Robert J. Topinka
University of East Anglia

'Wandering and Settled Tribes': Biopolitics, Citizenship, and the Racialized Migrant

Abstract

This paper argues that purportedly outdated racial categories continue to resonate in contemporary forms of racialization. I examine the use of metaphors of rootedness and shadows by a contemporary UK migrant advocacy organization and its allies to justify migrant regularization and manage illicit circulation. I argue that the distinction between rooted and rootless peoples draws on the colonial and racial distinctions between wandering and settled peoples. Contemporary notions of citizenship continue to draw upon and activate racial forms of differentiation. Citizenship is thus part of a form of racial governance that operates not only along biological but also social and cultural lines, infusing race into the structures, practices, and techniques of governance.

Keywords: Bio-politics, Citizen, Mobility, Race, Non-Citizen, Globalization

> 'On the occasions when I walk down Mile End Road towards Whitechapel, I sense their presence among the people milling around the busy street and market. Look closer and I observe them living in the shadows: innocent men, women, and children terrified of the authorities- a hard-working mother exploited by unscrupulous business people and resigned to accept low wages so she can feed and clothe her children. An honest father forced into dealing on the black market because years of waiting in limbo has stripped him of the power to make any other kind of choice…As much as this sounds like something from early Salvation Army history, it is not 1865 – this is Whitechapel in 2009. Those of us who live in London's East End are only too aware that "darkest England" is still well and truly with us. The "shadow people" are irregular migrants living in the UK.'

> -Salvation Army Captain Nick Coke, London, 2009

> 'My earnest hope is that the book…may cause those who are in "high places"…to bestir themselves to improve the condition of a class of people whose misery, ignorance, and vice, amidst all the wealth and great knowledge of the "first city in the world", is, to say the very least, a national disgrace to us.'

> -Henry Mayhew, 1861, London

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 2

Introduction

In a briefing paper supporting the Strangers into Citizens campaign, which seeks to offer amnesty to irregular migrants who have put down roots in the UK, Nick Coke of the Salvation Army compares the plight of irregular migrants to the suffering of the exploited peoples of the nineteenth century. Coke localizes his discussion of these 'shadow people' in London's urban fabric, specifically Mile End Road, an East End street that has long been home to migrant populations. Yet there is an immediate disconnect between Coke's urban scene and the people who inhabit it: On the bustling street, Coke can 'sense' the people 'living in the shadows.' However, as anyone who has ever walked down Mile End Road and seen the street markets, off-license liquor stores, fast food chains, and London Underground stations would know, Mile End Road is not a shadowy place. It is a straight, broad, bright, busy thoroughfare, not a labyrinth of dark corners and hidden passages. No one can literally live in the shadows on Mile End Road—there simply are not enough of them. Of course, Coke uses the phrase 'living in the shadows' metaphorically: As a shadow is absent direct light, so migrants live absent the direct protection of the law, the security of the nation-state, and the day-to-day stability such protections afford. Moreover, since these are metaphorical shadows, only some possess the ability to recognize them, to 'sense' the presence of those obscured figures. Yet when Coke casts his gaze upon them, he discovers that these figures are not so shadowy after all: They are not rootless, greedy criminals but mothers and fathers buffeted by the winds of capitalism and oppressed by the whims of the authorities as they attempt to form good, stable, lives and support their traditional families. They pose a problem, to be sure, but only because

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 3

the general public is unaware that these shadowy figures are in fact forming stable families.

Coke seeks to marshal support for the Strangers into Citizens campaign by inviting what he hopes will be an uncomfortable comparison to the nineteenth century, the Age of Industrialism in Britain and colonialism and slavery abroad. To be sure, this description of Mile End Road resembles quite precisely London in the mid-nineteenth century as described by Henry Mayhew, journalist, novelist, social reformer, and prolific documenter of street life. In *London Labour and the London Poor*, Mayhew casts his sociological gaze upon the street people of London, setting forth to identify, analyse, and categorize the masses who remain in the shadows for most of the national public. Mayhew was particularly concerned with the mobility of those masses. He writes:

> Of the thousand millions of human beings that are said to constitute the population of the entire globe there are—socially, morally, and perhaps even physically considered—but two distinct and broadly marked races, viz., the wanderers and the settlers—the vagabond and the citizen—the nomadic and the civilised tribes (1968 [1861–1862],1).

We can be certain that Coke would not extend his comparison this far, or follow Mayhew's argument 'there is a greater development of the animal than the intellectual or moral nature of man,' and a heightened inclination toward criminality among the wanderers (1968 [1861–1862], 3). Yet this assumption of an unstable, mobile, and potentially criminal class lurks unnamed in Coke's description of stable, honest families, haunting his depiction of migrants if only because he recognizes that his readers will likely doubt their stability and honesty.

This article explores the racialization inherent in the concept of citizenship by tracing how racialization operates in the apparently deracialized discourse produced by

and about the Strangers into Citizens campaign. I argue that the 'web of associations'

(Latour 2004) that animates citizenship is organized by a distinction between wandering

and settled, or rooted and rootless people, and that this distinction supports the racialized

management of people as they move through legalized and illicit circulatory channels.

