P-ISSN: 2808-0467
E-ISSN: 2808-5051
Homepage: https://iss.internationaljournallabs.com/index.php/iss

GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES: DILEMMA BETWEEN NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMAN SECURITY

Hardy Agusman[1], Dwi Ardhanariswari Sundrijo[2]
[1,2] *Department of International Relations, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, West Java, Indonesia*

[1] *hardy.agusman@ui.ac.id* [2] *riris.sundrijo@ui.ac.id*

PAPER INFO

Received: *May 2023*
Revised: *June 2023*
Approved: *June 2023*

ABSTRACT

Background: The refugee crisis have been an international concern as it is considered a multidimensional threat to security issues, both national and human security. States increased the level of protection that aims 'to maintain and to protect' their borders on behalf of sovereignty. On the other hand, refugees have the right 'to seek and to enjoy' asylum from persecution in other countries. In this context, refugee crisis implies the paradigm clash between national security and human security. The Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) is presented as the product of a "States Plus" approach to multilateralism that brought together several states, other stakeholders, and refugees to solve the dilemma above with the principle of burden and responsibility-sharing.
Aim: This article analyzes the legal mechanism that impacts the financial resources and fulfilment of the GCR objectives.
Method: The researcher combined a qualitative approach with a methodology for conducting a literature review. The majority of the articles and other sources used to compile the study's data were books and academic publications that examined relevant subjects.
Findings: Previously, refugee handling in the global refugee regime (1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol) tended to be state-centred. In contrast, GCR tends to be people-centred and comes from the refugee crisis realities (bottom-up). However, from the implementation aspect, there is a significant gap between the targets made in the Global Refugee Forum and its achievements. This discourse was dominated by a traditional state security perspective, while the humanitarian language emerged only in design framework of GCR.

KEYWORDS

refugee, national security, human security, Global Compact on Refugees, UNHCR

© The author(s). This work is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

The annual Global Trends 2021 reports published by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reported the number of forcibly displaced people worldwide, including refugees, asylum seekers, refugees in refugee-like situations, and internally displaced people, is around 89.3 million in total. The global number of refugees was 27.1 million, with 4.6 million as asylum-seekers and 53.2 million as internally displaced people (UNHCR, 2021b). However, in 2015, more than one million people travelled to Europe by sea. Thousands of those refugees heading to Europe died or went missing in the attempt (UNHCR, 2021a). The refugee crisis has been considered a threat to the national security of European countries. It is shown by several Western European countries such as Britain and France, along with Eastern Europe countries like Hungary, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and the Czech Republic, have increased the level of protection

that aims "*to maintain and to protect*" their borders to reduce or even prevent the entry of refugees and asylum seekers into their countries from Turkey's borders (Harding, 2015).

On the other side, there is an institutionalized global norm called the *non-refoulment* principle that has been adopted in Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which suggests that states cannot forcibly repatriate individuals to territories in which they may be persecuted, tortured, or be at risk of serious harm. The principle of *non-refoulment* is based on the right "*to seek and to enjoy"* asylum from persecution in other countries (Hyndman & Mountz, 2008). While *non-refoulment* may immediately correlate with the right to seek asylum, it prevents the host country from creating a policy to repel the refugees. Returning asylum seekers to territories where they are at risk of serious harm will violate Article 14. However, they will also violate the right to live, the right to freedom from torture or cruelty, inhumane or degrading treatment, and the right to liberty and security of the person (Hyndman & Mountz, 2008).

In this context, the refugee crisis implies the paradigm clash between national security and human security. National security has been described as the ability of a state to cater for the protection and defence of its citizenry (Hyndman & Mountz, 2008). As the language of human rights increasingly failed to protect asylum seekers, refugee advocates turned instead toward the concept of human security, believing that such an approach, which shifts the object of security discourse from states to people, could lead to a resurgence of international support for refugee protection (Hyndman & Mountz, 2008). It has been widely agreed that the experience of refugees is commonly characterized by discrimination, xenophobia, criminalization, poverty, humanitarian fatigue, lack of empowerment, dependency, and uncertainty of their stateless status.

The two sides of the refugee crisis that started in 2015 have caught the world's attention to dramatically increased asylum seeker numbers in Europe. To address this gap and better respond to the changing and growing needs of people on the move, the General Assembly of the United Nations affirmed the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) on 17 December 2018, whereby 193 States committed to a more equitable sharing of the burden and responsibility for hosting and supporting the world's refugees (United Nations, 2008). Burden sharing and responsibility are the main values of all stakeholders in solving the refugee crisis through GCR.

