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Abstract

Thousands of people including women, boys and girls from El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala are now on the way to find a safe place and better life outside of their home countries, exposing themselves to multiple forms of violence without ‘legal’ protection. Various reasons of the migrants leaving their homeland and violence on them have been disclosed through sources such as media, institutional reports and research. As the number of migrants of specifically women and young are growing, their experiences should thoroughly be comprehended and represented in a prism of gender and age/generation.

This research conducts a literature review focusing on three different channels: academic literature, non-governmental reports and documentary films. The study explores how is violence that surrounds young people’s especially young female migrants’ decisions to emigrate, and that is experienced during migration trails, which was addressed in the selected sources. It also seeks whether a relationship between violence, youth and gender in the context of migration has been described by the authors. The research reveals that many selected sources did not use gender and generation as an analytical lens for analysis of experiences of migrants. Also, most of the sources framed migrants as victims who are likely to be recognized as ‘passive’ and ‘vulnerable’ objectives, while the few authors captured that migrants’ agencies implement countermeasures against violence during the migrant trails.

Relevance to Development Studies

Unauthorized human transfer often facilitates human rights violation and exploitation, taking advantage of the migrants’ ‘illegal’ status. International protection and urgent response have been necessitated for Central American migrants. Representation of migrants’ experience by gender and generation reveals actors’ recognition and foci of target population. This research contributes to the academic and empirical fields in order to unveil the neediest population and shed light on migrants’ agency.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Background: From Voluntary to Forced Migration?

“Nos vamos, ya (we are going, now)”.

A woman told me that, and left the house with her 15-year old daughter. It was less than a week that they decided to undertake an illegal, perilous journey through Mexico in order to find a better life and an opportunity in the United States.

This story was not uncommon when I was staying with a Salvadoran family between 2014 and 2015, and this incidence led me to delving into this phenomenon. In fact, thousands of people from the Northern Triangle countries in Central America (NTCA), El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, imitate it to seek better life and a living condition in the U.S., and some others cannot reach there and instead stay in Mexico each year. The constituents are not only men but also women and children, who are extremely vulnerable in a dangerous migrant trail. The numbers of unaccompanied children and family was surged in 2014, showing almost 50,000 and 52,000 units respectively at the US-Mexico border according to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE 2014:3).

The migrant trend is not a new phenomenon in North and Central America. Violent conflicts in Central American countries generated a huge number of migrants in the 1970s and the 1980s, and many of them settled in the U.S. (Rodgers 2009:955). Although these wars finally finished, and the U.S. government sent back the migrants to their home countries, a trend of migration moving from Central America to North America has not gone down. According to Migration Policy Institute in the U.S., the immigrant population from Central America is constantly growing from 1980 to 2015, largely due to globalization. Most of migrants are pigeonholed as economic migrants whose aim are family unification.

---

and cueing themselves to be employed and relish better quality of life as is represented in seeking “American Dream” (Lesser and Batalova 2017: no pagination). On the other hand, the research accentuates, they also hope to eschew a plethora of menaces of natural disasters, political and economic instability and violence, and the endless poverty in these countries.

However, after the “2014 surge”, a sea of people, a majority of whom are unaccompanied children and women, arrived at the US-Mexico border, and the reason is avoidance of widespread violence and death threats in their countries of origin (Lesser and Batalova 2017: no pagination). This surge made a significant impact of shifting patterns of migrants from Central America on the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement who presented urgent needs for humanitarian protection (ICE 2014:3). Many migrants probably do not decide their migration voluntarily, but are forced to migrate to protect their family and their own life. As reported by Conference of Catholic Bishops in the U.S., violence in home country is one of the major motives to leave the home, for children and youth who arrive in the US (Carlson and Gallagher 2015:131). Combined with the severe condition of violence, political, economic and social problems such as poverty, few opportunities of employment and education trigger off their decision to migrate. These inter-related conditions prompt youth and children “to undertake a perilous journey at a young age with the hope of attaining long-term security” even though their status in the U.S. is illegal (Carlson and Gallagher 2015:131).

The complexity of young people’s experiences of migration is not linked only to violence and poverty at home. It is related to a combination of violence in migrants’ home countries and violence during their migration trails. Huge numbers of migrants confessed that they had suffered from diversified channels of violence during the journey. For example, according to a report of Doctors Without Borders in May 2017, 68.3 per cent of migrants have been exposed to some forms of violence during undertaking their migrant trails through Mexico.

---

Women and children are especially vulnerable to various forms of violence during the migration.

The research of Central American migrants, with the focus specifically on violence, youth and gender, is slowly developing as an academic field (e.g. Chavez 2016:4). There is an increasing number of scholars and institutions (such as international and Non-Governmental Organizations) researching this issue (Carlson and Gallagher 2015:130). However, comprehensive studies regarding violence surrounding the whole migration process – starting from violence as a motivation for migration and including violence during the migration trail – which are also focusing on gender and age/generation have been largely missing. This research is aiming at addressing the missing link.

**Research Objective**

In this research I conduct a literature review focusing on three different sources, in order to ascertain how is violence that surrounds young people’s decisions to migrate, and migration trails, addressed in academic literature, non-governmental reports and documentary films. I especially focus on young female migrants, and look whether a relationship between violence, youth and gender in the context of migration has been addressed by the authors.

Literature on migration often either addresses ‘violence at home’ as migrants’ motivation for migration, or ‘violence on the trail’ as their experience, but it does not often amalgamate the two. Also, mainstream migration studies frequently touch on ‘youth’ and ‘child-migrants’ without gender classification, or ‘women migrants’ without categorization them by age or generation. This study will combine those currently distinct elements in order to contribute to academic literature in regard to violence, gender and migration, by looking at violence as multidimensional, part of different stages of migration, and specific social characteristics of population, such as age and gender of young female migrants.
Research Question

The main research question is: how is the violence surrounding migrant from the Northern Triangle of Central American countries (NTCA), El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, towards the United States analysed and indicated in 1) the academic research, 2) reports of international organizations and agencies and 3) media sources and personal documents.

Sub-Questions would be as follows;

- How do the three sources address the violence as motivation of migrants triggering off migration, and as experience during undertaking the trail? What are similarities and differences in sources’ explanations of the violence, in their foci and gaps?
- Is violence as motivation and as experience (in these three sources) analysed through the prism of gender and generation/age of the migrants, and if so how?
- Do the three sources address the issue of how is violence as an experience of migration shared among migrants, their families and friends, and if so how?

Research Methodology

This research is conducted using three types of secondary sources: 1) academic literature, 2) non-governmental and supra-national organizations’ reports and 3) documentary films. The selection aims to investigate similarities and differences in comprehension of how violence is implicated in the lives of the migrants. The three different sources present specific institutions and constituencies, each engaged in the issue of migrants in its own way, with specific standpoints in contemporary society. Academia, international NGOs and supra-national agencies such as the United Nations, and media are selected as three sources with an assumption that their perspectives will tell us something about how are migrants perceived and treated in today’s societies. I use five academic studies, six reports and three documentary videos for this research. Two criteria are applied in the selection: a) the sources address migrants who had moved from the NTCA toward the U.S. including those who decided to stay in Mexico, and b) the sources explicitly address links between violence and migration. The
material I selected here is a combination of those that explore two violent sites - which are in migrants’ home countries and the migrant trails - and those which address only one of the sites.

**Academic sources**

Academic studies contribute to developing theories and providing new insights and/or approaches to address problems regarding migrations. They are supposed to offer deeper analysis and perspectives, although they do have biases related to the social and geo-political location of the author, theoretical perspective employed in analysis etc. The five selected academic articles address migrants from the NTCA traveling towards the US. Those are: Schmidt and Buechler (2017), García (2017), Keller et al. (2017), Vogt (2013) and Brigden (2017). Schmidt and Buechler (2017) and García (2017) refer to both sites of violence: in migrants’ home countries and that on the migrant trails in Mexico. Keller et al. (2017) seek motivations of migration with focusing on the home countries. Vogt (2013) and Brigden (2017), mainly shed light on migrant trails with little or no attention to a condition of home countries. Most of the research upon these articles are based was conducted in migrant shelters in either Mexico or the U.S. by using interviews with migrants and workers in shelters.

**Schmidt and Buechler (2017)** research the violence as the motivation of Central American migrant women for leaving their home countries, and the experience along migrant trails, with focus on “protective strategies” (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:139). Their research has two main objectives. First, it highlights how violence surrounding women in the countries of origin is a determinant of being migrants even though the route through Mexico menaces them. On the other hand, the study explains the role of social networks as a strategy for migrants to survive the perilous journey during the migration. The data was collected by ethnographic observations, interviews and conversations in a shelter for migrants, and the study of social media in Mexico from 2014 to 2015, involving twenty women age from 19 to 46 and the other key informants participated in in-depth interviews at the shelter (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:144-145).

**García (2017)** provides the “panoramic perspective” (García 2017:10) of Central American migration in his book “No More Walls: Exclusion and Forced Migration”. He stresses the contributions of the analysis of three dimensions
which are a) causes of the forced migrations, b) regional policies in the countries of origin, and c) experiences in migrant networks in the local communities along migrant trails, and their mutual relationships (García 2017:10). It is argued that “the processes of forced migration are triggered as a consequence of neoliberal policies and migration controls” such as for instance, enforcements of borders and implementation of laws by which migrations become more Sisyphean endeavour (García 2017:7). The data for this study was collected from other literature and reports, and three field studies in communities of Guatemala and shelters in Mexico between 2012 and 2014 (García 2017:8-9).

