

Sustainable Support for the Refugees: Approaching the Refuge as a Process in Seven Stages

Irina POP

Abstract. The general aim of the analysis, that we are involved in, is devoted to exploring the EU possibilities – institutional, civil society, and volunteer persons - to improve the support for the Internationally Displaced Persons (IDPs), commonly called "refugees"; to grant its sustainability. It introduces two main ideas. The first idea is that the international "refuge" is a process that is to be understood and managed in five main stages 1. Admission, 2. Transit, 3. Insertion, - 4. International Protection Status or Subsidiary Protection Status received 5. Voluntary repatriation. The second main idea proposed is to take into consideration that in any process of the refuge and refugees' protection, there are two parts a) those who assume the duty to protect and b) the protegees. Accordingly, the protection should have its peculiarities for each stage. In addition, each of the two parts sees the facts from its own angle. The protectors understand and project the refuge's management from the perspective of the costs involved and that of the available resources and efforts to solve the problems. The protegees see their needs and to what extent these are met. They also see their undeserved suffering. Accordingly, they expect to be assisted to put an end to the refuge cauchemar as soon as possible. To harmonize the perspectives and to conciliate the needs with the available resources, is to put both perspectives together, to enlarge the concept on what the process supposes. To communicate the concept of refuge which encompass the mentioned perspectives – among the officers, NGOs' members, volunteers that took the mission to support the refugees and further among the receiving communities' members - is a necessity. It is also to deploy efforts to deeply communicate on the refugees' needs and issues among the actors mentioned above. In parallel, it is to develop the communication on the assistance and on its limits (caused by the limited available resources) to the refugees and among them. To contribute to this communication, we elaborate the schema of the refuge' stages, with their main contents seen from both the parts involved. On the other hand, we introduce the Pyramid of the Refugees' needs. To concretize the theory, we also are trying to present Romania's politico-legislative frameworks in the special case of the massive influx of internationally displaced persons (IDPs) and its effectiveness on the Ukrainian "refugees", de facto IDP protection, according to the UN, adopted by the EU too, minimum standards. Here below we focus only on the schema of the stages.

Keywords: *Forcibly displaced population (FDP); Stages of the Refuge: Escaping, Admission, Transit; Insertion of the FDP by the receiving state; Refugees Integration, Refugees' Voluntary repatriation; Refuge' Consequences and Traumas on ex- Refuge & Reparations for the Victims*

Introductory notes

EU is constantly blamed as being a fortress, with many barriers against the non-EU citizens' entrance, insertion, residing, and integration here. Although there are all around Europe large diasporas of foreigners speaking more than 100 languages and dialects, there are large categories of legal migrants yearly welcomed in the EU, and Europe is one of the largest sanctuaries for refugees from all around the world.

From a Leftist point of view, the EU policy is constantly criticized of being reluctant to the integration of foreigners or at least of being not enough supportive as policies to integrate, as founds for integration, and as cultural empathy cultivated and showed. In the most radical leftist views, it is alleged to be unjust and discriminatory with foreigners, and even with immigrants' descendants. From the Rightist point of view, it is also criticized of being unjust to his citizens who are called to pay social contributions to be distributed to foreigners who do not work, and who generates different damages and issues to the European still of life.

A member of the Romanian Borders' Guards told a story about his professional frustrations that, he claims, are quite a general. *“A small group of Somalis crossed the border – external border of the EU - illegally and without any document. The youngest one, when the Police Border handcuffed him - on the breaching the Border Law – he took his telephone and asked the officer that handcuffed him to accept a picture with him. He raised his arms as a champion with his/her trophy and showed up a happy smiling to camera! For my family – he said to the astonished officer! They do not take us seriously, as a Police body - commented the officer!”*¹

The two cases evoked lead to address as an important political question: “Do we analyze the issue of refuge using a correct pattern? Is it adequate to the reality seen from the perspectives of those who are to benefice and to those who have – this time – to pay for?”

We try to answer such epistemological questions – epistemological, but with

¹ The misunderstandings were unavoidable here, because the perspectives were different but completely ignored in their difference. The two actors of the scene interpreted from different perspectives the same fact: the admission stage in refuge process. For the young Somali the getting into the “EU fortress” was the triumph in his battle to save his life threatened in the gangs' wars in the failed state of Somalia! For the police borders' officer, it was a case in law, which is a not a joke! The actors, on the behalf of pragmatism, remained to the fact, ignoring that the fact is itself indebted to the perspective of the culture that refer to it.

results in reality – by using a pattern in two steps. The first is to put in parallel the perspectives of those who are to enter the EU as refugees² – massive influxes of refugees – and those who are to receive them and to manage their options – under the constraints of financial resources and of their own capacities to face a huge new for their problem: the problem of reconstructing an interrupted life. The second step is to look at the refuge as a process with different issues and contains different five stages.

The resources that we used, apart from the UNHCR documents and tools – handbooks and guidelines inspired by the fieldwork – are the EU Directives and their transposing into Romanian legislations regulating this EU policy area, the reports on the Ukrainians arrived in Romania after 24 of February 2022, small investigations – 36 interviews – on the ex-refugees in Oradea, now Romanian citizens, and the discussions with police borders officers. (The attempts to interview persons with no ID documents that claim to be refugees when they were in the custody of the regional Inspectorate for Immigration – IGI – felt.)

To quest the core of the refugees' problem, the integration, we conducted interviews (30) with Romanians living today in today Germany (Bavaria). We interview people are a) ethnic German born in Romania, b) others as descendants of ethnic Germans, c) some as ex-fugitives from Communist Romania (political refugees), d) others as Romanian illegal migrants to Germany (1990-2007), e) undocumented migrants (entered legally for a period of 90 days, but who do not

² We define *the refugee's* notion as notion for an internationally refugee. It is taken accordingly with the 1951 *Geneva Convention on Refugee Status*. We do not count in the number of refugees as the all Internally Displaced Persons. The refugee is a legal status, recognized by an institution habilitated to do it, on the grounds of the international treaties, 1951, *Geneva Convention*, 1967, *New York Protocol on Refugee*; 1969 *Convention governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa*, and 1984, *Cartagena Declaration*. Accordingly, *a refugee is a person who has crossed national borders and who cannot or is unwilling to return home due to well-founded fear of persecution*.

Five types or persecutions are recognized in warranting the status of refugee to a person: racial, religious, political, linguistic, cultural in the UN treaties, the OAU and in 1984 *Cartagena Declaration* extended the refugee' definition:

"a person who have fled his/her country because his/her lives, security or freedom have been threatened by generalized violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, massive violation of human rights or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed public order".) *The stateless persons* are included.

In the popular culture, an international refugee is – simply - *an Internationally displaced person, or a specific migrant, who deserves much more attention*. (The cautions against those who represent danger for national security, public order, against terrorists, sentenced criminals or other that are abusing the humanitarian rights, are ignored, in this over simplified definition.) For the sake of the popular culture, that prefers "*refugees*", for the persons internationally forcibly displaced we will use below the term "*refugees*".

return when the period expired, after 2003); f) others EU citizens living and working in Germany as the EU citizens, after 2007. The interviews cover the main political categories and gave the atmosphere of Romanian ex-refugee life in Germany and their' feeling on their integration, in one of the EU states, with the most elaborated policies in integration. (They do not give and did not intend to give a statistical image of the Romanians' integration in Bavaria.) We also appealed, as precious resources in approaching the refugee's stages, to the published memories of some refugees.

