

International Refugee Law and Bangladesh: Navigating Sovereignty and Humanitarian Obligations

Md. Sagor Hossain^{1*}

¹Lecturer, Department of Law, Sonargaon University, 147/I, Green Road, Panthapath, Dhaka, Bangladesh

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36348/sijlcj.2025.v08i01.002>

| Received: 19.12.2024 | Accepted: 25.01.2025 | Published: 28.01.2025

*Corresponding author: Md. Sagor Hossain

Lecturer, Department of Law, Sonargaon University, 147/I, Green Road, Panthapath, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract

This article critically evaluates the intricate navigation between national sovereignty and international refugee law in Bangladesh, specifically concentrating on the nation's mechanisms of the protracted Rohingya refugee crisis. As a non-signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, Bangladesh's legal obligations are initially motivated by the influence of international humanitarian norms, regional considerations, and domestic policy frameworks. This paper examines Bangladesh's efforts to mediate its sovereign prerogatives with its moral and legal obligation to serve sanctuary to displaced populations. Through critical evaluation of legislative endeavors, governmental reactions, and the efforts of international actors such as the UNHCR, the article enunciates Bangladesh's multifaceted obstacles in its mandate to develop global refugee standards while indicating its domestic needs. The study articulates by proffering strategic suggestions aimed at liberalizing Bangladesh's mechanisms with international refugee protection protocols, thereby contributing to both the strategy on refugee administration and the progression of legal mechanisms in South Asia.

Keywords: Refugees, Sovereignty, Bangladesh, Humanitarian Obligations, International Law, South Asia, Domestic Mechanisms, Diplomatic Maneuvers.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the intricate and often debatable sphere of international law, the interlines of state sovereignty and humanitarian mandates remain a burning point of contention. For Bangladesh, a country that has established itself as an inadvertent epicenter for refugee influxes and crises, this duality is most focused on the realism of its attempts at the Rohingya refugee influxes. As a non-signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, Bangladesh holds a peculiar stand within the global refugee governance mechanisms, harmonizing a precarious state between nurturing its sovereign prerogatives and inclination to the moral and legal efforts mandated by international humanitarian law.

The debate between these obligations is not merely theoretical; it indicates the government policy, legal obligations, and diplomatic maneuvers dictated by the state. While international law prescribes that states serve refuge to those earnestly fleeing persecution, the

basic principles of non-refoulement, and fundamental respect for human dignity, simultaneously establish the right of sovereign states to formulate immigration and surveillance their territory. In Bangladesh, these active forces are fostered by the large-scale displacement of asylum seekers or refugees, particularly the Rohingya, who have prayed for sanctuary from prosecution and persecution in Myanmar [1]. This crisis and influx have precipitated a magnificent strain on Bangladesh's already over-packed environmental resources, leading to disputes about the spheres of humanitarianism and the compatibility of sovereign equality and rights with international law mandates [2].

As a pioneer in South Asia's refugee realism and dynamics, Bangladesh's establishment manifests complex insights into the broader expansions of refugee rights and protection in the Global South. Its attachment with international refugee law is outlined by an unparalleled set of political, legal, and socio-economic factors, as well as regional geopolitical obstacles. The

¹ James C Hathaway, *The Law of Refugee Status*, (Cambridge University Press, 1991) 120

² Noam Chomsky, *Global Discontents: Conversations on the Rising Threats to Democracy*, (Haymarket Books, 2017) 167

international community's presupposition of Bangladesh's refugee policies must be appreciated within the context of these hurdles, especially provided the truancy of an Institutional, irrevocable refugee protection framework within the jurisdiction of the country's national legal methodology.

This article aims to be in pursuit of to disentangle the exquisite equilibrium that Bangladesh must afflict between propounding its sovereignty and consummating its humanitarian indebtedness under international refugee law. By critically scrutinizing Bangladesh's legal and policy reciprocation to the Rohingya influxes, this study will traverse how the nation has maneuvered these twin obligations and the wider entanglement for refugee governance in the South Asian context.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study explores a qualitative research methodology to examine Bangladesh's involvement with international refugee law, juxtaposing its sovereign authorities' privileges with humanitarian obstacles. The research traces dogmatic experiments, concentrating on basic legal instruments such as the 1951 Refugee Convention, its 1967 Protocol, and pertinent international human rights agreements. Secondary sources, including scholarly articles, policy frameworks, and responses from legal institutions like UNHCR, are critically inspected to identify existing interpretations and lacunas in the remaining legal structure. A multidisciplinary approach is mandated to examine Bangladesh's mechanisms against regional arrangements in South Asia, focusing on privileges and shortcomings. Case study analysis, with a special concentration on the Rohingya refugee influx, enunciates the practical obstacles and policy replies forming refugee governance. Interviews and stakeholder statements, where accessible, serve nuanced insights into the mechanisms of legal, political, and socio-economic factors manipulating Bangladesh's status. Through these multidimensional pathways, the study attempts to build harmonized considerations of how Bangladesh liberalizes the turmoil between respecting its sovereignty and addressing the humanitarian response to the lack of institutional adherence to the international refugee regime.

3. Significance of the Study:

This article attempts a legal perception of how a newly emerging developing nation like Bangladesh navigates the dual obligations of harmonizing sovereignty and addressing international humanitarian commitments. It prescribes insights into the broader dynamics of refugee protection in South Asia and provides suggestions for developed refugee governance.

4. Objectives of the study:

1. To critically examine Bangladesh's approach to the international refugee-related legal framework, analyzing the legal, political, and

socio-economic factors that make its policies and practices relating to refugee protection while respecting sovereign authority.

2. To analyze the exposition of Bangladesh's non-signatory status to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, concentrating on how this position intervenes in its capacity to harmonize humanitarian obligations with domestic security and resource limitations.
3. To evaluate the contribution of regional and global cooperation in increasing refugee protection arrangements in South Asia, with special priority on Bangladesh's responses to neighboring countries and international institutions like UNHCR.
4. To advise strategic legal and policy frameworks that include Bangladesh's refugee governance mechanisms with international standards, establishing a practical nexus between respecting human rights and safeguarding its domestic interests in the perspective of existing and future potential refugee influxes.