The forms of racialization that implicitly structure Coke's discourse and that Mayhew

makes explicit thus continue to haunt contemporary notions of citizenship. Here I

examine the ongoing function of racialization by developing a colonial reading of

biopolitics (Stoler 2002). This focus at once emphasizes the historical formation of

biopolitics during eighteenth- and nineteenth-century colonialism and highlights the

ongoing role colonial modes of governance play in managing global flows and

optimizing the life of the population. As I argue here, race continues to distribute access

to legal belonging, credentialed movement and travel, and the protection of the

biopolitical state. Through an in-depth qualitative analysis of the public campaign

materials and policy documents of the Strangers into Citizens campaign, I reveal how

racialized conceptions of citizenship regulate two distinct circulatory channels governing

the global movements of people: One channel for credentialed, rights-bearing citizens—

the rooted, settled, and civilized—and another for purportedly dangerous, un-credentialed

bodies—the wandering, illegal, and savage.

Recent attention in the citizenship literature has been directed at acts of

citizenship (Isin 2009, Isin and Nielsen 2008, Isin and Saward 2013), and to the

recognition of migrant agency in constituting migrants as political subjects (Johnson

2012, Squire 2011, Nyers and Rygiel 2012). As Squire (2015) suggests, a focus on 'acts'

reveals not only that agency cannot be reduced to the capacity to resist structure, but also

that structure and agency are inadequate as analytical terms to describe the functioning of

power in the context of migration and citizenship. As a focus on racialization can reveal,

structures do not simply limit migrant agency by preventing movement or securing

borders. Instead, racialization functions not to prevent but to manage mobility. As I show

in what follows, racialization channels the movements of populations through a

hierarchical system that distinguishes between rooted and rootless people, legitimate

circulatory networks and shadow circulatory networks. Although existing work in

citizenship studies has examined the relationship between racism, the sovereign state of

exception, and migration (Bigo 2007, Doty 2007, Biswas and Nair 2010), the model of

the state of exception emphasizes founding moments, foreclosing attention to the ongoing

functioning of racialization. Racialization is indeed central to the project of modernity,

and the repercussions of this project continue to resonate in the contemporary moment

(Mills 1997, Winant 2001, Goldberg 2002, Mbembe 2013). By developing a colonial

reading of biopolitics, I demonstrate how racism continues to operate in the ongoing

governance of populations.

      To explore the racialization inherent in the concept of citizenship, I begin by

outlining how a colonial reading of biopolitcs requires attending to the relationship

between colonialism and the global mobility of peoples. I then turn to an analysis of the

discourse of the Strangers into Citizens campaign, which lobbies for legal status for

irregular migrants in Britain. I conducted an in-depth qualitative analysis of all of the

Strangers into Citizens briefing papers and a YouTube video, which the group released to

generate media coverage. In addition, I analyze the media coverage and public attention

the campaign received, focusing in particular on an op-ed in *The Guardian* and a report

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 6

from Migrant Watch UK but drawing as well on reports from *The Daily Mail*, *The Daily Express*, *The Independent*, *The Observer*, and *The Daily Telegraph* as well as the Catholic publication *The Tablet* and *The Universe*. Following Latour (2004), I do not approach the Strangers into Citizens campaign with a 'hermeneutics of suspicion,' hoping to uncover the campaign's obscured ideology. Indeed, it is quite clear that the campaign provides valuable resources to vulnerable people. Instead, and again following Latour, my purpose in using the campaign as an example is to trace the 'web of associations' that citizenship calls into being, and that the campaign, with its practical focus on achieving policy change, must negotiate.

My analysis of the Strangers into Citizens campaign comes in two sections: The first focuses on the campaign's distinction between rooted and rootless people, a distinction that assumes that some irregular migrants are qualified for citizenship and credentialed movement within the circulatory channels managed by the biopolitical state while others are not. I suggest that this ambivalent status of rootedness has its roots in the colonial tension between distancing the colonized from the colonizers while at the same time incorporating colonized peoples into the colonizing nation-state. In the next section, I discuss the campaign's frequent reference to shadows and living in the shadows. Although this metaphor seemingly invites comparison to a state of exception operating through a 'zone of indistinction' between inside and outside, the discourse of shadows in fact names an illicit circulatory economy rather than a founding sovereign exclusion. Examining the racial components of citizenship thus requires attending to race as an art of biopolitical governance and a technique for managing the global distribution of

peoples. I conclude by describing a model of racial citizenship that emphasizes the ways

in which race infuses not only bodies but also structures, discourses, and practices.

