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| Since light was shed on the migration crisis taking place between the Levant, North Africa, and European states on the other side of the Mediterranean, the debate on migrants’ rights, and the receiving states’ duties, has taken on a moral tone. The main function of this work is to explore the refugee crisis from a legal perspective. This will involve an analysis of the duty of non-refoulement in international law and comparing two distinct approaches to the concept, characterising them as follows: minimising jurisdiction and expanding jurisdiction. The first approach is undertaken by countries who seek to prevent individuals from reaching the borders of the State in the first place to avoid incurring the responsibilities associated with being unable to turn individuals back when they enter the jurisdiction. The case study used to discuss the first approach would be that of the United States, with a particular focus on Cuban and Haitian immigrants who sought to escape political unrest and socio-economic problems. The second approach is then that of expanding jurisdiction, wherein some countries seek to rescue those who manage to reach the vicinity of their borders, often by sea, and are protected by the State prior to the imposition of responsibility by international law. The case study used discuss the second approach would be that of the European Union, and particularly certain Member States, which have run programmes to protect refugees and migrants travelling by sea. Further to this, the EU has enacted a number of laws which allow anyone escaping a war or particular situation to be automatically considered a refugee and granted leave to remain. The analysis of both approaches is thus timely and compelling, given their appearance as polar opposites. The central idea of this proposal is to compare these approaches, from a legal perspective, and to better understand whether either, if any, offers a reasonable level of protection for the refugee. The ultimate aim of the work is to determine whether international law offers any protection to the most vulnerable individuals in its jurisdiction, and if such protection is best offered by law. |
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