**Abstract**

~~The p~~Persistent economic inequalities, environmental impacts, ~~as well as~~ and ~~the~~ growing violence in the countries of northern Central America have led to an increase in the ~~arrival~~ number of Central Americans arriving ~~to~~ at the southern border of Mexico~~.~~, Given ~~where the~~ the difficulties ~~to~~ of travelling ~~on~~ through Mexico and reaching the United States. ~~have contributed to the~~ a formation of a population has formed that is increasingly "trapped" in precarious forms of mobility and (in)mobility. The objective of this chapter is to show how ~~the~~ a restrictive migration regime generates a differential process of social inclusion and access to rights and public services. ~~For this purpose~~To this end, we ~~start~~ draw from ~~the approach of the~~an autonomy of migration approach, which analyzes mobility as part of a migratory control regime that leads to a differential inclusion of migrants. ~~The chapter analyzes, b~~Based on the lived experience of three young migrants with different legal status, the chapter analyzes how in Mexico, despite legal and institutional ~~the~~ progress made in ~~the legal and institutional framework to~~ promot~~ing~~e the "social inclusion" of migrants ~~in Mexico~~, there is an incongruity between these formal advances, the way they are implemented, and the concrete and localized experiences of the migrants, which in practice negatively affects the inclusion process and produces differential access to rights and services.

Key Words: Migrant youth, (in)mobility, rights, differential inclusion, exclusion.

**Introduction**

Since the 1980s, on the southern border of Mexico there has been a noticeable presence of ~~,~~ ~~the presence of~~ people from the countries of northern Central America[1] and, ~~more recently from other countries, both from the American continent itself and from the islands of the Caribbean, and from more distant places, located in Asia and Africa, have become noticeable.~~ ~~A~~ While this presence ~~that~~ was not new, ~~but rather~~ it had remained invisible for many actors, although not for others. The process of strategic (in)visibility has operated in different ways, ~~either by~~ enacted either by the Mexican state itself or by migrants (Rojas, 2020). Fundamentally, this more numerous and diverse migratory presence is the product of ~~modalities of~~ forced mobilit~~ies~~y caused by the confluence of different factors, notable among which are: ~~among which~~ the ~~the~~ different forms of violence and ~~the~~ ~~the few or no~~ limited or null possibilit~~yies~~ of escaping them or accessing justice ~~stand out~~.~~;~~ the persistent conditions of inequality derived from accumulated disadvantages and deprivations. ~~;~~ the lack of job opportunities and decent work and, in general, the lack of the guarantee~~s~~ and protection of rights. These f~~F~~actors, ~~among others, that affect~~ contribute to growing poverty, marginality and precariousness ~~in the different ways of life~~ that, in turn, generate fragility, uncertainty,

---

[1] While the focus of this paper is on the Central American migrant population in Mexico, it is important to note that in recent years, there has been a significant increase in the presence of migrants from further afield, including countries of South America, the Caribbean, Asia and Africa.

insecurity and instability, ~~but not necessarily inaction, but~~which in turn stimulate different reactions or responses from those affected. ~~the population itself.~~

~~The~~ With few or no ~~little or no means of~~ ~~alternatives to~~ stay~~ing~~ in their place~~s~~ of origin, many ~~have forced~~ people ~~and different~~ from different population groups in the countries of northern Central America (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) have been forced to move ~~from the countries of northern Central America (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) to move~~ within their countr~~y~~ies, as ~~we can~~ evidence~~d~~ ~~with~~ by ~~the~~ information provided by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR/ACNUR, 2019a). According to this source, ~~as of December 31, 2019,~~ there were 71,500 people internally displaced by violence in El Salvador and 318,500 in Honduras. These accumulated figures of displacement, produced in the periods 2006-2018 and 2004-2018 for the two countries, respectively, give us an ~~approximation~~ indication ~~to~~ of one of the strategies used to escape direct violence, or ~~the high probability of~~ the threat of being subject violence in ~~being victims of~~ any of its forms[2]. Another strategy is emigration to countries where people believe they may find some way out of their situations of social exclusion and vulnerability to violence. The number of people seeking asylum or who are recognized as "refugees" ~~, as well as that of "asylum seekers"~~ and who, therefore, managed to express before a government ~~the~~ a well-founded fear of returning to their places of origin, can serve as another ~~approximation~~ indication ~~to~~ of the situation in those places. According to UNHCR/ACNUR, at the end of 2019, there were 470,000 people ~~in the world~~ from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras seeking asylum or recognized as refugees in another country, ~~in those two categories,~~ "a figure that registered an increase of 33% compared to 2018" (2019b). For that same year, the Mexican Commission for Refugee Assistance ~~Mexican Commission for Aid to Refugees~~ (*Comisión Mexicana de Ayuda a Refugiados,* COMAR) received 43,026 requests for international protection from ~~these~~ those three countries, double ~~what Mexico had~~those received the previous year (21,219). Most of these applications were from people who arrived in the so-called "migrant caravans" (COMAR, 2020).[3]