Mobile Populations and Governmental Racialization

Barnor Hesse has argued that, instead of being attached primarily to phenotypical or

physiognomic difference, 'normalized race relations were actually constituted through the

colonial designations of *Europeanness* and *non-Europeanness*, materially, discursively,

and extra-corporeally' (2007, 646). Hesse's argument is not that study of biological race

should be discarded, but that the tendency to focus on 'some exclusive attachment or

attribution to the body as a discrete entity' risks obscuring broader colonial histories. In

other words, a focus on biological race alone cannot account for the ways in which

'colonial meanings and significations of "European/non-European" social existence…are

marked and assigned to…different assemblages' of languages, territories, histories, and

ideas in addition to corporeality (Hesse 2007, 656). As a credential supporting a

particular social existence, citizenship manages contradictions first introduced in the

colonial project. Ann Stoler has argued that there exists a 'fundamental contradiction'

within colonial domination: 'the tension between a form of authority simultaneously

predicated on incorporation and distancing' (2002, 83). Colonialism relies on distancing

the dominated population from the civilized conquerors while at the same time

incorporating the dominated other into the ambit of the nation-state. The paradox Stoler

identifies thus generates a further paradox: Although colonialism is a divisive form of

nation-state building—relying, for example, on carving continents into separate territories

under the domain of various European nations—this division in fact requires a global

circulatory system capable of incorporating dominated populations into the nation-state. Although the colonial practice of dividing land into discrete territories governed by a foreign power has largely (although not completely) disappeared from the world stage, the governing of global circulatory channels that colonialism first made possible continues to function through racial distinctions.

A colonial reading of biopolitics, then, emphasizes that biopolitics is a mode of governing the "global mass" (Foucault, 1997, 242) of peoples connected through colonial forms of colonialization. Differentiating and distinguishing this global mass is part of the process of producing the population. Biopolitics is a set of techniques that optimizes the life of the population by managing risky flows, including, in this case, the mobile bodies. Race offers a means of tracking those bodies and granting or denying entry to the population targeted for biopolitical optimization. Attending to Foucault's biopolitics through attention to coloniality can chart the ongoing effects of the 'European/non-European' distinctions, revealing how colonial racial distinctions continue to operate in the forms of what Hesse calls 'governmental racialization,' which draw on racial thinking and racial hierarchies to distribute and regulate global flows of people (2007, 656). As Paul Gilroy has argued, race is the result of the 'raciological ordering of the world' (2004, 14), which has long functioned to promote the mobility of white British colonial subjects while containing the movement of 'natives,' who were also British subjects but whose movement was less desirable (Anderson 2013, 33). Gilroy (2004) argues that former imperial nations compensate for their loss of prestige by pursuing national homogeneity, exacerbating the raciological ordering of the world. Under such conditions,

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 9

the postcolonial migrant come to be seen as dangerously mobile and 'unwanted intruders' (2004, 90).

The governing of mobility operates in a racialized key. Consider Mayhew's statement quoted above that wandering and settled tribes are different races when 'socially, morally, and *perhaps even physically considered*' (emphasis added). For Mayhew—who wrote in a cosmopolitan London that was home to peoples from Britain's many colonies—physical characteristics were only tentatively racial. Nevertheless, the category of race and its associations to mobility, criminality, and licentiousness helped Mayhew distinguish between 'the vagabond and the citizen.' Mayhew goes on to suggest 'that not only are all races divisible into wanderers and settlers, but that each civilized or settled tribe has generally some wandering horde mingled with, and in a measure preying upon, it' (1968 [1861–1862], 1). Thus Mayhew does not offer a distinction between wandering tribes and settled citizens merely to justify a founding inclusion. Instead, the distinction functions on a principle of hierarchical inclusion: The wandering tribes are not excluded from the civilized polity but thoroughly imbricated within it. Race thus offers a means of managing the 'wandering horde' by assessing who can be counted as a citizen and who cannot, and whose movements are threatening and whose are not.

Indeed, as Anderson (2013) argues, vagrancy laws not only criminalized but racialized the poor, offering a tool for managing their mobility that was further developed as Britain's empire expanded. It is not coincidental that the 'fiction of race' began to exert its greatest force as global mobility expanded (Balibar 1991, 89). Racial and ethnic identities were 'intricately related to the control of mobility' within the empire (Anderson 2013, 36). From the 1905 Aliens Act, which granted immigration officers the right to

deny entry to 'undesirable immigrants,' to the 2000 Race Relations (Amendment) Act,

which allows officials to discriminate on the grounds of ethnicity or national origin, the

racialized governance of mobility continues to haunt contemporary citizenship (Anderson

2013, 36, 42). This emphasis on managing mobility demonstrates that 'the imperial and

colonial past continues to shape political life" in former imperial countries (Gilroy 2004,

2). Approaching the biopolitical management of peoples through conceptualizations of

citizenship can both extend Hesse's argument that race extends beyond biology and

redress the tendency to treat the racial component of biopolitics only in the context of the

founding sovereign moment rather than in the ongoing governance of populations. A

focus on the ongoing history of racialization can thus reveal the very conditions of

possibility for global mobility.

