Transnational citizenship across the Americas

Ulla Dalum Berg & Robyn Magalit Rodriguez

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

INTRODUCTION

Transnational citizenship across the Americas

Ulla Dalum Berg and Robyn Magalit Rodriguez

A variety of phenomena including mass migrations, diasporas, dual citizenship arrangements, neoliberal economic reforms and global social justice movements have since the 1970s produced shifting boundaries and meanings of citizenship within and beyond the Americas. This special issue builds upon, but also extends, prior discussions on transnational citizenship, by situating new practices of 'immigrant' and 'emigrant' citizenship and the policies that both facilitate and delimit them in a broader political–economic context and accounts for how new forms of neoliberal governance shape such practices. The essays included here draw from a range of disciplines and inter-disciplinary perspectives that focus on migration between the United States and countries in Latin America and the Caribbean which in recent years have been transformed into 'emigrant states.'

Keywords: transnational citizenship; migration; emigrant states; neoliberal globalisation; the Americas

1. Introduction

In what is often referred to as 'the current era of globalization,' pre-existing dominant notions of national sovereignty and citizenship have been profoundly challenged. A variety of phenomena including mass migrations, diasporas, dual citizenship arrangements, neoliberal economic reforms and global social justice movements have since the 1970s produced shifting boundaries and meanings of citizenship within and beyond the Americas. In 'receiving' or destination countries, this has raised questions about how or whether to extend rights to newcomers. In sending countries, it has led states to find new ways of including their emigrant citizens into the nation state. This introduction and the essays included in this special issue builds upon, but also extends, prior discussions on migration and citizenship, by situating new practices of 'immigrant' and 'emigrant' citizenship and the policies that both facilitate and delimit them in a broader political–economic context and accounts for how new forms of neoliberal governance shape them. We ask: what is happening to the institution of citizenship under conditions of mass migration and neoliberal globalisation? What historical and contemporary processes made the 'immigrant figure' unworthy of citizenship in places like the United States regardless of whether or not they have been US citizens for generations? Why has the constriction of immigrant citizenship in the United States

accompanied the emergence of new forms of emigrant citizenship all over Latin America and the Caribbean? What is the relationship between the profound market reforms and retrenchment of the public sector and current attempts of Latin American states to reach out to emigrant citizens abroad? How are migrants making claims of belonging within the context of their 'unworthiness' in receiving countries like the United States and their new-found status as 'heroic' overseas citizens with relation to their countries of origin?

In this special issue, we present work on transnational citizenship in the Americas from a range of disciplines and inter-disciplinary perspectives that focus on migrants based in the United States from countries in Latin America and the Caribbean that have been transformed in recent decades into 'emigrant states.' We use the term 'across the Americas' not just to denominate the geographical span of the contributions but also to de-stabilise the dominant conflation between the US and 'America,' and just as importantly to point to the inter-connectedness of populations, economies and historical and political processes that simultaneously shape citizenship in the US and in Latin American and Caribbean countries.

2.   Transnational citizenship and its limits

Citizenship is conventionally defined as membership in a political and geographic community. Although its definition and scope is contested among scholars (Barry 2006), it is typically disaggregated into four dimensions: legal status, rights, political activity and other forms of participation in society, and as collective identity and sentiments of belonging (Bosniak 2000).[1] Yet, the fact that, as Nancy Fraser puts it, 'every state now has noncitizens on its territory and every nationality is territorially dispersed' (2007, p. 16) has forced scholars of citizenship to think of alternative modalities of membership and reckon with how migration and other global processes have challenged – and in some cases reaffirmed – notions of sovereignty, national identity and state control all of which have been historically linked to citizenship (Bloemraad *et al.* 2008). Thus in recent years, scholars from a range of disciplines and inter-disciplinary perspectives have increasingly gone beyond conventional notions of citizenship to come up with new theories and models for understanding the political activities and attachments of mobile subjects who either live outside of their country of citizenship or whose attachments otherwise span national borders. Adding various adjectives, they have reworked the concept of citizenship to better fit global and contemporary conditions of life within and between nation-states. The terms used to refer to such a realignment of territory, political institutions and society resulting from processes of 'globalization from below' include, but are not limited to 'post national citizenship' (Soysal 1994), 'multicultural citizenship' (Kymlicka 1995), 'cultural citizenship' (Flores and Benmayor 1997, Rosaldo 1997), 'diasporic citizenship' (Laguerre 1998), 'cosmopolitan citizenship' (Linklater 1998), 'urban citizenship' (Varsanyi 2006), 'stakeholder citizenship' (Bauböck 2007), 'emigrant citizenship' (Coutin 2007) and 'transnational citizenship' (Bauböck 1994, Smith 2003, Fox 2005). The question can rightfully be posed for any of these concepts, as Jonathan Fox (2005) does

