Objective and subjective difficulties in returning to the country of origin in case of refugees and other forcibly displaced persons, under the prism of different periods of time
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Abstract.
Integration and social inclusion policy appear to face various difficulties, in case of migrants, refugees, other forcibly displaced persons. It usually depends on various social, national, cultural and religious biases, prejudices, personal or interpersonal limitations that are shared either in the frame of receiving society or in one of the refugee seekers. Moreover, because of aforementioned features the integration policy works either properly and successfully or fails. Therefore, we can see brilliantly integrated individuals, who restore their level of personal, financial and social independence even while being a refugee and ones, who suffer from not being able to do this even after a long period of time. Anyway, the refugee seekers are legally treated as individuals, who will potentially stay on the territory of the receiving country during a limited period of time (thus, the necessary time, until the optimal conditions of well-being and welfare in their country of origin will not be properly restored). However, as the time passes by, the primary desire to be back home and reintegrate to the primary society decreases until the full elimination. And this tendency appear not be anyhow dependent both on difficulties that the refugee seekers face during integration and social inclusion periods and other factors as well. In our current research we have postulated objective and subjective difficulties of the fact, why the tendency of returning to the home land decreases with the time, and how the integration policy shall be changed to allow the most optimal level of social inclusion of new comers who potentially will become permanent foreign nationals staying abroad.
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Research results. The issue of temporary and permanent stay of refugees on the territory of receiving countries, in particular, on the territory of the EU, is directly related to subsequent procedure of returning and reintegration of aforementioned persons, once the “critical condition” in the home country ceases to exist. It means that currently existing procedure of integration of refugees and other forcibly displaced persons on the territory of the EU, including allowing access to labour market, free of charge integration language courses, professional courses to obtain additional qualifications in the aim of gaining better job opportunities, open access to educational system of a given country etc., ensures neither necessity, nor actual right for refugees to remain on the territory of a receiving country once special conditions in his/her homeland will be ended. Thus, the receiving country is a literally “temporary refuge”, regardless all optimal and successful tools of social inclusion and integration policy we may potentially emphasize here.

Basically, the procedure of refugee seeking legally appears to function as follows: a person, who is in need of fleeing from his/her home city (or country) as a result of ongoing war/armed conflict/economical and/or political instabilities, which may lead for this person to serious human rights violation, including torture, and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, flagrant denial of the right to a fair trial, risks of violations of the rights to life, integrity and/or freedom of the person, serious forms of sexual and gender-based violence, death penalty or death row, female genital mutilations etc., possesses a right to seek a refuge in a safe place, either on the territory of another region of his/her home country (by obtaining a status of internally displaced person) or on the territory of another country (by becoming a forcibly displaced persons (therefore, externally displaced one) and obtaining either international protection or a refugee status. A place of refuge, an accepting country provides appropriate legal, social and medical guarantees to refugees in the aim of ensuring a necessary level of medical service, legal support in the procedures of applying and obtaining either status of refugee or a person under international protection; children and
adolescents receives obligatory schooling, as well as language courses are traditionally provided to all persons in need, as a language spoken in a given country plays a crucial role in the process of integration and social inclusion.

All measures, that were mentioned above are dedicated to complete numerous social goals:

- Refugees and all forcibly displaced persons, are ones who naturally suffer from PTSD, anxiety, depression and so-called refugee syndrome, which may include as homesickness of various level of severity, as well as multiple health related disorders based on traumatic experience, which has taken place. Because of this, newcomers in need are, first of all, provided with necessary medical, psychological and social support in the aim of not feeling “acute separation” from the receiving society;

- Most of refugees, including children and adolescents bring a significant potential of creativity and intelligence, which, under a condition of an appropriate governmental support of the receiving country, may be introduced and implemented into a new society. Traditionally, all people, who were forcibly displaced abroad because of war, armed conflicts and other political/economical and social instabilities that we have mentioned before, are ready to support the receiving society in any possible way. On the other hand, language barriers, “feeling of stranger”, refugee syndrome may make a negative impact on their desire to disclose their bright ideas. Therefore, appropriate social support gives all newcomers in need a necessary hand of help on their way of social inclusion in the new society;

- The more appropriate social inclusion and integration policy will be introduced to refugees and other forcibly displaced persons, the less passive financial support they will need on the first stages of their new life, therefore, the faster they will be able to become a part of a labour (thus, socially active) market of a given society. It is quite visible on example of Ukrainian refugees on the territory of the EU countries, who have started from basic passive financial support from the governments in the given countries (even though not people applied for the support and, therefore, not all of them received it), after 4-5 months of staying abroad in the status of refugees or persons under
international protection, around 73% of Ukrainians either got their full-time job or founded their own business in a receiving country. It demonstrates clearly a level of effectiveness of the integration and social inclusion policy, which is being introduced currently on the territory of the EU. Thus, regardless being newcomers and Fresh off Boats (F.O.B.s) abroad, these people do not only stop being financial and social burdens for the State, but also introduces their own physical, mental and creative potential in the life of the receiving society. Therefore, a given country gets not only employees, but also entrepreneurs, scientific workers, researchers, sportsmen and, eventually, more people paying taxes and other obligatory fees together with their significant social, cultural and mental impact of life of a given society.