Rootedness and the Strangers into Citizens Campaign

The Strangers into Citizens campaign supports legislation to grant irregular migrants, or

migrants without legal status, amnesty to remain in the United Kingdom if they meet

certain criteria, including the ability to speak English, six years of residence in the UK,

employment references, and a clean criminal record. The campaign was active primarily

from 2006 to 2010, but it has since merged into the Citizens UK community-organizing

group. It was successful in building a broad coalition among NGOs, think tanks, faith

leaders, community groups, and political leaders including Boris Johnson. It also

succeeded in drawing coverage and stirring debate in the public press after a May 7, 2007

rally in Trafalgar square. Op-eds supporting the campaign were published in the Catholic

newspapers *The Tablet* and *The Universe* as well as in mass publications such as *The*

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 11

Independent, *The Observer*, *The Daily Telegraph*, and *The Guardian* ('Briefing Paper

No. 1', 7). *The Daily Express* and *The Daily Mail* published op-eds denouncing the

campaign ('Briefing Paper No. 1', 8), and the prominent think tank Migrant Watch UK

publicly opposed the campaign (Migrant Watch UK, 2007).

Although I focus in what follows on the ways in which the campaign's discourse

draws on and sustains racialized distinctions, it is important to emphasize that the

campaign itself is not a racist campaign, and that I am not suggesting that the campaign

leaders harbor a racist ideology. As Squire (2009) has noted, the campaign actively

challenged the hostility and fear that immigrants often face, particularly in public

discourse (Innes 2010). On the one hand, then, the campaign's broad coalition, which

includes significant input from migrants themselves, would seem capable of challenging

existing frameworks of diversity and integration that see immigrants as marginalized

'others' and outsiders to established communities (Ahmed 2004, Triandafyllidou 2001).

This challenge could potentially redirect discussions of community and cohesion to a

focus on forms of 'mobile solidarities' that destabilize distinctions between legal and

illegal, rooted or rootless people (Squire 2012). On the other hand, the campaign's

attempt to develop mainstream policy proposals has attracted criticism, particularly in the

campaign's emphasis on 'earned amnesty,' which I will discuss in more detail below

(Squire 2009). Strangers into Citizens addresses its discourse to the biopolitical state in

order to seek a change in the laws regulating the movement of peoples. The campaign

locates its argument within the existing legal, social, and cultural assemblages sustaining

contemporary notions of citizenship. This assemblage exists within the model of

governmental racialization Hesse describes. My analysis focuses on the '*undecidability* in

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 12

modernity's discourse of "race"' (Hesse 2007, 653). Race thus emerges in the campaign's discourse in the form of its address to the biopolitical state, which continues to rely on racialized distinctions that draw on racial assemblages of body, language, nation, landscape and more in order to manage and distribute global movements of people.

This assemblage of distinctions manages two channels of circulation, legal and illicit. These competing channels of circulation surface in the campaign's discourse, which relies on the relationship between circulation and containment on the one hand and rootedness and rootlessness on the other. The Strangers into Citizens campaign's focus on rootedness as the key criterion for amnesty reflects not only contemporary British anxieties over the unchecked circulation of migrants but broader histories of citizenship as a means of regulating and enforcing particular kinds of movement. Thus racialization functions as a designation distributing bodies into differing circulatory channels, forcing an engagement with the concept of citizenship as it emerges as part of nation-state governmentality, global forms of circulation, and the histories of colonialism and slavery that undergird these formations.

The campaign attempts to characterize migrants as rooted, stable, established populations who therefore ought to be eligible for citizenship and, by extension, offered the protections of the nation-state. The discourse of rootedness thus relates directly to the management of global flows of people within legal and illicit circulatory channels. Indeed, the Strangers into Citizen campaign's policy briefing documents and promotional campaigns repeatedly return to the theme of roots and rootedness. Official briefing documents explain that the campaign 'would advocate a pathway into citizenship for

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 13

irregular migrants who had put down roots in the UK' and offer a 'one-off pathway into citizenship for long-term irregular migrants who had put down roots in the UK.' ('Briefing Paper No. 1', 5). Promotional materials argue that 'when [migrants] have put down roots in their communities—when the UK is, to all intents and purposes 'home'—it isn't right to uproot them, whatever the strength of their original claim' ('Briefing Paper No. 4', 5). The emphasis on a 'pathway' to citizenship for those who have 'put down roots' suggests that rootedness qualifies the migrant for entry into legal channels—or pathways—of circulation. Rootedness thus establishes migrants as potential members of the nation-state, which would betray its principles by denying them entry: 'A pathway into citizenship for those who have put down roots in the UK will not only offer dignity to these disenfranchised peoples, but enhance our reputation for fairness and diversity' ('Briefing Paper No. 1', 5). Indeed, because rootedness qualifies migrants for acceptance into the nation-state, not extending citizenship would be to violate human rights: 'They have settled here, put down roots and started families – often they are desperate to work and contribute to the economy, but they do not have this most basic of human rights' (Ivereigh 2009, 10). Those with roots, then, are eager to participate in the community of the nation.

