การโยกย้ายถิ่นฐานในภาวะวิกฤตและสงครามกลางเมือง: การวิเคราะห์ข้อบกพร่องของมนุษยธรรมใหม่

Crisis Migration and Civil Wars: Analyzing the Defects of New Humanitarianism

Received 1 May 2024
Revised 18 June 2024
Accepted 20 June 2024

ดีจีเอ็น สัญชีวานี[1]
DGN Sanjeewani[2]

บทคัดย่อ

'การย้ายถิ่นในภาวะวิกฤต' แสดงให้เห็นถึงการเคลื่อนย้ายข้ามพรมแดนของผู้คนที่เกิดจากภัยคุกคามที่มีอยู่ในประเทศบ้านเกิดของตน การย้ายถิ่นรูปแบบนี้มักถูกเข้าใจว่าเป็นรูปแบบหนึ่งของการย้ายถิ่นในประเทศมากกว่าข้ามชาติ ผู้คนที่อพยพจากวิกฤตการณ์อย่าง 'สงครามกลางเมือง' ถือเป็นเหตุผลเบื้องต้นสำหรับความช่วยเหลือด้านมนุษยธรรมอย่างเร่งด่วน อย่างไรก็ตาม หลักการเรื่อง 'พื้นที่ด้านมนุษยธรรม' ที่จำกัดเฉพาะการเคลื่อนย้ายข้ามพรมแดนทำให้เกิดความคลุมเครือว่า 'มนุษยธรรม' ควรให้บริการใคร และตอบสนองความต้องการของ 'ผู้อพยพในภาวะวิกฤต' อย่างไร สถานการณ์เหล่านี้ถูกกำหนดโดยท่าทีด้านความมั่นคงของรัฐบ้านเกิดและรัฐเจ้าบ้านที่ให้ที่พำนักกับผู้อพยพ ซึ่ง 'อำนาจอธิปไตย' ยังคงไม่สอดคล้องกับการมีส่วนร่วมจากภายนอก บทความนี้จึงนำเสนอวิวัฒนาการของ 'มนุษยธรรมคลาสสิก' สู่การเป็น 'มนุษยธรรมใหม่' (NH) ซึ่งเป็นแนวคิดที่พัฒนาขึ้นแบบองค์รวมโดยมีพื้นฐานมาจาก 'ความมั่นคงของมนุษย์' (HS) วัตถุประสงค์หลักของบทความมีสองส่วนเพื่อตรวจสอบ 'การย้ายถิ่นในภาวะวิกฤต' และเพื่อสำรวจรูปแบบที่เป็นปัญหาของการตอบสนอง

[1] นิสิตปริญญาเอก สาขาการศึกษาการพัฒนาระหว่างประเทศ คณะรัฐศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย กรุงเทพฯ ประเทศไทย E-mail: nirukasanjeewani@kdu.ac.lk

[2] Ph.D. Candidate in Program of International Development Studies, Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

ด้านมนุษยธรรมต่อ 'การย้ายถิ่นในภาวะวิกฤต' โดยมีวัตถุประสงค์ย่อยสามประการ ประการแรกคือการอธิบายการขาดความชัดเจนทางแนวคิดเกี่ยวกับความเชื่อมโยงระหว่าง 'สงครามกลางเมือง' และ 'การโยกย้ายวิกฤต' ซึ่งบทความนี้ไม่ได้มุ่งเน้นตรวจสอบสาเหตุของ 'สงครามกลางเมือง' แต่ดูผลกระทบของ 'สงครามกลางเมือง' ต่อ 'การโยกย้ายวิกฤต' ประการที่สอง คือการวิเคราะห์ 'มนุษยธรรม' ซึ่งขยายขอบเขตหลักการแบบคลาสสิกของการให้การดูแลและการบรรเทาทุกข์ ในส่วนนี้เป็นการอภิปรายแนวคิดที่แตกต่างกันเกี่ยวกับการประยุกต์ใช้ 'มนุษยธรรม' ใน 'การย้ายถิ่นในภาวะวิกฤต ประการที่สามคือการตั้งคำถามว่าลักษณะของมนุษยธรรมใหม่เกี่ยวข้องกับ 'การย้ายถิ่นในภาวะวิกฤต' อย่างไร และพวกเขาตอบสนองความต้องการด้านมนุษยธรรมของผู้อพยพในภาวะวิกฤตอย่างไร เช่น สภาพแวดล้อมที่ปลอดภัยในค่ายและการส่งกลับโดยสมัครใจ ข้อโต้แย้งสำคัญที่สร้างขึ้นในบทความนี้เป็นตัวอย่างผ่านโครงการริเริ่มด้านมนุษยธรรมที่ดำเนินการโดยสำนักงานข้าหลวงใหญ่ผู้ลี้ภัยแห่งสหประชาชาติ (UNHCR) ในภูมิภาคตะวันออกกลางและแอฟริกา