5. LITERATURE REVIEW

The scrutiny of international refugee law, especially from the perspective of non-signatory states like Bangladesh, has garnered magnificent scholarly attention. Theoretical analyses predominantly spin around the principle of non-refoulement as prescribed in Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention, which proscribes the forced expulsion of refugees to borders where they are victims of persecution. While fundamental texts such as Guy S. Goodwin-Gill and Jane McAdam's *The Refugee in International Law* evaluate the international effect of refugee protection, regional explorations attract the unique obstacles affronted by South Asian countries. Scholars like Hélène Lambert pressurize the constraints of legal institutional frameworks in non-signatory states, especially where national legislation becomes inconsistent with global norms. From the Bangladeshi perspective, the literature consistently explores the Rohingya influx as a case study, with studies such as M. Rafiqul Islam's *Refugee Law in South Asia* prescribing critical thoughts into the nexus between state sovereignty and humanitarian commitments. However, lacunas exist in realizing the nuanced geopolitical mechanisms interfering with Bangladesh's refugee policy framework, especially its dependence on bilateral negotiations over multilateral legal frameworks. These observations underscore the pressing urgency for a comprehensive legal and policy-oriented exploration that connects national governance with international humanitarian mechanisms.

6. Theoretical Cornerstones of International Refugee Law: Principles, Norms, and Mandates

International refugee law, as a wing of public international law, is strengthened by indispensable principles that pursue to shield the rights of individuals

displaced across borders due to the fright of tyranny. These principles are systemized in the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, which together are the centerpiece of the international refugee protection apparatus [3]. However, beyond this formal mechanism, refugee law intervenes within a comprehensive, normative structure that circumscribes customary international law, zonal accords, and the evolving implementations of states, international organizations, and non-governmental thespians [4]. The conceptual underpinnings of refugee law are deeply embedded in the abstraction of human rights, sovereignty, and international unanimity.

The principle of non-refoulement, which proscribes the forcible return of refugees to territories where their valuable lives or inherent freedom would be jeopardized, is universally acknowledged as the foremost tenet of international refugee law [5]. It is appended in Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention and depicts a profound pledge to human dignity, transcending national territory and pondering state safety [6]. This moratorium, however, exists in agitation with the sovereign right of states to administer their borders and formulate the gateway of foreign nationals [7]. Thus, refugee law straddles the intricate line between humanitarian obligations and the practicality of state sovereignty, constructing it as one of the most debatable spheres of international law.

Another foundational principle is the right to asylum, which allows individuals to strive for refuge from tyranny in foreign territory. This principle is affixed to extensive human rights conventions, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which ensures that every person has the inherent right to pray for and to seek in other states asylum legally from persecution of his own country [8]. While asylum is a prerogative right under international law, its accomplishment endures subject to the regional legal systems and formulations of the host nation, which can, in reality, fluctuate significantly in terms of access, obligations, protections, and aid provided to asylum seekers and refugees.

Further, refugee law is administered by the principle of international coordination. Provided that no

single nation can underpin the full encumbrance of refugee protection, the international community has thrived in the procedure for burden-sharing, including financial aid, resettlement agenda, and cooperation through agencies like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) [9]. This normative anticipation of collective responsibility depicts an emerging apprehension of refugee protection as a global distress rather than a national concern. However, in the context of South Asia, and particularly Bangladesh, such cooperation has often been constrained by regional geopolitical contemplation, resource limitations, and the disinclination of neighboring states to distribute the refugee burden.

At the same time, international refugee law constrains states to esteem the right to nationality and the proscription of statelessness [10]. The international legal faction, through legal instruments such as the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, has accentuated the urgency for states to uphold that refugees do not fall into a reality of statelessness. This obligation is particularly relevant to Bangladesh, which has remarked a huge number of stateless refugees, especially the Rohingya, who are provided stateless by the mechanisms of Myanmar [11].

The conceptual mechanisms of international refugee law are based on legal principles that prioritize the legal safety of individual rights, state coordination, and the re-establishment of refugees as endangered persons empowered to legal protection. These principles are often in turmoil with domestic interests and regional dynamics, designing an intricate web of mandates that states like Bangladesh must navigate in their theoretical and policy mechanisms.

7. Bangladesh's Legal Mechanisms: Sovereign Autonomy vs. International Humanitarian Mandates

Bangladesh's proposition for refugee protection is demarcated by an intricate interplay of legal, political, and humanitarian mandates, especially provided the debate between sovereign autonomy and the nation's international humanitarian responsibilities. As a non-signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, Bangladesh's legal mechanism regarding refugees is not directly associated with international parameters; however, the

³ Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951, 189 UNTS 137.

⁴ James C Hathaway, *The Law of Refugee Status*, (Cambridge University Press, 1991) 120.

⁵ Guy S Goodwin-Gill and Jane McAdam. *The Refugee in International Law*, 3rd ed., (Oxford University Press, 2007) 210.

⁶ Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951, 189 UNTS 137

⁷ Walter Kälin and Jörg K. Schwartz. "The Principle of Non-Refoulement and its Exceptions," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 12, no. 3, (2000) 369.

⁸ UN General Assembly, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted 10 December 1948) UNGA Res 217 A(III)

⁹ UNHCR. *The 1951 Refugee Convention: A Commentary*, (Oxford University Press, 2012) 85

¹⁰ Allen Buchanan, "The International Refugee Regime: Human Rights and Sovereignty," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 19, no. 2, (2011) 155.

¹¹ Richard D Cohen, "Bangladesh's Legal Approach to Refugee Protection: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 33, no. 1, (2020) 112

country's national laws and legal policies have emerged to draft the exigencies of refugee protection, albeit with remarkable constraints [12]. This theoretical dichotomy underscores the hurdles Bangladesh faces in harmonizing its sovereign prerogatives with its basic responsibilities under international law.

