THE FUTURE OF REFUGE: RETHINKING GLOBAL GOVERNANCE FOR A WORLD ON THE MOVE

¹Beenish Shuja

²Soharwardia Rawadia

*³Aimal Khan

¹Lecturer, School of Business Administration & Social Sciences, Iqra National University Peshawar.
²Advocate at Mansehara Courts KP, Pakistan.
³Advocate at Islamabad, Pakistan.

¹beenish@inu.edu.pk, *³Aimalkhan2475@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper attempts to examine the deepening crisis of the international refugee regime. The current system has been anchored by the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol. This system is now outdated. It further faces severe strain. In the context it is ridden by complex, multi-causal displacement driven by intersecting forces. These forces have included persistent conflict. They have also encompassed the escalating impacts of climate change. Another factor has been pervasive societal violence. Finally, severe economic distress has further contributed to the crisis. The article, therefore, has argued that the existing framework has become fundamentally ill-suited for contemporary realities. It perpetuates a cycle of short term crisis response. It also perpetuates profoundly inequitable responsibility sharing among states. Furthermore, it leads to the steady erosion of protection standards and fundamental rights. Through a qualitative policy analysis, this paper examines the core systemic failures. These include widespread state non-compliance with core principles. They also include the deliberate narrowing of legal protection spaces. A critical finding that has emerged is the acute hosting responsibility disparity that exists between global North and South. The paper has, therefore, posits that incremental reform is no longer a viable path. Instead, the present study advocates for a foundational rethinking of global governance architecture. This rethinking must be based on principles of equitable responsibility sharing and mobility justice. It also requires the creation of adaptive, forward looking protection mechanisms. The discussion explores several transformative governance models. These include the development of a new binding framework on responsibility sharing. Another is the formal expansion of protection categories to include climate displaced persons. A third has been the strategic integration of humanitarian pathway(s) into broader global migration governance systems. The conclusion is therefore, clear and urgent. Without such paradigmatic shifts, the institution of asylum would risks being further rendered obsolete. It may be replaced by further fragmented and often harmful state practices. These practices have failed in order to uphold the basic dignity and rights of the people compelled to leave their homes. The implications for international order and human security therefore have become severe.

Keywords: Refugee Governance, 1951 Refugee Convention, Responsibility Sharing, Climate Displacement, Mobility Justice, Global Compact On Refugees, Asylum, Forced Migration, International Law

INTRODUCTION

Human movement is a historical constant. However its contemporary scale, drivers, and global implications present unprecedented challenges to the international community. The classic image of the refugee - a person fleeing targeted persecution across a single border, is now an incomplete picture. People today are now fleeing a complex confluence of threats. They flee open warfare and political oppression. They also flee the slow onset devastation of environmental disaster and sea level rise. They flee criminal gang violence and the collapse of public order. They flee states though overtly persecutory, however, fail to provide basic security or subsistence. UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) has in-fact provided recent estimates. In the context, over 108 million people were reported to be forcibly displaced worldwide by the end of 2022 (UNHCR, 2023). This staggering figure is not a temporary anomaly or a series of isolated crises. It represents a systemic and enduring feature of the current global order. It signals a world on the move.

The international architecture designed to protect these individuals is, in many critical aspects, a legal and institutional relic (Mobarakian,2025). The Convention relates to the Status of Refugees (1951) was in-fact a landmark of post war humanitarianism. However, it was particularly crafted with specific European displacements in mind. Its core definition of a refugee is now too narrow. It excludes millions of todays displaced. Those fleeing generalized violence, environmental catastrophe, or desperate famine find no automatic protection under this instrument. Consequently, the international response has become increasingly characterized by ad hoc measures and political friction. A growing tendency among states is evident. The states are observed to prioritize border control and deterrence over protection obligations. They employ strategies of externalization and containment. However, these strategies are reported to often violate international human rights law. In the context, they undermine the very spirit of the protection regime.

