"NEW VERMONTERS" AND PERSPECTIVES
on Vermont Migration

Pablo Bose
University of Vermont

Introduction

As the papers in this special issue demonstrate, the story of migration into and out of Vermont is a complex one. For urban geographers or migration studies specialists the state would not seem like an obvious place to situate one's work. Instead the bulk of such scholarship has focused on large-scale immigration, especially to so-called 'gateway cities' like New York, Toronto, and London (Singer, Hardwick and Brettel 2008). Yet as these collected papers and much of the emerging dynamics of migration in Vermont today demonstrate, the state is a microcosm—albeit with its own peculiarities and uniqueness—of many of the same processes, motivations and dynamics that have driven people in and out of place in the United States as well as internationally, both historically and in the present moment. In this paper therefore I shall briefly lay out some of the connections between migration patterns in Vermont and these broader global processes. I begin by briefly reviewing some of the key concepts in migration scholarship and examine how the papers in this special issue illustrate such themes. In the second half of this paper I focus more specifically on my own research on migrations in Vermont with a discussion of some of the most recent movements into the state, those of officially resettled refugees over the past three decades. As with the movements in and out of Vermont highlighted by the other authors in this issue, refugee arrivals and acculturation demonstrate both the similarities and stark differences in migration flows in a semi-rural region in the northeastern part of the United States with the movements of people across the globe.

Migration and Vermont

There are many reasons why people might leave their homes in a much more sustained way than through other forms of movement (such as occasional or even regular tourism). In some cases the movement might be temporary—for seasonal or occasional labor, for education, to take care of a family member, to pursue a love, to try a new adventure, or even as a flight for short term shelter. In others the move is more permanent—for a job in another place, to reunite with family, in search of opportunity or freedom, to be safe from harm, or to reinvent oneself (Castles, Miller and Ammendola 2003). These so-called 'push and pull' factors that drive migration are as varied (and yet as old) as human history itself, although the pace and scale of contemporary globalization often makes it seem as though all the world is constantly and consistently on the move. When we actually look at the patterns of global migration

however, we see that despite our sense that populations are in constant motion, the opposite is in fact true. Even with a surge in global refugee populations due to instability and conflict in many parts of the world, the total number of migrants—that is people who lived outside of their country of origin and including economic, labor and forced migrants—across the globe is estimated to be just under four percent of the overall global population (Migration Policy Institute 2015).

When we look at the major drivers of migration across the world today several particular themes stand out. One is the continued significance of economic motivations—both seasonal and more long-term—in the movement of people for work. Particularly strong evidence of this trend can be seen in the enormous amounts of money that continue to be sent by overseas workers back to their countries of origin. Known as 'remittances', such monies today rank second only to oil exports globally, reaching nearly $550 billion in 2013 with $414 billion of that figure going from workers to the developing world and far outpacing both foreign direct investment and aid to developing countries (World Bank 2015). Much of this money has moved informally; those who have left home have often tried to send resources to assist their families in maintaining their lives or in building newer and better ones. This includes helping a parent to improve a house or purchase a larger plot of land, sending money to build a village hospital or a community school, or enabling distant relatives to live a more affluent lifestyle relative to their neighbors. The two primary sets of flows of labor and capital we see in the world today in terms of remittances are from North America (primarily the United States) to Latin America and the Caribbean (primarily Mexico) and from the Persian Gulf (especially the United Arab Emirates) to South Asia (especially India).

Economics also drive other forms of migration—for example of skilled professionals and other transnational elites all across the world. These include doctors, engineers, and lawyers from both the developed and less-developed world to cities such as Dubai, Singapore, London, New York, and Tokyo. For many regions and countries the movement of such people through so-called 'brain drain' can be both a boon and a blessing—a benefit if such skilled people are coming into their cities or sending money home, but a significant burden if the loss of such talent diminishes one's home (Agrawal et al. 2011). The movement of professionals and other diasporic or transnational elites across the world has also played a significant role in a number of other processes including global gentrification, urbanization, and the development of new forms of ethnic enclaves (Bose 2015; King 2006).