คำสำคัญ: การอพยพย้ายถิ่นฐานในภาวะวิกฤต, พื้นที่ด้านมนุษยธรรม, มนุษยธรรมแนวใหม่

Abstract

‘Crisis migration’ demonstrates the cross-border mobilities of people caused by existential threats in their home countries. It is often misconceived as a form of migration that is more local than transnational. In this setting, people fleeing crises like 'civil wars' constitute prima facie grounds for urgent humanitarian assistance. However, limited 'humanitarian spaces' in cross-border mobilities have drawn ambiguities about who 'humanitarianism' is supposed to serve and how it addresses the needs of ‘crisis migrants’. These

situations are highly determined by the security stances of home and host states where the ‘sovereignty’ remains inconsistent with external involvements. Accordingly, the paper examines the evolution of ‘classical humanitarianism' into 'New Humanitarianism’ (NH), which is a holistically developed concept grounded in ‘Human Security’ (HS). The main objectives of the paper are two-fold; to examine ‘crisis migration’ and to explore the problematic forms of humanitarian responses to ‘crisis migration’. It interconnects with three sub-objectives. The first is to explain the lack of conceptual clarity about the nexus between the ‘civil war’ and ‘crisis migration’. It does not examine the root causes of 'civil wars' but rather focuses on how civil war situations drive people to migrate across borders in search of protection. The second is to analyze ‘humanitarianism’ which encompasses ensuring camp security from military threats and repatriating migrants to their home countries, extending beyond the classical slant of providing care and relief. The discussion includes different debates and concepts regarding the application of ‘humanitarianism’ in ‘crisis migration. The third is questioning how the characteristics of NH are related to 'crisis migration' and how they address the humanitarian needs of crisis migrants, such as a secure environment in camps and voluntary repatriation. The key arguments constructed in the paper are exemplified through selected humanitarian initiatives implemented by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in the Middle East and African regions.

Keywords: Crisis migration, Humanitarian space, New humanitarianism

Introduction

A ‘crisis’ is triggered against a background of apparent normalcy, resulting in dangers, and demanding urgent responses (Calhoun, 2008, p. 73). Rosenthal, Charles, and Hart (1989, p. 410) perceive ‘crisis’ as a threat to the social system, caused by uncertainty and a sense of urgency. Even though this uncertain nature is identified as an intrinsic feature of ‘crisis’, Nteka, (2021, p. 64) and Primc (2022, p. 62) argue that most ‘crises’ are predictable and last for months or years before they become a concern for policymakers. In Gundel’s (2005, p. 109) words, ‘crises’ are foreseen if the place, time or particularly the manner of their occurrence is known. Yet, a ‘crisis’ takes place when emergency measures have not yet materialized (McAdam, 2013, p. 9). Concerning this, Hermann (1969, p. 414) points out that ‘crises’ make high-priority goals for governments. In Bravo's (2009, p. 256) words, ‘crises’ threaten individuals' survival, forcing them to cross borders. Those are characterized as ‘crisis migration’ which is an inevitable outcome of ‘civil wars’, weak governance, and natural or other manmade disasters (McAdam, 2013, p. 2). The correlation between the ‘crisis migration’ and ‘civil war’ is straightforward (Mishali-Ram, 2022, p. 302), as ‘civil wars’ heighten the gradual escalation of violence between the military and civil society (Churruca-Muguruza, 2018, p. 5; McAdam, 2013, p. 9). All the conflict parties conduct large-scale violence during a ‘civil war’ by coercing civilians to flee their countries of origin. These modalities encompass a) the escalation of intensities (b) a sense of insecurity and danger (c) disruptions to the

functioning of society (Nteka, 2021, p. 67) and (d) the incapability of individuals and communities to cope with resource scarcity. In this way, ‘civil wars’ are considered breakpoints in the social order, bringing unprecedented chaos which results in unprecedented assistance. Martin et al. (2013, p. 126) contend that ‘crisis migration’ reflects the displacements or anticipatory movements of communities resulting from anticipated threats that could otherwise remain trapped in existing locations. McAdam (2013, p. 8) sets out the key attributes of ‘crisis migration’, namely (a) large and sudden migration flows (b) impact on host and transit communities and (c) challenges related to protecting and assisting the migrants. These findings indicate that ‘crisis migration’ is inextricably linked to ‘HS’ which strengthens the moral responsibilities of states to fulfill the basic needs of communities (Newman, 2003, p. 16). Thus, ‘crisis migration’ is intertwined with attaining 'freedom from fear' (physical and safety needs) and ‘freedom from want' (needs for food, shelter, and development) (Commission on Human Security, 2003, p. 4). This encloses the notion that crisis migration evokes victimhood, tragedies and urgency of the responses.

