Global Migration Institute
WORKING PAPERS

Urban Sanctuary, Migrant Solidarity and Hospitality in Asia

Smita Tiwary, Manjima Anjana, & Abhishek Yadav

Toronto Metropolitan University

Global Migration Institute

Urban Sanctuary, Migrant Solidarity and Hospitality in Asia

Smita Tiwary
Global Research Forum on Diaspora and Transnationalism (GRFDT)
New Delhi

Manjima Anjana
Global Research Forum on Diaspora and Transnationalism (GRFDT)
New Delhi

Abhishek Yadav
Global Research Forum on Diaspora and Transnationalism (GRFDT)
New Delhi

Series Editors: Anna Triandafyllidou, Richa Shivakoti, and Zhixi Zhuang

Acknowledgement

Abstract

Urban sanctuary and migrant solidarity have emerged as key themes in migration governance, often positioning cities as inclusive actors in contrast to exclusionary nation-states. While these frameworks have been theorised extensively in the Global North, such models remain underdeveloped in Asian contexts. This paper contributes to debates on urban sanctuary and practices of migrant solidarity by foregrounding perspectives from Asia, where practices of protection and inclusion often unfold outside formal legal frameworks and are shaped by religious traditions, informal economies, and socio-political histories. The paper clarifies the conceptual distinctions between sanctuary as a historically and geographically specific political project, and solidarity and hospitality as contextually embedded practices of care, aid, and inclusion. Drawing on a critical review of scholarly literature, policy documents, and media reports, the paper interrogates the limitations of North-centric sanctuary models in capturing Asian experiences. Through case studies of Delhi (India), Bangkok (Thailand), and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan), selected for their thematic fit rather than temporal comparability, the paper explores how sanctuary-like practices are negotiated within and against state frameworks, shaped by local solidarities and forms of discretionary governance. The concepts of liminality and gray spaces are examined to analyse sanctuary and solidarity practices beyond the spatially fixed assumptions embedded in conventional 'urban sanctuary' frameworks. By foregrounding the legal, cultural, and political particularities of Asian contexts, it reconceptualises hospitality and protection as dynamic, negotiated, and context-sensitive, contributing to more nuanced frameworks for migrant protection in the Global South

Keywords: Sanctuary cities, migrant solidarity, hospitality, Asia, urban governance, grey spaces, undocumented migrants, informal practices, refugee protection, liminality.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Urban sanctuary and migrant solidarity have become key themes in migration studies, marking a shift from nation-state–centric governance to city-led responses. Cities are increasingly viewed as more inclusive and adaptable than nation-states, which often structurally exclude migrants (Sharma, 2020). Initiatives like Caring Cities (Eurocities, 2022) and the 2018 Marrakech Mayoral Declaration (UN-Habitat, 2019) underscore cities' roles in migrant inclusion across global contexts. In North America, these efforts are commonly framed as sanctuary cities—a term with specific historical and cultural roots in faith-based and activist resistance to restrictive immigration enforcement (Bauder, 2016). Sanctuary, in this context, denotes a formal or informal commitment by local authorities to offer protection to the non-citizens, often by limiting cooperation with national immigration enforcement.

Elsewhere, particularly in Europe and Latin America, similar efforts have emerged under the banners of solidarity cities or cities of refuge (Christoph & Kron, 2019). These emphasise solidarity, defined here as collective and often grassroots forms of support for migrants, through advocacy, mutual aid, and inclusive public spaces, carried out by individuals, communities, and civil society actors. Closely linked, hospitality refers to the ethics and practices of welcoming migrants, often embedded in everyday interactions, religious traditions, and moral obligations, rather than in institutionalised frameworks. Both solidarity and hospitality, then, are broader and more diffuse than sanctuary, and more adaptable to contexts where legal protections may be weak or absent.

These models of sanctuary, solidarity and hospitality remain underdeveloped in the Global South, particularly in Asia, where sanctuary is rarely articulated in the same terms and institutional forms as in the Global North. Solidarity practices in Asia are shaped—and often constrained—by the region's socio-political history, levels of development, and legal-institutional frameworks. This paper is therefore a literature-driven inquiry into the concept of urban sanctuary, critically examining how existing studies conceptualise solidarity, protection, and hospitality for migrants and refugees. It draws on scholarly literature, policy documents, and media reports to interrogate the limitations of the Global North-centric 'urban sanctuary' framework and to explore alternative ways of thinking about sanctuary in Asia.

The conceptual and empirical engagements of the paper with the practice, politics, and spatiality of 'sanctuary' in Asia are guided by the following questions:

1. In what ways are urban sanctuary and solidarity practices conceptualised and operationalised within the context of Asian cities?

    (1.1)   What forms of tension, exclusion, and contradiction arise in the everyday enactment of sanctuary and solidarity practices, particularly in relation to state authority, legal regimes, and the lived experiences of diverse migrant populations?

    (1.2)   How might the concept of urban sanctuary and solidarity practices be rearticulated to capture the dynamics of migrant solidarity and protection more effectively in Asian contexts?

    (1.3)   In what ways can alternative conceptual frameworks, such as grey spaces and liminality, offer deeper analytical insight into these practices?

Through these questions, the paper employs review of the existing literature to explore how solidarity with undocumented migrants and refugees is expressed in Asian contexts, the drivers of these practices, and their interaction with national immigration regimes. Moving beyond spatial definitions, sanctuary is framed as a multidimensional assemblage of practices, processes, and ethical commitments (Houston et al., 2023). The paper also identifies the constraints shaping these expressions of solidarity and hospitality, ultimately contributing to a conceptual reworking of sanctuary practices and solidarity frameworks to better reflect the specificities of the Asian context.

The following section critically examines the concept of urban sanctuary to identify its limitations in capturing the realities of migrant solidarity in Asian contexts. However, these conceptual limitations do not imply the absence of sanctuary-like practices in the region. Rather, the aim is to relocate and reframe the idea of sanctuary within the distinct political, social, and cultural milieus of Asia. To ground this analysis, the paper draws on three case studies: Delhi (India), Bangkok (Thailand), and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), Pakistan. While Delhi and Bangkok represent urban contexts, the KPK case expands the lens to the provincial level, highlighting a broader set of dynamics.

These cases have been selected based on the availability of empirical materials, their capacity to serve as illustrative yet diverse examples of solidarity and hospitality practices, and their potential to unsettle Global North-centric conceptual frameworks. Although they do not capture the full spectrum of sanctuary practices across Asia, particularly in West Asia, they nonetheless offer valuable insights into varied modalities of protection and inclusion.
The case study section is followed by a comparative discussion that synthesises the key findings and evaluates the conceptual tools—such as urban sanctuary, grey spaces, and liminality—that best explain the empirical realities. The concluding section summarises the main arguments and outlines directions for future research, particularly the need for more context-sensitive conceptualisations of migrant solidarity in Asia.

2. (Re) Conceptualising Urban Sanctuaries

The origins of urban sanctuary practices can be traced to initiatives, often church-led, that have provided refuge for migrants and refugees, shielding them from legal authorities (Carro, 1986; Bezdek, 1995). A key moment in the post-WWII urban sanctuary movement occurred during U.S. protests against the deportation of Salvadoran and Guatemalan asylum seekers, when churches and individuals offered refuge despite legal risks, denouncing the actions as "wrongful and immoral" (Crittenden, 1988). This ethos was formalised in San Francisco's 1985 'City of Refuge' ordinance, which prohibited local cooperation with federal immigration authorities (Bau, 1994). Despite increased securitisation post-9/11 (Chishti & Bolter, 2021), sanctuary practices persisted, reflected in the 2007 New Sanctuary Movement (Yukich, 2013) and inclusive local policies (American Immigration Council, 2020), often provoking federal backlash (Robbins, 2017).

Beyond the U.S., the U.K.'s 'City of Sanctuary' movement (since 2005) prioritised awareness and service access over legal confrontation (Darling & Squire, 2012). Similar efforts exist in Canada (Moffette & Ridgley, 2018) and the EU (Özdemir, 2022; Saracino, 2024). These cases highlight two core features of urban sanctuaries: first, urban sanctuaries broadly refer to the spaces that facilitate the access of undocumented migrants and refugees to the services offered at the municipal/city/local level to ensure a decent life; second, sanctuary practices are context-specific—ranging from confrontational non-cooperation with federal law (as in the U.S.) to more

discourse-oriented approaches focused on cultivation of inclusivity (Bauder & Gonzalez, 2018; Bauder, 2019a).

Here, urban sanctuary emerges as a catch-all concept that covers diverse practices at the local level that extend solidarity with the migrant communities and enable their rightful existence despite the lack of citizenship status. Urban sanctuaries are transformative forces as they rearticulate urban belonging by presenting alternative forms of rights and migration experience based on being an inhabitant of the city, an identity that brings citizens and migrants together as a part of a unified urban community (Bauder, 2019a; Schwiertz & Schwenken, 2020). Through the scalar shift from nation-states to local governance bodies, such as municipalities, urban sanctuaries challenge the structural exclusion of migrants and refugees at the national level and the associated crisis narratives on the ''management' of undocumented migrants and refugees (Sahin-Mencutek et al., 2022).

Despite their radical potential, the concept of urban sanctuaries has noteworthy limitations. Their effectiveness in challenging exclusionary national migration regimes is limited by financial dependence on provincial and federal governments (Hudson, 2021). Faith-based organisations, while influential in shifting migration discourse, have had limited impact on substantive legal reform (Dastyari, 2019). Ethnographic studies have pointed that sanctuary policies often remain symbolic and conformist rather than confrontational, diminishing their transformative potential (Bazurli & De Graauw, 2023; Karageorgiou & Noll, 2022) and maintaining migrants at the political margins while enhancing the city's moral image (Bagelman, 2013).

Moreover, scholarship on urban sanctuary and migrant solidarity has largely focused on cities of the Global North, such as in the U.S.A., Canada, the U.K., Germany, and Switzerland (Paul, 2023; Bauder, 2016; Bauder & Weisser, 2019; Humphris, 2023). While context-specificity is acknowledged in this literature (Bauder & Gonzalez, 2018, p. 130), little attention has been paid to the Global South. In a pioneering study of urban sanctuary and solidarity practices in the Global South, Bauder (2019b) notes that the underlying theoretical assumptions of urban sanctuary and solidarity practices are inherently Eurocentric (p. 12).

There are various reasons why the concept of 'urban sanctuary' cannot be transposed to the Global South context without major context-specific reframing. First, the legal–institutional environment in much of Asia is fundamentally different. A majority of states in the region have not ratified the 1951 Refugee Convention or the 1967 Protocol, not simply due to 'instability' but because refugee governance is shaped by national security priorities, contested statehood, and longstanding concerns over demographic change (Forced Migration Review, n.d.a). In countries such as India, Thailand, Pakistan, and Malaysia, refugee protection operates through ad hoc administrative practices rather than rights-based regimes. These legal ambiguities create a different political economy of protection from that seen in the Global North, where sanctuary operates against the backdrop of stronger welfare systems and clearer statutory protections.

Second, migration dynamics within Asia differ qualitatively from North–South patterns. Intra-Asian migration has been rising steadily and now constitutes one of the largest regional migration corridors globally (IOM, 2024). But unlike Global North contexts, where states predominantly function as migrant destinations, migration in Asia involves overlapping roles as origin, transit, and destination. Movements are shaped by historically porous borders, ethnolinguistic continuities, seasonal and circular labour flows, and conflict-driven displacement—such as along the Afghanistan–Pakistan border or within the Mekong subregion. These dynamics produce layered forms of precarity and governance that do not map neatly onto sanctuary models grounded in formal municipal autonomy and rights claims (De Lombaerde et al., 2014).

Third, the socio-economic conditions within many Asian cities introduce additional constraints. Rapid urbanisation, infrastructural deficits, informal labour markets, and limited public services intensify competition over housing, healthcare, and employment. In this context, local authorities often lack the fiscal or political capacity to implement sanctuary-like policies. As a result, migrants depend heavily on informal actors—NGOs, religious institutions, community organisations, and migrant-led networks—for protection and support. These networks can be generative but also uneven and exploitative, especially for undocumented groups, women, and ethnic minorities (Bauder & Gonzalez, 2018; Bauder, 2019b; Godoy & Bauder, 2022; Forced Migration Review, n.d.b).