The background above describes a dilemma created by the refugee crisis between national security protecting the national interests of states and human insecurity faced by refugees. Thus, the research question of this article is "*do the norms of the Global Compact on Refugees serve the national security of UN member states or the human security of refugees*?" Indonesia's Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 on the Treatment of Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Indonesia recognizes the fundamental right to seek asylum and refuge. It is considered a step forward in Indonesia's treatment of asylum seekers and refugees (Yonesta, 2019). The regulation provides protection for refugees and asylum seekers in Indonesia by allowing them to access basic services such as health care, education, and employment (Dewansyah & Nafisah, 2021; Yonesta, 2019).

The Indonesian government's response to asylum seekers and refugees is conceptualized as "humanitarian assistance" through a politicized and securitized immigration-control approach[2]. Based on the Indonesian Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016, there is no

difference in protection treatment between asylum-seeker and refugee in Indonesia (UNHCR Indonesia, 2023).

This article shows that the influx of refugees is a problem with multiple effects and that every country is prone to the refugee crisis. The first section begins with conceptual discourse of national security and human security that explain different paradigm between state-centered and people-centred approaches. The second section of the article describes the norm emergence of the Global Compact on Refugees. The third section is process research through the legal mechanism of GCR. This section is crucial to illustrate the effectiveness of GCR. This legal mechanism should imply the financial resources of GCR requirements in the fourth section. The final section analyzes the fulfilment of GCR objectives that show the positioning of GCR between human security and national security. The article aims to present an academic discourse in terms of GCR partiality that imply to uneffectiveness of the international refugee regime.

METHOD

The researcher combined a qualitative approach with a methodology for conducting a literature review. The majority of the articles and other sources used to compile the study's data were books and academic publications that examined relevant subjects, specifically discussing the issue of global refugees. The three-stage Miles and Huberman (2014) approach, which includes data reduction, data visualization, and conclusion drawing/verification, was then used by the researcher.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dilemma Between National Security and Human Security

Today, the conversation surrounding the refugee crisis has become more popular. That is because of the development in the security paradigm post-Cold War. Cold War security discourse was dominated by State borders, national interests, and the arms race. This traditional view of security explains the underlying principles of the UN Charter of 1945, namely the sovereign equality of States, mutual coexistence, the maintenance of international peace and security through collective action, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States (United Nations, 1945). Within this context, refugees are viewed as potential threats to national security. In 1992, the UN Security Council formally recognized that "*non-military sources of instability in the economic, social, humanitarian and ecological fields have become threats to peace and security*." Superpower rivalry and bipolar politics had ended, and the world was entering a period of globalization and increased cross-border flows of capital, goods, and people (Edwards, 2017).

The dilemma between national security and human security is a complex issue that has been debated for years. Human security prioritizes individuals' security over national security and conceptualizes poverty as the real threat (Whitson, 2022). In contrast, national security is concerned with protecting the state from external and internal threats (Lama, 2018). Some argue that human rights and national security are not mutually exclusive and that it is possible to protect both (Mahmud et al., 2008). However, others argue that the two concepts are in conflict with each other.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) stated in its 1994 annual report that the concept of security has been too narrowly construed for too long "*as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interest in foreign policy, or as global security from the threat of a nuclear holocaust*" (UNDP, 1994). The UNDP identified two main components of this new approach: It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. Second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life (UNDP, 1994). They argued that it is time to move beyond the narrow national security or territorial integrity concept to an all-encompassing (transboundary) vision of human security (UNDP, 1994). National borders were increasingly seen as less important. Thus, refugee movements and other forms of population displacement had also assumed a new degree of political importance, largely because of their impact on national and regional stability. Noting that the security of people and the security of States are in that sense intimately linked (UNHCR, 1998).

In response to the increasing barriers to refugees, which represent declining respect for the principles of international human rights, refugee advocates have gravitated toward human security, arguing that this concept offers a complementary source of protection to the right to asylum (Odutayo, 2016). UN Commission on Human Security (CHS) defines human security as "*...to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment. Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms – freedoms that are the essence of life. It means protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations…*" (Commission on Human Security, 2008). UNDP offered an outlined four essential characteristics of human security: (i) it is a universal concern relevant to people everywhere; (ii) the components of security are interdependent; (iii) human security is easier to ensure through early prevention; and (iv) human security is people-centred (UNDP, 1994).