Such movements of people, money and skills have drawn the attention not only of scholars, but also of national governments and international organizations, especially as the importance of transnational networks in long-distance political conflicts remains as strong today in the 'global war on terror' as it was in previous decades with the involvement of expatriate Irish, Sri Lankan or Serbian and Croatian populations in the Balkans, South Asia, and the British Isles. Global conflicts also contribute to one of the largest contemporary population movements today, that of refugees. Today nearly sixty million people worldwide are considered to be forced migrants (UNHCR 2015); that is, people who have been forced to flee their homes and livelihoods due to persecution, civil war, or other forms of violence. These numbers include official refugees, asylum seekers, and internally-displaced persons (those not forced across a

border but still outside of their homes) but do not include groups displaced by development projects (such as the building of dams or roads) or by the potential effects of climate change. Ongoing conflicts in North and Central Africa, in the Middle East, and in parts of South Asia are particular sources of refugee flight today.

The past three decades have been witness to the largest surge of immigration into the United States since the late nineteenth century (Portes and Rumbaut 2014), but where a century ago the main immigrant sending countries to America were European ones, today they are primarily Latin American and Asian. And where in the late nineteenth century it was in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco that Irish, Italian, Polish, and other immigrants settled, today it is in the Midwest, the South, and all across rural regions and small towns (as well as the more traditional metropolitan areas) that we are seeing immigrants arrive in the United States (Massey 2008; Smith and Furuseth 2007). The bulk of such activity is comprised of Latino labor migration, though increasingly the movement of other immigrant groups to new locations is becoming a topic of interest for scholars and local communities.

The papers in this special collection illuminate how much migration in Vermont—despite the widely held notion that this is a place that is unremarkable when it comes to such flows—in fact follows many of these common patterns. For example, Mudgett's analysis of one particular case of the painful decisions made by young men in a Vermont farming family to either leave their homes to find work and access to land or to stay behind out of familial obligations and other kinds of necessity, resonates strongly with stories of historical patterns of rural-urban and regional migrations worldwide. They also find contemporary—albeit inverted—parallels to the dynamics that draw many young Latino men to work on dairy farms in Addison and Franklin counties in Vermont (Baker and Chappelle 2012; Radel, Schmook and McCandless 2010). For these young men too, there is a struggle between attachments to home and family and the need to find economic opportunity elsewhere; and much like the members of the Morse family, these young farmworkers' lives and capacities are circumscribed by various notions of masculinity and ambition.

As the letters between family members demonstrate, such migrations are not the linear journey conjured by the injunctions to 'go west young man'; instead the ties to home remain constant and deep. Indeed as many scholars of Latino labor migration have argued such movements should be better understood as part of a 'churn' or circular migration that has traditionally drawn young men away from home for temporary periods of work rather than as part of a longer term resettlement and that in the case of many Mexican households traditionally such work abroad was as much a part of a kind of male coming of age process as an economic necessity (Terrazas Papademetriou, and Rosenblum 2011).

Another clear parallel between Vermont migrations and common trends across the globe are the movements both out of the state and especially away from rural areas to more urbanized ones. As Geller, Marineau, and Watts argue in their paper, this has been a longstanding concern of politicians and community leaders in Vermont for some time, relating to fears of both demographic shrinkage and cultural erosion. The 19th century appeal to Swedish farmers to repopulate abandoned farms in Vermont is similar in this sense to the Canadian government's attempt to find the 'right' kind of immigrants to work its lands, what Day (2000) has referred to

as a "great chain of race" that placed Northern Europeans at the top of that list and made strong attempts to entice them to Canada.

In more recent years however the majority of narratives regarding migration and Vermont have centered on the perceived loss of skilled young people from the state, moving abroad or to other parts of the United States to pursue education or for work. Vermont is certainly not alone in such fears—so-called 'brain drain' has occupied the attention of policymakers and community members at multiple scales, from rural villages and farms to cities of the global South to developing nations. This is not simply a case of diminishing the population of certain areas but eroding their capacities for growth and resilience. If the best and brightest are to leave a given place, what opportunities does it have to thrive—or at least survive? The issue of brain drain also raises questions regarding the investments that places make in developing their communities, not least through public education. In the case of India, for example, critics have long decried state investments in science and technology education when the recipients of such training are then recruited to jobs in Silicon Valley (Varma and Kapur 2013), while the loss of publicly trained medical professionals from Africa to Western industrialized countries has been a similar source of consternation in many parts of that continent (Mills et al. 2011).