Other campaign materials emphasize that offering a pathway to citizenship for those who have earned it by demonstrating their rootedness would in fact allow those rooted peoples to move more freely. A promotional video includes a narrator describing life as an irregular migrant, intoning, 'imagine being a prisoner in a country, unable to leave, and unable to live a normal life' (Strangers into Citizens, 2007). Irregular migrants whose rootedness has not been recognized are forced to move through illicit, shadowy,

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 14

circulatory channels or find themselves forcibly rooted to place as prisoners. Indeed, in the same video, one migrant living in London explains, 'I've been here for 14 years now. I have a wife and three kids and I still don't have any rights. If my father dies I cannot go back home to his funeral' (Strangers into Citizens, 2007). Another migrant describes his life, saying 'you feel imprisoned within the country' (Strangers into Citizens, 2007). These interviews counter a dominant discourse that constructs migrants as dangerously mobile. The migrants in this promotional video are family men, long settled in the UK, who find, in a cruel irony, that they are imprisoned by the very fear of their mobility. In the campaign's discourse, rootedness qualifies these migrants for regulated movement, for access to the circulatory channels sustaining the biopolitical state. Indeed, there is immediate rhetorical force in insisting upon the rootedness of migrants. The term suggests that they are of British soil, so tied to life as if they sprung from the earth itself. Yet rootedness also implies rootlessness: Furtive mobility marks the migrant as a danger to be contained, but the rooted migrant no longer poses such a threat. Indeed, the rooted migrant becomes eligible for acceptance into the nation-state.

By emphasizing rootedness as the central criterion for citizenship, Strangers into Citizens obscures the problem of migrants who cannot root themselves for a variety reasons. It also calls up the spectre of racialized binaries between citizen and vagabond, in Mayhew's terms. Another example from the Strangers into Citizens briefing paper clarifies this latter point:

> What came as a surprise to those researching the issue was that tens of thousands of them *were not transitory*, migrant labour, arriving in the UK on the backs of lorries to make some money and leave. *They were a stable, resident population, with many years in the UK* ('Briefing Paper No. 4, 5. Emphasis added).

Here, once again, the tension between competing channels of circulation surfaces. Being

transitory implicitly disqualifies migrants from eligibility for regularization. Moreover,

being transitory is linked to unregulated, unchecked migration. Instead of entering at a

recognized border crossing and undergoing passport control, transitory migrants sneak

onto the backs of lorries, attaching like leeches onto the regulated system of international

commerce, only to depart the country, their pockets presumably full of cash. That form of

illicit mobility threatens the well-regulated mobility of the nation-state and the capitalist

system. In contrast, Strangers into Citizen advocates for stable residents, people with

families who have formed organic links in the UK, thus proving themselves to be worthy

targets of governmentality.

Indeed, the notion of earning citizenship, of earning a place in the biopolitical

population, motivates the specific policy proposals of the campaign. As each Strangers

into Citizens briefing paper explains in the first paragraph:

> We propose an 'earned amnesty' or 'pathway into citizenship', open to
> those with at least six years in the UK, who present employer and
> character references, a clean criminal record, and proficiency in English.
> The benefits are immense, not just for migrants but for UK economy and
> society: freedom from fear, undeserved criminality, and vulnerability to
> abuse; freedom to obey the law and pay taxes; freedom to travel ('Briefing
> Paper No. 1, 1).

Here, citizenship is earned through a desire to work, a lack of criminality, and English

language skills. Learning English, of course, emphasizes the importance of assimilating

to the linguistic and thus ethnic community of the UK. This language requirement

replicates the terms of the Immigration Restriction Act of 1897, which managed the

mobility of colonial others by requiring that they could speak a European language in

order to enter Britain (Anderson 2013, 33). The emphasis on a lack of criminality can be

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 16

understood in terms of the longstanding association of racial and ethnic others with potential violence and criminality. The association of citizenship and freedom is particularly interesting, though. Freedom from fear, undeserved criminality, and vulnerability to abuse all emphasize the protections the sovereign state affords: No citizen need fear physical violence or forced criminality so long as the state maintains its monopoly of violence. Yet the latter freedoms—freedom to obey the law (a particularly Orwellian formulation), freedom to pay taxes, and the freedom to travel—are what might be called biopolitical freedoms. These are the freedoms to participate in the well-regulated life of the optimized population, available only to those with proper credential for biopolitical citizenship. To pay taxes, for example, is to join the ranks of insured life through entry into the welfare state. Migrants, of course, have already traveled, but citizenship grants them the *freedom* to travel, which is in fact the credential to travel through officially recognized border crossings without fear of arrest or detainment.