Finally, any attempt to apply the sanctuary concept to Asia must grapple with postcolonial critiques of the liberal cosmopolitanism embedded in sanctuary discourse. Scholars argue that sanctuary practices in the Global North are underpinned by European humanist traditions, territorial privilege, and a particular moral economy of hospitality that often obscures colonial histories and the unequal production of displacement (Bignall, 2022; Pourmokhtari, 2013). Roy (2019) contends that the very notion of sanctuary carries assumptions that do not translate neatly to postcolonial contexts, where state formation, sovereignty, and belonging are shaped by distinct historical trajectories.

It is with these caveats in mind that this project examines sanctuary and solidarity practices in Asian cities not as imperfect versions of Northern sanctuary regimes, but as context-specific formations with their own histories, logics, and political possibilities.

3. Contextualising Urban Sanctuaries in Asia

Sanctuary practices in Asian cities are largely shaped by informal networks, religious traditions, and community-based solidarity, rather than formal legal frameworks. In many non-signatory states to the 1951 Refugee Convention—such as India, Pakistan, Malaysia, and several Gulf countries—protection for undocumented migrants and refugees arises through local and grassroots initiatives rather than national legal systems (Forced Migration Review, n.d. a).

Across Asia, many cultures and religious traditions emphasise hospitality, refuge, and sanctuary for displaced people, fugitives, and travellers, forming a cultural memory of migrant solidarity. Panakkeel & Alaoui (2020) reflect on the use of the cultural concept of Hinduism, *athithi devo bhava* (the guest is God), in depicting the Indian treatment of Sri Lankan refugees. The Tamil Nadu state government of India took proactive measures for the resettlement of refugees and their integration into the community, partnering with local NGOs and embarking on community-led initiatives, foregrounding the shared Tamil identity among the refugees and the residents (Panakkeel & Alaoui, 2020; Goreau-Ponceaud, 2024). Similar concepts like *mehmaan-nawazi* (hospitality) and *ummah* (global Muslim community) in Islam and *langar* (community kitchens) in Sikhism have historically provided sanctuary to displaced people. For instance, volunteers of a Sikh group, Khalsa Aid, organised a *langar* (free community kitchen) in 2017 at the Bangladesh-Myanmar border, providing food to 30,000 Rohingya refugees who have fled violence in Myanmar (Singh, 2017 a, Goyal, 2017).

Siruno (2021) and Siruno & Siegel (2023) highlight the spirit of *bayanihan* (solidarity, civic unity and cooperation), rooted in the culture of the Philippines, which played a significant role in mobilising the Filipino community in aiding the undocumented compatriots in the Netherlands during COVID-19. *Gotong royong* (mutual assistance), a principle culturally rooted in Indonesia and Malaysia, is at the centre of sanctuary practices in these countries, which has been identified

as an enactment of social citizenship (Suwignyo, 2019). Two exemplifications of sanctuary practices in conjunction with this principle are:

1. The *Gotong-Royong* community work was organised in conjunction with World Refugee Day in 2024 by ElShaddai Centre Berhad, a faith-based NGO in Malaysia. This initiative gathered undocumented migrants, stateless and refugees, with foreigners and locals, to do a community clean-up in Klang, a city in Malaysia. The initiative was aimed at showcasing the contribution that the refugee, undocumented and stateless communities can offer to Malaysia (ElShaddai Centre Berhad, 2024).

2. The *Gotong Royong Cucuk Vaksin* is a documentary short film about the efforts of the migrant and refugee community to help Malaysia's vaccination drive. The film features interviews with volunteers, such as a Somalian volunteer who helped in the vaccination drives or a migrant rights lawyer who got over 10,000 undocumented migrants vaccinated. The documentary points to the creation of a social identity above that of citizenship, framed by solidarity (Gotong-Royong Cucuk Vaksin, n.d.).

On similar notes, Ghufran (2011) notes the significance of the Pashtuni traditions, *melmastia* (hospitality) and *panah* (refuge), in mobilising support for the Afghan refugees in Pakistan. These instances point to the cultural rootedness of the sanctuary concept in the Asian context. However, one must be very careful in terming these instances as provisions of sanctuaries emanating from a sentiment of belonging that transcends the nationally defined boundaries of Self and the Other. Ethnic and religious identities in Asia often transcend the nation-state boundaries, shaping the region's culture and politics. Mishra (2014) rightly calls Asian nation-states "a multiplicity of nationalities," characterised by the legal demarcation of state boundaries that cut across ethnic and religious affinities.

 When sanctuaries are offered to undocumented migrants and refugees, the guiding spirit is the shared ethnic or religious identities rather than any cosmopolitan vision of shared humanity or shared residency in a geographical space. For instance, the shelter, healthcare, and education provided to Sri Lankan Tamil refugees by the Tamil Nadu state government of India (Valatheeswaran and Rajan, 2011) or to Myanmar Chin refugees in Mizoram (McConnachie, 2018) cannot easily be placed within the 'urban sanctuary' category as it is not the shared identity of being inhabitants of a city that guides sanctuary practices but shared ethnic ties (Tamil and Chin, respectively, in both cases).

In Asia, solidarity practices are shaped not only by shared ethnic and religious ties but also by a high degree of informality. Unlike the formal resistance of urban sanctuary movements in the U.S. and Europe, Asian cities rely on discretionary governance, with sanctuary negotiated on a case-by-case basis and often tied to informal economic integration. For instance, studies on the livelihood strategies of the Rohingya refugees (Hoque and Yunus, 2020; Wake and Cheung, 2016) note the significance of the informal economy for income generation, along with the role of social networks in facilitating access to jobs in the informal sector, protection from police raids, and access to social services. Similarly, Nursyazwani's (2025) research shows that despite the concept of *ummah* (global Muslim community), Arab and Middle Eastern refugees—viewed as more educated and "productive" neoliberal subjects—receive preferential treatment in Malaysia. Similar studies of irregular or undocumented migration from Bangladesh to India (Khadria, 2016; Khadria, 2020) have noted the lack of human capital investment and supportive policy frameworks from the state, pushing the migrants towards precarity and criminalisation. The predatory nature of informal institutions (Lelliott and Miller, 2023), which often exploit vulnerable migrants, must be

taken into account, rendering their description as sanctuary practices ignorant of the ground realities.

Urban sanctuaries in Asia are shaped by a complex interplay between local governance, civil society, and international actors. Unlike traditional sanctuary cities in the Global North, where municipal policies actively defy state restrictions on migration, urban sanctuaries in Asia often emerge in response to national governments' strategic devolution of refugee management responsibilities to local authorities. In Indonesia, for instance, cities like Makassar have taken on a growing role in accommodating asylum seekers, reflecting what Missbach et al. (2018) term the "local turn" in refugee governance. This shift is less about a normative commitment to sanctuary and more about redistributing responsibilities in the absence of a regional protection framework under mechanisms like the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration (Gleeson, 2017). While this local turn creates spaces of refuge, it lacks the explicit protections associated with sanctuary city models elsewhere.

Similarly, Hoffstaedter (2015a, 2015b) highlights how state–civil society partnerships play a crucial role in refugee reception, particularly in Malaysia and Turkey. In these contexts, NGOs emerge as close associates of the state, assuming state functions in providing assistance while remaining under strict governmental oversight. This creates a paradox where civil society actors extend sanctuary-like support but remain constrained by state control, as seen in Turkey's shutdown of international aid organisations without explanation.

Across these cases, urban sanctuaries in Asia emerge not as formalised sanctuary cities but as evolving governance arrangements where subnational authorities, civil society, and international organisations negotiate the terms of protection. While they provide crucial support for displaced populations, they remain precarious spaces shaped by state policies and geopolitical constraints. The following section aims to paint a more nuanced picture of sanctuary practices in Asia through three case studies: Delhi, Bangkok, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK).

4. Case Studies

4.1. Delhi, India

Delhi occupies a complex position within India's migration landscape. Although India is predominantly understood as a country of emigration, it simultaneously hosts significant populations of undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, and long-term refugee communities due to the porous nature of South Asian borders and the region's overlapping geopolitical conflicts. India is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, and refugee protection remains ad hoc, executive-driven, and deeply entangled with domestic politics, closely associated with the nation building of a post-colonial state and its 'cartographic anxieties' (Oommen, 1982; Chimni, 1998). As a result, refugees and undocumented migrants in Delhi navigate an ambiguous legal terrain where rights, protections, and recognition vary dramatically depending on nationality, religion, and geopolitical considerations.

4.1.1. Delhi and the historic moment of 'urban sanctuary'

The capital city, Delhi, has historically been a recipient of refugee influx. It has been argued that "modern Delhi has blossomed from the buds of refugee camps" established following the partition

of the subcontinent in 1947 (Rathore, 2022). The Partition of British India in 1947 created two independent nations, India and Pakistan, along religious lines, triggering massive communal violence. Post-partition, an estimated 14.5 million people were displaced within a short span of just four years, with Hindus and Sikhs migrating to India and Muslims to Pakistan (Bharadwaj et al., 2009, p. 3). The violence during this period, including atrocities such as mass killings, sexual violence, and abductions, resulted in the deaths of an estimated 1-2 million people (Dalrymple, 2015). The refugee crisis further strained resources and sowed long-lasting animosity between the newly formed nations.

As a result of the refugee influx, Delhi saw a staggering 90 per cent hike between 1941 and 1951, while the population in the rest of the country increased by 13 per cent (Raj and Sehgal, 1961). The historical experience of refugee integration in Delhi presents an interesting instance of sanctuary practices. With around 30 per cent of the city's population being displaced people (Pandey, 1997), the government embarked on a unique policy of refugee assimilation. The Relief and Rehabilitation Policy of the Government of India, 1948, presents a detailed description of the policies undertaken, which can be categorised into three umbrella initiatives:

1. Decentralisation of the refugee management responsibility to the local authorities with adequate fiscal support: The Delhi government alone received Rs.5,00,000 in grants and Rs.15,00,000 in loans for "relief schemes, grants and loans to students." (Prime Minister's Office, p. 6)

2. Rehabilitation of the refugees: The Rehabilitation and Development Board was created, which embarked on elaborate housing schemes in Delhi, along with the distribution of housing plots (p.10,11). By the end of 1950, the government had allocated nearly 2,958 acres of housing plots and housed 3,00,000 refugees in evacuated and newly constructed houses (Datta 1993: 290).

3. Refugee self-sufficiency: Along with rehabilitation, the policies also focused on ensuring the ability of the migrant communities to be independent and contribute to the economy. This was enabled through the provision of educational opportunities and the absorption of displaced people into professional communities matching their skills and training, with special attention paid to the informal sector- domestic workers, along with beggars, vagrants, and lower caste members facing ostracisation (Prime Minister's Office, pp.13-21).

The implementation of these policies was far from ideal. Discrimination along religious (Pandey, 1997), caste (Shahani, 2025) class lines (Kaur, 2009) prevailed. However, the refugees managed to persevere and played a significant role in boosting the economy (Datta, 1993), transforming the capital city into a bustling urban centre. While this presents a pertinent example of sanctuary practice, the case of post-partition refugee integration from 1947-1950 is also a historically unique case, as the refugee influx was considered the cost of independence, and the refugees were provided with citizenship status in India. This presents the only instance where the Indian government adopted a formal refugee policy (Rathore, 2022) and facilitated the local administration to provide sanctuary to the refugees. Its historically unique configuration distinguishes Partition rehabilitation from contemporary migration politics, where refugees and undocumented migrants are positioned as security threats rather than national subjects to be absorbed.

4.1.2. National politics and the tightening documentary regime

Post-Partition, India's refugee governance shifted dramatically. The inflow of undocumented migrants and refugees since then has followed conflictual dynamics with the nation-state interests, with the urban administration equally hostile towards the undocumented migrants (Mishra, 2025). The securitisation of migration has only intensified, with the undocumented migrants and refugees depicted as a threat to law and order in the destination border states (for example, Das and Talukdar, 2016). New arrivals—Afghan, Rohingya, Tibetan, Bangladeshi, and others—have encountered a securitised and exclusionary documentary regime. The national government retains exclusive jurisdiction over refugee policy, and in practice, this translates into politicised, nationality-based differentiation.

