



Forced Migration as a Human Rights and Social Justice Issue: Why It Matters Today—and Affects Us All

Nicole Dubus

Associate Professor, School of Social Work, San Jose State University, United States.

Article Details

Article Type: Review Article

Received date: 28th August, 2025

Accepted date: 03rd November, 2025

Published date: 05th November, 2025

***Corresponding Author:** Nicole Dubus, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, San Jose State University, United States.

Citation: Dubus, N., (2025). Forced Migration as a Human Rights and Social Justice Issue: Why It Matters Today—and Affects Us All. *J Soci Work Welf Policy*, 3(2): 168. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33790/jswwp1100168>.

Copyright: ©2025, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Forced migration is one of the most pressing human rights challenges of our time, with implications that extend far beyond those directly displaced. Forced migration is a human crisis event centered on the individual or family that must flee their homeland due to civil unrest, persecution, or inability to safely remain. This human crisis becomes a policy issue when hosting countries determine what services, if any, they will provide the migrant. The execution of these services often are in the hands of social workers who must manage the needs of the migrant, the host community, and the available resources.

Drawing on empirical studies and broader scholarly literature, this paper argues that resettlement approaches centered on resilience, cultural responsiveness, and trauma-informed care are both ethically imperative and foundational to the well-being of host communities. Case studies from Europe, the United States, South Asia, Africa, and the Pacific underscore the limitations of narrow, transactional service models and highlight the transformative promise of justice-oriented interventions. The ethical and policy dimensions elucidated here reinforce that forced migration is not merely a humanitarian issue, but a structural justice concern central to our collective social future.

Introduction

In this paper, forced migration is the focus. Forced migration is a subgroup of migration. Immigrants consist of those who immigrate to a country other than their home country. Many immigrants who migrate might plan to move to another country, have employment waiting for them, and might have family or other support in where they are moving. Forced migrants, however, usually arrive out of necessity, moving to the nearest country or to a country assigned to them by a resettlement agency. They often have no resources other than the clothes on their backs. Most forced migrants have experienced trauma in their country of origin and during their passage to the new country. They arrive with emotional, medical, and financial distress. In this paper, the term ‘forced migration’ will be used to describe those who had to flee their home country and arrive to the new country with multiple needs and few resources.

The dominant discourse on forced migration often reduces resettlement, their first year of living in the new country, to a logistical problem. Governments and agencies focus on relocation, housing provision, and employment pathways, as though integration could be achieved through bureaucratic checklists and policies. Yet research shows that policies alone can not adequately address all the complexity of forced migration. There are deeper questions of justice and human rights that need to be considered, and these questions fundamentally shape the meaning of resettlement itself [1].

Immigration policies have long reflected the political, economic, and social conditions of their times. From early settlement laws to contemporary debates over refugee resettlement and border security, the trajectory of immigration regulation reveals evolving national identities, labor needs, racial and ethnic prejudices, and human rights frameworks. This article provides a historical overview of immigration policies, tracing their development from the 19th century to the present day. By situating immigration within broader historical contexts—including industrialization, global wars, decolonization, and globalization—this study highlights the ways in which immigration policy has been used both to include and to exclude. Later in this paper, we will discuss the climate crisis in relation to forced migration, and how global changes increase the challenges for individuals fleeing to safety, the host communities that receive them, and nations that must grapple with policies and resources.

Immigration has always been a contested political and social issue. Policies governing entry, settlement, and citizenship are shaped by shifting historical forces, including labor market demands, racial ideologies, and geopolitical crises. While immigration laws purport to regulate population flows, they also reflect broader national anxieties about identity, belonging, and security [2]. Examining immigration policy historically reveals the persistence of three themes: (1) selective inclusion and exclusion; (2) the relationship between labor and migration; and (3) the increasing interplay between international human rights and domestic policy.

Early Immigration Control: The 19th Century

For much of the early 19th century, immigration to the United States and other settler societies was relatively unregulated. In the United States, the naturalization law of 1790 limited citizenship to “free white persons,” embedding racial restrictions from the outset [3]. Immigration was largely encouraged to settle land, fuel industrial growth, and populate emerging nations in the Americas.

However, as industrialization advanced and urban populations swelled, hostility toward immigrants—particularly those from non-Northern European backgrounds—grew. Nativist movements in the mid-19th century sought to restrict the arrival of Irish and German Catholics, who were perceived as culturally alien and economically threatening [4].

The first significant federal immigration restrictions emerged with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which suspended Chinese immigration for 10 years and denied Chinese residents the possibility of naturalization. This act institutionalized racial exclusion in federal immigration policy and set precedents for later restrictive measures [5]. In Canada, similar sentiments fueled the imposition of a head tax on Chinese immigrants beginning in 1885, a measure designed to discourage their entry while still profiting from their labor.