The concrete contents of feeling and acting on the refuge resulted from the two different perspectives of the hosts and hosted persons. That is there are differences between the specific meanings that the reality of the refugee's life has for themselves and for those who host them. Taking into account stage by stage, both sides is to find a way to solve a delicate issue: harmonizing the two parts with different visions and different expectations, cultures, and resources.

By consulting the sources mentioned, especially, the EU norms in regulating the field of refuge and asylum, international conventions and their additional implementation tools, and by reading reports on refugees published by the EU and UNHCR, Agency for Refugees, we hope to find out the content the refuge process in each of its five stages and how the contents change with the perspective embraced. The learning results were planned to be largely shared after.

Practically, we hope to achieve a simplified description of the refuge process' stages and their contents. From the refugees' perspective, the five stages plus, that we try to simply describe are *1. Admission*, *2. Transit*, *3. Insertion*, - for temporary protected persons, for the Asylum applicants, for those protected internationally or subsidiary -, *4. Integration* for the Asylum seekers, Internationally or Subsidiary Protected Persons, *5. Voluntary Repatriation* plus their prelude *stage O (pre-refuge stage)*, with the two subcategories *O A (Escaping from a threatened Home and the area where the threats to death are present)* and *O B (Escaping from motherland threatened by war or Crossing the border)*.

From the host states' perspective, the stages, simply presented, are 1. Refugees' Admission, 2. Refugees Transit, 3. Refugees Insertion, 4. Refugees Integration, 5. Refugees' voluntary repatriation of Refugees with a Temporary Protection Status ended.

Epistemologically, we attempt to draw an epistemological lesson on how it is to think and speak about refuge and refugees. We attempt to provide a way of thinking on the two perspectives, in terms of: Is one part's perspective more accurate than the other? Is a synthesis of the two possible? Or, in fact, fairness is reachable if you

simply precise the perspective that is embraced to get reports on the refuge and refugees.

By conducting field research, we aimed to understand the specific meanings that the reality of the refugee's life has for themselves and for those who host them in each of the five stages.

1. The "refuge's" stages at a glance

1.1 Main stages in the route to the safety of a "refugee" and the two perspectives on their content

At a glance, the main stages in the route of the fugitives – being the evacuee, the forcibly displaced peoples or people that took this way on their own initiative - who cross the borders as Internationally Displaced Persons are listed in the table below. Seen from the perspective of the fugitives, there are 1) *Fleeing from war and Reaching a safe country*; 2) *Fleeing from war & the Transit to another safe country requested personally*; 3) *Temporary settlement in a country of protection, up to a maximum of 3 years*; 4) *Long time settlement in a country of protection*, after an asylum application is positively solved; 5) *Voluntary repatriation*.

The criterium to distinguish among them are the fugitive *options* and the *safety that they got*. The first stage, *Reaching a safe country*, is about the threatened people to flee from their homes and to leave the state where the persecutions, risks, or/and threats to their life were more and more present or even unbearable and to get into a country where such risks are impossible. It is a completely other policy and jurisdiction that grants the human being's safety, human rights, and dignity. The second one, *the Transit to another safe country* it is about their option to go further to a state where they estimate that will be granted better material conditions to live. (Safety, human rights, and dignity are also granted.) In stage three, the stage of the *Temporary settlement in the country of protection*, the people get temporary protection that is comparable with that of the national citizens, in terms of the guarantees for the human being's safety, human rights respect, and person's dignity protection. It is also comparable with the access to the opportunities to work, housing, schools, and health care, plus possibilities to benefit from the social assistance, available in the country. In addition, the private donors, the NGOs, and the volunteers support supplementary Internationally Displaced Persons, proving solidarity with people in need. It is a stage that we call insertion. In stage four, the

Longtime settlement, a stage accessible only after an asylum application positively solved, the protegees got all the previous guarantees for the human being's safety, human rights respects, and the person's dignity protection as well as all there are given to them opportunities to work, housing, schools, and health cares. Mainly, all the supports available in the insertion stage are active. The novelties are: the supports are indefinitely available and there is open for them the possibility of naturalization, to become citizens of the state of protection. Stage 5 is the stage of **Voluntary repatriation**³. It is a repatriation assisted by the hosting state and the UNHCR plus the specialized NGOs.

There are two perspectives of describing the facts, that of the refugees and that of the hosting state. Firstly, they are defined from the perspective of the *Forcibly displaced peoples who cross the borders*, called in popular culture, the *refugees*. Here, there are emphasized the needs and expectations of the Internationally Displaced People (IDP). The complementary perspective is that of the hosting state. As contents of the stages, the hosting state's perspective comprises the duties assumed by it, under the political and legal obligations contracted under the international conventions signed and ratified. In brief, there are institutional duties. To them, there are other duties – un-informal, but important as immediate and warm movers in the IDPs' protection. There are the duties fulfilled by the receiving

³ The *voluntary repatriation* is not to be confused with the *voluntary return*. The concept of *voluntary repatriation* is a free option of an ex-fugitive or of groups of ex-fugitives that estimate that they can return safely at home. According with the EU norms, the *EU Council Directive 2001/55*, art. 21, (1), (2) and (3), they must be completely informed on what they must expect when they decide for voluntary repatriation. There are the international organizations involved in the refugees' protection, mainly by the UNHCR, the protective state the first responsible to fully inform them on the situation in the home country.

When the status of the temporary protection ends (when there are no more risks and threatens toward the ex-temporary protected persons), the voluntary repatriation is the most recommended alternative for the ex-refugees. The other alternatives will be an individual asylum application or the deportation.

They also must be assisted by the same actors until the ex-refugees arrived and get inserted at home.

(The political concept of the *voluntary return* is designed for those migrants that were under illegal conditions in one of the European countries and accept voluntary to be returned in the country of origins under different programs nationally financed and administrated. In the Western countries, there is a common practice to "compensate" the migrants to voluntary return back in their countries of origins. The media uncovered that the migrants are paid to leave– e.g. *The Independent*, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/france-immigration-refugees-migrants-ofii-didier-leschi-a7439421.html> – but similar documentations of the journalists from *The Guardian*, *The Telegraph*, *The Times*, *Der Spiegel* proved that sums among 500 Euro, (Italy) and 3000 pounds (UK) were paid to migrants to leave. There are also state' programs in Western countries to advertise and to support the migrants' voluntary return. As examples could be quoted: the Austria's program for voluntary return, *RESTART III*; the ex-Belgian program *Return and Emigration of Asylum Seekers*; the Spanish government *Voluntary Return Plan*.) In many European states, it is an alternative to deportation.

society's culture of solidarity, its' active moral, and religious obligations to be solidary with people without shelter and resources, especially with the vulnerable ones such as children -firstly, with the unaccompanied minors-, elders, disabled persons, pregnant women, mothers with small children, injured people, sick persons etc.) The specialized international organization, the hosting state and the NGOs advertised them as the "refugees" rights. To compact the text and for the sake of the popular culture that prefers the term "*refugees*"⁴, for the persons internationally forcibly displaced, we will use below the family of the term "refugees" and the entire family of the notion of refuge. Fully aware that the meaning of the term "*refugee*" – familiar for popular culture - is technically inexact, we introduced the quotation marks.