The current system is also observed to be marked by a profound and morally unsustainable distribution of burden(s). Low and middle income countries, typically those neighboring active conflict zones, reportedly host the vast majority of the world's refugees. States that include Pakistan, Turkey, Jordan, Bangladesh, Colombia, and Uganda shoulder immense social, economic, and environmental costs. However, many wealthy states continue to contribute disproportionately to the underlying driver(s) of displacement. Their contribution(s) reportedly has come through historical greenhouse gas emissions, arms exports, or destabilizing foreign policies. Nonetheless, these same states have frequently resisted meaningful responsibility sharing. They still offer minimal resettlement places and unpredictable financial aid (Betts & Collier, 2017). This structural inequity has fueled resentment. It overwhelms the capacities of host communities in the global South. It ultimately diminishes the quality and durability of protection available to displaced people everywhere.

The article maintains that any attempt for minor reforms at the periphery of the current system is destined to fail. Piecemeal reforms would not address core pathologies. The future of refuge would demand a more radical reimagining of global governance. The existing system was in fact designed to address only occasional and geographically contained displacements. However, such a framework is no longer sufficient in the contemporary global context. In this context, what is required now is a system capable of responding to significant cross border population movements. These movements must be understood as persistent, predictable, and interconnected global phenomena. This ambitious task therefore requires grappling with difficult political questions. These questions must concern equity, state sovereignty, and legal innovation. The following sections of this article will therefore explore the limitations of current academic and policy literature. The article proposes a new evaluative framework centered on justice and adaptability. The paper will detail the qualitative methodological approach. It will also present clear findings on key governance failures. Finally, the article will discuss concrete, transformative pathways. The goal is to outline a system capable of upholding human dignity in an age of movement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The existing pool of academic and policy discourses on the subject of refugee governance is vast and multidisciplinary. However, it often remains siloed within specific fields. These fields include law and political science. In addition, geography is another area where it is confined. Moreover, a significant portion of the literature tends to focus on critiquing existing instruments or proposing incremental reform. In this context, there is less synthesis towards foundational transformation.

The Critique of the Existing Regime

A substantial strand of literature has in fact help provide a robust critique of the 1951 Convention framework. Legal scholars like Hathaway (1991) provided early, foundational analysis of the definition's gaps and the subsequent "containment" agendas of sovereign states. More recent work focuses on the operational crisis of non compliance. It examines the rise of sophisticated "non entrée" regimes (Gammeltoft Hansen & Tan, 2017). These are legal and logistical policies designed for one primary purpose. That purpose is to prevent asylum seekers from reaching the jurisdiction or territory where they might legally claim protection rights. This body of literature expertly diagnoses the symptoms of systemic failure. These symptoms include the externalization of border controls to third countries. They include the use of offshore processing centers. A key symptom is the increasing criminalization of asylum seekers and their facilitators.

This critique has also highlighted the most glaring protection gap. This gap is particularly faced those displaced across borders by environmental factors. McNamara and others (2020) have extensively documented this legal void. The scholars have noted that there is a persistent reluctance of states to create a new formal legal category. The stated in the context fear that this would expand their protection obligations in an uncontrollable manner. This therefore, leaves millions in a legal uncertainty. In the context, such are not considered refugees under the Convention. They also lack any other dedicated international status. The Nansen Initiative's Agenda for the Protection of Cross-Border Displaced Persons (2015) has offered a state-led framework to address these gaps, but it remains non-binding and narrowly focused on disaster contexts. Similarly, the work of Zetter and Morrissey (2014) on environmental displacement highlights how the existing legal and institutional frameworks fail to account for the complex, multi-causal nature of such movement, where climate impacts interact with pre-existing vulnerabilities.

