important protection that is relevant to all asylum seekers, the
prohibition of expulsion (principle of non-refoulement). This provision forbids states from returning
individuals to their home countries if there is reason to believe his or her life or freedoms may be
threatened. Reaffirmed in International Humanitarian Law and numerous regional conventions, the
prohibition on refoulement has become a customary, or jus cogens, norm of International Human Rights
Law. It is considered such a fundamental principle that every state is bound by it regardless of whether or
not that state is party to the relevant conventions.

Since the 1951 Convention was crafted primarily with the goal of addressing the post-WWII refugee situation,
its provisions are limited to, “events occurring in Europe before 1 January 1951.” With growing awareness of
the global nature of the refugee issue, these geographical and temporal restrictions were lifted with the
addition of the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. As of today, 148 states have signed the 1951
Convention, the 1967 Protocol, or both. Both the Convention and the Protocol are binding on their parties;
states must apply its articles in good faith and without expectation of reciprocity.
Additional efforts by the international community to protect refugees are anchored in the foundation of the 1951 Convention/1967 Protocol. In 1967, for example, the United Nations General Assembly, recognizing the potential for refugees to cause friction between states, unanimously adopted the Declaration on Territorial Asylum. It clarified that granting asylum should be viewed as an act of solidarity with the international community, not an act of hostility. Article 3 also adds deeper meaning to the principle of non-refoulement, adding that prohibition on “rejection at the frontier” is included in its protections.

Between 1975 and 2010, the Executive Committee of UNHCR (ExCom) issued 110 Conclusions clarifying refugee needs and protections. These conclusions, ranging from a few lines of text to several pages in length, each provide greater detail on the practice and concerns of refugee protection. Samples of issues addressed include access to asylum, asylum-seekers at sea, burden sharing and international cooperation, causes of population displacement, refugee children, disabled persons, discrimination, education, health, mass influxes of refugees, armed attacks on refugee camps, the role of non-governmental organizations, right to return, statelessness, women and more. Organized chronologically, these conclusions construct a picture of the evolution of refugee policy since the 1951 Convention/1967 Protocol.

International Refugee Law constitutes one branch of the broader category of International Human Rights Law (IHRL). It is worth noting that some of the general provisions of IRHL apply to refugees. For example, article 22 of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child specifically addresses the issue of refugee children. This article states that refugee children retain the full rights offered to all children under the treaty, and in addition should be offered special protection. As another branch of IHRL, International Humanitarian Law (IHL) deals specifically with human rights in the conduct of war. Thus, it applies only in the presence of armed conflict. Nevertheless, its protections are sometimes pertinent to refugees. For example, the 1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment reaffirms the importance of the idea of non-refoulement.

Modern Challenges to International Refugee Law Between Refugee Rights and State Sovereignty

Clearly, international law prescribes the physical safety of asylum-seekers and refugees. It also guarantees them basic civil, economic, and social rights in a language that is universal, and asserts in no uncertain terms that the protection of these rights is a moral and legal obligation of the states themselves. This is captured in Article 3(3) of the General Assembly Declaration on Territorial Asylum, which states, “It shall rest with the State granting asylum to evaluate the grounds for the grant of asylum.” Herein lays the greatest challenge to the international refugee protection regime. The lines between international law and individual state sovereignty are not always clear. As refugee numbers soar and the economy plunges, the legitimacy of the international refugee regime is being put to a modern test.

The traditional notion of state sovereignty, based in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, gives a state exclusive governance over its own territory and the people therein. Sovereignty includes the right to create and enforce laws, collect taxes, wage war, form treaties with other nations, and decide who will be allowed to enter and receive protection from the state. Foreign interference in these affairs is considered a violation of state sovereignty. The effectiveness of international law, however, absolutely depends on the willingness of states to surrender some of their authority to the international system. Hypothetically, states are motivated to do so because it is in their own best interests.

It is out of respect for state sovereignty that international law relating to refugee protection falls short of mandating any specific procedures ensuring that states follow through.
A state is always free to cancel its obligations in the case that it perceives an individual or group to be a threat. States are increasingly using sovereignty as a justification for limiting their commitments to refugees. This could be due to a variety of reasons, from national security concerns, to fear of becoming economically burdened, to racism and xenophobia.