The third material, Keller et al. (2017), is different from other materials in terms of the objective, target population and loci of research. It is worth analyzing within this framework of gender and generation because their research presents important results of linkage between migration and violence in the migrants’ home countries. The research aimed to examine mental health and trauma exposure of the migrants who arrived at the U.S. border from Central American countries. It specifically seeks reasons of leaving their home countries through examinations of social and psychological aspects and the frequency of meeting the U.S. legal asylum criteria (Keller et al. 2017:1). They collected data by interviewing 234 people who were over 18 years old in Texas in 2014. As a result, the research showed 83 per cent of the interviewees stating violence as the primary reason for their journey, 90 per cent expressed fear to return to their home countries, and around 70 per cent were diagnosed as eligible for the asylum criteria (Keller et al. 2017:6).

The last two materials mainly analyse the migrant trail. Although Vogt (2013) stepped somewhat into situations of each migrant’s home country, her focus is put on how the migrants’ bodies are commodified within local and global economies in the migrant trails. In more technical terms, she argues the violence surrounding them along the journey is resulted from “historical trajectories of political and criminal violence and by local and global economies that profit from human mobility” (Vogt 2013:764). She named the economy surrounding migrants as “cachucho industry” in which the violence is systematized and used as central mechanism of making profits by taking advantage of migrants’ vulnerability (Vogt 2013:764). The data was collected by an ethnographic approach for 15 months in a shelter located in Mexico in 2008-9, and filtered by
“analytical lens of violence” (Vogt 2013:776). She concluded that the violence “cannot be separated from longer trajectories of political and criminal violence, economic demands, and state militarization projects” (Vogt 2013:776).

**Brigden (2017)** examines how Central American migrant men and women attempted to comprehend gender scripts which code masculine and feminine actions consciously or unconsciously as a strategy to overcome their migrant trails (Brigden 2017:1). It led to formulating an assertion that migrants do not only passively become victims of the violence derived from gender, but also perform gender to manage to arrive at their destination (Brigden 2017:1). Her approach is based on a study of improvisation, and feminist methodological and ethical discussions about fieldwork performances (Brigden 2017:12). The data was collected from interviews with 90 participants in fieldwork between 2009 and 2011 in 11 transit communities in Mexico, and targeted trips with 16 follow-up interviews in the U.S. Also, followed-up trips were made along the migration routes from 2014 to 2016. This research showed that “gender scripts” diffuse among migrants along the trail which play a significant role as strategies of both men and women (Brigden 2017:11).

**Reports**

The second source consists of six reports published by United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Amnesty International (Amnesty), Human Rights Watch (HRW), International Crisis Group (ICG), and the Scalabrinian International Migration Network (SIMN). Because of the number of young migrants is increasing, the attention of these organizations seems to be shifted from adult migrants to unaccompanied children and youth. In addition, the approaches of these organizations have been seemingly transformed from single dimension to broader views that tackle migration as a process ranging from motivation to leave to description of their trails to a policy formulation of detention in the U.S. and Mexico. The main methodology used in these reports is interviewing migrants, workers and governments’ officials of Mexico and NTCA. The principal approach is based on international law on human rights, and the audience for these reports is basically donors, activists and governments, provid-
ing recommendations and suggestions for changes in policies. Despite these similarities, each institution issuing report has its particular strategy and mission, and thus also its particular perspective on violence, gender and youth in relation to migration.

Two of the six reports are by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), for reasons related to the focus of my own research: “Children on the Run” (2014) and “Women on the Run” (2015). Both reports examine the necessity of international protection of children or women who arrived at the U.S. border from El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Mexico. The former report, UNHCR (2014), researched unaccompanied or separated children to ascertain a linkage between why these children left from their home countries and their international protection needs (UNHCR 2014:5). UNHCR interviewed 404 children from four countries consisting of 313 boys and 91 girls, ages from 12 to 17 who arrived at the U.S. before and during 2011. The research reveals that 58 per cent of children in total were under requirement of an international protection, with the average of 72 per cent from El Salvador, 64 per cent from Mexico, 57 per cent from Honduras and 38 per cent from Guatemala (UNHCR 2014:25). In the latter report, UNHCR (2015) investigated women’s experiences in a condition of violence in the NTCA and Mexico, which are interpreted as “protection crisis” (UNHCR 2015:3). The data was collected from in-depth individual interviews with 160 women (63 Salvadoran, 30 Guatemalan, 30 Honduran, and 37 Mexican, including 15 transgender women) age 18 to 57 in 2015, but without reflecting on age and generation as an analytical category for reflecting on women’s experiences (UNHCR 2015:13). It is stated that women’s serious experiences of human rights violations should be considered under the 1951 convention regarding refugee states, which led to promulgating 1967 protocol and related jurisprudence (UNHCR 2015:6). Both UNHCR reports conclude that all unaccompanied and separated children and women who arrived from the NTCA countries have to be screened properly for international protections and have to be provided an opportunity to access asylum procedures (UNHCR 2014:17, 2015:6).

Third report is by Amnesty International (2016), with the title “Home Sweet Home? Honduras, Guatemala And El Salvador's Role in A Deepening Refugee Crisis”. The aim is to “truly understand” the dynamic flow of migrants
from the regions, and to clarify the trails where migrants start and often end their journey (Amnesty 2016:5). The data was collected from five trips and interviewing around 50 deportees in reception centres, those who work for civil society and religious organizations, and government officials in NTCA and Mexico in 2016. It was unveiled that the governments of NTCA are “doubly failing” to protect their citizens in each step of the procedure (Amnesty 2016:5). It is argued that the states are failing to manage the conditions of chronic poverty and violence, which have penetrated into the region and rendered thousands of the people emigrating, and also to protect those who were sent back to the violent environments from which they left (Amnesty 2016:5).

The forth research is “Closed Doors” of Human Rights Watch (2016) which examined the situation of asylum application system in Mexico for migrants, specifically children. The research collected data by interviewing 61 children, boys and girls, more than 100 adults, and representatives of UNHCR and nongovernmental organizations without identifying adults’ gender and specific age of the interviewees. The research exposed several contradictions between the law of migrant protection and its enforcement in Mexico (HRW 2016:6). The research is relevant as it specifically focused on a Mexican government’s legal measures against migrant children, and related violations of law and migrant children’s rights, rather than focusing on violence either at home countries or on the migrant trail.

The fifth report is by the International Crisis Group (2016) delving into the migration phenomenon in terms of social, institutional and economic failures of the governments of Mexico, the U.S. and NTCA. The study collected data by interviewing migrants, officials, aid workers and activists in Guatemala and Mexico, without engaging in discussions about gender and generation, and without disclosing gender and age of the interviewees. The report criticised deportations by Mexico and the U.S. government, noting that with no treatment for endemic poverty and violence in the NTCA countries addressing the migration in Central America will fail (ICG 2016:24). It was concluded that receiving states of Mexico and the U.S. should offer opportunity for migrants to access an efficient process for asylum-seeking while the ‘sending’ countries of NTCA have to address the
insecurity more effectively, monitor and offer assistance for those who are deported from the ‘receiving’ countries in order not to reattempt migration (ICG 2016:i).

The last report is published by the Scalabrinian International Migration Network (2017) which operates migrant shelters to protect and assist migrants in Mexico, Guatemala and El Salvador. It is reported that since the spring in 2014, it has received more than 100,000 migrants, majority of whom are unaccompanied children, youth and young mothers with children escaping from violence in their home countries (SIMN 2017:81). The research reports the situation of current migration flow from NTCA towards the U.S., analysing how governments of the U.S., Mexico and other nations have responded to the migration crisis. It is critically argued that the “deterrence tactics— the use of interdiction, detention, and deportation, among other schemes” - are used in order to send a message to make those who have right to access asylum seeking to stay at home, without sufficient effort to address the root causes of their migration (SIMN 2017:80).

**Documentaries**

The last set of material are documentaries produced by different types of media broadcasters and organizations. These visual sources aim to appeal to public sentiment by broadcasting digested series of news. The methodology of three selected documentaries was a combination of interviewing migrants and following them through the journey. The visual materials also reflect biases of editors by focalising specific viewpoints and framing specific stories

The first source is “Between Borders: America’s Migrant Crisis” created by New York Times (NYT) Documentary in October 2015. It focuses on child migrants on the way to the U.S. and violence surrounding children when they return home, *inter alia*, to Honduras. Many children who were trying to migrate toward the U.S. were apprehended and deported, and were living in shelters in Honduras or as street children. They were interviewed in the video. The journalist visited some shelters and other places, interviewed three girls, two women, six boys and two men in Honduras, and accompanied and interviewed five other boys at their migrant trails and in a migrant shelter in Mexico.
The second video source is a short documentary made by Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA) in September 2016 which was titled, “Children Under Threat: Fleeing Central America and Seeking Refuge”. It addresses violence migrants faced at both sites - their home countries and their migrant routes - by interviewing both men and women, and young and adult.