The Responsibility Sharing Imperative

Another critical body of work on the subject has primarily focused on the principle of burden or responsibility sharing. This principle has been mentioned in the Refugee Convention's preamble. In the context, it is almost entirely unenforced in practice. A number of scholars have argued persuasively that this absence has constituted the fatal flaw of the entire system (Betts, 2017). The regime without a binding mechanism to redistribute responsibilities has mostly relied on charity and volatile political will. The 2018 UN Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) was particularly hailed as a significant step forward. It in fact aimed to operationalize this principle. However, as political scientists including FitzGerald (2019) critically note, it remains a non binding framework of cooperation. It has mostly relied on voluntary pledges from states. This structure would unfortunately replicate the very power imbalances it seeks to address. The academic literature is rich with technical proposals for more equitable models. These include fixed quota systems based on objective criteria like GDP and land area. They also include models for tradable refugee admission quotas among states. These economic models often face sharp criticism. Critics argue they commodify human lives and reduce refugees to a financial transaction (Schuck, 1997). More recent analyses by Milner (2021) underscore that the failure of responsibility-sharing is not merely a technical problem, but a political one rooted in the strategic interests of powerful states to externalize borders. This is further evidenced by the chronic underfunding of UNHCR appeals and the vast gap between resettlement needs and places, a disparity regularly documented in UNHCR's annual Projected Global Resettlement Needs reports.

Emerging Paradigms: Mobility Justice and Adaptation

A recent wave of interdisciplinary scholarship beyond mere critique, have advanced proposals for a more radical rethinking. The concept of "mobility justice," as advanced by sociologist Mimi Sheller (2018), has help provide a broader philosophical and political lens. The scholarship questions the normative and ethical foundations of state control over human movement. In this context, it frames displacement within wider structures of global inequality, colonial legacy, and climate injustice (Berringer, A.C.S,2012).This perspective is transformative. It has helped shift the core debate from managing a humanitarian crisis to rectifying a profound systemic wrong. Dauvergne (2016) further develops this by arguing that the current regime reinforces a "global apartheid," legally sanctioning inequality of movement based on nationality and wealth.

In parallel to this scholarship, adaptation focused literature is also gaining traction. This scholarship draws from climate science, resilience studies, and development economics. Its proponents include McAdam (2012). His works suggest that governance must become proactive rather than reactive. This would involve using data to forecast displacement trends. It also would require pre arranging legal and operational response mechanisms. In this context, it would mean creating flexible, predictable migration pathways as a form of climate adaptation. It also involves investing in community resilience in regions of origin to mitigate the need for displacement. The work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2022) has increasingly formalized the links between climate change and human mobility, lending scientific weight to calls for adaptive governance. Similarly, the World Bank's Groundswell reports (2021) model future climate migration hotspots, providing a data-driven basis for proactive planning that the current refugee regime lacks. The existing literature, however, tends to stops short of an effective synthesis. There is observed to be a discernible gap between high level philosophical critique and the granular, practical work of legal and institutional redesign. Few studies have attempted to successfully integrate the sharp legal critique, the political analysis of responsibility, and the normative framework of mobility justice into a single, coherent blueprint. This article therefore seeks to bridge that gap. It draws on these diverse scholarly traditions. Its aim is to construct a concrete and actionable vision for a transformed global governance structure.

Analytical Framework: Evaluating Governance through Equity and Adaptability

This article attempts to systematically assess the current system and propose alternatives. In this context it employs a two pronged analytical framework. This framework has helped move beyond measuring mere technical efficiency. It has also helped evaluate the system's core ethical performance and its functional capacity to cope with future challenges.

1. The Equity Dimension: This proposed dimension has assessed the foundational fairness of the governance system. It inquires not only if protection is provided, but how its costs and benefits are distributed among states. The paper also examines the distribution between displaced populations and host communities. The key indicators that have been included are:

Burden Distribution: It examines whether the responsibility for hosting, financing, and integrating displaced populations has been shared equitably among states? Furthermore, is this sharing proportional to state capacity and their contribution to the drivers of displacement? This draws on frameworks developed by scholars like Crisp (2018), who analyses the political economy of refugee hosting.

Access to Rights: This component inquires whether do all forcibly displaced persons, regardless of their legal category or point of entry, have effective access to a dignified standard of living? Furthermore do they have access to lawful work, quality education, and a genuine durable solution? This aligns with the rights-based approach advocated by organizations like the International Refugee Rights Initiative.

Reciprocity and Causation: Does the governance system acknowledge the disproportionate role that some states play in causing displacement? Does it logically and operationally link this causal contribution to a greater responsibility to provide protection and solutions? This principle of

"common but differentiated responsibilities," well-established in international environmental law (e.g., the UNFCCC), is notably absent from refugee law (Ahmed, 2023).