In this regard, these academic discourses highlight gaps in the literature concerning the definition and conceptualization of crisis migration. Crisis Migrants who attempt to meet these needs during their stay in host countries are eligible for refugee status. It means not all refugees are recognized as ‘crisis migrants’ since people who have been deprived of social and political rights can also apply for refuge abroad. For that reason, ‘crisis migration’ holds

a discrete sphere in migration. A refugee is defined as someone who is owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion' (Article 1, 1951 Refugee Convention). Refugee status is granted at the discretion of the host country (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 1996, p. 88) and persecution is the key factor in determining refugee status. Chetail (2014, p. 35) has stipulated persecution as a ' severe violation of human rights accompanied by state failures to protect the individuals. The Convention further mentions that migrants cannot be detained for illegal entry into the country of asylum and cannot be refouled to a state where they would face threats. Nevertheless, the convention does contain specific reference to the responsibilities of the home countries towards the migrants (Chimni, 1998, p. 360). Hence, it becomes clear that 'crisis migration' has no defined scope but rather is a response to circumstances that disrupt the routine order of society and require immediate action. Against this backdrop, humanitarianism' plays a vital role in 'civil wars' by alleviating suffering, safeguarding lives, and protecting the dignity of people (Calhoun, 2008, p. 75). 'Humanitarianism brings threatened and forgotten lives into existence (Fassin, 2012, p. 4). The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) explicates 'humanitarianism' as a humane, impartial, neutral, and independent provision of relief offered to victims (Gabiam, 2016, p. 382). While humane addresses human suffering wherever it occurs, impartiality governs the provision of services provided to those who are not or are no longer involved in hostilities The Geneva Convention Relating

to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949 guarantees impartiality in all situations, without any adverse distinction based on race, colour, religion or faith, sex, birth, wealth, or any other similar criteria (MacFarlane, 1999, p. 538). It connotes impartiality as a formative category that transcends any racial or national boundaries (Calhoun, 2008, p. 74). Neutrality prevents taking sides in hostilities or engaging in political, racial, religious or ideological controversies. (UNHCR, 2019). This establishes a safer environment for actors to operate. This is what Fassin (2012, p. 6) has referred to as 'the antipolitics of humanitarian' reason. Even so, 'humanitarianism' has never been neutral and can never be detached from politics (Herrera & Dalum Berg, 2019, p. 33). Then Independence is being autonomous from political, economic, military or other campaigns (European Commission, 2023). Laeken (2021, p. 4) calls all these four determinants 'humanitarian imperatives', which apply regardless of nationality, ethnicity, political or ideological views or social status. The Humanitarian Congress Vienna (2023) has stated these 'humanitarian imperatives' are non-negotiable and interrelate with a wider perspective of humanity that brings all human beings to be born free and equal in dignity. In civil wars, 'humanitarian imperatives' are intrinsic to providing humanitarian assistance to people who pose threats, risks, and vulnerabilities. Risks occur when they are exposed to dangers, while threats are actions that are visible or commonly acknowledged as harmful. Then vulnerability is depicted as a risk factor in the existing system that exposes a person to a hazard and to an inherent tendency to be affected.

This classical ‘humanitarianism’ is founded on the feeling of compassion, not the recognition of rights (Fassin, 2005, p. 362). Under this, ‘humanitarianism’ is presented as an alternative to state protection (Primc, 2022, p. 36). The primary importance was providing care and relief instead of assisting communities to move across borders and protecting them in host countries. Nonetheless, ‘humanitarianism’ has been expanded beyond state borders since the late 1970s in the form of “NH”. NH asserts collaborative actions and advances a moral shift in the way the international community approaches crisis-affected communities (Bah, 2013, p. 5). But NH is not a radical departure from classical ‘humanitarianism’, but a revamping of the classical approach through ‘wider participation’ (Mohamed-Saleem, 2020, p. 178). This shift gave rise to a ‘lively humanitarianism’, that strengthened collective actions and political involvement in the field. It also transformed the statuary functions of the UNHCR, formed in December 1950 to provide solutions for refugee problems under the 1951 Convention (Elie, 2010, p. 347).

