Article

Current Sociology Monograph
2018, Vol. 66(2) 167–191

DOI: 10.1177/0011392117736302
journals.sagepub.com/home/csi

Migration, migrants, and human security

Bandana Purkayastha
University of Connecticut, USA

Abstract

This introductory article outlines a framework to bridge some of the current fragmentation and knowledge hierarchies in the sociological field of migration. The article builds on the insights – and epistemological roots – used in different parts of the world to reflect on 21st-century realities of migration and human security. It considers international migrants, internally displaced persons, refugees and trafficked persons as part of a continuum of migrants who exhibit seasonal, temporary and long-term migration patterns. The framework draws upon the scholarship of the Global South and North on political-economic processes that have historically influenced migration and migrants' lives and continue to do so today. It considers the dominant approach used in studies of international migration and shows why it is necessary to go beyond the focus on nation-states and an emphasis on a particular group of migrants. The framework weaves the insights of scholars who work on international, internal migration and forced migration, as well as the critical literatures on intersectionality and human rights to build an approach that centers questions of migrants' human security. The framework emphasizes the glocal – i.e. intersecting global-national-local – terrains of migration and discusses human security within glocal terrains.

Keywords

Forced migration, glocal terrain, human rights, human security, internal migration, international migration, migrants' knowledge hierarchies

Introduction

Over the last few years, headline news and social media around the world have featured men, women and children who were fleeing large-scale violence, disasters and loss of

Corresponding author:
Bandana Purkayastha, University of Connecticut, Manchester Hall, Storrs, CT 06269-1068, USA.
Email: Bandana.Purkayastha@uconn.edu

prospects of livelihood. Their search for safer havens has been interrupted by expanding terrains of state security initiatives on land and sea to prevent migrants from reaching their territories, incarceration in detention camps within and across nation-states, and the growth of human smuggling rings that fail to deliver on promises to move people safely. According to the estimates by the United Nations, 65.3 million people had fled, or had been forced off their homelands by the end of 2015 (UNHCR, 2016a), and deserts and seas are littered with the bodies of those who perished trying to reach safe havens in recent years (*New York Times*, 2015). Recent global headlines also highlight a series of additional political efforts to control migration to the US, UK, EU and other countries.

While there are many diverse scholarly conversations on migration and migrants in the Global North and South,[1] the dominant sociological conversations[2] on migration continue to focus on international migrants' and their integration within nation-states. This monograph issue attempts to bridge the fragmented conversations and knowledge hierarchies on migration and migrants and highlight some of the contours of contemporary contexts of migration. Bringing an awareness of the political-economic-social processes that shape migration and migrants' lives, the insights from the scholarship on forced migration, and the critical literatures on intersectionality and human rights, this monograph issue emphasizes the glocal, i.e. intersecting global-national-local – terrains of migration and the human security of migrants. The articles draw upon the insights – and epistemological roots – used in different parts of the world to reflect on 21st-century realities of migration and human security.

This framework builds upon three key realities. First, neither nation-states nor migrants' lives are now contained within the territorial boundaries of nation-states. With the rapid improvement in communication technology,[3] many aspects of migrants' lives are organized in virtual spaces and range through multiple countries depending on their networks. These aspects of their lives are part of, not apart from, their lives in tangible geographic (local, national and transnational) spaces. At the same time, powerful nation-states, and many other actors including global security regimes, operate transnationally to track migrants across tangible and virtual spaces.[4] Many nation-states reach out to 'their people' offering access to resources in the 'home country' via dual citizenships or overseas citizenships. These transnational actions intersect with the national, regional and local dynamics that impede or facilitate different types of migration.

Second, if we look across the different conversations on migration in the Global North and South, scholars have identified many actors that shape migrants' lives prior to, during, and after migration in the contemporary world. While nation-states and states' migration-regimes remain critically important for understanding migration, international organizations such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, labor brokers, traffickers, smugglers, purveyors of violence, as well as humanitarian and aid agencies are involved in shaping terrains of migration. States are shaped by powerful political-economic interests that push them to balance the needs for cheaper labor with their powerful groups' interests to maintain their hegemony. Migration streams and migrants' lives emerge through these contradictory and coalescing forces.

Third, along with considering the intersecting social structures that shape processes of migration and migrants' lives *within* nation-states, in the last decade, many scholars have begun to use the language and framework of human rights – including the human right

of people to move – to delineate the structures that affect different types of migrants. Here, I argue that the human rights approach, and the implicit assumption about the role and ability of nation-states to ensure these rights, is no longer sufficient to understand the structures that substantively enable and impede migrants to fulfill their quest for secure lives. Hence it is important to understand migration and migrants in terms of human security in the expanded glocal contexts shaped by many actors.

The human security framework includes the objectives of the human rights charters and conventions and re-centers the focus on migrants' experiences within terrains of migration that are not confined to the territorial limits of nation-states. By focusing on human security, the issues of migrants' survival, their ability to access resources and opportunities to build lives of human dignity, and the socio-economic and political conditions that promote or impede their well-being are placed at the center of research. This approach, as I discuss later, can be used to analyze the experiences of a variety of migrants identified in the research in the Global North and South, ranging from those who travel across international boundaries in search of better life conditions to those who are forced to move and/or are trafficked. Focusing on expanded terrains of migration and a focus on different types of migrants offers a way of traversing some of the existing knowledge hierarchies between and within the Global North and South that have lead to the fragmentation of the field of migration. The next sections explain the lens for analyzing actors and structures that affect migration and migrants' access to substantive human rights, including their quest – often unfulfilled – for human security.

Migrations and migrants

Many diverging circles of conversations now mark studies of migrations and migrants in the Global North and South; these conversations overlap with studies of ethnicities (and the factors that keep migrant groups distinct from mainstreams), studies of diasporas (on issues of multiple migrations and the persistence of ties to symbolic homes) and explorations of citizenships (including the discussions about the nature of rights granted to migrants in exchange for their labor). Other conversations examine forced migrations and the structures of marginalization that shape the migrants' experiences.

Thematically, the global scholarship on migration examines many forms of international, internal, temporary, permanent and cyclical migration. These studies include altered contexts of migration (e.g. Aguilar, 1999; Kofman, 2013; Walsh, 2014), cyber migration (e.g. Aneesh, 2006), demographic characteristics of migrants (e.g. Boyd and Alboim, 2011), historical and contemporary indentured migration (e.g. Adur, 2011; Desai and Vahed, 2010), gendered labor migration (e.g. Bhatt, 2009; Kofman, 2013, 2014; Ueno, 2010), global care chains (e.g. Raghuram, 2012), internal migration (e.g. Abby and Mahamoud, 2005), marriage migration (e.g. Constable, 2003; Davin, 2007; Kang, 2011; Kim, 2015; Tyldom, 2013; Yeoh et al., 2013), migrant rights (e.g. Choo, 2013), return migration (e.g. Jain, 2013; Xiang, 2004; Xiang et al., 2013), seasonal migration (e.g. Korra, 2011; Mendiburo, 2015), settlement patterns, intergenerational integration and segmented assimilation of migrants within nation-states (e.g. Alba and Nee, 1997; Portes et al., 2005; Zhou, 1997) and students' migration (e.g. Fielding, 2015). A particularly robust conversation focuses on forced migration and trafficking in humans

enmeshed within powerful and often violent global political-economic forces, for instance, Abby and Mahamoud (2005) on displaced persons in Somalia, Baruah (2003) on displacements in North East India, Giri (2005) on Bhutanese women and children refugees, Grabska (2008) on refugees in Egypt, Hanafi and Long (2008) on Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, Majumdar et al. (2015) on the Rohingyas, Muggah (2017) on Latin American forced migration, Ray (2017) on Burmese refugees, Sanyal (2014) on urbanizing refugees, and Yousaf and Purkayastha (2015) on trafficking in Pakistan.

Constellations of scholarship have examined these different types of migration and the structural conditions in which migrants are enmeshed prior to, during, and after migration. At the heart of these conversations are theoretical and methodological questions about appropriate frameworks to analyze the causes and consequences of migration. These conversations are not clearly separable as scholarship of the Global North and South, but the *dominant* approach emanating from the Global North – and used in parts of the Global South – reflects an overarching concern about migrants who cross nation-states' boundaries. In this formulation, migrants are mostly assumed to move from less developed, less modern parts of the world to modern, developed nation-states of the North. The indicators of assimilation and integration originate from these assumptions and focus mostly on the record of migrants' efforts to integrate (e.g. Alba and Nee, 1997; Portes et al., 2005).

