

Summary of Widespread Support for Rescinding the June 2024 Asylum Ban

In June 2024, the Biden Administration issued a [Presidential Border Proclamation](#) and an Interim Final Rule (IFR) titled “[Securing the Border](#)” (June 2024 Asylum Ban), which was issued by the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security. [Joint analysis](#) of the Proclamation and IFR outlines how it will ban the majority of people who arrive between ports of entry from asylum, among other key provisions. Over 100 civil rights, human rights, faith-based, [immigrant rights and climate organizations](#), including Black-led, Indigenous, and LGBTQI+, organizations expressed their opposition to these measures and more than [20 Members of Congress](#) publicly objected to the Biden Administration’s June 2024 Asylum Ban. The strong support for rescinding the IFR reflected in the formal comments is particularly striking given the unduly limited 30-day comment period, which also included a major summer holiday.

After the Border Proclamation and IFR were published, organizations immediately issued [joint analysis](#), [policy briefs](#), [explainers](#), and [FAQs](#) detailing the adverse consequences and harms it would inflict on people seeking protection. Human Rights First [documented](#) the immediate impact of the June 2024 Asylum Ban and found that during the first two weeks of its implementation, people seeking asylum were summarily deported to danger and denied asylum screenings by U.S. border officers, denied access to legal advice or representation for fear screenings, and subjected to [targeted harm](#) in Mexico while [waiting up to seven months](#) for a CBP One appointment.

The National Immigrant Justice Center and other organizations released a July [report](#) documenting the human rights and due process violations six weeks after the June 2024 Asylum Ban was implemented. An August 2024 [report](#) by Hope Border Institute, Human Rights First, Immigrant Defenders Law Center, Kino Border Initiative, RAICES, and Refugees International documents the devastating impacts of the Asylum Ban’s elimination of a nearly 30-year-old safeguard to ask people subject to summary deportation whether they fear return. A [filing](#) submitted in litigation against the June 2024 Asylum Ban also documents the consequences of eliminating this safeguard.

Members of Congress condemned the unlawful Asylum Ban, which would return refugees to persecution in violation of U.S. law and international treaty obligations

On June 4, 2024 –the day the Border Proclamation and IFR were announced– Representatives Greg Casar (TX-35), Congressional Hispanic Caucus Chair Nanette Barragán (CA-44), Pramila Jayapal (WA-07), Ilhan Omar (MN-05), Ayanna Pressley (MA-07), Delia Ramirez (IL-03) and advocates held a [press conference](#) denouncing the anti-asylum executive action to unlawfully block refugees from seeking safety and return them to persecution.

Representatives Jesús “Chuy” García (IL-04), Delia Ramirez (IL-03), Raul Grijalva (AZ-07), and Nanette Barragán (CA-44) filed a formal public [comment](#) expressing their deep concern that “the IFR mirrors earlier asylum bans issued by the Trump and Biden administrations, violating the guarantee in the Immigration and Nationality Act that people fleeing violence and persecution may apply for asylum no matter how they enter the United States” and urged for the IFR to be rescinded in full.

On July 31, 2024, Members of Congress Nannette Barragán (CA-44), Jesús “Chuy” García (IL-04), Delia Ramirez (IL-03), Raúl Grijalva (AZ-07), Cori Bush (MO-01), Greg Casar (TX-35), Joaquin Castro (TX-20), Lou Correa (CA-46), Veronica Escobar (TX-16), Robert Garcia (CA-42), Sylvia Garcia (TX-29), Jonathan Jackson (IL-01), Pramila Jayapal (WA-07), James McGovern (MA-02), Eleanor Holmes Norton (DC-00), Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (NY-14), Rashida Tlaib (MI-12), Juan Vargas (CA-52), and Nydia Velázquez (NY-07) sent a [letter](#) to Secretary Mayorkas, Attorney General Merrick Garland, and USCIS Director Ur Jaddou urging rescission of the June 2024 Asylum Ban.

The Asylum Officers’ union opposed and urged rescission of the Asylum Ban, explaining that it violates U.S. law

The labor union representing the National Citizenship and Immigration Services Council 119 (“Council 119”) including Asylum Officers opposed the IFR in its entirety and [explained](#) that “[a]ny limitations and conditions imposed by the Departments must be *consistent* with § 208(a)(1)(A)’s guarantee that place of and status at entry should not impact a noncitizen’s ability to pursue their asylum claim. The IFR’s limitations are *inconsistent* with that guarantee, and they therefore may not stand.” The union filed an [amicus brief](#) in support of litigation against the ban, stating that the rule is unlawful and creates a system that is “almost certain to remove many who would qualify for protection under our immigration laws without any meaningful opportunity to raise their claims.”