Most importantly, ‘humanitarianism’ has been challenged by the classic modalities of international relations including state sovereignty and territorial integrity (Nascimento, 2004, p. 42). States are reluctant to involve themselves with crisis migrants and humanitarian organizations in a way that compromises their national sovereignty. Sovereignty holds the state’s sole authority in rulemaking and rule-enforcement (Slaughter, 2004, p. 284) and determines who belongs inside the state, and those who live beyond it. Edkins (2000, p. 38) has picked up on this point, by arguing that 'humanitarianism'

is how states preserve ‘sovereignty’. Even though ‘humanitarianism’ in civil wars can be discouraged by local authorities, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has the power to call for the expansion of ‘humanitarian assistance, without the state's consent. This became evident when the Council launched a ‘Cross-border Aid Mechanism’ in July 2014 to grant aid and relief assistance for Syrians crossing the ‘Bab al-Hawa’ border to enter Turkey. The mechanism was adopted through the Security Council resolution 2165 without obtaining the consent of the Syrian government (Diakonia International Humanitarian Law Center, 2022, p. 19). Thus, ‘humanitarianism’ can also operate outside the government’s jurisdiction (Parekh, 2017, p. 76; Nascimento, 2004, p. 42) This is what Walters (2011, p. 139) calls the making of 'humanitarian borders' where humanitarian organizations become increasingly involved in border management.

Instruments and Methods

This discussion employs selected humanitarian initiatives adopted by the UNHCR in the Middle East and African regions. It comprises three types of data regarding UNHCR's approach to "NH": (a) the evolution of UNHCR's efforts in NH amid crisis migration, (b) the challenges faced within the host states (c) UNHCR's broadening towards security, and military aspects and (d) its limited access to camps due to local insecurities.

According to UNHCR, crisis migrants are the communities who have left their own country because they cannot sustain themselves at home (Crisp & Kiragu, 2010, p. 21). It is a descriptive term for all those who move and require relocation in times of crisis. In this setting, the UNHCR's humanitarian operations are primally aimed at relieving the suffering of asylum seekers and refugees rather than eliminating the causes of their suffering. The institutional mandate of UNHCR was based on assuring legal protection for those who are sheltered in host countries (Orchard, 2015, p. 302). UNHCR also serves as an observer on national status-determination bodies (Verdirame & Harrell-Bond, 2005, p.78). UNHCR's work was initially confined to a rights perspective and gradually transformed its role to "HS" in the 1990s. (Hammerstad, 2011, p. 253). Consequently, UNHCR grew into a broadly based humanitarian agency. Crisp (2001, p. 3) has mentioned that this alteration has brought UNHCR a high profile in protecting the 'HS' of crisis migrants. The UNHCR thus increased the accountabilities of home countries towards voluntary repatriation (Bah, 2013, p. 19). Voluntary repatriation encompasses two elements, (a) returning migrants voluntarily to their home countries and (b) restoring the bond between citizens and the home countries (Stein, 1997, p. 3). The repatriation culture consistently developed by the UNHCR is explained by bureaucratic structures, and formal and informal rules that make repatriation more desirable, proper, and legitimate (Barnett, 2001). Barnett identifies three ambitions related to the 'HS' approach of UNHCR namely (a) acknowledging the importance of refugees and migration issues and

putting them firmly on the international political agenda, (b) promoting voluntary repatriation as an alternative to long- term exile and (c) maintaining moral commitments to protect migrants' asylum claims. These objectives are centred on protecting lives and maintaining a high moral standard (Laeken, 2021, p. 4). Moreover, this new humanitarian approach to the repatriation of crisis migrants aligns with Target 10.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals, which aims to facilitate orderly, safe, regular, and responsible migration through well-managed policies introduced by the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, recognizing for the first time the contribution of migration to sustainable development, underscores the importance of ensuring a safe and dignified return of crisis migrants to their home countries. This aligns with the SDG motto to 'leave no one behind'.

Concerning the UNHCR's approach towards the "NH", Barnett (2005, p. 726) views that 'NH' of UNHCR has been recently propagated as a result of the incapabilities and unwillingness of host states to protect crisis migrants and counter risks faced by them. In those situations. Host states can retain greater authority in initiating repatriations than the UNHCR. This was greatly evident through the repatriation plan commenced by the Libyan government in 2002 for Syrians who had sheltered there. The entire programme was carried out without the official participation of UNHCR or any assessment of security conditions in Syria (Yasin, 2023). UNHCR's involvement occasionally extends to military considerations as well. For instance. programs like the 'Security Partnership Project (SPP) were introduced by

the UNHCR in 2010 to improve law and order around the 'Dadaab camp' (sheltered by Somalians) in Kenya, whereas militarization appeared to manipulate refugees. The core objective of the SPP was to combat the recruitment of Somali refugees to fight on behalf of the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and al-Shabaab (Rudolph, 2013, p. 71). The SPP consisted of two components: (a) deployment of a police unit in the camp and (b) establishment of a registration and screening centre to enable a more systematic separation of people who pose security threats (Human Rights Watch, 2010, p. 21). The SPP evinced how the UNHCR's role in Kenya has gradually improved since 2007 when the UNHCR was forced by the Kenyan government to close its transit centre near the border.