However, this dominant stream of migration research in the Global North, as well as the mobilities framework that has developed over the last two decades (see Sheller [2017] for an overview), coexists with significant critiques by scholars who point to the failure of these frameworks to consider the gendered, racialized, sexualized structures and processes through which migrants' movements, rights and freedoms are curtailed (e.g. Aranda and Vaquera, 2015; Asencio, 2009; Das Gupta, 2008; Glenn, 2002; Golash-Boza, 2011; Kibria, 2002; Kofman, 2013; Kurien, 2007; Ortiz and Pombo, 2014; Purkayastha, 2005). For instance, in contrast to those who study assimilation in the USA, other American sociologists have examined migration through the lens of racism and genders. They have documented the creation and maintenance of hierarchies between migrants and natives, the continuing relevance of understanding earlier migration streams, especially the conditions that enslaved people, the internments, forced repatriation of migrants from Africa, Asia and Latin America, as well as the internal migration of settler colonialist 'natives' and forced removal of indigenous populations to accommodate these settlers (e.g. Das Gupta, 2008; Glenn, 2015; Golash-Boza, 2011; Selod and Garner, 2015; Weglyn, 1976). A focus on the varieties of female migrants – who now make up close to half the world's migrants – uncovers other political-economic-social constraints that shape their experiences (e.g. Abraham, 2000). Recent studies of transnational cultural assemblages, especially the 'soft power' of racism through these assemblages (Patil and Purkayastha, 2017), reveal how mobilities within contemporary dynamic spatio-temporal relations are interrupted and impeded.

These structural impediments migrants face are key to understanding migration and human security. Scholars from different countries (e.g. Dustmann et al., 2016; Giri, 2005; Kang, 2011; Kofman and Raghuram, 2005; Krisjánsdóttir and DeTurk, 2013; Li, 2011; Thomas, 2014; Yuval-Davis et al., 2005) have examined the impact of intersecting structures on migration processes and migrants. Authors have argued that migrants are

relatively privileged or marginalized because of their social location relative to the *intersecting structures* of nationality/gender/class/race/ethnicity/caste/religion/sexuality/age and, consequently, in their ability to move and access substantive rights after internal or international migration. Furthermore, they emphasized that force and violence by the state and other groups within and across nation-states play a crucial role in shaping migration and the continuing insecurities of migrants (Glenn, 2002; Purkayastha and Ratcliff, 2014). Thus, who are likely to access which rights and under which set of circumstances they are able to move and integrate are empirical questions rather than facts that migration scholars can take for granted (e.g. Aguilar, 1999; Bhattacharya et al., 2002; Das Gupta et al., 2010; Espiritu, 2003; Kofman, 2013; Purkayastha, 2012). The emphasis on intersectionality, with its emphasis on analyzing multiple levels of intersecting structures of domination and marginalization, sets this stream of conversation apart from the mobilities approach (see Sheller, 2017; Urry, 2000), which also recognizes the dynamic processes and flows shaping the contemporary world.

Using a theoretical approach that uses intersectionality to analyze migration and migrants' experiences emphasizes questions about the *rights* of different types of migrants and has, inevitably, overlapped with the rapidly growing literature on human rights. While the writing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the middle of the 20th century and subsequent covenants and charters facilitate, in theory, the ability of individuals and collectivities to seek human rights irrespective of the political system in which they are located, there are significant debates about the grounded realities of these rights (e.g. Armaline et al., 2011, 2015; Baxi, 2006; Xiang, 2004). With a focus on human security, this monograph issue draws upon one strand of the conversation: as states, and constellations of states, continue to delink migrants' labor from political and social rights (e.g. Adur, 2011; Walsh, 2014) or offer very limited citizenship-based rights (Aguilar, 1999; Kim, 2015), can we rely on states to uphold the *human* rights of migrants? A particular concern is the failure of the dominant nation-focused migration literature to recognize that other formal bodies of institutionalized authority, such as the United Nations or the World Health Organization, as well as global purveyors of violence such as privatized military groups and criminal gangs, shape migration and the lives of migrants in the 20th and 21st century (Armaline et al., 2015, 2017). To what extent do states resist, cooperate with and/or facilitate the actions of these extra-state entities? Focusing on different types of migrants and their rights raises questions about the complex structural circumstances that enable migrants to build *secure* lives, i.e. lives that are secure from threats 'derived from economic, food, health or environmental security, and threats to personal, community, and political security, or human rights violations' (Tripp et al., 2013: 6).

Since the diverse conversations focus on very different types of migration and migrants it is important to clarify a few of the critiques, concerns, and assumptions about the categories of migration and migrants that are discussed in migration research. Currently, there is a significant bifurcation in the literature between internal and international migration and migrants. The overwhelming focus on international migration as defined in the Global North has led to charges of methodological nationalism by scholars who point out that this dominant focus erases historical and contemporary power relations that shape migration (e.g. Dirlik, 2009; Samaddar, 2015; see also Amelina and

Faist, 2012). Equally important, others who migrate across international boundaries include trafficked persons and refugees (i.e. those who are designated as refugees by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees); these groups are typically studied separately. Similarly, internal migrants include those who are displaced internally, those who are trafficked, and those who move for jobs and better life opportunities. Since many nation-states include significant political/social/cultural diversities, internal migrants can be treated as foreigners in the places where they settle, or are forced to reside, especially if they are marked as linguistic, religious, political, racial, caste or tribal outsiders (see Njiru, this issue). Yet these internal migrant groups are mostly invisible within the overwhelming focus on a particular type of international migrant.

Discussing the need to bridge the divide between internal and international migration, King and Skeldon (2010) have argued that it is often difficult to clearly delineate internal and international migrants; the location and nature of national boundaries change, and migrants themselves might move in ways that blur the boundaries between different types of migration. They argue that creating middle order theories that cover both sets of migrants could be developed based on:

> … the application of a systems approach, originally derived from the study of internal migration, to international migration; the application of integration theory, traditionally applied with international migrants, to internal migrants; and the bringing together of internal and international migration in the debate on migration and development. (King and Skeldon, 2010: 1640)

Their argument provides one path for reconciling a source of fragmentation in the field. However, it is important to examine other, critical perspectives as well. Raghuram (2009) and Yousaf and Purkayastha (2015), among others, have argued that we need to interrogate the West-centric nation–state–modernity–development nexus by placing forced migration and global political-economic structural processes at the center of migration frameworks. A series of publications by the Calcutta Research Group question the ways in which nation-states are taken for granted in the dominant migration literature (MCRG, 2006).[5] As a member of this group, Samaddar (1999) has emphasized that nation-states are relatively new entities within the streams of histories in many parts of the world. He uses the term *transborder* migration to identify the structures that separate migrants from natives politically, socially, economically and culturally. Many of the political borders – internal and international – that currently serve the political needs of nation-states impede long-established channels of seasonal, circular, temporary and long-term migration, or these borders set up groups to become stateless people, as in the case of the Rohingyas (see Majumdar et al., 2015). The maps of the colonial era boundaries of many nation-states in Africa, Asia and Latin America are testimonies to imposed borders. At the same time, continuing colonial relations extend the borders of territories, for instance, the extension of European Union boundaries in the Caribbean, so that people located far away from the contiguous territory of the EU, are drawn into distant systems (Boatca, forthcoming). The politics of borders – and consequently the classification of migrants and natives, issues of settler colonialists and migrants' rights – emerge through these histories.

Heeding the calls to move beyond the dominant frameworks of the Global North,[6] I propose that in order to understand migration more holistically, we conceptualize migrants, and the structures and processes in which they are enmeshed, as though they are arrayed on a continuum: from international migrants (at one end), through internal migrants, refugees, internally displaced persons, and trafficked persons (at the other end). The distinctions between these classifications of migrants are dynamic, with a change in structural circumstances migrants might end up in different categories during their lifetime.[7] These are broad categories, more fine-grained types, such as seasonal, temporary, or circular migration, can be accommodated within this array. It brings into focus conditions prior to, during, and after migration. Who is a migrant and which type of migration describes their journey at any point in time are classifications that reflect worlds of formal policies and laws that govern their moves across borders, their ability to settle, and their access to critical resources that are needed for their survival and well-being. Since the questions of human security – especially the critical issues of survival and well-being – are related to violence (see Abraham and Tastsoglou, 2016), another way of thinking about these different types of migrants is to think about each category relative to their vulnerabilities to violence (German, 2013; Purkayastha and Ratcliff, 2014). While we are able to imagine the violence trafficked persons experience, international (family) migrants experience partner violence (e.g. Abraham, 2000), or violence from hate groups or the state depending on how welcome they are in a particular place (Jani, 2017). As Samaddar has argued, the terrain of internal to international migration does not exist as a benign continuum, instead:

> Studies of hunger in the 19th century, of itinerant movements, transportations of coolies, spread of famines, shipping of children, adult girls, trafficking in sex, labour, and human organs, and welfare legislations to cope with this great infamy tell us how actually we have arrived at our own time of subject formation under the conditions of empire. This is certainly different from the tradition of nation-centred histories. (Samaddar, 2015: 50)

Hence, migrants are conceptualized as a continuum of migrants whose experiences before, during, and after migration within and across countries are important for understanding migration beyond the confines of nation-state-centric frames. While this monograph issue does not resolve all the methodological and theoretical debates surrounding migration and migrants,[8] it responds to the need to bridge some aspects of the contemporary knowledge hierarchies that lead to fragmented theorization of migration. To further elucidate this approach, this monograph emphasizes two interrelated issues: the need to shift the conversation to migration and migrants' experiences within the *glocal* terrains of migration, and the need to investigate migrants' ability to build *secure lives* free of threats to their survival and well-being.