for 'transnational citizenship,' whether or not the concept is indeed suitable at all to account for the variety of practices in which states and migrants are redefining each other and the social contract that binds them together. If used narrowly, Fox argues, only dual citizenship would qualify for the term 'transnational citizenship' yet, if used too broadly, conceptual stretching might risk emptying the concept of meaning altogether. In this special issue, we use the concept of transnational citizenship as a framing device to analyse changing relations between states and citizenship across the Americas and within the contexts of transnational migration and neoliberal globalisation. Our contributors embrace Jonathan Fox's call for an analytical shift towards 'the dynamics and textures of participation' (2005, p. 171) in studies of transnational citizenship. Providing theoretically engaging discussions and empirically diverse case studies, the special issue thus contributes to debates that move beyond conventional notions of citizenship and national sovereignty and proposes that juridical 'state-based' categories of citizenship are out of touch with actual domains of practice in transnational and global contexts in which the state is no longer the exclusive arena for the practice of citizenship. This does not mean however that rights guaranteed by the receiving or sending states are increasingly irrelevant because individuals are ensured a set of universally accepted rights regardless of their membership in particular states.[2] On the contrary, states continue to play a critical role as granters of rights for single or multiple citizenship (in the case of dual nationality laws). However, the ability of people to act as transnational citizens is mediated by inequalities along the axes of gender, race, nationality and class, both in and between source and destination countries. This special issue features work that analyses the exclusionary politics and processes that constitute transnational citizenship and belonging in the era of neoliberal globalisation, resulting in a plethora of possible relations between states and migrants where 'embracement-cum-inclusion' is just one among other modalities.

Understanding these new forms of citizenship emerging out of a variety of empirical contexts requires a transnational perspective that can account for not only the actions of migrants and their organisations and the structuring activities of the state, but also the larger global forces which shape and produce these practices. Perhaps, the biggest shortcoming of much of the immigration and citizenship literature is that it does not focus enough on political economy or on the neoliberal forms of governance that shape the conditions of possibility of citizenship practices today. With this special issue, we argue that it is difficult, if not impossible, to fully explain and understand the dynamics and textures of transnational citizenship practices by Latin American and Caribbean migrants without understanding them in the context of a particular form of neoliberal globalisation.

3.   Neoliberal globalisation and transnational citizenship in the Americas

Neoliberalism is typically defined as a political ideology that posits the supremacy of the market over the state in regulating nearly all domains of social life (Brown 2003, Harvey 2007, Centeno and Cohen 2012). This political ideology has become

an increasingly hegemonic project globally. Neoliberal globalisation produces great (and growing) inequality not only within but also between states. The resulting 'sovereignty differentials' have vastly different consequences for different states, regimes of citizenship and for the possibilities for citizenship practice.

Amongst the key instruments of neoliberal globalisation in the formerly colonised world are structural adjustment programs. Following theorists who posited that creating optimum conditions for capitalist development would lead to 'modernization' or a 'catching up' to the West, many governments in Latin America actively intervened in their economies in the immediate decades after WWII aided by loans from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF). By the late 1970s and early 1980s, however, when the once-low interest loans granted by the World Bank and IMF spiked up, these debts became too onerous and resulted in what has become widely known as the Latin American and the Caribbean 'debt crisis.' Many governments in the region simply could not pay their loans and, paradoxically, they returned to the World Bank and IMF for bailout loans to pay their already existing loans. It was during this period that multilateral institutions impact 'structural adjustment' programs in the region (Babb 2005).

Neoliberal structural adjustment reform agreements particularly impacts social citizenship (i.e. access to public education, health and other social redistribution and welfare benefits) and its requisite rights and obligations in Latin American and Caribbean states. It can indeed be argued that the historical contractions of social citizenship in different Latin American and Caribbean countries that accelerated in the 1980s and 1990s, along with century-old structures of social and racial inequality, have impelled the large-scale migrations of the last three decades. Scholars of Mexican migration, for instance, have tracked an increase in emigration as a consequence of NAFTA, which integrated all markets except labour markets (Massey *et al.* 2002, Durand and Massey 2003).

It is during this same period, when national citizenship is being undermined, that Latin American and Caribbean countries have extended transnational citizenship to their overseas citizens. Migrants abroad are being re-incorporated into the body politic of migrant-sending states through a re-imagining of migrant subjects abroad as 'national heroes' and as partners in development. The celebration of the migrant as 'hero' is a shift in many ways from prior representations of migrants as threats to or traitors of the national project of the liberal state, and the act of migration as an act of abandonment of a national project of the whitened, criollo elites (Berg 2010). This shift is occurring in countries like Mexico, El Salvador, Peru and beyond Latin America, the Philippines. To herald the migrant as the new agent of development is to efface actual conditions of neoliberal reform and the fact that the long-term social effect of such reforms is what to a great extent have spurred contemporary migration. Indeed, migrants' remittances ultimately cushion source countries' resident populations since much of the remittance money is used to pay for once-free social services like education and health care as well as for the rising costs of now privatized utilities like water, gas, etc. (Faist 2008; see also Ratha 2005). As Fitzgerald suggests, 'remitting migrants are in

some ways perfect citizens, who give their resources while demanding little in return' (Fitzgerald 2009, p. 159). In many countries, migrants as 'perfect citizens' now set the standard around which other citizen-subjects are to be aligned. One might even say that migrants are the most ideal transnational neoliberal subjects because they are highly responsible, and self-motivated individuals who not only sustain their families at home but they also sustain themselves abroad. Moreover, migrants' remittances enable new forms of consumption which has increasingly become defined as its own contribution to citizenship (Trentmann 2007).Yet, what explains the seeming paradox of the diminishing of national citizenship alongside the expansion of emigrant citizenship?

