

Specific Challenges for Small States in the Protection of Refugees using the Example of Liechtenstein

1. Introduction

Liechtenstein is known as a tax haven in the middle of the European Alps. Although this might be true, it's not the whole truth about Liechtenstein. This contribution will try to give an insight into Liechtenstein's refugee policy of the past decades and thus try to explain what the specific challenges of a Small State are.

Liechtenstein currently has about 36,000 inhabitants. These 36,000 inhabitants live on a surface area of 160km². The Principality of Liechtenstein is a constitutional, hereditary monarchy on a democratic and parliamentary basis. The power of the State is embodied in the Reigning Prince and the People. In terms of size, Liechtenstein is the fourth smallest state in Europe. From abroad Liechtenstein is frequently seen as a country which merely adapts Swiss regulations. Although Liechtenstein and Switzerland have shared a customs union since 1924,¹ Liechtenstein is an independent and sovereign country. However, decisions, especially regarding refugees, are hardly made without looking at how the neighbouring states behave. And there is to mention that Liechtenstein and Switzerland had the same rules for immigrant until Liechtenstein created its own independent rules in 2008.²

The number of immigrants as a percentage of the population in Liechtenstein is relatively high at 33.2 percent.³ Liechtenstein has had a percentage consistently above the 30 percent mark since the 1970s. Most of Liechtenstein's foreigners are citizens of Switzerland, Austria, Germany, Italy, Turkey, the former Yugoslavia, Spain, Portugal and Greece.⁴ Unfortunately, the statistics do not tell us how many of these foreigners originally came as refugees.

In Liechtenstein the Geneva Refugee Convention came into effect in 1957. However, until 1998, Liechtenstein never had its own refugee legislation.⁵ Although many different groups of refugees had moved to Liechtenstein since the Second World War, it did not seem necessary to invent an own refugee legislation.

There are several times in history when Liechtenstein was either more or less accepting of refugees. Liechtenstein had a very restrictive refugee policy during the 1930s and was strongly oriented towards Switzerland. Liechtenstein kept this restrictive policy during the Second World War. However, only a few refugees tried to escape via Liechtenstein. This has to do with the fact that as a very small country and moreover as a country which is in close reach of Germany Liechtenstein has not been the preferred place to escape to. Not until the last days of Second World War was there a high movement of refugees at the Liechtenstein-Austria/Germany border. It can be said that Liechtenstein's refugee policy during the Second World War was more or less the same as the Swiss one.⁶ However, the situation during Second World War did not lead to the creation of refugee regulations in Liechtenstein – as was the case in Switzerland, for example. Liechtenstein did not see any need to do so. Refugees were generally treated according to the general rules for immigrants.

2. Liechtenstein and its refugees

Several refugee groups have come to Liechtenstein over the past 60 years. The lack of a specific law governing refugees and their treatment as “ordinary” immigrants repeatedly led to problems with the status of refugees. However, Liechtenstein did not decide to create its own refugee regulations until the war in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s made it evident that treatment of refugees had to be given a regulatory basis.

The first big movement of refugees after Second World War was that of Hungarians fleeing in 1956 and 1957.⁷ Shortly after the Hungarian Revolution in October 1956 Liechtenstein agreed to accept Hungarian refugees. There was huge sympathy coming both from the Liechtenstein government and from Liechtenstein society in general. Relief actions organised by the Liechtenstein Red Cross were initiated immediately.⁸ Generous donations were given by the Liechtensteiners to support the Hungarian revolutionaries.

All the actions taken in Liechtenstein – the demonstrations against the Russian military, the donations given etc. – were adopted from Switzerland. However, the political situation had changed since the Second World War. The very restrictive refugee policy during Second World War had also been a kind of concession towards the German Reich. By the 1950s the foreign policy situation had changed: Liechtenstein and Switzerland were now surrounded by friendly countries. The Soviet Union – as the new ideological enemy – was far away from the Swiss and Liechtenstein borders. A generous attitude towards the Hungarian refugees had therefore become easier and was no longer associated with a “foreign policy risk”.⁹

In total Liechtenstein accepted 15 Hungarian refugees. In addition, Liechtenstein supported six Hungarian students financially and psychologically to enable them to go to Zürich and continue their studies there. It was the Liechtenstein Red Cross with Princess Gina as president which selected the preferred refugees. Yes, Liechtenstein had preferences in taking Hungarian refugees.¹⁰ The refugees coming to Liechtenstein should preferably be Catholic and should be skilled workers. In this way the Liechtenstein authorities hoped to be able to integrate the refugees as quickly as possible into Liechtenstein society.

