THE RIGHTS OF REFUGEES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

States are increasingly challenging the logic of simply assimilating refugees to their own citizens. Questions are now raised about whether refugees should be allowed to enjoy freedom of movement, to work, to access public welfare programs, or to be reunited with family members. Doubts have been expressed about the propriety of exempting refugees from visa and other immigration rules, and even about whether there is really a duty to admit refugees at all. This book presents the first ever comprehensive analysis of the human rights of refugees set by the UN Refugee Convention, including analysis of its history and application by senior courts. Hathaway links these standards to key norms of international human rights law, and applies his analysis to the most difficult protection challenges faced around the world. This is a pioneering scholarly work, and a critical resource for advocates, judges, and policymakers.
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“[D]ecisions had at times given the impression that it was a conference for the protection of helpless sovereign states against the wicked refugee. The draft Convention had at times been in danger of appearing to the refugee like the menu at an expensive restaurant, with every course crossed out except, perhaps, the soup, and a footnote to the effect that even the soup might not be served in certain circumstances.”

Mr. Rees, International Council of Voluntary Agencies (Nov. 26, 1951)

“[I]t was clearly in the best interests of refugees that [the Refugee Convention] should be cast in a form which would be acceptable to governments, thus inducing them to accept at least certain commitments . . . Otherwise, they would be obliged to enter reservations which would probably exclude even those minimum commitments. Liberalism which was blind to the facts of reality could only beat the air.”

Mr. Rochefort, Representative of France (Nov. 30, 1951)
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