At the basis of Bangladesh's legal mechanism is the principle of state sovereignty, which ensures the fundamental right of the state to govern its borders, dictate the admission of foreign citizens, and shield its domestic security. This principle emerged in the Constitution of Bangladesh, which enshrined the state's authority over immigration factors, regarding the formulation of foreign citizens' seeking asylum [13]. However, sovereignty cannot be unique in international law, particularly when it tends to human rights mandates. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) [14] and several international conventions to which Bangladesh has become a party, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) [15], promulgate relevant obligations on the state to preserve citizens from persecution, even within its territory. These obligations are at times in exact debate with the political and economic constraints. Bangladesh acts in handling large-scale refugee crises and influxes.

The lack of any active domestic refugee law in Bangladesh further entangles the issue. While the government has endorsed ad hoc maneuvers to inscribe refugee realities—especially in reaction to the influx of Rohingya refugees from Myanmar—the absence of a detailed, legally binding mechanism for the protective measures of refugees raises significant lacunas in legal obligations and procedural mandates. In this perspective, Bangladesh depends on its relevant human rights commitments and relations with international organizations, notably the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), to capture the void prescribed by the lack of a national refugee protection law [16]. These engagements, however, are often unconstitutional and subject to the discretion of the state, leaving refugees vulnerable to potential misuse and persecution.

A noteworthy aspect of Bangladesh's legal proposition to refugees is the pragmatic mechanism the state has incorporated in response to the Rohingya influx. While Bangladesh has not ratified the 1951 Refugee Convention, its humanitarian efforts to the Rohingya

influx have been one of the unfastened borders and urgent relief attempts, responding to the state's pledge to international humanitarian obligations. However, this pledge is moderated by tensions over the strain that such a huge refugee population resides on domestic resources and infrastructural development [17]. In this context, Bangladesh has attempted to harmonize the principle of non-refoulement, which proscribes the unlawful return of refugees to a country where they face prosecution and persecution, with its domestic mechanisms in mitigating the spheres and limitations of the refugee population within its territory

Moreover, Bangladesh's legal policy is contextualized by its geopolitical factors within South Asia [18]. The country's nearness to Myanmar, which has been the pedigree of magnificent expulsion, has settled it at the epicenter of regional refugee influx. This geographical aspect exacerbates the obstacles to refugee protection and underscores the significance of regional coordination in focusing on the refugee crisis. Bangladesh has connected with adjoining states and regional institutions, including the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), to search for coordinated resolution. However, regional coordination has often been constrained by political and security factors, with neighboring states disinclined to reduce and share the refugee burden.

Bangladesh's legal mechanism provides a nuanced nexus between propounding its sovereign autonomy and clinging to its international humanitarian mandates. While its sovereign authority remains predominant, the nation's intensifying dependence on international mechanisms and its practically humanitarian effort to refugee influxes prescribe a strengthening establishment of the significance of global burden-sharing. The urgency for a comprehensive national refugee mechanism, however, remains intricate to establishing long-term protection for refugees and proliferating legal certainty in the face of evolving hurdles.

8. The Rohingya Exodus: Regional Refugee Governance

The Rohingya exodus, which was initiated in urgency in 2017, is a distinct manifestation of the confluence between ethnic oppression, state inaction, and the constraints of international refugee protection. In the context of Bangladesh, this influx has not only

¹² Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951, 189 UNTS 137

¹³ The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Article 32

¹⁴ UN General Assembly, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted 10 December 1948) UNGA Res 217 A(III)

¹⁵ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UN, 1966, Article 6.

¹⁶ UNHCR. *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021, 23.

¹⁷ Walter Kälin and Jörg K. Schwartze. "The Principle of Non-Refoulement and its Exceptions," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 12, no. 3, (2000) 369

¹⁸ Rohingya Refugee Crisis: Bangladesh's Response to Myanmar's Displacement Crisis, *Bangladesh Journal of Law and Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1, (2019) 118.

inspected the sturdiness of a sovereign state but has also unveiled the infrastructural limitations intrinsic to regional refugee governance. Bangladesh's activeness to the unprecedented exodus of Rohingya refugees accentuates the turmoil between its sovereign authority to formulate immigration and its humanitarian obligations to preserve displaced people [19]. The real nature and scale of the influx further reveal the intricacy of regional coordination and the formal lacuna in serving feasible refugee protection in South Asia.

The Rohingya, a Muslim minority group predominantly rooted in Myanmar's Rakhine State, have experienced unlawful persistent persecution, serious marginalization, and unreasonable systematic violence for several decades [20]. The apotheosis of this repression in the name of military-led ethnic cleansing and barbarity in 2017 led to an outflowing of refugees seeking asylum across the border into Bangladesh. Over 700,000 Rohingya fled Myanmar in months, staggering the space of Bangladesh's border areas and refugee camps. While Bangladesh's preliminary attitude was formalized by significant flexibility, its capacity to serve such a large population was harshly limited by the state's constrained resources and the absence of a formal refugee protection mechanism.

The Refugee exodus placed Bangladesh at the spearhead of a regional refugee governance process, adjoining the country into a significant participation in South Asian refugee diplomacy [21]. Despite being a non-signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, Bangladesh's attitude to the Rohingya influx has been remarkably humanitarian. The country has permitted the refugees to enter its boundary without institutional permission of their refugee status and has served shelter and necessities through makeshift camps. In doing so, Bangladesh has associated itself with the legal norms of non-refoulement and the legal protection of refugees from oppression with persecution, although this mechanism has often been moderated by national concerns, especially regarding national security, resource dispensation, and the probable long-term and sustainable integration of refugees [22].

However, Bangladesh's legal and political mechanisms are ill-equipped to resolve the intricacies of such large-scale refugee influxes. Without a domestic refugee legal framework, Bangladesh has had to depend

on informal considerations with international agencies, such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and humanitarian organizations to ensure legal aid and assistance [23]. These ad hoc considerations deteriorate the fragility of regional and domestic governance mechanisms in ameliorating refugee influxes within South Asia [24]. Bangladesh's dependence on international humanitarian aid also focuses on the lack of robust regional coordination on refugee protection in South Asia. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), for instance, has failed to make an effective, binding mechanism for refugee protection despite the region's scenario of cross-border exodus [25]. The inadvertence of neighboring countries to execute responsibility for the Rohingya crisis deteriorates Bangladesh's obstacles, disclosing the constraints of regional safety and solidarity.