Under conditions of neoliberal globalisation, citizenship is, as Ong (2006) puts it, 'mutating.' Ong argues that what has emerged in her region of focus (Southeast Asia) is a 'system of graduated sovereignty, whereby citizens in zones that are differently articulated to global production and financial circuits are subjected to different kinds of surveillance and in practice enjoy different sets of civil, political, and economic rights' (1999, pp. 215–216). These graduated zones, Ong argues, also protect states against pockets of political unrest by calibrating their control over sovereignty to the challenges of global capital. The notion of 'graduated sovereignty' is a productive one that can help us to understand the emergence of new forms of transnational citizenship in Latin America and, indeed, in other parts of the world (Rodriguez 2010). Emigrant citizenship is amongst the strategies by which the migrant-sending state can protect itself against pockets of political unrest. Hindess, for example, argues that 'democracy,' as institutionalised through the extension of citizenship, 'is the most effective means of ensuring that people will "own", or at least that they not actively resist, the package of political and economic reforms which their governments are required to implement' (Hindess 2002, p. 137). Hence, emigrant citizenship in Latin America and the Caribbean can be thought of as a modality of neoliberal governmentality by which populations are governed in ways that orient and comport them to the demands of the capitalist market (See Dean 1999, Brown 2003, Blom Hansen and Stepputat 2006, Ong 2006 for discussions of governmentality).

Complementing shifts in citizenship in sending countries are shifts in citizenship in destination countries. 'Receiving' states are retracting the kinds of social goods and privileges that were once attached to citizenship; indeed, 'immigrants' in destination countries like the United States, especially those who migrated and entered the country without proper state authorisation, are oftentimes ineligible for these social goods and privileges which are increasingly set aside only for citizens. This was the case in the United States, for example, when anti-immigration laws were passed alongside major welfare reforms in 1996 restricting access to social services for non-citizens. Even as they pay income and other taxes and contribute to the US society and economy in a variety of ways, immigrants are frequently portrayed, in the words of anthropologist Jonathan Xavier Inda, as 'parasite[s] intruding on the body of the host nation, drawing nutrients from it, while providing nothing to its survival and even threatening its well-being' (2000, p. 47). Indeed,

as Georges Fouron argues in this special issue, Haitian immigrants are oftentimes thought of and racialised as diseased black bodies. Consequently, in the nativist logic, such immigrants' access to the nation's goods must be limited.

The growing presence and visibility of Latin American migrants in the United States has heightened nativism and numerous anti-immigration laws and policies, constructing migrants, particularly those of Mexican and Central American origin, and their US-born children and grandchildren, as internal, cultural Others and perilous to national stability and continuity (Chávez 2008). For example, in Arizona, state and local policy-makers have in the past decade enacted a series of major laws, such as the 2010 SB1070, with the explicit aim of reducing the viability of life for immigrants in the state – by many considered the strictest and most anti-immigrant measure in recent US history. Moreover, national and regional security apparatuses put into place in the wake of 9/11 have led not only to the detention and deportation of long-term residents who do not enjoy the legal protection of citizens, but also to further labour subordination and social disciplining of non-citizens as a result of what Nicholas De Genova calls 'deportability,' that is, the imminent threat of forced removal (De Genova 2002). Some Latin American migrants, for example Salvadoran refugees turned gang members in the US, have even come to symbolise what Elana Zilberg (2011) terms 'the gang crime – terrorism continuum,' which have rendered these groups as potential terrorist threats.

If the pressures of the neoliberal project have made citizenship across the Americas precarious in new kinds of ways, the global financial crisis beginning in 2008 has increased this precariousness (Munck *et al.* 2011). While the financial crisis, on the one hand, temporarily dampened demand for migrant labour on the farmlands and in the metropolitan centres of the North and curbed the ability of migrants to send remittance at the scale they did before the financial collapse (Latin American and Caribbean Economic System (SELA) 2009), current statistics show that remittances since 2011 have been on their way up (Maldonado *et al*. 2012). The crisis may in fact also drive up the 'post-crisis' demand for migrant labour because migrants, especially the undocumented, represent the ideal 'flexible worker' (Castles 2011) who work on short term or no contract and without worker benefits. On the other hand, because the entitlements of citizenship are becoming more and more limited, Munck *et al.* argue (2011, p. 255), '[p]recarious citizenship is rapidly becoming a form of controlling the other and constructing the non-citizen in an exclusionary mode based most often on racialisation.' In this way, migrants are increasingly becoming subject to what these authors call 'the disciplinary threat of non-citizenship' (Munck *et al*. 2011, p. 255). De Genova (2010) has shown how in recent years global security regimes are amongst the apparatuses disciplining citizenship. While these exclusionary mechanisms of citizenship are not particularly new – in fact, US citizenship has always been defined in exclusionary way as Vargas-Ramos' article on Puerto Rican migrants reminds us – they are becoming increasingly visible as divides between rich and poor, citizen and non-citizens, and legal and 'illegal' become more salient.