The Progressive Era and the Rise of Restrictive Quotas

At the turn of the 20th century, immigration reached unprecedented levels, with millions of Southern and Eastern Europeans entering the United States, Canada, Argentina, and Brazil. These new arrivals faced suspicion from established populations, who questioned their racial fitness, political loyalties, and economic contributions [2].

In the U.S., the Immigration Act of 1917 introduced a literacy test and expanded the categories of excluded persons. More consequentially, the Emergency Quota Act of 1921 and the Immigration Act of 1924 established national origins quotas, favoring Northern and Western Europeans while severely restricting immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe and barring almost all immigration from Asia [2]. These policies reflected the influence of eugenics, racial science, and fears of radicalism following World War I and the Russian Revolution [6].

Canada similarly implemented restrictive measures, privileging immigrants from Britain and Northwestern Europe, while discouraging or outright excluding those from Asia, India, and Africa [7]. Australia adopted its infamous White Australia Policy, formalized by the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901, which used a dictation test to exclude non-European migrants [8].

Immigration During the Great Depression and World War II

The Great Depression of the 1930s saw immigration decline sharply as unemployment soared. States adopted policies prioritizing native-born citizens in the labor market, while refugees fleeing fascism in Europe found few nations willing to admit them. The tragic voyage of the *SS St. Louis* in 1939—carrying Jewish refugees turned away from Cuba, the United States, and Canada—symbolized the deadly consequences of restrictive policies during humanitarian crises [9].

World War II reshaped immigration in complex ways. On one hand, Japanese and other Asian immigrants faced internment, deportation, and surveillance under national security measures. On the other, wartime labor shortages spurred new policies like the Bracero Program (1942–1964) in the United States, which brought millions of Mexican laborers on temporary contracts. This duality—of exclusion and exploitation—highlighted how immigration policy was often driven by economic imperatives rather than consistent principles [10].

Postwar Immigration: Human Rights and Reconstruction

The aftermath of World War II ushered in profound changes in immigration policy. The horrors of the Holocaust and the displacement of millions of Europeans prompted the creation of international

refugee protections. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1951 Refugee Convention established the right to seek asylum from persecution [11].

In the United States, the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 admitted over 400,000 refugees, primarily from war-torn Europe. Subsequent legislation gradually dismantled racial exclusions: the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 ended Asian exclusion, though it retained restrictive quotas, while the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (Hart-Celler Act) abolished the national origins system altogether, creating a preference system emphasizing family reunification and skilled labor [2].

Canada, too, reformed its immigration policies, replacing overt racial discrimination with a points system in 1967 that assessed applicants based on education, language skills, and labor market demand [7]. Australia dismantled the White Australia Policy in the 1970s, embracing multiculturalism as official policy [8]. These reforms reflected both postwar human rights ideals and the economic needs of expanding industrial societies.

Immigration Policy in the Era of Globalization

From the late 20th century onward, immigration policy became increasingly shaped by globalization, economic restructuring, and geopolitical crises. Advanced economies increasingly relied on migrant workers for both high-skilled and low-wage sectors. In Europe, the guest worker programs of the 1950s and 1960s brought millions of Turks, Italians, and North Africans to work in industries, though these programs often failed to anticipate permanent settlement and integration [12]. In the Persian Gulf states, temporary labor migration from South Asia and Africa expanded dramatically, though migrants were denied rights to citizenship or family reunification [12].

Refugees and Asylum Seekers

The late 20th century saw rising refugee flows from conflicts in Southeast Asia, Central America, the Balkans, and Africa. Western countries resettled hundreds of thousands of Indochinese refugees after the Vietnam War, while others implemented temporary protection measures for displaced populations [13].

At the same time, asylum policies became more restrictive. The 1990s saw growing securitization of borders in Europe and North America, reflecting fears about terrorism, irregular migration, and cultural change [14].

Immigration in the 21st Century: Securitization and Crisis

The attacks of September 11, 2001, marked a watershed moment in immigration policy, particularly in the United States. Immigration enforcement became closely tied to counterterrorism, leading to the expansion of detention, deportation, and surveillance systems [15]. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security and policies like the USA PATRIOT Act underscored the convergence of immigration and security concerns.

In Europe, the 2015 “migrant crisis” brought over a million asylum seekers, primarily from Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq, sparking heated debates about borders, identity, and humanitarian obligations. While Germany and Sweden admitted large numbers, other European states erected fences, tightened asylum rules, and resisted resettlement quotas [16].