Furthermore, the UNHCR undergoes challenges in reaching camps within host states when those countries are experiencing civil war or violence. As an example, around 100,000 Eritreans in Ethiopia have been returned home since 2020 after being caught up in conflicts between Tigrayan forces and central government forces (Al Jazeera, 2022). There was a limited role for the UNHCR as it didn't have access to the four main camps 'Shimelba, Hitsats', 'Mai-Ayni' and 'Adi Harush' inside Tigray. Similarly, asylum seekers and refugees in Yemen were also at risk due to the conflicts between the Houthis and the Yemeni military in 2024. As a result, returns have increased from 'Mukalla' in Yemen to 'Bossaso', and 'Puntland' in Somalia regardless of the insufficient food, hygiene and medical support in those areas (Oxfam International, 2024) that was highly criticized by the peace scholars. The same reality was faced by the

UNHCR in the repatriation of Mozambicans from Malawi as it was executed without assessing the conducive situations there. A major obstacle was obtaining amnesty and legal protection for Mozambicans (Barnett, 2009, p. 4).

Results

In the context of New Humanitarianism (NH), it's evident that UNHCR's humanitarian approach has shifted from one primarily focused on exile to one oriented towards the homeland, specifically repatriation. (Crisp, 2001, p. 175). These processes are inherently political, as demonstrated by the aforementioned examples.

As UNHCR's Interoffice Memo (No. 5) notes, large-scale repatriations are 'difficult or even impossible' without a comprehensive monitoring system in political authorities (Harrell-Bond, 1989, p. 56). It means a comprehensive examination of political and human rights in the home countries is indispensable at the time of repatriation (Barnett, 2009, p. 637). For this reason, building channels of communication between the home country and UNHCR is an integral part of an effective and dignified voluntary repatriation that was lacking in the repatriation plan commenced by the Libyan government. Notably, the UNHCR has the legal authority to implement voluntary repatriation, even though no provision is found in the 1951 Refugee Convention or 1967 Protocol regarding voluntary repatriation (Harrell-Bond, 1989, p. 46). Nonetheless, the UNHCR Executive Committee's conclusions mention that voluntary repatriation must be followed by (a) removing the causes of migration to host countries, (b) ensuring the voluntary nature of the decision to

return (c) developing agreements between home, host countries and UNHCR on safe returns and (d) maintaining the dignity of migrants in repatriations (Stein, 1997, p. 4). On the other hand, Parekh (2017, p. 74) has stated that sheltering crisis migrants in camps is a terrible failure in meeting their needs. Along with this, migrants find themselves in an intractable state of limbo for years, frequently confined to camps in which they have limited freedom. Locating refugees in camps can become highly precarious when the host state is affected by civil wars or internal security problems, leading to situations where the UNHCR lacks access to the camps, as was the case in Ethiopia. The repatriation programme organized by the UNHCR from Yemen to Somalia and Mozambicans from Malawi further implied that repatriation may not always be effective in the absence of safety in home countries, Therefore, UNHCR's commitment to voluntary return needs to be reinforced by obtaining assurance from the home countries on safe return conditions (Kalumiya, 2000, p. 72). It also infers that the UNHCR's principle of non-involvement in politics is no longer applied to the contemporary governance of crisis migrants.

Discussion

The involvement of UNHCR, as discussed, highlights the 'humanitarian spaces' within host states to effectively address the issues related to crisis migration. As per Barnett (2020, p. 9) 'humanitarian spaces' in 'crisis migration' are fundamentally driven by the political will of the host states. The 'humanitarian spaces' are interpreted by the United Nations Office for Coordination of

Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) as operational environments which allow humanitarian actors to provide service and assistance in accordance with humanitarian principles and international law (Laeken, 2021, p. 3). In this regard, Leebaw (2007, p. 225) identifies politics as a way for 'humanitarian spaces' to be established, protected, and operated. Collinson & Elhawary (2012, p. 2) present four operational dimensions of 'humanitarian spaces' including 'agency space', 'affected community space', 'international humanitarian legal space' and 'complex political, military and legal arena'. The 'agency space' consists of an environment that strengthens the impartial operations of agencies and the 'affected community space' secures the rights of the community. Then, the 'international humanitarian legal space' upholds the legal obligations of states to serve the communities and the 'complex political, military and legal arena' is known for its interactions with actors, institutions, and processes. The manifestation of these four dimensions is three-fold fashion: (a) the moral belief that victims of war must be protected, (b) the responsibility of complying with the laws concerning the protection of victims, and (c) the willingness of relevant actors to offer humanitarian assistance.