The "refugees" stages - presented above as a process with two main categories of participants, the proteges and the protectors - are severely simplified. *De facto*, in the route to a safe country of those that flee from persecutions or threats toward their life or dignity, there are seven obvious stages. There are also other two stages to be considered: *Preliminary stage in the "refuge" process, the Stage 0, (OA and OB)*, as well as the *stage in which the ex-fugitives feel as active as their refuge's traumas. This is the stage, the Stage 5+.*

Figure 1. Five main stages in an individual's refuge

⁴In the European languages, the term *refugee* derives from the Latin language and Roman culture. The roots of the terms are the verb *fugio, fugere, fugi, fugitum*. *Fugio* is "to flee", and *refugium*, "a taking [of] refuge place". The meaning is mainly similar with the word and institution of *sanctuary*. It evokes the practice of the protection of those pursuit by the oppressive forces. Getting a shelter into a church is the most known custom of the sanctuary' culture. Historically, the Romanian culture of sanctuary, imposes to the executioner to stop any action against a convicted person, who is *ad hoc* chosen as his groom by a virgin. (Hasdeu, *Razvan si Vidra*). In Europe, the first codification known of such a protection, is the 1697 *Declaration of Indulgence in England and Scotland*.

In Western history, the term *refuge* was first applied to French Protestant Huguenots looking for safe place against Catholic persecution after the first *Edict of Fontainebleau 1540*. But the meaning of the term is older. According to the *Merriam Webster Dictionary*, historically, churches have been places where fugitives could seek at least temporary protection from the law. In Anglo-Saxon England, churches and churchyards generally provided *40 days of immunity*, and neither the sheriffs nor the army would enter to seize the outlaw. But gradually the right of sanctuary was eroded. In 1486 sanctuary for the crime of treason was disallowed, and sanctuary for most other crimes was severely restricted by Henry VIII and later abolished. In the 1980s many U.S. churches provided sanctuary to political refugees from Central America, and the U.S. government mostly chose not to interfere. Today, wildlife sanctuaries provide protection for the species within its boundaries, and farm-animal sanctuaries now rescue livestock from abuse and starvation. The term *refuge* is present in English language in the seventeenth century. The word longtime means "one seeking asylum".

Around 1916, when it evolved to mean "one fleeing home", applied in this instance to civilians in Flanders heading west to escape fighting in World War.

Stage	“REFUGEE” STAGES CONSIDERED FROM THE “REFUGEE’S” POINT OF VIEW	“REFUGEE” STAGES CONSIDERED FROM THE RECEIVING STATE’S POINT OF VIEW
1.	FLEEING from WAR and REACHING A SAFE COUNTRY (ESCAPING)	ADMISSION IN A COUNTRY OF PROTECTION
2.	FLEEING FROM WAR & TRANSIT TO ANOTHER SAFE COUNTRY REQUESTED PERSONALLY	<i>TRANSIT ENSURED</i> TO ANOTHER COUNTRY OF PROTECTION
	TEMPORARY SETTLEMENT IN A COUNTRY OF PROTECTION up to 3 years	INSERTION into the social life of the receiving community as a temporary protected person (3 years renewable) as an asylum seeker
4.	LONG TIME / DEFINITIVE SETTLEMENT IN A COUNTRY OF PROTECTION	INCLUSION/ INTEGRATION of a “Refugee” as an internationally protected person as a subsidiary protected person as a naturalized person
5.	VOLUNTARY REPATRIATION	SAFE REPATRIATION OF A REFUGEE SUPPORTED by UNHCR & RECEIVING STATE

1.2 A more complex view on the stages of the refuge

As we noted before, the main stages listed above are the core of a “refuge” process. They are preceded by *Stage 0* and succeeded by a final stage, *Stage 5+*. A more complex list of the stages is done in the table below.

FIGURE no. 2. STAGES OF “REFUGEE” SEEN FROM “REFUGEES” AND FROM RECEIVING COUNTRY’ POINT OF VIEW

Stage	REFUGEE’ STAGES CONSIDERED FROM THE REFUGEE’S POINT OF VIEW	REFUGEE’ STAGES CONSIDERED FROM THE RECEIVING STATE’S DUTIES
0	<i>ALLERTS ON WAR and PREPARING TO FLEE FROM WAR out of HOME, out of HOME-CITY & DECISSION TO ESCAPE from WAR and PERSECUTIONS</i>	<i>ALLERTS ON POTENTIAL MASSIVE INFLUX OF “REFUGEES” TO ITS BORDERS Preparedness for OPENING THE BORDERS</i>
1.	REACHING A SAFE COUNTRY	ADMISSION IN A COUNTRY OF PROTECTION
2.	REQUESTED PERSONALLY TRANSIT FROM A SAFE	<i>TRANSIT ENSURED</i> TO ANOTHER COUNTRY OF PROTECTION

	COUNTRY TO ANOTHER SAFE ONE	
3.	SAFETY PROVISIONS FOR A TEMPORARY SETTLED PERSON	INSERTION into the social life of the receiving community as a temporary protected person (3 years renewable)
4.	SAFETY AND BELONGING for the LONGTIME RESIDENTS into a country of protection or for the NATURALIZED EX-REFUGEES	INTEGRATION /INCLUSION's PARTNERSHIP as the longtime residents an asylum seeker as an internationally protected person as a subsidiary protected person as naturalized persons (citizens, born abroad)
5.	VOLUNTARY REPATRIATION	SAFE REPATRIATION SUPPORTED by the Protecting State & UNHCR
5+	<p><i>CONSEQUENCES OF THE DISPLACEMENT ON THE REFUGEES:</i></p> <p><i>LOSSES of THE BELOVED PERSONS</i></p> <p><i>Loses of the life sense</i></p> <p><i>Loses of their possessions</i></p> <p><i>TRAUMAS, that push some of them to suicide</i></p>	<p>Duties of the aggressors to pay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>COMPENSATIONS (material & psycho-cultural)</i> <p>Duties of all the political and civic bodies – states & organizations - to do their best to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>PREVENT the harming consequences of the refuge on individuals</i> - <i>PREVENT wars and political persecutions.</i>

1.3 The stage 0 and 5+ of the refuge and some possible explanation on their ignoring in the analyses of the refuge

As could be seen in the previous figure, - FIGURE no. 2, this text pleads for considering the “refuge” process as a process in 7 stages. The five ones are regularly considered implicitly in the analyses, policies papers, handbooks⁵ etc. (In the present analysis, we introduced only one single difference toward the traditional approaches. We detached as an autonomous stage, the *Insertion*, and did not melt

⁵ UNHCR (1979): *Handbook and Guidelines on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugees Status*, Geneva UNHCR, (reissued, 2011 <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4f33c8d92.html>) and in 2019, available at [5ddfc47.pdf \(unhcr.org\)](http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html) ; UNHCR (1992): *Handbook - Voluntary Repatriation: International Protection*. Geneva: UNHCR, Department of International Protection. available at <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html>.; UNHCR (2002): *Manual. Operations Management System.* ([unhcr.org](http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html)).; UNHCR (2011): *The Field Handbook for the Implementation of UNHCR BID Guidelines*, ([unhcr.org](http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html)); UNHCR (2018): *Global Compact on Refugees*, available at [UNHCR - Global Compact on Refugees – Booklet](https://www.unhcr.org/global-compact-on-refugees-booklet/).

it into the large category, *Integration*. We do it trying to reflect the reality, as the refugees themselves presented it to us, and as it is managed in the field, we operated the mentioned separations: between *Insertion* and *Integration*.)