Furthermore, CHS explains that human security can be achieved by fulfilling two aspects: protection and empowerment. Protection is defined as strategies by states, international agencies, NGOs, and the private sector [to] shield people from menaces. It refers to the norms, processes and institutions required to protect people from critical and pervasive threats. Protection implies a "top-down" approach. It recognizes that people face threats beyond their control, such as conflicts. Empowerment is defined as strategies [that] enable people to develop their resilience to difficult situations. Empowerment implies a "bottom-up" approach. It aims at developing the capabilities of individuals and communities to make informed choices and act on their behalf. Protection and empowerment are required in nearly all situations of human insecurity, though their form and balance will vary tremendously across circumstances (Commission on Human Security, 2008).

Different conceptualizations between national security and human security through the different paradigms create a debate on the complexity of refugee issues. National security is traditional security that relies on the right to protect the territory from external aggression and national interest. In other words, national interest is above the norms of humanity. While human security is non-traditional security focused on people (Refugees) who have the right to seek and enjoy asylum in another country. Within this context, individual rights may not be violated, even national interest. This clash make uncertainity of refugees life because they are forced to rely for their protection on international and domestic legal regimes that are only

enforced due to humanitarian goodwill. Thus, understanding the behavior of states in the international refugee system is relevant in this article, especially given the ongoing tensions between the humanitarian imperatives of the international refugee regime and national interests.

Global Compact on Refugees

The influx of refugees to Europe in 2015 clarified the real-world consequences of this failure to solve the refugee crisis. Under the principle of non-refoulment, States are obliged not to return refugees to the territories of States where their life or freedom would be threatened because of their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion (UNHCR, 1968). This means that once States admit refugees to their territories, they are obliged not to return them to the territories of a State where they would face persecution. As a result, it creates a heavy burden for States opening their borders to a large number of refugees; it is widely acknowledged that the large-scale arrival of refugees poses various financial, social, and security-related challenges for host States (Turk, 2003). Given these challenges, this article uses the term "burden sharing." It defines it as sharing the costs and responsibilities associated with protecting refugees, alleviating the pressures on states hosting a large number of refugees, and recognizing that refugee protection is a global responsibility (Türk & Garlick, 2016).

The number of refugees is growing, and a more equitable sharing of the burden for hosting and supporting refugees is desperately needed. Despite this need, the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees does not provide clear pre-determined criteria for burden sharing or any mechanism to ensure adequate compensation to countries hosting for supporting more refugees than others. This gap in the international refugee regime is widely acknowledged; it is identified as the "one weakness in the regime established by the 1951 Convention/1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees" by Goodwin-Gill, a "perennial gap" by Türk and Garlick (2016), the "Achilles heel of the universal refugee system" by Grandi, and was called "by far the weakest aspect of the refugee regime" by Betts (Betts, 2009; Ineli-Ciger, 2019). Based on those acknowledgements, it is clear that the international regime does not have a proper framework for solving the refugee crisis.

The resolution on UNHCR, which affirms the Global Compact on Refugees (as contained in A/73/12 (Part II)), was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 17 December 2018 (A/RES/73/151). The resolution underscores the importance of the Global Compact on Refugees as a representation of political will and the ambition to operationalize the principle of burden and responsibility-sharing, mobilize the international community as a whole, and galvanize action for an improved response to refugee situations (UNHCR, 2021a). The Global Compact on Refugees is a framework for more predictable and equitable responsibility-sharing with a "State Plus" approach among UN member States, international organizations, refugees, civil society, the private sector, and experts.

There is a pressing need in today's context to reinforce international cooperation to ensure more effective, swift, and comprehensive responses to the needs of refugees for protection, assistance, and solutions. UNHCR organized a Global Refugee Forum in Geneva at the ministerial level in 2019 and every four years after that, unless agreed by the United National General Assembly (UNGA). In the Global Refugee Forums, all UN members and

relevant stakeholders will be invited to announce concrete and mutually reinforcing pledges to support the achievement of the goals of GCR and consider opportunities, challenges and ways in which burden-sharing can be enhanced (United Nations, 2008).

In paragraph 7 of the GCR document, the objectives of the global Compact as a whole are to (i) ease pressures on host countries; (ii) enhance refugee self-reliance; (iii) expand access to third country solutions; and (iv) support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity. The Global Compact seeks to achieve these four interlinked and interdependent objectives through the mobilization of political will, a broadened base of support, and arrangements that facilitate more equitable, sustained and predictable contributions among States and other relevant stakeholders (United Nations, 2008). The event of 2015 above provides a historical overview of the norm emergence of GCR that the international refugee regime reveals its incompleteness. This helps to explain the actions States took based on the GCR legal mechanism that implies to financial and fulfilment of the objectives of GCR.