Certain groups—particularly non-Muslim minorities from Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Bangladesh—have been granted long-term visas, exemptions under the Foreigners Act, and routes to citizenship. Afghan Sikhs and Hindus, for instance, have historically been framed as persecuted minorities who fit India's self-image as a regional civilisational refuge. In contrast, Muslim refugees, especially Rohingyas, are routinely labelled "illegal migrants," securitised in political discourse, and exposed to eviction, detention, and deportation threats (Press Trust of India (a), 2019).

The Citizenship (Amendment) Act (CAA) formalised and intensified this differentiation. Under the original Citizenship Act (1955), anyone entering without valid travel documents from neighbouring countries was classified as an "illegal migrant" and ineligible for citizenship. The CAA 2019 created a religion-specific exception by enabling Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, Parsis, and Christians from Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Bangladesh to apply for naturalisation on a reduced timeline—from twelve years to six—provided they had been exempted from the Passport (Entry into India) Act, 1920 or the Foreigners Act, 1946. These groups are no longer considered illegal migrants and remain eligible for citizenship, effectively recoding them as *refugees* in legal terms and creating a distinction in the treatment of (some) refugees and undocumented migrants (Kapur, 2021)

For those outside the ambit of legal recognition, life in India's cities unfolds within a regime of permanent documentary precarity. At the city level, Delhi's governance landscape compounds these national dynamics. Authority is dispersed across the Delhi government, the Municipal Corporation of Delhi, the Delhi Development Authority, and central ministries. No single department is mandated to oversee migrant welfare, and the fragmented urban bureaucracy produces inconsistent, often contradictory practices. Everyday governance in Delhi is not solely shaped by formal state institutions. As Schindler's (2014) ethnography shows, the city is governed through multiple coexisting regimes involving non-state actors—resident welfare associations (RWAs), market traders' associations (MTAs), local political brokers, landlords, and informal strongmen. These actors regulate access to housing, street space, licenses, protection, and forms of everyday order. For undocumented migrants and refugee communities, this creates a paradoxical environment: In some neighbourhoods, local networks, landlords, and NGOs enable everyday toleration and stability. In others, RWAs, market associations, and police engage in aggressive surveillance, eviction pressures, or racialised exclusion. Migrant populations therefore navigate a patchwork of micro-governance arrangements, where access to safety, work, or housing depends less on formal policy and more on who controls space at the neighbourhood level.

4.1.3. Survival, solidarity and exclusion in the city

Despite the absence of a formal sanctuary regime, Delhi hosts multiple migrant and refugee communities who have carved out forms of belonging, livelihood, and security through negotiated, everyday practices. This subsection aims to give an overview of how different refugee and undocumented migrant communities experience hospitality in Delhi, which most often falls short of the standards and normative underpinnings of sanctuary-provisions.

The Tibetan exile community in India (and in Nepal and Bhutan in limited numbers) (Dorjee and Rigzin, 2024), established after the 1959 flight of the Dalai Lama and thousands of his followers from Chinese-occupied Tibet, is another example of sanctuary practice in the Asian context. India granted asylum and facilitated the resettlement of Tibetans in regions like Dharamshala, which became the administrative and cultural centre of the exile government (McConnell, 2009).

Majnu ka Tilla, an informal colony of exiled Tibetans in Delhi, has emerged as a tourist hub in the city, popularly called the Little Tibet (Rongmei, 2023). Beyond its role as a cultural and commercial hub, the settlement illustrates how refugee communities navigate urban informality to establish spaces of belonging. Balasubramaniam and Gupta (2019) highlight the significance of the Residents Welfare Association (RWA) of Majnu ka Tilla, which has been active since 1965 in advocating for residents' interests. Operating outside formal Tibetan rehabilitation policies, the RWA has enabled a shift from the rhetoric of refuge to a rights-based approach in asserting land claims. This institutionalisation of community governance distinguishes Majnu ka Tilla from other Tibetan settlements in India, where such rights-based claims are largely unavailable. As a result, internal divisions emerged within the Tibetan exile community, shaped by differential access to land and legal recognition. Tibetan settlements function as quasi-urban sanctuaries where exile governance structures provide education, welfare, and cultural preservation (Van Beek, 2004; Bentz, 2012). This case reflects a negotiated sanctuary model shaped by geopolitical considerations and informal governance rather than legal refugee status.

Unlike the Tibetan refugees, who are supported by organising and capacity building at the community level, Afghan refugees—many without formal documentation—have dispersed across neighbourhoods such as Lajpat Nagar, Bhogal, and Tilak Nagar, collectively known as "mini-Kabul" (Sharma, 2023; Press Trust of India (b), 2022). Their presence is sustained through dense communal networks, commercial activity (especially food enterprises), and the ability to inhabit "in-between" legal spaces. The ambiguity of their status generates vulnerabilities, especially regarding police encounters, housing insecurity, and employment exploitation, yet it also creates openings for informal negotiation. Everyday commerce, linguistic familiarity, and transnational remittance networks help soften the boundaries created by India's restrictive refugee policy. The boundaries carved out by the lack of legal status are constantly blurred through means like commerce, cuisine, and social contacts, despite the de facto ghettoisation (Roy and Mir, 2020; Roy, 2018; Anam, 2018).

Rohingya refugees in Delhi—many holding UNHCR cards without formal state recognition—live in conditions of acute precarity. Their peripheral settlements face routine evictions, surveillance, and political hostility, while the absence of state-accepted documentation restricts access to healthcare, education, and formal employment (Singh 2024 b; Choubey, 2024). This aligns with long-standing patterns in the city: UNHCR documents rarely function as valid IDs in practice, leaving refugees suspended between the categories of "migrant," "foreigner," and "de facto refugee" (Field et al., 2019). Research on Burmese refugees further highlights the severity of everyday risks, particularly for women and girls, who face pervasive harassment and gendered

violence despite UNHCR's 2009 Urban Refugee Policy (Bartolomei, 2015). Given India's refusal to codify refugee rights, protection remains uneven and heavily dependent on non-state actors.

Within this legal vacuum, sanctuary in Delhi is generated through informal infrastructures. NGOs provide education, legal aid, and psychosocial support; faith-based groups supply food, shelter, and care; and migrant-led networks help secure housing and income. These assemblages constitute infrastructures of social reproduction though their informality renders them fragile and uneven. Solidarity within these spaces is pragmatic—emerging from neighbourhood proximity, commerce, and shared marginality rather than from political commitments. Yet this everyday coexistence enables limited but meaningful forms of belonging. At the same time, refugees' prolonged illegality makes them vulnerable to exploitation, communalised suspicion, and political instrumentalisation. Lin and Paul's (2019) study of undocumented Bangladeshi migrants illustrates how insecure communities can become entangled in local patronage and scapegoating through incorporation into vote bank politics. UNHCR's focus on technocratic indicators of self-reliance—job placements, enterprise grants, income—often overlooks broader capabilities that matter for meaningful urban life, such as cultural participation, caregiving, and community-building (Field et al., 2019). Refugee autonomy in Delhi thus cannot be understood solely through documentation or livelihoods but must be situated within the wider assemblage of legal ambiguity, communal politics, and urban informality.

Delhi demonstrates that urban sanctuary in the Asian context cannot be understood through the legalistic, city-led frameworks common in North American and European debates. Hospitality here is neither municipal policy nor protected status; it is a contingent, historically embedded practice shaped by Partition's legacies of displacement, South Asian geopolitics, and postcolonial nation-building. Sanctuary is also informal, emerging through NGOs, faith-based organisations, local patrons, and migrant networks that substitute for absent state welfare. In the absence of domestic legal frameworks, international organisations like the UNHCR also plays an important role in developing quasi-legal practices aimed at enabling the sustenance of these communities. These actors generate infrastructures of care, learning, and survival, but they cannot stabilise rights, making sanctuary-in-practice at once generative and precarious.

4.2. Bangkok, Thailand

Bangkok exemplifies the "non-Convention" city, accommodating roughly 5,000 urban refugees and asylum-seekers from over 40 countries alongside more than 500,000 stateless persons, despite Thailand's non-ratification of the 1951 Refugee Convention (UNHCR, 2025). Simultaneously, nine Royal Thai Government (RTG)-managed border camps house over 90,000 primarily Karen, Karenni, and Burmese refugees who have fled conflict since the mid-1980s (UNHCR, 2025). This case illustrates the broader argument of the paper: sanctuary in Asia is rarely formalised through municipal ordinances, as in the Global North, but instead emerges through informal, precarious, and community-led practices that blur the boundaries between solidarity, hospitality, and survival.

In the absence of legal protection, urban sanctuary in Bangkok arises via informal networks including community-based spaces—faith-based schools, religious institutions, and community centres—that offer temporary refuge from arrest and deportation (Tuitjer & Batréau, 2019, pp. 6–7). These multifunctional sites provide education, communal gatherings, and a safe haven, embodying a de facto sanctuary despite their extralegal status. Unlike sanctuary cities in North America or Europe, where local authorities openly contest national immigration regimes,

Bangkok's sanctuary practices remain embedded in everyday negotiations of visibility and vulnerability, underscoring the limits of transplanting Global North frameworks into Asian contexts. However, sanctuary spaces remain precarious; refugees must maintain low visibility to evade police raids, continually negotiating their presence in public and private spheres. The constant threat of enforcement actions renders these havens temporary and unstable, underscoring the conditional nature of hospitality under criminalisation (Tuitjer & Batréau, 2019, pp. 6–7).

Therefore, refugee communities supplement institutional gaps through mutual aid: shared housing arrangements, pooled remittances, and informal alert systems—often via mobile networks—to warn of immigration sweeps. Such migrant solidarity networks, reinforced by FBO-led initiatives, facilitate access to food, healthcare, and psychosocial support, illustrating grassroots hospitality amid legal exclusion. These practices resonate with the broader Asian traditions of hospitality and solidarity discussed earlier, yet they remain fragile, contingent, and shaped by the absence of legal recognition, highlighting the tension between ethical commitments and structural exclusion.

Together, these dynamics reveal how urban sanctuary, solidarity, and hospitality in Bangkok coalesce within a terrain defined by temporality, community agency, and persistent vulnerability.

4.2.1. Migrant Solidarity

Thailand's non-ratification of the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol leaves asylum-seekers and refugees legally classified as undocumented migrants, exposed to arrest and deprived of formal protection (Jesuit Refugee Service, n.d.). This legal vacuum foregrounds the central question of the paper: how solidarity and sanctuary are operationalised in contexts where state authority denies formal refugee status, compelling civil society to assume quasi-state functions. In Bangkok, urban refugees originate predominantly from Pakistan, Somalia, Cambodia, and Vietnam, reflecting the heterogeneous nature of forced displacement in Southeast Asia (Jesuit Refugee Service, n.d.). This legal vacuum has prompted civil society actors—NGOs, faith-based organisations (FBOs), and refugee communities themselves—to develop parallel support systems that address gaps in legal aid, healthcare, and basic subsistence.

Refugee solidarity in Bangkok is characterised by cross-sectoral collaboration. Clinics operated by Tzu Chi provide free primary medical care and referrals, while advocacy agencies such as Asylum Access Thailand (AAT) and the Bangkok Refugee Center (BRC) offer legal counselling, protection monitoring, and small-scale financial assistance (Asylum Access Thailand, 2022). These organisations forge alliances with local health centres and private practitioners to extend service coverage, often negotiating ad hoc agreements that allow refugees to access otherwise restricted facilities without fear of detention.

The Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) Thailand exemplifies a comprehensive NGO-led response under restrictive policy conditions. Its Urban Refugee Project (URP) combines casework—addressing urgent needs in housing, nutrition, healthcare, and transport—and psychosocial services tailored to trauma recovery (Jesuit Refugee Service, n.d.). Beyond emergency relief, JRS implements capacity-building through educational programmes for Myanmar migrant children along border regions and vocational training for urban refugees, thereby promoting self-reliance and community leadership (Jesuit Refugee Service, n.d.).

Refugee-led networks further reinforce solidarity and protection. As Tuitjer and Batréau (2019, p. 9) observe, migrants use mobile phones and social media to circulate real-time alerts about police raids, creating a decentralised warning system that mitigates the risk of arrest. Shared living

arrangements and collective resource pooling—whether for remittance loans, transportation costs, or bulk food purchases—underscore refugees' agency in crafting informal safety nets within Bangkok's precarious urban milieu.

