

# Mapping the soft borders of citizenship

## An introduction

*Roberto G. Gonzales and Nando Sigona*

---

On 10 August 2016 the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) announced that some renewal requests for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) filed between 14 February 2016 and 16 May 2016 were delayed due to technical difficulties and could fall outside of expected processing times. As a result of the delay, hundreds of undocumented immigrants who were granted work authorization under a 2012 administrative action under U.S. president Barack Obama were prevented from receiving renewed work authorization cards and fell out of status. For many who were forced to quit their jobs this 'liminal legality' (Menjívar 2006) was a stark reminder of the fragility of their temporary and partial status.

By mid-2016, more than 741,500 undocumented young people had been granted a DACA status, and more than 526,000 had been approved for renewals.<sup>1</sup> In the short term, DACA beneficiaries had taken giant leaps from the margins. Their new status had opened up new avenues of access: many had found new employment, had increased their earnings, had received drivers' licences, had started building credit, and had received health care through their jobs (Gonzales, Terriquez and Rusczyk 2014). What's more, the deportation relief provided by DACA gave beneficiaries a sense of belonging and eased their worries about being apprehended and removed from the country.

But DACA was not without its problems. As an executive memorandum that shifts bureaucratic practices and priorities, DACA has limited inclusionary power. It does not offer a pathway to citizenship or other forms of legal status. It does not provide its beneficiaries with the ability to bypass legal exclusions from federal financial aid. And, it is temporary and revocable, an empirical reality that casts some troubling doubt on beneficiaries' futures. In the fall of 2016, Gina Hernandez felt this when she fell out of status due to USCIS's technical issues.<sup>2</sup> A 31-year old history teacher working at a public high school in the borough of Queens, New York, Gina was forced to take a leave of absence from the classroom after her new employment authorization card failed to arrive on time.

Gina was working under a work authorization that expired on 6 August. On the advice of an attorney to apply for renewal between 120 and 150 days

of the expiration date, she submitted her application in early May. Despite receiving a letter notifying her that her renewed DACA status had been approved, Gina's work authorization card still had not arrived. When the new school year began she was not allowed to enter the classroom. When we asked her about her predicament she expressed frustration and worry:

'I feel like I'm back to where I was before, you know, undocumented. I think I had a false sense of security with DACA, like that I actually had status. Now, I don't know. I mean, at any moment it can all be taken away just like that. [DACA] is something, right? Like I can now drive and work legally. Well, I mean, I can and I can't, you know. I used to think that it solved a lot of my problems. I know the renewal will come through and I can get back to my classroom. But I feel more cautious now, like a bird with only one wing.'<sup>3</sup>

Meanwhile, in the United Kingdom following the referendum that saw 52 per cent of British voters casting their vote to leave the European Union, three million non-British EU residents woke up on 24 June 2016 to find out the world around them was going to change and they had very little control over the direction these changes were going to take. The European citizenship, the 'world's first example of fully institutionalised trans, or post-national political rights beyond the nation state' (Favell 2010: 187), that had granted them the quasi-unrestricted freedom to live and work in any of the EU member states since the early 1990s, but gave them no right to vote in national elections and referenda, was going to evaporate and their legal status and their life in the UK had become uncertain. But, even worse than that, shocked EU residents found themselves turned into a 'bargaining chip' in the negotiations between the British government and the EU and, as never before, felt the weight of their exclusion from the British polity. The new British Prime Minister, Theresa May, repeatedly refused to guarantee residence rights to EU citizens. 'As part of the [Brexit] negotiation we will need to look at this question of people who are here in the UK from the EU', she said in a broadcast interview.<sup>4</sup> Following the referendum announcement and at a faster pace after its outcome, hundreds of thousands of EU citizens sought legal advice on their status and discovered that just a few months before the referendum Theresa May, the then Home Secretary, had introduced an 85 page-long form for EU residents willing to see their permanent residency (PR) status acknowledged. Among the instructions provided, applicants were required to count the days they had spent outside the UK in the five years preceding the application. To many this was not just a veritable nightmare in practical terms – why would one keep such a detailed record of one's visit abroad if there was no need to? – but also troublesome on a more existential level. Such is the distance between a normative construction of the *EU citizen* as someone who feels at home everywhere in the EU and is valued for embracing freedom of movement

within the EU, both long and short term, and that of the *immigrant in the UK* who may see their chances of permanent residency jeopardised if they happen to have spent too many days abroad. The discovery of the application form came to many as a shock as up until March 2016 EU residents had become permanent residents automatically after five years. The PR certificate has become a necessary prerequisite for applying for British citizenship – something few felt compelled to consider until June 2016.

What does it mean to be part of a national community, but to have only partial access to the polity? And how does the redefinition of the boundaries of the polity transform the hierarchy of membership within society? In contemporary Western societies, these questions are at the centre of heated debates about the boundaries of society and the place of immigrants in it, and on the minds of many migrants with partial or incomplete forms of status (Anderson, Gibney and Paoletti 2011). The presence of growing populations across the globe without formal legal immigration status – but with varying degrees of rights – compels us to rethink long-held assumptions about the ways in which participation and inclusion are tied to legality.