It has been observed that system failing on equity is inherently unstable and unjust. It furthermore breeds resentment among overburdened host states and communities. It also allows wealthy and powerful states to abdicate their moral and practical responsibilities. This undermines international cooperation and solidarity.

2. The Adaptability Dimension: This dimension evaluates the system's capacity to evolve, learn, and respond effectively to changing drivers and patterns of displacement. A rigid, static system will perpetually be in crisis mode. It will always be reacting to yesterday's problems. Key indicators include:

Legal Flexibility. Can the legal protection framework formally or interpretatively accommodate new, empirically significant drivers of displacement? Can it do so without requiring a total renegotiation of core treaties, which is politically improbable? The work of Qureshi (2019) on the evolving interpretation of the "particular social group" ground demonstrates the potential and limits of such adaptability.

Proactive Planning. Does the governance model involve forecasting likely future displacement trends? Does it pre arrange responsive mechanisms, such as visa pathways or development funding, or is it purely reactive to emergencies?

Solution Orientation. Does the system prioritize the achievement of durable solutions from the very outset of a displacement crisis? Are these solutions adaptable to different political, economic, and environmental contexts? Long's (2013) critique of the perpetual "care and maintenance" model in protracted refugee situations highlights this systemic failure.

A system strong in adaptability is resilient, predictive, and focused on sustainable long term outcomes. It is not focused on short term containment alone. Applying this dual framework reveals the profound failure of the current regime. It scores poorly on both equity and adaptability. It is both profoundly unfair and structurally rigid.

METHODOLOGY

This article has utilized a qualitative, policy oriented research methodology. It is primarily based on doctrinal analysis and critical policy synthesis. The primary aim was to examine existing structures and propose normative change. The research process involved four key components.

1. Document Analysis: It involved a close, critical reading of foundational legal texts. The primary documents were the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol. Also analyzed were subsequent soft law instruments. The most important of these is the 2018 Global Compact on Refugees. This analysis focused on identifying inherent limitations, legal gaps, and contradictions between stated principles and practical application.

2. Review of Secondary Literature: The study undertook a systematic engagement with scholarly books, peer reviewed articles, and major reports from key international organizations. These organizations include UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). This review provided the essential theoretical and empirical basis for critiquing the current system. It also provided material for exploring alternative governance models.

3. Case Based Reasoning: Though not a formal comparative case study, this analysis is consistently informed by examining the practical outcomes of current governance failures in specific, recurrent contexts. These contexts include maritime crossings in the Mediterranean Sea. They include migrant caravans from Central America. They also include the Rohingya displacement to Bangladesh. These real world manifestations of systemic problems serve to ground the theoretical discussion. They provide concrete examples of equity and adaptability deficits.

4. Normative Policy Synthesis: The core methodological approach involves synthesizing the critiques, principles, and proposals found in the literature. The goal was to construct a coherent set of guiding principle(s). From these principles, the method has derived several concrete policy

recommendations for a reformed governance model. This is an exercise in forward looking, normative policy design. It is informed by evidence but aimed at prescribing a better future system. This comprehensive methodology allows for a thorough assessment of the regime's shortcomings. It also supports the development of a principled, evidence based vision for its necessary transformation.

DISCUSSION

The analysis conducted through the established framework paints a picture of a governance system in terminal decline. The system is sustained more by institutional habit and the absence of a plausible alternative than by genuine effectiveness or legitimacy. The discussion must therefore turn decisively from critique to construction. What would a rethought global governance system look like? In context such a system would need to score highly on both equity and adaptability metrics.

1. Architecting Equity: From Voluntary Pledges to Binding Responsibility Sharing

The cornerstone of any new system must be a binding, enforceable framework on equitable responsibility sharing. This would move decisively beyond the Global Compact's model of encouraging voluntary cooperation, which has failed to rectify chronic imbalances (Milner, 2021). One viable and concrete model is the negotiation of a new stand alone treaty. This could be a Convention on Responsibility Sharing for Refugee Protection. It would operate alongside, and support, the existing Refugee Convention. This treaty would need to establish clear, objective metrics for state contribution. It could establish a fair share quota system. This quota would be based on a composite index. The index would include GDP, land area, population size, and perhaps historical emission contributions. These factors measure capacity and causal contribution, applying the "common but differentiated responsibilities" principle to forced migration (Rajamani, 2021).