These multilayered solidarities—NGO-driven service provision, faith-based healthcare partnerships, and grassroots refugee networks—constitute an adaptive ecosystem of hospitality in a legal environment that offers no formal sanctuary. While lacking state endorsement, such collaborative models enable many refugees to maintain basic security, access essential services, and cultivate communal resilience amid persistent legal and economic exclusion.

4.2.2. Hospitality in a Hostile Environment

Although Thailand has no formal refugee recognition framework, undocumented newcomers routinely rely on informal hospitality extended by private actors, including landlords and communities. Tuitjer and Batréau (2019) report that certain landlords and neighbours in central districts provide shelter, food, and practical support to undocumented migrants, despite the risk of penal sanctions (pp. 10–11). Such informal arrangements constitute vital survival strategies: they enable access to housing markets that would otherwise bar non-Thai nationals, and promote reciprocal ties through which basic needs are met.

This hospitality can be described as conditional and performative hospitality. Stevens (2018, p. 8) describes refugees' "tourist performance"—a set of everyday practices (e.g., using taxis instead of buses, frequenting high-visibility areas) designed to mimic tourist comportment and thus evade police scrutiny. While this strategy permits greater mobility, it simultaneously reinforces refugees' outsider status and underscores the provisional nature of their welcome (Stevens, 2018, pp. 8–9).

In lieu of state-led protection, international agencies and NGOs fill critical service gaps. UNHCR's Bangkok office issues "proof of registration" cards that mitigate refoulement risk and, through implementing partners, provides modest financial stipends, livelihood workshops, and psychosocial counselling (UNHCR, 2024). However, Stevens (2018, pp. 8–9) cautions that these resources cover only a fraction of urban refugees' needs, leaving many without secure shelter or health care.

Migration pathways into Bangkok further accentuate vulnerability, leading to precarious journeys. Shum (2014) documents multi-day, clandestine crossings: Lao and Cambodian migrants bribe border officials or cross at night; Vietnamese often traverse Cambodia by smugglers; Chinese nationals journey via the Mekong River into northern Thailand before overland transport to Bangkok. Concealment in cargo trucks and overcrowded vans typifies these journeys, producing acute risks of exploitation and trafficking (Shum, 2014).

Palmgren's (2013) ethnographic study of Khmer Krom, Rohingya, and Vietnamese refugees reveals the emergence of "tentative sanctuaries" through community networks. Newcomers gravitate toward established enclaves—often in peripheral neighbourhoods with lower surveillance—where affordable housing and informal work are accessible (pp. 22, 30). Landlords aware of refugees' needs sometimes charge nominal rents, effectively creating urban sanctuaries within a hostile legal environment (Palmgren, 2013, p. 30).

Local solidarity extends beyond co-ethnic support to religious institutions. Palmgren (2013, pp. 30–31) documents instances of Thai neighbours and market vendors sharing surplus food,

alerting refugee families to impending raids, and interceding with police for leniency. Buddhist temples and Christian churches occasionally provide food distributions and sanctuary, although such assistance remains sporadic and ad hoc rather than institutionalised (Palmgren, 2013, p. 31).

Access to urban sanctuary varies by group and social capital. Long-settled communities like the Rohingya leverage entrenched informal economies to maintain relative resilience, whereas newer arrivals often lack such networks. For instance, during the 2011 floods, undocumented refugees were excluded from government evacuation centres and relied entirely on their own solidarity networks for rescue and relief (Palmgren, 2013, pp. 31–32). This differential vulnerability underscores the unevenness of hospitality in Bangkok.

There are limits to informal sanctuary. Although social networks and performative strategies afford moments of security, they do not alter refugees' fundamental precarity. Palmgren (2013, pp. 37–38) emphasises that informal hospitality neither confers legal rights nor guarantees long-term protection; rather, it offers only fleeting reprieve within an overarching scenario of legal insecurity and potential detention.

4.2.3. Urban Refugees in Bangkok and the Impact of COVID-19

Prior to COVID-19, refugees accessed care through public hospitals—chiefly Rajavithi and Sirindhorn—using UNHCR registration cards for subsidised treatment, but faced language barriers, transport costs, and caps on covered services. Private clinics were largely unaffordable, while civil-society providers such as the Tzu Chi clinic offered free consultations, medications, and referrals, though without the capacity to underwrite advanced diagnostics or inpatient fees (Asylum Access Thailand, 2022).

During the pandemic's onset, refugees relied on social media, UNHCR bulletins, and CSO communications for public-health guidance. Organisations including the British Refugee Council, Tzu Chi, and the Mirror Foundation distributed masks, hand sanitisers, and staple food parcels. However, overcrowded housing made physical distancing impracticable, and many families reported intra-communal outbreaks (Asylum Access Thailand, 2022).
Testing inequities compounded vulnerability: RT-PCR assays remained prohibitively expensive, and antigen kits were similarly cost-prohibitive, driving reliance on home remedies and traditional medicines. Sporadic NGO referrals to field hospitals offered limited relief, while formal mental-health support was nearly absent despite rising stress from job losses and isolation (Asylum Access Thailand, 2022).

Vaccination campaigns from mid-2021 included refugees under Bangkok's municipal rollout, with most receiving Sinopharm, Sinovac, or AstraZeneca doses. Yet, transportation costs to vaccination sites and documentation requirements—valid passports or UNHCR cards—posed barriers. Many refugees depended on CSO-issued attestation letters to gain entry, illustrating NGOs' critical intermediary role in bridging administrative gaps (Asylum Access Thailand, 2022). Despite these efforts, systemic obstacles persist: legal exclusion bars refugees from Thailand's universal health coverage and social-security schemes; language differences impede effective care; and out-of-pocket expenses for secondary and tertiary services remain catastrophic. The pandemic thus both magnified existing disparities and underscored the reliance of Bangkok's urban refugees on informal hospitality and NGO-mediated healthcare access (Asylum Access Thailand, 2022).

4.2.4. Positive Development: Statelessness Resolution in Thailand

Statelessness in Thailand is both a governance challenge for the state and a lived challenge for displaced and minority populations, whose exclusion from citizenship underscores the limitations of urban sanctuary in the Asian context. Therefore, Thailand's enduring challenge of statelessness for Thai government and stateless individuals has garnered renewed policy attention with the Thai Cabinet's adoption of a landmark resolution on 29 October 2024, which offers an expedited pathway to permanent residency and nationality for approximately 484,000 long-term stateless residents and their Thailand-born children (UNHCR Thailand, 2024). UNHCR Representative Tammi Sharpe characterises this measure as "the most dramatic reduction of statelessness the world has ever seen," reflecting its potential global significance (UNHCR Thailand, 2024).

The resolution delineates two principal beneficiary groups. First, around 340,000 individuals—comprising long-term residents and officially recognised ethnic minorities whose presence was documented by Thai authorities between 1984 and 2011—are rendered immediately eligible for permanent residence (UNHCR Thailand, 2025). Second, over 140,000 Thailand-born children of stateless parents gain automatic qualification for Thai nationality, thus addressing a key intergenerational gap in legal identity (UNHCR Thailand, 2024). Collectively, these provisions cover a substantial share of the nearly 600,000 registered stateless persons in Thailand.

Procedural reforms aim to reduce application backlogs through shortened processing times and streamlined eligibility criteria, focusing on demonstrable loyalty, good conduct, and lack of affiliation with other states (UNHCR Thailand, 2024). Substantively, the policy aligns with Thailand's commitments as a founding member of the Global Alliance to End Statelessness and its 2023 pledge at the Global Refugee Forum to prioritise nationality for children born on Thai soil. Moreover, Thailand's engagement with ESCAP's "Get Every One in the Picture" campaign underscores its commitment to strengthening civil registration and vital-statistics systems regionally (UNHCR Thailand, 2024).

The resolution also pays particular attention to vulnerable ethnic minorities such as the Moken, whose statelessness was spotlighted after the 2004 tsunami. UNHCR's technical assistance, financial support, and NGO partnerships facilitate community outreach, guide applicants through procedural requirements, and help secure basic rights such as education and healthcare (UNHCR Thailand, 2024). This approach—combining legal reform and institutional cooperation—marks a substantive shift in Thailand's strategy to eradicate statelessness and enhance social inclusion.

4.2.5. Challenges and Ambiguities

Despite such efforts, in overall outlook, the experiences of urban refugees in Bangkok reveal the complexities of urban sanctuary, migrant solidarity, and hospitality in the city. While informal networks and community efforts provide essential support, they are insufficient to address the systemic challenges faced by refugees. The lack of legal recognition leaves refugees in a state of perpetual insecurity, where even the most basic activities, such as seeking healthcare or finding work, become fraught with risk.

Moreover, the reliance on informal hospitality and solidarity highlights the absence of state responsibility. Refugees are forced to depend on the goodwill of NGOs, FBOs, and local communities, which often lack the resources to meet their needs fully. This dependency creates

a precarious balance between visibility and invisibility, as refugees must navigate the city while avoiding state surveillance.

While informal networks and community efforts provide crucial support, the absence of formal legal frameworks leaves refugees in a state of vulnerability. The experiences of urban refugees in Bangkok underscore the need for more inclusive policies that recognise the rights and dignity of all migrants, regardless of their legal status. By developing greater solidarity and hospitality, cities like Bangkok can become true sanctuaries for those seeking refuge.

Taken together, Bangkok demonstrates how sanctuary in Asia is enacted through fragile assemblages of NGOs, faith-based organisations, and migrant networks, rather than through municipal defiance of national law. This case underscores the need to reconceptualise sanctuary beyond Global North models, situating it within the precarious, negotiated, and culturally rooted practices of Asian cities.

4.3. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), Pakistan

Pakistan has long been a central destination for Afghan refugees, particularly in the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the late 1970s. Over successive waves of conflict—including civil war, Taliban rule, U.S.-led interventions, and the recent Taliban resurgence—millions of Afghans have sought refuge in Pakistan. The UNHCR estimated that about 1.7 million refugees received shelter in Pakistan (Banerjee, 2014), 54 per cent of whom are males and 46 per cent females (Javed, 2020). Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) has hosted a significant share of refugees, with nearly 60 percent of Afghan refugees residing in the province (UNHCR, 2018). These include those who arrived in earlier decades, and those groups of people who have remained, returned after repatriation, or arrived more recently as undocumented migrants or labourers. While around 40 percent of Afghan refugees in Pakistan live in designated refugee villages, the majority are integrated—formally or informally—into rural and urban settlements across the country. Most of these refugees are ethnically Pashtun, and many live in socio-economic conditions shaped by both precarity and local embeddedness. Children constitute the largest demographic group among them, reflecting both natural population growth and the long-term, intergenerational nature of displacement. Despite periodic efforts at repatriation, ongoing instability in Afghanistan continues to drive cross-border movement, making Pakistan—and particularly KPK—a critical site for examining practices of migrant solidarity, informal hospitality, and contested sanctuary.

4.3.1. Migrant Solidarity based on Ethnic Linkages

The settlement of Afghan refugees in Pakistan since the late 1970s illustrates how informal networks and ethno-religious solidarities have shaped refugee experiences in South Asia. Initially housed in camps in the North-West Frontier Province and Balochistan with support from the Pakistani government and UNHCR, many Afghans gradually moved into cities from the 1980s onward (Khan 2017), often in search of employment. This transition was not simply a matter of economic necessity but was facilitated by kinship ties, ethnic affiliations, and religious solidarities that made urban migration feasible. For later arrivals, particularly in the 1990s when factional fighting in Afghan cities intensified and food aid to camps was reduced, these informal connections provided crucial pathways into urban life without formal registration.

Social networks along lines of kinship, ethnicity, sect, and political affiliation became key determinants of destination choice. Pashtun refugees gravitated toward Peshawar, where ethnic

solidarity enabled them to access the labour market and, in some cases, procure Pakistani identity cards (Javed, 2020). In Quetta, tribal leaders extended protection to Afghan groups, offering land for camps or informal settlements and facilitating access to documentation. Hazara refugees relied on the patronage of local Hazara leaders, establishing enclaves such as Hazara Town with schools, clinics, and community-based livelihoods (Borthakur, 2017). Similarly, Ismaili institutions in Karachi provided shelter and employment opportunities to Ismaili refugees. These examples underscore how migrant solidarity, rooted in shared identity, allowed Afghans to navigate liminality — the uncertain space between displacement and integration.