About ten years later, in 1968, thousands of people fled from Czechoslovakia. As in 1956, demonstrations against the Soviet Union took place in Liechtenstein.¹¹ And as in 1956 Liechtenstein took Switzerland as an example by adopting ad hoc regulations for Czechoslovakian refugees and by deciding to accept Czechoslovakian refugees.¹² Liechtenstein did not want to be blamed by the international community for not accepting some refugees. However, this time no conditions in respect of the religion or social status of the refugees were imposed. In total, 25 Czechoslovaks found a new home in Liechtenstein.¹³ Liechtenstein society was very sympathetic towards both groups – the Hungarians and the Czechoslovaks – because they were regarded as the victims of the Communist system upheld by the Soviet Union.

However, neither the Liechtenstein nor the Swiss authorities felt the same sympathy towards another group of refugees, namely the Chileans. In September 1973, General Pinochet overturned the democratically elected left-wing government of President Allende. At first sight the aftermath of the coup seemed to mirror the situation in Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1956 and 1968. However, the situation was different. In Chile it was the left-wing supporters of Allende who had to flee. Neither in Switzerland

nor in Liechtenstein did any authority make an attempt to accept any Chilean refugees.¹⁴ On the contrary, both Switzerland and Liechtenstein were afraid of the Chileans, who were regarded as “communists”. Nevertheless, through the efforts of some left-wing parties and groups in Switzerland, some Chileans did reach Switzerland. But Liechtenstein did not follow suit, although in Liechtenstein itself many attempts to accept some refugees from Chile were made by private organisations. Several months passed until the Liechtenstein government gave a final, negative answer: the protection of Chilean refugees was not the aim of the Liechtenstein authorities. They argued that Chileans would be difficult to integrate into Liechtenstein society. However, the main reason for not accepting any Chileans was fear of communist agitation.¹⁵

The three refugee groups mentioned above have one thing in common: all were victims of brutal aggression, whether from a right-wing or left-wing source. For all three groups Liechtenstein had no specific refugee regulations which could be followed. Liechtenstein decided ad hoc how to behave and thus mainly copied Swiss behaviour, which in the case of the Hungarians and the Czechoslovaks was very positive and in the case of the Chileans very negative. The Hungarians and Czechoslovaks were welcomed and integrated very rapidly. There seem to have been no problems in integrating them into Liechtenstein society. However, the 1950s and 1960s were a “good” time to flee to a Western European country, if you can call it that. Thanks to the economic boom the refugees did not have any problems in finding a job and, moreover, they were seen as welcome additions to the workforce by – for example – Swiss and Liechtenstein society.¹⁶ Liechtenstein therefore did not see any necessity to implement specific refugee regulations.

Most of the Western European countries accepted refugees from Indochina after 1979.¹⁷ So did Liechtenstein. However, Liechtenstein did not decide easily to accept Indochinese refugees. The first option was to help locally by giving donations. Liechtenstein’s authorities feared that the Indochinese people would not be easy to integrate and therefore held back at first. They also argued that only if several families were accepted would it make sense to take any refugees.¹⁸ Although Liechtenstein did finally decide to accept refugees from Indochina it only did so as a result of pressure which came firstly from private organisations within Liechtenstein,¹⁹ but also from the international community. It would not have been a good idea not to follow the positive example of Switzerland. In the case of the Indochinese refugees the lack of specific regulations for refugees revealed its consequences clearly for the first time. The Indochinese people were treated as immigrants.²⁰ They were stateless. But due to the very restrictive naturalisation regulations there was no possibility for them to become citizens in an appropriate way. As with all other immigrants, they too had to be approved by public ballot before they could acquire Liechtenstein citizenship.²¹ In practice this was a nearly insuperable barrier. It was not until 2000 that the naturalisation rules were changed.²² Immigrants now have a legal right to acquire Liechtenstein citizenship after they have lived for 30 years in the Principality.