The 2005 hotel bombings in Amman, Jordan serve as an example of the potential conflict between refugee protection and state security concerns. Prior to the incident, Jordan’s Eastern borders where open, offering an escape route for tens of thousands of Iraqi refugees fleeing the U.S.-led war and occupation. The bombings targeted three large hotels, killing sixty people and injuring 115 others. Beyond the casualties, such violence represented a threat to Jordan’s tourism industry, which depends on its reputation as a safe destination. The bombers were later identified as Iraqis who had crossed into Jordan three days prior to the attacks. In light of this event, Jordan began to see refugees as potential security threats, and its border policies were markedly stricter after 2005. This case illustrates how the Right to seek Asylum is in some cases an unfortunate casualty of the fight against terrorism.

In the summer of 2011, a similar situation unfolded in the United States when two Iraqi terror suspects were arrested in the state of Kentucky. The investigation that led to their arrest didn’t begin until five months after the men had passed through the U.S. refugee resettlement program. They were charged with conspiring to send U.S. weapons to terrorists in Iraq. It was the first case of its kind in the United States, and though the men were only two of thousands of resettled Iraqis in Kentucky alone, it instantly raised contention over refugee resettlement programs.

**Burden Sharing**

All these factors lead to the perception that the burden of refugees is becoming increasingly unbalanced.

Since burden-sharing is the key strategy of providing proper refugee protection, the UNHCR Executive Committee has issued numerous conclusions reaffirming its importance and calling for states to pull their weight. For example, Conclusion number 67, issued in 1991, “Calls on governments in a position to assist, “to establish refugee admission ceilings, in the context of international burden-sharing.” Conclusion number 93, issued in 2002, “Stresses that responsibility and burden-sharing and the availability of durable solutions promote and strengthen the capacity of host States with limited resources to receive asylum-seekers and to provide adequate reception arrangements.”

The Executive Committee has also issued over twenty-five conclusions relating specifically to refugee rights and state obligations in situations of mass influx. These conclusions acknowledge the heavy burden of mass influxes on countries of first asylum. ExCom conclusion number 100, issued in 2004, recommends that the international community develop comprehensive plans early on in refugee crisis situations. Action plans should include, “arrangements on a bilateral or multilateral basis to apportion burdens and responsibilities in response to specific mass influx situations.” UNHCR’s Executive Committee finally calls for more research into the impact of mass influxes and protracted refugee situations on the environmental, economic, and social well-being of asylum states, particularly developing states.

**Manipulation of Refugees**

A disturbing trend in the crisis facing refugees is the tendency of states to manipulate them for political gain. Particularly, the presence of refugees can draw attention to and legitimize a struggle, and refugee camps can serve as buffer zones or recruitment centers.
Regional Approaches to Refugee Protection

Developments in regional refugee protection have the potential to help states deal with the challenges and threats facing International Refugee Law. They allow regions to focus on their specific needs and challenges in relation to refugees, and add another layer of encouragement for states to meet their commitments. A few key developments in regional practices demonstrate how regional legislation should build on and partner with the international scheme.

Most notable among regional provisions is the 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa. The OAU Convention adopts the definition offered by the 1951 Convention, but adds that the term refugee also applies to any person who has fled due to, “external aggression, occupation, foreign domination, or events seriously disturbing public order.” Article II of the convention focuses on outlining specific procedures that should govern states’ approaches to asylum seekers. The OAU Convention is the only legally binding regional treaty related to refugees.

Following the example of the OAU, the Organization of American States (OAS) issued the 1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugees. The document adds to the refugee definition in a similar way, including,

...persons who have fled their home country because their lives, safety, or freedom have been threatened by generalized violence, foreign aggression, internal conflict, massive violation of human rights, or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed public order.

The Cartagena Declaration is not binding, but parts of it have been incorporated into state constitutions, meaning that it still has an impact on regional approaches to refugee issues.

Both of the above documents were produced by formerly colonized countries experiencing periods of rapid transition, which contributed to a heavy refugee burden. In the 1960s, decolonization spurred large migrations across the African continent; meanwhile, in the 1980s, South America was fairly unstable, with many of its states going through major democratic transitions. With this pattern in mind, the revolutions of the Arab Spring represent a potentially huge regional transition. With this comes a potential opportunity for the region to recognize its needs and reform its approach to refugee issues.