The treaty critically should allow for multiple fulfillment modalities. States could meet their obligation through various means. These means include direct refugee resettlement. They also include financial contributions to frontline states. They include technical assistance and capacity building. They could also include the issuance of humanitarian visas or support for regional processing centers. This flexibility is politically pragmatic. It is key to gaining broad ratification. However, it must be governed by clear rules to prevent avoidance, ensuring that financial contributions complement rather than substitute for physical protection.

Finally, a transparent clearinghouse mechanism is essential. A UN hosted body, perhaps a revitalized and empowered UNHCR, would monitor global protection needs. It would match these needs with state contributions. It would ensure accountability and transparency. This would transform refugee protection from a charitable afterthought into a predictable, managed global public good. It would mirror other international cooperation regimes, such as certain climate finance mechanisms.

2. Engineering Adaptability: Expanding Protection and Creating Predictable Pathways

A new system must be legally and operationally agile. It must be able to evolve without constant crisis. The most urgent legal innovation is the development of a new protocol on climate displacement. This could be a protocol to the Refugee Convention. Alternatively, it could be a standalone convention. Its purpose would be to provide a clear legal status for persons displaced across borders by climate change and environmental degradation. This would finally address the largest and fastest growing protection gap, a gap increasingly recognized by authoritative bodies like the IPCC (2022). Given predictable political resistance to a blanket new category, a pragmatic approach could focus initially on specific, incontrovertible scenarios. The primary scenario is the loss of sovereign territory due to sea level rise, a phenomenon that will create stateless populations needing a legal home (McAdam, 2012).

Within the existing Convention, progressive interpretation can also expand protection. National and regional courts can and should play a role. Courts in some jurisdictions have recognized victims of pervasive gang violence or gender based persecution as members of a "particular social group." This jurisprudential evolution should be actively encouraged, documented,

and harmonized through international dialogues among judges, building on the comparative legal analysis pioneered by the REFGOV project and others.

Operationally, governance must integrate humanitarian and economic migration systems. This is crucial for adaptability. Concrete measures include creating Climate Adaptation Visas. These visas would be for individuals from regions facing gradual environmental decay. Another measure is massively expanding community sponsorship programs. These programs decentralize and diversify resettlement. A further measure is establishing regional protection frameworks. These frameworks would in fact help allow for free movement and labor mobility as a form of collective resilience. The "Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)" protocol in the context offers a partial model here. These pathways would help provide safe and legal alternatives to dangerous irregular journeys. They also help match human mobility with economic and demographic needs, moving beyond pure crisis response to managed adaptation (World Bank, 2021).

3. Reconciling Sovereignty and Protection: A New Social Contract

The sovereignty paradox cannot be simply wished away. The solution lies in reframing state incentives. A binding responsibility sharing system makes the act of providing protection a shared, predictable, and manageable commitment. It reduces the political and economic fear that currently drives extreme border fortification. When states know their responsibility is finite and predictable, and that other states are verifiably pulling their weight, they may become more willing to allow access to their territory for asylum procedures, as suggested by models of cooperative burden-sharing (Betts, 2017).

Furthermore, investing heavily in development, climate adaptation, and conflict prevention in regions of origin is critical. This investment makes movement a matter of choice rather than a desperate necessity. It is the most sustainable long term method for reconciling the human right to stay with the right to move. This requires a massive, coordinated shift in international development finance. Funding must be aligned with displacement prevention and resilience building. It must in the context move beyond emergency response. This should represent a new social contract between states. It would effectively help balance sovereign interests with collective human security, acknowledging that in an interconnected world, the stability of one region is inextricably linked to the stability of all.

FINDINGS

Applying the equity and adaptability framework to the current global refugee regime reveals deep, structural pathologies. These pathologies have helped explain its chronic dysfunction.