GCR is Constructed as a Non-Binding Mechanism

GCR became a global norm in the international refugee regime after being decided by almost all UN member states in General Assembly. The GCR states in paragraph 4 that it is not legally binding. However, the paragraph goes on to State:

"*Yet it represents the political will and ambition of the international community for strengthened cooperation and solidarity with refugees and affected host countries. It will be operationalized through voluntary contributions to achieve collective outcomes and progress towards its objectives, set out in para 7. These contributions will be determined by each State and relevant stakeholder, taking into account their national realities, capacities and levels of development, and respecting national policies and priorities*."

According to the pledge above, States would decide on their contributions to the Global Refugee Forums. These contributions would be completely voluntary. In theory, there are two ways to address the gap in the international refugee regime: first, through a hard law or the adoption of a binding instrument on burden sharing and second, through soft law, by adopting non-legally binding principles on how to achieve equitable burden sharing. These two approaches can analyze GCR within the legal mechanism approach.

Hard law refers to legally binding obligations that are precise and that delegate authority for interpreting and implementing the law—for instance, treaties, conventions and protocols made into laws and enforced. Many authors have argued that burden sharing should be dealt with hard law. At the same time, Türk and Garlick (2016) noted that state obligations concerning burden sharing should be the subject of a new additional protocol to the 1951 Convention. Goodwin-Gill and McAdam (2017) argued that a new treaty to address the burden-sharing gap might be the most suitable solution. Furthermore, António Guterres noted in 2015, "*if there is one Protocol yet to be drafted to complement the 1951 Convention, it is one on international solidarity and burden sharing*."

The most obvious advantage of regulating burden sharing under a treaty or a protocol is that it would create clear legal obligations for States that are enforceable. The conclusion and adoption of such a convention or protocol on burden sharing can lead to an equitable, effective and orderly distribution of burdens among States and fill the gap in the existing

global refugee regime concerning burden sharing. However, the main obstacle behind the conclusion and adoption of such an instrument is today's political reality, and States fight for their sovereignty and national interests above all. Moreover, the formalization of burden sharing under a convention or a protocol may also be undesirable since, if only some States ratify this instrument and others do not, it would undermine the objective of ensuring extended global cooperation (Einarsen & Engedahl, 2016). Addressing the normative gap concerning burden sharing through hard law is not a viable option.

The second way to address the gap in the international refugee regime on burden sharing is through soft law. Though there is no universally agreed definition of soft law, Boyle and Chinkin (2007) noted that "*non-legally binding instruments used in contemporary international relations by states and international organizations*" can be described as soft law. The disadvantage to filling the gap on burden sharing with soft law is that the recommended guidance and agreed principles on burden sharing would be non-binding. States usually cannot be held accountable for not observing the agreed principles or the recommended guidance and for their unfulfilled pledges (Ineli-Ciger, 2019). Addressing the gap on burden sharing through soft law, in particular, *ad hoc* initiatives, can enable States to decide on and negotiate their contributions to burden sharing, which could lead to the ineffective burden sharing arrangement of law. Thus, soft law is the weak aspect of the Global Compact on Refugees' legal mechanism.

Soft law such as GCR is weak because it gives countries more control to decide whether they will contribute to the refugee crisis. To understand how countries affect the refugee crisis, we need to talk about European countries. Several countries in Europe have featured prominently in the anti-immigrant rhetoric. The anti-immigrant rhetoric can be seen in the policy of several countries in Europe regarding the influx of refugees and asylum-seekers "*to maintain and to protect*" their national security. The main drive of anti-immigrant attitudes is the perception of a threat, fueling fear that immigrants will hurt one's way of life. Most academic studies explaining opposition to immigration and immigrants retain two main threats: the realistic threat, the economic and security threat, and the symbolic threat, which is about national identity, values and clash of cultures (Eyes on Europe, 2020). 'Hardliners' in anti-immigrant rhetoric, such as the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, seized on this to shut down migration to Hungary (Buonanno, 2017). Hungary constructs the razor-wire which the entire length of Hungary's borders with Serbia and Croatia, where hundreds of thousands of migrants have crossed during the refugee crisis. He announced 3,000 new "border hunters" to tighten control at Hungary's fences, calling for stronger controls at Europe's external borders (Dearden, 2016).