Moving the conversation from nation-states to glocal terrains

While nation-states continue to wield significant power to shape migration flows and migrants' lives, a growing strand of scholarship recognizes the porosity of national

boundaries and the contemporary transnational context produced by flows of people, finances, ideas, media images and technologies (Appadurai, 1990; Urry, 2000) within which migrants build lives across nation-states (e.g. Levitt, 2001; Portes et al., 2005; Vertovec, 1999). The rapid economic development in areas outside the Global North, as well as the ease of movement and communications, has lead to transnational migration, return migration to homelands of origin, as well as circular migrations in earlier and later stages of life (Jain, 2013; UN, 2015; Xiang et al., 2013). Many studies of immigrant transnationalism, developed within the dominant international migration frame, assume that the boundaries of nation-states are sufficiently porous to enable migrants to maintain ties with homelands. Different mechanisms operate – between migrants, communities, institutions – to maintain transnational connections (Faist, 2013; Levitt, 2009). Scholars who are critical of the dominant approach point out that politics and power inequalities between nation-states shape different possibilities and impediments to transnational migration. Many groups of migrants do not enjoy easy passage between nation-states. For instance, Kibria (2011) and Guevarra (2009) have examined the cases of Muslim migrants and Filipina migrants to analyze the global and national structures that interrupt or promote transnationalism for these groups. International migrants also find it hard to maintain ties with family if the host country designates the nation-state-of-origin as politically problematic and maintaining ties to people in those places as suspicious-anti-national-practice (also see Purkayastha, 2005). Analyses of forced migration reveal other significant impediments to building transnational lives. In sum, a focus on the array of migrants reveals different ways in which migrants have to contend with dynamic structures of a transnational context, including the transnational structures that remain less visible in the shaping of everyday lives.

Samaddar (2008) and Dirlik (2005), among others, point out that nation-states in the Global North have relied on streams of immigration and emigration for their development. At the same time, these nation-states were organized to uphold the hegemony of dominant groups within the nation-states and global empires. International and internal migrants were essential to this scheme of nation-hood in order to define a nation's identity and its borders. Focusing on the ways in which these hierarchies were embedded within nations, some scholars argued that these earlier streams of European-origin settler colonialists in the United States or Australia benefitted from porous international boundaries as they migrated; at the same time, their migrations led to the forced migration of the indigenous groups (e.g. Das Gupta, 2008, 2015; and Glenn's [2015] work on the US). Ortiz and Pombo (2014) also argue that forced migrations and displacements in Mexico and Latin America require analyses of de-territorialization and re-territorialization to fully understand the dimensions of these internal migrations. The Migration Policy Institute has pointed out that the migration of indigenous groups in the Americas, Africa, Asia, Europe and Australia was not even linked to the issue of their rights till very recently (Yescas, 2010). The continuing popularity of the frameworks based on nation-states, modernity and development, whether these are used in the Global North or South, is based on the selective erasures of these histories of migration.

The scholars who have discussed multiple modernities as a basis for understanding global theories (e.g. Eisenstadt, 2000; Patel, 2000) offer a useful reminder that the Global North models of histories do not apply across the world. Applying this insight to

migration studies suggests it is important to consider the histories of migration – including histories of colonization and forced migration – as well as more recent trajectories of global-national-local intersectionalities that shape migration as reflections of these multiple trajectories of modernities. Traces of earlier migration streams are often evident in the ways social and political borders persist within nation-states. These trends are evident when single languages (e.g. English), racial ideologies (e.g. in Nazi Germany) and single religions (e.g. Christianity, Hinduism, or Islam) are used to mark the identities of nations, and, in turn, designate who are 'migrants' and consequently outsiders to the nation. Internal migrants, similarly, are drawn into the process of creating local social and political borders based on race, caste, tribe, religion, culture, class, or other locally salient hierarchies. For instance, a focus on the varieties of female migrants – who now make up close to half the world's migrants – reveals how older gendered-intersectional structures, that might have disappeared from other sections of society, nonetheless shape their position of vulnerability within nation-states and as they cross borders as displaced persons or refugees. These specific contours of different borders may not always coalesce; nonetheless partly coalescing or disjunctured borders within global-national-local terrains remain, cumulatively, palpable impediments to diverse migrants' human security.

Political-economic structural changes from the last decades of the 20th century also provide the impetus for going beyond nation-states and considering glocal terrains of migration. Several contradictory political processes now coexist at the global level and these intersect with national and local structures. The growth of supra-national political units such as the European Union, or the Mercosur Residence Agreement among South American countries (Arcarazo, 2015), has lead to an easing of national boundaries for the migration of selected groups within those regions (e.g. Dustmann, 2008). Many nation-states have attempted to make it easy for selected migrants who reside in a subset of countries to come back 'home' and to repatriate money and resources (e.g. Bhagavatula, 2015). Faced with continuing labor shortages, some developed nation-states, like Japan, have attempted attract groups with roots in these nations, creating the imaginaries about 'homelands', and offering relatively easy conditions of migration and settlement, even though these invitations to migrants with 'national roots' may be at cross-purposes with local political realities (e.g. Kim, 2008; Iwata and Nemoto, this issue).

An opposite process is also evident as nation-states begin to securitize hitherto-porous national boundaries to control certain types of migration (e.g. Bruggeman, 2002; Lucas et al., 2014; United States Conference of Catholic Bishops [USCCB], 2015). Powerful groups of nation-states create global security blocks and expand the reach of political surveillance far beyond their national political boundaries (Bigo, 2014; Collyer and King, 2015; Levitan et al., 2010; Pickering, 2004; Thomas, 2014). A particular aspect of this extension of national power is evident in the aggressive ways in which nations are exercising their jurisdiction in maritime spaces as they push back 'unacceptable' migrants and refugees who attempt to reach their land borders via boat (e.g. Frenzen, 2015; Innis, 2015; Majumdar et al., 2015). Recent political campaigning targeting 'uninterrupted flows of migrants' are further strengthening the boundaries against migrants (Ashkenas and Aish, 2016).

Many other changes, associated with contemporary globalization processes, continue to interact with national and local structures to shape migration. Structural adjustment

policies and resultant local disasters drive people to seek human security within and across countries (Das Gupta et al., 2010). The rapid spread of global neoliberal structures, especially those that lead to footloose production, stateless corporations and reliance on flexible labor, has generated repeat migration as people move within and across nation-states *repeatedly* in search of jobs and other aspects of secure lives. As the scale and scope of wars and armed conflicts have grown rapidly across the world, such conflicts and the routinization of large-scale violence lead to displacements of people within and across nation-states (e.g. German, 2013; Pandey, 2006). Environmental disasters – often human made and/or the result of deliberate policy, including through the impact of violence during wars – also lead to displacements (Das Gupta et al., 2010). A growing corpus of research has begun to record the violence that shapes these displacements as migrants are forced to move to places where they are strangers and outsiders. Additionally, vulnerabilities to violence often act as precursors for trafficking in human beings within and across states (Yousaf and Purkayastha, 2015).

Surveying worlds of forced migrants, it is clear that despite the public sympathy for some refugees featured in the media – for instance the outpouring of sympathy after the picture of a drowned Syrian boy was published (Smith, 2015) – the reality is that these migrants are also subject to draconian immigration controls.[9] Samaddar (2015) argues that humanitarian initiatives set up within other states' territories effectively maintain the agendas of imperial powers to control who moves, to which destinations, and under which circumstances (see also, e.g., Frenzen [2015] on Europe; Wee and Jayasuriya [2002] on Asia; Innis [2015] on Australia; or Levitan et al. [2010] on Turkey as the margin of Europe). Certainly the data show that most refugees – i.e. those who cross international boundaries and are classified as refugees by the UN – are located in Turkey, Pakistan, Lebanon and in other countries outside the Global North (UNHCR, 2016b). Depending on their relative power, these refugees, in turn, might be able to move from the camps to other locations where they might displace the local residents (as settler colonialists do); in most cases their arrival in large numbers are likely to attract a backlash from groups who see refugees as consuming scarce national or local resources to which they are not entitled. Refugees, in turn, attempt to fully or partially integrate into the new places of residence, and feel welcomed or rejected in their daily lives; many might move again – including emigration, or return to homelands when they are older – depending on the borders they encounter at different stages of their lives (BBC Media Action, 2014).