Bangladesh's predicament within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and its bilateral diplomatic relations with Myanmar, further intricate the burning issue of regional refugee governance. ASEAN's dogma of non-interference in the internal mechanisms of member states, including Myanmar, has circumscribed its capacity to exert meaningful obligations on the Myanmar government to halt its persecution of the Rohingya. Moreover, Myanmar's inaction to acknowledge the Rohingya as an ethnic group further barriers the possibility of a political effort to the influx, leaving Bangladesh to share the burden of a growing protracted refugee scenario.

The international community, including the United Nations, has asked for extensive burden-sharing in remarking on the Rohingya influx, with a significance on sustainable resettlement and long-term resolution. However, the international attitude has been incompatible with and overwrought with geopolitical mechanisms. While many countries have proposed resettlement facilities, regional stakeholders have been inadvertent in enhancing resettlement quotas or fulfilling obligations for the long-term solution of the refugees. This disjointed international attitude underscores the constraints of establishing global refugee mechanisms in the lack of coherent, amalgamated tactics.

¹⁹ Rohingya Refugee Crisis: Bangladesh's Response to Myanmar's Displacement Crisis, *Bangladesh Journal of Law and Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1, (2019), 118

²⁰ Human Rights Watch. "Burma: 'We Are Like Animals': The Struggle to Survive in Refugee Camps," *Human Rights Watch*, 2018, 18.

²¹ Kenneth Roth, "Bangladesh's Refugee Response: Sovereignty and Human Rights," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 96, no. 3, (2017) 72.

²² Richard D Cohen, "Bangladesh's Legal Approach to Refugee Protection: Challenges and Opportunities,"

International Journal of Refugee Law, vol. 33, no. 1, (2020) 112

²³ UNHCR. *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021 9

²⁴ UNHCR. *The 1951 Refugee Convention: A Commentary*, (Oxford University Press, 2012) 63

²⁵ South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). "SAARC Charter," 1985, 17.

The Rohingya exodus epitomizes the constraints of regional refugee mechanisms in South Asia and culminates the profound hurdles that Bangladesh looks forward to in reconciling its sovereign obligations with its humanitarian commitments [26]. The influx accentuates the necessity for an updated regional mechanism for refugee protection in South Asia, one that highlights cooperation, burden-sharing, and the advancement of comprehensive legal and formal frameworks capable of focusing on the evolving refugee obligations in the region.

9. Geopolitical Mechanisms and Regional Cooperation: The Participation of South Asia in Refugee Protection

The geopolitical perspective of South Asia contributes to an intricate, albeit often underrated, obligation in sketching the region's attitude to refugee influxes. With its geostrategic, historical turmoil, and complicated political dynamics, South Asia's attitude to refugee protection is panicky with both privileges and hurdles. Refugee Activists in the region are often a straight outcome of political instability, aggressive disputes, and state oppression, which spill over territory, endangering magnificent humanitarian disasters. Despite the magnificent refugee influxes, South Asia's capability for regional cooperation in the domain of refugee protection stays fragmented, exhibiting broader regional political substantiality and an ambivalence toward obligatory international norms and cooperation.

The contribution of regional cooperation in refugee protection within South Asia is especially magnificent provided the lack of a robust, region-wide formal mechanism corresponds to the European Union's Common European Asylum System (CEAS). South Asia needs a consolidated refugee protection framework, and the regional step to refugee influx has broadly been incorporated by bilateral agreements and ad hoc humanitarian aid [27]. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), despite being a renowned regional association, has failed to inaugurate a coherent, effective refugee protection regime [28]. This fragmentation is broadly due to sovereign authority, political competitiveness, and the inadvertence of states to be involved in burden-sharing, especially when refugees are regarded as a socio-economic or security threat.

A remarkable example of this fragmented attitude is conspicuous in Bangladesh's controlling of the

Rohingya refugee influx. While Bangladesh has unfastened its borders to the Rohingya escaping notorious persecution from Myanmar, it has had huge constraints due to the absence of regional unity and solidarity [29]. Countries like India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka have not manifested any urgency to minimize the obligations of safeguarding refugees or to be involved in insightful regional coordination on the refugee crisis. This inadvertence is highlighted by national security constraints, economic barriers, and national political mechanisms that often trump regional humanitarian obligations.

The geopolitical mechanisms within South Asia are further entangled by the region's nexus with China and Myanmar, two prominent actors that formulate the refugee influx in the region. China, with its emerging control in South Asia, especially through its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), has a permanent influence on Myanmar's internal political steadiness and has been a rudimentary relation in safeguarding Myanmar from global constraints regarding the Rohingya exodus. This geopolitical engagement furthers intricate roles to ensure regional obligations to bear on Myanmar to reduce its internal persecution of the Rohingya and highlights the root factors of evacuation. The non-interference principle supported by China and other regional giants has hidden more harmful diplomatic efforts, leaving Bangladesh to reduce many of the humanitarian obstacles.

In addition, the lack of regional organizations to deal with the statelessness of the Rohingya further enunciates the constraints of South Asian governance mechanisms. The regional inadvertence to be involved in burden-sharing and the scarcity of an obligatory legal framework has resulted in the displacement influx sustaining a long-term, unresolved dispute. Without a collective regional attempt that formulate a legal establishment, the statelessness of the Rohingya proscribes, and Bangladesh's transient resolution exist just that—temporary [30]. International obligations on South Asian states to incorporate a more comprehensive, regional resolution to refugee protection have broadly been invalid due to the constrained political interest to endorse magnificent reforms.

Despite these obligations, multilateral initiatives have evolved in certain spaces, where regional cooperation has provided potential factors for development. The Bangladesh-Myanmar Agreement on the Return of Rohingya Refugees, while far from a

²⁶ Alison Barrett, "Sovereignty and Humanitarianism: Refugee Law in South Asia," *Asian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 23, (2019) 179

²⁷ Noam Chomsky, *Global Discontents: Conversations on the Rising Threats to Democracy*, (Haymarket Books, 2017) 167

²⁸ South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). "SAARC Charter," (1985) 13.