In the literature, we acknowledged a few⁶ suggestions for considering *Escaping* as a specific stage. Although, reality pushes us to recognize it. Let's think only of the crucial importance of the civilians' refuging of the humanitarian corridors or of the simple fire ceasing⁷, to allow them to flee. The massive influx of Ukrainian refugees, that Romania has had to deal with recently, 2022 starting from February, pressed our understanding to acknowledge theoretically what the reality differentiates. Reality taught us to see *Escaping* as a dramatic strive to get salvation and to save. A girl fleeing bombs, caring on her back her dog, is a global symbol image, for what escaping is. On Romanians TV reports the facts of escaping were current and impressively variate. They tell with facts that *Escaping* is a stage, possibly the most shocking one of all. The Ukrainian persons, until February 24, secure in their secure home, city, and country, became instantly homeless, city-less, and threatened to be country-less. We saw daily more and more media reports, on mothers with freezing children, crossing the Romanian border on foot, after long hours in queues at the Ukrainian side of the borders with Romania, after long and dangerous journeys (of days) across their bombed country. TV reports showed people in the snow, in very cold weather, looking for support among strangers speaking a totally different language. Somebody was telling a reporter, a child's remark: here is less cold! The people telling their stories on how they arrived here – in media and directly in the interviews – emphasize how difficult was to decide to leave, and, after, to find an appropriate route to get out of their destroyed home city or village and further, a route to a safe country. How difficult was it to rely on themselves, on their individual chances, when their country was under attack? This is *Escaping!*

In the summer of 2022 – when Russia President's decret established partial mobilization - we saw on media reports the long queues of cars with people from Russia trying to escape to Georgia, Kazakhstan, or Finland.

Under the impressions created by the Ukrainian “refugees”, the old stories about what the refuge and deportations were in Romania, uncovered how much

⁶ A theoretical account on *Escaping* – seen from the perspective of the international protectors – could be found in Gilbert, Geoff, and Rüsç, Anna Magdalena, (2017): Policy Brief 5, *Creating safe zones and safe corridors in conflict situations: Providing protection at home or preventing the search for asylum?*, Kaldor Centre for International Refugee Law, June, 2017.

⁷ In 2022, the Ukrainians civilians, besieged in a Mariupol factory, Azovstal, were deprived by their right to refuge for more than 40 days.

kinds of harm the settled people suffered, how many traumas are related to the war's refuge, and how vivid they are in the individuals and communities' memories:

- deportations – forcibly removed people from their cities, and countries -, with their cohorts of evils as families destroyed, children sent out of families to be saved, the families' lost, sufferance, forced labor, exploitations, victims of the medical experiences conducted on them, disabilities, misery, diseases, chaotic movements (free to get home, but not knowing where), no energy to return, no homes to return at, plus possessions destroyed and confiscated ...

- evacuations – remove the civilians from their cities in order to protect their lives.

- and the hell to live with the horrible memories when they become the victims of their unbearable cauchemars and many committed suicides.

- the hell to life with the misunderstandings on their traumas,

- or capacity to forgive⁸ etc.

“My first memories are not from our home – G.S. said. (I only learn about it, again and again. I know it well, although I never succeed in getting in. When my parents returned from Auschwitz, here in their grandparents' home and city home, our house was occupied by other people. It was other people's house, the house of numerous refugees' families, impossible to relocate. My parents accepted that there is no there house anymore. They rented two rooms on the Delavrancea Street, with access to a kitchen and bathroom. My first memories are from there. More precisely, I remember people sitting on a large table and me under the table looking at their huge feet's which stepped my light! (My parents' friend speaking about their lost homes, my parents speaking on ours, where I never entered.)”⁹

My grand-grand ma' told to us, how she fled, to the other village, in the forest, and how she lost my grandma and other members of the extended family, who refused to leave the house! (IP.)

My godmother, CF, told us - about her beloved mother's family house, a house in Cernauti (today Ukraine), “situated at the N. Iorga's Street, no. 4, nearby the University” – she recited with nostalgia. C. never has been there. (She was born in the refuge time.) Although, she kept in her heart the memory of the home, that her mother many times told her, is waiting to warmly embrace her” – she said.

C. and her mother refueged four times and death passed very close to them,

⁸ Eva Mozes did and advocated the acts of forgiveness among the victims of the WWII, the descendants of the war criminals and the direct victims, that got the power to cross over.

⁹ G.S., born in a camp, in family of the last transport of deportees from Oradea - those times belonging to Hungary – came to Oradea, Romania. After a very complicate life story, qualified as an engineer, lived in Israel, Nigeria and again in Romania. He never recovered the family house.

at least two times. One time, together her mother, her uncle, and other people evacuated in an emergency. The truck of refugees, where they were sitting on a tractor wheel occupied quite entirely the available space. The truck was bombed and overturned in a fairly deep puddle. Her mother, covered in mud, could no longer come to the surface. Exhausted gave up until she heard her daughter's voice (C's voice), calling from the middle of the tractor wheel: Mother, Mother. I can't see you! She reached the lifeline. Since then, the mother many times told her, with special gratitude: "You saved my life!"

Other stories are tragic. *"My life ended there, told her grandmother to Hanna (Auschwitz)! You, and today's family, you, are only my duty!"* People – who arrived home from deportation – were rejected from their previous communities¹⁰, because ... they were the victims of the tragedy.

We rarely found analytical literature on the traumas created by the "refuge", to the individuals¹¹, to the communities where they arrived as victims, and to the entire humanity injured and weakened in its solidarity.

There are cases when the victims themselves refused to speak about what happened to them. They feel ashamed and longtime kept silent, even toward their own family.

Stories like the previous ones, and many others, legitimate the category that reflects the traumas and the consequences of the refuge, and the legitimization of the claim for justice for the victims.

1.4 Why the stages 0 and 5+ missing in the major analysis of the refuge process?

The possible explanations of the stages' avoidance could be of two kinds: general, with the reference to the refuge as a process, and peculiar, regarding the stages **0** and **5+**.

¹⁰ Khalaf, Farida and Hoffman, Andrea. C.. (2016): *The Girl Who Beat Isis: My story*, International Edition is a report from the hell and about how difficult it is to escape from there, based on the experience of a young Yazzidy rapped by ISIS. Farida describes the *Escaping* stage from the perspective of personal experience. She provides the evidences that only a subject of the rape who succeed to escape could offer. The story of the life of the dr. *Miklós Nyiszly*, the forensic medic that worked for Mengele and finally arrived to suicide, spoke about the traumas that a deportee has to face for his/her entire life.