Another rapidly growing reality, which remains under-theorized, is important for understanding migration today. While we typically think of migrants and migration in terms of embodied human beings who move, the rapid growth of virtual spaces as contexts of socio-political lives raise new questions about migration. Some work has begun to trace migrants' lives in virtual spaces, including migrants' organizing via web-spaces (see e.g. Narayan et al., 2010). Based on his work on Indian call centers, Aneesh (2006, 2015) has raised questions about the personhood of migrants who do not move, though their labor and their daily lives are subject to the political, social and economic logics and policies located in distant locales. Equally important, a large number of corporations constantly gather data on people around the world, and then trade, and profit from these data. Aneesh (2009) points out that unlike previous decades algocratic structures

– structures based on algorithms – are organizing labor and lives without the benefits of political safeguards of people's rights. Building on his conclusions we should ask, what, then, are the borders of personhood that is the basis of much of our theories of migration? Similar questions arise from studies of persons whose organs are harvested and legally or illegally sold to benefit the lives of more privileged people far away (Yousaf and Purkayastha, 2015). Should organ trafficking be considered under migration since the organs move but not the person whose body parts have been harvested? Even though these questions have not been explored extensively by migration scholars, the rapid growth of life in virtual spaces, as well as the technology that can separate embodied human beings from their body parts, labor, or their very personhood, suggests that we should analyze glocal intersectional structures that span tangible *and* virtual terrains. Certainly, the detailed data on people across the globe that corporations and security regimes access and act upon (see e.g. *The News*, 2008) alert us to the need to expand the sociological conceptualization of terrains of migration.

Thus, it is important to consider multi-level power relations *between and within* nation-states in tangible and virtual spaces that shape the terrain in which groups can move, settle, and build secure lives. Who can move (or not), under what conditions can they move to their intended destinations, and which entities shape their access to rights and benefits during and after migration are empirical questions that cannot be easily answered if we mostly focus on nations and national borders to craft our explanations. An adequate frame for analyzing migration today should consider the intersection of historic and contemporary glocal conditions. At the same time, the framework needs to be mindful of not glossing over national or local specificities in its quest for generalizations (see also Hanafi, 2016). I also suggest that we need to understand the *disjuncture and coalescence* of different sets of structures in tangible and virtual spaces at the global, national and local levels in order to understand the glocal terrain of migration and migrants' human security.[10]

Glocal terrains and migrants' security

How do glocal processes affect migrants' security? A significant body of literature has documented questions of belonging and inclusion of migrants (e.g. Reed-Danahay and Brettell, 2008; Valentine, 2007; Yuval-Davis, 2006); these earlier discussions remain germane to analyses about immigrant integration into nation-states. However, an emphasis on a glocal terrain raises specific questions about the tapestry of rights within which migrants are positioned in this terrain. How should migrants be positioned to access the resources needed to re-build their lives? If we consider different types of migrants, the governance of migrants only partly resides within the ambit of nation-states – who is responsible for ensuring rights? The human rights framework offers a point of entry into this issue.

As Andersen (2003), Baxi (2006), Falcon (2016), Lauren (1998) and other scholars have documented, the impetus for human rights emerged not so much from the efforts of Western nation-states to bestow rights to those who resided within their territories, but through the geopolitics where powerful states claimed to bestow rights to all within their territories while undermining the efforts of the colonized, enslaved,

segregated and marginalized to claim rights.[11] These marginalized rights-claiming groups had experienced deaths and massive displacements because of state policies and state-sponsored violence within nation-states and in colonies. Many of these groups lived in modern nation-state systems that denied them the means of survival or 'normal' human freedoms (e.g. Andersen, 2003). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) declared human rights as the basis of lives of human dignity and framed the understanding of human rights as a combination of political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights for all individuals. Decades of development of charters and conventions created a vast web of international governance structures in a human rights regime. These human rights instruments include the rights of people to move as well as their human rights within territories in which they settle (e.g. Jordan, 2002; Levitan et al., 2010). However, the responsibility for ensuring human rights has remained mostly with nation-states even though powerful states have continued to assert states' rights *not to follow* these conventions and charters or, at best, make human rights contingent upon state security.

Thus, the use of a human rights frame for understanding migration and migrants' lives within a glocal terrain is not straightforward. International human rights governance structures and human rights cultures might appear to ensure improving conditions for all human beings; in practice, the question of migrants' rights raises critical questions about the gaps they experience (see Baxi, 2006). On the issue of migration, states retain the ability to rebuff migrants on the grounds of state security. States stratify rights of different groups of internal and international migrants, negatively affecting the ability of migrants to build lives that are free from threats to their survival, freedom and dignity. Additionally, the ability of groups of nation-states to act as global security blocs enables them to detain migrants in other nations or in detention centers within their territories without access to due legal processes. These actions negatively affect migrants' abilities to move or claim rights (e.g. USCCB, 2015).

In spite of these shortcomings, some aspects of human rights scholarship remain important for understanding the human security of migrants. Moving away from a nation-state-centric-citizenship frame of rights has allowed scholars to challenge a key tool nation-states use to marginalize many migrants: the classification of legal or illegal migrants (e.g. Golash-Boza, 2011; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Golash-Boza, 2011). Critical scholars have kept in the foreground the visible and less visible political, civil, economic, social *and* cultural conditions that significantly impede migrants' ability to build secure lives (Iwata and Purkayastha, 2011). Since very few migrants are granted citizenship in a new country easily, and citizenship rights vary significantly by state, the human rights approach offers a fruitful lens to assess states' roles in ensuring migrants' access to substantive rights. The lack of rights has led some scholars to recognize that migrants continually organize for substantive rights (e.g. Adur, 2011; Choo, 2013; Das Gupta, 2001, 2006; Jordan, 2002).

A few human rights scholars have pointed out that human rights violations occur within the nexus between states and corporations. For instance, Armaline et al. (2015: 12) note, 'the question of whether and how well states recognize and enforce human rights is not simply one of motivations and intentions of political leaders: these leaders function in an institutional setting where non-governmental actors from powerful

institutions, particularly economic actors like corporations and financial institutions, affect the state's ability to do so'. For instance, the logic of capitalism coupled with the logic of securitizing states has introduced new stratifications and processes that delink labor and rights (e.g. Armaline et al., 2015; Bhattacharya et al., 2002; Fullerton and Robertson, 2011). Many nation-states and supra-national blocks have begun to control migration through temporary guest-worker programs where the contributions of labor to a nation-state are separated from social and political benefits (Walsh, 2014). As a result, there is a rapid growth of *contingent migrants*. Furthermore, it has become profitable to develop industries to control migration. For instance, criminal networks profit from human smuggling and trafficking. We are also becoming aware of the growth of crimmigation complexes, i.e. systems that blur the boundaries between criminal justice and immigration enforcement in order to control and manage migrants (Golash-Boza, 2015; USCCB, 2015). In addition, cyber migrants (Aneesh, 2015), whose claims for rights are kept at a distance from the states that benefit from their labor, pose a particular challenge for envisioning migrant rights and their human security.

The data on female refugees and internally displaced migrants make it evident that their human security, including their vulnerability to violence, remains an ongoing concern (see e.g. Njiru and Purkayastha, 2015; Yescas, 2010). Looking across the array of migrants it is also clear that we cannot only think of migrants as just males. A number of questions relating to the migration and human rights of females remain unaddressed even though their numbers are growing. Who provides for the well-being of female migrants, their safety and security, their bodily integrity, their health as well as other rights; do we recognize their contributions to care-work that ensures the security of other migrants especially the young and old? A number international entities and humanitarian groups have begun to play an important part in shaping the experience of migration. But, as Roth (2015) and Holzer (2015) have pointed out, despite their stated objectives, these groups are not always effective in ensuring rights or security during the process of migration or migrants 'temporary settlement' in camps. Additionally Samaddar's critiques about humanitarian efforts (Samaddar, 2015; and this issue) further emphasize the gaps between efforts and the actual security of migrants.