The experiences of contemporary migrants – whether undocumented, irregular, precarious, or temporary – powerfully demonstrate that while current social science frameworks offer some utility, notably around the concepts of membership and incorporation, these approaches require revision.

## **Unpacking the migration and citizenship nexus**

Contemporary societies have become increasingly diverse, layered, and interconnected. Indeed, the processes of neoliberal globalization have loosened labour protections, restructured the welfare system, delocalized state borders, and led to widening inequalities (Piketty 2013).

What's more, these processes have fractured the connection between state, territory and residents, triggering a significant transformation in the experiences of membership in Western democracies while also giving rise to a host of new non-state actors operating transnationally.

All of this is occurring at a time when nation-states are also undergoing significant demographic and social changes as a result of aging populations and international migration (Sassen 2006; Castles 2013).

The contemporary proliferation of immigration statuses – or 'figures of membership' – for non-citizens is one of the manifestations of this transformation (cf. Zetter 2007). However, little is known about two important aspects of this phenomenon: firstly, the impact of the proliferation of legal statuses on the citizens of these societies and citizenship more broadly and, secondly, how immigration statuses intersect with social cleavages such as age, class, gender, race, and national origin.

This book provides some answers to these vexing puzzles. Through a range of theoretically innovative and empirically rich case studies that cover the

experiences of a multitude of figures of membership, including undocumented migrants, Roma, mixed status families and new citizens, it investigates the interplay between forms and modes of contemporary membership, immigration and citizenship regimes, and the meanings and practices of belonging.

As globalization scholar Saskia Sassen (1998: 56) validly notes, ‘migrations are not autonomous processes; they don’t just happen, they are produced’. Indeed, citizenship and alienage are mutually constructed (Bosniak 2006; McNevin 2011, 2013) and, as this book illustrates, are also intimately connected, both in theory and in everyday interactions.

Conceptions of state membership have been traditionally based on a notion of a bounded community whereby rules of legal citizenship determine community belonging and set the parameters for exclusion. This approach examines the role formal and informal state structures and practices play both in creating populations who fall outside the bounds of formal membership – those who are constructed as ‘illegal’ or ‘temporary’ – and in enforcing and sustaining these groups’ legal vulnerability. Scholars have been keen to point out that illegality is more than a juridical status; it is also a sociopolitical one (Coutin 2000; De Genova 2002). From this vantage point, illegality is historically and legally produced and is situated within a broader framework of a global economy (Goldring, Berinstein and Bernhard 2009; Menjivar and Kanstroom 2013). In other words, it is produced and, for many, experienced as a ‘master status’ (Gonzales 2015).

Sociological anthropologist Susan B. Coutin (2000) argues that the combination of legal regulations and the threat of deportation render undocumented immigrants ‘legally non-existent’ – legally outside the United States while physically present within the country. And anthropologist Sarah Willen (2007) further deepens our understandings of illegality by drawing attention to the effects of daily perceptions of uncertainty, danger, and the threat of deportation. These ongoing worries produce specific kinds of fear and anxiety that often have physical as well as emotional effects – what Willen aptly terms the ‘embodiment’ of illegality. These personal, repetitive manifestations of illegality and semi-legality (Kubal 2013) remind us of the inherent contradictions between the needs of capital and the drawing and defining of national boundaries: migrants may be centrally incorporated into local labour markets, but immigration laws and practices constrain their daily lives.

Recently, however, a burgeoning line of scholarship in the social sciences, often across traditional disciplinary boundaries, is challenging the primacy of the nation-state for determining membership and endowing rights, arguing that recent trends in globalization, human rights, and diaspora politics have made state borders less consequential (Soysal 1994; Ong 1999; Benhabib 2004; Bosniak 2006). Focusing on non-citizens’ long-term presence and their status as persons, this scholarship argues that non-citizens create spaces of belonging that supersede legal citizenship (Rosaldo 1994; Reed-Danahay and Brettell 2008; Tonkiss and Bloom 2016). In doing so, it draws attention to the

ways in which those formally outside the law lead everyday lives, form relationships, and participate in the communities in which they live. By deliberately uncoupling a sense of belonging from notions of formal citizenship, scholars have pointed out that immigrants often transcend the boundaries of territory and polity, carrying out their everyday lives in various social and political fields. This work on the informal modes of belonging provides a corrective for the limitations of dominant discourses of membership that over-emphasize formal, legal immigration status as a pre-requisite to an individual's ability to assert a claim to belong, it also reverses the onus between belonging to a national community and being recognized as a formal member of it (cf. Isin 2008). Immigrants feel part of a community because of sentiments influenced by social relationships and cultural beliefs and practices (Coutin 2003).