On the other hand, not all forcibly displaced persons, including refugees or ones seeking for international protection, appear to be almost immediately successfully socially included and integrated particularly in the EU society. There are numerous people, struggling from currently active social prejudices, biases, significant cultural and religious differences that may not be overcome, at least, in the frame of generations of newcomers. In case of refugees from Middle Asia, African continent and others, it appears to be more probable that their children will be completely integrated in the European society and will never face any kind of social and/or moral differences because of being brought up on European values and postulates of equality, non-discrimination and tolerance.

While we are analyzing both groups of adult refugees/forcibly displaced persons, despite proper or improper outcome of integration and social inclusion policy in every given case, even if the complete social inclusion and integration appear to be impossible due to multiple differences that were mentioned above, all groups of newcomers, who arrived on the territory of receiving countries because of critical conditions in their homeland as it was postulated on the very beginning of our discussion, all those people regardless their sometimes full immersion into a life of a new society face the same life-changing perspective, the one, which literally will reverse their situation once again. Namely, the
necessity/ability/possibility to return to their homeland.

On the current stage of our research results discussion we may emphasize crucial differences between migrants and refugees/forcibly displaced persons. The first of group of newcomers, thus, choose voluntarily to change the country of their permanent stay seeking for better living, occupational and self-development opportunities. Sometimes, the educational possibilities or only private goals may also make an impact into an aforementioned decision. Anyway, once the choice is made, the reverse to the past situation is less probable, because the individual does something, what he/she actually desires. In case of refugees and/or generally forcibly displaced persons, we cannot talk about directly voluntarily decision to change a place of their permanent stay. It is rather a forced solution to protect one’s life, health, social, humanitarian and civil rights, in case of outer danger of any kind. Children’s well-being and welfare also become a corner stone in choosing between remaining in the country, which faces life threatening danger or fleeing abroad seeking a temporarily refuge. Thus, we cannot describe this kind of solution as a voluntary one, rather an objective voluntary desire to flee for personal life, safety and sometimes freedom.

Therefore, if in case of migrants their future life goals and plans are naturally tightly connected with a receiving society in a long lasting perspective, refugees and other forcibly displaced persons dominantly postulate returning and reintegration into their home society, once it will be safe and adapted for appropriate level of well-being. Therefore, the refuge is being treated both by governmental institutions and refugee seekers as a temporarily remedy for critical conditions that people were forced to face as a result of instabilities, which take place in their home country. Temporary solution hereby also means that regardless level of social inclusion and integration among forcibly displaced persons, they are mostly still seeking for an opportunity to be back home, despite level of comfort, financial and social security they have obtained in the receiving country. And the aforementioned tendencies are typical as for forcibly displaced persons who have been perfectly integrated in the shortest period of time (as Ukrainians), and those, who may
suffer difficulties directly after arrival and through longer period of time afterwards as well (as refugees from African countries). The analyzed data basically appears as follows: (Diagram 1, Diagram 2).

Diagram 1
Data on refugees/forcibly displaced persons from the Middle East countries as well as African continent and their wishes either to remain on the territory of the receiving country or not, during the first 5 years of stay in the country of a refuge.

- People, who postulate their desire to be back home
- People, who are ready to remain on the territory of the receiving country forever, in case of possibility

55% 45%

Diagram 2
Data on Ukrainians, who received either refugee status or status of a person under international protection, once the full-scale war as a result of Russian aggression on Ukrainian territory on February 24, 2022, took place. The aforementioned data present the period of time since 2022 accordingly.

- People, expressing their desire to be back home, once the war will end
- People who express their desire to remain on the territory of the receiving country forever, in case of possibility

35% 65%
Thus, we can clearly emphasize that despite differences in financial, education and other potentials that were being brought to the receiving countries by refugees/forcibly displaced persons themselves, as well as regardless subjective simplicity or, oppositely, challenge, that each of individuals may face on their integration and social inclusion road, all representatives of both groups dominantly declare a desire to be back home, therefore, to return and to reintegrate to initial society.