Livelihood strategies further demonstrate the role of informal ties. Afghan refugees engaged in marginal economic activities such as rag-picking, waste recycling, and daily wage labour, but also leveraged ethnic and community networks to enter more lucrative trades like carpet weaving, transport, and cross-border commerce. Educated Afghans found employment with NGOs serving their communities, while Afghan-run clinics, schools, tailoring shops, and other services catered both to refugees and locals (Haufler, 2007). Such diversification reflects the dynamic agency of refugee populations, who transformed from passive recipients of aid into active participants in urban economies through solidarity-based support systems.

The presence of Afghan refugee also reshaped industries in Pakistan. In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, where 57 percent of Afghan refugees settled, more than 70 percent of carpet weavers were Afghans (Khan, 2017), whose skills and techniques contributed to the global rise of Pakistani carpets (Sayed & Abdul Tamim, 2016). Similarly, Afghan traders dominated the honey business in Peshawar, expanding an industry that employed over 600,000 people by 2016 (Zahor ul Islam, 2019). These economic contributions were not merely individual achievements but collective outcomes of ethnic linkages and informal networks that sustained refugee livelihoods.

In the broader Asian context, such patterns highlight how refugees survive and adapt through solidarities that transcend formal state structures. Informal ties — whether kinship, sectarian, or ethnic — provide protection, access to resources, and pathways into economic life, enabling refugees to endure the liminality of displacement. Afghan refugees in Pakistan exemplify how migrant solidarity rooted in identity and informal networks becomes a critical mechanism of survival and integration in the region.

4.3.2. Vulnerability and Unpleasant Experience

Surviving in Pakistan was a mixed experience for Afghan refugees. Pakistan's Foreigners' Act of 1946 provides the overall legal framework for its immigration policy, requiring all persons entering the country to carry a valid travel document, and if necessary, a visa. Pakistan is not a signatory to the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, although its actions concerning Afghans have largely been guided by the principles of international refugee law since the start of mass arrivals of Afghans at the beginning of the 1980s. The Pakistani government accorded Afghans *prima facie* refugee status in the early 1980s, but this was not formalised by any legal instrument and in a way, the Foreigners' Act still applies to them with certain exemptions. The status of Afghans in Pakistan is in this way effectively governed by policy and administrative measures, which are subject to change, as was visible at many events.

Without citizenship status or other permission to work in Pakistan, legally, Afghans do not have access to "formal" employment – a major barrier to their economic security and upward mobility (Borthakur, 2017). Those with Pakistani identity cards are in a better position to access secure work, but they are still vulnerable to being apprehended by authorities and must rely on the good

favour of their employers. Afghans living in Pakistani cities cite police harassment and extortion as the greatest threat to their security at present. This threat has grown in recent years with government pressure on Afghans to repatriate. As a result of their lack of legal identity, many poorer Afghans are subject to insecurity of land tenure, as without a Pakistani identity card, they cannot officially own property (Ahmadzai, 2016). Eviction is a constant threat to Afghans in illegal settlements, where often unfavourable lease agreements are made between landlords and Afghans, irrespective of whether the settlement itself is in violation of the law. As a result of the lack of any way for these Afghans to feel secure in their dwellings, they are often forced to fall back on ethnic and social links, which, while offering some degree of protection and security, can put them in a potentially exploitative situation (Ahmadzai, 2016).

Many Afghans have significant concerns about the lack of the rule of law, particularly based on ethnicity, and have heard of violence against women and other crimes being committed with impunity. However, the benefits of urbanisation may be the factor that tilts the balance in favour of remaining in Pakistan.

4.3.3. Solidarity to Hostility: Change in Perception

Though Afghan refugees were initially welcomed in Pakistan, the public and policy perceptions about Afghan refugees gradually changed from acceptability on humanitarian grounds to their condemnation as a threat to national security and an economic liability. The Shigri Report, published in 1998, was the first manifestation of such policy-level perceptions about Afghan refugees. It linked Afghan refugees to crimes such as drug trafficking, arms smuggling, vehicle thefts, etc., blamed them for terrorism and the introduction of the so-called "Kalashnikov culture" in Pakistan, accused them of illegally obtaining Pakistani identity documents, criticised their commercial activities in Pakistan, and even criticised them for introducing differing social values and cultural traits, such as "a ferocious temperament and tribal character" (Shigri Report, 1998). After the arrival of Afghan refugees in Pakistan, a competition was started between refugees and local citizens over resources, water, land, food and property. This created a gap between refugees and citizens of two provinces of Pakistan, i.e. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan, where refugees in large numbers were being hosted (Aslam, 2001). There are also economic concerns that most Afghan traders have their business in different cities of Pakistan, but do not pay taxes. For instance, in Peshawar alone, these traders became billionaires but still evaded paying taxes. Such things created a burden for local taxpayers and businessmen, and the growth of revenue collection is also badly affected (Roehrs, 2015).

Public discourse in Pakistan has often linked the arrival of Afghan refugees to urban challenges such as traffic congestion and environmental stress. These claims are frequently voiced by political leaders, local media, and segments of the population who perceive refugees as competitors for scarce resources. Critics argue that Afghan refugees, by accepting lower wages, have displaced local workers in certain sectors, thereby fueling anxieties about employment. Following the events of 9/11, attitudes toward Afghan refugees hardened considerably. Concerns about limited housing and overcrowded urban spaces led many Pakistanis to call for their repatriation. At the same time, refugee camps were increasingly portrayed in security narratives as potential sites for militant recruitment and training. This framing, often advanced by state officials and security agencies, contributed to a decline in official protection for refugees. Reports of random interrogations and coercive measures illustrate how security concerns became intertwined with migration policy, resulting in large-scale pressures on Afghan communities to return to their homeland. The Taliban have been able to easily penetrate the Pashtun-dominated camps and blend in with the refugees, making any detection by officials difficult.

However, with the help of the local population, Afghan refugees have created a space for themselves in Pakistan. However, the question remains regarding belongingness. How do Afghan refugees imagine themselves in terms of belongingness? How are they perceived by the local population? Unlike the sanctuary cities and migrant solidarity practices in Europe and America, Afghanistan's experience with its host society has been a mixed bag. In some places, they have been able to garner support from the host country on ethno-religious lines, in other places, they have been looked down upon as 'burdens' or 'criminals', who should return to their homeland. Also, the approach the local population has toward Afghans is not static and fixed but ad hoc and context-specific. Therefore, instead of understanding them through the prism of migrant solidarity, a new term should be devised, which could present their actual situation.

5. Findings and Discussion: Prospects of Urban Sanctuary in the Asian Context

A close examination of urban sanctuary practices in the Asian context, informed by case study analysis, reveals that the concept of urban sanctuary cannot be easily transposed onto Asia without significant qualifications. The use of the term 'urban sanctuary' in academic literature is often ambiguous, lacking clear boundaries. While some scholars associate sanctuary cities with the 'right to the city'—extending protections and services to undocumented migrants and refugees despite their lack of legal status—others employ the term to denote general well-being and opportunities for migrant integration (Houston, et. al., 2023). The terminology of 'sanctuary' is only meaningful in the former context, as migrants who follow legally sanctioned pathways do not require a sanctuary as the term indicates, even though measures are required to ensure their well-being and inclusion in the urban space.

5.1. The Limitations of Urban Sanctuaries in Asia

Asian states—particularly in South and Southeast Asia—continue to prioritise postcolonial nation-building and assert strong territorial sovereignty. Unlike the multi-level governance structures that allow European or North American cities to adopt sanctuary policies, cities such as Delhi and Bangkok operate with limited fiscal and political autonomy. Their municipal governments remain structurally dependent on national directives, leaving little institutional space to extend protections to undocumented migrants or refugees.

The case studies illustrate how this centralisation constrains sanctuary-like practices. In Delhi, despite long histories of receiving displaced populations—from Partition onwards—any support for undocumented migrants emerges through NGOs, neighbourhood networks, or religious organisations rather than through municipal authority. These actors operate cautiously, given the state's tight control over citizenship and security. In Bangkok, a sanctuary for undocumented migrants is not articulated through municipal authority but through fragile assemblages of NGOs, faith-based organisations, and migrant networks. These actors provide humanitarian aid, shelter, and advocacy, yet their efforts remain precarious, shaped by limited resources and constant negotiation with state authorities. Unlike Global North sanctuary cities, Bangkok's practices are informal and culturally embedded rather than legally codified. The state's strong control over immigration and security means that NGOs and religious groups must operate cautiously, often avoiding overt political confrontation. As a result, sanctuary in Bangkok is contingent, negotiated, and vulnerable to disruption, underscoring the limitations of applying urban sanctuary models rooted in municipal defiance to Asian contexts. Although Pakistan has hosted millions of Afghans for decades, assistance is primarily provided by NGOs, the UNHCR, and community networks,

which offer humanitarian relief, education, and informal work opportunities. However, these arrangements remain fragile, as the state exerts control over registration, movement, and repatriation, with recent deportation campaigns highlighting their insecurity. Therefore, in Pakistan, refugee protection practices are largely informal, negotiated, and rooted in cultural and humanitarian traditions. Civil society groups and religious organisations have been active as significant agents; however, they must act cautiously, balancing aid delivery with the risk of government intervention. Consequently, the sanctuary for Afghan refugees in Pakistan is unstable, dependent, and constantly shaped by shifting political and security dynamics.

Across all three cases, informal networks offer livelihoods, shelter, or mediation with authorities, but these practices remain precarious and often clandestine due to the absence of any legal mandate. This lack of formal recognition also contributes to limited academic documentation and inhibits the development of policy frameworks that openly address sanctuary-like practices. Together, the cases underscore that urban sanctuary in Asia cannot be understood through the institutional models prevalent in the Global North, but instead must be situated within centralised state structures, contested sovereignties, and informal regimes of care.

5.2. Rethinking Sanctuary: Shared Identities and Informal Networks

Given these constraints, the Asian context challenges conventional understandings of urban sanctuaries. Instead of focusing solely on legal initiatives taken at the municipal level, it is crucial to consider the peripheral spaces within urban centres where undocumented migrants reside. Unlike Western sanctuary models that emphasise de facto rights and services based on a shared urban identity, sanctuary practices in Asia are often shaped by ethnic, religious, and historical linkages that transcend national borders. This dynamic is visible across all three case studies, where informal networks operate as the primary infrastructure of sanctuary: in Delhi, neighbourhood organisations, religious institutions, and migrant-led groups cushion the absence of municipal support; in Bangkok, ethnic associations and faith-based charities mediate access to housing, work, and safety from police raids; and in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, cross-border kinship, tribal codes, and community solidarity underpin everyday protection. Together, these cases demonstrate that informal networks—not municipal authority—constitute the core architecture of hospitality in Asia.

The broader literature reinforces this. For instance, McConnachie (2018) highlights how Chin refugees from Myanmar have been received in Mizoram, India, due to strong historical, cultural, and ethnic ties between the Chin and Mizo communities. Despite the Indian central government's directive to prevent Myanmar refugees from entering, the Mizoram state government adopted a welcoming stance, offering food, blankets, education, and healthcare in collaboration with local NGOs and communities (Khai, 2024). In contrast, Manipur's state government aligned with the central government's restrictive approach, arresting and repatriating refugees. These divergent responses underscore the political nature of sanctuary provision, where the decision to extend protections to specific migrant groups is shaped by broader political, ethnic, and cultural considerations rather than a universal commitment to migrant rights.
NGOs and international organisations—especially UNHCR—remain vital intermediaries in all three cases, but their influence is limited by the need to negotiate carefully with central governments. Their work in Delhi, Bangkok, and KPK illustrates how sanctuary practices operate in tight regulatory spaces, requiring constant navigation between advocacy, service provision, and political risk.

Any discussion of sanctuary in Asia must also incorporate the region's varied mobility patterns, including internal displacement and internal migration. As seen in Delhi's informal settlements or Bangkok's urban peripheries, many internal migrants—despite being citizens—experience exclusion akin to that faced by undocumented migrants due to ethnic, linguistic, or regional marginalisation. With climate-induced displacement expected to intensify across Asia (Das & Basu, 2023), future conceptualisations of sanctuary must extend beyond international refugee law to capture these intersecting vulnerabilities and the informal, identity-based solidarities that sustain migrant populations in the absence of formal protections.