Over the last several years, there has been considerable debate about the definition of citizenship, as some have questioned whether it should even be understood in relation to the nation-state (Marshall 1950).<sup>5</sup> Scholars have coined phrases for alternative forms of citizenship: 'global citizenship', 'transnational citizenship', 'postnational citizenship', 'social citizenship', and 'multicultural citizenship' (Bosniak 2006). Some of these conceptions propose models of societies in which different populations participate through group membership rather than on the basis of individual rights. What gives these broad definitions of citizenship a particular credence is the empirical observation that there is seldom complete overlap between the boundaries of a particular nation and the boundaries of the population that lives in that nation (Yuval-Davis 2006).

Drawing distinctions between legal forms of citizenship that determine 'the full exercise of legal rights', on one hand, and participatory forms of citizenship that denote an 'effective presence in the public sphere', on the other, scholars have revealed these routine manifestations of citizenship as both participatory and local in character (Balibar 1988: 724; cf. Reed-Danahay and Brettell 2008).

These more democratic articulations of citizenship have more to do with the community participation of citizens as social and political actors than with laws endowing them with the rights to do so. It is the *being* of citizenship that is emphasized over the becoming (Castles and Davidson 2000). Asserting cultural forms of citizenship involves agency. Sociologist Nira Yuval-Davis (2006) draws an important distinction between belonging as an emotional sense of home, and what she calls 'the politics of belonging'. For her, these politics are not just about the ongoing work the state puts into maintaining and reproducing community boundaries. The politics of belonging are also about the ongoing challenges to those boundaries by members within the community.

To be sure, both the older and the newer definitions, while they disagree on the significance of states and state borders, raise critical questions as to when

and how territorial presence constitutes membership, and the extent to which practices of membership 'create and situate individuals in certain positions within the social space' (Isin 2002: 25), producing new forms of belonging.

Recent scholarship has demonstrated that migrants living in spaces of exclusion do not experience its constraints uniformly. As one scholar has noted, migrants are seldom just undocumented (Kubal 2013: 11). Indeed, precariousness is experienced in various spaces and types of interactions: tight labour markets that are prone to abuse and harsh conditions, limited or no access to public and social services, costly and discriminatory housing markets, barriers to banking services and the acquisition of credit, and limitations in social relationships (Menjívar and Kanstroom 2013). However, on a daily basis, one's immigration status may be less or more salient to most of their activities. They may be regular in one sense and irregular in another; they may be fully excluded from the legal-political system but able to carry out a range of social interactions and activities (Sigona 2012; Sigona and Hughes 2012; Bloch, Sigona and Zetter 2014).

This observation draws our attention to the spaces, experiences, and moments where citizenship is more *and* less consequential. Access to each of these domains is differently shaped by a constellation of entry points and barriers across time, space, and place, offering a variety of configurations of rights and limitations. Where one resides, the absence or availability of resources, the attitudes of local actors and institutions, and individual characteristics such as age, gender, and race shape one's experiences along a continuum from integration to exclusion.

Linda Bosniak reminds us that the boundary between 'legal' and 'illegal' is at sometimes sharp but at other times fuzzy. It is within the fuzzy spaces that a different perspective has evolved: that which views borders as more permeable and highlights the spectrum of grey spaces between 'legal' and 'illegal' statuses (Goldring, Berinstein and Bernhard 2009). This perspective provides a framework through which to assess the factors that mediate the relationship between macro-level structures (global processes and immigration policies) and micro-level practices (the everyday decisions and actions of migrants) and allows us to capture the dynamic processes of contemporary membership. At the level of immigrants' daily lives, these processes shape a range of experiences that fall between exclusion and belonging. Approaching borders as potentially non-rigid recognizes the inherent contradictions between the efforts of nation-states to draw and patrol borders, on one hand, and the persistent yet elastic demand for labour on the other hand. Migrants who have little or no formal rights interact every day with a multitude of state agencies, community institutions, and individuals. These conditions make it possible for both citizens and migrants to sometime operate 'as if the boundaries did not exist' (Benton 1994: 229).

Indeed, there is general consensus that illegality is a legally and routinely produced status and that there is a need for a critical examination of the

social and political conditions under which people are constructed as ‘illegal’ (De Genova 2002). At the same time, however, there is a growing recognition that the state produces different constellations of categories of non-legal or less-than-legal statuses (for a thorough review see Kubal 2013). Many migrants today occupy statuses that are temporary, uncertain, and non-linear. Changes in or violations of a range of immigration laws or bureaucratic requirements can move immigrants back and forth, between legal and non-legal statuses (Jasso et al. 2008).