In sum, as citizenship entitlements narrow in destination countries and the scope of policing and controlling to whom these entitlements belong is broadening, source countries are extending citizenship transnationally to their overseas citizens into their 'rightful' homes. Scholars like Escobar draw connections between shifting citizenship regimes in sending and receiving countries. These shifts are mutually constitutive in her view. Escobar attributes the expansion of dual citizenship laws and extension of extraterritorial rights in Latin America to anti-immigration legislation in the United States in the 1990s linked to US neoliberal reform. She argues that after the immigration law of 1996, several Latin American countries changed their laws and constitutions to guarantee that their emigrant citizens could access citizenship rights in the United States or defend the rights they had previously possessed as legal residents, but which they had lost after 1996 (Escobar 2007, p. 51). It should not be surprising then, for the case of Mexico, that the emergence of the 'heroism' discourse and new forms of dual citizenship emerged in 1998, only a few short years after the introduction of NAFTA and of the 1996 immigration law in the United States. Under contemporary conditions of neoliberal globalisation, citizenship everywhere is increasingly less about rights and privileges and more a 'key mechanism,' as suggested by Munck *et al.* (2011), for nation-states to regularise the transnational flows of labour across national boundaries.

Transnational citizenship practices, as the contributions to this special issue usefully demonstrate, must be understood as an outcome of sovereignty differentials between states and transnational contestations between states and subjects (both citizen and non-citizen) over economic, political and social rights within the context of neoliberal globalisation and transnational security regimes. The new transnationalised citizenship regimes that we are witnessing emerge all over the Americas (and elsewhere in the world) are characterised by transnationality (i.e. the territoriality of citizenship is being rescaled) and by multiple forms of social and racialised exclusion (or inclusion) rooted in sovereignty differentials (Coutin and McGuire; Fouron). Moreover, diasporic populations and migrant communities abroad frequently make claims on and participate in the source country either because of the multiple exclusions they face in the destination country (Vargas-Ramos), or they make claims to belonging in destination countries regardless of what their legal status or citizenship may be (Galvez). Indeed, migrants may even eschew nation-based citizenships in favour of other forms of political collectivity (Rodriguez).

4.   Overview of contributions

The contributions to this special issue offer important interventions in understanding transnational citizenship as it is extended (or denied) to and practiced by migrants who move between Latin America and the Caribbean and the United States. It is perhaps important to underscore that we and our contributors did not start out with a shared understanding or definition of 'transnational citizenship.'

But as noted above, all contributors coincide in their awareness of the limits of the conventional juridical category of 'citizenship,' including its exclusionary dynamics, and all focus on the various ways in which axis of difference along the lines of race, class and legal status matters in the construction of citizenship and how these dynamics unfold and are extended transnationally. Each author represented here treats citizenship as a dynamic and strategic concept and looks at how the abilities of people to act as citizens in certain social spaces is structured by larger political and economic forces both in source and destination country as well as transnationally.

Our decision to focus this special issue on the geopolitical and socio-cultural terrain of the Americas brings in various issues particular to the histories of governance, citizenship and democracy that characterise this part of the world and connect populations, economies and historical and cultural processes across the Americas. All of the cases featured here are countries with clear historical ties to colonialism, empire, US military occupations, large-scale mass migrations and, more recently, free-trade agreements and transnational security regimes.

Puerto Rico is an important case that has often figured as an anomaly in migration studies as Puerto Ricans are citizens of the country to which they mostly migrate (the US). Along with the Philippines, Cuba and Guam, Puerto Rico was acquired by the United States from Spain at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War in 1898 and the US and Puerto Rico thus began a long-standing relationship. US citizenship was imposed on Puerto Ricans with the passing of the Jones Act in 1917 and in 1947 Puerto Rico was granted the right to elect their own governor. Yet, many Puerto Ricans, both those who migrated and those who did not, were living for most of the twentieth century with the failed promises of American citizenship (Thomas 2010). Until this day, Puerto Ricans are still perceived in the US as 'second-class' citizens who embody many of the social ills of US society including poverty, crime and violence, etc., what Ana Ramos-Zayas has referred to as 'delinquent citizenship' (2004). Indeed, the Puerto Rican case perhaps most emblematises how sovereignty differentials between different nations, along with racialisation and cultural and language differences, play a role in exclusion. Puerto Ricans can only fully exercise their citizenship rights when they move to the United States but most of the time, as Vargas-Ramos finds, they simply do not. Indeed, it is not as if Puerto Ricans are politically apathetic. They are highly involved in a range of political activities when they are in Puerto Rico even when returning to the island after long periods of absence. For Vargas-Ramos, this illustrates how more than citizenship it is perhaps belonging that matters most in terms of whether and to what degree people get involved politically. He notes that the difference in rates of Puerto Ricans' political involvement illustrates how politics is structured differently in each political community: Puerto Rico's political community is inclusive whereas the US political system operates largely in a manner that sidelines newcomers and marginalises the undesired colonial Other.