For Vermont, the fact that nearly two-thirds of young people attending college do so out of their home state and that the age 19-34 population has shrunk by close to 20 percent in the past twenty-five years has contributed to a similar perception. Yet as Geller, Marineau, and Watts argue in their analysis of the positions taken by politicians as well as through media discourse on the topic, the rural youth out-migration narrative has become a broadly understood, internalized, and somewhat reductionist one that often functions as a given truth rather than as a concept which requires careful unpacking and examination.

Indeed, Morse's study of long-term attachments and return migration via the Vermont Roots Migration Project takes a fascinating look at the reasons that some have chosen both to leave the state and—perhaps more importantly—why others have chosen to return. In her paper in this collection Morse highlights not only some of the initial findings of this ongoing study but also many of the methodological challenges one might find in conducting migration research. This is so valuable because the tools most commonly used by migration scholars— such as census and other demographic data or records of economic practices like remittances— often yield only partial views of complex processes. Phenomenon such as circular or return migration or the simultaneous attachments that new immigrants might feel to both new and old homes are often obscured or presented without nuance when using such sources of information.

For such reasons many scholars have increasingly turned to more interdisciplinary and mixed methods approaches to migration studies (Bose 2012). Census data in a raw form for example, can be extremely imprecise in detailing the nuances of any individual's identity and affiliations, keep elements in the migration decision-making process. And rarely if ever can quantitative measures provide an accurate depiction on their own of what the life of a migrant looks like. Without qualitative research to triangulate with demographic data, the portrait will remain incomplete.

What is more, the physical dispersal of migrants has also always posed a challenge to the researcher—how does one find those who are on the move in the first place? Thus the Vermont

Roots Migration Project's approach to finding participants for the study therefore offers a promising and novel tool for migration scholars, wedding a more traditional survey instrument to a social media delivery platform; essentially building a rapid-fire snowball-sampling effect that harnesses the power of existing networks to widen its reach.

There are challenges in such a method to be sure, as Morse herself acknowledges—the self-selection bias of respondents particularly interested in the research topic, the digital divide that sorts very different hierarchies of migrants into the subject pool, differential access to technologies and technological literacy that might also affect the sample. But, the use of social media both as a research technique and as a platform through which migrants themselves are connected has become increasingly acknowledged in the field of migration studies as a promising venue (Dekker and Engersen 2014; Crush et al. 2012; Comito 2011).

This is not to suggest of course that more traditional forms of demographic, sociological, and economic analysis should be abandoned in the discussion of migration dynamics—far from it. As Bolduc and Kessel demonstrate in their contribution to this collection turning to such forms of information may prove effective at uncovering the grounded realities behind many of the same narratives that Geller, Marineau, and Watts have argued dominate the perception and public discourse in Vermont. Bolduc and Kessel acknowledge the demographic trends of an aging population and significant amounts of youth out-migration, but contextualize these within an analysis of the influx of other migrants *into* the state.

Looking at both U.S. Census data as well as a series of statewide quality of life surveys they have undertaken in recent years, Bolduc and Kessel provide insight into Vermont as a migrant destination as well as a place from which migrants elsewhere might originate. In doing, so they illuminate another important narrative in Vermont regarding migrants—the economic, political, and especially the cultural impact of 'back to the earthers', flat-landers, New Yorkers, or any other manner of those who are outsiders or 'come from away.' Their work suggests a significant gap between the income and educational levels of in-migrants—primarily from other parts of the United States—to Vermont, with newcomers outpacing native-born Vermonters by a wide margin.