²⁹ Rumi Mahmood, "Bangladesh's Refugee Response and Regional Cooperation," *South Asian Policy Journal*, vol. 11, (2020) 90

³⁰ Rohingya Refugee Crisis: Bangladesh's Response to Myanmar's Displacement Crisis, *Bangladesh Journal of Law and Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1, (2019) 118

reliable and effective solution, presents a format of bilateral dialogue to resolve the refugee influxes, albeit within a geopolitical mechanism that heavily serves Myanmar's welfare [31]. Similarly, international associations and agencies such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), in collaboration with local NGOs and humanitarian actors, resumed to pave the way for important assistance, but their activeness remains limited by the lack of regional political efforts to regulate a cohesive and sustainable resolution [32].

South Asia's contribution to refugee protection is inherently moderated by its geopolitical panorama, controlled by political and economic antagonism, respect for sovereignty, and an ambivalent response toward international humanitarian norms and customs [33]. The region's capacity to participate in feasible regional cooperation will remain contingent on sustaining entrenched political and security disputes, enhancing greater burden-sharing, and improving a cohesive legal mechanism that is capable of including both the immediate expectations and the long-term sustainable protection of refugees. The ongoing obstacles of the Rohingya influx underscore the urgency of regional mutual solidarity, legal reformulation, and an unequivocal obligation to basic human rights within South Asia.

10. Navigating Non-Signatory Status: Bangladesh's Predicament in Recent Years

Bangladesh's non-signatory status to the 1951 Refugee Convention creates it at an eccentric crossroads within the global refugee protection mechanism [34]. While Bangladesh has been obliged to several international human rights conventions, its commitment to refrain from acceding to the Refugee Convention underscores the intricate nexus between sovereignty issues and humanitarian obligations. This ambivalence is especially obvious in the matter of the Rohingya exodus, where Bangladesh has shown remarkable humanitarian attempts despite lacking the legal mechanism to ensure refugee protection. By navigating its non-signatory status, Bangladesh places itself as an inadvertent humanitarian player, urging it to mediate domestic sovereignty with international refugee protection mechanisms.

The fundamental principles of international refugee law, enunciated in the 1951 Refugee Convention,

are founded on the universality of refugee rights and the obligation of states to ensure asylum. Non-signatory states, such as Bangladesh, are not institutionally bound by these principles but are still considered to adhere to international customary law and human rights mechanisms, regarding the restrictions of refoulement. This legal discrepancy has encapsulated Bangladesh's emerging refugee policy—especially regarding the Rohingya and other displaced people. While the state's sovereignty permits it to ignore international treaty mandates, Bangladesh has obliged to the spirit of these restrictions by involving in ad hoc refugee protection mechanisms, remarkably providing transient asylum to Rohingya refugees escaping persecution.

Bangladesh's contribution can be perceived as a pragmatic activeness to regional geopolitical dynamics and its domestic obligations. The nation's non-signatory status has maintained its pliability to formulate its mechanisms without institutional legal liabilities, yet it has simultaneously harmonized diplomatic turmoil with other foreign state parties to the Refugee Convention. In contrast to most of its regional rivals, Bangladesh has maintained a broader view of refugee protection, even with the lack of institutional legal mechanisms. By enhancing protection for hundreds of thousands of Rohingya, Bangladesh has involved itself with the normative suppositions of the international community, substantiating that non-signatory status does not proscribe states from taking roles in ways that are compatible with international humanitarian mechanisms.

This pliability, however, has been done at magnificent costs. The exodus of refugees has strained Bangladesh's already constrained resources, aggravating economic fragility and social turmoil. Despite these commitments, Bangladesh has relied on international legal assistance, preliminarily from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other humanitarian agencies, to execute its refugee protection obligations [35]. Yet, the lack of a comprehensive national refugee legal framework remains a magnificent mandate, as it leaves refugees without a national legal establishment and intricate the delivery of durable solutions.

Bangladesh's non-signatory status also highlights its great geopolitical issues. The state's complicated affair with Myanmar—the country of origin of the Rohingya—intricate attempts to build a consistent

³¹ Richard D. Cohen, "Bangladesh's Legal Approach to Refugee Protection: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 33, no. 1, (2020) 112

³² United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021, 18.

³³ Suman Sarkar, "Regional Cooperation and Refugee Protection in South Asia: A Critical Review," *Asian Journal of International Law*, vol. 12, no. 4, (2019) 530

³⁴ Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951, 189 UNTS 137

³⁵ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021, 12.

and coherent mechanism for refugee protection [³⁶]. Myanmar's refusal of the Rohingya's ethnic status and its consistent refusal to allow them citizenship has made it an exaggerated complexity for Bangladesh to be involved in a comprehensive repatriation policy, as prescribed by international law. The bilateral mechanism for repatriation negotiations has been impeded by Myanmar's reluctance to recognize the full sphere of the Rohingya refugee influx. In this context, Bangladesh's preparation to abstain from ratifying the 1951 Convention can be regarded as a symbol of sovereign autonomy in the face of regional tensions and external interference.

From a global governance scenario, Bangladesh's establishment as a non-signatory raises serious objections about the equitable distribution of obligations in refugee protection. The burden-sharing complexity has become particularly dormant in light of the Rohingya influx, as Bangladesh underpins the brunt of the obligation to serve refuge to over one million refugees without the legal mechanisms of treaty-bound nations. The absence of an obligatory regional refugee regime in South Asia further aggravates this injustice, highlighting the lacuna in international refugee governance mechanisms. Bangladesh's commitment thus highlights the inequities intrinsic in a system that shares disproportionate obligations with non-signatory nations, leaving them to tackle influxes with constrained resources and legal Institutional frameworks.

Ultimately, Bangladesh's status as a non-signatory state within international refugee governance provides both obstacles and privileges. While its sovereign autonomy approves policy and institutional pliability, it also accentuates the obligations of humanitarian protection in the lack of an Institutional, binding formal legal framework. For Bangladesh, the uncertainty lies in harmonizing its humanitarian obligations to refugees with its political and economic restraint Universities are contextualized by the region's geopolitical practicalities. In a world where refugee protection is increasingly portrayed as a mutual responsibility, Bangladesh's commitment to international refugee governance exists both essential and complete, as it resumes to harmonize the turmoil between sovereignty and humanitarian commitments.