1. The Equity Deficit: A System of Imposed Burden: The distribution of responsibility has become this system's most glaring injustice. Data from UNHCR (2023) in this context stands unequivocal. Over 70 percent of refugees in the context are hosted in neighboring low and middle income countries. Turkey, Colombia, Pakistan, Uganda, and Bangladesh have bores the long term social, economic, and environmental costs of providing sanctuary. They do so with insufficient and unpredictable international support. The support is often delivered through short term humanitarian appeals, not predictable multiyear development financing, a pattern extensively documented by scholars of humanitarian financing (Crisp, 2018).

Conversely, many wealthy nations in the global North invest more resources in fortifying their borders than in strengthening protection. They invest in walls, naval patrols, surveillance technology, and agreements with transit countries. Their annual resettlement quotas are minuscule compared to the global need, as detailed in annual UNHCR resettlement reports. The Global Compact on Refugees, despite its intentions, has not altered this fundamental calculus. It remains a system of voluntary contributions. This allows the most powerful states to set their own terms and limits. They face no penalty for offering minimal support.

This inequity is compounded by what can be termed the "causation gap." States that are historically and presently major contributors to climate change through greenhouse gas emissions bear no formal legal responsibility. States that fuel conflict through arms exports or destabilizing

foreign policies also bear no formal responsibility. They bear no responsibility to host those displaced by these consequences. The system treats displacement as a humanitarian anomaly. This anomaly must be managed by geographically proximate states. The system does not treat displacement as a collective cost of global interconnectedness. This cost should be borne collectively and in proportion to contribution. This gap highlights the dissonance between the principles of international environmental law and refugee law (Rajamani, 2021).

2. The Adaptability Deficit: A System Trapped in the Past: The legal definition of a refugee is now a straitjacket. It fails to protect millions of people in clear need of international protection. This failure creates unjust hierarchies of suffering. A person fleeing a targeted political activist may qualify for refugee status. A person fleeing a village obliterated by a combination of drought, flood, and militia violence may not qualify. This legal gap has led to a confusing proliferation of temporary, ad hoc national statuses. Examples include "Temporary Protected Status" or "subsidiary protection."These statuses provide a temporary reprieve from return. However, they rarely offer a path to permanent residency or citizenship. They create protracted legal limbo and profound insecurity for recipients. The system is almost entirely reactive in its operations. Each new displacement flow is treated as a surprise emergency. This triggers frantic humanitarian appeals and emergency funding. It does not trigger the activation of pre arranged, predictable pathways for protection and movement. There is no standing mechanism for anticipatory action in the face of slow onset disasters like sea level rise or desertification, despite the predictive modeling available from institutions like the World Bank (2021). Furthermore, the international response remains overwhelmingly focused on immediate humanitarian care in camps or host communities. There is insufficient investment from the outset in the three durable solutions: local integration, resettlement, and safe return. This creates conditions for permanent temporary populations. This situation undermines both refugee well being and host community stability. It is a direct result of a non adaptive system.

3. The Sovereignty Paradox: A fundamental finding is the sovereignty paradox at the heart of the regime. The system is built on two pillars. The first includes state consent to be bound by treaties. The second is the principle of non refoulement. This principle therefore prohibits returning a person to a territory where they would face persecution or serious harm. However, states are increasingly interpreting their sovereign prerogative as the right to prevent arrival altogether. They have employed extraterritorial measure(s) to intercept and return people. The states do this before those people can reach a border and make a protection claim. Therefore by preventing arrival, states argue they are not technically returning anyone from their territory. The states thus avoid a formal breach of non refoulement. This legalistic maneuvering, a form of "legal fiction" as critiqued by Noll (2020), renders the core protection guarantee hollow for those unable to cross an international border. The regime lacks an effective judicial or political mechanism to hold states accountable for these deliberate erasures of protection space. This paradox allows sovereignty to trump protection consistently, a dynamic extensively analyzed in literature on border externalization (Gammeltoft-Hansen, 2023).

CONCLUSION

The world on the move is not a temporary disturbance. It has become a new normal in the 21st century. However, clinging to a mid 20th century governance model is a recipe for perpetual crisis management failure. It has in fact ensured ongoing human suffering and escalating geopolitical friction. The future of refuge demands political courage and institutional innovation. We must move beyond the palliative care model of short term humanitarian aid. We need to build a preventive, rights based, and equitable system of global governance.