The above data constitute only ~~one indicator~~an indication of the cases of people from the north of Central America fleeing critical situations~~:~~, ~~given that~~ there are thousands of migrants who have emigrated for the same reasons, but who do not apply for international protection, ~~although~~ even though they may ~~they require~~ need it. This may be ~~, among other reasons,~~ i) due to their lack of knowledge about the process, ~~ignorance,~~ ii) due to ~~disbelief~~a lack of trust, iii) because their ~~arguments are dismissed and their~~ applications are rejected, iv) because they have "desisted" or "abandoned" application processes that trap them in spaces where they cannot work or where they feel threatened, v) because they are not

[2]According to the Inter-Institutional Commission for the Protection of Persons Internally Displaced by Violence (CIPPDV), in Honduras, 77% of ~~the~~ displaced households were displaced because they had been "victims of specific acts of violence" and 22% were displaced as a measure of self-protection due to fear of widespread violence (CIPPDV, 2019, p. 38).

[3] Although it is not possible to state exactly what the response rate is to asylum applications ~~for~~ each year, given the lag in ~~the~~ case-handling and ~~that we~~a lack of ~~would require~~ follow-up statistics, ~~other than those published,~~ we can get an idea of the number of cases with positive and negative resolutions per year. In 2019, for example, COMAR responded to 12,574 people who applied for asylum: 81% received a positive response (9,034 with refugee recognition and 1,283 with complementary protection), ~~and~~ with the ~~rest~~ remaining 19% receiving a~~a~~ negative resolution (2,257) (COMAR, 2020).

**Comentado [A5]:** This is used more to mark the start of a period. I suggest leaving the 2019 date out as it does not refer to the data.

**Con formato:** Fuente: Cursiva

**Comentado [A6]:** 81 percent is astonishingly high. It may be worth commenting on that.

informed or are dissuaded from requesting this resource, vi) because their objective is to seek asylum/refuge in another country, ~~and~~ or vii) because there are those who do not consider it necessary and do not want to feel immobilized and monitored. As Sabine Hess (2012) has pointed out, many of these migrants are "stuck in mobility" (p. 428) or "caught in mobility" (p. 434; see also Núñez and Heyman, 2007; Collyer, 2010; Schapendonk, 2012) in "areas of precarious transit" (p. 428), where they are susceptible to deportation (De Genova, 2002), but ~~in which~~where, despite marginality and precariousness, they implement different strategies for survival and (in)mobility[4].

Similarly, we can find other forms of entrapment, which Carling (2002) has called "involuntary immobility" (p. 5). In this situation, there are people who, due to the restrictive migration policies of ~~the~~ "transit" and destination countries, have been forced to remain in certain territories to apply for international protection and await ~~its~~ a resolution, whether positive or negative, as is the case ~~with~~ for people from ~~the three countries of~~ northern Central America who mobilized in the so-called "caravans", but who have been "immobilized" in some Mexican cities and ~~, therefore,~~ cannot advance to other territories[5]. Also, in cities in northern Mexico ~~we can find~~there are people from these countries waiting for a response to their request for asylum in the United States. Other forms of involuntary immobility can also be found in cases of people, mainly from Guatemala, who have settled in some locations in southern Mexico bordering Guatemala and who have not planned or do not aspire to move to other destinations, ~~among other reasons,~~ because they have a precarious legal status (Basok and Rojas, 2017), they fear deportation or ~~to~~ becoming ~~e~~victims of other forms of violence ~~and~~or as is common, ~~, in several cases,~~ because they feel tired of overcoming multiple obstacles, among other reasons.

Among those who are trapped in (in)mobility, we can identify different profiles. For this chapter we will focus on young people from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras who are in Mexico, either as "refugees" or as applicants for refugee status, or as migrants who are not "refugees" or applicants, but who left their countries for similar ~~or other~~ reasons, or those who left for reasons not related to threats. Our objective is to show that their social inclusion in Mexico is differential, that is, they have selective and restricted access to rights, depending on their (regular/irregular) legal status. To this end, we have divided this chapter into four parts. In the first, we ~~place~~ use ~~as a starting point the approach of the~~an autonomy of migration approach as a starting point, through which migration is conceived as a social movement and migration policy as part of a governance regime that makes (in)mobility precarious, and affects the selective and differential inclusion of migrants. Second, we ~~refer~~ outline ~~to~~ some of the "social inclusion" programs or actions ~~for "social inclusion"~~ in Mexico. Third~~ly~~, we illustrate ~~the~~ differential access to rights based on the experience of three young people and, fourth~~ly~~, we reflect on the challenges to public policy ~~on~~ around the issue of inclusion and the need to design social policies that effectively allow the realization of rights, which ~~would pose a~~ raises questio~~ns~~~~ning of~~ regarding the migration policies emanating from a restrictive migration regime such as ~~the~~ that of Mexic~~o~~~~an one~~.