Coupled with the fact that out-migration flows are greater than those of in-migration flows the difference between 'new' and 'true' Vermonters become potentially more magnified—at least in the perceptions of quality of life, political representation, ideological affiliations, and commitments to variously defined 'traditional values.' Such differences and potential conflicts between newer and more established communities are of course not a new phenomenon and indeed has become increasingly common due to the influx of wealthier, more educated populations seeking rural or small-town experiences in multiple sites from Canada's eastern shores (Grant and Mittelsteadt 2004) to the American South and Pacific Northwest (Nelson, Nelson and Trautman 2014) and from the Chinese countryside (Salazar and Yang 2013) to Swedish coastal communities (Tjørve, Flognfeldt, and Tjørve 2013) among many others.

Bolduc and Kessel also point out that migration into Vermont—in particular international migration—has been concentrated in the northern part of the state. Movement—whether into or out of the state—has not been evenly distributed, however. In fact, international migration today comprises nearly half of the movements into Vermont (U.S. Census Bureau 2015) and

yet is confined to a small number of cities and towns. As such it would be useful for scholars to engage in a more sustained fashion with the regional nature of migrations to investigate which particular towns or areas might be disproportionately affected by such flows. This area is a rich vein of enquiry and in the final section of this paper, I illustrate one component of this dynamic—the resettlement of official refugees in one particular county and set of towns in Northern Vermont.

The New(est) Americans in Vermont

As the papers in this collection demonstrate, migration out of Vermont is not a new phenomenon. And despite its reputation as one of the least populous, primarily rural and demographically homogenous parts of the United States, Vermont has an equally long history as a destination *for* migrants—though rarely from as diverse a group of lands as might be found in the traditional immigrant-receiving states like California, Texas, Florida, or New York. Less than five percent of its approximately 650,000 people are foreign-born while a majority of Vermonters have Quebecois or European heritage (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). Since 1990, however, there has been a marked increase in the foreign-born population. The bulk of this growth consists of status refugees resettled in the main metropolitan area surrounding the city of Burlington, including newcomers who hail from diverse locations in Southeast Asia, Eastern and Central Europe, Africa, and South Asia. The arrival of so many newcomers into such a putatively homogenous community raises many questions about their integration as well as the impact on their new homes. Such trends are not unique to Vermont—as migrants arrive in more new or unfamiliar destinations similar questions are being asked across the world (Massey 2008; Singer and Wilson 2011; Eastmond 2011).

Unlike other areas however, refugees are overwhelmingly the main source of immigrants in Vermont. And refugees are unlike other immigrant groups in the fact that they a) receive state support for the first year of their transition to new homes and b) have little or no say on where they will be placed in that initial year. Unlike almost any other immigrant group in the United States (or globally for that matter) refugees are resettled at the behest and direction of the state. Neither refugees nor the towns in which they are placed have much input on their placement, a situation that has led to many tensions and criticisms in the past and raises questions about how social services are affected by the influx of new clients, or whether inter-ethnic tensions have developed between refugees and other migrant or minority groups or with the society at large. In many mid-sized towns across the United States today civic leaders, school officials, community organizers, and the population at large are raising just such questions and concerns regarding their capacity to incorporate and acculturate refugee newcomers (Committee on Foreign Relations 2010; Haines and Rosenblum 2010).

At the same time, refugee groups themselves are challenging service providers and resettlement agencies to ensure that their needs are properly met (GAO 2012). Many receiving sites—especially those without a lengthy history of immigrant settlement—are working hard to adjust to the arrival of groups of newcomers who are often marked as visibly different by language, culture, religion, or phenotype. For the newcomers themselves, settling in non-

traditional settings often means a lack of access to many of the resources that have helped ease the transition in more established immigrant destinations (Massey 2008).

Refugees have been arriving in Vermont since the 1980s, mirroring in many ways the national resettlement patterns seen across the United States. This has meant successive waves of resettlement including Southeast Asians during the late 1980s, Central Europeans during the 1990s, and African groups from approximately 2000 onward (Portes and Rumbaut 2014). The largest refugee populations currently in Vermont are Bosnians, Vietnamese, and Nepali-speaking Bhutanese with significant numbers of Somali Bantu, Congolese, Sudanese, Burundians, Meskhetian Turks, Iraqis, and Burmese also present (RPC 2016). Many of these groups have arrived in large numbers over a relatively short time—for example roughly 1700 Bosnians were resettled between 1994-1997 and 1600 Bhutanese were resettled between 2008-2014. While the absolute numbers of refugees in Vermont is small compared to states such as California, Texas, or New York, the program has had a successful history, with close to 6500 refugees settled since 1987, almost entirely in Burlington and its surrounding towns (RPC 2016). It is the specificity of this placement that is important to note—while Vermont's roughly 300 refugees per year seem small compared to the annual U.S. resettlements of nearly 75,000 yet when put into the context that all are placed within a metropolitan area of under 200,000 people there is a disproportionate impact to the less than 1000 who have been sent annually to New York City over the same period.