These early experiences with refugees did not induce Liechtenstein to create refugee regulations. It was not until the war in the former Yugoslavia at the beginning of the 1990s that it became clear that Liechtenstein had to devise an independent refugee policy. Humanitarian concessions had to be put on a legal basis.

All of the EU countries, plus Switzerland, accepted refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina.²³ Liechtenstein also helped quickly and straightforwardly.²⁴ Immediately

after the war broke out the temporary residence permits for Yugoslavian seasonal workers were extended.²⁵ Liechtenstein adopted this measure from Switzerland. In June 1992 Liechtenstein decided to accept about 50 refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina.²⁶ The refugees entered the Principality only two weeks after the Liechtenstein authorities had reached their decision. Some refugees found places to stay in privately owned properties, others in community owned properties. The authorities did not at first want to accept any further refugees. However, only a short time after having stated that it would not accept any more Yugoslavian refugees, the government changed its mind and allowed a further 50 refugees, mainly women and children, to enter the country. The people of Liechtenstein showed exceptional sympathy towards the refugees and gave them financial support. Liechtenstein would be a place where the Yugoslavs could stay until war was over.

In addition to the refugees which came to Liechtenstein on this “regular” basis, some “illegal” refugees also crossed the border into Liechtenstein. These people did not get the same positive support as the other refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The Yugoslav conflict initiated a discussion about refugee policy in Liechtenstein which led to the implementation of specific regulations for refugees in 1998.²⁷ Only a few months after these came into effect a large number of refugees from Kosovo found their way to Liechtenstein. By summer 1999 more than 600 refugees from Kosovo had come to Liechtenstein. The Liechtenstein authorities did not want any more.²⁸

The war in former Yugoslavia did not end as soon as had been expected. The refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina stayed longer than had been intended at the beginning. They found jobs, their children went to the regular school and they adapted to the Liechtenstein way of life. By contrast, the refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina who did not come as “regular” refugees but came to Liechtenstein illegally were not allowed to work. In doing so, the Liechtenstein authorities were attempting to prevent other potential refugees from coming to Liechtenstein.²⁹

Nevertheless, after the war, most of the refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina did not want to go back to their home country.³⁰ Many things had changed there, the infrastructure was badly damaged and in the meantime they had integrated into Liechtenstein.

So when the refugees from Kosovo came, Liechtenstein had learned its lesson. In line with the new refugee regulations all the measures being taken were designed to prevent the Kosovars from becoming too well integrated in Liechtenstein. Tiny and cramped housing conditions were one way of preparing them for not being able to stay forever in Liechtenstein. They were allowed to work, but could only keep 3 Swiss Francs for each hour they worked. The rest was retained by the authorities to pay for the expenses Liechtenstein was incurring. These measures and some promised benefits resulted in most refugees returning to Kosovo as soon as it became possible again.³¹

There is one last group of refugees that should be mentioned in this historical part. One day in October 1993, 18 Tibetans stood in front of the castle in Vaduz, seeming to have appeared from nowhere. In the 1960s, when Switzerland and other European countries had accepted Tibetan refugees, Liechtenstein did not follow suit.³² Now, many years later, Tibetans suddenly showed up unexpectedly in Liechtenstein.³³

The Liechtenstein authorities did not believe their escape story. However, due to international pressure Liechtenstein could not send them back to Tibet. The following years were dominated by a discussion as to whether the Tibetans really were Tibetans and whether they had any right to asylum. Liechtenstein did not want to accept them as

refugees. After years of fighting they were finally granted asylum in 1998. The newly created refugee regulations had made it possible.