El Salvador is a particularly interesting case for the discussion of transnational citizenship because this Central American country is located at the centre of debates in the US about what Elana Zilberg calls the 'neoliberal security-scape' (2011, p. 3); that is the contemporary manifestation of long-standing and contested attempts of both El Salvador and the United States to control the mobility of subjects deemed problematic or dangerous – attempts which also ends up fuelling new forms of mobility.[3] Based on interviews with deported gang members from the US to El Salvador and US Foreign Service Officers (FSOs) stationed in El Salvador, Susan Coutin and Connie McGuire address and juxtapose the life circumstances of migrants and FSOs as very different kinds of transnational subjects who all fall outside of the nation's borders. As transnational subjects, deportees are doubly excluded because their presence is rendered undesirable to both the sending and receiving states by the very transnational processes that constitute their condition of exclusion. In contrast, FSO are doubly included because of their privileged access to US citizenship and because their position as foreign diplomats in El Salvador grants them access to privileges otherwise reserved for Salvadoran elites. Coutin and McGuire develop the concepts of 'transnational alienage' to analyse the experiences of long-time US residents who were deported to El Salvador as criminal deportees and 'transnational foreignness' to understand the experiences of US Foreign Service Officers (FSOs) stationed in Central America and Mexico. Though positioned very differently – one group as abject non-citizen deportees and the other as what we could call 'hyper-citizen' FSOs – deportees' and FSOs' lives are entangled and connected through the very transnational processes that either grant or deny them the privilege of membership. Analysing and juxtaposing life narratives from these differently positioned transnational subjects, Coutin and McGuire argument, can shed light on the uneven spaces, subjectivities and membership claims produced by national security regimes. Indeed, what these authors offer is a sobering exposition on sovereignty differentials between states, particularly the United States' privileged position in the world order, and the impact that this differential has for citizenship and exclusion transnationally. FSOs' mobility is tied to their US citizenship and their job is to carry out the work of US border enforcement extraterritorially. Hence, a very novel intervention by Coutin and McGuire is that they examine American citizenship (as 'transnational foreignness') from a transnational lens. Indeed, for those who hold American citizenship, it is perhaps a form of transnational citizenship *par excellence*. US citizens' ability to do this work, however, is premised on the assent and cooperation of the El Salvadoran state, further highlighting the sovereignty differentials at play.

Haiti is included as a case study in this special issue because of the salience of race in the transnational scholarship on Haiti and because of Haiti's pioneering experience of its Tenth Department. In the late 1980s, the Haitian government of Henry Namphy created the Office of Diasporic Affairs, which when Jean-Bertrand Aristide took office in 1991 was moved to the Office of the President (Laguerre 1998, p. 163). Aristide created the Ministry of Haitians Living Abroad (Ministere

des Haitiens vivant a l'Etranger) in 1994, which became the main bureaucratic entity to coordinate the relations between the diaspora and the government of Haiti. The Aristide administration conceptualised the Haitian diaspora symbolically as the Tenth Department (Le Dixieme Departemente), an extraterritorial unit of the Republic, which comprised Haitian migrants living mainly in the US, Canada and France.[4] Yet, migrants abroad also have their own understandings about belonging and affective attachment to their homeland. Glick-Schiller and Fouron (2001) have argued how family obligations and the experiences of immigration are understood through a language of blood and descent that link Haitian migrants in the US to broader concepts of a transnational homeland that Haitians enact through 'long-distance nationalism.' But at the same time, notions of 'blood' and 'homeland' can also be a mechanism of exclusion. George Fouron's paper in this special issue reminds us of the ways US citizenship is ultimately an exclusionary institution that is based on racialised understandings of belonging. Fouron's piece illustrates how exclusionary citizenship in the United States is defined transnationally. First, citizenship exclusion (which is ultimately linked to immigration exclusion) can be attributed to diplomatic, state–state relations. Fouron finds, for example, that Haitian migrants have been inconsistently welcomed to the United States based on the United States' shifting relations with Haiti. Often privileging Cold War imperatives over the principle of humanitarianism, Haitian refugees fleeing from the US-backed authoritarian Duvalier regime were not given immediate entry into the United States because they were fleeing a US government ally.[5] At the same time, Haitians were excluded and racialised simply because they were black. Haitian boat people, according to Fouron, were figured as destitute people seeking to 'sponge off the welfare system,' and were racialised in much the same way as African-Americans (also an excluded group of US citizens). Fouron reminds us how US citizenship is deeply defined by 'anti-blackness' (see Martinot and Sexton 2003, Wilderson 2003) and persistent notions of 'white supremacy' (Feagin 2001). At the same time, the exclusion of Haitians also occurred in the context of transnational public health concerns. Fearful that Haitians were carriers of HIV/AIDS, public health officials automatically incorporated them into the at-risk group for HIV/AIDS, which automatically would limit their immigration admission to the United States. Reminiscent of other kinds of public health threats attributed to selected immigrant groups (Asians as carriers of 'bird flu,' Mexicans as carriers of tuberculosis, etc.), the exclusion of Haitian immigrants based on such dubious 'medical grounds' is an important example of the ways that racialised immigrant bodies are seen as 'contagion,' a threat contaminating the US body politic. This view is extended to the second-generation and also to immigrants' naturalised counterparts (regardless of how many years they have lived in the United States) who, as Fouron forcefully argues, are still figured as such latent threats.