¹¹ The perspective of the specialists that cure the PTSD, psychological disorders of refugees with origins in the trauma they suffered in their way to a safe country could be founded in Jubilut, Liliana Lyra; Madureira, André de Lima. *The Challenges of the Protection of Refugees and Forced Migrants in the Framework of Cartagena + 30. REMHU, Revista Interdisciplinar da Mobilidade Humana*, vol 22, nº 43, p. 11-33, Brasília, July/Dec 2014.

The avoidance of the theory on the refuge stages – with their use only fragmentary and implicitly – could be found in three main aspects.

Firstly, the avoidance of the theory of stages could be explained by the “traditional” view of it, a view grounded in the fact that the refuge was historically a peripheral one, quantitatively and qualitatively. Few refugees and not-determinative for the nature of the global solidarity around the definitory values of humankind characterized the previous epochs of our history.

On the other hand, the contemporary massive influx of refugees found humanity limitedly prepared. The entire available social energy of those states, which admit refugees, must be directed to solve the concrete problems of supporting the refugees, according to the principles, and to do it without delay. That is, the protectors are overwhelmed by the refugees’ fluxes and by the issues connected to their support.

In the same explanation comes the overwhelming work to assist the huge number of evacuees, deportees, and “refugees” across the world. Globally, the “refugees” number become higher and higher, with a 1.2% /yearly’s increase. At the end of May 2022, the total number of forcibly displaced persons raised to 100 000 000, according to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Filippo Grandi¹². The asylum was granted to 26,6 mil out of 100 mil. Out of them half are internally displaced persons. That is out of 2 people seeking asylum only 1 got it. Technically, only those got the status of a refugee, practically the status of persons under *international protection*, or *Subsidiary protection*. (The other “refugees”, the internally displaced persons (IDPs), and the asylum seekers¹³ who did not get the status are on themselves. At the global level, according to UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in 2022 the IDP number reached 50,9 million people, and those in the process of asylum of 4,4 mil.) The increasing tendency of the phenomenon of forcibly displaced persons (FDPs) is constant and, probably, irreversible. On the other hand, protection becomes a mission more and more demanding because of the huge and increasing refugees’ number. It also becomes more and more complicated because of the complexity of the issues that the protectors must face. Let's think only of the refugees from East D.R. of Congo, shouted in the spring of 2018, by the army and police in Rwanda because of their opposing to integrate in the Rwanda program for

¹² UNHCR (2022): *A record of 100 million people forcibly displaced worldwide* available [UNHCR: A record 100 million people forcibly displaced worldwide || UN News](#). consulted, October, 2022.

¹³ UNHCR (2022): *Refugees statistics*, available at [Refugee Statistics | USA for UNHCR \(unrefugees.org\)](#), consulted, October, 2022.

refugees' integration¹⁴.

The protectors are also overwhelmed because the refugees' typology expands constantly. As results, we have the refugees from wars, the political refugees – as they were defined after the World War II – and new categories, not yet accepted in the political definition. (e mention here the victims of the natural disasters – floods, volcanos' eruptions, desertification of lands other times hospitable for life, as it is the case in Asia, with the riverine civilization along the Uzboy river, a tributary of the Oxus River (today, Amu Darya). A new category not yet included in the political definition is the displaced persons because of the chronic drought etc. A new already predictable category of refugees is the famine's displaced persons out of their country, the starvation refugees. With global warming and the flooding in coastal regions across the globe, it is not excluded, that in a decade a new category of refugees would appear: the coastal refugees.

We have also special categories of "refugees", as those of vulnerable persons. We have in mind the unaccompanied minors escaping or trying to escape from catastrophes (or even driven away by their parents to save them from extreme poverty, or risks of dying by the lack of water or access to resources); the disabled persons, the pregnant women, the sick and wounded persons; the victims of trafficking in human beings, the elders, and others.

Recently (starting with September 2022), the people fleeing from Russia, (on the verge of the decree on the *partial mobilization of Russian citizens* to fight in the "special military operation" in Ukraine) become a category to be carefully analyzed, and not rejected *ab initio*.

Secondly, the avoidance of producing a "big picture" on the refuge process, and its components – the stages - could relate to the refugees' condition. They put limited interest in the conceptualizing. The individuals' pressing concern is getting admitted and surviving in the new environment. That is, the victims are limitedly not interested in analysis and on what is the pattern of what happens, in stages. They are concerned to resist. Post-festum, as we noted before based on the memories of the ex-refugees, that heroically accepted to open their deep wounds and to speak, the victims are bound in the circle of silence-shame-pain-silence. In brief, there are the very subjects of the refuge that kept the topic ignored.

¹⁴ Ntanyomar, R., Delphin, (2020): *Congolese refugees in Rwanda: two years of silene or fear?* Available at <https://easterncongotribune.com/2020/02/21/congolese-refugees-in-rwanda/>. consulted, October, 2022.

The third explanation for the difficulty to find a theory on the stages of refuge could be the angle of approaching the refuge. Those who regularly deal with the topic are politicians and jurists. Their work is consisting of rules, laws, institutions charged to operate, procedures, and good practices; all of them focused on the duty of the state to be in line with the principles of non-refoulement, non-discrimination, non-exclusiveness *hic et nunc*.

The peculiar reasons to regularly ignore the stages 0 and 5+, to operate with them neither implicitly, could be – aside from the general reasons listed above – their peculiarities. Indeed, they are stages where the “protectors” are not there, with some exceptions¹⁵ and circumstantial acts when the “refugees” get wounded, or in the other emergency situations when the Emergency Units act.

The protectors that do not intervene yet are the first peculiarity of stage 0. It was the peculiarity of stage 5+. Recently, - in 2012 the EU adopted the *Directive of Victims*¹⁶ - and there is in the EU a legal framework to partially compensate victims of crimes – inclusively of those victimized during a refuge process -. For the traumas generated by the refuge, there are no reparments possible.

Conclusions or why the refuge process is to be considered in the stages?

Listening or reading the stories on the refuge, as they are done in the refugees’ memories or interviews, looking at specific needs that the refugees experienced in the stages cannot be ignored. (The classical stages mentioned above and their psycho-social content¹⁷ do not result naturally from each real story of a person who experienced the refuge. Although familiarity with many cases discloses the pattern of the multi-stadial process, which consists of the Admission, Transit, Insertion, Integration, and Voluntary Repatriation of the person who runs from hell, preceded by the Escaping, and ended in the Refuge’s Consequences, and many times, in the Traumatic experiences of the “refugees”.) It is undeniable that the

¹⁵ As exceptions to the general rules that the people are on themselves, in the first moments, when they flee from war, there are to be mentioned as present there to protect: the domestic local authorities, which alarm the inhabitants and direct them to the less risky routes; the Red Cross – and similar NGOs – that organize the “the humanitarian corridors for refugees”; the UNHCR that call for temporary protection in the neighboring save states and monitories the HRs respects during the fled etc.

¹⁶ EU (2012): *Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime* available at [EUR-Lex - 32012L0029 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2012/29/oj), consulted May- October, 2022.

¹⁷ We approached the contents of each stage in the paper: Irina Pop (2022): *Stages of Refuge’s Contents*, submitted to be published in the JIMS.

reality of the refuge, seen from a refugee's perspective, is a reality in stages. There are stages in the refugees' needs, in their actions to cope with their situation.