Many migrants who today possess a legal status, for example, were once undocumented. Similarly, those who are legally residents can also lose that status. This is the case for those who enter the country with a temporary work, study, or travel permit and then overstay or violate the terms of their authorized entry, or in the near future the status of EU citizens living in the UK. In addition, even legal residents may be subject to deportation for relatively minor offences, due to legislation that has expanded the grounds for deportation.<sup>6</sup> Globally, immigration laws endow immigrants with certain rights in some domains but not in others. Laws may define one’s entry as illegal but under certain circumstances also provide legal permission to remain in the country. Or laws may define a range of legally permissible weekly work hours for visa holders but deem anything in excess of those hours illegal (Düvell 2008: 488). In the United States immigrants granted Temporary Protected Status (TPS) are able to reside and work legally but are ineligible for social services. Examples such as these blur the sharply drawn distinctions between legal and unauthorized statuses.

Moving away from the binary categories of ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’, ‘documented’ and ‘undocumented’, several scholars have argued that traditional, dichotomous ways of viewing immigration statuses are not sufficient. Tomas Hammer (1990) has applied the term ‘denizens’ to those legal residents of a country who are not naturalized citizens but who enjoy some economic and political rights. Luin Goldring and her colleagues (2009) employ ‘precarious’ to describe the multiple pathways to an irregular status among immigrant populations in Canada.

And, in her examination of Central American immigrants living in uncertain legal status and caught in the legal limbo of TPS, sociologist Cecilia Menjívar introduced the concept ‘liminal legality’ to highlight the grey areas in which many immigrants live. While TPS immigrants are sometimes able to renew permits, a period of nonrenewal (due to lengthy processing times or denial) can push a TPS immigrant out of status, even if temporarily. Building on the work of anthropologists Victor Turner and Susan Coutin, Menjívar observed that immigrants often live in a state of legal limbo that can persist indefinitely, sometimes never leading to citizenship or other forms of formal legal immigration status. This long-term uncertainty, or ‘permanent temporariness’, is characterized by ambiguity, endowing immigrants with characteristics of both legal *and* ‘illegal’ statuses. As such, this real-life condition underscores the inadequacy of binary approaches to membership.

Other research exploring the spaces between legality and illegality has demonstrated that experiences of illegality often are dependent on specific and situational contexts. Drawing attention to migrants' social worlds, scholars have pointed to examples where migrants' ordinary practices are in disharmony with their formal immigration status (Ruhs and Anderson 2006; Gleeson 2010; Rigo 2011; Rytter 2012). In other words, even when they are excluded from the legal-political system, spaces of inclusion determined by local policies or by institutional practices make it possible for individuals without formal legal status to engage in community activities, establish relationships, and have children. In some locales, they also receive critical services that address everyday needs (e.g., health care and police protection) and are afforded opportunities to more fully participate in community life – e.g. by serving on local councils or voting in local elections (Jones-Correa 2005; Lewis and Ramakrishnan 2007; Marrow 2009). In some cases, local policies allow unauthorized or irregular migrants to obtain drivers' licences and rent apartments. In other places, local institutions and/or bureaucracies circumvent the legal system to offer medical care, free legal services (translators and interpreters), and advocacy. Scholars suggest that certain bureaucratic agencies and their staff draw from a professional ethos that sees immigrants as deserving and act to provide services to them as they would to any other clients (Marrow 2009). The response of these bureaucrats – e.g., social workers, health care employees, and teachers – allows immigrant populations important forms of access and enlarges their social worlds.

This perspective also highlights instances of immigrant agency and access in the face of exclusionary laws. But often, the forms of belonging that exist in the grey spaces between inclusion and exclusion are conditional, partial, temporary, and revocable. Belonging is fragile and contradictory. In some places and contexts, local actors may provide spaces of access and inclusion; in other places and contexts, they may impose additional levels of enforcement, exclusions, and difficulties for migrant populations. At any moment, inclusionary policies and practices can be overturned or curtailed, depending on the willingness of local institutional agents and legislators. It is important to note that even immigrants who enjoy spaces of inclusion can be apprehended, detained, and removed from the country.

To be sure, such agonistic and performative understandings of membership do 'not result in a clear delimitation between insiders and outsiders, between political belonging and non-belonging' (Hepworth 2014), rather in a 'complex terrain of contested identities' (Isin 2002: 4; McNevin 2009). We argue that membership is an always emergent condition that is inherently both situated and embodied (Willen 2007; Gonzales and Chavez 2012; Sigona 2015, 2016), 'continually produced in and through struggles over identity; over who belongs and who does not, and who is legitimately or illegitimately present in the nation' (Hepworth 2014: 14; Squire 2010).

Migration scholarship has claimed that the egalitarian promise of citizenship has obscured recognition of its exclusionary nature and prevented

necessary interrogations of the concept itself. By focusing on the boundaries of both communities and concepts, current migration research has sought to address this gap. Notable contributions to this have queried what *is* citizenship (Joppke 1999, 2010), who form the subjects of citizenship (Bosniak 2006), how subjects of citizenship are constituted (Isin 2002), the relationship between nationhood and conceptions of citizenship (Brubaker 1992), the incorporation of migrants across different states (Bloemraad 2006), and the relationship between human rights and citizenship rights (Soysal 1994).