These policies show the behaviour of States to protect their sovereignty from refugees that are assumed as a threat. On one side, asylum based on Global Compact on Refugees is based on the principle of non-refoulment until a proper examination has taken place in the reception state's jurisdiction to determine whether the asylum-seeker meets the conditions for international protection and can claim refugee status. Hence, based on a non-binding mechanism, the State defines its contribution to the implementation of GCR. As a consequence of soft law, GCR enforcement has no sanction if the commitments set out in the Global Refugee Forum are not achieved. This condition causes the uncertainty of

commitment to achieve the target through the GCR, thus harming refugees in terms of their rights.

Financial: GCR is Financially Dependent on States' Voluntary Contribution

In analyzing the financial dependence of GCR on the States, it can be seen from the source of UNHCR's income. The funding of UNHCR, which has a mandate to protect refugees and contribute to the humanitarian organizations that serve refugees, remain fully voluntary (Fitzpatrick, 2017). Financial contributions from states are vital for UNHCR because accounting for almost 86% of annual income in 2021 (UNHCR, 2022). The gifts show that UN member states as the major contributor to refugee response via UNHCR. That percentage implies that major programs or other requirements are needed to implement GCR.

The non-binding mechanism above impacts the political commitments of the State in financial contribution. According to the pledge, States would decide on their assistance in the Global Refugee Forums. These contributions would be completely voluntary (United Nations, 2008). The Global Refugee Forum is set to take place every four years to galvanize financial support, technical expertise and policy change to help reach the goals of the GCR. This pledge shows uncertain financials in support of the objectives of the Global Compact. Moreover, there is a big funding gap between budget and funds available reached by UNHCR. Funds available reached $5.153 billion in 2021, leaving an overall funding gap – funds available compared to the needs-based budget of $9.248 billion – of 44%, compared to 41% in 2020 (UNHCR, 2021a). The funding gap show another problem of UNHCR to excute the program.

Official Development Assistance (ODA), as one of the financial resources of UNHCR, plays an important role. According to OECD, between 2018 and 2019, humanitarian assistance grew significantly (by 25%) compared to the 0.7% growth in total ODA. During the Covid-19 pandemic, bilateral donors have roughly maintained commitments to health, while most other sectors have seen cuts, including humanitarian. Furthermore, it is worth noting that in 2021, only five Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members - Denmark, Germany, Luxembourg, Norway and Sweden - met or exceeded the internationally agreed SDG target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income (GNI) for ODA. The 2021 ODA total is equivalent to 0.33% of DAC donors' combined GNI and is still below the UN target. The data shows that ODA is not binding only on state policy commitments. It should impact financial uncertainty resources for GCR enforcement.

The refugee crisis needs sustainable cooperation among all stakeholders in preventing and addressing root causes. Meanwhile, among the donors that provided the information in the OECD survey, almost half allocated between 50 and 100 per cent of their bilateral ODA to the refugee crisis in projects and programmes associated with one year or less (UNHCR, 2021b). Those points show a powerful contribution of a state as a donor to implementing GCR objectives. Unfortunately, the State's contribution is uncertain because of its short-term commitment. Looking inside the voluntary mechanism and uncertain financial resources that depend on states' voluntary contributions creates a problem between needs and humanitarian funding.

Fulfilment of Objectives: GCR Show an Artificial Interest in Protecting The Rights of Refugees

The effectiveness of GCR can be analyzed by comparing the fulfilment of objectives and the before and after implementation of GCR (Pre and post-2018). Voluntary and non-binding mechanisms impact the contribution of all stakeholders by fulfilling the GCR objectives. Thus, the difference between the principle and practical actions of the program should show how sufficient the impact of GCR enforcement is to fill the gap in the international refugee regime through burden sharing and burden responsibility.

There are four objectives of the GCR. *First*, ease pressures on host countries. The spirit of this first objective is to serve human security by protecting refugees in host countries. Millions of refugees live in protracted situations, often in low and middle-income countries facing their own economic and development challenges. The average length of stay has continued to grow. There is an urgent need for more equitable sharing of the burden and responsibility for hosting and supporting the world's refugees while taking account of existing contributions and the differing capacities and resources among States. According to UNHCR's Refugee Population Statistics Database (2021a), 85% of refugees are hosted in developing countries.

GCR Indicator Report (2021a) stated that pledges and contributions are commitments by States, organizations, businesses, academics and refugees that advance the Compact's objectives. Unfortunately, only close to 47% (698 of 1,477) of the total Global Refugee Forum pledges were made towards GCR Objective 1 - ease pressures on host countries. That data shows the weak commitments of all stakeholders to achieve the target of pledges and contributions agreed upon in the Global Refugee Forum 2019, especially states as the party most responsible for human security issues.