The last source is “Crossing Mexico’s Other Border” published by VICE MEXICO in March 2013. VICE is an organization which addresses deep social issues and specifically target youth audience. This documentary described migrants’ routes through Mexico focusing on shifting trends of migration. Although it highlights only the migrant route without addressing the violence in home countries and is relatively older than the other two video materials, the interviews with migrants, authorities and activists are worth being analysed to capture how migrants are recognised by each actor within a framework of the documentary.

Structure of Paper

The following chapter will present an analytical framework for this research. The research is based on Stuart Hall’s concept of representation which would be complemented by two methodologies of focalization and framing. As analytical frameworks, the Galtung’s system of violence is applied to facilitate categorising the types of violence. Also, perspectives of gender and age/generation, specifically violence against women and girls, are applied for the reflection on the three sources. Chapter three will analyse the violence in migrants’ home countries of NTCA comparing perspectives of the three sources (i.e. academia, report and media). This chapter seeks to comprehend how the three sources address roots causing current migration from historical, economic, social and cultural conditions in these countries. Chapter four will provide a broad map of collective violence experienced by migrants during the migrant trails and analyses how do the three sources address and analyse the situation through Mexico. This chapter also provides an analysis of elements regarding violence such as migrants’ strategies countering violence. Chapter five seeks to comprehend how the selected literature addresses a linkage between violence, gender and generation and which part is lacking. As the concluding chapter, it discusses how each
source frame the migrants and focalise their perspectives, comparing the violence in migrants' home countries and violence during migrant trails.
Chapter 2
Conceptual and Analytical Framework

The objective of this chapter is to outline the theoretical perspectives that inform analysis of the three selected sources in order to comprehend their representation of migration from Central America towards the United States.

Representation

A principal concept of this research is based on the politics of representation to understand how violence in several stages of migration in Central America is represented by three selected sources. The main assumption of Stuart Hall is that the practice of representation is “the production of meaning through language” (Hall 1997:16). He introduced constructionist approach which assumed that texts and words are not merely used as a mirror of social reality but are constructing and representing social reality through the practice. He argued that “Meaning is produced by the practice, the ‘work’, of representation. It is constructed through signifying practices” (Hall 1997:28). Also, Meijer argued that “what we experience as reality is formed through the represented and the representable” (Meijer 1993:368). Each source is analysed through constructionist approach to see the representation constructed by the authors and the specific meanings afforded to violence, gender and age/generation. It is important to note that analysing representation means understanding the bias. Utilizing focalisation and framing as tools has been central in the analysis.

Focalization is defined by Meijer as “the connection between the subject of vision, and that which is seen” (Meijer 1993:375). This perspective allows me to find which protagonist is focused on by the producer of the text/visuals, and which are absent. It reveals the boundaries between people who are focalised, accepted and synthesised as “us” by the audience and those who are not shed light to, and are denied being protagonist, or are represented as “others” (Meijer 1993:369). In this research, this is useful to analyse who and how is focalised and stressed in the setting of migration in the selected sources. The other analytical method is framing which allows me to analyse the ways the events related to migration are reported, as reflection of “a process of recurring selection and
emphasis in communicating perceived reality” (Papacharissi 2008:53). Framing plays an important role of “how individuals cognitively comprehend and file events, and as such, are an important determinant of how a news story is told” (Papacharissi 2008:53). Also, each frame can be categorised into two types; episodic and thematic frames. Episodic frames are focusing on describing single cases which are likely to be seen through the lens of negative stereotypes, while thematic frames offer broader coverage focusing on the socio-political and historical context of the case (Papacharissi 2008:58). In this research, I analyse how each source frames the violence surrounding young, female migrants in two settings (the home and the trail) as motivation for leaving home-country and as experience during the migration. From this point of view, the point of analysis would be: what are the dominant frames used in these sources’ coverage of migrants, and how the frames are employed.

**Analytical Framework: The System of Violence**

To analyse multiple forms of violence experienced by Central American migrants, the theory of violence triangle, which is introduced by Johan Galtung in 1969, is useful to classify the violence in both settings of migrant trail and the home countries. Although Galtung initially brought the concept of violence almost 50 years ago, his classification is still practical to understand multi-dimensional aspects of violence. He defined violence as “the cause of the difference between the potential and the actual, between what could have been and what is” (Galtung 1969:168). With this concept, his interpretation of violence was beyond the general understanding of direct violence, the visible harm or destruction. He named visible, physical violent act such as killing, injuring and harming as “direct violence”, while the indirect harm or influence on suffering of people - such as poverty, famine, oppression and discrimination - was defined as “structural violence”. Galtung explained the difference between direct and structural violence by associating direct violence with “an actor that commits the violence as personal or direct, and to violence where there is no such actor as structural or indirect” (Galtung 1969:170). Later, he added the concept of “cultural violence”, defined as “those aspects of culture, the symbolic sphere of our existence that can be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence” (Galtung 1990:291). He emphasised that his understanding is not that an entire culture of
a country or a society itself is violent, but rather that some aspects of culture can be violent. These three systems of violence form the core analytical lens in this research and help me to see how three different sources address the complex situation in Central American migration.

**Gender and Generation: Violence Against Women and Girls**

The system of violence triangle is not sufficient when we look at the impact of violence through the prism of gender and generation. In the migrant trail, women and young girls face specific modes of violence and may differently be treated by surroundings. In this research, violence against women and girls will be applied to complement the Galtung’s violence theory.

Violence against women is defined as “a violation of human rights and a form of discrimination against women and shall mean all acts of gender-based violence that result in, or are likely to result in, physical, sexual, psychological or economic harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life” (Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, 2011). Gender based violence against women and girls is related to the practices that are linked to hegemonic masculinity and heteronormativity. Connell defined hegemonic masculinity as the legitimised gender practice in exercising men’s dominance over women and ‘less masculine’ men in patriarchal society (Connell 2005:77). The Latin American culture of “Machismo” can be identified as hegemonic masculinity and this concept is embedded in the state as an institution and in the society as a whole. The concept of heteronormativity determines the ideal role of men and women within institutionalized heterosexual relationships, specifically in patriarchal society. Thus, heteronormativity refers not only to specific ideas about female and male sexuality, but to the fact that those ideas are institutionalized – in institutions such as family, marriage, the state etc. Within this context, violence against LGBT people should also be taken into account, specifically violence against lesbian and

---

3 Cited from Council of Europe
[https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/090000168008482e](https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/090000168008482e)
transgender women. Budhiraja et al. argued that “human rights abuses against lesbian and bisexual women are shaped and determined by particular gender prescriptions and standards as well as by sexual identity” (Budhiraja et al. 2010:137). Thus, for this research I examine whether and how the selected sources utilize the concepts of gender-based violence, hegemonic masculinity and heteronormativity, and whether and how they pay attention to the gendered power relationships and violent practices that influence migrant’s decisions to leave their countries and their experiences on the migrant trail.

The study of children and youth will be applied to see whether and how the selected sources recognise and describe children’s and young people’s experience differed from adulthoods’ experience, with particular attention to girls. White argues that although children and young population are patently ‘vulnerable’ in the sense of necessity for adult protection, focusing too much on vulnerability alone can “encourage notions of the young as passive, helpless victims, obscuring their strengths and competences, their own ideas about ways of coping with adversity, and their rights to take part as active agents in their own” (White 2003: no pagination). For analytical purpose, I apply the United Nations’ definition of youth which defines the population between 15 and 24 years old4, even though biological age does not have to correspond with social responsibilities children and youth may have in their families and communities.

In analysing humanitarian response for crisis such as regarding refugee and migration, it is important to recognise “who is affected — women or men, girls or boys — and who among them is the most at risk” so as to offer adequate service to those who are most in need (IASC 2006:8). To examine how the humanitarian response impacts the affected population, the data should be gathered by categorising sex and age and other factors, including ethnicity and religion (IASC 2006:8).

---

Chapter 3
Analysing Violence in Migrants’ Home Countries

In this chapter, I analyse how the three selected sources, academic literature, reports by UN and NGOs and documentaries, address the violence in the NTCA as migrants’ home countries. The Galtung’s system of violence and the perspectives of gender and generation as an analytical tool will be applied to seek a linkage between violence, gender and generation/age. Although conditions of the three countries, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala are not the same, there are many commonalities such as transnational criminal groups through these regions.

Brief Reflection on Violence in the NTCA

Northern Triangle of Central America - El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala - is one of the most violent areas in the world, due to high level of homicide and crime rates (SIMN 2017:81-82). According to the statistics of United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, El Salvador is marked the highest homicide rate of 108 per 100,000 people, followed by Honduras presenting the second highest rate of 63 per 100,000 people in 2015. Violence among them mainly accrues from the organised criminal groups and street youth gangs which are called “Maras” acting over the three countries (Rodgers 2009:956). In particular, the research states that names of the two largest gang groups, the Mara Salvatrucha and the Discos, are permeated in these regions. They engage in cruel killings and violence against each other to control areas and drug routes, which are factors to maintain the extreme level of violence in this region (UNHCR 2015:16). Historically, these groups have been organized in Los Angeles, the U.S., when many Central Americans migrated in order to escape from the civil wars in the 1970s and the 1980s (Chavez 2016:71). After the end of these wars, the U.S. government started to deport those who did not have legal resident permit in the U.S. including gangs and convicts, and over 90 percent of them were from the Northern Triangle region (Rodgers 2009:956). The research states that deported gang members were reunified again in their countries of origin,

5 Cited from UNODC statistics https://data.unodc.org/#state:13
which created the gang groups. Also, according to the research, they expanded their numbers and the control of the areas with involving local citizen particularly young men and boys. UNHCR (2015:16) estimated around 20,000 gang members exist in El Salvador, 12,000 in Honduras, and 22,000 in Guatemala. Homicide is mainly caused by conflicts between gangs, criminal groups and the state police, due to controls of territory and drug trafficking route from South America to the North (UNODC 2013:44). This condition of violence leads to making the murder, impunity and female homicide rates at the highest level in the world (UNHCR 2015:16). Amnesty International (2016:11) also argues that the daily violence is undermining the citizen’s right to life, freedom of movement and education in their home countries.