Building on these discussions, this monograph issue uses the *human security* approach to examine both the glocal structures that affect migrants as well as their ability to build economically/politically/socially/culturally secure lives. This human security approach is rooted in human rights, but is not primarily focused on the actual edifice of formal laws or conventions. The emphasis is on people and their experiences, the question of their substantive rights, and the multiple entities that affect their access to rights. This approach includes the conceptualization of human rights from below that recognizes rights are not easily available and human beings organize for and attain rights through struggles (Armaline et al., 2011). Situated within a glocal context of migration, this human security approach recognizes that people may have 'legal rights and protections from discrimination and violence, but, in reality, migrants may encounter structural constraints including lack of income, education, and access to legal systems and protections from discrimination and violence' (Tripp et al., 2013: 8), which affects their survival and well-being.

In sum, this monograph issue recognizes an array of migrants' experiences to move beyond one source of fragmentation in the field; it recognizes multiple modernities and

does not sacrifice the local specificities in the cause of universalizing theories. The focus on human security addresses some of the major concerns raised by Samaddar and others about adequate conceptualization of the spatio-temporal terrain in which migration takes place, without losing sight of the specificities of the locales in which migrants are positioned. In order to unravel the disjunctured and coalescing structures that shape different levels, it uses the insights of racism and gender scholars about intersectionality and the multiple actors that shape the migration terrain. Most of all, the focus on human security renews the focus on questions about who are migrants and who are natives to a place and how are these distinctions decided formally and through practice; which types of migrants are recognized, which groups remain invisible; which groups are subject to greater violence and global security controls as they *travel and settle*; and which intersecting lattice of structures affects them glocally. In sum, thinking about migration, migrants and human security leads us to examine migrants and human security as a dynamic process shaped by glocal structures that unfold by shoring up traces of some older hierarchies while creating new ones.

The framework and the articles

The articles in this monograph issue traverse the literatures on different types of migrations and migrants and their human rights and security. By looking at diverse migrations and types of migrants, this issue weaves several fragmented conversations across the Global North and South to focus on glocal terrains of migration and human security of migrants. The global-national-local structures that create the glocal terrain, are not aligned perfectly, but act as forces that coalesce and clash. Within these glocal terrains, nation-state borders are neither all encompassing nor completely porous. The degree to which borders act as impediments to migrants' quest for human security is reflective of historical and contemporary structures in tangible and virtual spaces. The articles in this monograph issue emphasize that migration studies require an understanding of global processes that intersect with 'a fractured nation-hood, its fault-lines, the historical continuities and discontinuities, the dynamics of a territorially contained entity coexisting with a world of flows' (Samaddar, 1999: 14).

By focusing on the glocal migration terrain, the authors are better able to analyze the structural conditions under which an array of internal and international migrants move or are forced to move, temporarily or permanently to countries in the Global South or North in search of more secure life conditions. Analyses of their human security remain central to theorizing about migration and migrants.

The first set of four articles emphasizes the glocal terrain of migration and human security. Ranabir Samaddar focuses on the historical sociology of migrations in the 19th and 20th century. Building on his earlier scholarship (e.g. 1999, 2015), his theoretical article discusses the need to place forced migration at the center of migration frameworks. He discusses migration as a centerpiece of capitalist production, and draws our attention to government, corporate and humanitarian efforts to control migrant flows.

The next two articles examine forced migration to delve into the nature of migration, the link between global and nation-state based processes and the questions of migrants' human security. Both articles emphasize the outcome of structural violence as causes of

migration. Drawing upon data on trafficking in Pakistan, Farhan Yousaf also positions forced migration within a glocal terrain of violence. He argues that marginalized groups often go through multiple migrations that can include episodes of trafficking for sex or labor. Without longitudinal studies and incisive interrogation of terms such as 'voluntary' economic migrants or refugees, neither the experiences of forced migration, nor the structures that engender such migration can be researched adequately. Yousaf points out that the gaps between international and local policies and trends of current interventions do little to address the human security of these migrants.

Roseanne Njiru discusses the migration of internally displaced persons in Kenya and discusses the fault-lines that position internally displaced people (IDPs) as unwelcome strangers and foreigners within their own nation-state. Pointing to the impact of the disjuncture between international initiatives and grounded realities, she raises questions about the dichotomy of IDPs and refugees, and questions the global politics of humanitarianism on these migrations. Further, she examines the government resettlement and global humanitarian processes and shows how this disjuncture between national and global processes privileges the nation's physical boundaries and shapes particular experiences of human security of IDPs.

The fourth article in this series examines the continuities between forced and 'choice' migration over time. Focusing on South Africa, and the historical and contemporary migration of Indians to South Africa, Mariam Seedat-Khan and Belinda Johnson discuss the intersections of structures of slavery and indenture as part of a global colonial project, and how these aligned with the processes of marking race-lines through apartheid within the nation. The traces of this *longue durée* are visible in the national fault-lines in South Africa today. By examining the historical and contemporary bases of migration, Seedat-Khan and Johnson argue that some national fault-lines persist even after seismic political changes reshape a nation. They document the experiences of Indian migrants, especially the recent migrants who continue to experience insecurities due to waves of xenophobia.

The next set of articles examine human security of migrants under conditions of temporary, long-term and return migration. These South-to-North, South-to-South and North-to-South migrations mostly focus on the experiences of migrants. These articles examine the experiences of different types of migrants post-migration to show how glocal intersectional structures shape human security.

Even as nations sort and sift who is allowed to migrate internally or internationally to provide labor, these needs of labor are frequently in contradiction with local political imperatives of who is to be welcomed. The question of migrants' security is central to the article by Habibul Khondker, who focuses on how temporary migrants build affirming identities as a way of building a sense of security. Khondker discusses the experience of migrants from Bangladesh who are granted temporary working rights (without concomitant political or social rights) in the United Arab Emirates. Set amid this condition of contingency and precarity, Khondker discusses the ways in which migrants seek to build cultural networks to recreate a sense of identity and wellbeing. He points out that the migrants are forced to remain focused on their home-states, a form of transnationalism, shaped by the circumstances of contingency. Their articulations of security remind us to keep social and cultural aspects of migrants' lives relevant to our discussion of human security.

Hiranthi Jayaweera examines a different aspect of migrants' security by focusing on access to healthcare for vulnerable migrant women in England. She is interested in what happens after migration as these migrants attempt to access healthcare. Vulnerable categories of migrant women include asylum seekers, refugees, refused asylum seekers or undocumented migrant women, trafficked women, Roma, women with limited fluency in English, and migrants from the European Union (EU) with no health insurance card. She shows that within the last three years there have been significant changes in the way the National Health Service is organized. These changes affect the design and delivery of healthcare to the population. At the same time, changes to immigration rules, including the 2014 Immigration Act, have led to increasing restrictions on eligibility and access to healthcare for migrants, and the social construction of 'deservingness' of health rights among vulnerable migrant women creates barriers to providing healthcare. She identifies selectivity in defining which migrant women are seen as most needing support, and insufficient consideration of inequalities in wider determinants of health, thus affecting vulnerable migrants' human security.

Chih-Yan Sun focuses on migrants who return to Taiwan after living for years in the US and Europe. These relatively-privileged migrants are looking for more secure lives in Taiwan than are available for them in the US or Europe. The article not only identifies a Global North to Global South stream of migration, Sun implicitly interrogates these classifications including the notion that the North is synonymous with modernity and development. The article touches on the fault-lines within nations as the relatively-privileged migrants expect rights and greater human security upon return. Sun argues that the assumption in the West-centric literature that migrants retain transnational ties with their homelands because of ethno-cultural similarities overlooks the cultural transformations that migrants undergo as part of acculturating to host societies. He further argues that their privileged positions within the global political-economic structures enable these migrants to engage in three types of boundary-making strategies to reconfigure their rights and security in the 'home' country.

Iwata and Nemoto analyze migrants who come to Japan in search of work. Their choice of a non-Western developed country reveals structures and aspects of human security that are not widely discussed in the migration literature. On the one hand, this article illustrates the concept of multiple modernities and how these affect migrants. On the other hand, the authors emphasize the continuing role of Western ideologies and structures of race in the construction of the global political-economy, and how these global-level racial ideologies intersect with local ideologies to shape the glocal terrain of migration. They focus particularly on the contrast between the experiences of the Japanese-origin Brazilians, who were encouraged by the government to migrate to Japan (to help maintain the pre-eminence of the Japanese race), and the experiences of white and black migrants from the US. They show how powerful global hierarchies render phenotypic Japanese-Brazilian 'insiders' lower in the migrant strata, compared to black and white migrants from Western countries. While picking up some strands of conversation offered by Sun, Iwata and Nemoto reinsert the structures of race into discussions of human security.