Core contributions are defined in the OECD survey as funds provided on an uncertain basis to international refugee-mandated agencies, such as UNHCR and UNRWA, or other entities whose principal activity is to aid refugees and host communities. The core contributions reported by donors as part of the survey amounted to USD 710 million in 2019. Compared to their level in 2018 (USD 733 million), the registered unearmarked funds declined by 3.2%. This tendency is consistent with reductions in the share of unearmarked or softly earmarked voluntary contributions received by UNHCR (35%, 33%, and 30% in 2017, 2018, and 2019 respectively). These continuous decreases in uncertain contributions limit the important role of the refugee crisis program. The overall proportion of ODA for refugee and host communities channelled directly through national actors reported by the 2020 OECD survey decreased, with levels at 8 per cent in 2018 and 4 per cent in 2019. The data show uncertainty in financial resources to implement GCR.

Second, enhance refugee self-reliance. The second objective stands for the right of refugees in the long term, which indicates the strong stand for human security that not only focuses on protection which tends to be a 'top-down' approach, but also on empowerment which tends to be a 'bottom-up'. The refugee crisis has become a commodity for UN member states on behalf of human rights fulfilment and fundamental freedoms for all (GCR para. 9). In fact, only about 31% (452 of 1.477) of the total Global Refugee Forum pledges were made towards GCR objective 2 in support of enhancing refugee self-reliance (UNHCR, 2021). Furthermore, the report shows three aspects highlighted through Objective 2: access to work,

poverty and education. The data show that three-quarters of refugees have access in law to key attributes of a decent job, that around Two-Thirds of refugees live in poverty, and almost half of refugee students are out of school (UNHCR, 2021b). According to the data above, two-thirds of the aspects show the fulfilment of refugee right as GCR spirit is below the target.

Third, expand access to third-country solutions. According to GCR Indicator Report 2021, the percentage of the world's refugee population with access to third-country solutions declined from 2% in 2016 to less than 1% in 2020. In 2021, 1.4 million refugees will require urgent resettlement, an increase of 25% from 2016. In 2020, only one refugee in 100 found a solution, and this was related to the COVID-19 pandemic. This number is the lowest rate over the last 20 years through access for refugees to third-country solutions. The number of persons resettled with UNHCR assistance in 2020 was 82 per cent lower than in 2016. The number of returns to countries of origin declined by 55 per cent. The pandemic has, however, exacerbated a downward trend that started earlier. The rate has declined since its relative peak in 2016 (UNHCR, 2021a).

Fourth, support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity. This objective is the global norm in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights related to the basic rights of humans (Liberty, property, security and the right to resist oppression). The State's commitment to this objective can be seen in financial support by ODA. In support of refugee returnees in countries of origin, ODA decreased from USD 784 million in 2018 to USD 584 million in 2019. According to OECD, countries of origin have fewer donors than countries of asylum. The fourth objective highlighted the financial support in countries of origin and the access to return to their home countries. Voluntary return was at its highest in 2016, with 552,000 returnees. Since then and until 2020, there has been an overall downward trend in the number of returns. The second increase, observed in 2018, was overshadowed by the declines recorded during the rest of the period. In 2020, only one per cent of refugees were able to return to their country of origin, compared to three per cent in 2016 (UNHCR, 2021b).

Those assessment of GCR objectives in line with Betts (2009) arguments that two key components of a international refugee protection regime are the right to asylum and a durable solution. Goodwin-Gill has defined durable solution as a process of integration into a society which will successful and lasting only if it allows the refugee to attain a degree of self-sufficiency, to participate in the social and economic life of the community and to retain personal identity and integrity. There are three recognised durable solutions: voluntary repatriation, local integration and resettlement in a third country (Lal, 2017). Thus, GCR objectives provide a new hope for human security approach into refugee crisis issues. This is the main spirit of the human security approach to the fate of refugees

Global Compact on Refugees: Dilemma Between National Security and Human Security

The result above shows the partiality of GCR in two aspects; design framework and implementation. It can be acknowledged that GCR values pro-human security under United Nations Development Program (2003) indicators. *First*, people-centred refugees as the centre of analysis. Second, multilateralism, international cooperation, and interdependence. A

central recognition of GCR is its 'whole-of-society' approach or 'State Plus' approach, which brings together States and a wide range of other actors to agree on a common plan like NGOs, business, the World Bank, and new processes like innovative financial mechanisms, can play a role. Moreover, it can be seen from the GCR objectives - to ease pressures on host countries and expand access to third-country solutions. These two objectives encourage state commitment to international cooperation (multilateralism), whether national security is self-help. Third, prevention. GCR foresees a global mechanism for mo1bilizing international collaboration in the Global Refugee Forum. This aims to prevent the refugee crisis in Europe in 2015. There is a gap between need and financial resources with an unpredicted influx of refugees. Fourth, Protection and empowerment. As the main goal of GCR, it can be seen from its objective to enhance refugee self-reliance and support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity.