These activities of gangs directly influence on citizens’ life, which resulted in the surge of migration specifically of women and children in 2014 discussed in introduction. UNHCR conducted research to ascertain the logic of unaccompanied and separated children who arrived alone at the US-Mexico border. The research uncovered that more than half of children had been potentialized to relish of international protection, which emphasised the linkage between the migration, fear of widespread violence and insecurity in their countries of origin (UNHCR 2014:6). Also, Kellar et al. (2017:6) showed that 83 per cent of the interviewed migrants stated violence as the primary reason for their journey and around 70 per cent were diagnosed as eligible for the asylum criteria. International Crisis Group (ICG) (2016:8) argued that even though there are multiple motives for people to become migrants such as seeking better jobs to support family and joining parents and relatives, the fundamental reason is that violence is unbearable. In relation to that the group shows a quote by a woman, “but you can’t live in fear”. These studies confirmed that the trend of current migration has shifted from the previous dominant reason for Central American migrants, which was motivated by an economic opportunity; rather, today it is to save themselves and their families and continue a normal life separated from the widespread violence (e.g. Amnesty 2016:6, ICG 2016:i).

In this context, an impact on violence in these countries may heterogeneously affect population, depending on their gender and generation. It can be analysed by categorising it into three forms of violence according to the Galtung’s system of violence, i.e. direct, structural and cultural violence. Among the
selected sources, four out of five academic studies, all six reports and two out of three documentaries addressed the linkage of direct and structural violence with migration while not all of them discussed what difference these forms of violence make in terms of gender and generation.

The Combination of Direct and Structural Violence

Half of the selected sources explicitly pointed out that a combination of direct and structural violence in home countries motivated people to undertake the migrant journey. In this analysis, obvious and visible violence such as killing, direct death threats, kidnapping, sexual assault and violence, extortion, murder of family or close members are categorised into “direct violence” which is generated by certain perpetrators such as gangs and criminal groups. Keller et al. (2017:6) described this kind of violence as traumatic events and noted that 90 per cent of participants expressed their fear of returning to their home countries. Combined with the direct violence, the norm of impunity is categorised as “structural violence” which makes people afraid of reporting to the state where the police work together with gang members (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:147). Keller et al. (2017:6) report that most of the participants could not expressed their fear to the police or local authorities because they were afraid to “gang retaliation (39%), concerns about police corruption (23%), or belief that a police report would be ineffective or detrimental (25%)”. The research estimates that approximately 70 per cent of all participants are diagnosed to meet the criterion for asylum-seeking status although there is a difference among countries: El Salvador 79%, Honduras 74% and Guatemala 41%. Amnesty International (2016:6) confirmed in their research that the violence is a crucial “expulsion factor” of people in the NTCA, in particular, El Salvador and Honduras. The organization formulates an assertion that the direct violence by gang groups and territorial control obviously violate the citizen’s right to life, education and movement, and women are specifically subject to the violence. It is concluded that the government and authorities in the NTCA did not only failed to prevent the gang groups from growing and controlling their territory, but also involved and collaborated with the groups in the corrupting law enforcement (Amnesty 2016:5). According to an interview in New York Times (2015), the director of the shelter in Hon-
Duras suggested that combination of various causes such as high levels of poverty, lack of opportunities of education and employment and violence mainly become triggers for children to move toward the U.S. in spite of dangers of the trails. For example, the documentary exemplified a young man as an interviewee in a migrant shelter, and he described that his reason for leaving home was a combination of factors such as no opportunity of employment, corruption, criminal gangs and violence. Another child noted that the gangs in Honduras are recruiting children because of their preparation for gang wars. WOLA added that younger and younger population are leaving their home countries because of these factors, and SIMN also suggests the combination of “the impunity rate of 95% (Chavez and Avalos 2014)”, violence, poverty, and lack of opportunity has incentivised Central Americans, especially children, to move towards Mexico and the U.S. (SIMN 2017:82).

Schmidt and Buechler (2017:147) argue that conditions of the post-war in the NTCA have been “an ideal breeding ground” for gang groups to control the area, which was created by the climate of corruption among authorities related to drugs, political instability, and the U.S. deportation of migrants including criminals with guns. The social inequalities are increased as a result of economic reforms and created vulnerabilities of the populations, leading to numbers in the gang and criminal groups to be expanded (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:150).

It is assumed that this violence has replaced “political violence of earlier years” in post-war Central America and is related to the lack of security in the post-war period (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:147). They referred to Rob Nixon’s term of “slow violence” to explain the slow process of undermining people’s, especially women’s lives, and highlight “inhumane conditions including inadequate shelter and hunger as well as physical violence in their homes, communities, and on the migrant trail” (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:149-150). The authors explained that lack of economic opportunities, expanding violent scenes and gendered inequalities are inseparable factors for women to flee from their countries of origin (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:150). SIMN analysed that chronic poverty due to the lack of competitiveness in global market as the crucial problem to exacerbate the violence (SIMN 2017:82).
In addition to the detailed description of the violence in home countries, García (2017) and Vogt (2013) offered views of the migration from a perspective of selectability of their life rather than their motivation. They do not focus on the direct harm such as gang violence or murders, and offer little or no attention to migrants’ gender and generation. García (2017) describes the violence during the civil war using Guatemalan case and argues that the current migration flow is triggered “by armed conflict and [then] by neoliberal policies” (García 2017:38) which are implemented by the government after the end of civil wars in each country. He addresses direct violence as a part of structural and political violence because, he explains, the forced migration is linked to the displacement of war period (García 2017:14). Additionally, he examined regional policies which played an important role to promote dismantling local economies and exclusion that forced the vulnerable population to emigrate. Among those various policies are "the Plan Puebla Panama", "the Plan Colombia", "the Merida Initiative" and "the Central America Regional Security Initiative" (Garcia 2017:39). Vogt analyses the situation of Northern Triangle as "double bind of economics and violence" (Vogt 2013:769) which consist of chronic unemployment, violence and death and is caused by collective histories of violence, economic insecurity and militarization. She described the root of such violence from structural and historical views that “systematically weaken the ability of people to live in their home communities with safety and justice” (Vogt 2013:766-767). The legacy of war-time violence combined with economic instability created “the conditions for what some call “new violence” to emerge (Benson et al. 2008) in post-war Central America” and it allowed the border between “political violence and criminal violence [to] become blurred (Coutin 2007; Godoy 2005; Zilberg 2011)” (Vogt 2013:768).

Both of these authors analysed the violence in home countries at macro-level which assumes that historical and political background forces people to move towards the North. This approach allows to address the root causes of the current phenomenon of migration which is embedded through the history, culture and society in this area. However, they have often overlooked specific aspects of violence especially gender and generation, and the ways direct, structural and cultural violence are gendered and determined by age.
Amnesty International brings different and important perspectives in terms of governments’ response in three countries of the NTCA. The reports critically analysed the governments’ and authorities’ “lack of recognition of internal displacement” (Amnesty 2016:26). Authors of the report argue that the authorities are failing in the duty to protect the citizens by not only ignoring the increasing levels of violence and murders but also by “minimizing the importance of violence as a push factor for migration” (Amnesty 2016:26). The authorities interpret that the reasons of migration as simply “economic factors” and the increase of asylum-seeker “was merely the product of clever ‘coyotes’ who knew how to coach their clients and manipulate the system” (Amnesty 2016:27). The research argues “the multi-causality of migration and the inherent interconnectedness of its push factors” are unrecognised and ignored by officials (Amnesty 2016:26). Amnesty International viewed some authorities’ reluctance to recognise the violence as the largest push factor for migrants, and thus to offer protection for migrants and deportees (Amnesty 2016:29). The U.S.-funded development program “the Plan of the Alliance for Prosperity” is referenced by authorities as the main strategy to address the root causes of migration, but no one could offer any insight into how the strategy gives protection for migrants whose human rights have been violated during the migrant trail in Mexico and those who have been deported back despite the fact that many of them face a great risks and danger (Amnesty 2016:45). Amnesty International concluded that none of these governments offer comprehensive program or clear policy for offering protection. The report suggests that the crisis of migration will not end until the leaders of sending countries address and make concentrate effort towards resolving security problems in their own countries (Amnesty 2016:6).