In the Americas, Venezuelan displacement since 2015 has produced the largest refugee crisis in Latin America’s history, with over 7 million people fleeing economic collapse and repression. Neighboring countries like Colombia have experimented with expansive inclusion policies, granting temporary protection status to millions [17].

The 21st century has witnessed a surge in populist and nationalist movements that frame immigration as a threat to sovereignty and cultural identity [18, 19]. Events such as Brexit crystallize this

anxieties-driven politics, rooted in resentment against globalism, multicultural elites, and socio-economic inequality [20-22]. In the United States, debates over the border wall and hardline enforcement policies reflect how immigration has become central to the populist political agenda [23, 24]. Meanwhile, across Europe, far-right parties consistently portray migration not only as an economic threat but also as a danger to cultural and national identity [25, 26].

Immigration, and forced migration in particular, have been of great concern to many nations most notably since the inception of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in 1951. As we move forward, our century presents additional challenges. These challenges are currently affecting individuals, communities, and nations. Below, our current climate crisis is examined in relation to immigration and forced migration.

Climate Change and the Future of Immigration Policy

Looking forward, climate change is poised to become a dominant driver of migration. The World Bank [27] projects that over 200 million people may be displaced by 2050 due to sea-level rise, drought, and extreme weather. Yet international refugee law does not currently cover climate-displaced persons, raising urgent policy questions about protection and responsibility-sharing [28].

Climate Crisis Impact on Migration

Research on the impact of the climate crisis on migration is emerging. In the September, 2025 addendum to the International Refugee Assistance Project [29] it was reported that 46% of migrants from Mexico, Central America, and South America seeking US protection experienced an environmental disaster, with 64% of those migrants experiencing more than one disaster. However, it is difficult to ascertain which factors are the main drivers of migration. According to the Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment (March 12, 2024), climate crisis is described as a “threat multiplier” exacerbating the factors that force a migrant to flee their home to seek safety. Because the UNHCR was established to address the needs of those displaced due to war, civil unrest, or persecution, it does not include the causes of migration based on climate crises. This further hampers assessments on drivers of migration. Yet, statistical modeling studies predict an estimate of 62 million adults will be displaced due to climate crises [30].

Climate Change and the Future of Immigration Policy

The future of immigration policy will likely involve balancing humanitarian commitments with pressures for border security, as well as addressing structural inequalities between sending and receiving regions. Historical patterns suggest that while exclusionary policies may arise in times of economic or political crisis, long-term integration and inclusion tend to expand as societies adapt to demographic realities.

The history of immigration policy illustrates the interplay between economic need, national identity, racial ideologies, and human rights. From the outright racial exclusions of the 19th century to the more complex but still restrictive frameworks of the 21st century, immigration has remained a site of tension between openness and control. Understanding this history is essential to grappling with today’s challenges—whether responding to refugee crises, managing labor migration, or preparing for climate displacement. Immigration policy has always been more than a matter of numbers; it is a mirror reflecting societies’ deepest values, fears, and aspirations.

Studies of service providers in Iceland, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States highlight a tension between the pressure for rapid integration and the need to nurture resilience [1, 31, 32]. While some emphasize workforce participation and language acquisition, others recognize that true integration must extend beyond economic metrics to address the psychic wounds of displacement. A German provider

remarked, “We can get someone into a job quickly, but if they are still traumatized, isolated, and fearful, have we really helped them integrate?” [33].

Similar dilemmas are visible in Bangladesh, where the rapid construction of refugee camps for over 900,000 Rohingya provided shelter but left residents with little access to education or sustainable livelihoods. These conditions preserved physical survival but perpetuated dependency and psychological harm [34]. In Lebanon, millions of Syrians live in legal limbo, often without work permits or secure status, producing exclusion and long-term insecurity [35].

If human dignity is subordinated to economic contribution, refugees risk being reduced to labor units rather than being recognized as people with histories and aspirations. By contrast, resilience frameworks restore agency and dignity. They emphasize the social, cultural, and institutional supports that allow displaced persons to recover and belong [36, 37].

Evidence from the Field: Gaps and Opportunities

Persistent gaps in services exacerbate displacement challenges. Refugees frequently receive assistance with housing and orientation but are seldom asked about their emotional well-being. One participant lamented: “*I got help finding a flat, but no one asked me how I was sleeping at night*” [31]. These omissions reflect broader trends: resettlement systems often prioritize visible, procedural outcomes while neglecting unseen wounds.

These challenges are echoed globally: Afghan refugees in Australia have reported poor outcomes in health and schooling where interpreter services were underfunded.