Chart 1: Accepted asylum seekers in Liechtenstein from 1956 to 1998³⁴

	1956	1968	1979	1982	1998	Total
China (Tibet)					19	19
Tschechische Republik		25				25
Ungarn	15					15
Vietnam			20	11		31

Chart 2: Asylum seekers in Liechtenstein from 1992 to 2010³⁵

	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
Russland								2			5	17	9	8	10	6	3	19	32
Übr. GUS							6	8	2	3	15	20	22	13	15	3	5	9	6
Westl. Balkan	50	100	100	283	130	91	304	484	43	105	67	53	24	9	8	2	4	9	44
Somalia														11	7	2		118	3
Eritrea																		110	
Übr. Afrika								2			3		3	2	2	6	4	3	16
Westeuropa								3	5	3	3		5	2	1	2	3	4	1
Übr. Nationen							6	23	1	1	3	12	11	8	3	11	7	22	11
unbekannt															1				
Total	50	100	100	283	130	91	316	522	51	112	96	102	74	53	47	32	26	294	113

3. Final remarks

As a small state, Liechtenstein wishes to – and needs to – decide independently about its refugee policy. Nevertheless it is embedded in the international community and its “do’s” and “don’t’s” just as much larger countries are. There is a demand and a need for Liechtenstein to act like the others, for example by accepting numbers of refugees in proportion to its native population. Recently Liechtenstein has made a promise to take responsibility for accepting some of the refugees stranded in Malta. In May 2012, 19 persons, coming originally from Somalia and Eritrea, but having lived for some years in Malta, were given permission to move to Liechtenstein.

Liechtenstein is a member of the Schengen/Dublin system. You could say that Liechtenstein is a winner in this system. Liechtenstein has no air or sea port and is surrounded by safe “third countries”. This means that Liechtenstein’s responsibility to take refugees is only very small because most of the refugees have been registered in another country before entering Liechtenstein. In autumn 2009 about 200 people from Somalia and Eritrea made their way to Liechtenstein. Taken by surprise at first by the unforeseen situation, Liechtenstein was easily able to take counter-measures by placing controls at the Swiss-Liechtenstein border – which is not normally controlled as a result of the

Customs Treaty. The Liechtenstein authorities were in a position to send refugees back to wherever they came from as long as Liechtenstein could prove where they had been before. The border controls immediately led to illegal immigration being reduced to zero. Since then, no comparable level of illegal immigration has been registered.

Notes

¹ See Matthias Hofstetter, *Der Zollvertrag zwischen der Schweiz und dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein aus dem Jahre 1923*, Lizentiatsarbeit Universität Freiburg/Schweiz, Doppleschwand 2000; Sven Bradke/Heinz Hauser, *75 Jahre Zollvertrag Schweiz-Liechtenstein. Jubiläumsschrift im Auftrage der Gesellschaft Schweiz-Liechtenstein*, St. Gallen 1998; Peter Geiger, *Schweizerisch-liechtensteinische Zollvertragsgemeinschaft in der Zeit der Krise und des Zweiten Weltkrieges*, in: Eidgenössische Zollverwaltung (Hg.), *70 Jahre Zollvertrag Schweiz-Fürstentum Liechtenstein 1924-1994*, Heft 4/1994, 18-24; Rupert Quaderer-Vogt, *Der Weg zum Zollvertrag*, in: Eidgenössische Zollverwaltung (Hg.), *70 Jahre Zollvertrag Schweiz-Fürstentum Liechtenstein 1924-1994*, Heft 4/1994, 12-17.

² See Veronika Marxer, *Ausländer*, in: *Historisches Lexikon des Fürstentums Liechtenstein*, upcoming; Martina Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“ Liechtensteins Umgang mit Fremden seit 1945, Zürich/Vaduz 2012, especially 63-73; Claudia Heeb-Fleck/Veronika Marxer, *Die liechtensteinische Migrationspolitik im Spannungsfeld nationalstaatlicher Interessen und internationaler Einbindung 1945-1981. Texte und Materialien*, Typoskript, Schaan 2001.

³ See Amt für Statistik (Hg.), *Bevölkerungsstatistik. Vorläufige Ergebnisse 31. Dezember 2011*, Vaduz 2012, 4.

⁴ See Martina Sochin, *Liechtensteinische Ausländerpolitik. Zwischen Wunschdenken und Wirklichkeit. Studie zuhanden der liechtensteinischen Regierung*, Juli 2012, 3.

⁵ See Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 233-235; Vernehmlassungsbericht zur Totalrevision des Gesetzes vom 2. April 1998 über die Aufnahme von Asylsuchenden und Schutzbedürftigen (Flüchtlingengesetz; neu: Asylgesetz), www.llv.li/pdf-llvrk_vernehmml._asylgesetz.pdf (27. Oktober 2010).