Asylum Policy in the European Union

The European Union (EU) is in the process of developing a Common European Asylum System (CEAS) in accordance with the provisions of the 1951 Convention. This program is promising as well as unique. It began with UNCHR’s establishment of the Asylum Systems Quality Assurance and Evaluation Mechanism (ASQAEM), which closely examined the quality of asylum programs in eight European countries, made suggestions for improvement, and aided each countries in setting up Quality Assessment Units (QAU)s for long-term improvement of their asylum procedures. This was the first quality assessment program aimed at regional asylum practices, and may serve as a model for future advancements in other regions. The development of ASQAEM is ongoing, and UNHCR is monitoring it very closely due to the important role of the EU in matters of refugee resettlement.
Refugees in the Arab World

There is no doubt that refugees constitute one of the Arab World’s greatest humanitarian challenges. Together, the continents of Africa and the Middle East host 70% of the world’s refugees, yet the majority of Arab states have not yet fully embraced even the most fundamental international conventions relating to refugees. Most Middle Eastern states are not party to the 1951 Convention, though this trend does not hold true in the case of North African states, whose commitment to International Refugee Law was influenced by the development of the OAS Convention.

The League of Arab States has not produced any convention related to refugees. The 2004 Arab Charter on Human Rights (an update from the un-ratified 1994 version) does include a brief mention of the right to asylum in Article 21, which states:

*Everyone shall have the right to seek political asylum in other countries to escape persecution. This right shall not be enjoyed by persons facing prosecution for an offense under ordinary criminal law. Political refugees shall not be extraditable.*

In contrast to other regions’ adoption of more inclusive definitions of the right to asylum, Article 28 slims down the language of international law. It states that individuals have the right to seek political asylum, but does not mention that they have the right to receive (or “enjoy”) political asylum. It does not define what constitutes “persecution” and its assertion that refugees are non-extraditable falls somewhat short of a harsh condemnation of refoulement. The 2004 version of the Charter went into force in 2008, but as of 2010 had received only seven ratifications from its twenty-two member states, limiting its authority.

The general practice of the League of Arab States, like many of its individual members, is to respond to refugee situations on a case-by-case basis. However, the regional commitment to refugee protection has not kept up with modern demand. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), addressing the League of Arab States directly in 2009, pointed out that Arab country financial contributions total only one percent of its budget, down from eight percent in the 1980s. Some states have not adjusted their contributions in over a decade.

In reaction to the absence of regional legislation for refugee protection, the Group of Arab Experts, supported by UNHCR, convened to issue its 1992 Declaration on the Protection of Refugees and Displaced Persons in the Arab World. Although the document is not legally significant, it drew attention to several unique features of conversations about refugees in the Arab World. First, it raised the issue of Palestinian refugees, the longest standing caseload in the world (Article 9). UNRWA, which was created especially to address the situation of Palestinian refugees, reports that its caseload in the Arab World is 4.7 million, descended from 914,000 Palestinians who originally fled during with the 1948 conflict resulting in the establishment of the state of Israel. The number of Palestinian refugees continues to grow substantially along normal demographic trends, yet everything about their situation is complicated by the contentious nature of the question of Palestine.

The second intriguing point the Declaration raises is the legal role of Islam in many Arab States. Article 5 sites “the humanitarian principle of asylum in Islamic Law and Arab values.” Likewise, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) has taken steps to emphasize the urgency of the refugee issue in accordance with this principle. In 1994, it issued Resolution No. 32 on the Problem of Refugees in the Muslim World, which states that "solidarity [on the refugee issue] is dictated by the principles of brotherhood and the defense of human rights and human dignity, which are deep-rooted in the Islamic heritage and traditions." Resolution No.
32 offers support for international refugee law and declares the commitment of the OIC in working with UNHCR to improve the conditions of refugees in Muslim countries.

In Islam, the right to Asylum can be traced to the Prophet Muhammad’s flight from Mecca to Medina to escape persecution. Thereafter, the Quran offers asylum as a fundamental form of protection for Muslims and non-Muslims alike. This is discussed in terms that include istijara (plea for protection), ijara (providing protection), iwaa (sheltering) and aman (safety). It is argued that this Hijrah Law in Islam provides better rights for refugees than the international regime, yet this has not been brought into practice by modern day Islamic states. The strength of the history between Asylum and Islam and the revival of Hijrah Law may be an interesting angle from which to advocate the importance of refugee rights in the Arab World.

