

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The contested politics of mobility: politicizing mobility, mobilizing politics

Book Section

How to cite:

Squire, Vicki (2011). The contested politics of mobility: politicizing mobility, mobilizing politics. In: Squire, Vicki ed. The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity. London, UK: Routledge.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2010 Squire/Routledge

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415584616/>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Chapter 1

The Contested Politics of Mobility: Politicizing Mobility, Mobilizing Politics¹

Vicki Squire

Irregular migration has become a highly politicised issue over recent years, and has been central to the formation of migration policies and border controls across many regions and countries of the ‘global North’. In the US, for example, immigration reform under the Obama administration includes an emphasis on effective enforcement procedures, improved legal processes for workers and employers, and the development of ‘...a firm but fair way to deal with those who are already here’ (Napolitano, 2009).² Similarly, the European Commission’s 2010-2014 Stockholm programme emphasises the importance of addressing the issue of irregular migration through migration policies and border controls, such as in the development of a ‘...flexible immigration policy that is in line with the needs of the job market whilst at the same time support[ing] the integration of immigrants and tackl[ing] illegal immigration’ (Europa, 2009). In Canada, by contrast, irregular migration has been a less prominent issue, although it has increasingly punctuated public and political debate over recent years at key moments of ‘crisis’ (see Goldring, Berinstein and Bernhard, 2009). The limited focus on irregular migration in this context would seem to reflect the geographical specificity of Canadian border regions, which lie at a significant physical distance from regions of the ‘global South’. Given that the rendering of certain border regions as sites of intensified governmental activity is critical in understanding the growing concern with irregular migration, it is perhaps unsurprising that US and EU policies have been organised around irregular migration

more explicitly than has been the case in Canada. After all, border regions of Southern and Eastern Europe, along with the US-Mexican border region, have been key sites whereby political struggles over irregularity have been played out over recent years.

While controls have often been located at traditionally-defined border regions (see Nevins, 2002), there has been an increasing proliferation of sites whereby such controls are enacted over recent years. There are two ways in which the proliferation of controls can be conceptualised: first, in relation to the development of physical checks and controls beyond and within territorial borders or boundaries and, second, in relation to the development of digitalized checks and controls prior to travel. The extension of physical controls beyond territorial borders has been a particularly prominent feature in the EU context (see Lavenex, 1999, 2004, 2006). Here, processes of externalization have been implemented through neighbourhood policies, sea and land patrols, and foreign policy initiatives. The foreign policy dimension is evident in the European Commission's the Global Approach to Migration, for example, which aims to '...manage migration in a coherent way through political dialogue and close practical co-operation with third countries' (Commission of the European Communities, 2008). Such developments can be seen as reflecting a wider drive to deter or intercept irregular migrants before they reach their 'destination', as is evident in the 'Tampa incident' of October 2001 when the Australian government ordered the redirection of a ship that was carrying 187 mainly Iraqi migrants to Indonesia (see Pickering, 2005). Yet the proliferation of physical controls does not simply occur through processes of externalization. As this collection clearly demonstrates, it is more adequate to describe the contemporary context as marked by an 'implosion' or 'diffusion' of such controls both within and beyond state territory (see Côté-Boucher,

2008). Moreover, there is also a second way in which policies of interception have been institutionalized, which is evident in the on-going development of digitalized visa regimes and pre-travel authorization systems (see Grabbe, 2000; Salter, 2006). When it comes to understanding how controls have proliferated in relation to the issue of irregular migration, it is thus important to examine 'borderzones' from a multi-dimensional perspective.

While many control initiatives have been developed with the objective of restricting the irregular migration of people from the global South to the global North, they also emerge in a context marked by rising humanitarian concerns regarding irregular migration. In particular, the death of migrants *en route* has become a particularly pressing issue across various regions (see Cornelius, 2001), an awareness of which has been heightened at moments such as that in July 2006, when tourists on a beach in Tenerife found themselves helping boatfuls of African migrants to shore. There are numerous cases in which people migrating by less than privileged means to regions such as Europe and North America have lost their lives *en route*, whether due to 'accidental' means (such as death from unsafe means of travel), 'natural' means (such as death from health problems provoked by the pressure of migration), or 'purposive' means (such as death by vigilante activities or border policing practices). Worryingly, the problematic distinction between regular and irregular migration has been further entrenched in attempts to address such tragedies. The distinction between regular and irregular migration that informs neoliberal 'managed migration' policies is now a familiar one. On the one hand, the 'legitimate' movement of people across borders has been approached as a productive force to be harnessed or managed while, on the other, the 'illegitimate' movement of people across borders has been approached as

destructive force to be controlled or restricted. It is where irregular migration is articulated as a destructive force that is linked to the death of migrants *en route* that a rationalist utilitarian hierarchy of migration is portrayed as a moral humanitarian hierarchy. This moral hierarchy entices migrants to enact their victimhood effectively (see Aradau, 2008), and elevates some migrants as ‘victims of trafficking’ while demoting others as ‘would-be economic migrants’, ‘bogus asylum seekers’ or ‘criminal foreign nationals’ (see Squire, 2009). Such a moral hierarchy is problematic on many counts, not least because it serves to evade broader questions about why it is so many people are willing to risk their lives to migrate from the global South to the global North.