There are many obstacles that these refugees might face in their new homes. They are certainly not the first in-migrants to Vermont, which has traditionally seen an influx of French Canadians as well as Europeans primarily as a labor force in agriculture and timber during earlier eras. But such flows significantly decreased over the course of the twentieth century and by the start of the refugee resettlement program in Vermont in 1987 no real infrastructure—language training or refugee specific employment services, for example—existed to aid in transitions. Therefore, while the small scale and the reputation for progressive politics that Burlington and Vermont possess may be quite attractive to many refugees, there remain many challenges. One is the issue of alienation as many refugees find themselves isolated as a small community in an otherwise apparently racially and culturally homogenous state like Vermont. The long and cold winters come as a very literal shock to many of the newcomers. Some refugees are also still dealing with the after-effects of the trauma caused both by the reasons for their flight from their home country and the extensive and stressful process of refugee determination. For some there are significant language barriers, especially for historically disadvantaged groups. In other cases the presence of so many small groups often makes it difficult to provide adequate services—for example, finding translation for twenty-five or perhaps even five people from a given community is a significant problem. A lack of major industries also means that the types of industrial jobs available to refugees in larger metropolitan areas are not as easily accessible in Vermont.

Yet there are issues for refugee resettlement in Vermont that extend beyond the processes and politics of resettlement or of immigration itself. Beyond the lack of infrastructural supports and access to services, refugees may also find themselves in new destinations being slotted—explicitly as well as subconsciously—into what Omi and Winant (1994) describe as a set of

racial codes that creates a hierarchy of identity and belonging in the United States. Vermont is not only demographically 'white' but as Vanderbeck (2006) suggests, a particular kind of rural whiteness has long been a tool used by the state to market itself to wealthy vacationers. What does it mean to be a newcomer—especially one who is marked by race, ethnicity, religion, language, or some other characteristic as 'other'—in this homogenous and apparently bucolic space? For many refugees from Somalia, Sudan and other parts of Africa, they find their identity marked as both black and often Muslim and are thereby treated to the same forms of stereotypes prevalent in other parts of the United States. On the other hand, Central European refugees such as Bosnians and Kosovars—while no less 'othered' initially by language or religion—may be able over time to 'whiten' in ways akin to the trajectory of working class European immigrants in turn-of-the-century America (Roediger 2005). Yet others such as the Bhutanese refugees who constitute one of the largest recently resettled populations in the US and have achieved remarkable successes in terms of employment and education in a relatively short period may be viewed through the lens of the 'model minority' formation that has been deployed so perniciously within American racial politics (Prashad 2000).

What do such racial dynamics mean in the daily lives of refugees, and what implications do they hold for the towns in which they are placed? In the case of Vermont, accusations of racial profiling have arisen from African refugees in terms of their treatment by local police forces (Bose 2013). Myths of the model minority, on the other hand, can serve to obscure the ongoing problems of economic instability of certain communities such as Southeast Asians because their overall performance is aggregated with that of the relatively wealthier (and predominantly non-refugee) Chinese and Indian populations (Thrupkaew 2009). And while inter-ethnic conflicts have not yet arisen in large numbers in Vermont, their potential in both established and newer non-traditional reception sites remains high in the United States, and beyond, as we see through conflicts between Bhutanese and African-Americans in Erie, Pennsylvania (Bose 2013), Hmong and other minorities in Eau Claire, Wisconsin (Hein 2006), and African refugees and Aboriginal populations in Winnipeg, Canada (Madariaga-Vignudo 2009).