Guests or Refugees? The Case of Jordan

“We receive those escaping dire circumstances for humanitarian purposes. These people found a safe refuge in Jordan, where they are provided a decent and stable life, but it does put a strain on our infrastructure and natural resources. In spite of this, we will not abandon our humanitarian role, and we will continue to support them until circumstances are such that they can return to their countries.” King Abdullah II

Due to Legal Aid’s proximity to Jordanian refugees, this report will focus specifically on the condition of refugees in Jordan. This case study will shed light on some of the concerns that affect refugees throughout the Arab World.

Hosting more refugees per capita than any other nation in the world, Jordan has a reputation for being hospitable to the weak and weary. In 2010, UNHCR reported that Jordan hosted 450,915 refugees, including populations from Iraq, Somalia, and Sudan. This number does not include Palestinian refugees, which number nearly 2 million in Jordan and constitute 42% of total Palestinian refugees worldwide. Between Palestinian and Iraqi refugees, Jordan falls at the top of the twenty-four countries hosting refugees in protracted situations, defined by UNHCR as those who have been in exile for a period of longer than five years. In addition to hosting the oldest refugee populations, recent violent unrest in Syria means that Jordan also hosts some of the world’s newest refugee populations; several thousand Syrians have crossed Jordan’s Northern border in the last several months.

These rather impressive numbers do not tell the full story of refugees in Jordan, however. Like most of its neighbors, Jordan has not signed the 1951 Convention or the 1967 Protocol, though it has ratified the 2004 Arab Charter on Human Rights and it is also a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Despite hosting the fifth most numerous population of refugees in the world, Jordan receives extremely low numbers of new asylum claims each year; in 2010 it only had 2,071 pending cases. Rather than signifying an efficient system, this statistic indicates that Jordan has no legitimate system for dealing with the claims of its massive number of refugees. Jordan relies heavily on UNHCR, UNRWA, and NGOs to establish the necessary frameworks to meet refugee needs, both with Palestinians and other populations.

Adding to the neglect of refugees in Jordan is the state’s tendency to define refugees as “guests”, a term which carries with it a sense of warmth and hospitality, but which in reality serves as a potential loophole for denying these individuals the legal rights that accompany the term, “refugee.” This was the policy in the case of Iraqi refugees in Jordan, leaving many with expired visas and renewed neglect. This became an issue again as Syrians began crossing Jordan’s Northern border in 2011. The perception was that Jordanian officials employed the term “guest” as a cautious political measure to avoid offending the Syrian government.
Finally, the politics of refugee protection are evident in Jordan, with refugees receiving different levels of care and attention based on nationality. For example, to help relieve the burden of refugees it created by occupying Iraq, the United States raised its quota for Iraqi refugees; this was done at the cost of lowering the number of African refugees it would resettle. The bottom line is that refugees are offered aid and attention in part based on the “popularity” of the conflict that displaced them. In Jordan, this means that, at the moment, Iraqi refugees receive large amounts of aid while Sudanese and Somali refugees are virtually ignored.

Refugees of the Arab Spring

In the midst of the excitement of the Arab Spring, millions of people lost their homes. Several countries in the region are now facing a mass-influx of refugees, and these populations threaten the stability of countries in periods of significant transition, like Egypt and Tunisia. The refugees of the Arab Spring generally fall into two distinct categories: those who are being displaced for the first time and those third-country nationals who were already refugees or migrant workers, who are now being twice-displaced. Because revolutions in the Arab World have touched countries that harbored significant refugee populations (Syria hosted the most Iraqi refugees and Yemen hosted many Somali refugees, for example). The Arab Spring’s refugees have been subjected to unequal treatment in which some groups are assisted faster and more thoroughly, while others are neglected with tragic consequences. As an example, this report will especially focus on the fate of refugees displaced by the brutal conflicts in Libya and Syria.