**Cultural Violence**

According to Galtung’s definition of violence, the culture of ‘machismo’ can be seen as a cultural violence, which is derived from patriarchal Latin American society as a form of hegemonic masculinity and legitimised through the existence of “a long tradition of a culture of marginalisation and mistreatment of women” (Zulver 2016:175). The culture of machismo which is embedded in society and institutions such as the government, police and judicial system in the region have been largely researched from feminist perspectives (e.g. Zulver 2016, Hume
2009, Walsh and Menjívar 2016). However, there are very few analyses among the selected sources regarding cultural dimension of violence in the NTCA.

Schmidt and Buechler mentioned cultural dimension of violence relating to the role of mothers in Latin America. Mothers are expected to be responsible for nourishing children so that “the gendered expectations of motherhood” make women to be “sole providers” for children (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:150). UNHCR offered the case of LGBTI people, particularly transgender women, show how impossible for them it is to find safety at home (UNHCR 2015:30). The authors do not speak about cultural violence, but implicitly suggest the social norm of discrimination against transgender people because of gender identity and/or sexual orientation and obviously criticise the lack of protection for them in the NTCA. Various testimonies of transgender women in the research showed direct attacks, discrimination and harassment by numerous people including criminal group members, authorities, police and family members (UNHCR 2015:28-29).

Amnesty International pointed out that no government has adequate systems to investigate crimes regarding the homicide of women and LGBTI people, although the incidences of violence against them is a result of their gender identity and/or their sexual orientation (Amnesty 2016:15). Human Rights Watch added that “impunity is the rule for femicide and crimes of sexual violence” (HRW 2016:24). It is argued that specifically transgender women, “who because of patriarchal social norms are particularly stigmatized”, are targeted by direct violence of gang members and authorities and that “they often face greater obstacles to access justice, due to discrimination” (Amnesty 2016:15). They concluded as a result, many LGBTI people who have experienced violence, have no option except to flee their country (Amnesty 2016:15).

These three sources addressed the cultural violence implicitly or explicitly although contrary to my expectation, none of them addresses heteronormativity, masculinity, or the term ‘machismo’ or ‘macho’ culture.
Gendered Representation and Gender-Based Violence

Unexpectedly, academic research offered very limited analysis on the difference that migrants’ gender and generation could make. For example, Schmidt and Buechler (2017) stated that they use feminist perspective as analytical tool, but they did not mention anything about gendered violence in the migrants’ home countries. Also, the victims they described are only women, without mentioning male victims and LGBTI people. To the contrary, most of the male actors are mentioned as gang members, guides, fellow migrants, criminals, or governmental officials and are described as the perpetrator of various forms of gender-based violence against women, such as rape and sexual violence. Even though the targeted population in the research (age from 19 to 46) includes young female migrants, the difference of the impact of youth and adulthood on being the victim or the perpetrator of violence is not addressed in the research. Meanwhile, the research of mental health, which is conducted by Keller et al (2017) targeted those who were over 18 years old – thus it included young adults. However, their sex and age have not been included into the analytical perspectives and are not mentioned even though the research might have had difference in results if gender and generation were explicitly included. The violent site the authors investigated were only migrants’ home countries and violence as the reasons of leaving countries, but there is no mention about migrant trails.

Contrary to the lack of attention to gender and generation in academic texts, gender-based violence seems to be one of the largest focus among the reports. UNHCR and Amnesty International offered broad context of women’s circumstance in the migrants’ home countries. UNHCR pointed out that many women cannot find safety even at home, which is rarely expected to receive any support from authorities. The domestic violence, mainly physical and sexual violence, often combined with psychological violence, sometimes become life-threatening and brutal for women and children (UNHCR 2015:25). Many women confessed to UNHCR that they have abusive partners who were members or associates of gangs and criminal groups, which makes it more difficult for women to seek the protection from authorities. UNHCR argue that the police officers and their family also receive threats and are being targeted if they refuse to work and cooperate with gangs (UNHCR 2015:16). Also, UNHCR argued that many women even do not know the reason why they or their family members become target
by the gang groups as their husbands, partners or children often do not participate in the violence surrounding them (UNHCR 2015:19). Majority of women who were interviewed were living in community controlled by gangs or criminal groups and most of them became target of direct threat and attacks. Moreover, simply witnessing a murder can be a threat for violence in community and a reason for a forced displacement. UNHCR stated that the criminal groups are often the highest powers in the areas that the government is hardly able to protect its citizens and specifically the women. The increasing number of gangs control their territories and its citizens (UNHCR 2015:16) and everyday threat and violence become reality even just watching the violence in community. UNHCR (2015:19, 27-28) addressed that indigenous and LGBTI population are specifically exposed to extreme violence not only by criminal groups but also by family members, state officials, and other community members. Transgender women interviewed by UNHCR experienced more frequent occurrence of gender-based violence and lack of police protection, as their gender identity further exacerbated their vulnerability. Living in the community, they are often subject to discrimination and physical violence where there is a high level of violence anyway. The “discriminatory lack of access to safe work” increase their potential risk of serious harm and attack (UNHCR 2015:29).

Amnesty International (2016:14) confirms that women who suffer from targeted violence or gender-based violence have right to ask for international protection even if it is by partner or family. It insists that an impact of violence differently affect people “according to their gender identity and/or their sexual orientation”, and women are “routinely subjected to violence and the duty to investigate is routinely flouted” (Amnesty 2016:14). UNHCR (2015:23) argues that although all three countries have the law of addressing violence against women, police and state authorities do not have ability to offer sufficient protection for women. None of the women interviewed by UNHCR stated that they received adequate treatment or protection by police or authorities. Rather, some women mentioned that the police and authorities collaborate with gangs and criminal groups and directly threaten, harm and attack women (UNHCR 2015:23).

In the documentaries, New York Times addressed a girl in the shelter who talked about her experience of sexual abuse and violence. WOLA’s documentary
clearly divided physical violence against men and sexual violence against women by using interviews both at home and on the trail. It frames the migrants - both men and women – as victims of violence and does not mention about perpetrators, and it suggests the possibility of persecution by government when people claim to be the victims of violence.

**Perspective of Gender and Generation: Violence against Girls and Boys**

There are very few descriptions of experiences of children and youth among these sources, and even less linkages between gender and generation. Among the selected sources, three reports (Amnesty, UNHCR and HRW) and two documentaries (NYT and WOLA) addressed youth and children to various extent, but the academic texts hardly did. Although some authors such as Schmidt and Buechler and Keller et al., mention migrants who over 18 years old - which includes youth population - none of them offered specific analysis of youth and issue of generation in relation to violence be it at home or on the trails.

UNHCR directly researched children’s reason of migration, who were between 12 to 17 years old and consist of 22.5 % of girls and 77.5 % boys in the report published in 2014. They offered multiple types of direct violence which are experienced by the children such as violence in the community, abuse in the home and sexual violence. They revealed a gender difference in children’s experience of gang-related harm, for example, 37 % of boys discussed “violent forced conscription” while only 7% of girls talked it, and 24% of girls confessed “rape, other sexual violence or threats of same” which only 1% of boys mentioned (UNHCR 2014:27). On the other hand, the other report of UNHCR “Women on the Run” does not categorise the youth and adulthood although their target includes young population between 18 and 25 years old. Amnesty International (2016:18) argues that the linkage between violence and children’s reason of migration is directly related to that of adults. They mentioned that youth and children are particularly targeted of recruitment for gangs, stressing that gender differences are important as “boys are exposed to economic exploitation in the form of forced conscription and girls are at risk of sexual exploitation” (Amnesty 2016:18). The report mentions concerns with education and future employment
of youth forcibly involved in gangs. Leaving schools of entire generation prospects “at risk, perpetuates social exclusion, and further complicates efforts to extricate them from the hold of organized crime” (Amnesty 2016:17). Human Rights Watch and the Scalabrinian International Migration Network have similarities in their ways of analysis. Both reports address children’s experience mentioning several types of violence in home countries and argue that children are especially vulnerable in the region. As one person said, “if you’re young and poor, your life is at risk every day” (SIMN 2017:82). However, they did not reveal the child interviewee’s gender and age. Also, they offered only examples of the cases as the reasons of fleeing and did not specifically analyse the root causes of the violence.

New York Times documentary video mentioned Honduras as one of the most difficult place to live as a teenager. It describes that drug abuse among children is common in Honduras because of their desire to forget about hunger, pain or anxiety in the situation of the country. Moreover, the journalist questioned students in the class about violence in community and asked for detail. But these students expressed the sensitivity and feeling of fear for their security when they talked about the violence, and refused to engage in some discussions. WOLA documentary does not reveal the age of interviewees but that can be roughly identified visually. The video showed experiences of young girls/woman and boys/man regarding direct violence and threat by gang members. However, they did not offer any reasons of the violence and harm in the NTCA, and the analysis of why these young people are targeted.

Conclusion

There are two perspectives in analysing violence in migrants’ home countries. One is to see violence as motivation of migration, which is addressed by most of the sources, putting emphasis on experience and process of decision-making of each migrant. This perspective allows analysing the individual experiences of migrants by categorising gender and generation. However, this approach focuses mostly on direct violence and seems to easily overlook broader perspectives of history and politics. Some of the materials focused on both direct and structural violence, while cultural violence is most often overlooked or ignored. Only one academic study and two institutional reports, Schmidt and Buechler (2017),
UNHCR and Amnesty International, implicitly mentioned issues related to cultural dimensions of violence. Although many sources addressed sexual violence, they seldom analyse gendered lives of the citizens, and only UNHCR, Amnesty International and New York Times focused substantially on generation.