Trauma care illustrates the gap vividly. Clinicians misdiagnose displacement-related distress because they lack migration-specific frameworks. One explained, “I treated her as if she had depression, but her distress came from fearing deportation and missing her children still in Syria” [32]. This pattern mirrors Rohingya women in Cox’s Bazar who exhibit chronic trauma symptoms tied not only to past violence but to ongoing statelessness and uncertainty [38].

Despite these failures, resilience flourishes when people find social anchors. A strengths-based methodology shift in Germany found that refugees draw resilience through cognitive strategies (e.g., positive reframing), community engagement like volunteering, and remaining connected to identity and purpose [36].

Similarly, ecological models point to religiosity, family solidarity, school connectedness, and social support as protective factors across systems [39]. These findings suggest that a resilience approach can reshape services: from meeting outward needs to nurturing inner pathways of healing and growth. In Jordan, Syrian refugee women created informal support networks where caregiving and microfinance initiatives enabled them to regain control of their lives [40]. Such examples illustrate resilience as a collective process, nourished by solidarity and social capital.

Why Forced Migration Affects More Than Migrants

The burdens of displacement extend beyond migrants themselves. Interpreters and providers also report experiencing secondary trauma, often absorbing the suffering of those they serve. As one interpreter explained, “*I carry their pain home with me, and I don’t know what to do with it*” [41].

Communities, too, feel the strain. In Lebanon, Syrian refugees’ limited access to preventive health care has driven greater use of emergency services, overburdening fragile health systems [35]. In Europe, restrictive work policies for asylum seekers perpetuate dependency, fueling resentment and political backlash [42]. By contrast, Canada’s sponsorship model demonstrates that engaging local communities in refugee integration fosters solidarity and reduces xenophobia [43].

Ethical Dimensions of Forced Migration

Ethical frameworks reveal why displacement demands justice-oriented solutions. From a deontological perspective, states and providers are duty-bound to ensure equal care and access. Kant's classic articulation of deontology emphasizes that moral worth is grounded in acting from duty, not from consequences [44, 45]. Contemporary philosophers define deontological ethics as approaches prioritizing duties, rights, and rules over outcomes [46]. Modern textbooks often contrast deontology with consequentialism, showing its application in bioethics, law, and human rights debates [47, 48]. Utilitarian reasoning shows that exclusionary policies generate social harms, while inclusive systems reduce costs and maximize well-being.

Ethical analysis illuminates why resilience-centered refugee support transcends pragmatic policy—it aligns with moral imperatives:

The ethics of care, meanwhile, foreground the relational aspect of justice. As one refugee in Iceland put it, “What helps me most is when someone listens and believes me” [31]. This highlights that ethical refugee policy requires recognition and empathy, not merely efficient service delivery. Refugees in Germany also reported greater well-being when treated with respect by local authorities, illustrating how care itself fosters resilience [36].

Policy as Ethical Signaling

If resettlement policy emphasizes rapid economic assimilation, it implies that cultural difference is problematic. A resilience—and justice—framework, in contrast, normalizes pluralism and rights-based inclusion, establishing norms that uphold all marginalized communities [33].

Cultural Responsiveness as an Ethical Imperative

Providers in U.S. community health centers described cultural competence as critical—but vague and underfunded—and lamented inconsistent interpreter access. One reflected: “When I don’t have an interpreter, I know I’m failing my client. It’s not fair to them, and it’s not ethical practice” [33].

Research further substantiates cultural competence as an equity issue—not a luxury. Culturally competent care improves provider knowledge and patient outcomes, yet refugee populations face distinctive barriers that are poorly defined in existing literature [49]. Effective models include bicultural staff, community engagement, and frameworks like the Purnell Model, which advocates for ethnographic awareness and progressive cultural competence growth [50]. Interprofessional training models and culturally adapted interventions [51, 52] further illustrate how such approaches produce more meaningful engagement with refugee patients.

Trauma Care Informed by Structural Context

Dubus [32] demonstrates how clinicians often misinterpret refugees’ distress: in one case, depressive symptoms arose not from clinical pathology but from fears of deportation and separation from children in Syria (p. 603). This misdiagnosis reflects a broader failure to address political-legal, economic, and social determinants of mental health. Trauma in forced migration involves “triple trauma” phases—pre-flight, flight, and post-flight stressors—that intersect with displacement histories [53], demanding multifaceted, context-sensitive responses [37].

Resilience as Relational and Contextual

Participants engaged in community-building and group initiatives reported renewed strength and purpose. One refugee reflected: “I cannot change my past, but I feel stronger because I now belong to a group that supports me” [32]. These reflections mirror findings that volunteer work, activism, work, and social ties serve as resilience pathways [36]. The relational nature of resilience connects to ecological resilience theories: well-being arises through skillful negotiation and resource navigation across interdependent environments [54].

