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| **Introduction.**  The keyword is forced migration;forced Migration is “a general term that refers to the movements of refugees and internally displaced people (those displaced by conflicts within their country of origin) as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine, or development projects. Forced (or involuntary) migration includes a number of legal or political categories. The majority of forced migrants flee for reasons not recognized by the international refugee regime, and many of them are displaced within their own country of origin  **However**, a historian are to justify the difference between migration and displacement in the study of forced migration for a reader to understand?  Displacement is a particular form of migration, in which individuals are forced to move against their will. Where people are forced to move within their country of origin, this is referred to as internal displacement. Displaced Person / Displacement. The displacement of people refers to the forced movement of people from their locality or environment and occupational activities. One of the major challenges today is the growth in the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) worldwide. Forced Migration estimated to about 65 million displaced. Forced migration is a negative form of migration, often caused by persecution, development, or exploitation. One of the largest involuntary migrations in history was caused by development. Some reasons for this migration occurring is due to environmental or natural disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine, conflicts, and more examples of this are the refugees and asylum seekers in Syria and people fleeing natural disasters like Earthquakes that have occurred in the past few years in Haiti. These reasons may fall under these four areas: Environmental, Economic, Cultural and Socio-political. Within that, the reasons may also be 'push' or 'pull' factors. Poor economic activity and lack of job opportunities are also strong push factors for migration.  According to Penz in 1997 described forced migration that is typically conceived as an ‘evil’, as something that ought morally to be avoided, but are there circumstances when it might be justifiable? This is a question that is obviously relevant to scholars of deportation, as states often claim that expulsion or particularly of convicted non-citizen criminals’ increases public security (Gibney 2013b). But the matter has received most attention by way of discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR). Discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement involves the coordinated and state sanctioned displacement of communities to facilitate development projects and is typically, though not exclusively associated with the countries of the global South. What makes this displacement of particular interest is that the (coerced) movement of people is typically justified in utilitarian terms on the grounds that the development project in question (e.g. the building of a dam) will have benefits to the community as a whole (e.g. the electrification of areas without power) that far outweigh the suffering of the relatively small number of people that will be displaced.  The key issue has been stated by Peter Penz: ‘Even if it is recognized that displacement is bad because it involves harm or coercion, it is possible that is a justifiable evil...In particular, the question arises of whether the good that development does can morally outweigh its bad consequences, including uprooting people’. A number of scholars of discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement DIDR have drawn upon ethical theory to reflect on the losses for individuals and communities caused by displacement. In illuminating work, Drydyk (1999; 4-5), for example, uses John Rawls’s theory to conceptualize the costs of displacement to include damage to a community’s ‘self-respect’ caused by the loss of their ‘cultural space and identity’ and ‘networks and associations’. The sophisticated reckoning of the costs of displacement evident in work like Drydyk’s has provided the foundation for more demanding accounts of the terms under which discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement might be morally acceptable. Peter Penz has helped map the moral terrain of discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement by outlining three moral claims in conflict in discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement situations conceptions of the public interest; considerations of freedom, property, and collective or self-determination; and matters of equity and justice, with the latter involving how the costs and benefits of the project are shared across the affected population (Penz 1997: 37–41). For Penz, the most pertinent of these considerations is self-determination, which requires that legitimate displacement involves consultation with the community at risk of displacement. Legitimate displacement needs to involve ‘negotiated resettlement’ and costs need to be ‘fully compensated’ (Penz 1997: 41). One implication of recent discussions on discussions of development induced displacement and resettlement is that there are situations in which the coerced movement of communities to make way for development projects can be morally justifiable. As Penz notes, the ‘self-determination’ of the community being displaced 41‘cannot be asserted in such unqualified terms that development which serves both the public interest and distributive justice is blocked’ (1997: 41). Nonetheless, the displacement of communities and individuals cannot be morally justified simply by appealing to some utilitarian calculus; legitimate displacement requires a just process, with all the complexities that recent scholarship has made clear this entails.  The question of under what conditions return might be ‘just’ is of particular importance also to justify who is refugees in returned to his country of origin for two different reasons: first, because refugees have typically escaped a position of acute vulnerability and their rights risk being violated once again upon return; second, because the question of whether refugees might have a duty to return to their country (because by doing so they may be able to help rebuild their country of origin or show gratitude to the state of asylum) is often a politically salient one. While normative discussion of the legitimacy of repatriation programmes is not new (Weiner 1998; Barnett 2001), return processes have only recently begun to receive systematic normative attention. Megan Bradley, for instance, has argued that there is an intimate connection between enabling a ‘dignified return’ by refugees a stated goal of most international organizations involved in repatriation and appropriate redress for the injustices experienced by those who have been forced to flee. For redress or reparation plays an essential role in asserting the dignity of refugees by showing that the rights of such people cannot be breached with impunity respects basic rights.  