These questions have prompted discussion of citizenship as both a legal and a social institution with multiple dimensions that can be conferred or claimed in partial and asymmetric ways. It has been shown that the identities, rights and practices associated with being a citizen can be at odds with formal citizenship status, and that the entitlements conferred by citizenship can be obtained through claims to membership that supersede the nation-state (cf. Soysal 1994; Sassen 2002; Benhabib 2007). In an increasingly mobile world, migration muddles the distinction between insider and outsider and unsettles consolidated categories of analysis of citizenship and alienage.

However, the focus on citizenship's boundaries has also generated a significant body of scholarship engaging with citizenship's continued and constitutive exclusions. Most often these exclusions have been considered in reference to unauthorized migration and presence within a state. An important reference point within this research is Agamben's (1998) work on sovereign power. His theorization of the depoliticized subject produced within and by a state of exception has been applied extensively within migration and citizenship studies, as well as precipitating a groundswell of literature critiquing Agamben-inspired representations of migrant subjects as agency-less social actors (cf. Isin 2008; Rancière 2010; Nyers and Rygiel 2012; Sigona 2012; Redclift 2013; Bloch, Sigona and Zetter 2014). At stake is how to understand who belongs to the polity, and the relationship between political community and those who are excluded from it, and how to account for the possibility of change of the status quo.

In the remaining pages of this introduction we sketch a brief profile of some figures of contemporary membership whose experiences and predicaments will be examined by the contributors of this collection. Drawing on the contents of the individual chapters, we provide a rationale for the structure of the book which is divided into two Parts: in the first, we discuss our understanding of membership as situated, embodied and interpersonal, grounded in everyday spaces and interactions; and, in the second, the practices through which, and spaces where the boundaries of membership are and can be negotiated, redrawn and contested.

### **Normalizing legal ambiguity and protracted precariousness**

This collection investigates the predicaments of individuals and groups that embody the complexity and fluidity that characterize societal membership

today. The experiences of undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, EU Roma, mixed-status families, new citizens, and unaccompanied migrant children offer a standpoint from which to explore spaces of belonging and membership that too often are left at the margins, neglected because imagined as transient, as in the process of entering citizenship or disappearing as foreign. In this collection we bring the everyday experiences of those for whom there seems to be no ‘appropriate niche in the framework of general law’ (Arendt 1968: 278) at the centre of the analysis of contemporary membership.

Our starting point is the empirical observation that there are many long-term residents in our societies who are not citizens, but who nonetheless have rights and entitlements. These rights and entitlements may originate from different sources. Certainly, the human rights regime is one of them, but it is not the only one. Rights and entitlements may also originate from another state’s diaspora policy or result from some kind of *ius domicilii*, which is in recognition of an individual presence in a place over a more or less extended period of time, irrespective of their formal immigration status (see Carens 2013).

But this is only one side of the story we would like to tell in this book. There are also some citizens who because of their ‘race’, minority status, migration history, and gender (the reasons of exclusion vary between contexts and scales) find themselves excluded from an idealized image of citizenship as well as from tangible aspects of it – one that happens to inform much of the debate on citizenship and alienage, with the former being an ideal condition that many aspire to achieve. But the experiences of naturalized citizens, children of undocumented parents, citizens in mixed-status families, and citizens of a stigmatized minority background are a reminder that citizenship is often based on a politics of exclusion that operates externally as much as internally; and not all citizens are equal before the law, not only on paper, but also in practice (Anderson 2013). We would argue that discourses of earned citizenship – i.e. ‘citizenship is a privilege not a right’ – coupled with the policy and practice of denaturalization are making, not only the status of non-citizens but also that of citizens more precarious. These processes are playing out especially among, but not limited to, those in mixed-status families subject to various degrees of qualification (often related to income as in the UK’s family reunion policies) and among naturalized and dual citizens who may be deemed a threat to the public order.

This book brings together a diverse set of case studies of migrant and minority populations located in the grey areas which are both within and beyond the traditional realm of citizenship, an expanding space, we argue, marked by increasing legal ambiguity and protracted precariousness. In doing so, the book aims to destabilize the consolidated, and often normatively loaded, binary narratives around legality and illegality, citizenship and non-citizenship that have shaped much of the immigration debate to date, and to open up a space of possibility both politically and discursively where transformations and tensions underpinning the relationship between the individual and the state at a time of neoliberal globalization and global human rights aspirations can be

understood, negotiated and contested. As *Nicholas De Genova* suggests in his contribution, citizenship and alienage may be best understood as two key figures of a spectrum of bordered identities – categorical distinctions among different sorts of people configured in relation to territorially defined states by the differences in space produced by borders. The author argues that by incorporating the concept of bordered identities in the citizenship discourse it becomes possible to better appreciate how bordered exclusions do an inclusionary work that is inseparable from the systemic processes of migrant illegalization and the subordination of migrant labour. In the shadows of a bordered world, the author concludes, migrant ‘illegality’ emerges as the shadow of citizenship itself. ‘Coming out of the shadows’, a play on anthropologist Leo Chavez’ seminal monograph, *Shadowed Lives* (1992), and a popular metaphor used by migrants’ rights activists and advocates takes then a different meaning as it challenges us to question normative assumptions of citizenship and to expose the interconnectedness and fluidity of this status, as much as that of undocumented.