Forced Migration’s Broader Social Impact

Vicarious Trauma and Systemic Stress

Interpreters and providers often absorb refugees’ stories of trauma without organizational support [41]. Without proper debriefing, supervision, or compensation, such emotional toll diminishes workforce well-being and service integrity—producing cascading failures.

Public Health Implications

Lack of culturally effective care results in untreated physical and mental health needs, increasing emergency service use and public system burden [33]. As such, refugee care is not isolated—it intersects directly with public health, community cohesion, and fiscal sustainability.

Policy Vision: Towards Structural Justice

Achieving justice in forced migration demands integrated policies: Resettlement success should be evaluated not only in terms of employment or housing but also through indicators of resilience such as social connection, dignity, emotional stability, and future orientation [33, 36]. Governments should mandate and fund culturally competent care infrastructure: interpreters, bicultural staff, and training grounded in models like Purnell’s [49, 50].

Trauma care remains a critical gap in refugee services. Clinicians often misinterpret displacement-related distress, mistaking fears of deportation or separation from family for depression [32]. These misdiagnoses underscore the need for trauma-informed approaches that integrate legal, social, and health dimensions simultaneously [37]. Workforce sustainability requires protective systems for interpreters and providers—including supervision and mental health support [41].

Finally, resettlement must be participatory. Community inclusion enhances cohesion and counters xenophobia—building social infrastructure where refugees and hosts thrive together [55].

Forced migration is not merely a logistical challenge; it is a test of justice, an empathy imperative, and a measure of societal values. Cases and testimonials reveal the limitations of current models and the transformative potential of resilience-based, culturally responsive, and trauma-informed interventions. Ethically, such approaches respect dignity, promote well-being, and nurture relational trust. Practically, they stabilize communities, sustain service systems, and affirm inclusive futures. As displacement continues to shape global reality, our response defines not only the fate of refugees—but the kind of world we choose to build.

From Current Crises to Climate Displacement

The lessons of today’s refugee crises foreshadow tomorrow’s climate displacement. The IPCC [56] warns that climate change will be one of the greatest drivers of future forced migration. The World Bank [27] projects up to 216 million internal climate migrants by 2050 in six regions. Already, disasters displaced over 80 million people in 2024 [57].

Case studies reveal what this future may look like. In the Pacific, rising seas have already forced Fiji to relocate villages under its Planned Relocation Guidelines, though many communities resist leaving ancestral lands [58]. Kiribati has purchased land in Fiji as a contingency for future resettlement—an unprecedented act of anticipatory migration planning [59]. In Africa’s Sahel, prolonged droughts have driven rural populations toward cities and across borders, triggering conflict over land and water [60].

Legal gaps loom large. In *Teitiotia v. New Zealand* (2020), the UN Human Rights Committee suggested that returning someone to life-threatening climate conditions could breach the right to life, hinting that non-refoulement obligations may evolve [61]. Regional frameworks such as Africa’s Kampala Convention already cover

disaster displacement, but global refugee law does not. Without reform, most climate-displaced people will remain outside formal protection.

Policy Implications and Pathways Forward

Today's lessons underscore tomorrow's imperatives. Resettlement must be measured not only by employment or housing but by indicators of resilience: social connection, stability, and dignity [33, 36]. Cultural competence and interpreter access are essential to equity [33, 49]. Trauma-informed care must integrate housing, legal security, and family reunification [32, 53].

For climate migration, proactive adaptation is vital. Investments in early-warning systems, resilient infrastructure, and climate-smart livelihoods reduce displacement [27]. When movement occurs, protection must include humanitarian visas, temporary protection regimes, and regional compacts modeled on the EU's Temporary Protection Directive [62].

Planned relocation must be participatory, as shown in Fiji. Communities must shape the process to preserve cultural identity and livelihoods [58]. Finally, responsibility-sharing is indispensable. Wealthier states must provide predictable financing and solidarity mechanisms to avoid leaving vulnerable regions to manage disproportionate burdens alone [63].

Social Work Preparedness for the Climate Crisis

The global climate crisis constitutes not only an environmental phenomenon but also a pressing social justice issue. Extreme weather events, food and housing insecurity, population displacement, and mental health impacts underscore the social dimensions of climate change [56]. The burdens of these crises fall disproportionately on marginalized communities, including low-income groups, Indigenous peoples, and racialized populations.

Social work, with its holistic orientation toward the person-in-environment and its commitment to human rights, is well-positioned to engage with climate-related social challenges. This article examines how social workers' training, skills, and knowledge make them effective agents in managing the social welfare of individuals and communities during the climate crisis.

