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The Dependent Variable:
State policies toward acceptance, recognition, repatriation, resettlement of refugees.

The Independent Variable:
- International pressure
- Concerns for state image
- Relations between the host state and the state of origin
- Domestic politics of host state
- IGO – NGO relations

The Puzzle:

In East Asia, countries that are signatories to the 1951 United Nation’s Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol have been less likely to accept and resettle refugees and stateless persons than states that are not parties to the Convention and Protocol. Why are states that are not signatories more willing to resettle refugees and deeply cooperate with UN bodies on refugee/stateless people than states that are signatories?

Hypotheses:

1. Antagonistic relations between the Host state (or destination state) and the Source state (or state of origin of the refugees) leads to more resettlement of refugees by the Host state.

2. Enforcement mechanism by UN leads to fewer resettled refugees.

3. Presence of NGOs independent of the UN, or increase in local government capacity/autonomy leads to more refugees being recognized and/or resettled.
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