### **Everyday spaces and practices of inclusion and exclusion**

The first part of the book considers how ideas of citizenship and membership shape the everyday lived experiences of citizens and non-citizens across a range of contemporary societies in Europe and North America, and how the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion operate across a range of geographical spaces and through individuals’ everyday interactions with the state.

The chapters in this first part document and critically examine several ways in which citizenship and membership may be experienced: as a feeling of loss, as fear and alienation; but also as hope, joy and aspiration. Authors pay particular attention to the strategies that individuals put in place, on their own and collectively, in order to renegotiate membership in everyday situations and settings, from Roma encampments to the intimacy of family homes, from local authority offices to citizenship ceremonies.

Authors also give careful consideration to the external and internal borders of nation-states where new spaces of legal ambiguity and precariousness are forged and policed (Goldring and Landolt 2013). In her chapter, *Cecilia Menjivar* maps the emergence of new spaces of ‘irregularity’ produced in the interstices between federal and state legislations in the United States and invites scholars to pay more attention to how laws at the state level impact how individuals make sense of their rights and of citizenship and belonging from uncertain legal positions.

We expand the idea of space to consider the ways in which certain individuals are positioned in relation to ‘institutions of citizenship’; and explore how migrants and citizens alike may negotiate their positioning in order to seek certain rights and entitlements. The more intimate space of the family is the topic of the chapter by *Jane Lilly López*. Each year in the United States, tens

of thousands of American citizens legally marry non-citizens. López explores the ways in which the non-citizen status of one spouse can have significant family-level impacts on the other spouse's citizenship experience. Her chapter elucidates the interactions between the different dimensions of citizenship, clarifies the extent of the family-level impacts of citizenship, and challenges the notion of citizenship as a purely individual-level trait. *Kristen Biehl* explores how immigrants negotiate their position in urban spaces where distinct and conflicting rights regimes, and governing practices related to national belonging co-exist. Biehl's analysis of an Istanbul neighbourhood sheds light on how the meanings, practices and politics of membership in Turkey are being transformed in everyday spaces of encounter between diverse migrant groups.

### **Becoming political: contesting the boundaries of membership**

Having provided a snapshot of the ways in which citizenship and membership are experienced and also spatially and bureaucratically constructed, the chapters in Part 2 consider the ways in which policies and practices of exclusion are contested, both through social movements and individual acts of resistance and how the political claims of these figures of membership test the boundaries of the political community to generate 'new political relations across the terrain of human mobility and border control' (McNevin 2013: 182).

In order to discern the generative quality of ambivalence, the authors in Part 2 draw on original research conducted in a number of countries. They engage with issues of voice and representation and also critically examine the normative implications of alternative claims to membership which underlie resistance. For *Irene Bloemraad and her co-authors*, protest-based 'citizenship acts' have the capacity to empower and energize undocumented migrants and open up narrative and political spaces where the meaning of 'citizenship' can be renegotiated and be made more inclusive. These acts are not limited to non-citizen actors and citizenship is itself marked by multiple lines of inclusion and exclusion, as scholars of post 9/11 securitization have validly pointed out. The layering of citizenship can be understood within the broader phenomenon of civic stratification (Morris 2002). The 'acts of citizenship' of vulnerable citizens, such as stigmatized ethnic minorities, unsettle the imagined fixity of citizenship.

The occupation of an abandoned school in Rome by 50 Italian and immigrant families, three tent camps of 'failed' asylum seekers in a square in central Oslo, the 1,900 kilometre march of undocumented migrants across seven national borders and 20 European cities provide fitting ethnographic case studies of the instability of the binaries legal and 'illegal', citizens and aliens. *Rosa Parisi* argues that the struggle for a house becomes an opportunity for building and practising a different idea of citizenship which crosses the borders between nationals and aliens. For *Synnove Bendixsen*, the claims-making

tactics and strategies of undocumented migrants in Oslo illustrate how being irregular is an unfixed position, and that political agency is dynamically formed in relation to both the ideologies and cultural values of the governing system towards which the claims are made, and the self-defined, or self-understanding/identification of migrant actors. *Thomas Swerts'* analysis shows that the emergence of non-citizen political participation is transforming the meaning of citizenship from below. Swerts understands the march as a form of 'non-citizen citizenship', enacted in and through symbolic practices like the crossing of borders and the staging of protests. He concludes that the case of the European march simultaneously points to the advent of post-national forms of citizenship while re-confirming the importance of the nation state. *Huub van Baar* argues that the emergence of Romani activist and artistic practices can be considered as boundary practices of citizenship through which Romani migrants and asylum-seekers try to challenge their securitization and to claim various kinds of rights vis-à-vis state practices such as repatriation from Germany and expulsion from France.