Eco-Social Work and Climate Justice

Eco-social work has emerged as a subfield that emphasizes the interdependence of ecological sustainability and human well-being [64]. Scholars argue that environmental crises exacerbate preexisting social inequalities, requiring professions like social work to integrate ecological awareness into practice. Social work's ethical frameworks, such as the Global Agenda for Social Work and Social Development, have increasingly highlighted climate justice as integral to professional responsibility [65].

Training for Climate-Responsive Practice

Social work education provides critical preparation for engaging with complex crises. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE, 2020) emphasizes holistic assessment, cultural competence, and systems theory, all of which apply to climate change. Mallon (2021) highlights the integration of climate literacy into curricula, suggesting that eco-social frameworks strengthen social workers' capacity to navigate environmental disruptions while promoting equity and resilience.

Practice Competencies

Social workers are trained in trauma-informed care, crisis intervention, and case management, which are vital in disaster recovery and adaptation. They are also skilled in community organizing and policy advocacy, enabling them to amplify marginalized voices in climate governance [65]. Collectively, these competencies establish the profession as a key actor in advancing social welfare during environmental crises.

Crisis Intervention and Trauma Support

Climate-induced disasters produce acute and long-term psychosocial impacts. Social workers' grounding in trauma-informed care equips them to address post-disaster stress, grief, and displacement trauma. By providing mental health support and facilitating access to resources, they mitigate the human toll of ecological crises.

Community Resilience and Organizing

Building adaptive capacity requires grassroots engagement. Social workers employ community organizing techniques to strengthen local networks, foster mutual aid systems, and promote inclusive resilience strategies. This aligns with the profession's person-in-environment perspective, situating community well-being within broader ecological and social systems.

Policy Engagement and Advocacy

Social workers' commitment to social justice translates into advocacy for equitable climate policies. By engaging in policymaking at local, national, and global levels, practitioners highlight the needs of marginalized populations and challenge structural inequities. Their participation in interdisciplinary climate action reinforces the social dimension of sustainability.

Equity and Anti-Oppressive Practice

Social workers' knowledge of oppression, inequality, and structural violence informs climate justice work. The profession foregrounds the lived experiences of communities most affected by climate change, ensuring interventions do not replicate systemic inequities. This anti-oppressive lens positions social work as a critical actor in shaping inclusive and equitable responses to the climate crisis.

Implications for Social Work

Education

Integrating climate change into social work curricula is essential. Training should emphasize eco-social frameworks, interdisciplinary collaboration, and policy literacy to prepare future practitioners for climate-responsive practice.

Practice

Practitioners should prioritize disaster readiness, trauma-informed care, and community resilience strategies. Expanding the scope of social work to explicitly address environmental justice ensures relevance in a rapidly changing world.

Policy

Social workers must engage in policy advocacy to influence climate adaptation and mitigation strategies. Elevating the voices of vulnerable populations within policy frameworks affirms the profession's ethical mandate to pursue justice and equity.

Conclusion

The climate crisis represents one of the most significant social welfare challenges of the 21st century. Social workers, through their training, practice competencies, and theoretical knowledge, are uniquely equipped to manage its impact on individuals and communities. By integrating trauma-informed care, community resilience, policy advocacy, and equity-focused frameworks, the profession affirms its central role in advancing climate justice. To sustain relevance and effectiveness, social work must continue to evolve, embedding ecological awareness across education, practice, and policy domains.

Forced migration today is a mirror of justice: it reveals how societies value dignity, belonging, and solidarity. Testimonies from refugees, interpreters, and providers highlight the failures of transactional models but also the potential of resilience-centered, culturally responsive, and trauma-informed systems. These same lessons apply to the climate crisis. The Rohingya camps in Bangladesh, Pacific relocation in Fiji and Kiribati, and drought-driven displacement in Africa's Sahel illustrate the urgency of reform.