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) confirmed the Asylum Ban violates core protections of international refugee law

The UNHCR submitted a [public comment](#) opposing the Asylum Ban, concluding that the “IFR runs afoul of fundamental principles and standards of international refugee and human rights law that are binding on the United States, including obligations of non-refoulement, the right to seek and enjoy asylum, and the prohibition of non-penalization for irregular entry and/or presence.” UNHCR also filed an [amicus brief](#) in support of litigation against the ban, again noting that the rule contravenes international law and warning that it “may lead to the refoulement of large numbers of refugees.”

Faith-based groups and leaders opposed the Asylum Ban and warned of its devastating impact

Faith-based organizations filed public comments condemning the Asylum Ban, including the [United States Conference of Catholic Bishops](#), [Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.](#), [Interfaith Immigration Coalition](#), and [Church World Service](#). The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops [warned](#) that the rule would “undermine the ability for families to seek humanitarian protection” and threatens to separate families, causing “long-term harm to children.” Bishop Mark J. Seitz of El Paso [condemned](#) the Asylum Ban: “We are deeply disturbed by this disregard for fundamental humanitarian protections and U.S. asylum law.”

Faith-based groups also issued public statements opposing the Biden Administration’s announcement of its Asylum Ban, including: [Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.](#), [HIAS](#), [Global Refuge](#), [Church World Service](#), [Hope Border Institute](#), [Jesuit Refugee Service/USA](#), the [United States Conference of Catholic Bishops](#), the [Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice](#), the [United Women in Faith and Immigration Law & Justice Network](#), [Lutheran Social Services of the National Capital Area](#), the [Episcopal Church](#), the [National Council of Jewish Women](#), and [National Association of Evangelicals](#). Prior to the announcement, faith-based organizations joined more than 150 organizations in a [letter](#) voicing their deep concern over reports to “shut down” the southern border and offered a [10-step list of actions](#) to effectively address the challenges at the border.

The International Mayan League, a leading Indigenous rights organization, confirmed the Asylum Ban will subject Indigenous Peoples to discrimination and inflict immense harm

The International Mayan League (Mayan League) [outlined](#) the harmful impact the Asylum Ban would have on Indigenous Peoples. The Mayan League explained that it would exacerbate language barriers and discrimination, leading to the return of Indigenous refugees to dangerous conditions where they face persecution and death.

Black-led organizations detailed the harms and discrimination that Black asylum seekers will face due to the Asylum Ban

[Haitian Bridge Alliance](#), [African Communities Together](#), and [Undocublack](#)’s statements and tweets highlighted how the Asylum Ban will disproportionately harm Black asylum seekers by denying equal access to asylum and subjecting them to targeted violence, discrimination, and even death. In addition, the Congressional Black Caucus Immigration Task Force and Representative Yvette D. Clarke issued a [statement](#) urging the administration to expand pathways for legal migration for people who are seeking refugee protection.

LGBTQ+ organizations united to strongly oppose the Asylum Ban

Human Rights Campaign, the largest political lobbying civil-rights organization for LGBTQ rights with more than three million members and supporters nationwide, submitted a [comment](#) highlighting its opposition to the June 2024 Asylum Ban, stating that this decision does not align with the historically most pro-LGBTQIA+ administration. Since the rule turns away and bans noncitizens who could likely establish eligibility for asylum, it will block and deny asylum protection to many LGBTQI+ people who are eligible for it under U.S. law. The Human Rights Campaign noted that currently, “being LGBTQ+ is criminalized in 63 countries and jurisdictions around the world—and is punishable by death in 12 of them. Many LGBTQI+ people who flee to the U.S. leave their homes because they are being targeted due to their sexual orientation, gender identity, or both.” The Asylum Ban will make it especially difficult for LGBTQI+ people to receive the protection they are legally entitled to.

Immigration Equality issued a [statement](#) and submitted a joint [comment](#) opposing the Asylum Ban on behalf of **Oasis, Immigration Equality, The Black LGBTQIA+ Migrant Project, Border Butterflies Project, Council for Global Equality, Equality California, Familia: Trans Queer Liberation Movement, The Human Rights Campaign, Lambda Legal, National Immigrant Justice Center, Lawyers for Good Government, National Center for Lesbian Rights, National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund, Rainbow Railroad, The Transgender Law Center, and Young Center for Immigrant Children’s Rights**, warning that “the IFR will subject LGBTQ/H refugees to grave harm, either because it will result in the wrongful denial of meritorious queer and trans asylum claims, or because LGBTQ/H refugees will put their lives in danger trying to comply with the IFR’s illegal requirements.”

A diverse array of organizations and many Members of Congress have also [expressed their opposition](#) to the prior, May 2023 asylum ban.