On the other hand, this research found that GCR strongly works towards the interest of member states' national security and supports the continuation of the centrality of real politics in international affairs. The GCR's pro-national security character is seen in the way it has no control over how the power of the State in carrying out the resolution in GCR. As discussed thoroughly above, the main problem lies in the GCR mechanism, which is non-binding that influences the independency of GCR in terms of its financial resources. The data shows the fluctuating amount of funds and donors year by year depending on the political will of States. Thus, States will justify their commitment and policy toward the refugee crisis, cherry-picking relatives with a significant interest in their national security.

The last argument, which strengthened GCR's partiality in serving its member states' national security, is related to fulfilling their four objectives. The data is based on the GCR Indicator Report, published annually, to measure the progress through GCR. From these four objectives, the indicators discussed in this article show how the pledges and impacts of GCR are still far from the target they aim to achieve, as stated in the GCR indicator framework. According to BS Chimni (2019), the arrangements for responsibility sharing in the Refugee Compact are not accompanied by effective measures or obligations. The proposed mechanisms rely more on the voluntary contributions of States – whether by way of humanitarian or development assistance or by their willingness to take in asylum seekers (Chimni, 2019). According to Betts (2018), States' obligations towards refugees who have entered their territory or jurisdiction are relatively clearly defined, however, States' are not obligated to support refugees who are on the territory of another State. Because of this, national governance frameworks are a vital subject for consideration in identifying and implementing sustainable solutions for global refugee crisis.

Today, national governance frameworks in most countries hosting significant refugee populations create environments that are more restrictive than enabling (Arnold-Fernández, 2019; Zetter & Ruaudel, 2016). Those at the national level are most often the primary source of strictures that bound refugees' lives and determine refugees' power to create their own life paths following the trauma of displacement (Haddad, 2009). The Global Compact on Refugees falls significantly to encourage adjustments to national laws and policies. According to Arnold-Fernandez (2019), "Key tools for effective burden and responsibility sharing," are identified as funding, involvement of multiple stakeholders, and data – but not national laws, policies, practices and institutions (IIIA:3). The implication is that host state

governance frameworks are not a central tool to be considered in determining how to share the burden and responsibility of hosting refugees (Arnold-Fernández, 2019).

The political will of states to cooperative responses are required to generate political solutions to address the protracted refugee situation, it is difficult to precisely reconcile the international responsibility to protect refugees with the domestic interest. While refugees' rights to emigrate in order to seek asylum are internationally guaranteed and morally legitimated, the determination of providing asylum remains exclusively within a states' domain (Haddad, 2009). Ultimately, the term security has a different logic. National security relates to the logic of consequences because the nature of government is to maintain power and expand its influence for the survival of the state. On the other side, human security is about the logic of appropriateness on behalf of the emancipation of all human beings. Refugees have the same right to life in dignity. Through an assessment of GCR, this research shows how apart from experiencing protection, asylum seekers, refugees, and other non-citizens have frequently been the victims of states' national security policies.

CONCLUSION

In analyzing the partiality of the Global Compact on Refugee to fill the international refugee regime in burden sharing and burden responsibility, this article show two points; the spirit of the GCR principle and its implementation. In spirit aspect, GCR serves for human security of refugees through people-centred, international cooperation, prevention, protection and empowerment. Previously, refugee handling in the global refugee regime (1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol) tended to be state-centred. In contrast, GCR tends to be people-centred and comes from the refugee crisis realities (bottom-up). However, from the implementation aspect, there is a significant gap between the targets made in the Global Refugee Forum and its achievements. This discourse was dominated by a traditional state security perspective, while the humanitarian language emerged only in design framework of GCR.

Seeing the refugee crisis is transnational in nature, it is necessary to have comprehensive approach as GCR design framework "State Plus" approach. Unfortunately, there is no sufficient impact after implementing the GCR agreement through the non-binding mechanism, financially dependent on states' voluntary contribution and a big gap in fulfilment of objectives achievement. Thus, as identified above, GCR's perspective of human security remains justified at no more than an aspirational level. However, this article is limited to explaining the sufficient impact of a detailed sector program. That impact needs further elaboration to show how the uncertainty of States' contribution is interlinked to achieving GCR objectives.