In the final article, Shweta Majumdar Adur analyses the passages of sexual minority migrants from the Global South to the 'safer havens' in the Global North. She focuses on

highly educated migrants from the one of the largest migrant sending countries (India) to another large migrant attracting country (US), and highlights that questions of human security cannot be discussed simply with reference to human capital of migrants without considering the glocal context in which today's highly-educated groups exist. Focusing on sexual minorities, she illustrates how racism/sexuality are invoked in the political rhetoric about national security, and how these ideologies and structures affect these migrants. Her article implicitly and explicitly illustrates the multi-level disjunctured and coalescing axes of marginalization as sexual minority migrants reveal their status in some contexts and not in others. Yet irrespective of their voices or silences on their sexuality, they encounter significant impediment to achieving their dreams of building lives of dignity in a secure context.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the comments and ongoing support from numerous scholars in the US, India, and other countries.

Funding

The work on this monograph issue was generously supported through a sabbatical from my home institution University of Connecticut, a fellowship at the Institute for Advanced Studies, JNU, Delhi, India in 2016, and a Fulbright-Nehru fellowship to India in 2017.

Notes

1. While the term Global North typically refers to North America, the European Union and Australia, and the Global South to the rest of the world, I do not suggest that the world of scholarship is so neatly divided. Scholars from diverse countries have produced scholarship that mostly cite Northern scholars and use their dominant frameworks. Similarly, the critical scholarship in the Global North specifically rejects the focus on migrant integration and assimilation, pointing out the structural impediments that are invisible in the dominant frameworks. The critical frameworks, like intersectionality, are better positioned to mesh with the frameworks proposed by some important scholars in the South. Thus the terms North and South indicate specific streams of conversations, conceptualization and assumptions. While some scholars have used the terms one-third and two-third world to indicate the structures of power inherent in these divisions, I have continued to use Global North and South, with some ambivalence, as these are more familiar terms.
2. An analysis of some major sociology journals such as *American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, Demography, Social Forces, Journal of International Migration and Integration, International Migration Review, Asian Pacific Migration, International Migration*, along with *Gender and Society* and *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, between 2010 and 2015, show the continuing dominant emphasis.
3. Mobile phones and emails created a revolution in keeping in touch quickly and efficiently. Facebook started in 2004, WhatsApp started in 2009. These 21st-century technologies have made it easier to construct lives across continents.
4. The US's new demand to travelers to turn in their social media passwords is simply one manifestation of this process.
5. According to the Pew surveys (www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/03/03/india-is-a-top-source-and-destination-for-worlds-migrants/), India is both the top source and destination of

the world's migrants. Hence it is particularly important to consider the Indian scholarship that does not replicate the dominant Northern frameworks in order to challenge existing knowledge hierarchies.

6. One problem of looking across an array of migrants, especially for quantitative researchers, is the difficulty of finding equivalent data for various categories of migrants. Different entities that gather data use different classifications of migrants. However, that is a methodological problem that will require better specification of the shortcomings of selected quantitative data sets. But a theoretical framework covering different types of migrants should describe and understand today's migration and migrants in ways that better reflect contemporary conditions.
7. As Manashi Ray (2017) has pointed out, refugee movements – including whether they can move out of camps – are a reflection of the networks of sponsorships by family, churches and aid groups; at times their movement is similar to international migrants.
8. Despite this attempt to address some aspects of the knowledge hierarchies, other problems remain. A significant drawback, that could not be addressed satisfactorily here, is the issue of languages. While the authors of this monograph issue are experts in many languages, nonetheless, the literature reflects the dominance of work published in English since these are most widely distributed.
9. Among newspapers with global reach, the *New York Times* has published a series of articles in 2015 and 2016 on the ways in which refugees are rebuffed or in de facto prisons in the Global North. Similarly, BBC Media Action has published reports recording the voices of refugees.
10. This idea of coalescence and disjunctures is based on my earlier work on a transnational, intersectional framework of ethnicity where ethnicity of migrants emanates through a series of coexisting layers of identity that coalesce *and* clash depending on layers of structures (Purkayastha, 2005).
11. There are significant debates about the sources and futures of human rights, including the embedded West-centric ideas of modernity and development that structure the effort to establish human rights regimes (see Baxi [2006] or Moyn [2010] for very different assertions of 'human', 'rights', and the path to acquiring these rights). Given the limitations of space, I have only referred to Baxi's work as a powerful exemplar of the recent work in the Global South on human rights. The corpus of scholarship increases exponentially if we look across the world.

References

Abby A and Mahamoud D (2005) Internally displaced minorities in Somalia and Somaliland. South Asia Forum for Human Rights (SAFHR). Available at: http://www.safhr.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=132&Itemid=562&limitstart=20 (accessed July 2015).

Abraham M (2000) *Speaking the Unspeakable*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Abraham M and Tastsoglou E (2016) Interrogating gender, violence, and the state in national and transnational contexts: Framing the issues. *Current Sociology Monograph* 64(4): 517–534.

Adur S (2011) The 'cost' of the American Dream. In: Armaline W, Glasberg D and Purkayastha B (eds) *Human Rights in Our Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the US*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Aguilar F (1999) The triumph of instrumental citizenship? Migrations, identities and the nation state in South East Asia. *Asian Studies Review* 23: 307–336.

Alba R and Nee V (1997) Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review* 31: 826–874.

Amelina A and Faist T (2012) De-naturalizing the national in research methodologies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35: 1707–1724

Andersen C (2003) *Eyes off the Prize The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944–1955*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aneesh A (2006) *Virtual Migration: The Programming of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Aneesh A (2009) Global labor: Algocratic modes of organization. *Sociological Theory* 27: 347–370.

Aneesh A (2015) *Neutral Accent: How Language, Labour, and Life Became Global*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Appadurai A (1990) *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Aranda E and Vaquera E (2015) Racism, the immigration enforcement regime, and the implications for racial inequality in the lives of undocumented young adults. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1: 88–104.

Arcarazo D (2015) Toward a South American citizenship? The development of a new post-national form of membership in the region. *Journal of International Affairs* 68: 213–221.

Armaline W, Glasberg D and Purkayastha B (eds) (2011) *Human Rights in Our Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the US*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Armaline W, Glasberg D and Purkayastha B (2015) *The Human Rights Enterprise: The State, Resistance, and Human Rights*. London: Polity Press.

Armaline W, Glasberg D and Purkayastha B (2017) De jure vs. de facto rights: A response to 'Human Rights: What the United States Might Learn From the Rest of the World and, Yes, From American Sociology'. *Sociological Forum* 32: 220–224.

Asencio M (ed.) (2009) *Latina/o Sexualities: Probing Power, Passions, Practices, and Policies*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ashkenas J and Aish G (2016) European populism in the age of Trump. Available at: www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/12/05/world/europe/populism-in-age-of-trump.html?_r=0 (accessed 15 January 2017).

Baruah S (2003) Citizens and denizens: Ethnicity, homelands and the crisis of displacement in North East India. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 1: 44–66.

Baxi U (2006) *The Future of Human Rights*. New Delhi: Oxford.

BBC Media Action (2014) *Voices of Refugees*. London: BBC Media Action.

Bhagavatula S (2015) Migration, citizenship, and development: Diasporic membership policies and overseas Indians in the United States, *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 36: 245–247.

Bhatt W (2009) The gender dimension of migration in India: The politics of contemporary space in Orissa and Rajasthan. *Development in Practice* 19: 87–93.

Bhattacharya G, Gabriel J and Small S (2002) *Race and Power: Global Racism in the 21st Century*. London: Routledge.

Bigo D (2014) The (in)securitization practices of three universes of EU border control. *Security Dialog* 45(3): 209–225:

Boatca M (forthcoming) *Caribbean Europe: Global Pasts and Present-Day Coloniality*.

Boyd M and Alboim N (2011) Managing international migration: The Canadian case. In: Rodriguez GD (ed.) Managing Immigration and Diversity in Canada: A Transatlantic Dialogue in the New Age of Migration. Toronto: McGill Queen's University Press.

Bruggeman W (2002) *Illegal Immigration and Trafficking in Human Beings Seen as a Security Problem for Europe*. Deputy Director, Europol report.

Choo H-Y (2013) The cost of rights: Migrant women, feminist advocacy, and gendered morality in South Korea. *Gender and Society* 27: 445–468.

Collyer M and King R (2015) Producing transnational space: International migration and the extra territorial reach of state power. *Progress in Human Geography* 39: 185–204.

Constable N (2003) *Romance on a Global Stage: Pen Pals, Virtual Ethnography, and 'Mail-Order' Marriages*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Das Gupta M (2006) *Unruly Immigrants: Rights, Activism and Transnational South Asian Politics in the United States*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Das Gupta M (2008) Rights in a transnational era. In: Buff RI (ed.) *Immigrant Rights in the Shadows of Citizenship*. New York: New York University Press.

Das Gupta M (2015) Mexican migration to Hawai'i and U.S. settler colonialism with Sue P. Haglund. *Latino Studies* 13(4): 455–480.