**Comentado [A7]:** Is it entirely involuntary in these cases? Perhaps leave as "other forms of immobility"?

**Con formato:** Resaltar

**Con formato:** Resaltar

**Comentado [A8]:** I suggest this to be more specific

**Methodology**

~~In this~~This chapter ~~we~~ is based on ~~rely on~~ interviews conducted within the framework of projects carried out by the authors between 2017 and 2019. Although ~~, in which~~ we ~~have~~ did not necessarily focu~~ssed~~ on a specific age group ~~defined by age~~in these projects, ~~but in which we did~~ we focus here on interview~~s~~ carried out with young -people in mobility, which we define as those between the ages of 18 and 29~~, which is the range that we have established to refer to young people in mobility~~. Although these projects were carried out independently, they ~~have~~ had similar objectives, ~~which~~ and we were able to ~~allows us to~~ select ~~approach~~ experiences from the interviews in which forms of differential inclusion ~~are~~ were evident. The two investigations ~~are~~ were qualitative and ~~are~~ based on in-depth interviews. In the project "Cross-border mobility and labo~~u~~r insertion of the Guatemalan population in Mexico: regional specificities on the southern border" (2018-2019), 115 interviews were conducted with men and women originally from Guatemala in seven areas of Mexico's southern border, but only five interviews conducted in border towns of Campeche were selected to analyse for the current chapter. Its objective was to document cross-border mobility and insertion, identify mobility modalities, trajectories and strategies and analyze living conditions and processes of social inclusion/exclusion. In the project "From transit country to country of destination. Emerging spaces of refuge for Central Americans in Mexico", coordinated by Susann Vallentin Hjorth Boisen (2017-2018) interviews were conducted with 35 men and women in Tapachula, of which 11 interviews with people between the ages of 19 and 29 were selected. The objective of the project was to analyze the process of socioeconomic insertion and the livelihood strategies of the households of asylum seekers, refugees and people with complementary protection from Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador in the city of Tapachula on Mexico's southern border.

> **Comentado [A9]:** Above 3 cases are mentioned. Clarify how interviews are used maybe.

The two projects ~~have a common~~ share a concern for- the experience of people in mobility and both seek to highlight the diversity of migrants' situations, which in terms of public policy is crucial for the comprehensive care of people facing the accumulation of disadvantages (Saraví, 2020) and different forms of inequality.  We have privileged the point of view of people in mobility, to ~~know~~ discover the meanings and experiences associated with mobility, ~~in congruence~~ in fitting with ~~the~~ an ~~approach of the~~ autonomy of migration approach, through which priority is given to "subjective practices, desires, expectations and behaviors of the migrants themselves" (Mezzadra, 2012, p. 160). Based on this experience, we can analyze the multiple complexities around processes of inclusion in Mexican society, as well as highlight the gaps or discontinuities between public policies aimed at the protection and "integration" of migrants, regardless of their migratory status, and ~~its~~ their fulfillment.

**Precarious (in)mobility and differential inclusion**

When we review the ~~reasons~~ factors that drive or affect the mobility/migration of people, they are usually classified as voluntary and forced, generally placing economic reasons in the former and different forms of violence in the latter, ~~including~~ or disasters derived from

meteorological or geological ~~impacts~~phenomena[6]. This classification, as some authors have already pointed out, has only contributed to distinctions that have been used as mechanisms for inclusion/exclusion of those who deserve or do not deserve protection (Casas-Cortes et al., 2015; Erdal & Oeppen, 2018) and who are labelled as refugees/asylum seekers, in the first case, and migrants with irregular status, in the second, ignoring the complexity of the causes, ~~but~~ and also ~~of~~ the decisions of the migrants. For this reason, Erdal and Oeppen (2018) insist that this dichotomous categorization be ~~reviewed~~ rethought along the lines of a ~~and analysis be made that consider the~~ "voluntary-forced mobility" spectrum, to which we can add the category of "involuntary immobility" proposed, among other authors, by Carling (2002).