Both Fouron and Coutin and McGuire provide important insights on the transnational and extraterritorial constitution of US citizenship, and relatedly, US

boundary-making and enforcement. That is, their contributions highlight how unequal relations of power between the United States and countries like Haiti and El Salvador have crucial impacts on the way citizenship is defined for Haitians and Salvadorans as well as for how these populations experience and try to claim citizenship and belonging. The unequal power relations at play in both these cases are exacerbated by neoliberalism, on the one hand, and securitisation on the other. Yet, at the same time, the Haitian and El Salvadoran state are also implicated in colluding with the United States around a neoliberal and global security agenda.

No discussion of transnational migration and citizenship across the Americas is complete without a sustained discussion of US–Mexico relations. Not only is the Mexican population in the US larger than all other Latin American national-origin groups combined, but Mexico is also a distinct case because of the strong and proactive presence of both the Mexican federal state and state governments since the 1990s (Goldring 2001, Smith 2003, Escobar 2006).[6] These various levels of government in Mexico engage in the promotion of matching funds programs (*dos-por-uno* and now also *tres-por-uno*, reflecting the neoliberal logic of maximisation) and a number of other outreach efforts. These efforts lead to the establishment of the Institute for Mexicans Abroad (IME) in 2011, which hosts a consultative council of over a hundred Mexican migrant organisations in the US and Canada. Yet as a predominantly rural migration flow, Mexican migrants also sustain strong loyalties and translocal ties and consistent involvement in community affairs back home outside of the immediate realm of the state (Rouse 1995, Fox and Rivera-Salgado 2004, Smith 2006, Stephen 2007).

Alyshia Galvez's piece on the experiences of citizenship among undocumented Mexicans in the United States reminds us that citizenship is always vernacular; that is, it is always shaped by cultural practices, whether this concerns the practices of states or citizens (as well as of those non-citizens who claim citizenship). Moreover, Gálvez suggests, we need to question whether citizenship as a fluid and ever changing and contested category is the only mechanism by which to understand claims for rights. Her paper draws on ethnographic data from two different research projects with largely undocumented Mexican immigrants in New York City to examine the lived, or vernacular meanings of citizenship for these immigrants. She finds that immigrants are centrally concerned with asserting their right to mobility against the immobility they experience as undocumented immigrants and non-citizens under the conditions of the United States' neoliberal security regime. The centrality of this demand for mobility is important because through this demand, undocumented migrants are making a claim to 'transnational citizenship' in the sense of being able to cross borders at will to actualise their lives without the constant threat produced by their 'condition of illegality.' Differently put, their claims to mobility, or freedom of movement, might be understood as exceeding the boundaries of citizenship since citizenship is ultimately nation–state based. Neither, however, are their claims to mobility being

articulated simply in 'human rights' terms, which are ultimately guaranteed by states. Galvez cautions, however, that demands for mobility may be construed as a form of neoliberal citizenship, which is not a guarantee of inclusion or rights. She argues that while there might be emancipatory and radical potential in conceptualisations of 'vernacular citizenship', at the same time it can also reinforce neoliberal notions of an idealised self-regulating citizen-subject.

Finally, Rodriguez's contribution broadens the discussion by focusing on alliances between Latin American and Asian migrants in transnational political spaces. Rodriguez examines how migrants in Latin America together with their counterparts in Asia articulate critiques of the neoliberal migration-as-development programs (around which source states have tried to reincorporate their emigrant citizens) that are being propagated by and through multilateral formations like the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). Specifically, Rodriguez traces the formation of the International Migrants Alliance (IMA) and the campaigns it has engaged in since its establishment. Founded in 2008 by 108 self-described 'grassroots' migrant organisations, the IMA is one of several transnational coalitions of groups from nearly every continent of the world with a sizeable number of groups from Asia and Latin America, yet it represents one of the most radical sectors of the transnational organising grassroots. Rodriguez suggests that through their work in IMA, migrants from across the globe express a new form of political subjectivity, what she calls 'migrant labour transnationalism,' that has the potential to transcend the historic divides of race, nation and citizenship. Migrant labour transnationalism, unlike the homeland-oriented, citizenship-based, state-complicit forms of migrant political transnationalism generally identified in the scholarship, is based on counter-hegemonic nationalisms through which migrants' contest their home states' complicity with the project of neoliberal globalisation. Migrant labour transnationalism is, moreover, formed through contentious forms of engagements and new transnational networks, and offers migrants the possibility of new class-based collective identifications that are not constrained by citizenship nor by labour unions or other traditional international labour organisations. If, as this special issue illustrates, transnational citizenship is ultimately a form of neoliberal citizenship, migrant labour activists through their work in coalitions such as the IMA offer new imaginaries of collectivity that are worth paying attention to.

