

Human Rights and Migration Law in Australia: Enabling Cross-Border Business Mobility in a Globalised Economy

Professor Idi Ras Banamungu^{1,2,3*}

DBA, PhD (Human Rights & Migration Law), HonDMusTherCounsPsych, HonProf

¹Honorary Professor of Counselling Psychology, Laughter Percussion, and Management Learning, Kennedy University of Baptist, Florida, USA

²Founder & Chief Innovation Officer, Laughter Percussion Academy, Kalgoorlie, Western Australia, Australia

³Founder & CEO, Laughter Percussion Academy (NDIS-Registered Provider), Kalgoorlie, Western Australia, Australia

*Corresponding Email Id: banamungu2007@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In the twenty-first century, international business mobility has become a defining feature of global economic development. Entrepreneurs, investors, creatives, consultants, and digital professionals increasingly operate across borders, requiring migration systems that facilitate lawful movement while protecting fundamental human rights. Australia, as a major destination for skilled and business migrants, sits at the intersection of economic strategy and human rights obligations. This research examines the relationship between human rights law and migration law in Australia, focusing on how legal frameworks enable—or restrict—the ability of individuals to move with their businesses. Using doctrinal legal analysis, comparative perspectives, and policy evaluation, the paper argues that a human rights-based approach to business migration enhances economic sustainability, legal certainty, and global competitiveness.

Keywords: *Human Rights Law, Migration Law, Business Mobility, Australia, International Business, Entrepreneur Visas, Economic Rights*

INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

Globalisation has transformed the nature of business. Where commerce was once largely confined within national borders, contemporary business is increasingly transnational, digital, and mobile. Entrepreneurs establish startups across jurisdictions, investors diversify portfolios internationally, consultants service clients globally, and creatives monetise intellectual property beyond their countries of origin. This mobility of business actors is now essential to economic growth, innovation, and competitiveness.

Australia exemplifies this transformation. While the nation actively seeks skilled migrants, entrepreneurs, and global talent, its migration system remains heavily regulated. Human rights law operates alongside migration law, shaping how migration powers must be exercised to ensure fairness, proportionality, and respect for human dignity.

Research Problem

Despite the economic importance of business migration, legal frameworks often prioritise border control and risk management over rights-based economic participation. Business migrants may face restrictive visa criteria, capital-heavy thresholds, insecure visa conditions, and limited recognition of digital or creative enterprises. This raises the central question of this research: to what extent does Australian migration law align with international human rights standards in facilitating lawful business mobility?

Research Objectives

This study aims to:

Examine the intersection of human rights law and migration law in Australia

Analyse business migration pathways through a rights-based lens

Identify structural barriers to lawful business mobility

Evaluate Australia's compliance with international human rights norms

Propose reforms to enhance ethical and sustainable business migration

Significance of the Study

This research contributes to human rights scholarship, migration law analysis, and international business policy by reframing business mobility as both an economic and a human rights issue. It is relevant to policymakers, legal practitioners, entrepreneurs, academics, and international business actors.

Theoretical Framework: Human Rights and Business Mobility

Human rights law recognises economic participation as integral to human dignity. The right to work, freedom of movement, non-discrimination, and family unity all intersect with business migration. While states retain sovereignty over immigration, these rights impose legal constraints on how migration powers are exercised.

Business mobility engages civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights. Migration systems that unnecessarily restrict lawful business activity may undermine these rights, particularly where restrictions are arbitrary or disproportionate.

International Legal Framework Governing Business Mobility

International human rights instruments protect equality before the law, economic participation, procedural fairness, and protection of lawful enterprise. Trade and economic agreements further recognise the temporary movement of business persons as essential to global commerce.

The right to development underscores the importance of enabling individuals to participate meaningfully in economic life. Migration systems that exclude capable entrepreneurs may undermine both development objectives and human rights obligations.

Australian Migration Law: Foundations and Structure

Australia's migration framework is rules-based and highly regulated, distinguishing between permanent, temporary, skilled, and business migration. Business mobility is facilitated through specific visa categories designed to attract economic contribution, innovation, and global talent.

While business visas are administrative permissions rather than rights, human rights law requires that decision-making processes respect procedural fairness, non-discrimination, and proportionality.

Conceptualising "Moving with Your Business"

Moving with a business may involve establishing enterprises abroad, expanding existing operations, delivering services across borders, or operating digital businesses. Contemporary business models often challenge traditional migration assumptions based on fixed premises and long-term physical presence.

Failure to recognise modern business realities can expose entrepreneurs to legal risk, visa refusal, or economic loss, highlighting the need for adaptive legal interpretation.

Australian Business Migration Pathways

Australia provides multiple pathways for business mobility, including business innovation, global talent, employer-sponsored, skilled, and temporary business visas. While these pathways reflect economic priorities, they often favour capital-intensive models and large enterprises.