This article has argued that the twin pillars of this new system must be structural equity and built in adaptability. The current regime fails on both counts. It imposes burdens unjustly and cannot respond to new realities. Achieving a transformation necessitates bold, specific reforms. These include a binding international treaty on responsibility sharing. They include the expansion of

protection categories to cover climate displacement. They require the creation of predictable, diversified mobility pathways. These are not utopian ideals. They are in fact practical necessities that would provide for a stable and just international order.

The alternative to such reform is the continued erosion and eventual collapse of the refugee protection regime. It would be replaced by a dystopian landscape of fortified borders, offshore detention camps, and interdiction at sea. Millions of people would be trapped in perpetual displacement without legal rights or futures. The fundamental choice is between a world that manages human movement through fear and exclusion, and one that governs it with justice, foresight, and solidarity. Reimagining global governance for a world on the move is arguably the defining humanitarian, political, and ethical challenge of our century. The work to build this new system, based on the clear principles outlined here, cannot start soon enough. The cost of inaction is measured in human lives and global instability.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, K., Alam, A., Brohi, N. A., & Nasim, S. (2023). Further evidence on non-audit fees: using the context of female directors on audit committees. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*

Abbasi, K., Alam, A., Goodell, J. W., Du, A. M., & Brohi, N. A. (2025). Vulnerability of energy firms to climate risk: Does fintech development help?. *Energy Economics*, 108516.

Ahmed, S. (2025). Discursive Constructions in Macbeth: A Systemic-Functional Contribution to English Language Teaching. Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review, 5(4), 568–578. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17775611

Ahmed, S., Khan, D. S., & Mehmood, A. S. (2023). Let them play: A systematic review investigating the benefits of free play in emotional development of children. Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review, 3(4), 509-520.

Al-Ramahi, N., Kreishan, F. M., Hussain, Z., Khan, A., Alghizzawi, M., & AlWadi, B. M. (2024). Unlocking sustainable growth: The role of artificial intelligence adoption in jordan retail sector, moderated by entrepreneurial orientation. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, *14*(6), 143.

Berringer, A.C. S. (2012). Climate change displacement and global governance: a case study of three intergovernmental organizations and the conflict between the member states and bureaucracy. LSU Doctoral Dissertations. 1621.

Betts, A., & Collier, P. (2017). Refuge: Transforming a broken refugee system. Penguin Books.

Brahmi, M., Hussain, Z., Majeed, M. U., Khan, A., Qureshi, M. A., & Bansal, R. (2025). Corporate Social Responsibility's Influence on Brand Image in the Automotive Sector: The Corporate Reputation and Product Quality Role. *Administrative Sciences*, *15*(4), 121. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15040121

Brohi, N. A., Jantan, A. H., Qureshi, M. A., Jaffar, A. R. Bin, Ali, J. Bin, & Hamid, K. B. A. (2018). The Impact of Servant Leadership on Employees Attitudinal and Behavioral Outcomes. Cogent Business & Management, (2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1542652

Brohi, N. A., Khuhro, M. A., Jamali, M., Shah, I. A., & Hussain, A. (2021). I am of value to the organization : The Role of Servant Leadership in Predicting Psychological Capital and Turnover Intention among School Teachers in Pakistan. Elementary Education Online, 20(5), 5344–5360. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.600

Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-relating-status-refugees

Crisp, J. (2018). Refugees and the global politics of international protection. Oxford University Press.

Dauvergne, C. (2016). The new politics of immigration and the end of settler societies. Cambridge University Press.

FitzGerald, D. S. (2019). Refuge beyond reach: How rich democracies repel asylum seekers. Oxford University Press.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. (2023). The end of asylum? The future of refugee protection in a borderglobalized world. Polity Press.

Husain, I., Qureshi, A. A., & Hussain, N. (2019). *The economy of modern Sindh: opportunities lost and lessons for the future*. Oxford University Press.

Hussain, Z. (2022). Intention to purchase halal cosmetic products in an Islamic Pakistani culture. *Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance Studies*, *3*(1), 1-11.