In this background, the NH attends not just to the needs of 'crisis migrants', but also to promote camp security, voluntary repatriation and restoration of adequate living conditions in the home countries (Hilhorst, 2018, p. 2: Visoka, 2015, p. 274) (refer to page no. 3 and 4). It implies that NH goes beyond simply registering the migrants. In that sense, NH is openly political in defending human security in host countries and reinforcing a homeland-

oriented approach for ‘crisis migrants’ (Bah, 2013, p. 5). With this, camps are commonly known as a ‘humanitarian space’ which offers minimal standards of protection for all, creates a geographical space that is free from fighting, and facilitates acts of humanitarian organizations (Hilhorst & Jansen, 2010, p. 1117). But camps have now become one of the most critical devices in the long-term exile of migrants. Relating to this, voluntary repatriation has been considered an alternative to the temporary status of crisis migrants as it eliminates the uncertainties of sheltering them in camps for a longer period (Chimni, 1991, p. 543).

Mostly, repatriation processes are intertwined with 'securitization' as noted by Verdirame and Harrell-Bond (2005, p. 15). This was evident in the repatriation plan initiated by the Libyan government in 2002 for Syrians who had sought shelter there (Refer to page no. 4) ‘Securitization’ is anchored in the fears of losing symbolic control over territorial boundaries (Bigo, 2002, p. 65) which obstructs the entry of crisis migrants and limits humanitarian concerns. ‘Securitisation’ presents an existential threat to a referent object while justifying taking actions against it outside the moral bounds of political procedures (Bigo, 2002, p. 72). Hence, securitizing crisis migrants impedes the materialization of humanitarian assistance across borders (Roepstorff, 2020, p. 288). It exhibits that there has been no 'decoupling' of humanitarianism from threat perceptions. According to Boettcher (2004, p. 347), states can be remarkably insensitive to crisis migrants rather than treating them humanely. As such, political actors control ‘humanitarian spaces ‘in host states to advance or legitimize their partisan and security

interests (Terry, 2002, p. 30). Such circumstances may also result in 'premature repatriation,' as took place in Yemen and Malawi (refer to page no.4). The stage like 'premature repatriation', takes place when the conditions at home are not changed sufficiently for them to return, thereby jeopardising the transition into a safe country (Stein, 1997, p. 4). All these realities indicate that 'NH' is a poorly understood social and spatial phenomenon.

Conclusion

This article has approached 'humanitarianism' from a contextual perspective rather than a universal perspective. 'Crisis migration' in the context of 'civil wars' instinctively unfolds the urgency of addressing the needs of victims. The humane obligations of states to save aliens from harm overlap with their political calculus predicated on security considerations. It means, the value of the 'humanitarian imperatives' lies arguably in a state's willingness and ability to accommodate crisis-effected communities who cross borders. These realities suggest that 'humanitarianism' is not an absolute principle, but rather a political idea connected to the state's policies. In this way, access to those affected communities can be impossible due to the political agendas of the governing authorities. Therefore, forming and maintaining a 'humanitarian spaces' in 'crisis migration' is a constant challenge and very limited in practice. Such a sphere raises questions about the accountability of the governance of crisis migrants. Markedly, a 'crisis' like a 'civil war' rarely ends with a negotiated settlement, making NH less efficacious. It has undercut the UNHCR's humane role in voluntary repatriation and

restoration of conducive conditions in home countries. In sum, what has been promoted as solutions to 'crisis migration' is not driven by ‘humanitarianism’ but rather has made a conundrum about the roles of states and humanitarian organizations in responding to ‘crisis migration’.

Acknowledgment

The author extends sincere gratitude to Dr. Bhanubhatra " Kaan” Jittiang, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Chulalongkorn University, for his invaluable guidance and support throughout the research.

References

Al Jazeera. (2022, October 26). *Lebanon begins ‘voluntary’ repatriation of Syrian refugees*. Retrieved January 20, 2024, from https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/10/26/lebanon-begins-voluntary-repatriation-of-syrian-refugees

Bah, A.B. (2013). The contours of new humanitarianism: War and peacebuilding in Sierra Leon. *Africa Today*, *60*(1), 3-26. https://doi.org/10.2979/africatoday.60.1.3

Barnett, M. (2001). Humanitarianism with a sovereign face: UNHCR in the global undertow. *The International Migration Review*, *35*(1), 244-277. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2676060

Barnett, M. (2005). Humanitarianism transformed. *Perspectives on Politics*, *3*(4), 723–740. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3688176

Barnett, M. (2009). Evolution without progress? Humanitarianism in a world of hurt. *International Organization*, *63*(4), 621-663. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40345951

Barnett, M. (2020). *Humanitarianism and human rights: A worlds of difference*. Cambridge University Press.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 27*, 63-92. https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270S10