In sum, as a whole, this special issue offers a fresh perspective on the complex politics of inclusion and exclusion entailed in current attempts of state officials and migrants in both source and destination countries across the Americas to extend, claim and enact forms of transnational citizenship. Despite the global financial crises of the late 2000s and the current proliferation of global securityscapes, migration flows across the Americas and across the globe – indeed as a product of neoliberal globalisation in the broadest sense – are not likely to lessen anytime soon and hence, the boundaries of citizenship will continue to be challenged as

people go about living their lives and claiming their rights across the borders that come in their way.

Notes

1. In Latin American scholarship, the Spanish term *ciudadania*, which translates as citizenship, encompass both the notion of political membership and belonging but also as social rights, in English usually labelled as 'social citizenship' or 'substantive citizenship.' For an overview of citizenship debates in Latin America, see Dagnino (2003) and Taylor and Wilson (2004).
2. The UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families would be one such example among many others of universal rights.
3. Zilberg (2011) notes, for example, how former US-bound Salvadoran refugees turned 'deportee trash' are now seen fleeing El Salvador a second time around, this time as victims of gang war violence in El Salvador, a distinct US cultural influence, one could argue, on this Central American nation.
4. The government first appointed the leaders for the Tenth Department, but grassroots community leaders who represented larger constituencies soon challenged these government appointed leaders (Laguerre 1998, pp. 162–163; see also Glick-Schiller and Fouron 2001).
5. This same tendency can be observed elsewhere in Latin America, for example, when Guatemalan and Salvadoran who fled violence in their home countries in the 1980s had much lower approval rates on their asylum applications than their Nicaraguan counterparts, because they were fleeing US backed right-winged authoritarian regimes.
6. Mexicans are the largest population of Hispanic origin living in the United States, representing a total of 33.5 million Hispanics of Mexican origin, which accounts for nearly two-thirds (64.6%) of the US Hispanic population in 2011, according to the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (Pew Hispanic Center 2013).

References

Babb, S., 2005. The social consequences of structural adjustment: recent evidence and current debates. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31 (1), 199–222.

Barry, K., 2006. Home and away: the construction of citizenship in an emigration era. *NYU Law Review*, 81, 11–59.

Bauböck, R., 1994. *Transnational citizenship: membership and rights in international migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bauböck, R., 2007. Stakeholder citizenship and transnational political participation: a normative evaluation of external voting. *Fordham Law Review*, 75 (5), 2393–2447.

Berg, U.D., 2010. El Quinto Suyo: contemporary nation-building and the political economy of emigration in Peru. *Latin American Perspectives*, 37 (5), 121–136.

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., and Yurdakul, G., 2008. Citizenship and immigration: multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 153–179.

Blom Hansen, T. and Stepputat, F., 2006. Sovereignty revisited. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35 (1), 295–315.

Bosniak, L., 2000. Citizen denationalized. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 7, 447–509.

Brown, W., 2003. Neoliberalism and the end of liberal democracy. *Theory and Event*, 7 (1).

Castles, S., 2011. Migration, crisis and the global labour market. *Globalizations*, 8 (3), 311–324.

Centeno, M.A. and Cohen, J.N., 2012. The arc of neoliberalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38, 317–340.

Chavez, L.R., 2008. *The Latino threat: constructing immigrants, citizens, and the nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Coutin, S.B., 2007. *Nations of emigrants: shifting boundaries of citizenship in El Salvador and the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dagnino, E., 2003. Citizenship in Latin America: an introduction. *Latin American Perspectives*, 30 (2), 211–225.

De Genova, N., 2002. Migrant 'illegality' and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 419–447.

De Genova, N., 2010. Antiterrorism, race, and the new frontier: American exceptionalism, imperial multiculturalism, and the global security state. *Identities*, 17 (6), 613–640.

Dean, M., 1999. *Governmentality: power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.

Durand, J. and Massey, D.S., 2003. The costs of contradiction: US border policy 1986–2000. *Latino Studies*, 1 (2), 233–252.

Escobar, C., 2006. Migration and citizen rights: the Mexican case. *Citizenship Studies*, 10 (5), 503–522.

Escobar, C., 2007. Extraterritorial political rights and dual citizenship in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 42 (3), 43–75.

Faist, T., 2008. Migrants as transnational development agents: an inquiry into the newest round of the migration–development Nexus. *Population, Space and Place*, 14 (1), 21–42.

Feagin, J., 2001. White supremacy and Mexican Americans: rethinking the 'Black-White paradigm'. *Rutgers Law Review*, 54, 959–987.