Such dichotomous classifications (voluntary-forced migration; regular-irregular migration) are the product of restrictive migration regimes that define who are deserving or not of international protection or status regularization and, therefore, who can have access to services or rights; ~~but~~ this access is limited, selective or differential, depending on legal status. Such restricted access is part of the same migration control policies, but ~~but~~ applying after the entry of migrants, ~~whether~~ as determined by ~~they have~~ their regular or irregular status. Ataç and Rosenberger (2019) exemplify this restriction for migrants with irregular status in the European Union, who have limited access to health services. In Mexico, we can find this same kind of differentiation in health services, among those who have the status of "refugees", asylum seekers and migrants with irregular status, despite the fact that in the ~~p~~Political ~~c~~Constitution of Mexico as well as in the Migration Law of 2011, states that, regardless of their status, the Mexican state must guarantee migrants this and the other fundamental rights. Thus, categories of migrants are created that are included differentially. According to Bishop (2012), "[t]he concept of differential inclusion enables a more nuanced understanding of how the institution of the border produces particular stratifications and how the emerging regimes of governance… operates" (p. 130). This differential access to rights refers to a range of precarious positions of people with different status ("refugees", refugee/asylum seekers and migrants, whether or not they hold a migration document). These different positions relate to differences in access to the labor market, civil and political rights, as well as welfare and health care, education and housing services, among others (Bishop, 2012). In this stratification, class, gender and ethnic-racial distinctions accentuate inequalities and marginality, as well as the uncertainty, insecurity, and instability that characterize precarious (in)mobility (Rojas & Winton, 2019).

From ~~the~~ an ~~perspective of the~~ autonomy of migration perspective, the function of this migration control regime is not only to close or strengthen borders and develop increasingly sophisticated mechanisms to detain and deport migrants; ~~i~~Its function is also to establish a system of differential inclusion through the illegalization of migrants (Mezzadra, 2012, p. 171). From this critical perspective, it is considered that "migration is a co-constituent of the border as a site of conflict and as a political space" (Casas-Cortes et al., 2015, p. 69; see also Bishop, 2012); It is a force that can challenge the creation of new borders, as well as the devices or mechanisms of control and power (Bishop, 2012). So, if the border is a complex social institution of tensions between reinforcement practices and crossing practices (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2017, p. 21), what this control seeks is not "to arrest mobility, but to

---

[6] On the causes of emigration from Central America, see Rojas and Ángeles (2019).

tame it" (Walters, 2004, cited by Hess, 2012, p. 433). This has led to reorganizations (in the plural) of each of the "receiving" or "transit" sStates, which have conceived migration and migrants as a problem, which has resulted in governance regimes of the (in)mobility (Hess, 2012, Bishop, 2012), whose restrictive policies increase the precariousness for people on the move and shape not just the spatiality of mobility, but also its temporality (Rojas & Winton, 2019).

In the last twenty years, thousands of people of Central American origin have confronted the restrictions of the migration and mobility regime in Mexico; thousands have managed to reach their original destination; oOthers are "trapped in mobility" in Mexico in processes of applying for refugee status; oOthers are "trapped in (in)mobility" in Mexican territory without "legal status", many of them rejected as applicants for refugee status, but the majority without not having made such an attempt; others achieved refugee status or complementary protection but with are uncertainty about their future; others were deported and others died along the way, among many other possible situations. In all these cases, mobility has been experienced as protracted and contingent migrant struggles (Rojas & Winton, 2019), whether they are everyday struggles for survival or struggles to move in different territories, either making such movement visible or making it invisible (Rojas, 2020).

Among these people we identify young people who try to live on the margin, to survive in an environment in which they are or feel adrift. As already mentioned, in this chapter we are interested in highlighting the lived experience of young people who find themselves in some kind of "entrapment" in certain locations of the so-called southern border of Mexico, whether or not they are applicants for refugee status applicants, whether or not they have a legal status in Mexico, but who have decided or contemplated considered to staying in Mexico, (although their this decision may change, , either to move forward, or to return to some previous place). As other authors have suggested, we start from the idea that many of these movements are not unilinear (see, for example, Schapendonk, 2012; Basok et al., 2015), although they may be in some sections of the route, and in many cases a destination is thought of as a possible goal; furthermore, that these movements are contingent, historical, and personal (Rojas & Winton, 2019).

In this chapter, we are interested in highlighting how differential inclusion/exclusion is expressed from the point of view of young migrants, including i) migrants with different (regular/irregular) status, ii) applicants for refugee status and iii) people who have already been recognized as "refugees", born in the north of Central America, focusing our gaze on three cases that can may be illustrative of situations that we can place between survival and social inclusion in localities on the Mexico's southern border.

**Public policies and differential inclusion**

In the spectrum of voluntary-forced mobility, the a restrictive migration regime produces different categories of migrants that establish differentiated access to rights and the services that are linked to each of them. From the an approach of the autonomy of migration approach, although migrants are excluded from certain rights, this does not imply that they are excluded from all or, in other words, that there is total exclusion. In the case of those who already have refugee status or complementary protection and asylum/refugee applicants, including