Das Gupta S, Siriner I and De P-S (eds) (2010) *Women's Encounter with Disaster*. Kolkata and London: Frontpage Publications.

Davin D (2007) Marriage migration in China and East Asia. *Journal of Contemporary China* 16: 83–95.

Desai A and Vahed G (2010) *Inside Indian Indenture, A South African Story, 1860–1914*. Capetown: Human Sciences Research Council.

Dirlik A (2005) The end of colonialism? The colonial modern and the making of global modernity. *boundary* 2 32: 1–31.

Dirlik A (2009) Globalization as the end and the beginning of history: The contradictory implications of a new paradigm. *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture, Society* 12: 4–22.

Dustmann C (2008) *The Impact of EU Enlargement on Migration Flows*. London: UK Home Office.

Dustmann C, Fasani F, Frattini T, et al. (2016) On the economics and politics of refugee migration. Available at: www.cream-migration.org (accessed 2 April 2017).

Eisenstadt SN (2000) Multiple modernities. *Daedelus* 129: 1–29.

Espiritu Y (2003) *Asian American Women and Men: Love, Labor, Laws*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Falcon S (2016) *Expanding Racisms: Transnational Feminisms, Intersectionality Politics, and Human Rights*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Faist T (2013) The mobility turn: A new paradigm for the social sciences? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36: 1637–1646.

Fielding T (2015) *Asian Migrations: Social and Geographical Mobilities in Southeast, East, and Northeast Asia*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Frenzen N (2015) Migrants at sea. Available at: http://migrantsatsea.org/2015/05/27/european-migrant-death-database-deaths-at-the-borders-of-southern-europe/ (accessed 10 October 2015).

Fullerton A and Robertson D (2011) Labor rights after the flexible turn: The rise of contingent employment and the implications for worker rights in the United States. In: Armaline A, Glasberg D and Purkayastha B (eds) *Human Rights in Our Own Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 22–33.

German L (2013) *How a Century of War Changed the Lives of Women*. London: Pluto Press.

Giri B (2005) Mourning the 15th anniversary of crisis: The plight of Bhutanese refugee women and children. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 40: 345–369.

Glenn E (2002) *Unequal Freedoms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glenn E (2015) Settler colonialism as structure: A framework for comparative studies of US race and gender formations. *Race and Ethnicity* 1: 52–72.

Golash-Boza T (2011) *Immigration Nation: Raids, Detentions, and Deportations in Post-9/11 America*. New York: Paradigm Publishers.

Golash-Boza T (2015) *Deported: Immigrant Policing, Disposable Labor and Global Capitalism*. New York: New York University Press.

Grabska K (2008) Who asked them anyway: Rights, policies and wellbeing of refugees in Egypt. In: Grabska K and Mehta L (eds) *Forced Displacement: Whose Needs are Right?* London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–25.

Guevarra A (2009) *Marketing Dreams, Manufacturing Heroes: The Transnational Labor Brokering of Filipino Workers*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hanafi S (2016) Post colonial global sociology. Available at: http://futureswewant.net/sari-hanafi-postcolonial/ (accessed 15 November 2016).

Hanafi S and Long T (2008) Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon: Laboratories of state-in-the-making, discipline and Islamist radicalism. In: Lentin R (ed.) *Thinking Palestine*. London: Zed Books.

Holzer E (2015) *The Concerned Women of Bududuram: Refugee Activists and Humanitarian Dilemmas*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hongadneu-Sotelo P and Golash-Boza T (2011) Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program. *Latino Studies* 11: 271–292.

Innis M (2015) Australian leader is pressed on whether migrant smugglers were paid to turn back. *New York Times*, 13 June.

Iwata M and Purkayastha B (2011) Reflections on cultural human rights. In: Armaline W, Glasberg D and Purkayastha B (eds) *Human Rights in Our Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the US*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jain S (2013) For love or money: Second-generation Indian-Americans 'return' to India. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36: 896–914.

Jani P (2017) Why are South Asians facing a wave of violence? Available at: https://socialist-worker.org/2017/03/09/why-are-south-asians-facing-a-wave-of-violence (accessed 10 April 2017).

Jordan A (2002) Human rights or wrongs: The struggle for rights based response to trafficking in human beings. *Gender and Development* 10: 28–37.

Kang S-E (2011) Marriage migrants, just legally discriminated foreigners. *Women's News (Seoul)*. Available at: www.womennews.co.kr/news/50145 (accessed 23 June 2016).

Kibria N (2000) Ethnic options, ethnic binds. *Sociological Perspective* 43: 77–95.

Kibria N (2002) *Becoming Asian American: Identities of Second Generation Chinese and Korean Americans*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kibria N (2011) *Muslims in Motion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kim N (2008) *Imperial Citizens: Koreans and Race from Seoul to LA*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kim M (2015) Citizenship projects for marriage migrants in South Korea: Intersecting motherhood with ethnicity and class. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 20(4): 455–481.

King R and Skeldon R (2010) 'Mind the gap' integrating approaches to internal and international migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36: 1619–1646.

Kofman E (2013) Gendered labour migration: Europe and emblematic figures. *Journal of Ethnic and Refugee Studies* 39: 579–600.

Kofman E (2014) Towards a gendered evaluation of (highly) skilled immigration policies in Europe. *International Migration* 52: 117–128.

Kofman E and Raghuram P (2005) Gender and skilled migrants: Into and beyond the work place. *Geoforum* 36: 149–154.

Korra V (2011) Labour migration in Mahabubnagar: Nature and characteristics. *Economic and Political Weekly* 46(2): 67–70.

Kristjánsdóttir E and DeTurk S (2013) Cultural insiders to cultural outsiders: Structure, identity, and communication in the adaptation of domestic, involuntary migrants. *Howard Journal of Communications* 24(2): 194–211.

Kurien P (2007) *A Place at the Table: Multiculturalism and the Development of an American Hinduism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lauren P (1998) *The Evolution of International Human Rights*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Levitan R, Kaytaz E and Durukan O (2010) Unwelcome guests: The detention of refugees in Turkey's 'foreigners' guesthouses. *Refugee* 26: 77–90.

Levitt P (2001) *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Levitt P (2009) *God Needs No Passport: Immigrants and the Changing American Landscape*. New York: New Press.

Li K-Y (2011) *Deoli Camp: An oral history of Chinese Indians from 1962 to 1966*. University of Toronto (Canada), ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, MR76088.

Lucas S, Purkayastha B with Iwata M (2014) *Still Canadian? Identity, Difference, Ethnicity and Race in the Experience of Canadian Migrants to the United States*. London and Kolkata: Frontpage Publications.

Majumdar S, Mathur P, Chopra K and Chakraborty M (2015) *Rohingyas in India: Birth of a Stateless Community*. Kolkata: MCRG. Available at: www.mcrg.ac.in/PP71.pdf (accessed August 2017).

MCRG (Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group) (2006) *Voices of Internally Displaced People in South Asia. A Report by Calcutta Research Group*. Kolkata: MCRG.

MCRG (Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group) (2015) Available at: www.mcrg.ac.in/# (accessed 10 July 2016).

Mendiburo A (2015) Las representaciones sociales que tienen los migrantes, 'temporalis' respect a los habitants de Saint-Remi Quebec. *Migraciones Internacionales* 8: 231–256.

Moyn S (2010) *The Last Eutopia: Human Rights in History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Muggah R (2017) Europe's refugee crisis is making headlines, but Latin America's is just as alarming. Available at: www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/03/refugee-crisis-migration-europe-latin-america/?ET_CID=1656810&ET_RID=001b0000006jiPqAAI (accessed 1 May 2017).

Narayan A, Purkayastha B and Banerji S (2010) Constructing virtual, transnational identities on the web: The case of Hindu student groups in the US and UK. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 32: 495–517.

New York Times (2015) 60 million people fleeing chaotic lands, UN says. Available at: www.nytimes.com/images/2015/06/18/nytfrontpage/scan.pdf (accessed 13 January 2016).

Njiru R and Purkayastha B (2015) *Voices of Internally Displaced Persons in Kenya: A Human Rights Perspective*. Kolkata and London: Frontpage Publications.

Ortiz VL and Pombo PD (2014) Introduction: Indigenous migration in Mexico and Central America (trans. M Olavarria). *Latin American Perspectives* 41(3): 5–25.

Pandey G (2006) *Routine Violence: Nations, Fragments, Histories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Patel S (2000) Modernities: Sociological categories and identities. *Current Sociology* 48(1): 1–5.

Patil V and Purkayastha B (2017) The transnational assemblage of Indian rape culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Epub ahead of print. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2017.132270

Pickering S (2004) Border terror: Policing, forced migration and terrorism. *Global Change, Peace and Security* 16(3): 211–226.