The historian remind us about the largest forced migration in history? The Expulsion of the Germans was the Largest Forced Migration in History. In December 1944 Winston Churchill announced to a startled House of Commons that the Allies had decided to carry out the largest forced population transfer or what is now a days referred to as “ethnic cleansing” in human history. Migration is the permanent movement of people from one place to another. Voluntary migration is where the migrant has a choice whether or not to migrate and other kind of migration is forced migration. In forced migration, a government or authority forces someone to move confronting the Realities of Forced Migration. The political potency of fears of immigration often of waves of refugees in particular is nothing new. Historians recall campaigns against Jewish immigrants in Britain in the 1880s, and the U.S. Nativist movement of the 1920s, which opposed entry of all people not of British or Western European descent. The White Australia policy, designed to keep out Asians, was supported by the labor movement and all political parties up to the 1960s. With the end of the Cold War, migration again became a key issue, with fears of tens of millions of East-West migrants, as well as countless more from the South. Extreme right-wing parties mobilized public opinion, and racist violence escalated throughout Western Europe. States strengthened border controls and tightened up refugee rules.  But the predicted mass influxes from the East never happened. Most migrants to the West were people returning to ancestral homelands: ethnic Germans to Germany, Albanians of Greek origin to Greece, and so on. Other migrants usually came only if they could link up with existing social networks of previous migrants, who helped them find work and housing. Migration stabilized and declined. Today, the UN estimates that 175 million people live outside their countries of birth. Even allowing for under-counting especially of undocumented migrants only about three percent of the world's population are migrants.  Yet by the beginning of the new millennium, migration was again a hot topic. Britain experienced growing entries of asylum seekers and undocumented workers. Germany adopted measures to turn the descendants of the "guest workers" of the 1960s and 1970s into citizens. Southern European countries became aware of a sharp fall in fertility, while inflows across the Mediterranean from North Africa increased. Both Canadians and Americans were divided about the merits of their relatively open immigration policies. Is this all a re-run of old themes, or is something new happening? Taken as a whole, it appears something new *is* afoot: population movements are taking on increased significance in the context of current global social transformations.  **Firstly**, forced migration is growing in volume and importance, as a result of endemic violence and human rights violations. **Secondly,** policy makers are attempting to implement differentiated policies for various categories of migrants. Specifically, there is global competition to attract highly skilled migrants, but refugees, unskilled migrants, and their families are unwelcome. **Thirdly**, there is growing understanding that migration both economic and forced is an integral part of processes of global and regional economic integration. **Fourth**ly, it has become clear that immigrants do not simply assimilate into receiving societies, but rather tend to form communities and retain their own languages, religions, and cultures. **Finally**, migration has become highly politicized, and is now a pivotal issue in both national and international politics.  A question to justified forced migration; who are Today's Forced Migrants? Forced (or involuntary) migration includes a number of legal or political categories, all involve people who have been forced to flee their homes and seek refuge elsewhere. Popular speech tends to call them all "refugees," but this is actually quite a narrow legal category. The majority of forced migrants flee for reasons not recognized by the international refugee regime, and many of them are displaced within their own country of origin.  According to the 1951 United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, a refugee is a person residing outside his or her country of nationality, who is unable or unwilling to return because of a "well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." One hundred and forty-five of the 191 UN member states have signed the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol. Member states undertake to protect refugees and to respect the principle of non-refoulement (i.e., not to return them to a country where they may be persecuted). This may require allowing refugees to enter and granting them temporary or permanent residence status. Officially recognized refugees are often better off than other forced migrants, because they have a clear legal status and enjoy the protection of a powerful institution: the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).  The global refugee population grew from 2.4 million in 1975 to 10.5 million in 1985 and 14.9 million in 1990. A peak was reached after the end of the Cold War with 18.2 million in 1993. By early 2003, the global refugee population had declined to 10.4 million, according to UNHCR. The broader category of "people of concern to the UNHCR" (which includes refugees, some internally displaced persons, and some returnees) peaked at 27.4 million in 1995, and was down to 20.6 million in 2003. In addition to the people with whom UNHCR is concerned, the establishment of the state of Israel and the displacement of many Palestinian Arabs led to the world's longest-standing refugee situation, with over four million refugees today  **CONCLUSION**  This paper shows that the ethics of forced migration is a diverse, growing, and vibrant area of scholarship. From its primary concentration on the question of asylum and refugees, the normative study of forced migration has recently branched out to consider the claims of repatriated refugees, people facing deportation, undocumented migrants, and a range of other groups. The claims of these forced migrants have served as a prism through which academics concerned with forced migration have critically questioned the moral boundaries of citizenship, the balance between the social good and the individual and group interest, the ethics of reparation for historical injustice, and the integration of marginalized people. There remain significant gaps: in particular, normative scholars have tended to be disproportionately concerned with the ethics of forced migration as it relates to the concerns and value frameworks of developed, Western, liberal states. Yet as the field of forced migration becomes more crowded and nuanced in the years ahead, the amount and quality of normative reflection on its main concerns seems only likely to grow rapidly.  Work cited:  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See Bradley 2008, 2013; Long 2008, 2013).  See Drydyk (1999; 4-5), uses John Rawls’s theory to conceptualize the costs of displacement  See Roger Zetters 2015 (21) Displacement, Protection, and Policy Coherence Protection in crisis Forced Migration and Protection in a global era  Adelman, H. & McGrath, S. (2007) ‘To Date or to Marry: That is the Question’.  Journal of Refugee Studies 20(3), pp. 376-380.  Crisp, J. (1 July 2009) ‘Plenary Presentation IASFM 13: the Boundaries of Policy’.  Feller, E. (2006) ‘Asylum, Migration and Refugee Protection: Realities, Myths and the  Promise of Things to Come’. International Journal of Refugee Law 18:3-4, pp. 509-536.  Hathaway. J. (2007) ‘Forced Migration Studies: Could We Agree Just to “Date”?’Journal of Refugee Studies 20(3), pp. 349-369. |