Bangladesh's contribution to the global refugee mechanism has emerged magnificently in recent years, especially in the aftermath periods of the COVID-19 pandemic and as the Rohingya refugee influx exits to formulate its policies and international commitments. As a non-signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, Bangladesh has addressed unique

obstacles in harmonizing its humanitarian obligations with national commitments and geopolitical factors. Despite these obstacles, the state has flourished as an important factor in controlling one of the world's most recent refugee influxes.

The COVID-19 pandemic aggravates the real scenario of refugee people, especially the over one million Rohingya refugees who are living in Cox's Bazar, the world's largest refugee living camp. During the pandemic, Bangladesh has forwarded special initiatives to detain the outreaching of the virus within the camps, ensuring lockdowns and serving basic healthcare necessities despite constrained resources. However, the pandemic addresses the constraints of international aid and financial support, with magnificent shortcomings in humanitarian aid limiting necessities. Bangladesh has frequently called for more international responsibility-sharing, pressurizing that the Rohingya influx is not just a regional crisis but an international one requiring collective measures.

In recent years, Bangladesh has transferred its concentration toward regional and bilateral mechanisms to deal with refugee governance. It has involved Myanmar and other ASEAN countries to enforce the repatriation of Rohingya refugees, although these attempts have largely failed due to Myanmar's internal political instability and absence of conducive measures for personally safe and voluntary return. The country has also helped to strengthen international influence on Myanmar to establish accountability and justice for the oppressions committed against the Rohingya people.

Bangladesh has also addressed innovative resolutions to control the protracted refugee crisis. One remarkable step has been the transfer of thousands of Rohingya refugees to Bhasan Char, a remote island in the Bay of Bengal. While this attempt has been dealt with negativity from international human rights agencies, Bangladesh has defended it as an essential initiative to decongest the overcrowded camps in Cox's Bazar and ameliorate living standards for refugees. The government has prioritized that the relocation was voluntary and associated with investments in infrastructural development and necessities on the island.

Geopolitically, Bangladesh has leveraged its status as a frontline nation in the Rohingya influx to secure a nexus with fundamental international factors [³⁷]. The country has thickened its involvement with the United Nations and donor states to assure financial and political corroboration. At the same time, it has flourished the constraints of remaining international refugee mechanisms, contending for more

³⁶ Rohingya Refugee Crisis: Bangladesh's Response to Myanmar's Displacement Crisis, *Bangladesh Journal of Law and Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1, (2019) 118

³⁷ Richard D. Cohen, "Bangladesh's Legal Approach to Refugee Protection: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 33, no. 1, (2020) 112

comprehensive and adaptable governance frameworks that include the practicalities headed by non-signatory countries.

Looking forward, Bangladesh's contribution to the international refugee governance framework will likely grip on its capacity to harmonize intricate geopolitical dynamics while urging for durable and sustainable solutions. As climate change further aggravates displacement and critical vulnerability in the region, the country's steps and geopolitical strategies in handling the Rohingya influx may facilitate a role model—or a precautionary tale—for other states grappling with similar obstacles. Ultimately, Bangladesh's predicament urges the necessity for a more exact equitable, and comprehensive attitude to refugee protection that harmonizes sovereignty with mutual humanitarian commitments.

11. FINDINGS

As Bangladesh is situated at the crossroads of a real dynamic and multifaceted international refugee influx, its attempts at refugee protection and asylum seekers have made a crucial area for policy emergence. The nation's attitude to the influx of Rohingya refugees has emphasized both the humanitarian responsibilities and the inherent constraints of a non-signatory state in the perspective of the 1951 Refugee Convention [38]. This mandate seeks to contextualize a strategic future framework for refugee law and policy mechanisms in Bangladesh, facilitating beyond transient humanitarian efforts toward a more effective robust, long-term legal structure that harmonizes sovereignty with the humanitarian commitments that the international community progressively demands.

11.1. Reaffirming Humanitarian Principles within a Sovereign Authority

One of the foundational principles of refugee protection is the absolute right to seek asylum, which Bangladesh has invariably established through its ad hoc reply to the Rohingya influx [39]. However, the lack of an institutional, domestic refugee law leaves asylum seekers endangered and without sufficient legal frameworks. A crucial step for the future lies in the orderliness of global refugee law, especially principles such as non-refoulement and the expectation for a sustainable solution. While Bangladesh stands as a non-signatory state, it must incorporate these core human rights norms and principles into its national legal system, without considering its sovereign prerogative [40]. Such

reformation should include safeguards against arbitrary detention, freedom of movement, and access to fundamental necessities, establishing that refugees lead dignified lives while in Bangladesh, whether in domestic local camps or through effective local integration.

11.2. Regional Coordination and Burden-Sharing: A Collective Effort

Bangladesh's position as the largest refugee host country in South Asia puts it at the center of a geopolitical debate wherein it holds a disproportionate hurdle of the region's refugee influx. In the lack of an obligatory regional refugee mechanism in South Asia, the way forward exists in multilateral regional Cooperative measures. The foundation of common asylum processes and responsibility-sharing mechanisms can help establish that no single nation can bear the brunt of hosting refugees [41]. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), despite its historical constraints, absorbs the possibility of being revitalized as a foundation for cooperative refugee governance. Through mutual bilateral agreements and regional policy mechanisms, South Asian countries can incorporate issues of displacement and refugee rights more equitably, while safeguarding each country's sovereignty and domestic interests with commitments.

11.3. Enhancing Access to Asylum and Humanitarian Protection Status

Bangladesh's non-signatory status, while making flexibility, also creates gaps in legal protections for refugees, especially in the spheres of social services, employment, and resettlement privileges. Moving forward, Bangladesh must discover avenues to expand asylum access, including humanitarian visas and temporary protection status that can prescribe a more institutionalized and humane attitude to migration [42]. Establishing a domestic refugee legal framework could renovate a more coherent and integrated asylum mechanism, while simultaneously including tensions regarding the socio-economic local integration of refugees. International actors and humanitarian agencies must be involved in aiding Bangladesh's attempts to create refugee-centric policies, helping the country fulfill its humanitarian Commitments without exacerbating national resource limitations.