In the epilogue *Anderson and Gibney* further expand the analytical terrain of this collection inviting us to shift our gaze from aspiring citizens (those hoping to be naturalised) to individuals who already hold a form of legal status, and argue that by looking at legal and political constructions of 'worthy' and 'unworthy' citizens enables us to locate a hierarchy of exclusions along a spectrum of membership that constructs the individuals concerned – depending on their breach of citizen norms – as more like an alien and less like a citizen.

## Notes

- 1 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. Number of I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals by Fiscal Year, Quarter, Intake, Biometrics and Case Status: 2012–2016 (30 June). Published 13 September 2016.
- 2 Gina is a pseudonym used to preserve anonymity.
- 3 Personal interview by Roberto G. Gonzales, 6 September 2016.
- 4 <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jul/03/theresa-may-europeans-uk-brexits-brits-abroad>
- 5 In his classic definition of citizenship – 'full membership of the community, with all its rights and responsibilities' – British sociologist T. H. Marshall (1950: 28–29) does not mention the state.
- 6 In the United States, for example, two pieces of legislation, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA) and Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), both signed into law by President Clinton in 1996, expanded (for immigration purposes) categories of offences designated as aggravated felony, and made detention and deportation mandatory penalties for these acts.

## References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: sovereign power and bare life*, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Anderson, B. (2013) *Us and them? The dangerous politics of immigration control*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, B., Gibney, M. and Paoletti, E. (2011) 'Citizenship, deportation and the boundaries of belonging', *Citizenship Studies*, 15(5): 547–563.
- Arendt, H. (1968) *Imperialism: part two of the origins of totalitarianism*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Balibar, E. (1988) 'Propositions on citizenship', *Ethics*, 98(4): 723–730.
- Benhabib, S. (2004) *The rights of others*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2007) 'Twilight of sovereignty or the emergence of cosmopolitan norms? Rethinking citizenship in volatile times', *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1): 19–36.
- Benton, L. (1994) *Law and colonial cultures*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloch, A., Sigona, N. and Zetter, R. (2014) *Sans papiers: the social and economic lives of undocumented migrants*, London: Pluto Press.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006) *Becoming a citizen: incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bosniak, L. (2006) *The citizen and the alien: dilemmas of contemporary citizenship*, Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (1992) *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany* (Vol. 21), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carens, J. (2013) *The ethics of immigration*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, S. (2013) 'The forces driving global migration', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 34(2): 122–140.
- Castles, S. and Davidson, A. (2000) *Citizenship and migration: globalization and the politics of belonging*, New York: Routledge.
- Chavez, L.R. (1992) *Shadowed lives: undocumented immigrants in American society*, San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Coutin, S. (2000) *Legalizing moves: Salvadoran immigrants' struggle for U.S. residency*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Coutin, S.B. (2003) 'Cultural logics of belonging and movement: transnationalism, naturalization, and US immigration politics', *American Ethnologist*: 508–526.
- De Genova, N. (2002) 'Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31: 419–447.
- Düvell, F. (2008) 'Clandestine migration in Europe', *Social Science Information*, 47(4): 479–497.
- Favell, A. (2010) 'European identity and European citizenship in three "Eurocities": a sociological approach to the European Union', *Politique Européenne*, 30(1): 187–224.
- Gleeson, S. (2010) 'Labor rights for all? The role of undocumented immigrant status for worker claims making', *Law and Social Inquiry*, 35: 561–602.
- Goldring, L. and Landolt, P. (eds) (2013) *Producing and Negotiating Non-Citizenship: Precarious Legal Status in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Goldring, L., Berinstein, C. and Bernhard, J.K. (2009) 'Institutionalizing precarious migratory status in Canada', *Citizenship Studies*, 13(3): 239–265.
- Gonzales, R.G. (2015) *Lives in limbo: undocumented and coming of age in America*, Oakland: University of California Press.
- Gonzales, R.G. and Chavez, L. (2012) "'Awakening to a nightmare": abjectivity and illegality in the lives of undocumented 1.5 generation Latino immigrants in the United States', *Current Anthropology*, 53(3): 255–281.