⁶ See Peter Geiger, *Kriegszeit*, 2 Bände, Vaduz/Zürich 2010; Ursina Jud, *Liechtenstein und die Flüchtlinge zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, Vaduz/Zürich 2005; Peter Geiger, *Krisenzeit. Liechtenstein in den Dreissigerjahren 1928-1939*, 2 Bände, Zürich 2000, here Bd. 2, 427-447; Monika Imboden/Brigitte Lustenberger, *Die Flüchtlingspolitik der Schweiz in den Jahren 1933 bis 1945*, in: Carsten Goehrke/Werner G. Zimmermann (Hg.), „Zuflucht Schweiz“. *Der Umgang mit Asylproblemen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Zürich 1994, 257-308. As of 1923 Liechtenstein naturalised people for money. Mostly Jewish people used this possibility to get a passport with whom they were able to travel abroad. See Nicole Schwalbach, *Bürgerrecht als Wirtschaftsfaktor. Normen und Praxis der Finanzienbürgerung in Liechtenstein 1919-1955*, Vaduz/Zürich 2012.

⁷ Especially for Liechtenstein see Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 241-265; Ibolya Murber, *Flucht in den Westen 1956. Ungarnflüchtlinge in Österreich (Vorarlberg) und Liechtenstein*, Feldkirch 2002.

⁸ See Red Cross Liechtenstein, *Liechtensteiner und Liechtensteinerinnen*, in: *Liechtensteiner Volksblatt and Liechtensteiner Vaterland*, 31. Oktober 1956; non-official transcript by the Liechtenstein parliament, 7. November 1956; Fürstliche Regierung, *Aufruf*, in *Liechtensteiner Volksblatt*, 20. November 1956.

⁹ For the Swiss situation see Christine Banki/Christoph Späti, *Ungarn, Tibeter, Tschechen und Slowaken. Bedingungen ihrer Akzeptanz in der Schweiz der Nachkriegszeit*, in: Carsten Goehrke/Werner G. Zimmermann (Hg.), „Zuflucht Schweiz“. *Der Umgang mit Asylproblemen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Zürich 1994, 369-415.

¹⁰ See LLA, RF 277/058, Prinz Karl Alfred to Fürst Franz Josef and Fürstin Gina, 12. November 1956; LLA, RF 277/058, Red Cross Liechtenstein to Regierung, 9. Dezember 1956.

¹¹ See Jürgen Schindler, „Dazu ist ganz klar festzuhalten, dass eine glaubhafte Asylpolitik nicht nach der politischen Einstellung der Flüchtlinge fragen darf“. Zur Ideologie der liechtensteinischen Asylpolitik zwischen 1968 und 1974, unpublished paper at the Historical Department at the University of Zurich, 2001/2002.

¹² See Banki/Späti, Ungaren, Tibeter, Tschechen und Slowaken, 394-402.

¹³ See chart cited on page 8. See H.W., Die CSSR-Flüchtlinge in Liechtenstein, in: Liechtensteiner Volksblatt, 28. November 1968.

¹⁴ See Claudio Bolzmann, Chilenische Flüchtlinge in Europa seit dem Militärputsch in Chile 1973 (Beispiel Schweiz), in: Klaus J. Bade/Pieter C. Emmer/Leo Lucassen/Jochen Oltmer (Hg.), Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa. Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, Paderborn 2007, 436-438; Michael Walther, Neuansiedlung im Sinn der humanitären Tradition. Die Geschichte der schweizerischen Kontingentspolitik ab 1950, in: Michael Walther, Sie waren einst Flüchtlinge. Neun Lebensgeschichten, Zürich 2009, 145-198; see Schindler, „Dazu ist ganz klar festzuhalten, dass eine glaubhafte Asylpolitik nicht nach der politischen Einstellung der Flüchtlinge fragen darf“.

¹⁵ See Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, especially 256-259.

¹⁶ See also Dušan Šimko, Tschechoslowakische Flüchtlinge in West-, Mittel- und Nordeuropa seit 1968, in: Klaus J. Bade/Pieter C. Emmer/Leo Lucassen/Jochen Oltmer (Hg.), Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa. Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, Paderborn 2007, 1050-1053; Jan Willem ten Doesschate, Ungarische Flüchtlinge in Europa seit 1956, in: Klaus J. Bade/Pieter C. Emmer/Leo Lucassen/Jochen Oltmer (Hg.), Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa. Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, Paderborn 2007, 1065-1067.