Two Camps in Libya

Nearly 1,002,982 refugees have fled Libya this year. For most, the destination was the border states of Egypt and Tunisia. In Tunisia, two major concentrations of refugees several hours apart tell two very different stories. Those who made it to Tatatoine, Tunisia experienced something quite remarkable; according to the UN, nearly 50,000 Libyan refugees were initially taken into the private homes of Tunisian citizens in a warm expression of solidarity. The remaining 7000-10,000 individuals, a comparatively manageable number, were able to choose between camps funded and operated by UNCHR, the United Arab Emirates, and Qatar. The Qatari camp, the nicest of the three, provided flat screen TVs, fairly clean bathrooms, a playground for children, and three medical tents.

Just a few hours North of the unusually hopeful scene in Tatatoine, a very different story unfolds. Coucha, Tunisia hosts a greater number of refugees than Tatatoine, but there is one crucial difference; in Coucha, the refugees are not native Libyans, but rather non-Arab migrant workers, mostly from African countries. The camp has been attacked by Tunisian residents of nearby towns and set on fire. International actors that have taken action in Tatatoine have not offered the same presence or assistance in Coucha. As a result of these extremely desperate circumstances, many of the camp’s refugees have embarked on dangerous missions, sailing the seas in tiny boats in hopes of washing ashore in Italy.

Tunisia is not the only place where the quality of refugee care can be predicted by race. In Libya itself, many third-country nationals have also attempted to escape by sea to Italy. About 10,000 people have made this crossing from Libya since the beginning of the conflict, and 1,400 have drowned. At least one case has been reported of a boatload of refugees drowning due to negligence when nearby air and sea crafts ignored their repeated pleas for help.
Out of the seventy-two passengers on board, only eleven survived. The reluctant reception and in some cases rejection of Arab Spring refugees by European nations is extremely alarming. Britain and France in particular have expressed the sentiment that the Arab Spring’s refugees are not welcome in the European Union. Their positions have come under criticism, especially in light of the fact that they participated in the military intervention in Libya.

Currently, UNHCR reports that it is 39.5 million dollars short of what it needs to deal with the Libyan refugee crisis, and cautions that continued presence of Libyan refugees in Egypt and Tunisia could strain the resources of these countries as they are trying to rebuild themselves.

**Syrian Refugees**

After accepting 1.2 million Iraqi refugees, Syria faces a deep crisis of its own, which has driven tens of thousands across the borders toward Jordan and Turkey. The Turkish Red Crescent reports that over 30,000 Syrian refugees are currently residing in camps in Hatay, a province in the South of Turkey. This situation will certainly test the close ties Turkey has maintained with Syria. The Turkish government has reportedly been in contact with the Syrian government to attempt to set up a buffer zone for refugees near the border. Meanwhile, Jordan has let far fewer refugees cross its borders, and originally insisted on referring to them as “guests.”

Human rights groups report that thousands are camped on the Syrian side of the borders between Turkey and Jordan. These concentrated groups have been targeted by mortar attacks, poisoning, and other forms of terror by the Assad regime. Human Rights Watch has described the situation in the camps as particularly dire, citing a lack of access to water, unsanitary conditions, and food shortages. Many of these refugees fear that if they leave and the regime does not fall, they will be barred from returning to their homes. They also fear being transported to rather isolated camps in Turkey, where care and conditions are better, but international observers have struggled to enter and issues of freedom of movement are a concern.

**Recommendations for Regional Reform**

The refugee situations stemming from conflict in Libya and Syria demonstrate the magnitude of the issue addressed in this paper. In light of serious modern threats to the international refugee protection regime, the Arab World desperately needs to develop regional legislation related to refugees, and draw attention to the need to systematically address this issue rather than waiting until disaster strikes. Particular emphasis should be placed on encouraging states to update their refugee policies to meet international standards. States that have not acceded to the 1951 Convention or 1967 Protocol should be encouraged to do so. Furthermore, it is imperative that individual governments incorporate the principles of international refugee law into their own national legislation, focusing especially on key aspects such as non-refoulement.

On an international level, the principle of burden sharing depends on states reviewing and enhancing their commitments to refugees. Reforming national immigration policies and procedures to clearly distinguish between asylum seekers and other groups will help ensure that the former receive proper rights and attention. Finally, continued cooperation with UNHCR is necessary to ensure that each state fulfills its commitments.
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