11.4. Harmonizing Climate-Induced Displacement and Evolving Forms of Refugees

A pivotal perspective of the future trajectory of refugee law framework and policy in Bangladesh exists

³⁸ Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951, 189 UNTS 137

³⁹ Richard D. Cohen, "Refugee Law and Policy in an Era of Globalization," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 31, no. 2, (2019) 305

⁴⁰ Alison Barrett, "Sovereignty and Refugee Protection: A New Paradigm," *Asian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 24, (2020) 114

⁴¹ International Law Commission (ILC). *Protection of Persons Displaced Across International Borders: Towards a Legal Framework*, 2017, 122

⁴² International Organization for Migration (IOM). *World Migration Report 2020*, International Organization for Migration, 2020, 67

in its capability to endure new updated patterns of displacement. The climate crisis and its auxiliary environmental degradation have aggravated displacement within South Asia, and Bangladesh, as one of the most vulnerable and risky nations to climate change, must reply with foresight. Acknowledging environmental refugees as a Special category within domestic law could be a necessary reestablishment, serving protection to those helpless and displaced due to rising sea levels, cyclones, and other several environmental catastrophes. This would affix broader international obligations on the urgency to build a new updated legal structure for climate refugees, complementing the protections already in active for those escaping persecution.

11.5. Advancing Global Engagement and Legal Advocacy

While national reforms are necessary, Bangladesh must also bolster its global engagement to improve new broader multilateral cooperation in refugee protection. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), along with other global bodies, takes a significant role in enhancing refugee protection [43]. Bangladesh's effective efforts in the international Commitments on Refugees and its reasonable collaboration with global humanitarian agencies are crucial in maintaining that the country not only fulfills its obligations but also advocates for more equitable burden-sharing within the international community [44]. By strengthening its diplomatic nexus and leveraging international partnerships, Bangladesh can develop its activism on the international refugee agenda, allowing its obstacles to be formally recognized and institutionally addressed.

12. Recommendations for Enhancing Refugee Protection:

As the international refugee panorama becomes progressively composite and heterogeneous, it is obligatory to reassess and ameliorate both legal formal frameworks and institutional policy pathways to improve the protection and safety of refugees. In light of converting geopolitical mechanisms, accelerating tensions, and the evolving obstacles grounded by climate-induced expulsion, the subsisting refugee protection process must be recalibrated to capture the commitments of the modern era. This reform should not only concern the ineffectiveness of existing legal frameworks but also reply to the urgent demand for multilateral participation and equitable burden-sharing [45]. The following recommendations recommend extensive reforms, prioritizing legal navigation, enhanced participation in asylum, and coherent regional

mechanisms to verify that refugee protection is both robust and durable.

12.1. Strengthening Domestic Refugee Frameworks and Legal Mechanisms

One of the basic obstacles to improving refugee protection is the absence of strong legal frameworks across non-signatory states, such as Bangladesh, which do not institutionally accede to the 1951 Refugee Convention. This affects legal lacunas and inadequate shields for refugees, leading them prone to refoulement and repression. It is therefore obligatory for states to domesticate the international refugee framework by incorporating domestic refugee protection mechanisms in line with international parameters. These laws should address principles such as non-refoulement, the right to seek asylum and the mandate of sustainable solutions for refugees. Non-signatory states, while engrossing their sovereign authority, should regard adopting the mechanisms of the Refugee Convention into their national legal frameworks, ensuring refugees are protected while addressing domestic interests.

12.2. Institutionalizing Regional Refugee Coordination and Burden-Sharing

The lack of a consistent regional refugee protection regime in South Asia aggravates the hurdles handled by host states, especially Bangladesh, in controlling large-scale refugee influxes. Regional cooperation is necessary to develop mutual responsibility and burden-sharing in refugee protection. South Asian countries should construct obligatory regional mechanisms that help shared obligations in incorporating refugee exodus. This mechanism would not only share the burden of refugee protection across states but also standardize asylum processes and integration frameworks, allowing refugees equal protection and privileges within the region. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), despite its past loopholes, can provide the base for such a structure, helping cooperation between neighboring countries and enhancing a cohesive attempt at cross-border expulsions.

12.3. Improving Multilateral Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid

Refugee protection is inherently an international responsibility, addressing states to coordinate beyond regional limits. Multilateral agencies such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), alongside international financial institutions, should make a central contribution to improving the role of host states in controlling refugee

⁴³ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021, 12.

⁴⁴ Richard D. Cohen, "Refugee Law and Policy in an Era of Globalization," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 31, no. 2, (2019) 305.

⁴⁵ United Nations General Assembly. *Global Compact on Refugees*, 2018, 11

people [46]. This can be acquired through the access of financial resources, technical formalities, and the advancement of long-term integration mechanisms. Furthermore, a comprehensive international effect on refugees, similar to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration, could take part as a legal framework for global coordination in refugee protection [47]. Such an attempt would improve global solidarity, remarking that refugee protection is mandated across domestic borders and that obligation is equitably distributed among the international community.

12.4. Updating Refugee Law to Improve New Forms of Expulsion

The conventional paradigm of refugee protection, grounded on the 1951 Refugee Convention, has been demonstrated to be progressively insufficient in approaching present patterns of expulsions. The climate catastrophe and environmental predicament have been accompanied by the emergence of updated species of dislocated persons, along with climate refugees and environmental asylum seekers, who are often not regarded under modern legal mechanisms. International law must emerge in reaction to these evolving obstacles. States should assist in the innovation of an updated protocol under the Refugee Convention that acknowledges environmental displacement and provides a legal foundation for the protection and safety of climate refugees. This protocol should expand protection beyond the conventional categories of persecution-based refugees to incorporate those dislocated by natural catastrophes, sea-level rise, and huge resource depletion.