- Gonzales, R.G., Terriquez, V. and Rusczyk, S.P. (2014) 'Becoming DACAmended: assessing the short-term benefits of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(14): 1852–1872.
- Hammer, T. (1990) *Democracy and the nation state: aliens, denizens and citizens in a world of international migration*, Aldershot: Gower.
- Hepworth, K. (2014) 'Encounters with the clandestino/a and the nomad: the emplaced and embodied constitution of non-citizenship', *Citizenship Studies*, 18(1): 1–14.
- Isin, E. (2002) *Being political: genealogies of citizenship*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Isin, E.F. (2008) 'Theorising acts of citizenship', in E.F. Isin and G.M. Nielsen (eds), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 15–43), London: Zed Books.
- Jasso, G., Massey, D.S., Rosenzweig, M.R. and Smith, J.P. (2008) 'From illegal to legal: estimating previous illegal experience among new legal immigrants to the United States', *International Migration Review*, 42(4): 803–843.
- Jones-Correa, M. (2005) 'The bureaucratic incorporation of immigrants in suburbia', *Immigration to the United States: New Sources and Destinations Conference*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, February (Vol. 3).
- Joppke, C. (1999) *Immigration and the nation-state: the United States, Germany, and Great Britain*, London: Clarendon Press.
- Joppke, C. (2010) *Citizenship and immigration* (Vol. 2), Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kubal, A. (2013) 'Conceptualizing semi-legality in migration research', *Law and Society Review*, 47(3): 555–587.
- Lewis, P.G. and Ramakrishnan, S.K. (2007) 'Police practices in immigrant-destination cities: political control or bureaucratic professionalism?' *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(6): 874–900.
- Marrow, H.B. (2009) 'Immigrant bureaucratic incorporation: the dual roles of professional missions and government policies', *American Sociological Review*, 74(5): 756–776.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950) *Citizenship and social class* (Vol. 11), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McNevin, A. (2009), 'Contesting citizenship: irregular migrants and strategic possibilities for political belonging', *New Political Science*, 31(2): 163–181.
- McNevin, A. (2011) *Contesting citizenship: irregular migrants and new frontiers of the political*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- McNevin, A. (2013) 'Ambivalence and citizenship: theorising the political claims of irregular migrants', *Millennium*, 41(2) 182–200.
- Menjívar, C. (2006) 'Liminal legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan immigrants' lives in the United States', *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(4): 999–1037.
- Menjívar, C. and Kanstroom, D. (eds) (2013) *Constructing immigrant 'illegality': critiques, experiences, and responses*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, L. (2002) *Managing migration: civic stratification and migrants' rights*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Nyers, P. and Rygiel, K. (2012) *Citizenship, migrant activism and the politics of movement*, London: Routledge.
- Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible citizenship. The cultural logics of transnationality*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Piketty, T. (2013) *Capital in the 21st century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rancière, J. (2010) *Dissensus: on politics and aesthetics*, London: Continuum.

- Redclift, V. (2013) *Statelessness and citizenship*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Reed-Danahay, D. and Brettell, C.B. (eds) (2008) *Citizenship, political engagement, and belonging: immigrants in Europe and the United States*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rigo, E. (2011) 'Citizens despite borders: challenges to the territorial order of Europe', in Squire, V. (ed.) *The contested politics of mobility: borderzones and irregularity*, London: Routledge.
- Rosaldo, R. (1994) 'Cultural citizenship and educational democracy', *Cultural Anthropology*, 9(3): 402–411.
- Ruhs, M. and Anderson, B. (2006) 'The origins and functions of illegality in migrant labour markets: an analysis of migrants, employers and the state in the UK', WP-06-30a, COMPAS working papers, Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Rytter, M. (2012) 'Semilegal family life: Pakistani couples in the borderlands of Denmark and Sweden', *Global Networks*, 12(1): 91–108.
- Sassen, S. (1998) *Globalization and its discontents: essays on the new mobility of people and money*, New York: New Press.
- Sassen, S. (2002) 'The repositioning of citizenship: emergent subjects and spaces for politics', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 46: 4–24.
- Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, authority, rights: from Medieval to global assemblages* (Vol. 4), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sigona, N. (2012) "'I have too much baggage": the impact of legal status on the social worlds of irregular migrants', *Social Anthropology*, 20(1): 50–65.
- Sigona, N. (2015) 'Campzanship: reimagining the camp as a social and political space', *Citizenship Studies*, 19(1): 1–15.
- Sigona, N. (2016) 'Everyday statelessness: status, rights and camps', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(2): 263–279.
- Sigona, N. and Hughes, V. (2012) *No way out, no way in: irregular migrant children and families in the UK*, Oxford: COMPAS.
- Soysal, N.Y. (1994) *Limits of citizenship: migrant and postnational membership in Europe*, Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Squire, V. (2010) (ed.) *The contested politics of mobility: borderzones and irregularity*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Tonkiss, K. and Bloom, T. (2016) 'Focus: re-thinking noncitizenship', *Focus*, 31.
- Willen, S.S. (2007) 'Toward a critical phenomenology of "illegality": state power, criminalization, and abjectivity among undocumented migrant workers in Tel Aviv, Israel', *International Migration*, 45(3): 8–38.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006) 'Belonging and the politics of belonging', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40(3): 197–214.
- Zetter, R. (2007) 'More labels, fewer refugees: remaking the refugee label in an era of globalisation', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2): 172–192.