The two materials, Vogt (2013) and García (2017), do not engage in such an analysis, but rather brought up a different perspective. They focus on the phenomenon of migration as forced by broader structural and political violence rather than the decision of each individual migrant, and the effect of direct violence. This approach allows us to seek causal linkages between the phenomenon from broad perspective including historic and political background. This, however, can overlook the perspective of women’s and/or girl’s micro-level of experiences which is crucial in order to comprehend the gendered aspects of daily reality as motivation to be migrant.

Four out of five selected academic literatures addressed the violence in migrant’s home countries which can be categorised into two analytical approaches as mentioned above. As the former approach, Schmidt and Buechler (2017) and Keller et al. (2017) addressed the combination of direct and structural violence, which becomes a crucial push factor. Schmidt and Buechler offered a little analysis of cultural violence regarding the role of mothers in Latin America, while their analysis on gender-based violence in the NTCA was very limited. Keller et al. did not focus on migrants’ gender and generation/age, although their target of research includes youth population, as well as cultural violence. As the latter approach, García (2017) and Vogt (2013) offered a rather comprehensive point of view in this regard, addressing direct violence as a part of structural and political violence, although their research did not focus on gendered dimension of violence and that of generation, specifically young women and girls.

All analysed reports addressed violence as the strong motivation of migration. They addressed the phenomenon of migration and violence from broader perspectives, adding more substance to direct violence within society. Only UNHCR and Amnesty International offer deeper analyses of the influence of gender-based violence and generation, looking at forced recruiting of boys and young men into gangs and sexual violence against women and girls. Amnesty International offered crucial analysis which are: governments of the NTCA are
lacking “recognition of internal displacement” (Amnesty 2016:26), none of these
governments offer comprehensive program to address those who are deported
(Amnesty 2016:36) and there is no clear policy in the NTCA to offer assistance
for the migrants whose human rights have been violated during the migrant trail
in Mexico (Amnesty 2016:6). Other three reports, Human Rights Watch, ICG
and SIMN, also addressed some of those issues, but much of discussion was not
analysis of influence of violence but rather just examples in the home countries,
and the main objectives of the reports seem to be recommendations for govern-
ments. Although the reports showed a few linkages between violence, gender
and generation, most of the analyses are not explicitly addressing targeted pop-
ulation’s gender and/or age.

Regarding the documentaries, New York Times and WOLA addressed the vio-
lence at home countries as motivation of migration. They argued four push fac-
tors in the NTCA which are high levels of poverty, the lack of opportunities for
children in education, health, and in advancing their lives, high levels of violence,
and high levels of corruption. Both documentaries clearly indicated the linkage
between migration and violence in homeland by testimonies of children and
youth. NYT documentary shows both boys and girls as victims, and WOLA
addresses both youth and adults, men and women as victims, but there is a clear
difference between their way of representing the victims. WOLA argues that
people interviewed in the video cannot show their faces because of their fear of
being persecuted and killed for talking about the violence, gangs or government,
while NYT do not mask all of the children’s face but only when they talk about
personal experience such as sexual assault and being witness of murders.

To conclude, although twelve sources addressed the violence in migrants’ home
countries, the way of representing the migrants’ experience in their homeland
varies specifically in terms of gender and age/generation. In many times, even
though the research focuses women’s experience, the perspective of generation
- mainly youth - is often ignored, or the research addressed gender-based vio-
ience without paying attention to victimization of LGBTI people, boys and men.
Chapter 4
Analysing Violence during Migrant Trails

In this chapter, I will provide a broad map of collective violence during migrant trails from the description of selected sources. Then, I analyse how do the three sources address and analyse the situation of direct, structural and cultural violence surrounding migrants in terms of gender and generation. Apart from the analyses of the violence experienced by migrants during the trails, I show some author’s different approach regarding violence such as a migrant strategy resisting to the violence noted above and political violence which often finishes migrants’ journey by apprehending and deporting.

The Situation of Violence Surrounding Migrants

As a site of violence against migrants, the migrant trails through Mexico are analysed by four out of five academic materials, four out of six reports and all of three documentaries. While most of these materials mainly focus on direct and structural violence which will be analysed later, two academic studies present broader context of the situation of migration. García (2017:42) describes that the migration from the NTCA towards the U.S. “activates” the networks along the migrant trails with creating a huge amount of profits as ‘legal sectors’ of the economy even though most of the migrants are ‘illegal’. Vogt (2013:764) called the economy surrounding migrants as “cachuco industry”. According to her explanation, the term “cachuco” means a sort of “dirty pig” in Mexico, which is often used to degrade people from Central America (Vogt 2013:764). As Vogt (2013:764) noted, the words signify not only indicating the dirty profit by using violence against the migrants, but also “the dynamic economic industry” which is generated by transiting huge number of ‘illegal migrants’. The industry has a characteristic of “the specific social and cultural dimensions of exclusion that are central to exploitative economic processes” (Vogt 2013:770). A powerful criminal group in Mexico, called Los Zetas, is one of the main actors of the cachuко industry, controlling the migrant trail and commodifying the migrants in multiple ways (VICE 2013). International Crisis Group analyses the systematization of criminal group mainly the Zeta Franchise as a “postmodern” group which is not
based on familial management, unlikely to other criminal organizations (ICG 2016:13). The Scalabrini International Migration Network argued that gangs and criminal groups are “increasingly sophisticated in their ability to monitor the migration of certain individuals and families” even in the migrant shelters (SIMN 2017:83). For example, they adapt to the use of social media to trace the migrants throughout their journeys (SIMN 2017:83).

**Direct and Structural Violence During Migrant Trails**

Many sources suggest that most of migrants are subject to all kinds of abuses such as extortions, kidnapping, human trafficking, drug trafficking, forced labour and sexual slavery while on the migrant transit (e.g. VICE 2013, Vogt 2013, ICG 2016). It is also argued that women and children are especially vulnerable along the journey, subject to gender-based violence from traffickers, smugglers and corrupt authorities (e.g. SIMN 2017, UNHCR 2015, VICE 2013). Analysing these multiple forms of violence in terms of gender and generation, the categorization of direct and structural violence need to be complemented. This subchapter steps into discussions of those violence.

Vogt (2013:771) makes a case holding a dual dimension composed of direct and structural violence of the infamous train, so-called "La Bestia", on the roof of which the migrants cross long stretches of Mexico’s territory. The image of the migrants from Central America, riding on the roof of that train is a symbol of migration in this region. However, Vogt (2013:771) analyses that this is one of the most feared risks for migrants to be injured or killed accidentally around the train tracks. She added that an accident caused by the train should be recognised “as the result of structural, state, and local economies of violence and inequality” (Vogt 2013:771). She analysed that “the transformation from productive labourer to disabled subject tells us how the migrant journey has become a site of violence and commodification wherein migrants’ bodies may both gain and lose value” (Vogt 2013:771-2). The logic may also imply that woman and children are more violated than men because of the free riding entailing no protection.

The second form of violence is "Human smuggling" which is defined as “transformation of migrants into human cargo” (Coutin 2007:111 as cited in
Vogt 2013:772) by exchanging huge amount of money for exporting persons from the NTCA to the U.S. UNHCR specifically addressed economic matters such as high fees for human smugglers and extortion throughout the migrants’ journey. The reports bring up sexual and physical violence that smugglers often use against their clients during the journey. However, the relationship between smugglers and migrants is often blurred and complicated because smugglers are charged to protect their customers from violence at the same time exploiting them (Vogt 2013:773). Also, the targets are tended to be young woman as Bridgen (2017:5) argued that “the guides treated the people well, except for the abuse of a few young women”.

The third form of violence is “human trafficking” and/or "kidnapping" which can have various possibility of violence and human rights violation in the context of commodification of human body. Vogt (2013:773-4) explained that migrants can be kidnapped to ask their family for ransoms which are often combined with the sexual abuse and violence, or to commoditise their bodies or body parts to be sold through organ or sex industry. She argued that human bodies have values not only as the physical bodies which are highly profitable in sex industry, but also as part of the social networks and relationships of lives per se (Vogt 2013:773). A documentary made by VICE suggested that human trafficking is physical, psychological and modern form of slavery by which criminals degrade women’s and men’s self-esteem, making them think themselves as worthless. In the VICE video, sex work is described in two forms: forced and voluntarily. The situation of women who have little economic resource means they can only choose to work as sex worker to earn money to move towards their destination and to nourish their children. This is because the sex work is the most accessible work for illegal migrants. This condition generates the market of prostitution and brothels along the migrant route. Also, Schmidt and Buechler (2017:151) mentioned "migrant sex trade" as a result of human trafficking and prostitution or “the absence of other viable economic opportunities for women to provide for their families and pay for their onward journey to the U.S.”. But is remains a question whether such forms of sex work, linked to poverty and lack of other opportunities, can be called ‘voluntary’. Also, even when
women ‘choose’ to be sex workers by themselves, there are always risks of exploitation, gender-based violence and human rights violation (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:151).