5.3. Informal Economies and Migrant Agency

Beyond shared identities and community solidarities, sanctuary-like practices in Asia unfold through migrants' participation in informal economies, which both enable survival and expose them to exploitation. In all three case studies, undocumented migrants occupy essential yet precarious labour niches ranging from construction work, domestic labour, factory and service-sector jobs to daily-wage and small-trade activities. Their labour is indispensable yet unrecognised, allowing cities and local economies to benefit from migrant precarity without extending formal protections.

At the same time, migrants are not passive participants. They actively organise the informal infrastructures that facilitate arrival, employment, housing, and navigation of hostile bureaucracies. These include labour-sharing networks among Rohingya and Afghan communities in Delhi, NGOs, faith-based organisations, and migrant networks in Bangkok, and refugee-led support arrangements in KPK. While these structures fall short of formal sanctuary, they function as self-built platforms of protection, often more reliable than state systems (Capaldi, 2023).

Ghettoization and the formation of migrant enclaves, often framed as consequences of exclusionary policies, can also function as strategies of mutual self-help and collective resilience. In the case studies, such spaces—whether Rohingya settlements in Delhi, migrant-dense neighbourhoods in Bangkok, or Afghan settlements in KPK—serve to insulate communities from hostile administrative practices while enabling access to informal networks of housing, work, and social support. Recognising these enclaves as both protective and socially productive highlights how grassroots survival strategies operate alongside, and sometimes in lieu of, formal sanctuary mechanisms. Understanding these spatial practices is therefore essential to rethinking sanctuary beyond strictly legalistic or municipal frameworks

5.4. Conceptualising Migrant Experience through 'Gray Spaces' and 'Liminality'

To better capture the lived realities of undocumented migrants and refugees in Asian cities, this section turns to the concepts of 'gray spaces' and 'liminality'—frameworks that illuminate both structural and experiential dimensions of precarious belonging. Yiftachel's (2009a; 2009b) notion of gray spaces describes populations who are neither fully included nor excluded, occupying zones of tolerated illegality under constant threat of eviction or criminalisation. This condition resonates across the case studies: undocumented workers in Bangkok's construction sector, Rohingya and Afghan settlements in Delhi, and Afghan refugee neighbourhoods in KPK survive by navigating regulatory ambiguity and periodic crackdowns. These spaces are co-produced by migrant occupation, technologies of surveillance, and state practices that exploit migrants' labour while withholding rights.

Scholarship also highlights how gray spaces may be created 'from above' (Tzfadia, 2017), where initially informal or extra-legal occupations are selectively regularised when aligned with state or ethno-national interests. While the empirical logics differ from the South Asian context, the concept helps illuminate how certain migrant localities—such as Tibetan settlements in Delhi or long-standing Afghan refugees in Peshawar—occupy politically tolerated but legally ambiguous positions.

Building on this, liminality captures the psychological and affective dimensions of displacement. Migrants experience a temporal and existential "in-between" state, as highlighted in studies from Kampala (Boer, 2015), Colombia (Murcia, 2018), Istanbul (Nord & Alletorp, 2016), and Tel Aviv/Jerusalem (Kemp et al., 2022). The Asian cases reflect similar dynamics: Tibetan refugees in Delhi (Dayal & Morenas, 2024), undocumented workers in Bangkok, and long-term Afghan residents in KPK navigate a sense of suspended stability—present yet not belonging, visible yet legally absent.

Together, gray spaces and liminality provide analytical tools that move beyond the spatial fixities implied by conventional urban sanctuary frameworks, allowing us to focus on the concrete practices through which practices of solidarity and hospitality are enacted and negotiated in everyday life. This approach emphasises the micro-politics of protection: how migrants navigate legal precarity, informal governance, and social networks to secure housing, livelihoods, and community support. While gray spaces map the structural and spatial conditions of precarious legality, liminality captures the affective, temporal, and existential dimensions of living under uncertainty. By studying practices of solidarity provision—including NGO support, migrant-led networks, faith-based aid, and informal negotiation with authorities—we can reframe sanctuary-in-practice as a dynamic assemblage of strategies, solidarities, and survival mechanisms, rather than a fixed legal or municipal policy. Applying these concepts to the Asian context allows for a conceptual reworking that is sensitive to region-specific legal, cultural, and political conditions. Migrants thus emerge not as passive recipients of protection but as active architects of survival, solidarity, and belonging, offering a more grounded and context-sensitive framework for understanding migrant solidarity and hospitality in the Global South.

6. Conclusion

This paper calls for a conceptual reworking of 'urban sanctuary' that is attentive to the specific legal, cultural, and political terrains of Asia, thereby offering more context-sensitive frameworks for migrant protection in the Global South. The review has pursued two aims: first, and primarily, to assess the relevance of the concept of 'urban sanctuary' largely shaped by Global North experiences when applied to Asian urban contexts; and second, to seek the conceptual avenues for understanding solidarity and hospitality practices in Asia on their own terms. By examining the context-specific logics of protection in Delhi, Bangkok, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), the paper shows that while Asia may not host formalised sanctuary regimes comparable to those in North America or Europe, it nonetheless sustains diverse and deeply rooted forms of hospitality, protection, and solidarity that merit conceptual recognition.

The literature review revealed that sanctuary cities in the Global North are often embedded in legal and policy frameworks that institutionalise non-cooperation with exclusionary national immigration regimes and are facilitated by local governance bodies and civil society equipped with resources to foster inclusivity. In contrast, sanctuary and hospitality practices in Asia operate largely outside formal legal channels, shaped instead by discretionary governance, informal networks, religious and ethnic solidarities, and community-based support systems. The absence

of ratification of the 1951 Refugee Convention by many Asian states and the resulting lack of national legal frameworks for refugee protection mean that sanctuary in Asia is rarely about legal contestation with the state. Instead, it is often expressed through negotiated practices, informality, and moral economies of care.

The case studies affirmed these patterns. In Delhi and Bangkok, undocumented migrants and refugees navigate hostile legal terrains by relying on networks of kinship, NGOs, faith-based organisations, and informal labour markets. These networks both enable survival and expose migrants to exploitation, illustrating the double-edged nature of informal sanctuary. In KPK, ethnic linkages are the determining factors in the state's selective extension of protections to Afghan refugees, often driven by political expediency. The KPK case also highlights the need to consider provincial and even rural settings as critical sites of sanctuary. Thus, this analysis also calls into question the spatial assumptions of much sanctuary literature. Framing sanctuary solely as a function of the city overlooks the complex scalar and institutional dynamics at play in the Global South.

Together, these examples highlight several tensions in the everyday enactment of solidarity in Asia: between protection and precarity, inclusion and informality, state authority and grassroots agency. They show that sanctuary is not only a space of refuge but also of negotiation and contradiction. Formal sanctuary policies in the Global North may signal moral resistance to exclusionary norms, but in Asia, solidarity is more often a matter of quiet pragmatism, survival, and incremental inclusion. The provisional and selective nature of hospitality highlighted in the case studies challenges the liberal humanist ideals that often underpin Global North sanctuary discourses, reminding that sanctuary is not a universally coherent concept but one shaped by histories of empire, inequality, and exclusion. The paper also introduced the conceptual lenses of grey spaces and liminality as alternative ways to understand solidarity practices in Asia. These frameworks better capture the ambiguous legal status of migrants, the informal nature of support structures, and the provisional, negotiated nature of belonging.

Finally, while the paper offers valuable insights, it also opens up important avenues for further exploration. Much of the sanctuary scholarship remains heavily weighted toward Western Europe and North America. Through a literature review, this paper has shifted its analytical focus to the Asian context and has prepared the groundwork for broadening and deepening the sanctuary framework, expanding its spatial scope beyond cities and its analytical scope beyond legality and policy. However, there is further need for more empirically grounded studies that examine the specificities of South and Southeast Asia, West Asia, and broader South-South migration contexts. These studies must also explore how gender, caste, religion, and other social hierarchies intersect with sanctuary practices in Asia, particularly given the region's structural inequalities and deeply embedded social stratifications. This requires centring voices and experiences from the margins: migrants, informal workers, grassroots organisers, and community leaders who enact solidarity daily, often without recognition or protection.

 It is also necessary to capture the temporal dimensions of hospitality—the ways in which solidarity unfolds over time, shifting with political change, funding cycles, and migration flows. In the next phase of this project, these directions will guide further research into underexplored sites of sanctuary across Asia, including West Asian and Central Asian contexts. Such work will contribute not only to a more inclusive sanctuary literature but also to a more just and context-sensitive understanding of migrant solidarity worldwide. In doing so, the aim shall be to foreground 'solidarity as everyday practice'—a reimagining that is essential for both scholarship and policy in an age of deepening global displacement.

7. References

Ahmadzai, A. A. (2016). How refugees changed the Afghan-Pakistan dynamic. Islamabad: The Diplomat. https://thediplomat.com/2016/09/how-refugees-changed-the-afghan-pakistandynamic/#:~:text=Afghan%20refugees%20provided%20cheap%20labor,them%20from%20the%20Pakistan's%20government. Accessed on 12 September 2025.

American Immigration Council. (2020, October 21). Sanctuary Policies: An Overview. American Immigration Council. https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/sanctuary-policies-overview Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Anam, Q. (2018, December 17). Livelihood strategies of Afghanistan refugee community in urban Delhi, India. Social Justice Perspectives (SJP). http://hdl.handle.net/2105/46667. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Asylum Access Thailand. (2022). Health Care Access and Services for Urban Refugee Communities During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Community Findings. Bangkok: Asylum Access Thailand.

Bagelman, J. (2013). Sanctuary. Alternatives Global Local Political, 38(1), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/0304375412469314.

Balasubramaniam, M., and Gupta, S. (2019). From refuge to rights: Majnu ka Tilla Tibetan colony in New Delhi. kritisk etnografi – Swedish Journal of Anthropology, 2(1-2). https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1427099/FULLTEXT01.pdf. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Banerjee, P. (2014). Forced migration in South Asia. In E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, G. Loescher, K. Long, & N. Sigona (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies, pp. 613–625. Oxford University Press.

Bartolomei, L. (2015). Surviving the city refugees from Burma in New Delhi. In K. Koizumi & G. Hoffstaedter (Eds) Urban Refugees Challenges in Protection, Services and Policy (pp. 164–186). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315733258-10

Bau, I. (1994). Cities of refuge: No federal pre-emption of ordinances restricting local government cooperation with the INS. La Raza Law Journal. 50 (7). https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/berklarlj7&div=7&id=&page=. Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Bauder, H. (2017). Sanctuary cities: Policies and practices in international perspective. International Migration, 55(2): 174–187.

Bauder H (2021) Urban migrant and refugee solidarity beyond city limits. Urban Studies, 58 (16) 3213–3229.

Bauder, H. (2016). Sanctuary Cities: Policies and practices in international perspective. International Migration, 55 (2), 174–187. https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12308.

Bauder, H. (2019a). Urban Sanctuary in Context. In J. Darling and H. Bauder (Eds.), Sanctuary cities and urban struggles, pp. 37-63. Manchester University Press.

Bauder, H. (2019b). Urban Sanctuary and Solidarity in a Global Context: How Does Africa Contribute to the Debate? In Merian Institute for Advanced Studies in Africa (MIASA) (Eds). MIASA Working Papers. https://miasa.ug.edu.gh/wp-content/uploads/191127-MIASA-WP_20191-Bauder.pdf. Accessed on 10 February 2025
.

Bauder, H. & Juffs, L. (2019). Solidarity in the Migration and Refugee Literature: Analysis of a Concept. Journal of Ethnic Migration Studies. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1627862

Bauder, H., and Gonzalez, D. A. (2018). Municipal responses to 'illegality': urban sanctuary across national contexts. Social Inclusion, 6 (1), 124–134. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1273.