The mobility of credentialed migrants contrasts sharply with that of migrants without credentials. The former population moves through the regulated circulatory channels of biopolitics, while the latter threatens those channels. As the narrator in the abovementioned promotional video explains, the campaign 'isn't going to flood our country with new migrants. We believe in controlling our borders' (Strangers into Citizens, 2007). The campaign, then, supports the plight of rooted migrants seeking mobility through regulated channels, not migrants who might flood borders or flout laws. In another campaign document that combines statements of support from activists and institutions, Tim Finch of the Institute for Public Policy and Research explains, 'we support the Strangers into Citizens idea of regularisation being "earned"…Regularisation

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 17

should be a process, properly administered…Not everyone who wants to stay should be regularised. The process will identify many who should be removed. We would not baulk at that. Borders require policing' ('Briefing Paper No 4.',5). The problem with irregular migrants, Finch suggests, is that 'Some will turn or be recruited into crime. They are certainly—though most unwillingly—part of an economy that breaks the law in areas such as the minimum wage and proper working conditions' ('Briefing Paper No. 4', 5). Although Finch is an ally of the Strangers into Citizens campaign rather than a member of it, his comments reveal the "web of associations" between mobility and criminality structuring the discourse by and about the campaign. By associating irregular mobility with criminality, this discourse echoes the vagrancy laws that first criminalized and racialized the poor, establishing the conditions for the racialized management of mobility (Anderson 2013).

Although Finch is careful to acknowledge that irregular migrants are often drawn into crime unwillingly, he goes on to elaborate at length their lack of fit for biopolitical citizenship:

> They will be using some public services, but often inappropriately: turning up at A&E departments at hospitals, for instance, because they are not allowed to register with a GP. Their children are probably in school; but if the family is living in the shadows, on the margins of society, constantly fearful and unsettled, the education outcomes of these children are not likely to be good. Generally, we are talking about people who cannot be properly integrated into our society. ('Briefing Paper No. 4', 5)

Migrants lacking credentials thus pose a direct threat to the forms of social insurance the biopolitical state guarantees, such as minimum wage, healthcare, and education. Regularizing migrants is a means of managing those threats. As another campaign document argues, 'regularisation is the state's way of reasserting its control over a section

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 18

of the population and the economy which lie largely outside its regulatory authority. Non-payment of taxes, exploitation, black-market trading and people trafficking are all undesirable elements in a modern economy' ('Briefing Paper No. 3', 2). The document goes on to suggest that regularization is means of 'extending state control over immigration flows' ('Briefing Paper No. 3', 3). Regularization, then, expands the reach of the biopolitical state, incorporating illicit forms of movement into its managerial ambit. Illicit channels of circulation threaten to undermine legal channels. The 'earned amnesty' Strangers into Citizens proposes thus functions to distinguish between the rootless wanderers who threaten the system and the settled citizens-in-waiting who might be successfully incorporated within it. Statements such as these thus clearly rely on a division between rooted and rootless migrants, regular migrants and migrants who cannot be regularized. While these statements in themselves are not racist, they rely upon and activate distinctions forged in racial thinking: The colonial paradox of simultaneous incorporation and distancing surfaces in these distinctions between migrants who can be regularized and migrants who cannot. The division between regular and irregular migrants, rooted and rootless peoples, wandering and settled tribes, functions to sustain the circulatory channels biopolitical governments manage.

Biopolitical Circulation and the Shadows of Citizenship

As I have shown, the Strangers into Citizens campaign relies on a discourse of rootedness and rootlessness that relies upon and activates racialized distinctions between wandering and settled tribes. These distinctions, in turn, sustain the distribution of peoples into the legal circulatory channels of biopolitics and illicit channels of unregulated circulation.

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 19

Citizenship is increasingly articulated to what Ong (2006) calls 'mobile technologies of governing' (16) that manage global flows of people by distinguishing between credentialed and irregular migrants, creating an unequal distribution of mobility among populations (Bigo, Carrera, Guild 2013). In this context, forms of 'governmental racialization' manage the contradiction between incorporation and distance by providing techniques for granting or denying entry to the biopolitical population. Race, therefore, is not a stable concept but a set of practices, a 'social routinization and institutionalization of regulatory, administrative power…exercised by European ("white") assemblages over non-Europeanized ("non-white") assemblages' in order to control 'admission to "European" conceptions of humanity' (2007, 656). Indeed, as I showed above, Mayhew did not assume the stability of the distinction between wandering and settled tribes but instead called for an analysis of how the mingling between the categories threatened the stability of nineteenth-century civilization. Governmental racialization offers a set of practices of differentiating between the settled and rooted from the wandering and rootless.

The processes and practices of 'governmental racialization' surface in the Strangers into Citizen's campaign's frequent references to shadows, a metaphor that names the illicit circulatory network that poses a risk to well-regulated circulation. In his op-ed in *The Guardian*, campaign leader Austin Ivereigh writes that the population of irregular migrants 'lives in a shadow world.' As Salvation Army 'Captain' Nick Coke suggests in a Strangers into Citizens briefing paper, the shadowy figure of the irregular migrant is drawn to 'the black market'—the shadow economy—and quickly begins to operate beyond the vision of the nation-state. Biopolitical techniques regulate surplus

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 20

population by promoting 'the "good" circulation on which globalized markets depend…while preventing the "bad" circulation that poses a risk to national and international stability.' (Duffield 2007, 187). Forms of 'differential racism' (Balibar 1991) distinguish between 'good' and 'bad', well-regulated and shadowy forms mobility, making it possible 'to fragment, to create caesuras within the biological'—and cultural, linguistic, and national—'continuum addressed by biopower' (Foucault 1997, 255). This fragmentation is an ongoing process. Without the credential of citizenship, the noncitizen can only be dangerously mobile—noncitizens move, we might say, paraphrasing Coke, through the shadows.