Focusing on gender-based violence, Schmidt and Buechler (2017:148) argue citing Goldberg (2014) that “80% of women and girls are raped while in-transit” where rape is used as a form of payment during journey, perpetrated by guides, accompanied migrants, criminal gang members, or governmental officials. These are often not reported due to the lack of trust in law enforcement officials amongst migrants (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:149). Brigden focuses especially on violence against women such as sexual assault, rape and killing. She argues victims are not only women but also men and LGBT people although there is no mention about age/generation (children and youth). She also mentions that Central American women will be targeted “not only because they are women, but because they are migrants” (Brigden 2017:5). Criminals identify the migrants because of their way of clothing, behavior, dialect and accent (Brigden, 2017:5, VICE 2013). She argues that not only women migrants without accompanying male protectors such as partner, brother, and fathers face increased risks of violence, but male migrants also face risks. This seems especially relevant for women’s husbands or fathers when they attempt to guard women against abuse and violence, which can be “assaulted, raped and killed” (Brigden 2017:5). UNHCR report stresses that victims on the migrant trails are women, girls, families, and LGBT people, particularly transgender women, without shedding light on male victims, or noting that perpetrators are gangs, criminal groups, officials, authorities and smugglers. Several women had spoken to the researchers that they started using contraceptives from the begging of their journey, in order to minimise the risk to be pregnant if they were raped during the trail (UNHCR 2015:6).

Cultural Violence

The dimension of cultural violence was addressed only by Brigden out of 11 sources in which violence during migrant trails was addressed. She analyses that “traditions, including limitations on travel to unknown territory, validate violence against women in Central America” (Brigden 2017:5). She also suggests
that the culture of home countries, specifically El Salvador, contributes to migration: “prevalent notions of masculinity in El Salvador naturalize violent behavior, alcohol abuse and sexual promiscuity as biological traits” (Brigden 2017:8). Also, she argues that “men continue to face hidden risks along the route. Some men also suffer rape, but with the additional stigma of homosexuality, they may be even less likely to admit to such victimization” (Brigden 2017:8). Specifically, she describes that “‘feminine’ gay men and transgendered persons are subjected to harassment, even inside the safe space of the Catholic migrant shelter” (Brigden 2017:9). Although Brigden’s description does not include the words which directly address culture of machismo or patriarchal society, she implicitly suggests the existence of social and cultural norm of gender role and heteronormativity even during the migrant trails.

**Countering Violence during Migrant Trails**

Most of the sources focalised the migrants as victims of multi-dimensional violence. Two studies however revealed other faces of migrants during the trails. Schmidt and Buechler (2017:152) described migrant networks as social capital that can provide “new immigrants important information for daily needs” to survive the trail such as transportation, alimentation and shelters. Most migrant networks were created at the shelter and maintained by using social media even after the migration has ended, providing a sense of security especially for female migrants (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:152-153). These networks were important in the context of insecurity in order to create social networks for people who discarded the human network in their home countries (Schmidt and Buechler 2017:154). Brigden also argued that the use of social network is important for making “weak ties” which maintain “interpersonal relationships with relatively low levels of emotional intensity, trust and obligations” (Granovetter 1973, 1361 as cited in Brigden 2017:4) in order to cooperate among migrants and consolidate the experience of migration. Brigden’s main scope of research is migrants’ performance of gender, for instance concealing their sex or nationalities, as survival strategies during migrant trail. She argues that improvisations around masculinity or femininity in the migrant trail helped migrants in many ways to survive their journey (Brigden 2017:12). These two authors do not view the migrants only as people victimized by violence during the trail; rather, they see them as
survivors of the journey with their own agency, sometimes improvising various gender strategies and creating social networks to support each other.

**Political Violence to Terminate Migration**

One of the feared aspects of structural violence for migrants, which has also gathered huge attention by international actors, is the law and the policy implementation by the governments of the U.S. and Mexico. These governments responded to the crisis of migration from Central America to the North with enforcement of apprehension and deportation instead of increasing the capacity of screening and protection (e.g. Amnesty 2016, ICG 2016, NYT 2015).

Vogt (2013:771) criticized that the security policies allowed new forms of violence to spread and target migrants from the NTCA. By implementing detention and deportation policies, Mexican government legitimize the violence against migrants including state violence of apprehension and deportation, viewing the migrants the same as drug smugglers, terrorists, and gang members, without screening their situation properly (Vogt 2013:771). García (2017:43) highlights the paradox that migration control is increasing, while the climate that allows organized crime to exploit migrants is created at the same time. He suggests that migration control and the rise of organized crime make migrant route more dangerous and expensive, consuming much time to transit the route (García, 2017:63). This condition makes migrants more vulnerable to violence and to be targeted as commodities in the cachucho industry. Vogt argued that this situation of crime should be related to the context of violence in Mexico, such as so called “drug wars” and state enforcement, called by scholars as “low-intensity conflicts,” “small” or “new wars” (Kaldor and Vashee 1997; Reyna 2009 as cited in Vogt 2013:773). In this context, expanded organized crime and violence become similar to armed conflict creating profit for corrupted authorities (Vogt 2013:773).

The Scalabrini International Migration Network (SIMN) (2017:85) argued that the U.S. response of “prioritized border enforcement, detention, and interdiction by Mexico” is inadequate treatment for the migrants. They pointed out that the system of apprehension and deportation of migrants in Mexico offers very few opportunities for migrants to achieve asylum status (SIMN 2017:83).
They showed only 217 migrants could apply for status in Mexico, although 30,000 people had been detained in one detention centre during 2016 (SIMN 2017:83). Moreover, the report criticized the U.S. supported refugee screening system as insufficient and inadequate (Human Rights Watch 2016:49), resulting in the fact that some of the people who were deported back to El Salvador were injured or killed (according to a report by NGO in the region; SIMN 2017:84).

Human Rights Watch argued that the system of screening, detention and deportation does not match specifically with children’s and adolescent boys’ and girls’ protection needs. The governments not only fail to tell children and youth about their rights but also discourage them to apply for international protection (HRW 2016:4-5). They found some discrepancies between law and reality such as treatment of boys and girls in detention centres. It is revealed that the screening and applying system for international protection is closed or limited deliberately for migrants, specifically children.

International Criminal Group criticises the response of these government for the endemic migration, arguing that the “Dangers Awareness” campaign which aims to discourage people to migrate from their home countries may have partly succeeded to prevent children not to come to the U.S. alone i.e. un-ac- companied, but “many families seem to have preferred to face risks in route over risks at home” (ICG 2016:16). ICG argued that the U.S. government has a responsibility from historical and political perspectives for the current migration crisis from Central America. They argued that the widespread violence is “partly a legacy of the armed conflicts… during the 1970s and 1980s under military-dominated governments Washington supported” (ICG 2016:21). Deportation of more than 250,000 convicted criminals after the end of civil wars has exported gang groups to El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras (ICG 2016:21). Moreover, the U.S. is one of the largest consumer of South American drugs which “has fuelled the growth of powerful organised criminal groups that control and fight for territory along drug routes in Mexico and Central America” (ICG 2016:21).
Conclusion

Most of the selected sources address the experiences of migrants in multiple ways including direct and structural violence, while the discussion of cultural dimension of violence is very limited, which is only offered by Brigden (2017).

Two out of four academic materials, Schmidt and Buechler (2017) and Brigden (2017), mentioned about direct and structural violence focusing on gendered dimension while none of them mentioned about difference in generation. Brigden addressed the issue about LGBTI people and male victims of violence. As macro-level analysis, the other two sources addressed the industry along the flow of migrants which suggest that regional, national and international economies make huge profit. Also, they address that the policy against migration by Mexico and the U.S. is not adequate to treat migrants, which makes the trail much more harsh and expensive. Schmidt and Buechler (2017) and Brigden (2017) brought up the migrants’ strategy to protect themselves, which is not mentioned in other sources of UN or NGO’s reports and documentaries.

The information of reports is very limited in the analysis of violence during migrant trails. Only International Crisis Group addressed the concrete violent incidents which can be categorized as direct and structural violence, however was limited view in gender and generation. SIMN offered unique information about migrant shelter, although there is no deep analysis about gender and generation. Amnesty International and UNHCR did not focus on the migrant trail rather than the violence in migrants’ home countries. All reports are based on human rights approach. Human Rights Watch and International Criminal Group measure the eligibility for humanitarian protection. However, their analysis of violence did not address the impact difference with gender and generation. These actors’ main focus is the response of Mexican and the U.S governments regarding after apprehended and deported.

Three documentaries clearly divided by categorizing victims, perpetrators and protectors in each documentary. Only VICE categorized authority as “Protector” of migrants, although most of the sources recognize the complicity of government’s authority with criminal groups. Gendered dimension of migration analysed by VICE was prostitution as both voluntary and coercive. New York Times and Washington Office on Latin America analysed sexual exploitation
during the migration. Regarding issues of generation, New York Times interview has taken place only with migrant boys. On the contrary, WOLA stressed the difference of violent experience that boys are economically exploited, and girls are sexually exploited.
Chapter 5
Framing Migrants and Focalising Their Perspectives

This concluding chapter reflects on findings of my analysis of how have three different sources been written about migrants. My main questions were about their ability to address both the violence at home and during the migration, and analysed it with focusing on both gender and age.