If states continue to treat migration as a logistical inconvenience, millions more will be consigned to limbo in the decades ahead. But if migration is reframed as both a human right and an adaptation strategy, societies can transform displacement into resilience-building. How governments respond now—to Syrians, Rohingya, Ukrainians, and others—will determine how they respond to tomorrow's climate-displaced populations. The stakes are not limited to refugees: they define the future moral fabric of global society.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Dubus, N. (2018). Integration or building resilience: What should the goal be in refugee resettlement? *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(4), 413–429.
- Ngai, M. M. (2004). *Impossible subjects: Illegal aliens and the making of modern America*. Princeton University Press.
- Gerstle, G. (2021). *The rise and fall of the neoliberal order: America and the world in the free market era*. Oxford University Press.
- Higham, J. (1955). *Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism, 1860–1925*. Rutgers University Press.
- Lee, E. (2003). *At America's gates: Chinese immigration during the exclusion era, 1882–1943*. University of North Carolina Press.
- King, D. S. (2000). *Making Americans: Immigration, race, and the origins of the diverse democracy*. Harvard University Press.
- Knowles, V. (2007). *Strangers at our gates: Canadian immigration and immigration policy, 1540–2006* (Rev. ed.). Dundurn Press.
- Jupp, J. (2002). *From White Australia to Woomera: The story of Australian immigration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Abella, I., & Troper, H. (1982). *None is too many: Canada and the Jews of Europe 1933–1948*. University of Toronto Press.
- Calavita, K. (1992). *Inside the state: The Bracero Program, immigration, and the INS*. Routledge.
- Goodwin-Gill, G. S. (2008). *The refugee in international law* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Castles, S. (2006). Guestworkers in Europe: A resurrection? *International Migration Review*, 40(4), 741–766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2006.00042.x>
- Loescher, G., & Milner, J. (2003). *The politics of protection: The limits of humanitarian action*. Cornell University Press.
- Hollifield, J. F., Martin, P. L., & Orrenius, P. M. (2014). *Controlling immigration: A global perspective* (3rd ed.). Stanford University Press.
- Nguyen, M. T. (2019). The war on immigrants: Securitization, racial governance, and resistance. *Social Justice*, 45(4), 1–23.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2018). A “refugee crisis” unfolding: “Real” events and their interpretation in media and political debates. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(1–2), 198–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1309089>
- Freier, L. F., & Parent, N. (2019). The regional response to the Venezuelan exodus. *Current History*, 118(805), 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1525/curh.2019.118.805.56>
- Migration Policy Institute. (2019). *Populism and immigration policy in the United States and Europe*. Migration Policy Institute. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/Schain-PopulismUSandEurope-Final-Web.pdf>
- Taggart, P. (2023). Identity under attack: Immigration and the populist radical right. In C. R. Kaltwasser, P. Taggart, P. Ochoa Espejo, & P. Ostiguy (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of new populism* (pp. 1–8). Springer. https://link.springer.com/rwe/10.1007/978-981-99-7802-1_248
- Calhoun, C. (2017). *Populism, nationalism and Brexit*. Arizona State University. https://calhoun.faculty.asu.edu/sites/g/files/litvpz3321/files/publications/articles/populism_brexit.pdf
- Eatwell, R., & Goodwin, M. (2018). *National populism: The revolt against liberal democracy*. Penguin.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash. *Faculty Research Working Paper Series, RWP16-026*. Harvard Kennedy School.
- Comparative Migration Studies. (2020). Brexit, Trump, and the shifting politics of populism. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 8(30). <https://comparativemigrationstudies.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40878-020-00208-y>
- Stanford University. (2018). *Global populisms workshop: Immigration and populism*. Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. <https://fsi.stanford.edu/global-populisms/global-populism-workshop-2018>
- Le Monde. (2024, June 8). How the far right envisions Europe. *Le Monde*. https://www.lemonde.fr/en/opinion/article/2024/06/08/how-the-far-right-envisions-europe_6674195_23.html
- Mixed Migration Centre. (2023). *The instrumentalisation of migration in the populist era*. <https://mixedmigration.org/the-instrumentalisation-of-migration-in-the-populist-era/>
- Clement, V., Rigaud, K. K., de Sherbinin, A., Jones, B., Adamo, S., Schewe, J., & Shabahat, E. (2021). *Groundswell Part 2: Acting on internal climate migration*. World Bank.
- McAdam, J. (2020). Protecting people displaced by the impacts of climate change: The UN Human Rights Committee and the principle of non-refoulement. *American Journal of International Law*, 114(4), 708–725. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ajil.2020.31>
- International Refugee Assistance Project (2024). Enduring Change: a data review of firsthand accounts of climate mobility impacts. Retrieved from: <https://refugeerights.org/news-resources/enduring-change-a-data-review-of-firsthand-accounts-of-climate-mobility-impacts>
- Burzynski, M., Docquier, F., Deuster, C., & de Melo, J. (2022). Climate Change, Inequality, and Human Migration. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 20(3), 1145–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvab054>
- Dubus, N. (2020). Trauma care for forced migrants. *Trauma Care*, 2(4), 600–610.
- Dubus, N. (2022). Resiliency with forced migrants: A qualitative study of providers and forced migrants through a resilience perspective. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(2), 27.
- Dubus, N., & Davis, A. (2018). Culturally effective practice with refugees in community health centers: An exploratory study. *Advances in Social Work*, 18(3), 874–886.
- UNHCR. (2025a). Global trends: Forced displacement 2025.
- Fouad, F. M., Sparrow, A., Tarakji, A., Alameddine, M., El-Jardali, F., Coutts, A., Abbata, A. (2019). Health workers and the weaponisation of health care in Syria. *The Lancet*, 390(10111), 2516–2526.
- Walther, L., Amann, J., Flick, U., Ta, T. M. T., Bajbouj, M., & Hahn, E. (2021). A qualitative study on resilience in adult refugees in Germany. *BMC Public Health*, 21, 828.
- Simich, L., & Andermann, L. (2014). *Refuge and resilience: Promoting resilience and mental health among resettled refugees*. Springer.
- Riley, A., Varner, A., Ventevogel, P., Taimur Hasan, M. M., & Welton-Mitchell, C. (2017). Daily stressors, trauma exposure, and mental health among Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 54(3), 304–331.