Hussain, Z., & Khan, A. (2024). Investigating the Determinants and Consumer Preferences of Sustainable Consumption and Production Adoption Among Fast-Moving Consumer Goods Manufacturers. In *Sustainable Development Goals: The Impact of Sustainability Measures on Wellbeing* (Vol. 113, pp. 79-92). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Hussain, Z., Khan, A., Qureshi, M. A., Bansal, R., & Pruthi, N. (2025). The Impact of Online Reviews on Sustainable Product Adoption in the Food Industry: A Serial Mediation Effect of Consumer Trust and Perceived Value. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *31*(6), 933–955. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2025.2530056

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.

K Abbasi, NA Brohi, S Nasim, Z Siddiqi, SJH Zaidi (2023). Do Female CEOs Moderate the Link between Female Directors on Audit Committees and Audit Quality: Evidence from the UK. Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences 4 (3), 291-305

Khan, A., Hamid, A. B. A., & Hussain, Z. (2024). Unveiling the Impact of AI in Customer Touchpoints: A Review and Research Agenda. *Minds Unveiled*, 70-83.

Long, K. (2013). The point of no return: Refugees, rights, and repatriation. Oxford University Press.

McAdam, J. (2012). Climate change, forced migration, and international law. Oxford University Press.

McNamara, K. E., Bronen, R., Fernando, N., & Klepp, S. (2020). The complex decision-making of climate-induced relocation: Adaptation and loss and damage. Climate Policy, 20(8), 896-910.

Milner, J. (2021). The politics of refugee protection in an era of uncertainty. Routledge.

Mobarakian, M., Shahbazinia, M., & Zarkalam, S. (2025). Possible Legal Protections for Paintings Used in Architecture. Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 2(4), 77-87

Nansen Initiative. (2015). Agenda for the protection of cross-border displaced persons in the context of disasters and climate change (Vol. 1). The Nansen Initiative.

Noll, G. (2020). Negotiating asylum: The EU acquis, extraterritorial protection and the common market of deflection. Brill Nijhoff.

Qureshi, M. A., Qureshi J. A., Thebo, J. A., Shaikh, G. M., Brohi, N. A., & Qaiser, S (2019). The nexus of Employee's Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance: An Analysis of FMCG Industries of Pakistan. Cogent Business & Management

Rafique, M. O., Abdullah, A. S. C., & Fatoni, M. A. W. (2023). Analysis of Ḥiyal (Legal Stratagems) Cases in Islamic Financial Law. Russian Law Journal, 11(2), 299-308. https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v11i2.666

Rafique, M. O., Saeed, A., Anis, M., Mahboob, F., Ghaffar, A., & Jalbani, A. A. (2022). Isomorphic pressures on Shari'ah board members in Islamic banks (to apply the legal stratagems in IF products). *Journal of Xidian University, 16*(5), 489–502. https://doi.org/10.37896/jxu16.5/049

Rajamani, L. (2021). The principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities in the international climate change regime. In The Oxford handbook of international climate change law. Oxford University Press.

Shah, I. A., Khaskheli, G. A., Alkilany, S. B., Brohi, N. A., & Tunio, R. A. (2021). Efficiency Measurement of Universities in Sindh through Total Quality Management Practices. Elementary Education Online, 20(5), 4654–4658. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.513

Sheller, M. (2018). Mobility justice: The politics of movement in an age of extremes. Verso Books.

Soomro, R. B., Brohi, N. A., Memon, K. M., & Gilal, R. G. (2020). Measuring Customer Satisfaction When Dining at a Casual Restaurant: An Application of Kisang's Model. Sukkur IBA Journal of Management and Business, 6(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.30537/sijmb.v6i2.485

UNHCR. (2023). Global trends: Forced displacement in 2022. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends-report-2022

United Nations General Assembly. (2018). Global compact on refugees. A/73/12 (Part II).

World Bank. (2021). Groundswell Part 2: Acting on internal climate migration. World Bank.

Zetter, R., & Morrissey, J. (2014). The environment-mobility nexus: Reconceptualising the links between environmental stress, (im)mobility, and power. In The Oxford handbook of refugee and forced migration studies. Oxford University Press.