At the same time, once we decide to compare data obtained by social survey led among people with refugee/forcibly displaced persons backgrounds, who have experience of staying in a refugee for more than 5 years (e.g. Ukrainians, who were forcibly displaced from Ukrainian territory in 2014, once the first stage of full-scale war initiated by Russia took place, or refugees/forcibly displaced persons from Middle East countries and/or African continent, who arrived to the territory of the EU in particular more than 5 years ago), the indicators appear to be drastically different. (Diagram 3).
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**Diagram 3**

Data on wishes and perspectives of future permanent stay of refugees/forcibly displaced persons from the Middle East Countries, countries of African continent and Ukraine, since 2014 up to 2023.
Thus, according to the data which was postulated above, regardless level of success of possible social and cultural integration and inclusion into the European society, the longer period of time passes by for refugees being on the territory of receiving country, the lesser becomes a desire to potentially turn back home and reintegrate to their primary society.

It is necessary to mention here, that the right to return to the country of origin always remain an inviolable right of every individual seeking for a refuge and/or international protection, particularly, on the territory of the EU. Therefore, any kind of person possessing the aforementioned special status may decide to turn back home and do it on the basis of his/her own free will, without any potential limitations from the side of governmental institutions in the receiving country. Moreover, the idea of returning and reintegration of refugees and people under the international protection to a primary society, once the critical condition in their homeland will be ceased, postulates an ideal solution/final for every single forcibly displaced person’s case, according to the European Union legislation in the analyzed sphere [7]. At the same time, decision on returning constitutes a right and potential free possibility, especially, if we are talking about returning to countries which still remain in an unstable economical, political or social situation, are in the process of ongoing full-scale war and/or armed conflict etc. Because, what is important, under international human rights law, the principle of non-refoulement guarantees that no one should be returned to a country where they would face torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and other irreparable harm. This principle applies to all migrants at all times, irrespective of migration status. The principle of non-refoulement forms an essential protection under international human rights, refugee, humanitarian and customary law. It prohibits States from transferring or removing individuals from their jurisdiction or effective control when there are substantial grounds for believing that the person would be at risk of irreparable harm upon return, including persecution, torture, ill-treatment or other serious human rights
violations. Under international human rights law the prohibition of refoulement is explicitly included in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT) and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (ICPPED). The prohibition of refoulement under international human rights law applies to any form of removal or transfer of persons, regardless of their status, where there are substantial grounds for believing that the returnee would be at risk of irreparable harm upon return on account of torture, ill-treatment or other serious breaches of human rights obligations. As an inherent element of the prohibition of torture and other forms of ill-treatment, the principle of non-refoulement is characterized by its absolute nature without any exception. In this respect, the scope of this principle under relevant human rights law treaties is broader than that contained in international refugee law. The prohibition applies to all persons, irrespective of their citizenship, nationality, statelessness, or migration status, and it applies wherever a State exercises jurisdiction or effective control, even when outside of that State’s territory [6]. Therefore, until the situation in the home country of refugees/forcibly displaced persons, or even the ones, who have not obtained a properly regulated status of a person under protection is optimized, the individual cannot be forcibly returned home and, therefore, cannot face an expulsion from the receiving country. Thus, the returning back home, alongside with reintegration to a primary society basically postulates the right, but not a necessity/obligation for any refugee seeker.

However, as the aforementioned situation appears to be logical and comprehensible, because people seeking for a refuge will not rather look for opportunities to be back to the dangerous territory no matter what, (however, last two year have clearly presented numerous exceptions from the aforementioned logical rule), once the situation in the primary country is balanced, numerous refugees, asylum seekers, forcibly displaced persons, individuals under international protection decide to remain on the territory of the receiving country according to the tendency, which we
have disclosed in the Diagram 3. Therefore, every year, over 300,000 foreign nationals are ordered to leave the EU, however, only around 21% of them return back to their home country or to the country from which they travelled to the EU [7].

Thus, what reasons make refugee seekers change their primary desire to turn back home into the desire to life permanently on the territory of the receiving countries? We will emphasize the most important of them, which we were able to obtain in the process of our social review in the frame of our current research:

- “Syndrome of traitor” - a phenomenon, which we shall critically observe and seriously take into account. Regardless the basic subconscious desire of every human being to protect his/her life, health and dignity from any danger, which is approaching, the longer refugee remains abroad (while the danger in his/her home country takes place), the bigger amount of people, who did not want or were not able to flee abroad will treat him as a traitor of a homeland. What is really important, (the practice of Ukrainian refugees on the territory of the EU countries discloses it clearly), it does not matter, whether this individual sustains his/her home country financially from the distance or not (he/she may work and donate appropriate sum of money for protection and well-being of his/her country, however, in case of staying in the home country he/she may not have had such an opportunity), regardless voluntary service for his/her local community including his/her compatriots abroad, he/she will not be excluded from the possibility to be socially treated as a traitor. Sometimes, however, it is a dominant personal subconscious fear, which does not have necessarily depend on social opinion as it is, but may be a personal stopping factor for a refugee, working as a so-called “voice of subconsciousness”;