The situation that refugees find themselves in therefore often places them in a doubly difficult position. On the one hand they must negotiate the complex and often labyrinthine structures of resettlement in the United States, the bureaucracy of state, federal and municipal agencies (often themselves locked in turf battles), and the capricious decisions of the numerous gatekeepers who dole out access to better resources often on a whim. On the other hand they are seen by many of the other marginalized groups in the area where they are resettled—especially the historically disadvantaged communities of color (as small as they may be in a place like Vermont)–to have gotten an easy ride, more support, and greater legitimacy in the eyes of the world. Within the different refugee communities as well we see conflicts arise over interests that are assumed to be the same. While many Bosnian, Iraqi, Somali and Sudanese refugees may be Muslim, they may practice very different forms of Islam, differences that play out most markedly in things like the contests over the leadership of the local mosque.

Despite such challenges, Vermont and Burlington remain relatively attractive destinations for refugees and the program is highlighted by USCRI as an example of a successful resettlement site (USCRI 2016). Refugee respondents speak especially of the prospects for a

peaceful and healthy lifestyle in Vermont. Francine did not know much about the state or town before she and her family from Burundi arrived but has been generally pleased with what she has experienced:

> To tell you the truth, I had never heard of Vermont before. After all the interviews when they told me in the camps that we were going there we thought it was a mistake and they were sending us to Canada. But it is very nice. The people are friendly and helpful.

Gopal, a Bhutanese man echoes the same sentiments about the nature of the native Vermonters: "They are very willing to help you, you just need to know how to ask. If you work hard and are willing to listen they will help you." Madhu, another refugee from Bhutan was not initially placed in Burlington but moved with his family from his original placement having heard of the reputation of Vermont: "We were originally located in Atlanta but it was in a housing project. It was very dangerous. There were gangs. We were concerned for our children and their future. Now we are in Vermont and we are much happier."

What does the story of resettlement in Vermont teach us about the placement of refugees in new destinations like Burlington? How are we to understand the ways in which a semi-rural state with a low-density population, a scattering of small towns, a dearth of economic opportunity, and a homogenous population has dealt with the influx of newcomers from all corners of the world? For example, since the 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States the question of refugee resettlement have often been deeply politicized, leading in some cases to calls to halt the program or to limit placements from certain (mostly Muslim) countries (Seipel 2015)—it is instructive to see how Vermont deals with such debates; the spate of recent attacks in Paris and elsewhere and the question of how to resettle Syrian refugees in particular have gripped politicians, local authorities and refugees themselves all across the United States. But there are other issues that should equally concern us. Do the relatively small populations of particular groups we see placed in Vermont result in situations of social alienation and disenfranchisement amongst refugees? How does being perceived through a racial lens affect the acculturation of newcomers?

It is also important to consider the capacity of Vermont towns to welcome and adequately support refugees, especially if they continue to be concentrated into a handful of them. For local service organizations—from resettlement agencies to schools, healthcare providers, employers, and housing advocates—a lack of forewarning and knowledge of who is coming and when often leads to a scramble to provide adequate supports, clashes over expectations and cultural norms and in some cases a duplication of efforts. Such a context is compounded by the lack of resources confronting refugee organizations and local communities all across the United States. If not properly addressed this situation can lead to a potential backlash and indeed calls for a halt to resettlements as in famous cases such as Lewiston, Maine. Vermont has not had such a situation arise as yet—the resettlement program here has been a notable success and represents a new chapter in the long history of Vermont migrations. Paying closer attention to how these dynamics evolve in the future will be an important element of ensuring the program's long-term viability.

So, while the rest of the work in this edited collection provides us with exploration surrounding why and how youth leave, stay, and negotiate their migration decisions, as this paper shows, many of the same "push and pull" factors remain at work among populations who did not originate in the state nor selectively choose to settle there. What is more, ultimately, new migrants in the state bring fresh perspectives on the conditions experienced within the state while raising important questions surrounding how northern New England might respond to increasing diversity as it grapples with the forces of globalization. As small, often rural areas wrestle with material questions of economic security and viability, so too they must query how the changes they experience due to migration into and out of their locality might shape the nature of their social context, their cultural conditions, and indeed, what it actually means to be a member of the community.