Bauder, H., and Weisser, T. (2019). Solidarity Cities in Germany and Switzerland: A brief overview of initiatives. In Usha George (Ed), RCIS Research Brief [Report]. Ryerson Centre for Immigration & Settlement. https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/centre-for-immigration-and-settlement/tmcis/publications/researchbriefs/2019_2_Bauder_Harald_Weisser_Timo_Solidarity_Cities_in_Germany_and_Switzerland_A_Brief_Overview_of_Initiatives.pdf. Accessed on 10 February 2025.

Bazurli, R., and De Graauw, E. (2023). Explaining variation in city sanctuary policies: insights from American and European cities. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 49(14), 3649–3670. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2023.2198811.

Bentz, A. S. (2012). Being a Tibetan refugee in India. Refugee Survey Quarterly, 31(1), 80–107. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45054715

Bezdek, B. L. (1995). Religious outlaws: narratives of legality and the politics of citizen interpretation. Tennessee Law Review, 899 (62). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2924952. Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Bharadwaj, P; Khwaja, A. I., and Mian, A. R. (2009). The Partition of India: Demographic Consequences. SSRN. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1294846

Bignall, S. (2022). Colonial humanism, alter-humanism and ex-colonialism. In: Herbrechter, S., Callus, I., Rossini, M., Grech, M., de Bruin-Molé, M., John Müller, C. (Eds) Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42681-1_55-1.

Birey, T., Cantat, C., Maczynska, E., et al. (2019). Challenging the political across borders. Migrants' and solidarity struggles. Central European University cited in Mariama Awumbila, Faisal Garba, Akosua K. Darkwah & Mariama Zaami. (2023). Migrant Political Mobilisation and Solidarity Building in the Global South, In: Crawley, H., Teye, J.K. (eds) The Palgrave Handbook of South–South Migration and Inequality. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39814-8_33.

Boer, R. D. (2015). Liminal space in protracted exile: the meaning of place in Congolese refugees' narratives of home and belonging in Kampala. Journal of Refugee Studies, 28(4), 486–504. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feu047.

Borthakur, A. (2017). Afghan refugees: The impact on Pakistan. Asian Affairs, 48, (3), pp. 488-509. https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2017.1362871.

Capaldi, M.P. (2023). Present-Day Migration in Southeast Asia: Evolution, Flows and Migration Dynamics. In S. Petcharamesree, S and M. P. Capaldi (Eds), Migration in Southeast Asia. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25748-3_1.

Carro, J. L. (1986). Sanctuary: the resurgence of an age-old right or a dangerous misinterpretation of an abandoned ancient privilege. University of Cincinnati Law Review TAT, 747 (54). https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/ucinlr54&div=39&id=&page=. Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Choubey, N. (2024, March 6). The struggles of being Rohingya women. The Caravan. https://caravanmagazine.in/communities/struggles-of-rohingya-women

Chimni, B. (2015). Outside the Bounds of Citizenship: The Status of Aliens, Illegal Migrants and Refugees in India. In *In M. Crock (Ed.) Refugees and Rights* (1st ed., pp. 485–521). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315244969-21

Chishti, M. and Bolter, J. (2021). Two decades after 9/11, national security focus still dominates U.S. Immigration system. Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/two-decades-after-sept-11-immigration-national-security. Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Christoph. W & Kron. S, (Eds) (2019) Solidarity Cities in Europe: Charity or Pathsways to Citizenship – A New Urban Policy Approach. Berlin: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. Available at: https://www.rosalux.de/en/publication/id/40039/. Accessed on 8 March 2025.

Crittenden, A. (1988). Sanctuary: a story of American conscience and the law in collision. Grove/Atlantic, Incorporated.

Dalrymple, W. (2015, June 22). The bloody legacy of Indian partition. The New Yorker. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/06/29/the-great-divide-books-dalrymple. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Darling, J., and V. Squire (2012). Everyday Enactments of Sanctuary: The UK City of Sanctuary Movement. In R. K. Lippert and S. Rehaag (Eds.) Sanctuary practices in international perspectives: migration, citizenship and social movements, pp. 191-204. Abingdon: Routledge.

Das, D., & Basu, S. (2023). Climate change, migration, and internally displaced populations in the Indian Ocean Region – evidence from South Asia and East Africa. Journal of the Indian Ocean Region, 19(2), 167–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/19480881.2023.2255386

Das, J., and Talukdar, D. (2016). Socio-Economic and Political Consequence of Illegal Migration into Assam from Bangladesh. Journal of Tourism & Hospitality, 05(02). https://doi.org/10.4172/2167-0269.1000202

Dastyari, A. (2019). Let the Asylum Seekers Stay: Strengths and Weaknesses of Church Sanctuary as a Strategy for Law Reform. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.26180/5db80a3108b0f.

Datta, V. N. (1993). Panjabi refugees and the urban development of Greater Delhi, In R. E. Frykenberg (Ed), Delhi Through the Ages: Selected essays in Urban History, Culture and Society, pp. 287–305, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dayal, A., and Morenas, L. A. (2024). Liminality and urban acceptance: a case of Majnu ka Tilla, Delhi. International Journal of Urban Design and Development. 2(01), 36-46. https://journals.stmjournals.com/ijudd/article=2024/view=143332. Accessed on 14 February 2025.

De Lombaerde, P., Guo, F., and Neto, H. P. (2014). Introduction to the special collection: South–South migrations: what is (still) on the research agenda? The International Migration Review, 48(1), 103–112. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24542838. Accessed on 10 February 2025.

Dorjee, T., and Rigzin, T. (2024, February 8). South Asia's Tibetan refugee community is shrinking, imperiling its long-term future. Migration Information Source. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/tibetan-refugees-india. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

ElShaddai Centre Berhad. (2024, July 22). Inspiring community spirit with gotong-royong. ElShaddai Centre Berhad. https://ecb.org.my/2024/07/22/inspiring-community-spirit-with-gotong-royong/. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Eurocities. (2022, May). Caring cities: Acting in solidarity with all refugees. Eurocities. https://eurocities.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Eurocities-Statement-on-Caring-cities-and-solidarity-with-all-refugees_final.pdf. Accessed on 10 February 2025.

Field, J., Tiwari, A. D., & Mookherjee, Y. (2017). Urban refugees in Delhi: Identity, entitlements and well-being. International Institute for Environment and Development. http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep02736

Forced Migration Review. (n.d. a). Non-signatory States and the international refugee regime. Forced Migration Review. https://www.fmreview.org/issue67/janmyr/. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Forced Migration Review. (n.d. b). Cities of Solidarity: Local Integration in Latin America - Forced Migration Review. https://www.fmreview.org/varoli/. Accessed on 10 February 2025.

Ghufran, N. (2011). The Role of UNHCR and Afghan Refugees in Pakistan. Strategic Analysis, 35(6), 945–954. https://icrms.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/ghufran2011.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Gleeson, M. (2017). Unprecedented but Unfulfilled: Refugee Protection and Regional Responses to the Andaman Sea 'Crisis'. Antropologi Indonesia, 38(1), 6-20. https://doi.org/10.7454/ai.v38i1.8747.

Godoy, M., and Bauder, H. (2022). Sanctuary and solidarity cities in the global South. In M. B. Jørgensen and C. Schierup (Eds.) Contending global apartheid transversal solidarities and politics of possibility, pp. 224-244. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004514515_011.

Goreau-Ponceaud, A. (2024). Lives in exile? Perspectives on the resettlements of Sri Lankan refugees in Tamil Nadu, India. World Development, 180 (106629). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106629.

Gotong-Royong Cucuk Vaksin. (n.d.). Gotong-Royong Cucuk Vaksin [YouTube playlist]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLUjhxgmzxhJ2BV0XoAa9ipwH1ZnaoY0gP. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Goyal, D. (2017, September 14). Rohingya Muslims crisis: 'Guru ka langar' begins at Bangladesh-Myanmar border, target 35,000 meals per day. The Indian Express. https://indianexpress.com/article/india/rohingya-muslims-crisis-guru-ka-langar-begins-at-bangladesh-myanmar-border-target-35000-meals-per-day-4842965/. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Haufler, V. (2007). The private sector and governance in post-conflict societies. In D. W. Brinkerhoff (Ed.), Governance in Post-Conflict Societies: Rebuilding Fragile States, Routledge. UK

Hoffstaedter, G. (2015a), Urban refugees and UNHCR in Kuala Lumpur: Dependency, assistance and survival, In: K. Koizumi and G. Hoffstadter (Eds.), Urban Refugees: Challenges in protection, services and policy, London: Routledge, pp. 187-205.

Hoffstaedter, G. (2015b), Between a rock and a hard place: Urban refugees in a global context, In: K. Koizumi and G. Hoffstadter (Eds.) Urban Refugees: Challenges in protection, services and policy, pp. 1-10. London: Routledge.

Hoque, M. M., and Yunus, M. (2020). Livelihood Diversity of Forcibly Displaced Rohingyas Encamped in Bangladesh. The Bangladesh Development Studies, 43(3/4), 77–119. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27116974. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Houston, A., Salhi, C., & Lincoln, A. K. (2023). Messaging inclusion with a consequence: U.S. sanctuary cities and immigrant wellbeing. Journal of Migration and Health, 8 (100199). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmh.2023.100199.

Hudson, G. (2021). A Ship Without a Captain: Political Disengagement and the Failings of Sanctuary City Policy in Toronto, Canada. In: Faret, L., Sanders, H. (Eds.) Migrant protection and the city in the Americas. Politics of citizenship and migration. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74369-7_4

Humphris, R. (2023). Sanctuary city as mobilising metaphor: how sanctuary articulates urban governance. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 49(14), 3585–3601. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2023.2198808.

International Organization for Migration (2024) Migration and Migrants: Regional Dimensions and Developments." In World Migration Report 2024. Geneva: IOM. https://worldmigrationreport.iom.int/what-we-do/world-migration-report-2024-chapter-3/asia

Javed, A., Khan, S., Syed, R., and Ahmad, V. (2020). Socio-economic Inclusion of Afghan Refugees in Pakistan, Working Paper No. 192, SDPI. Available at Assessing Socio-Economic Impact of Afghan refugees in Pakistan (sdpi.org). Accessed on 11 March 2024.

Jesuit Refugee Service. (n.d.). Our Work in Thailand. Retrieved January 2025, from Jesuit Refugee Service: https://www.jrsusa.org/country/jrs-thailand/#:~:text=JRS%20Thailand%20provides%20educational%2C%20emergency,to%20see%20beyond%20their%20displacement.&text=Mental%20Health%20&%20Psychosocial%20Support%20(MHPSS,variety%20of%20complex%20psychosocial%20needs

Karageorgiou, E., and Noll, G. (2022). What Is Wrong with Solidarity in EU Asylum and Migration Law? Jus Cogens, 4(2), 131–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42439-022-00059-4.

Kapur, M. (2021). India's Citizenship (Amendment) Act. The Statelessness & Citizenship Review, 3(1), 208–35. https://doi.org/10.35715/SCR3001.1119

Kaur, R. (2009). Distinctive citizenship refugees, citizens and postcolonial state in India's partition. Cultural and Social History, 6 (4), 429–46. https://forskning.ruc.dk/en/publications/distinctive-citizenship-refugees-citizens-and-postcolonial-state-. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Kemp, A., Resnik, J., & Sharabi, T. (2022). Urban governance of liminal legality comparing the incorporation of migrant children in Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem. Political Geography, 98 (102645). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2022.102645.

Khadria B. (2016). "Involuntary and Illegal Migration to India: The Case of Bangladesh", NORRAG NEWS (NN), vol. 53, May, Special Issue on: Refugees, Displaced Persons and Education - New Challenges for Development and Policy; Section on: Regional Lenses on the Global Politics of Involuntary Migration – Asia: South, South-east and East, pp. 118-119.

Khadria B. (2020). "Between the 'Hubs' and 'Hinterlands' of Migration in South Asia: The Bangladesh-India Corridor", International Journal of South Asian Studies, vol. 10, pp. 1-10, Tokyo.

Khai, T.S. (2024). India's refugee policy dilemma and its impact on Myanmar refugees at the India–Myanmar frontier. Discov Public Health, 21(153). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12982-024-00295-7.

Khan, A. (2017). Afghan Refugees in Pakistan, Institute of Strategic Studies.

Lelliott, J. and Miller, R. (2023). The nexus between corruption, migrant smuggling, and human trafficking in Southeast Asia. In: Petcharamesree, S., Capaldi, M.P. (Eds) Migration in Southeast Asia. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25748-3_11.