- Individuals, who are seeking refugee abroad traditionally face property losses on the territory of their home land. Sometimes, it comes also along with loss in job opportunities and other possible material possessions. Therefore, they do not have literally “where to go back”. The longer situation of instability in the country of origin takes
place, the higher appears a level of possibility of such a loss because of numerous factors;

- Once the person gains social connections with a receiving country (job opportunities, friendship, relationships with a local partner, social, financial and mental stability), the opportunity to turn back home appears to be difficult because of a primary necessity to pose all stability under a danger and insecurity. This condition of insecurity is not directly connected with the decision to turn back to the state of origin literally, but with the decision to interrupt stable connections, that were so difficult to restore. Therefore, the longer persons stays abroad, the more stable his/her financial, well-being/mental and social situation appears to be;

- The Healing Amnesia [4] protects mentally vulnerable people suffering from traumatic experiences of the past from all possible negative consequences of those experiences. Once the person turns back to the territory, where he/she has faced life threatening danger, the healing amnesia may be ceased and person will experience every kind of mental trauma once again and, most probably, will continue experiencing it throughout his/her whole life. Moreover, turning back to the country of origin will be tightly connected with negative flashback for these people, which will unable any kind of successful reintegration and reintroduction to their primary society, as the individuals will most probably suffer from mental disorders caused by all consequences of the traumatic experience that were ceased by healing amnesia;

- Every war, armed conflict, economical/political/social instability leads to an increased level of confirmed interpersonal violence, including domestic, sexual and gender-based ones. All people understand it subconsciously and it is absolutely objective and situationally comprehensible factor connected with turning back from the situation of insecurity and life-threatening to the after-fear reality, where “the weakest representatives may refund the fear of the strongest ones”. Economical instabilities, job and property losses also cause the impoverishment of the local society, what will make people with a stable income and financial opportunities the most vulnerable social groups;
- Adults rather tend to give children the most “secure” and proper opportunities in case of instability. If the situation of potential insecurity and instability appears, founded by life-threatening situation in the country of origin, parents try to protect their children permanently and to separate them from future possible dangerous flashbacks. Therefore, parents traditionally decide to remain on the territory of the receiving country to provide secure and appropriate future with necessary level of stability, well-being and welfare for their children;

- Regardless successful or less successful integration or social inclusion policy, the more years are passing by, the more profound interpersonal and personal boundaries are being built between the individual and receiving country. What is really crucial to mention here, it is not necessary that person losses everything in his/her country of origin, whether he/she has relatives there and/or bright professional future or not, the links that are being built on the territory of a new country naturally eliminates an opportunity to come back home in most of refugee cases.

The catalogue, which we have mentioned above cannot be exhaustive. However, the most important reasons of non-returning and non reintegration are definitely presented. Thus, we shall primary understand that every temporary displaced refugee case potentially may (or rather will) appear to be a permanent foreign national (equal to migrant), enjoying the same level of rights and seeking the same level of long term opportunities as the other newcomers. As the history and international policy tends to show, the wars, armed conflicts, political/economical/social and other instabilities are not being solved during less than 5 or even 10 years. Most of them develop into long lasting or so-called “frozen conflicts and/or instabilities”, unable to be resolved in any visible perspective of time. Therefore, every integration and social inclusion policy shall always take into account this fact of “easily changing status” of temporary stay into permanent one perspective in case of refugees and other forcibly displaced persons, and to optimize the integration policy accordingly.

Conclusions.

1. The integration and social inclusion policy includes
numerous stages that provide medical, social, legal and other services to migrants, refugees and other forcibly displaced persons, including ones seeking for international protection status. All people in need receive schooling and linguistic opportunities, appropriate integration courses, access to the labour market and other tools to lead their life in a refugee with dignity and on the necessary level of a welfare.

2. Tendencies to be or not to be socially included and integrated into the EU society in particular depend on various factors. Traditionally, we name here social, cultural and religious prejudices, biases, personal limitations either of the society representatives or refuge seekers on their way to complete social inclusion.

3. There are numerous cases, when among refuge seekers only the following generations appear to be perfectly adapted and integrated into the EU society, while a generation of a “properly refuge seekers” declare to live “on the border of two worlds” unable to totally accept tendencies and social policies of the EU.

4. Regardless level of social inclusion and integration, representatives of all countries, cultures, nationalities and religions that are currently presented on the territory of the EU among refuge seekers, appear to disclose the same level of desire to return and be reintegrated to their primary society, once the critical conditions in their home country will be ceased, as in case of ones remaining in the receiving countries for the period of time up to 5 years, as for ones, who live on the EU territory longer than 5-10 years. Alongside with a similar tendency, the change of desire to turn back is drastic.

5. There are multiple reasons of changing the desire to turn back and reintegrate into the home society of a refugee/forcibly displaced person after 5-10 years of staying abroad in the receiving countries. Numerous of them, but not an exhaustive catalogue certainly, were presented in the frame of our current research.
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