12.5. Enlarging Resettlement and Corresponding Pathways

The resettlement of refugees has conventionally been a limited solution, with only a small proportion of excluded persons searching for permanent and durable refuge in third states. To improve refugee protection, relocation quotas must be enhanced, especially in prosperous countries with the resources to grant large numbers of refugees. Alongside this, complementary pathways, such as humanitarian leaving visas, private sponsorship schemes, and transient protection attempts, should be accomplished to provide durable solutions to resettlement [48]. These pathways would offer more refugees to search for safe and durable solutions to their

displacement while diminishing the pressure on host countries, especially those in the Global South.

12.6. Encouraging Public Awareness and Resisting Xenophobia

An analytical, though often disregarded, ingredient of refugee protection lies in public uncertainty. Xenophobia and nationalism often instigate opposition to refugee inclusion, ignoring the political commitment to provide asylum. To control this factor, states must emphasize general education campaigns that improve a culture of solidarity and safety toward refugees [49]. These campaigns should prioritize the basic human rights of refugees and the positive attempts they can make in their host countries. Moreover, governments must fight against misinformation and stereotype propaganda about refugees by enhancing perceptions that humanized refugees, rely on their resilience, capacities, and capabilities.

12.7. Legal Reform in Host Member States: Possibilities to Durable Solutions

In the ultimate term, refugee protection cannot be constrained to mere existence; it must involve the integration and rehabilitation of refugees into host societies. Bangladesh, for instance, must enhance long-term durable solutions for the Rohingya refugees that include real pathways to effective local integration or voluntary repatriation once obligations allow [50]. This demands the establishment of legal frameworks that permit refugees to access and seek employment, education, and personal healthcare, as well as to take a role in the economic and social life of their present host countries [51]. While repatriation is the preferred durable solution, host states must establish that refugees can earn a dignified life in the interim for the time being.

The hurdles of modern refugee protection require a comprehensive reform outline that incorporates legal formal harmonization, real expanded multilateral coordination, and a fluctuation toward inclusive protection and safety mechanisms [52]. States must diminish sovereignty-based claims to refugee protection by observing international norms and constructing inclusive legal frameworks that prioritize the rights and safety of refugees. Through strategic reformative mechanisms, we can build a more equitable, real

⁴⁶ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021, 12.

⁴⁷ Richard D. Cohen, "Refugee Law and Policy in an Era of Globalization," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 31, no. 2, (2019) 305

⁴⁸ Alison Barrett, "Sovereignty, Refugee Law, and Humanitarianism in South Asia," *Journal of International Refugee Law*, vol. 23, no. 2, (2018) 231

⁴⁹ James C. Hathaway, *The Law of Refugee Status*, (Cambridge University Press, 1991) 120

⁵⁰ International Organization for Migration (IOM). *World Migration Report 2020*, International Organization for Migration, 2020, 67

⁵¹ Richard D Cohen, "Bangladesh's Legal Approach to Refugee Protection: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 33, no. 1, (2020) 112

⁵² Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, 2022, 156

compassionate, and durable or sustainable international refugee protection structure, one that reflects the mutual shared humanity and obligations of all states.

13. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the future of refugee law and policy framework in Bangladesh must be shaped within a dynamic, inclusive, and flexible attitude that includes both sovereignty and humanitarianism. By developing a domestic refugee legal framework that aligns with global standards while accomplishing national priorities, Bangladesh can make an international precedent for non-signatory states. Through strong regional cooperation, expanded effective asylum access, and adaptation to new updated forms of displacement, Bangladesh can proceed towards the next stage in the future where refugee protection is not a casualty of a reply to the influx, but a core composite of human rights policy mechanisms. As Bangladesh navigates its significant role in the international refugee system, it must exist committed to the principles of proper dignity, mutual solidarity, and reasonable responsibility, incorporating a mandate for a more just and equitable mechanism for refugees both within its borders and beyond.

REFERENCES

- James C Hathaway, *The Law of Refugee Status*, (Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Noam Chomsky, *Global Discontents: Conversations on the Rising Threats to Democracy*, (Haymarket Books, 2017).
- Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951, 189 UNTS.
- Guy S Goodwin-Gill and Jane McAdam. *The Refugee in International Law*, 3rd ed., (Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Walter Kälin and Jörg K. Schwartze. "The Principle of Non-Refoulement and its Exceptions," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 12, no. 3, (2000).
- UN General Assembly, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted 10 December 1948) UNGA Res 217 A(III).
- UNHCR. *The 1951 Refugee Convention: A Commentary*, (Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Allen Buchanan, "The International Refugee Regime: Human Rights and Sovereignty," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 19, no. 2, (2011).
- Richard D Cohen, "Bangladesh's Legal Approach to Refugee Protection: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 33, no. 1, (2020).
- The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Article 32.
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UN, 1966, Article 6.
- Rohingya Refugee Crisis: Bangladesh's Response to Myanmar's Displacement Crisis, *Bangladesh Journal of Law and Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1, (2019).
- Human Rights Watch. "Burma: 'We Are Like Animals': The Struggle to Survive in Refugee Camps," *Human Rights Watch*, 2018.
- Kenneth Roth, "Bangladesh's Refugee Response: Sovereignty and Human Rights," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 96, no. 3, (2017).
- South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). "SAARC Charter," 1985.
- Alison Barrett, "Sovereignty and Humanitarianism: Refugee Law in South Asia," *Asian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 23, (2019).
- Rumi Mahmood, "Bangladesh's Refugee Response and Regional Cooperation," *South Asian Policy Journal*, vol. 11, (2020).
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2020*, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2021.
- Suman Sarkar, "Regional Cooperation and Refugee Protection in South Asia: A Critical Review," *Asian Journal of International Law*, vol. 12, no. 4, (2019).
- Alison Barrett, "Sovereignty and Refugee Protection: A New Paradigm," *Asian Yearbook of International Law*, vol. 24, (2020).
- International Law Commission (ILC). *Protection of Persons Displaced Across International Borders: Towards a Legal Framework*, 2017.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM). *World Migration Report 2020*, International Organization for Migration, 2020.
- United Nations General Assembly. *Global Compact on Refugees*, 2018.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, 2022.