Following the interventions of the "refugees" protectors, it becomes obvious that there are stages in the refuge. There are stages when the refugees face specific challenges and the "protectors" assist them in specific ways. Again, the Admission, Transit, Insertion, Integration, and Voluntary Repatriation emerged as phases with specific features, which require distinct evaluations of the concrete conditions of refugees; distinct efforts of special human resources, distinct budgetary efforts, distinct assessments on how the refugees' needs were covered. In one word, it is impossible to ignore that the policy in refugee assistance, as a unitary policy deployed in five main phases, is a policy that must be adequate in each moment, and it must be adequate in each stage of the refugees' route. The same pattern lets us know about the stage of Escaping as the pre-refuge stage, and on that the Consequences and Traumas in the post-refuge stage, as the stages most ignored in the lessons on the refuge. The stages appear as distinct phases of the same process, which let us see their specific content and their interconnections and mutual dependencies.

All of these prove that there are stages in the "refuge" and their understanding, by those who take the mission to protect the refugees, is imperious for more effectively and efficiently organizing their protection.

It is disputable, whether the refugees will take advantage of the concept of the refuge in stages. Similarly, it is under some doubt, if familiarity with the big picture of the refuge could help them to early acquire a status of dignity in the hosting society. It is under discussion if the protectors would benefit from the acknowledgment of the stages of refugees when they have only specific and limited missions in supporting refugees.

In brief, it answers the big question: Does the stadial approach improve the refugees' life? Does it optimize the temporary protectors' circumstantial actions and efforts?

More contributions to firmly answer the questions above are needed.

As for us, we do believe we proved consistently that, the stages exist, and it is legitimate to speak on them according to real life.

On the other hand, it is pragmatic to operate to the notion of the stages. Why? Because the stages' notion indicates what needs are to be covered and how the limited resources available are to be used; the stages indicate what is to be

prioritized now, and what is highly probable to happen tomorrow.

The operation with the category of stages allows us to get the big picture in projecting the strategy of the refugees' assistance; to learn the dynamic of the refuge, of the needs and of the experience in assisting them to become independent. The notion of stages could eliminate the idea of the uniqueness and imperiousness of the integration in the route of a refugee in a hosting country. The stages' notion instructs us that in many cases, possibly in the large majority, the insertion is enough to grant to the refugee the possibility to be not dependent on the other's help. The stage of insertion as a notion is also more adequate, for avoiding the refugees' fears of assimilationist policies. It also supports them to keep open their hopes for repatriation.

The stadial approach is useful for not wasting resources, and not letting refugees' needs unmet!

That is why, we strongly recommend the notion of designing strategies, implementing policies, and training the human resources – NGO leaders and very active volunteers too -, stage by stage. That is to arrive at available resources specialized for each stage and familiarized with the entire process.

Sources and Bibliography

- Amnesty International, (2022): *The World Refugees in Numbers* available at [The World's Refugees in Numbers - Amnesty International](#), consulted June, 2022.
- Amnesty International, (1997): *Rwanda: Human Rights Overlooked in Mass Repatriation*, available at [Rwanda: Human rights overlooked in mass repatriation - Amnesty International](#), consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- CoE, ETS No. 148 (1992): *European Charter for Regional and Minority Language* available at <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list?module=treaty-detail&treatynum=148>. Consulted July, 28, 2022.
- CoE, Parliamentary Assembly (2006): *Recommendation 1740 /2006 – on the place of mother tongue in school education* - available at <http://semantic-pace.net/tools/pdf.aspx?=-ZmlsZWlkPTE3NDIx>, [consulted July, 2002]
- Amnesty International, (2022): *The World Refugees in Numbers* available at [The World's Refugees in Numbers - Amnesty International](#), consulted June, 2022.
- Amnesty International, (1997): *Rwanda: Human Rights Overlooked in Mass Repatriation*, available at [Rwanda: Human rights overlooked in mass repatriation - Amnesty International](#), consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- Council of Europe (2021): *Action Plan on Protecting Vulnerable persons in the Context of migration and Asylum in Europe (2021-2025)*. Available at [ES369022_PREMS 021421_GBR 2050 Action Plan 2021 2025 Migrants TEXT WEB BAT 16X24.pdf \(coe.int\)](#).

- Crisp, Jeff, and Long, Katy, (2016): *Safe and voluntary refugee repatriation: from principle to practice*, in the “*Journal on Migration and Human Security*”, no. 4 (3), pp. 141 – 145.
- Crisp, Jeff, (2003): *A New Asylum Paradigm? Globalization, Migration and the Uncertain Future of the International Refugee Regime*, UNHCR (2003) at12, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/research/opendoc.pdf>.
- EU (2022): Communication from the Commission on *Operational guidelines* for the implementation of Council implementing Decision 2022/382. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52022XC0321%2803%29&qid=1647940863274>.
- EU (2022): *Council Decision 2022/382 establishing the existence of a mass influx of displaced persons from Ukraine Article 5 of Directive 2001/55/EC, and having the effect of introducing temporary protection*, (2022/C 126 I/01). <https://www.consilium.europa.eu>.
- EU (2021): *Asylum quarterly report - Statistics Explained* (europa.eu)
- EU (2021): EU Commission *Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL addressing situations of crisis in the field of migration and asylum* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu>.
- EU (2020): COM 609 final, *Communication from the Commission on a New Pact on Migration and Asylum* [EUR-Lex - 52020DC0609 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU FRA (2020): *The Handbook on European law relating to asylum, borders and immigration, Handbook on European law relating to asylum, borders and immigration | European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights* (europa.eu).
- EU (2016): *Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union*, (2016/c 202/01), [EUR-Lex - 12016ME/TXT - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU (2013): *Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection* (recast) <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32013L0033>.
- EU (2013): *Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection* available at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013L0032>.
- EU (2012): *Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA*, available at [EUR-Lex - 32012L0029 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU (2011): *Directive 2011/95/EU (Qualifications Directive)* standards for the qualifications of non-EU nationals as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, [EUR-Lex - 32011L0095 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU (2003): *Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents* available at [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/=CELEX:32003L0109](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/).
- EU (2003): *Council Directive 2003/86 / EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification*, available at [EUR-Lex - 32003L0086 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU (2001): *Council Directive 2001/55/EC of 20 July 2001, (Temporary Protection Directive)*, [EUR-Lex - 32001L0055 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu). [temporary protection directive](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU (2012.) *Treaty on the functioning the European Union (Consolidated Version), Treaty of Lisbon 2007 2*, Official Journal C 326, 26/10/2012 P 0001 – 0390, available at [EUR-Lex - 12012E/TXT - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu).
- EU (1992.) *Treaty on European Union (Consolidated Version), Treaty of Maastricht*, 7 February 1992, Official Journal of the European Communities C 325/5; 24 December 2002, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b39218.html>.