Portes A, Fernandez-Kelly P and Haller W (2005) Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(6): 1000–1040.

Purkayastha B (2005) *Negotiating Ethnicity: South Asian Americans Traverse a Transnational World*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Purkayastha B (2012) Intersectionality in a transnational world. *Gender and Society* 26: 55–66.

Purkayastha B and Ratcliff K (2014) Routine violence: Intersectionality at the interstices. In: Segal M and Demos V (eds) *Advances in Gender Research*, Vol. 18B. London: Emerald Publications.

Raghuram P (2009) Which migration, what development? Unsettling the edifice of migration and development. *Population, Space, and Place* 15: 103–117.

Raghuram P (2012) Global care, local configurations – Challenges to conceptualization of care. *Global Networks* 12(2): 155–174.

Raghuram P, Madge C and Noxolo P (2009) Rethinking responsibility and care for a postcolonial world. *Geoforum* 40: 5–13.

Ray M (2017) Crossing borders: Family migration strategies and routes from Burma to the US. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Epub ahead of print. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2017.1314815

Reed-Danahay D and Brettell CB (eds) (2008) *Citizenship, Political Engagement, and Belonging: Immigrants in Europe and the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Roth S (2015) *The Paradoxes of Aid Work*. London: Routledge.

Samaddar R (1999) *Marginal Nation: Transborder Migration from Bangladesh to West Bengal*. New Delhi: SAGE.

Samaddar R (2008) On governing unruly population flows. *Refugee Watch* 32: 1–35.

Samaddar R (2015) Returning to the histories of the late 19th and early 20th century immigration. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 10 January, pp. 49–55.

Sanyal R (2014) Urbanizing refuge: Interrogating spaces of displacement. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(2): 558–572.

Selod S and Garner S (2015) The racialization of Muslims: Empirical studies of Islamophobia. *Critical Sociology* 41: 9–19.

Sheller M (2017) From spatial turn to mobilities turn. *Current Sociology* 65(4): 623–639.

Smith H (2015) Shocking images of drowned Syrian boy show tragic plight of refugees. *The Guardian*, 2 September. Available at: www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/02/shocking-image-of-drowned-syrian-boy-shows-tragic-plight-of-refugees (accessed 7 October 2015).

The News (2008) The Haneef affair: From arrest to enquiry. Available at: www.abc.net.au/news/2008-10-15/the-haneef-affair-from-arrest-to-inquiry/542576 (accessed 1 May 2017).

Thomas D (2014) Fortress Europe: Identity, race and surveillance. *International Journal of Francophone Studies* 17: 445–468.

Tripp A, Ferree M and Ewig C (eds) (2013) *Gender, Violence and Human Security*. New York: New York University Press.

Tyldum G (2013) Dependence and human trafficking in the context of transnational marriage. *International Migration* 51(4): 103–115.

Ueno K (2010) Identity management among Indonesian and Filipina migrant domestic workers in Singapore. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology* 19: 82–97.

UN (2015) International migration report. Available at: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2015.pdf

UNHCR (UN High Commissioner for Refugees) (2016a) Global forced displacement hits record high. Available at: www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2016/6/5763b65a4/global-forced-displacement-hits-record-high.html (accessed 28 April 2017).

UNHCR (UN High Commissioner for Refugees) (2016b) UNHCR global trends – Forced displacement in 2016. Available at: www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2016/ (accessed 15 December 2016).

USCCB (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops) (2015) Unlocking human dignity. Available at: www.usccb.org/about/migration-and-refugee-services/upload/unlocking-human-dignity.pdf (accessed April 2016).
Urry J (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies*. London: Routledge.
Valentine G (2007) Theorizing and researching intersectionality: A challenge for feminist geographers. *Professional Geographer* 59: 10–21.
Vertovec S (1999) Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22: 445–462.
Walsh J (2014) From states of immigrants to states of transience: Temporary migration in Canada and Australia. *International Sociology* 29(6): 584–606.
Wee V and Jayasuriya K (2002) New geographies and temporalities of power: Exploring the new fault-lines of Southeast Asia. *The Pacific Review* 15(4): 475–495.
Weglyn M (1976) *Years of Infamy: Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps*. New Delhi: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.
Xiang B (2004) Towards an emigration study: A south perspective. *Economic and Political Weekly* 21 August, pp. 3798–3803.
Xiang B, Yeoh B and Toyota M (eds) (2013) *Return: Nationalizing Transnational Mobility in Asia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Yeoh B, Chee HL and Baey GHL (2013) The place of Vietnamese marriage migrants in Singapore: Social reproduction, social 'problems' and social protection. *Third World Quarterly* 34(10): 1927–1941.
Yescas C (2010) Hidden in plain sight: Indigenous migrants, their movements and their challenges. Available at: www.migrationpolicy.org/print/4375#.WOR9FlPyugw (accessed 10 March 2015).
Yousaf F and Purkayastha B (2015). *Human Trafficking Amidst Interlocking Oppressions: The Case of Pakistan*. Kolkata: Frontpage Publications.
Yuval-Davis N (2006) Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice* 40(3): 198–214.
Yuval-Davis N, Anthias F and Kofman E (2005) Secure borders and safe havens: The gendered politics of belonging: beyond social cohesion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28: 513–535.
Zhou M (1997) Segmented assimilation: Issues controversies and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review* 31: 975–1008.

Author biography

Bandana Purkayastha is Professor of Sociology and Asian American Studies at the University of Connecticut (UCONN). She has served as the President, Sociologists for Women in Society (2013–2014), and is currently the American Sociological Association's (ASA) national representative to the International Sociological Association (2014–2018). Her research interests focus on intersectionality, human rights, migration, violence and peace; she has published over 50 peer-reviewed articles, books and chapters on these subjects. Her recent work includes *Human Rights in Our Own Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the US* (co-edited), which was awarded ASA-Human Rights section's Gordon Hirabayashi book award; and 'Intersectionality in a transnational world' (in *Gender and Society*). She has been recognized for her teaching, mentoring, research and leadership through several university, state and professional awards, including ASA-Asia and Asian American section's 2016 Contribution to the Field (career) award.

Résumé
Cet article introductif propose un cadre pour dépasser certaines fragmentations et hiérarchies de savoir qui touchent actuellement le champ de la sociologie des migrations. L'article s'appuie sur les idées - et les racines épistémologiques - utilisées dans différentes parties du monde pour réfléchir aux réalités de la migration et de la sécurité humaine au XXIème siècle. Il inclue les migrants internationaux, les personnes déplacées, les réfugiés et les victimes de la traite dans le cadre d'un même processus que partagent les modèles de migration saisonnière, temporaire et à long terme. Le cadre proposé est basé sur la littérature du Sud et du Nord globaux sur les processus politico-économiques qui ont influencé historiquement (et continuent à influencer) les trajectoires et la vie des migrants. Sur la base de l'approche dominante dans les études sur les migrations internationales, il démontre pourquoi il est nécessaire d'adopter cette approche au-delà des Etats-nations et d'un groupe particulier de migrants. Le cadre relie experts sur les déplacements internationaux, nationaux et forcés, ainsi que la littérature critique sur l'intersectionnalité et les droits humains, pour construire un cadre sur la sécurité humaine des migrants. Le cadre met l'accent sur le glocal - à l'intersection de zones mondiales, nationales et locales.

Mots-clés
Terrain glocal, migrations internes, migrations internationales, migration forcée, sécurité humaine, hiérarchies de savoir

Resumen
Este artículo introductorio propone un marco para la superación de ciertas fragmentaciones y jerarquías de conocimiento que afectan actualmente al campo sociológico de la migración. El artículo maneja ideas y fundamentos epistemológicos de distinta procedencia geográfica para reflexionar sobre las realidades de la migración y la seguridad humana en el siglo XXI, incluyendo a migrantes internacionales, desplazados internos, refugiados y víctimas de trata como partes de un mismo proceso que comparten patrones migratorios estacionales, temporales y a largo plazo. El marco propuesto se basa en la literatura sobre Sur y Norte globales al respecto de los procesos político-económicos que han influido históricamente (y siguen influyendo) en las trayectorias y vidas de los migrantes. Partiendo del enfoque dominante en los estudios sobre migración internacional, demuestra por qué es necesario llevar ese enfoque más allá de los estados-nación y de un grupo concreto de migrantes. El marco conecta las visiones de expertos en desplazamientos internacionales, internos y forzosos, así como la literatura crítica sobre interseccionalidad y derechos humanos, para construir un enfoque centrado en la seguridad humana de los migrantes en un terreno glocal – la intersección entre ámbitos globales, nacionales y locales.

Palabras clave
Terreno glocal, migración interna, migración internacional, migración forzosa, seguridad humana, jerarquías de conocimiento