‘Violence at home’ as a motivation for migration, and ‘violence on the trail’ as experience of migrants on a route to the new place are both addressed by many sources: Schmidt and Buechler (2017), Human Rights Watch (2016), International Criminal Group (2016), the Scalabrini International Migration Network (2017), UNHCR (2015), documentaries of New York Times (2015) and Washington Office on Latin America (2016). However, these sources separately describe only one out of the two, and does not analyse with combining them. Clearly, many migrants are motivated to leave their home countries by high level of violence. As the number of crimes increases, the more migrants decide to cross the migrant trails. For example, ICG (2016:24) suggests that the surge of migrants is “both consequence of criminal violence and opportunity for criminals to exploit vulnerable people in transit”. Furthermore, most of analysed materials assert that enforcement of apprehension and deportation by Mexico and the U.S. governments put migrants more clandestine and perilous route to make themselves invisible while exposing them to criminal groups and corrupted authorities simultaneously (see e.g. Amnesty International 2016, ICG 2016). Also, it is important to view from the wider perspective of that the industry surrounding migrants, which Vogt called “Cachuco Industry”, benefits from ‘illegal’ migrants in local, national and global ‘legal’ market forms (García 2017, Vogt 2013).

1. Academic literature

Unexpectedly, a linkage between violence and gender is much better addressed by reports and documentaries than by the academic sources while a relation between violence and age or generation is rarely addressed all together. Academic research offered relatively limited foci on violence as a part of the
wider root causes of migration in home countries, and highlighted more the migrant route. Only two academics offered analyses of gendered dimension of migration, which were unexpected results. It seems that the scope of research is limited in academic sources in order to offer in-depth analysis of experiences on specific migrants.

As a common understanding, all academic authors framed migrants as victims of violence regardless of whether they consider migration as voluntary or forced. Vogt (2013) and García (2017) framed that migrants are victims of political and structural violence which is produced within the historical processes and accruing huge profits for the regular, legal market economy even though migrants are called ‘illegal’. The two authors used episodic frames which describe migrant phenomenon as a single case of forced migration. On the other hand, Schmidt and Buechler (2017) and Bridgen (2017) also put shed light on protective strategies of migrants to resist to violence during the journey, specifically among migrant women. An insight of migrant’s agency to counter violence was only addressed by these two academic studies while all of the other sources only focused on victimization of migrants. These two studies used the thematic framing so as to elucidate more than one dimension of migrants’ agency.

In addition, none of academic materials highlighted different impacts on experiences of migration trails by generation, focusing specifically on youth and children. Even though some empirical research targeted migrants who are age 18 to 24 years through interviews, youth was not an analytical category, and young migrants were presumably taken as adults in these academic sources.

2. Reports

Reports delved into the phenomenon more widely and offered multiple dimension of the phenomenon of migration. They try to comprehend it from many point of view by applying rich sources of data. Their aim is to present the policy implication to governments; thus, they often focus on failures of the states to address the migrants and their issues. Also, the issue of gender-based violence, specifically domestic violence and violence related to LGBTI population is sufficiently addressed only by the reports of UNHCR and Amnesty International, even though some academic research analyses it with putting weight on women.
All reports described that most of migrants are victims who are forcibly displaced from their home countries.

UNHCR focalised children and women migrants while produced reports that specifically focused on their experiences (in 2014 and 2015). In the report on children, although UNHCR addressed boy and girl migrants, there is no reference to their experiences during their migrant trails. Those who are addressed in the report about women migrants were not classified by age or generation even though the research focused on women who were age from 18 to 57 years (thus included young adults). Amnesty International refers to the lives of women, boys, girls and LGBTI population, and to a large extent focalized their experiences. The organization offered comprehensive analysis regarding direct, structural and cultural violence in migrants’ home countries, but the violence during their migrant trails was not addressed. Human Rights Watch focalised child migrants of boys and girls specifically. Their experiences on violence during their migrant trails were applied to explain eligibility for humanitarian protection and Visas which permit them to remain in Mexico temporarily. However, the analysis does not offer discussion of concrete violence during migrant trails. Although they focused on children, the analysis of violence regarding migrant trails by gender and generation is limited. Rather, their weight was more on the process of a protection system of Mexican government to the child migrants than childhood and youth as analytical categories. Detailed information of targeted people who were interviewed by International Criminal Group were not explicitly unveiled in terms of gender and generation. The research offered some perspective regarding gender and generation, but the majority was sourced by secondary materials. Rather, it appears that they focus on responses of governments of the NTCA, Mexico and the U.S. The Scalabrini International Migration Network offered a unique analysis on migrants in terms of ‘their protector’ as managing shelters. The institute’s research is based on daily work in shelters receiving a number of migrants including young women and children. However, the report offered the general trend of and information on the shelters rather than an analysis of the experiences by gender and generation.
3. Documentaries

Three documentaries framed the migrants very differently. In an analysis of violence in migrants’ home countries, New York Times and WOLA confirmed a linkage of migration and violence while VICE focused only on migration trails.

New York Times (2015) offered some concrete images of migrant journey by its accompanying on children who were attempting to migrate. However, there is almost no attention to violence in their migrant trails which are what most of the other materials for research on this academic area put into consideration. Only through testimonies of children who have already attempted to migrate, this documentary could describe that immigrants were looked as criminals by people, and were targeted by violence and killing by criminal groups and authorities. Instead, the documentary argues that the U.S. have pressured Mexico to apprehend the children at the Mexico-Guatemala border and migrant routes through Mexico in order to prevent them from arriving at the U.S. As a consequence, there is an increase in numbers of detention by the Mexican government, and costs of migration for those attempting it have been pushed higher (NYT 2015). Thus, those who cannot afford to hire smugglers, including children, need to make the trails which exposes them to a number of risks and dangers alone. Migrant children in focus of NYT documentaries were all boys even though there were also girls in the shelter, who explained that they had already tried to migrate but were found out and deported. One migrant boy did not seemingly worry about the journey. Instead, he noted his group of boys has “valor” (courage) to complete migration by only themselves. This can mean that migration of unaccompanied children could be interpreted as an expression of proper, or desirable masculinity. Totally ignoring the boy’s position that makes boy(s) bring up courage and do decision making for migration, the journalist kept expressing that, because of dangers, children should not do thing such as migration by themselves. Thus, this documentary focalized a western point of view on childhood as a time of innocence and need of protection while clearly the boys in question did not see themselves in the same way.

Similar to the NYT, Washington Office on Latin America documentary claimed that Mexican government should expend its ability not in detaining and
deporting but in screening migrants who arrive to confirm the need for protection without deporting them and thus returning them to the same situation they have fled. This documentary can be seen as the U.S. propaganda warning migrants not to leave their countries. While the video shows violence in the home countries in the first part of the documentary, much more horrible violence during the migration trail is discussed in most of the content. The experiences during the trail is depicted as much more tragic than a situation at the home countries so that people are discouraged from starting migration. The video finishes with expressions of hope of people who try to find happiness in their own countries rather than in migrating to the U.S. Thus, what is focalized here is the official U.S. anti-migration policy.

A documentary made by VICE discussed a gendered aspect of violence in relation to sexual and economic exploitation such as sex workers and human trafficking. There are three main protagonists in this documentary: an officer of migrant protection, a priest who operates migrant shelter, and a migrant woman who works as a sex worker for a brothel in Mexico. The first two persons, a representative of the state (local government) and shelter workers, are framed as protectors for migrants from multi-dimensional violence which is basically perpetrated by organised criminal groups. This is the only source in which the state authority is framed as a protector of migrants. The representative of the local government stated that there are discrepancies in Mexican law that the migrants are considered the same as criminals by General Population Law while the Special Prosecutor’s Office for Crimes Committed Against Migrants needs to protect the migrants. It should be noted that authorities are recognised by many actors as having been complicit with criminal groups and committing crimes against migrants. Another significant element of this video is that it does not seemingly characterise migration as a “bad phenomenon”. That is, the video can be translated as a shifter of focalization from migrants to officials and back by showing protectors of the migrants and migrant workers who decide themselves to work (across the border). The background sound-track music follows the dynamics of the narrative (sometimes very lively or melancholic) and adds another layer to the stories of the different protagonists. Also, there are very few addressment on the reasons why migrants leave their places.
In conclusion, many of sources analysing the migrants and their experiences on violence at the home countries and during the trail, and each of the source presents very important information of individual experiences of direct violence, or broader socio-historical context of structural violence, but they are not combined to be explained in any source selected for this thesis. Sometimes individual motivations – such as escaping forced recruitment by the gangs – are mainly highlighted. Unexpectedly, not many sources used gender and generation as an analytical lens even though they depict experiences of violence by women or youth in practice. Childhood and youth are seemingly addressed only as a separate, specific category; nonetheless the empirical base of the academic or NGO research includes youth in the interviews. These elements leave focalization problematic because it is not necessarily from their perspective even if the discussion is about migrants. This is especially clear because most of the sources address migrants as victims – and thus in a way treat them as an object in need of help or intervention. Only two of the examined sources, de facto, recognized migrants’ agency and put the strategies they developed into consideration in order to protect themselves and support each other at the trail. Thus, there are many challenges for academia, NGOs and the media to disseminate the story of migrants from migrants’ own perspectives, for they are separately analyse immigration problems.
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