- EU (2000): *EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, art.18 (The right to asylum shall be guaranteed with due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the status of refugees and in accordance with the Treaty of the European Union Treaty and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.) Article 18 - Right to asylum | European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (europa.eu).*
- EU (2000): *Charter of Fundamental Rights*, today part of the TFUE [EUR-Lex - 12012P/TXT \(europa.eu\)](#).
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles, ECRE, (2018): *Refugee rights subsiding? Europe's two-tier protection regime and its effect on the rights of beneficiaries*, available at [aida_refugee_rights_subsiding.pdf \(asylumineurope.org\)](#), [consulted July, 12, 2022].
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles, ECRE, (2021): *Country Report: Romania AIDA RO_2019update (asylumineurope.org)* [consulted July, 18, 2022].
- Foster, Michelle. (2007): *International Refugee Law and Socio-economic Rights: Refuge from Deprivation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Gilbert, Geoff, (2019): *Not bound, but Committed: operationalizing the Global Compact on Refugees in "International Migration"*. No. 57 (6), pp. 27-42, available at [Not Bound but Committed: Operationalizing the Global Compact on Refugees - Gilbert - 2019 - International Migration - Wiley Online Library](#), consulted June 2022.
- Gilbert, Geoff, (2019): *Indicators for the Global Compact on Refugees in the "International Journal of Refugees Laws"*, No. 30 (4), pp. 635-639.
- Gilbert, G. and Rüsçh, AM., (2018): *Rule of Law and United Nations Interoperability in "International Journal of Refugee Law"* 1/ 2018, pp. 30 (1), 31-70, available at <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eev020>, consulted June/2022.
- Gilbert, Geoff, and Rüsçh, Anna Magdalena, (2017): *Policy Brief 5, Creating safe zones and safe corridors in conflict situations: Providing protection at home or preventing the search for asylum?*, Kaldor Centre for International Refugee Law, June, 2017.
- Goodwin-Gill, Guy S., and McAdam, Jane, (2007): *The Refugee in International Law*, 3rd ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, Colin & Foster, Michelle, (2009): *International Refugee Law and Socio-Economic Rights: Refuge from Deprivation*, in *Human Rights Law Review*, Volume 9, Issue 4/ 2009, Pages 696–698., <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngp029>.
- International Rescue Committee (IRC) (2018): *"Outcomes and Evidence Framework"* available at [International Rescue Committee \(IRC\) What's in My Bag? :: What Refugees Bring When They Run for Their Lives - Carryology - Exploring better ways to carry.](#)
- Jubilut, Liliana Lyra; Madureira, André de Lima. The Challenges of the Protection of Refugees and Forced Migrants in the Framework of Cartagena + 30. *REMHU, Revista Interdisciplinar da Mobilidade Humana*, vol 22, nº 43, p. 11-33, Brasília, July/Dec 2014.
- Khalaf, Farida, and Hoffman, Andrea. C. (2016): *The Girl Who Beat Isis: My story*, International Edition.
- Long, Katy. (2014): *The Point of No Return: Refugees, Rights and Repatriation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mutamo, Aggrey. (2016): *"Kenya: How Kenya Sealed the Repatriation of Refugees."* All Africa, May 11. <http://allafrica.com/stories/201605120367.html>.
- Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sanctuary>. Accessed 3 Jul. 2022.
- Ntanyomar, R., Delphin, (2020): *Congolese refugees in Rwanda: two years of silene or fear?* Available at <https://easterncongotribune.com/2020/02/21/congolese-refugees-in-rwanda/>.
- Moccia, Luigi, & Pop Lia (eds.) (2018): *Migrants & Refugees across Europe*, European University Press, Berlin, Bochum, Dulmen, London, Paris.

- Organization of the African Unity (OAU), 1969: *Convention governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa*, available at, [Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa](#), consulted many times May- June 2022.
- Pop, Lia, (2018): “*Marginal Multilingualism as the Roma People Identity*” in “*Journal of Identity and Migration Studies*”, [http://www.e-migration.ro/jims/ Vol12_No1_2018_pp_96_130_POP.pdf](http://www.e-migration.ro/jims/Vol12_No1_2018_pp_96_130_POP.pdf).
- Pop, Lia, & Pop, Irina, (2018): *Temporary Protected Status for the Nationals of the Third Countries and Stateless Persons: A Notion to be Promoted in Fighting Xenophobia*, in JIMS, Vol.12, no. 2, pp.81-91. [Temporary Protected Status for the Nationals of the Third Countries: A Notion to be Promoted in Fighting Xenophobia – DOAJ](#).
- L. Pop, I. Pop (2019): *Marginal multilingualism and its potential to fight xenophobia/Romaphobia*, Vol13_No1_2019_pp_96_130;
- Lia Pop, (2022): ‘*Learning all from all*’. *A Roma approach to marginal multilingualism*, in Francois Grin, Laszlo Maracz and Nike Pokorn (eds), *Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies*, Amsterdam, 2022, pp.473-486.
- Romania (2022): *Romanian Border Guards communication on the number of Ukrainians entered in Romania since 22 of February 2022 until June 21, 2022, entered into Romania*, 1 307 528 Ukrainian citizens. (See [Traficul la frontieră în data de 21 iunie 2022 - Politia de Frontiera](#), accesed June 23 2022).
- Romania. IGI (2022) : *Ziua Mondiala a Refugatului, IGI | ZIUA MONDIALĂ A REFUGIATULUI (gov.ro)*.
- România. (2022, March, 7): *Hotararea de Guvern pentru Modificarea Normelor Metodologice de Aplicare pentru Legea 122/ 2006 privind azilul in Romania [Government Decision to Modify the Methodological Norms to apply the Law 122/ May 4, on asylum in Romania]* available - in Romanian – at [proiect modif legislativă \(gov.ro\)](#).
- România. (2022): *Legea nr. 22/2022 pentru modificarea și completarea Ordonanței de urgență a Guvernului nr. 194/2002 privind regimul străinilor în România, [Law no. 22/2022 for modifying and completing of several normative acts regarding the status of the aliens in Romania]* available - in Romanian – at [Legea nr. 22/2022 pentru modificarea și completarea Ordonanței de urgență a Guvernului nr. 194/2002 privind regimul străinilor în România](#).
- România. (2019): *Legea nr. 122 din 4 mai 2006 privind azilul în România actualizată, [Law no. 122 / May 4, 2006, on asylum in Romania updating the Law no. 122 / May 4 2006, on asylum in Romania]* available - in Romanian – at [legea nr.122 din 04 mai 2006 privind azilul in romania martie 2019. \(gov.ro\)](#)
- România. (2018): *Legea nr. 247 din 5 noiembrie 2018 pentru modificarea si completarea unor acte normative privind regimul strainilor in Romania, [Law no. 247/5 November 2018 for modifying and completing of several normative acts regarding the status of aliens in Romania]* available in Romanian language at [LEGE 247 05/11/2018 - Portal Legislativ \(just.ro\)](#).
- România. (2015): *Legea nr. 331/2015 pentru modificarea și completarea unor acte normative în domeniul străinilor, [Law no. 331 / 2015 for modifying and completing of several normative acts regarding the status of alliens]* available - in Romanian language - [LEGE nr.331 din 16 decembrie 2015 pentru modificarea și completarea unor acte normative în domeniul străinilor \(cdep.ro\)](#).
- România. (2006): *Legea nr. 122 din 4 mai 2006 privind azilul în România, [Law no. 122 / May 4 2006, on asylum in Romania]*, available – at [legea nr.122 din 04 mai 2006 martie 2019.pdf \(gov.ro\)](#)
- România. (2006): *Legea nr. 15 din 2 aprilie 2006 privind statutul si regimul refugiatilor în România, [Law no. 15 / April 2, on refugees’ status and regime in Romania]*, available - in Romanian language – at. [LEGE nr.15 din 2 aprilie 1996 privind statutul și regimul refugiatilor in Romania \(cdep.ro\)](#).
- România (2002): *Ordonanță de urgență nr. 194 din 12 decembrie 2002, privind regimul străinilor în România, republicată în formă consolidată, [Emergency Ordinance no. 194 of December 12, 2002,*