Boettcher, W. (2004). Military intervention decisions regarding humanitarian crises. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 48*(3), 331-355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002704264271

Bravo, M.T. (2009). Voices from the sea ice: The reception of climate impact narratives. *Journal of Historical Geography, 35*(2), 256-262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhg.2008.09.007

Calhoun, C. (2008). The imperative to reduce suffering: Charity, progress, and emergencies in the field of humanitarian action. In M. Barnett and & T. Weiss (Eds.), *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics* (pp. 73-97). Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801461538-005

Chetail, V. (2014). Are refugee rights human rights? An unorthodox questioning of the relations between refugee law and human rights law. In R. Rubio-Marín (Ed). *Human Rights and Immigration* (pp. 19-72). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701170.003.0002

Chimni, B. S. (1991). Perspectives on Voluntark repatriation: A critical note. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *3*(3), 541-547. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/3.3.541

Chimni, B.S. (1998). The geopolitics of refugee studies: A view from the south. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 11*(4), 350–374. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/11.4.350-a

Churruca-Muguruza, C. (2018). The changing context of humanitarian action: Key challenges and issues. In H.J. Heintze and P. Thielbörger (Eds.), *International Humanitarian Action*: NOHA Textbook (pp. 3-18). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14454-2_1

Collinson, S., & Elhawary S. (2012). *Humanitarian space: A review of trends and issues*. Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute.

Commission on Human Security. (2003). *Human security now*. Commission on Human Security.

Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, (Adopted on 26 April 1954, Entered into force on 6 June 1960), article 1, UNTS 360. https://www.unhcr.org/ibelong/wp-content/uploads/1954-Convention-relating-to-the-Status-of-Stateless-Persons_ENG.pdf

Crisp, J. (2001). Mind the gap! UNHCR, humanitarian assistance and the development process. *The International Migration Review, 35*(1), 168-191. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2676057

Crisp, J., & Kiragu, E. (2010). *Refugee Protection and International Migration: A Review of UNHCR's Role in Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Diakonia International Humanitarian Law Center. (2022). *The United Nations Security Council and humanitarian operations in Syria: A legal analysis*. International Humanitarian Law Centre. https://www.diakonia.se/ihl/news/the-united-nations-security-council-and-humanitarian-operations-in-syria-a-legal-analysis-2/

Edkins, J. (2000). *Whose hunger? Concepts of famine, practices of aid* (Vol. 17). University of Minnesota Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttsxkq

Elie, J. (2010). The historical roots of cooperation between the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and the International Organization for Migration. *Global Governance, 16*(3), 345-360. https://www.jstor.org/stable/29764951

European Commission. (2023). *Humanitarian principles*. https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/who/humanitarian-principles_en

Fassin, D. (2005). Compassion and repression: The moral economy of immigration policies in France. *Cultural Anthropology*, *20*(3), 362-387. https://doi.org/10.1525/can.2005.20.3.362

Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason: A moral history of the present*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520271166.001.0001

Gabiam, N. (2016). Humanitarianism, development, and security in the 21st century: Lessons from the Syrian refugee crisis. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, *48*(2), 382-386. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743816000131

Goodwin-Gill, G. & McAdam, J. (1996). *The refugee in international law.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/law/9780198808565.001.0001

Gundel, S. (2005). Towards a new typology of crises. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, *13*(3), 106-115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2005.00465.x

Hammerstad, A. (2011). UNHCR and the securitization of forced migration. In B. Alex & G. Loescher, Gil (Eds.), *Refugees in International Relations* (pp. 237-260). Oxford University Press.

Harrell-Bond, B.E. (1989). Repatriation: Under what conditions is it the most desirable solution for refugees? An Agenda for Research. *African Studies Review, 32*(1), 41-70. https://doi.org/10.2307/524493

Hermann, C. F. (1969). International Crisis as A Situational Variable. In J.N. Rosenau (Ed.), *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (pp. 409-421). Free Press.

Herrera, G., & Berg, U.D. (2019). Migration crisis and humanitarianism in Latin America: The case of Ecuador. In N. N. Sørensen, & S. Plambech (Eds.), *When human welfare meets the political and security agendas* (pp. 31–49). Danish Institute for International Studies. https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep21445.5

Hilhorst, D. (2018). Classical humanitarianism and resilience humanitarianism: Making sense of two brands of humanitarian action. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action, 3*(15), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-018-0043-6

Hilhorst, D., & Jansen, B.J. (2010). Humanitarian space as arena: A perspective on the everyday politics of aid. *Development and Change, 41(*6), 1117–1139. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2010.01673.x

Human Rights Watch. (2010). *Welcome to Kenya: Police abuse Somali refugees.* https://www.hrw.org/report/2010/06/17/ welcome-kenya/police-abuse-somali-refugees

Kalumiya, K. (2000). State sovereignty and protection of refugees and displaced persons. In S. Baldini - Guido Ravas (ed). *Humanitarian Action and State Sovereignty - Refugees: A Continuing Challenge*. Dragan European Foundation.