As Vermont looks ahead at how it will respond to how people make decisions to move within, out of, or into the state, it behooves lawmakers, stakeholders, researchers, and the civic public alike to reflect on how Vermont's relationship with migration is a multifaceted and nuanced one. Examining the broad trends visible through quantitative data as in Bolduc and Kessel's work, the historical context of migration in Vermont as in Mudgett's research, and being mindful of the power of words and ideas in shaping both social and political reality as highlighted by Geller, Marineau, and Watts helps enquire around Vermont's social, political, and civic landscape. Indeed, ongoing studies like the Vermont Roots Migration Project stand an exciting chance to capture not just the tenor of migration forces, but the richness of actors' engagement with their movement decisions. And finally, by attending to the newest arrivals in the Green Mountain State, we are offered an opportunity to glimpse what the Vermont of tomorrow might look like as more diverse populations arrive from many corners of the globe.

In sum, this volume was compiled to add to the discussions surrounding what migration in New England looks like, comment on the experiences of one state, and provide an opening for connecting this small part of the United States to the broader work being conducted in other places and spaces. On balance, in an age of increasingly compressed time and space as globalization spreads and changes, examining the nature of migration in the small state of Vermont offers the opportunity to view a microcosm of larger concepts, flows, and trends visible in much broader work. As the case of refugees resettled in the state shows, there is much one can learn.

—————————————————

DR. PABLO BOSE is an Associate Professor of Geography at the University of Vermont. The primary focus of his research over the past decade has been on migration, transnationalism, diasporas, and diverse environments. E-mail: Pbose@uvm.edu

References

Agrawal, A., D. Kapur, J. McHale, and A. Oettl. 2011. Brain drain or brain bank? The impact of skilled emigration on poor-country innovation. *Journal of Urban Economics* 69(1): 43-55.

Baker, D. and D. Chappelle. 2012. Health status and needs of Latino dairy farmworkers in Vermont. *Journal of Agromedicine* 17(3): 277-287.

Bose, P.S. 2014. Living the way the world does: global Indians in the remaking of Kolkata" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 104(2): 391-400.

Bose, P.S. 2013. Building sustainable communities: immigrants, acculturation and mobility in Vermont" *Research in Transportation Business and Management* 7 (July 2013): 81-90.

Bose, P.S. 2012. Mapping movements: interdisciplinary approaches to migration research. In *Handbook of research methods in migration*, ed. C. Vargaz-Silva, 273-294. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Castles, S., M.J. Miller and G. Ammendola. 2003. *The age of migration: international population movements in a modern world*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Committee on Foreign Relations. 2010. *Abandoned upon arrival: implications for refugees and local communities burdened by a U.S. resettlement system that is not working* (No. 9780160862458 0160862450). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Crush, J., C. Eberhardt, M. Caesar, A. Chikanda, W. Pendleton, and A. Hill. 2012. Diasporas on the web: new networks, new technologies. In *Handbook of research methods in migration*, ed. C. Vargaz-Silva, 345-365.

Day, R. 2000. *Multiculturalism and the history of Canadian diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dekker, R., and G. Engbersen. 2014. How social media transform migrant networks and facilitate migration. *Global Networks* 14(4): 401-418.

Eastmond, M. 2011. Egalitarian Ambitions, Constructions of Difference: The Paradoxes of Refugee Integration in Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies* 37(2): 277-295.

Government Accounting Office (GAO). 2012. Refugee resettlement: greater consultation with community stakeholders could strengthen the program. GAO-12-729. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Grant, J., and L. Mittelsteadt. 2004. Types of gated communities. *Environment and Planning B* 31: 913-930.

Haines, D. and K. Rosenblum. 2010. Perfectly American: constructing the refugee experience. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies* 36(3): 391-406.

Hein, J. 2006. *Ethnic origins: the adaptation of Cambodian and Hmong refugees in four American cities*. New York: Russell Sage.

King, A.D. 2004. *Spaces of global cultures: architecture, urbanism, identity*. New York: Routledge.