39. Fritz, H., & Masarik, A. S. (2020). *An illustrative review of protective factors that foster resilience among refugee populations*. Boise State University.
40. Doocy, S., Lyles, E., Akhu-Zaheya, L., Burton, A., & Burnham, G. (2019). Health service access and utilization among Syrian refugees in Jordan. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 18(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-019-1026-0>
41. Dubus, N., & LeBoeuf, H. S. (2019). A qualitative study of the perceived effectiveness of refugee services among consumers, providers, and interpreters. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 56(5), 827–844.
42. Betts, A., & Collier, P. (2017). *Refuge: Transforming a broken refugee system*. Allen Lane.
43. Labman, S. (2016). Private sponsorship: Complementary or conflicting interests? *Refuge*, 32(2), 67–80.
44. Kant, I. (1991). *The metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1797)
45. Kant, I. (1996). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)
46. Alexander, L., & Moore, M. (2020). Deontological ethics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Fall 2020 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/>
47. Shafer-Landau, R. (2021). *The fundamentals of ethics* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
48. Waller, B. N. (2019). *Ethics: A pluralistic approach to moral theory* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
49. Lau, L. S., & Rodgers, G. (2021). Cultural competence in refugee service settings: A scoping review. *Health Equity*, 5(1), 124–134.
50. Purnell, L. (2002). The Purnell Model for cultural competence. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 13(3), 193–196.
51. Theodosopoulos, L., Fradelos, E. C., Panagiotou, A., Dreliozi, A., Tzavella, F., (2024). Delivering Culturally Competent Care to Migrants by Healthcare Personnel: A Crucial Aspect of Delivering Culturally Sensitive Care. *Social Sciences*, 13(10). DOI:10.3390/socsci13100530
52. Sossou, M. A., Craig, C. D., Ogren, H., & Schnak, M. (2008). A qualitative study of resilience factors of Bosnian refugee women resettled in the southern United States. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 17(4), 365–385.
53. Kirmayer, L. J., Narasiah, L., Munoz, M., Rashid, M., Ryder, A. G., Guzder, J., Hassan, G., Rousseau, C., & Pottie, K. (2011). Common mental health problems in immigrants and refugees: General approach in primary care. *CMAJ*, 183(12), E959–E967.
54. Ungar, M. (2012). *The social ecology of resilience: A handbook of theory and practice*. Springer.
55. Khalili, M. (2012). Former refugees and community resilience. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53(3), 401–418.
56. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *AR6 Synthesis Report*.
57. IDMC, & IOM. (2025). *Global Report on Internal Displacement 2025* (GRID 2025).
58. McMichael, C., Katonivualiku, M., & Powell, T. (2021). Planned relocation and everyday agency in Fiji. *Climate and Development*, 13(8), 693–702.
59. Campbell, J. R., & Warrick, O. (2014). *Climate change and migration issues in the Pacific*. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
60. Rigaud, K. K., de Sherbinin, A., Jones, B., Bergmann, J., Clement, V., Ober, K., Midgley, A. (2018). *Groundswell: Preparing for internal climate migration*. World Bank.
61. UN Human Rights Committee (UNHCR). (2020). Views adopted by the Committee under article 5 (4) of the Optional Protocol, concerning communication No. 2728/2016 (*Ioane Teitiota v. New Zealand*).
62. European Commission. (2024). *Temporary protection for people fleeing Ukraine*.
63. Platform on Disaster Displacement. (2019). *Strategic Framework 2019–2022*.
64. Besthorn, F. (2012). Vertical Farming Social Work and Sustainable Urban Agriculture in an Age of Global Food Crises. *Australian Social Work*, 66, 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2012.716448>
65. Dominelli, L., (2018). Personal reflections on 30 years of social work development in China. *China Journal of Social Work*, 13(1):18. DOI:10.1080/17525098.2020.1756209