Indeed, the metaphor of shadows recurs in the campaign's discourse. Documents refer to migrants as a 'shadow population in Britain' ('Briefing Paper No. 1', 2), describing how these migrants are 'living in the shadows' ('Briefing Paper No. 4', 5), and suggesting that irregular migration 'shadows their existence' ('Briefing Paper No. 4', 6). The shadow metaphor receives visual representation in the campaign's promotional video. The video is a collection of interviews with advocates for the campaign, including irregular migrants, faith leaders, and British citizens. The migrants provide moving narratives of the difficulties they face as a result of their tenuous migration status. The video makes the shadow metaphor visual by showing these migrants in blurred focus. The need to preserve the anonymity of some of the interviewees is, of course, a practical reason for this technique, but the video uses the same technique of blurred focus for interviewees who later appear unconcealed on screen. The video opens with a blank white background and the figure of an interviewee slowly fades into focus over the sound of the interviewee's voice as she explains her uncertain legal status. As soon as the

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 21

interviewee's face comes into focus, the images blurs once again, and figure of the

interviewee finally dissolves into the white background. Then, the narrator asks the

viewer to 'Imagine being forcibly separated from your family—living life in the

shadows, afraid of authority' (Strangers into Citizens 2007). During this narration,

distorted figures move across the frame in blurred focus, a visual representation of 'living

life in the shadows.' These images at once promote sympathy for those forced to live 'life

in the shadows' and offer a reminder of the dangers of such a life—those in the shadows,

after all, are 'afraid of authority,' their shadowy existence making it impossible for them

to become participants in the well-regulated population biopolitics promotes.

Biopolitical racial differentiation and racial governance distribute and manage

access to the well-regulated population, wherein birth rates, death rates, marriage rates,

literacy rates, and so on offer a means of tracking and managing the population in order

to optimize life. Unregulated movement poses a threat to this optimization. Hence Coke's

discussion of migrants 'living in the shadows' on Mile End Road: Physically present in

the nation-state, they nevertheless remain outside its arts of governance. Indeed, the

Strangers into Citizens campaign routinely emphasizes that the irregular migrants who

meet their criteria for earned amnesty—which include English language skills, six years

of residence in the UK, employment references, and a clean criminal record—would

contribute to rather than detract from the biopolitical optimization of life. As the narrator

in the video suggests, 'All they want to do is leave a decent life, like you and me'

(Strangers into Citizens, 2007). In his *Guardian* op-ed, Ivereigh asserts, 'Immigrants are

generally young, fit, and educated at another country's expense: they are not a burden on

the benefits system' (Ivereigh 2009). Another campaign document claims, 'They get

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 22

married, send their kids to local schools and put in much more to our society than they

take out. Yet they dare not emerge into the open because they fear losing everything'

('Briefing Paper No. 4', 8). The campaign thus emphasizes that migrants deserving of

'earned amnesty' are young, healthy, educated, and married, reducing the perceived

hygienic or sexual threat of the racial other. In other words, they are strong candidates for

contributing to the biopolitical optimization of life. This discourse thus replicates colonial

anxieties about race and reproduction that generated attempts to manage marriage

between white British subjects and colonial natives (Stoler 2002, Turner 2014). Living in

the shadows does not threaten the purity of the state, but it does disrupt racialized

governance as it seeks to distribute peoples across circulatory channels by relying on a

logic of racial differentiation. As the Strangers into Citizens campaign asks, 'Why do we

treat these people like strangers when they behave like citizens?' (Stranger into Citizens,

2007).

Conclusion

I have argued here that the Strangers into Citizens campaign relies on a discourse of

rootedness to suggest that certain irregular migrants are qualified for citizenship and

credentialed entry into legal circulatory channels. The metaphor of shadows names the

illicit circulatory channels that threaten and undermine the legal channels, straining the

ability of the biopolitical state to manage the distribution of peoples in such a way as to

optimize the life of the population. This emphasis on rootedness and on shadow

circulation draws upon and activates racial distinctions first developed under colonial rule

in order to manage the contradiction between distancing colonized peoples from the

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 23

colonizers and incorporating them into the colonial system. Describing migrants as rooted

distinguishes them from rootless migrants, a distinction that resonates with nineteenth-

century distinctions between wandering tribes and settled citizens. The management of

circulation is thus an example of governmental racialization.

Examining the relationship between race and citizenship requires attention to

biopolitical citizenship, a form of citizenship tied not to fixed territory but to fitness for

the project of optimizing life. Rootedness, in this case, does not indicate that a particular

body is *physically* tied to the territory of the nation-state, but that the body is fit for the

practices the biopolitical state promotes. This fitness is not only a matter of biology but of

culture, language, custom, habit, and more. In the case of the Strangers into Citizens

campaign, the migrant qualified for 'earned amnesty' speaks English, holds a job,

maintains a clean criminal record, and indeed is often young, married, and well-educated.