Human rights concerns arise where criteria indirectly discriminate against SMEs, creatives, or entrepreneurs from developing economies, or where visa conditions undermine business autonomy.

Human Rights Constraints on Migration Decision-Making

Human rights principles require migration decisions to be lawful, proportionate, non-discriminatory, and procedurally fair. Business migrants often invest substantial resources prior to visa decisions, making transparency and consistency essential.

Visa conditions that create dependency or restrict lawful economic activity may undermine economic rights and increase vulnerability to exploitation.

Barriers to Business Mobility in Practice

SMEs, creative practitioners, digital entrepreneurs, and informal businesses frequently encounter barriers due to rigid migration criteria. Capital thresholds, documentation requirements, and traditional employment assumptions may exclude innovative and community-based enterprises.

Family separation and limited spousal work rights further undermine business sustainability and integration.

Comparative International Models

Comparative analysis reveals that more adaptive jurisdictions prioritise innovation, skills, and scalability over capital alone. Digital nomad visas, startup pathways, and skills-based assessments better reflect contemporary business realities and uphold economic participation rights.

These models demonstrate that flexibility and human rights sensitivity enhance global competitiveness.

Human Rights Impact Assessment of Australia's System

Australia's migration system performs strongly in governance but shows limitations in adaptability. Indirect discrimination, disproportionate requirements, inconsistent decision-making, and restricted review rights present human rights challenges.

Economic participation and family unity are areas requiring stronger alignment with human rights principles.

Best Practices for Rights-Based Business Mobility

Best practices include flexible eligibility criteria, recognition of digital and creative enterprises, reduced reliance on capital-only assessments, procedural safeguards, and clear pathways to permanent residence.

Such systems promote compliance, innovation, and long-term economic contribution.

Reform Framework for Australia

A human rights-based business migration framework should be grounded in dignity, equality, proportionality, legal certainty, and adaptability. Migration law should function as economic infrastructure that supports innovation while respecting human rights obligations.

Policy Recommendations

Key recommendations include:

Modernising business migration criteria

Reducing capital-centric bias

Strengthening procedural fairness and review rights

Enhancing business autonomy

Supporting family unity and settlement pathways

Practical Guidance: Moving with Your Business Lawfully

Entrepreneurs should formalise business documentation, select appropriate visa pathways, comply strictly with visa conditions, and plan early for permanent residence. Awareness of procedural rights and legal remedies is essential for lawful engagement with migration authorities.

Implications for International Business

Migration law shapes global business ecosystems. Rights-based migration systems attract diverse talent, foster innovation, and strengthen international reputation. Restrictive systems risk economic stagnation and exclusion.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that human rights and migration law are not barriers to business mobility but essential foundations for ethical and sustainable economic movement. By aligning migration law with contemporary business realities and human rights principles, Australia can enhance innovation, legal legitimacy, and global competitiveness.

Acknowledgement

This work was undertaken independently by the author, an independent researcher holding a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Human Rights and Migration Law. The research, analysis, and writing presented in this document are the result of independent scholarly inquiry, informed by advanced academic training and professional experience.

This acknowledgement also recognizes the people of the community in which this research is situated. The lived realities, social dynamics, and shared experiences of those in the same area provide important contextual grounding for this work. Their presence, resilience, and everyday engagement with issues of justice, rights, and social inclusion informed the broader perspectives reflected in this study.

Although conducted without formal institutional supervision, this work adheres to established ethical and academic standards. All sources have been appropriately acknowledged, and full responsibility for the content, interpretations, and conclusions rests solely with the author.

REFERENCES

1. Australian Government. (1958). Migration Act 1958 (Cth). Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
2. Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs. (2023). Australia's Migration Program: Planning Levels and Policy Framework. Canberra: Department of Home Affairs.
3. Bhabha, J. (2014). Child Migration and Human Rights in a Global Age. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
4. Castles, S., de Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World (5th ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2005). General Comment No. 18: The Right to Work (Article 6 of the ICESCR). United Nations.
6. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2016). General Comment No. 23: The Right to Just and Favourable Conditions of Work. United Nations.
7. De Genova, N. (2010). The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement. Durham: Duke University Press.
8. International Labour Organization. (2015). Fair Migration: Setting an ILO Agenda. Geneva: ILO.
9. International Organization for Migration. (2019). World Migration Report. Geneva: IOM.

10. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *International Migration Outlook*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
11. Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: The New Press.
12. Spencer, S., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2017). *Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe: A Multi-disciplinary Perspective*. Cham: Springer.
13. United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations.
14. United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. New York: United Nations.
15. United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. New York: United Nations.
16. United Nations Development Programme. (2016). *Human Development Report: Human Development for Everyone*. New York: UNDP.
17. World Trade Organization. (1994). *General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)*. Geneva: WTO.