REFERENCES

Arnold-Fernández, E. E. (2019). National governance frameworks in the global compact on refugees: Dangers and opportunities. *International Migration*, *57*(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12643

Betts, A. (2009). Institutional proliferation and the global refugee regime. *Perspectives on Politics*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592709090082

Betts, A. (2018). The global compact on refugees: Towards a theory of change? *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *30*(4), 623–626.

Boyle, A., & Chinkin, C. (2007). *The making of international law*. OUP Oxford.

Buonanno, L. (2017). *The European migration crisis* (Vol. 103). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Chimni, B. S. (2019). Global compact on refugees: One step forward, two steps back. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *30*(4). https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey067

Commission on Human Security. (2008). *Human security now: Protecting and empowering people*. Reliefweb International.

Dearden, L. (2016, August 27). *Hungary planning 'massive' new border fence to keep out refugees as PM vows to hold them back by force*. Independent.

Dewansyah, B., & Nafisah, R. D. (2021). The constitutional right to asylum and humanitarianism in Indonesian law: "Foreign refugees" and PR 125/2016. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2021.8

Edwards, A. (2017). Human security and the rights of refugees: Transcending territorial and disciplinary borders. In *International Refugee Law*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315092478-20

Einarsen, T., & Engedahl, M. (2016). The universal asylum system and the 2016 New York Declaration: towards an improved 'global compact' on refugees? *The Future of Refugee Law*, 10.

Eyes on Europe. (2020, November 30). *Explaining the main drivers of anti-immigration attitudes in Europe*. Eyes on Europe.

Fitzpatrick, J. (2017). Revitalizing the 1951 Refugee Convention. In *International Refugee Law*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315092478-10

Goodwin-Gill, G. S., & McAdam, J. (2017). UNHCR and climate change, disasters, and displacement. In *UNHCR - The UN Refugee Agency*.

Haddad, E. (2009). *Refugee in international society: Between sovereigns*. Cambridge University Press.

Harding, L. (2015, September 13). *Refugee crisis: Germany reinstates controls at Austrian borders*. The Guardian.

Hyndman, J., & Mountz, A. (2008). Another brick in the wall? Neo-refoulement and the externalization of asylum by Australia and Europe. *Government and Opposition*, *43*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2007.00251.x

Ineli-Ciger, M. (2019). The global compact on refugees and burden sharing: Will the compact address the normative gap concerning burden sharing? *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, *38*(2). https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdz003

Lal, R. (2017). Durable solutions for protection of refugees and their correlation with social and economic rights. *International Journal of Law*, *3*(1).

Lama, M. P. (2018). Human vs. national security. *Global-e Journal of UC Santa Barbara*, *11*(22).

Mahmud, H., Quaisar, M. M., Sabur, Md. A., & Tamanna, S. (2008). Human security or national security: The problems and prospects of the norm of human security. *Journal of Politics and Law*, *1*(4). https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v1n4p67

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Odutayo, A. (2016). Human security and the international refugee crisis. *Journal of Global Ethics*, *12*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2016.1251484

Turk, V. (2003). Forced migration and security. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/15.1.113

Türk, V., & Garlick, M. (2016). From burdens and responsibilities to opportunities: The comprehensive refugee response framework and a global compact on refugees. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *28*(4). https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eew043

UNDP. (1994, January 1). *Human development report 1994*. Human Development Reports.

UNHCR. (1968). *The 1951 Refugee Convention*. UNHCR.

UNHCR. (1998). *The state of the world's refugees 1997: A humanitarian agenda-Chapter 1: Safeguarding human security*.

UNHCR. (2021a). *Global compact on refugees indicator report*.

UNHCR. (2021b). *Global report 2021*.

UNHCR. (2022). *UNHCR global appeal 2022*. UNHCR.

UNHCR Indonesia. (2023). *Refugee status determination*. UNHCR Indonesia.

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of The United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*. United Nations.

United Nations. (2008). *The global compact on refugee*.

Whitson, S. L. (2022, January 10). *The human rights vs. national security dilemma is a fallacy*. Foreign Policy.

Yonesta, F. (2019, June 20). *Illegal or protected? Indonesia's inconsistent policy on refugees*. Indonesia at Melbourne.

Zetter, R., & Ruaudel, H. (2016). Refugees' right to work and access to labor markets – An assessment, part I: Synthesis. *KNOMAD Study*, *4*(3).