Komito, L. 2011. Social media and migration: Virtual community 2.0. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62(6): 1075-1086.

Madariaga-Vignudo, L. 2009. *More Strangers than Neighbours: Aboriginal-African Refugee Relations in Winnipeg's Inner City*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Research Alliance.

Massey, D. 2008. *New faces in new places: the changing geography of American immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Migration Policy Institute. 2015. International migration statistics. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/international-migration-statistics (last accessed November 21, 2015)

Mills, E.J., S. Kanters, A. Hagopian, N. Bansback, J. Nachega, M. Alberton, C.G. Au-Yeung. 2011. The financial cost of doctors emigrating from sub-Saharan Africa: human capital analysis. *BMJ* 343: d7301.

Nelson, P.B., L. Nelson, and L. Trautman. 2014. Linked migration and labor market flexibility in the rural amenity destinations in the United States. *Journal of Rural Studies* 36: 121-136.

Omi, M., and Winant, H. 1994. *Racial formation in the United States: from the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Portes, A. and R.G. Rumbaut. 2014. *Immigrant America: A portrait*. 4th edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Prashad, V. 2000. *The karma of brown folk*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Radel, C., B. Schmook, and S. McCandless. 2010. Environment, transnational labor migration, and gender: case studies from southern Yucatan, Mexico and Vermont, USA. *Population and Environment* 32(2-3): 177-197.

Roediger, D. 2005. *Working toward Whiteness: how America's immigrants became White—the strange journey from Ellis Island to the suburbs*. New York: Basic Books.

Salazar, N.B., and Y. Zhang. 2013. Seasonal lifestyle tourism: The case of Chinese elites." *Annals of Tourism Research* 43: 81-99.

Seipel, A. 2015. 30 governors call for halt to U.S. resettlement of Syrian refugees. http://www.npr.org/2015/11/17/456336432/more-governors-oppose-u-s-resettlement-of-syrian-refugees (last accessed November 17, 2015)

Singer, A., S. Hardwick, and C. Brettell. 2008. *Twenty-first-century gateways: immigrant incorporation in suburban America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Singer, A. and J. Wilson. 2011. From 'there to here': refugee resettlement in metropolitan America. In *Race, ethnicity, and place in a changing America*, ed. J. Frazier, E. Tettey-Fio, and N. Henry, 364-388. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Smith, H.A. and O. Furuseth (ed.) 2007. *Latinos in the New South: transformations of place*. Charlotte: University of North Carolina Press.

Terrazas, A., D.G. Papademetriou and M.R. Rosenblum. 2011. *Evolving Demographic and Human-Capital Trends in Mexico and Central America and their Implications for Regional Migration*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute

Thrupkaew, N. 2002. The myth of the model minority. In *Race, Class and Gender in the United States* ed. P. Rothenberg, 224-230. New York: Worth.

Tjørve, E., T. Flognfeldt, and K.M.C. Tjørve. 2013. The effects of distance and belonging on second-home markets. *Tourism Geographies* 15(2): 268-291.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 2015. Facts and figures about refugees. http://www.unhcr.org.uk/about-us/key-facts-and-figures.html (last accessed November 25, 2015)

U.S. Census Bureau. 2015. Vermont QuickFacts. http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/50000.html (last accessed March 4, 2015)

U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants (USCRI). 2016. USCRI Vermont. http://refugees.org/field-office/vermont/ (last accessed January 29, 2016)

Refugee Processing Center (RPC). 2016. Historical arrivals broken down by region (1975-present). http://www.wrapsnet.org/Reports/AdmissionsArrivals/tabid/211/Default.aspx (last accessed January 29, 2016)

Vanderbeck, R. 2006. Vermont and the imaginative geographies of American whiteness. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96(3): 641-659.

Varma, R., and D. Kapur. 2013. Comparative analysis of brain drain, brain circulation and brain retain: a case study of Indian Institutes of Technology. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 15(4): 315-330.

World Bank. 2015. Migration and remittances data. http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/0,,contentMDK:21924020~pagePK:5105988~piPK:360975~theSitePK:214971,00.html (last accessed August 3, 2015).