Race, therefore, extends beyond the body, infusing the very arts, practices, and

techniques of government, and racial distinctions operate in the service of managing the

global distribution of peoples. It is not biology that prevents strangers from becoming

citizens but a complex assemblage of racial techniques and structures first developed

under colonialism and continually activated in the discourses and structures supporting

governmental racialization.

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 24

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, Bridget. 2013. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Balibar, Etienne. 1991. "Is There a Neo-Racism?" In *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, edited by Immanuel Wallerstein and Balibar, translated by Chris Turner, 17-27. London: Verso.

Bigo, Didier. 2007. "Detention of Foreigners, States of Exception, and the Social Practices of Control of the Banopticon." In *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*, edited by Prem Kumar Rajaram and Carl Grundy-Warr, 3–34. Borderlines 29. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bigo, Didier, Sergio Carrera, and Elspeth Guild. 2013. *Foreigners, Refugees or Minorities? Rethinking People in the Context of Border Controls and Visas*. Surrey: Ashgate.

Biswas, Shampa, and Sheila Nair. 2010. *International Relations and States of Exception: Margins, Peripheries, and Excluded Bodies*. London: Routledge.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn. 2007. "States of Exception on the Mexico-US Border: Security 'Decisions' and Civilian Border Patrols"." *International Political Sociology* 1 (2): 113–27.

Duffield, Mark. 2007. *Development, Security, and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1997. *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures as the College de France, 1975-1976*, translated by David Macey. New York: Picador.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

—. 2004. *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Goldberg, David Theo. 2002. *The Racial State*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hesse, Barnor. 2007. "Racialized Modernity: An Analytics of White Mythologies." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (4): 643-663.

Innes, Alexandria J. 2010. "When the Threatened Become the Threat: The Construction of Asylum Seekers in British Media Narratives." *International Relations* 24 (4): 456-477.

This is the accepted version of a manuscript
forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 25

Isin, Engin. 2009. "Citizenship in Flux: The Figure of the Activist Citizen." *Subjectivity* 29: 367-388.

Isin, Engin F and Greg M. Nielsen. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. London: Zed Books.

Isin, Engin and Michael Saward. 2013. *Enacting European Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ivereigh, Austen. 2009. "Amnesty for Illegal Immigrants." The Guardian, May 3. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/libertycentral/2009/may/03/amnesty-illegal-immigrants

Johnson, Heather. 2012. "Moments of Solidarity, Migrant Activism and (Non)Citizens at Global Borders: Political Agency at Tanzanian Refugee Camps, Australian Detention Centres, and European Borders." In Nyers and Rygiel. P.109-128

Latour, Bruno. 2004. "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam?" *Critical Inquiry* 30 (2): 225-248.

Mayhew, Henry. 1968 [1861–1862]. *London Labour and the London Poor.* 4 Volumes. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Mckeown Adam. 2008. *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Migrant Watch UK. 2007. "Strangers into Citizens?" Migrant Watch UK, May 4. http://www.migrationwatchuk.org/press-release/152

Mills, Charles M. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Nyers, Peter and Kim Rygiel. 2012. *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*. London: Routledge.

Ong, Aihwa. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Squire, Vicki. 2012. *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity* London: Routledge.

—. 2009 "Mobile Solidarities: The City of Sanctuary Movement and the Strangers into Citizens Campaign." *Center for Citizenship, Identities and Governance*. The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK.

—. 2011. "From Community Cohesion to Mobile Solidarities: The *City of Sanctuary* Network and the *Strangers into Citizens Campaign*." *Political Studies* 59 (2): 290-307.

This is the accepted version of a manuscript forthcoming in Citizenship Studies.

Topinka 26

—. 2015. "Acts of Desertion: Abandonment and Renouncement at the Sonoran Borderzone." *Antipode* 42 (2): 500-516.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Strangers into Citizens. 2007. "Strangers into Citizens." YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NLf1COGUc0E

—. N.D. "Strangers into Citizens Briefing Paper No. 1: Out of the Shadows: The Story of the Strangers into Citizens Campaign." *Strangers into Citizens*, London.

—. N.D. "Strangers into Citizens Briefing Paper No. 2: Regularisation: Practical and Humane." *Strangers into Citizens*, London.

—. N.D. "Strangers into Citizens Briefing Paper No. 3: Popular, Effective, and No 'Green-Light' Effect: the Spanish Regularisation of 2005." *Strangers into Citizens*, London.

—. N.D. "Strangers into Citizens Briefing Paper No. 4: Why I Support this Call." *Strangers into Citizens,* London.

Triandafyllidou, Anna. 2001. *Immigrants and National Identity in Europe*. London: Routledge.

Turner, Joe. 2014. "The Family Migration Visa in the History of Marriage Restrictions: Postcolonial Relations and the UK Border." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. doi: 10.1111/1467-856X.12059.

Winant, Howard. 2001. *The World Is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War Two*. New York: Basic Books.