Lin, S. G., & Paul, M. C. (1995). Bangladeshi migrants in Delhi: Social insecurity, State power, and captive vote banks. Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, 27(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.1995.10413070

McConnachie, K. (2018). Boundaries and belonging in the Indo-Myanmar borderlands: Chin refugees in Mizoram. Journal of Refugee Studies, 31(3), 314–333. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fey012.

McConnell, F. (2009). De facto, displaced, tacit: The sovereign articulations of the Tibetan Government-in-Exile. Political Geography, 28(6), 343–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2009.04.001.

Mishra, B. K. (2014). The nation-state problematic in Asia: The South Asian experience. PERCEPTIONS, XIX (1), pp. 71-85. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/816017. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Mishra, H. (2025, February 3). Illegal migration changing Delhi's demography, undermining poll process: JNU report. India Today. https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/illegal-migration-delhi-demography-electoral-process-crime-networks-slums-jawaharlal-nehru-university-jnu-report-2673899-2025-02-03. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Missbach, A., Y. Adiputera, and A. Parbandari (2018), Is Makassar a 'sanctuary city'? Migration governance in Indonesia after the "local turn", Advances in Southeast Asian Studies, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-0003.

Moffette, D., and Ridgley, J. (2018). Sanctuary City organizing in Canada. Migration and Society, 1(1), 147–155. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2018.010113.

Murcia, L. E. P. (2018). 'The sweet memories of home have gone': displaced people searching for home in a liminal space. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 45(9), 1515–1531. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2018.1491299.

Nord, N. M., & Alletorp, N. (2016). Navigating protracted liminality: An anthropological study of the experiences of Syrian refugees in Istanbul in re-establishing livelihoods after displacement (Master's thesis, Lund University). Lund University Publications. https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=8889982&fileOId=8889985. Accessed on 14 February 2025.

Nursyazwani. (2024). 'The Value of "Ummah": Racio-Religious Capital and Rohingya Refugees' World-Building'. Third World Quarterly 0(0): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2025.2469616

Oommen, T. K. (1982). Foreigners, refugees and outsiders in the Indian context. Sociological Bulletin, 31(1), 41–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022919820103

Özdemir, G. Ş. (2022). Urban solidarity typology: A comparison of European cities since the crisis of refuge in 2015. Cities, 130 (103976). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities. 2022.103976. Palmgren, P. A. (2013). Irregular Networks: Bangkok Refugees in the City and Region. Journal of Refugee Studies, 27(1), 21-41.

Panakkeel, M., & Alaoui, A. E. (2020). Manifestation of Atithi Devo Bhavah maxim on Sri Lankan Tamil refugees treatment in India. SIMULACRA JOURNAL SOCIOLOGY, 3 (2), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v3i2.8402

Pandey, G. (1997). Partition and Independence in Delhi: 1947-48. Economic and Political Weekly, 32(36), 2261–72. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4405816.

Paul, O. (2023). Expanding Sanctuary: The City of Sanctuary Movement in London. Critical Sociology, 49(7–8), 1307–1321. https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205231151599.

Pourmokhtari, N. (2013). A postcolonial critique of state sovereignty in IR: the contradictory legacy of a "west-centric" discipline. Third World Quarterly, 34(10), 1767–1793. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24522099. Accessed on 10 February 2025.

Press Trust of India (a). (2019, July 31 a). Nearly 500 illegal Bangladesh nationals detained, deported: Delhi police to SC. The Times of India. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/delhi/nearly-500-illegal-bangladesh-nationals-detained-deported-delhi-police-to-sc/articleshow/70471951.cms

Press Trust of India (2022, October 18 b). How a tiny basement in Delhi's Jangpura is helping hundreds of Afghan refugees. ND TV. https://www.ndtv.com/delhi-news/how-a-tiny-basement-in-delhis-jangpura-is-helping-hundreds-of-afghan-refugees-3442497. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Prime Minister's Office. (1948). Relief and Rehabilitation Policy of the Government of India. File No 29(113), Digitized Public Records, Prime Minister's Office, New Delhi: National Archives of India, https://indianculture.gov.in/archives/relief-and-rehabilitation-policy-government-india. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Raj, B. and Sehgal, K. C. (1961). Census of India 1961 Volume XIX, Delhi: Government of India,https://www.google.co.in/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://censusindia.gov.in/nada/index.php/catalog/30719/download/33900/52860_1961_GEN.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjF_dzyt8CLAxVQSmwGHYrnJPsQFnoECBAQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1CvEv3SneDYaPdXQa_WyV7. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Rathore, R.S. (2022, December 29). Embracing "Refugee-Istan": A look at Delhi's refugee history and why it must continue. Economic and Political Weekly. 57(52). https://www.epw.in/engage/article/embracing-%E2%80%98refugee-istan%E2%80%99-look-delhis-refugee#_ftn2. Accessed on 11 February 2025.

Robbins, L. (2017, January 25). 'Sanctuary City' mayors vow to defy Trump's immigration order. New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/nyregion/outraged-mayors-vow-to-defy-trumps-immigration-order.html.Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Rongmei, P. (2023, January 31). Taste of Tibetan culture and history in Majnu-ka-tilla. Times of India Travel. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/travel/destinations/taste-of-tibetan-

culture-and-history-in-majnu-ka-tilla/articleshow/97469895.cms. Accessed on 12
February 2025.

Roy, A. (2019). The city in the age of Trumpism: From Sanctuary to abolition. Environment and
Planning D Society and Space, 37(5), 761–778.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775819830969.

Roy, P. (2018). Delhi, India: A case report of refugees in towns. Tufts University.
https://fic.tufts.edu/publication-item/delhi-india-refugees-in-towns/. Accessed on 12
February 2025.

Roy, S., & Mir, R. (2020). The Afghan refugees of Lajpat Nagar: The boundaries between them
and Delhi. Crossings Journal of Migration and Culture, 11(2), 201–216.
https://doi.org/10.1386/cjmc_00025_1.

Sahin-Mencutek, Z., Barthoma, S., Gökalp-Aras, N. E., et al. (2022). A crisis mode in migration
governance: comparative and analytical insights. Comparative Migration Studies, 10
(12). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00284-2.

Saracino, D. (2024). Understanding solidarity in the European Union: an analytical framework.
Theory and Society, 53(5), 1093–1118. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-024-09566-3.

Schwiertz, H., and Schwenken, H. (2020). Introduction: inclusive solidarity and citizenship along
migratory routes in Europe and the Americas. Citizenship Studies, 24(4), 405–423.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2020.1755155.

Shabbir, S and Ahmed, V. (2015). Welfare Impact of Afghan Trade on the Pakistani Provinces
of Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Stability: International Journal of Security
& Development, 4 (1): 6, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.5334/sta.et.

Shahani, U. (2025). Bonded citizenship: Caste, Partition, and the prevention of exit. Modern
Asian Studies, 59(2), 427–454. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0026749x25000034

Sharma, K. (2023, October 29). In Delhi's mini Kabuls, hearts beat for AFG and Rashid Khan.
The Times of India. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/delhi/in-delhis-mini-
kabuls-hearts-beat-for-afg-and-rashid-khan/articleshow/104794730.cms. Accessed
on 12 February 2025.

Sharma, N. (2020). Home Rule National Sovereignty, and the Separation of Natives and
Migrants. Duke University Press.

Schindler, S. (2014). A New Delhi every day: multiplicities of governance regimes in a
transforming metropolis. Urban Geography, 35(3), 402–419.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2014.881019

Shum, T. C. (2014). Refugees' Transnational Mobility: A Study of Asylum Seeking in Hong Kong
and Urban Thailand. Refugee Survey Quarterly, 33(4), 50-80.
https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdu013.

Shigri, A.A. (1996). Report on illegal immigrants and Afghan refugees in Pakistan, Government of Pakistan (GOP). https://easo.europa.eu/file/30904/download?token=17vIUnYM. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Singh, I.P. (2017, September 14 a). Sikh group starts langar for Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. The Times of India. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/south-asia/sikh-group-starts-langar-for-rohingya-refugees-in-bangladesh/articleshow/60512983.cms. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Singh, S. R. (2024, November 15 b). No child left behind? Not if you're a Rohingya refugee in north-east Delhi. The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com/news/cities/Delhi/no-child-left-behind-not-if-youre-a-rohingya-refugee-in-north-east-delhi/article68872874.ece

Siruno, L. (2021, May 6). 'We are Filipinos, we do bayanihan, we help each other': undocumented migrants in the Netherlands during COVID. LSE Blogs. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/covid19/2021/05/06/we-are-filipinos-we-do-bayanihan-we-help-each-other-undocumented-migrants-in-the-netherlands-during-covid/. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Siruno, L., & Siegel, M. (2023). Resilience strategies of Filipino irregular migrant domestic workers in the Netherlands during the COVID-19 pandemic. Population Space and Place, 29 (6). https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2676.

Solidarity City. (n.d). A city for all - Solidarity City. https://solidarity-city.eu/en/. Accessed on 9 February 2025.

Stevens, B. (2018). The Involuntary Immobility of Bangkok's Urban Refugees. Barcelona: United Nations University Institute on Globalization, Culture and Mobility (UNU-GCM).

Suwignyo, A. (2019). Gotong royong as social citizenship in Indonesia, 1940s to 1990s. Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, 50(3), 387–408. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26859705. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Taylor, P. M., Aragon, L. V., & Rice, A. L. (1991). Beyond the Java Sea: art of Indonesia's outer islands. National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution.

Triandafyllidou, A. (2022). A crisis mode in migration governance: comparative and analytical insights. Comparative Migration Studies, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00284-2.

Tuitjer, L., & Batre´au, Q. (2019). Urban refugees in a 'non-Convention' city: Assembling agency in Bangkok, Thailand. City, 23(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2019.1575077.

Tzfadia, E. (2017). Informal Outposts in the West Bank: Normality in Gray Space. In M. Allegra, A. Handel, and E. Maggor (Eds), Normalizing occupation: the politics of everyday life in the West Bank settlements, pp. 92-111. Indiana University Press.

UN-Habitat Guidance Document. (2019). Local Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees - A Gateway to existing ideas, resources and capacities for cities across the world. Available at Local Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees - A Gateway to existing ideas, resources

and capacities for cities across the world | UN-Habitat (unhabitat.org). Accessed on 18 March 2024.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2018) Data Portal, Retrieved from Operational Portal Refugee's Situation, UNHCR portal. https://data2.unhcr.org/en/country/pak. Accessed on 12 March 2025.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Thailand. (2024, October 31). UNHCR commends Thai Cabinet's landmark resolution to end statelessness. https://www.unhcr.org/th/en/56329-unhcr-commends-thai-cabinets-landmark-resolution-to-end-statelessness.html. Accessed on 12 March 2025.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2025). Thailand. https://www.unhcr.org/countries/thailand. Accessed on 25 Feb 2024.

Valatheeswaran, C. and Rajan, S. I. (2011). Sri Lankan Tamil Refugees in India: Rehabilitation Mechanisms, Livelihood Strategies, and Lasting Solutions, Refugee Survey Quarterly, 30 (2), 24–44, https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdr005

Van Beek, M. (2004). Tibetans in Nepal: The dynamics of international assistance among a community in exile. Journal of Refugee Studies, 17(1), 136–137. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/17.1.136.

Victoria M, Esses, L.K., and Gaucher, D. (2017). The Global Refugee Crisis: Empirical Evidence and Policy Implications for Improving Public Attitude and Facilitating Refugees Settlement, Social Issues and Policy Review, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12028.

Wake, C., and Cheung, T. (2016). Livelihood strategies of Rohingya refugees in Malaysia 'We want to live in dignity'. Humanitarian Policy Group Working Paper. https://www.refworld.org/reference/countryrep/odi/2016/en/111156. Accessed on 12 February 2025.

Yiftachel, O. (2009a). Theoretical Notes On `Gray Cities': the Coming of Urban Apartheid? Planning Theory, 8(1), 88–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095208099300.

Yiftachel, O. (2009b). Critical theory and 'gray space': Mobilization of the colonized. City, 13(2–3), 246–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810902982227.

Yukich, G. (2013). One family under God: immigration politics and progressive religion in America. Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199988662.001.0001.