Fitzgerald, D., 2009. *A nation of emigrants: how Mexico manages its migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Flores, W.V. and Benmayor, R., eds., 1997. *Latino cultural citizenship: claiming identity, space, and rights*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Fox, J., 2005. Unpacking 'transnational citizenship'. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8 (1), 171–201.

Fox, J. and Rivera-Salgado, G., 2004. *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States*. La Jolla, CA: Center for US-Mexican Studies, UCSD/Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, UCSD.

Fraser, N., 2007. Transnationalizing the public sphere: on the legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion in a post-Westphalian world. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 24 (4), 7–30.

Glick-Schiller, N. and Fouron, G., 2001. *Georges woke up laughing: long-distance nationalism and the search for home*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Goldring, L., 2001. The gender and geography of citizenship in Mexico-US transnational spaces. *Identities*, 7 (4), 501–537.

Harvey, D., 2007. *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hindess, B., 2002. Neo-liberal citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 6 (2), 127–143.

Inda, J.X., 2000. Foreign bodies: migrants, parasites, and the pathological body politic. *Discourse*, 22 (3), 46–62.

Kymlicka, W., 1995. *Multicultural citizenship: a liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laguerre, M.S., 1998. *Diasporic citizenship: Haitian Americans in transnational America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Linklater, A., 1998. Cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 2 (1), 23–41.

Maldonado, R., Bajuk, N., and Hayem, M., 2012. *Remittances to Latin America and the Caribbean: regaining growth* [online]. Multilateral Investment Fund, Inter-American

Development Bank. Available from: http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getDocument. aspx?DOCNUM=36723460 [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Martinot, S. and Sexton, J., 2003. The Avant-garde of White supremacy. *Social Identities*, 9 (2), 169–181.

Massey, D.S., Durand, J., and Malone, N.J., 2002. *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigration in an era of economic integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Munck, R., Schierup, C.U., and Wise, R.D., 2011. Migration, work, and citizenship in the new world order. *Globalizations*, 8 (3), 249–260.

Ong, A., 1999. *Flexible citizenship: the cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ong, A., 2006. *Neoliberalism as exception: mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pew Hispanic Center, 2013. *Hispanics of Mexican origin in the United States, 2011*. Report released on 19 June 2013. Available from: http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/06/19/ hispanics-of-mexican-origin-in-the-united-states-2011/ [Accessed 28 June 2013].

Ramos-Zayas, A.Y., 2004. Delinquent citizenship, national performances: racialization, surveillance, and the politics of 'worthiness' in Puerto Rican Chicago. *Latino Studies*, 2 (1), 26–44.

Ratha, D., 2005. *Workers' remittances: an important and stable source of external development finance* [online]. Economics Seminar Series. Paper 9. 2005. Available from: http:/ /repository.stcloudstate.edu/econ_seminars/9 [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Rodriguez, R.M., 2010. *Migrants for export: how the Philippine state brokers labor to the world*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rosaldo, R., 1997. Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. *In*: F.Y. Benmayor, ed. *Latino cultural citizenship: claiming identity, space, and rights*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 27–38.

Rouse, R., 1995. Questions of identity: personhood and collectivity in transnational migration to the United States. *Critique of Anthropology*, 15 (4), 351–380.

SELA, 2009. *Global recession, migration and remittances: effects on Latin American and Caribbean economies*. SELA.

Smith, M.P., 2003. The social construction of transnational citizenship. *UC Davis Journal of International Law and Policy*, 9 (105), 105–125.

Smith, R.C., 2006. *Mexican New York: transnational lives of new immigrants*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Soysal, Y.N., 1994. *Limits of citizenship: migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Stephen, L., 2007. *Transborder lives: indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California, and Oregon*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Taylor, L. and Wilson, F., 2004. The messiness of everyday life: exploring key themes in Latin American citizenship studies: introduction. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 23 (2), 154–164.

Thomas, L., 2010. *Puerto Rican citizen: history and political identity in twentieth-century New York City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Trentmann, F., 2007. Citizenship and consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7 (2), 147–158.

Varsanyi, M.W., 2006. Interrogating 'urban citizenship' vis-à-vis undocumented migration. *Citizenship Studies*, 10 (2), 229–249.

Wilderson, F., 2003. Gramsci's Black Marx: whither the slave in civil society? *Social Identities*, 9 (2), 225–240.

Zilberg, E., 2011. *Space of detention: the making of a transnational gang crisis between Los Angeles and San Salvador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

ULLA DALUM BERG is Assistant Professor in the Departments of Latino and Hispanic Caribbean Studies and Anthropology at Rutgers University.
ADDRESS: Latino and Hispanic Caribbean Studies, Rutgers University, 54 Joyce Kilmer Avenue, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8040, USA.
Email: uberg@rci.rutgers.edu

ROBYN MAGALIT RODRIGUEZ is Associate Professor in Asian American Studies at University of California Davis.
ADDRESS: Asian American Studies, University of California Davis, 3102 Hart Hall, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA.
Email: rrodriguezucd@gmail.com