Laeken, A. V. (2021). *The humanitarian paradox: Can it ever be ethically justified to withdraw aid from a humanitarian crisis?* [Master's Thesis, Ghent University]. Universiteitsbibliotheek Gent. https://libstore.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/003/013/277/RUG01 -003013277_2021_0001_AC.pdf

Leebaw, B. (2007). The politics of impartial activism: Humanitarianism and human rights. *Perspectives on Politics*, *5*(2), 223–239. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20446421

MacFarlane, N. S. (1999). The regionalization of European: Foreign and security policies. *International Journal, 54*(4), 537- 561. https://doi.org/10.1177/002070209905400103

Martin, S., Weerasinghe, S., & Taylor, A. (2013). Crisis migration. *Brown Journal of World Affairs, 20*(1), 123-137.

McAdam, J. (2013). *Conceptualizing Crisis Migration* (UNSW Law Research Paper No. 2013-20). https://ssrn.com/abstract=2232519

Mishali-Ram, M. (2022). International crisis in the midst of civil war. *International Relations, 36*(2). 307–326. https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178211052822

Mohamed-Saleem, A. (2020). Localising humanitarianism, peace making, and diplomacy: The challenges facing muslim INGOs. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development, 15*(2), 178–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1542316620925802

Nascimento, D.S. (2004). The inclusion of human rights in humanitarian assistance: The difficult but necessary way between theory and practice. *Yearbook on Humanitarian Action and Human Rights* (pp. 41-84). Universidad de Deusto.

Newman, E. (2003). Introduction and survey. In E. Newman & J. Selm (Eds), *Refugees and forced displacement: International security, human vulnerability, and the state* (pp. 3-31). United Nations University Press.

Nteka, N. (2021). Crisis analysis and management. *Entrepreneurship, 9*(1), 64-7.

Orchard, P. (2015). Refugees and internally displaced persons. In R. Mac Ginty & J.H, Peterson, (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to humanitarian action* (pp. 298 -311). Routledge.

Oxfam International. (2024). *Somali returnees from Yemen, survivors of a conflict that needs to end*. https://www.oxfam.org/en/somali-returnees-yemen-survivors-conflict-needs-end

Parekh, S. (2017). *Refugees and the Ethics of Forced Displacement*. Routledge.

Primc, K. (2022). *Challenging the shrinking humanitarian space in the European Union* [Master's Thesis, Uppsala University]. Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1684938/fulltext01.pdf

Roepstorff, K. (2020). A call for critical reflection on the localisation agenda in humanitarian action. *Third World Quarterly, 41*(2), 284–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2019.1644160

Rosenthal, U., Charles M.T., & Hart, P. (1989). *Coping with crises: The management of disasters, riots and terrorism*. Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd.

Rudolph, T.A. (2013). *The securitization of humanitarian aid: A case study of the Dadaab refugee camp* [Master's Thesis, Dalhousie University Halifax, Nova Scotia]. DalSpace Institutional Repository. https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/bitstream/handle/10222/38745/Rudolph-Terence-MA-IDS-November-2013.pdf?sequence=1

Slaughter, A.M. (2004). Sovereignty and power in a networked world order. *Stanford Journal of International Law, 40*, 283–327.

Stein, B. N. (1997). *Refugee repatriation, return, and refoulement during conflict*. USAID. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnacd092.pdf

Terry, F. (2002). *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*. Cornell University Press.

The Humanitarian Congress Vienna. (2023). *The humanitarian imperative is non-negotiable*. https://humanitariancongress.at/event/the-humanitarian-imperative-is-non-negotiable/

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2019). *Humanitarian principles*. https://emergency.unhcr.org/protection/protection-principles/humanitarian-principles

Verdirame, G., & Harrell-Bond, B. (2005). *Introduction rights in exile janus-faced humanitarianism*. Berghahn Books.

Visoka, G. (2015). National NGOs. In R. Mac Ginty and J. H Peterson (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to humanitarian action* (pp. 267-279). Routledge.

Walters, W. (2011). Foucault and frontiers: Notes on the birth of the humanitarian border. In U. Bröckling, S. Krasmann, T. Lemke (Eds), *Governmentality: Current issues and future challenges* (pp. 138-164). Routledge.

Yasin, I. (2023, October 3). *The Syrian refugee crisis in Lebanon: Between political incitement and international law*. https://arabcenterdc.org/resource/the-syrian-refugee-crisis-in-lebanon-between-political-incitement-and-international-law/