- regarding the regime of foreigners in Romania, republished in consolidated form] ORDONANȚĂ DE URGENȚĂ nr.194 din 12 decembrie 2002 privind regimul străinilor în România (cdep.ro).
- România (2001): *Ordonanță de Urgență nr.194/2001* (Emergency Ordinance no. 194/December, 12), repetat amendată) repeatedly ammended available in Romanian language ORDONANȚĂ DE URGENȚĂ nr. 194 din 12 decembrie 2002 (gov.ro),
- România (2001): *Legea nr 123/2001 privind regimul străinilor în România (Law no. 123/2001 on the regime of foreigners in Romania)* repeatdely amended, available in Romanian language, LEGE nr.123 din 2 aprilie 2001 privind regimul străinilor în România (cdep.ro).
- Romania (1991): *Constitution of Romania*, 8 December 1991, art. 18 Right to asylum (*The right to asylum shall be guaranteed with due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the status of refugees and in accordance with the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union* (hereinafter referred to as 'the Treaties') available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b53c4.html>
- România (1961): *Legea nr. 362 pentru Aderarea României la Convenția privind Statutul Apatrizior [Law – Act- no. 362 for Romania's Accession to the Convention on the Status of Stateless Persons]* available - in Romanian – at aderarea României la Convenția privind statutul apatrizilor din 1954.
- Saliu, Hasan, eds. (2018): *The role of media on refugee issues, (Abstracts of the International Seminar)*, IASFM &Thessaloniky.
- Sharpe, Marina, (2012): *The 1969 African Refugee Convention: Innovations, Misconceptions, and Omissions*, 58 : 1 RD McGill 95.
- Spindler, William,(2007): *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea*, RefugeesMag., Dec. 2007, at 16, 19, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/publ/PUBL/475fb0302.pdf>, consulted May 2022.
- UN (1948): *Universal Declaration on Human Rights*, art. 14. (1) (Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.), available at Universal Declaration of Human Rights | United Nations.
- UN (1951): *The Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, or 1951 Geneva Convention (Convenția privind statutul refugiaților (T)*, adoptată de România în 1991, Textul actului a fost publicat în limba română în "Monitorul Oficial", nr. 148/17 iul. 1991, CONVENTIE1951.doc (unhcr.org), consulted repeatedly, April-July 2022.
- UN (1961): *Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, With Introductory Note* by Guy S. Goodwin-Gill, New York, 30 August 1961. available at Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness Done at New York on 30 August 1961, available at Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, 1961 (un.org). consulted May-July 2022.
- UN (1967): *Declaration on Territorial Asylum with Introductory Note* by Guy S. Goodwin-Gill, New York, 14 December, 1967. Declaration on Territorial Asylum (un.org).
- UN/ (1967): *Convention on the Status of Refugees and the New York Protocol*, available at UNHCR - Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. consulted repeatedly, April-July 2022.
- UN (1970): *Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Co-operation and Friendly Relations among States in accordance with the UN Charter*, available at Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations - Main Page. consulted July 2022.
- UN (1989): *Convention on the Rights of the Child* The International Convention on the Rights of the Child or Convention on the Rights of the Child | UNICEF consulted repeatedly, April 2022.
- UNHCR (2018): Global Compact on Refugees*, UNHCR - Global Compact on Refugees – Booklet, consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.

- UNHCR (2016): *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants*, *Refugees and Migrants* (unhcr.org), consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (2015): *Global Trends 2014: World at War*. available at [Global Trends Report says worldwide displacement has hit an all-time](http://www.unhcr.org/global-trends-2014) ([unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)), consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR, (2014): *Guidelines on temporary protection or stay arrangements*, available at [Refworld | Guidelines on Temporary Protection or Stay Arrangements](http://www.refworld.org/docid/4f33c8d92).
- UNHCR (2011): *The Field Handbook for the Implementation of UNHCR BID Guidelines*, ([unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org))
- UNHCR (2011): *Handbook and Guidelines on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status under the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*. Geneva: UNHCR. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4f33c8d92>, consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (2004): *Handbook for Repatriation and Reintegration Activities*. Geneva, <http://www.unhcr.org>. consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (2002): *Manual. Operations Management System*. ([unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)), consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (2002): *Project Planning in UNHCR. A Practical Guide on the Use of Objectives, Outputs, and Indicators*, *Microsoft Word - prac15.doc* ([unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)), consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (1979): *Handbook and Guidelines on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status*, Geneva UNHCR, (reissued 2019), available at [5ddfc47.pdf](http://www.unhcr.org/5ddfc47.pdf) ([unhcr.org](http://www.unhcr.org)), consulted repeatedly June 2022.
- UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). (1980): *Voluntary Repatriation*, No. 18 (XXXI). <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae68c6e8.html>, consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (1992): *Handbook - Voluntary Repatriation: International Protection*. Geneva: UNHCR, Department of International Protection. available at <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html>.
- UNHCR (1983): (Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme) *General Conclusion on International Protection* No. 29 (XXXIV). available at <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae68c6818.html>, consulted June and July, 2022.
- UNHCR (1992): *Discussion Note on Protection Aspects of Voluntary Repatriation*. EC/1992/ SCP/CRP.3. available at <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae68cd314.html>. consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (1996a): "Chapter 2.3: *Voluntariness*." in *Handbook - Voluntary Repatriation: International Protection*. Geneva: UNHCR, Department of International Protection. available at <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html>. consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR (1996b): "Chapter 2.4: *Ensuring Return in Safety and with Dignity*." In *Handbook - Voluntary Repatriation: International Protection*. Geneva: UNHCR, Department of International Protection. available at <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3510.html>, consulted repeatedly May and June 2022.
- UNHCR Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights and Global Migration Group (no year mentioned): *Principles and Guidelines, supported by practical guidance, on the human rights protection of migrants in vulnerable situations* a guide available at [PrinciplesAndGuidelines.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/PrinciplesAndGuidelines.pdf) ([ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org)).
- Žagar, Igor, Neža Kogovšek Šalamon and Marina Lukšič Hacin Ana Mlekuž, (eds) (2018): *The Disaster of European Refugee Policy: Perspectives from the "Balkan Route"*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Zimmermann, Andreas, ed, (2011): *The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and Its 1967 Protocol: A Commentary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.



Sites

europa.eu. Migration and asylum | European Commission (europa.eu)

(gov.ro) (igsu.ro), IGI (gov.ro)

<http://www.unicef.org>.

International Organization for Migration, IOM

Crucea Rosie Romana

European Migration Network

<https://www.lifegate.com/app/uploads/refugee-redistribution-plan.jpeg>.