¹⁷ See Olaf Beuchling, Vietnamesische Flüchtlinge in West-, Mittel- und Nordeuropa seit den 1970er Jahren, in: Klaus J. Bade/Pieter C. Emmer/Leo Lucassen/Jochen Oltmer (Hg.), Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa. Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, Paderborn 2007, 1072-1076; Olaf Beuchling, Vom Bootsflüchtling zum Bundesbürger. Migration, Integration und schulischer Erfolg in einer vietnamesischen Exilgemeinschaft, Münster/New York 2003; W. Courtland Robinson, Terms of Refuge. The Indochinese Exodus and the International Response, London 1998.

¹⁸ See transcript by the Liechtenstein parliament, 4. April 1979, 110-112; Annual report Red Cross Liechtenstein 1979; see also Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 266-278.

¹⁹ For helping the refugees at the beginning, there was founded a task force named „Indochinese Refugees“.

²⁰ See Arbeitsgruppe für indochinesische Flüchtlinge, Wer ist ein Flüchtling?, in: Liechtensteiner Volksblatt, 7. Januar 1980; LLA, V 140/00244, Stellungnahme der Fremdenpolizei zur Anfrage eines indochinesischen Flüchtlings betreffend die Ausstellung eines Passes, 27. Juli 1992.

²¹ With regard to the Liechtenstein citizenship regulations see Veronika Marxer, Vom Bürgerrechtskauf zur Integration. Einbürgerungsnormen und Einbürgerungspraxis in Liechtenstein 1945-2008, Vaduz/Zürich 2012; Regula Argast, Einbürgerungen in Liechtenstein vom 19. bis ins 21. Jahrhundert. Schlussbericht, Vaduz/Zürich 2012.

²² See Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, especially 133-144; Martina Sochin D'Elia, Doppelte Staatsbürgerschaft bei Naturalisierung. Eine europäische Situationsanalyse unter spezieller Berücksichtigung Liechtensteins, Arbeitspapiere Liechtenstein-Institut Nr. 37, Barend 2012.

²³ See Pascal Goeke, Flüchtlinge aus dem ehemaligen Jugoslawien in Europa seit 1991, in: Klaus J. Bade/Pieter C. Emmer/Leo Lucassen/Jochen Oltmer (Hg.), Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa. Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart, Paderborn 2007, 578-585.

²⁴ See Sochin D'Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 280-287; 290-301.

²⁵ See LLA, RF 348/073, Ressortantrag Fremdenpolizei, 17. März 1992.

²⁶ See LLA, RF 348/073, Regierungsbeschluss, 26. Juni 1992.

²⁷ See LGBl. 1998, Nr. 107, Gesetz vom 2. April 1998 über die Aufnahme von Asylsuchenden und Schutzbedürftigen (Flüchtlingsgesetz).

²⁸ See Alexander Batliner, Flüchtlingssituation in Liechtenstein verschärft sich weiter, in: Liechtensteiner Volksblatt, 10. März 1999.

²⁹ See LLA, RG 1995/1442/001-005, Amtsvermerk der Regierung, 20. Juni 1995; LLA, RG 1995/1442/001-005, Regierungsbeschluss, 18. Juli 1995; LLA, RG 1995/1631/001-032, Flüchtlingshilfe an Regierung, 23. November 1995.

³⁰ See N.N., 141 Flüchtlinge möchten Fristverlängerung, in: Liechtensteiner Volksblatt, 17. Mai 1997; Norman Hoop, „Wir können nicht zurück!“, in: Liechtensteiner Volksblatt, 16. Oktober 1997; Gerolf Hauser, Eine Rückkehr nach Bosnien?, in: Liechtensteiner Volksblatt, 15. November 1997.

³¹ See Sochin D’Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 301-307.

³² See Banki/Späti, Ungaren, Tibeter, Tschechen und Slowaken, 369-415.

³³ See Sochin D’Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 307-321.

³⁴ See Sochin D’Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 239.

³⁵ See Sochin D’Elia, „Man hat es doch hier mit Menschen zu tun!“, 241.