

Arzoo Osanloo, University of Washington

Collaborative Group Project: What is the future of refugee protection?

Last update: Summer 2021

Assignment: During the class session on Tuesday, March 7, 2017, please meet with your designated groups, discuss the readings using the questions below, and post your reading-discussion responses on the CANVAS prompt. The main question to consider is: **What is the future of refugee protection?** Responses must be at minimum 500 words. They are due on the CANVAS site by 5:00 PM on Tuesday, March 7, 2017. Please make sure that the names of all group members appear on your submission. To see your groups, see attachment below.

Guidance: To aid in your reflections, I offer three articles: Behrman, Field, and Goodwin-Gill (the last one is supplemental), and a few journalistic pieces. As usual, please reference the articles in your reading-discussion response post.

1. (Simon Behrman) In "Legal Subjectivity and the Refugee," Simon Behrman argues that "the way out of today's desperate state of refugeehood does not lie primarily in the demand for greater legal rights. Rather, the rejuvenation of the refugee as a political subject is suggested as a more effective way forward." What does Behrman mean by this and how does he propose a solution for today's "desperate state of refugeehood"? Does this connect with any of our earlier readings? Consider Agamben, Arendt, Malkki, and Derrida.
2. (Jeannie Rose Field) Field's article, "Bridging the Gap Between Refugee Rights and Reality: a Proposal for Developing International Duties in the Refugee Context," succinctly lays out the problem that this course starts with - the gap between human rights promises for refugees and the dismal reality of few practical solutions. Field actually attempts to develop one. What does she suggest? How does it address the problem with sovereignty? Given our discussion last week of the relationship between humanitarian policy and security, is this plausible?
3. (Guy Goodwin-Gill) Goodwin-Gill is a long-time refugee advocate. He revisits some ideas about refugee protection he raised in 1998. Are his solutions plausible in today's climate? What solutions does he offer to elaborate a more complete refugee regime of protection?
4. I have also selected a few short journalistic pieces, two that discuss the refugee crisis as a "debt" that the US may have inherited in some contexts, given its actions abroad. One essay considers US's hosting of refugees as a [form of reparations](#). The other essay coincides with my questions at the beginning of the quarter: what is [the responsibility of 'intervening' countries](#) to the refugees? Should they have a responsibility to take in more refugees? The third short piece considers the 1951 Convention and whether it's time to come up with a [new](#)

[one](#). And finally, the last essay asks whether it would work simply to provide refugees with a [new country](#)(!).

Given these readings (and your reflections on the course overall), what possibilities does your group see for the future of refugee protection?

[Behrman, Legal Subjectivity 2014 1-21.pdf](#)

[Field, Refugee Rights Reality, 2010 512-57.pdf](#)

[Goodwin-Gill Dynamic of RefLaw, 2014 651-66.pdf](#) (supplemental)