The framing of irregular migration as a political concern across regions of the global North is thus intimately linked to processes of securitization and criminalization, which inscribe exclusionary distinctions between ‘desirable’ and ‘undesirable’ or ‘productive’ and ‘threatening’ forms of migration (see Bigo, 2004; Huysmans, 2006). These distinctions are not only problematic in terms of the moral and rational hierarchies that they augment and the questions that they encourage us to avoid. So also are they problematic because they tend to occlude the fact that our knowledge of the issue of irregular migration is both incomplete and contested. In the North American and European regions, which are the primary focus of this book, the numbers of irregular migrants are often uncertain. While there are official estimates of a total of 10.8 million irregular migrants resident in the US (Hoefler, Rytina, and Baker 2010), figures are not officially collated in Canada but are proposed to lie between 200,000 to 500,000 (see Goldring, Berinstein and Bernhard, 2009). Indeed, it is notoriously difficult to measure the population of irregular migrants. In the EU, for

example, policy documents have often referred to the possibility that there are up to 8 million irregular migrants. However, this figure has recently been challenged by researchers of the Clandestino project, which estimated there to be between 1.9 and 3.8 million irregular migrants across all 27 EU member states in early 2008.³ The very question of how many irregular migrants reside in a specific region is thus a highly politicised issue around which ‘number games’ are often played. Moreover, the scope of our knowledge regarding irregular migration is limited. There is growing support for research such as that of the Clandestino network, which furthers our knowledge about the numbers and impact of irregular migration. There is also significant governmental interest in research into the origins and routes of irregular migrants. However, our understanding of the expectations and experiences of irregular migrants is limited, and often remains reliant on relatively small-scale studies (e.g. Bloch, Sigona and Zetter, 2010). This is indicative of a governmental drive toward managing migration, as well as of an institutionalised lack of concern regarding the migrant strategies, experiences and claims that are critical to our understanding of irregular migration (see Andrijasevic, 2010).

It is thus in the context of a fraught politics of irregular migration that this book is located. Rather than engaging directly in ‘number games’, *The Contested Politics of Mobility* aims to shed light on the political struggles which underpin such games and on the ways that such struggles constitute ‘borderzones’ in which irregularity itself is contested. In this capacity, the book brings together critical theoretical and empirical work on irregularity with the aim of bridging two divides: first, the divide between European and North American research and, second, the divide between a body of research which focuses on the politics of control and a body of research which focuses

on the politics of migration or movement. The divide between European and North American research is one which may in part reflect the different histories of migration on each continent, with North America historically being a region of immigration, in contrast to a European history of colonial emigration. However, at the contemporary juncture these regions occupy similar positions in relation to migration from the global South to the global North. A consideration of the ways in which migration is irregularized in each context is thus important in getting a broader perspective on a politics of mobility that is organised around irregularity, and in facilitating a consideration of how such politics are implicated in contemporary geometries of spatialized injustice (see Dikec, 2001). The second divide that the book seeks to bridge between those focusing on control and those focusing on migration requires conceptual and theoretical work as well as detailed empirical investigations. This is important in order that irregular migrants are critically engaged as subjects of political struggles around mobility, rather than simply as objects of such a politics. Specifically, this facilitates a consideration of what is at stake in a politics of mobility that is organised around irregularity, as well as a consideration of how the agency of migrants (and citizens) can be creatively, yet carefully, addressed as part of this politics.

So what are we referring to when we discuss the issue of irregular migration? In its mainstream definition irregular migration refers to those who enter a nation-state without authorization, or to those who reside within a nation-state without authorization. It can also be used to refer to those who breach the terms of their visit or residency within a nation-state, such as those who work without permission. In order to create some critical distance from this mainstream reading of irregularity (or

illegality), however, this book refuses the term ‘illegal immigration’ to describe movements of people across borders or the presence of people within any given location. An emphasis on immigration invokes a state-centric perspective on the migratory process, while an emphasis on illegality is problematic because it criminalizes migrants. Indeed, the labelling of migrants as ‘illegal immigrants’ (in the European and North American contexts) or as ‘illegal aliens’ (in the North American context) delegitimizes the strategies and diminishes the agency of migrants, because it inscribes migrants as criminal or ‘culpable’ subjects (see De Genova, 2002). As an alternative, *The Contested Politics of Mobility* uses irregular migration as an alternative term that potentially opens the possibility for a more nuanced and multi-dimensional perspective on irregularity, while also bringing the agency of migrants to the fore.

Analyses of migrant agency or migration have often been approached in the academic literature in relation to the movement from the national to the transnational level. In the field of economics, for example, analysts have drawn attention to the importance of migrant remittances. Migration here features as a dimension of a global economy, which moves beyond protectionism without necessarily destabilizing the framework through which national economies operate (e.g. see Terry and Wilson, 2005). In the fields of sociology and cultural studies, concomitantly, analysts have drawn attention to the importance of migration in the formation of diasporic networks of belonging. Migration here facilitates a move beyond a sedentary nationalistic frame without necessarily undermining its cultural grounds (e.g. see Brah, 1996). Similarly in the field of politics, analysts have drawn attention to the ways in which migrants enact a ‘post-national’ frame of human rights. Migration in this respect invokes an alternative

frame of rights provision to that of national citizenship, without necessarily displacing the individual's relation to the state (e.g. see Soysal, 1999). While post- or transnational accounts are interesting in that they show how a shift in scale can be important in rendering visible migrant agency, they are perhaps less well placed in terms of their ability to examine the ways in which struggles around irregularity reconstitute politics in terms that unsettle any singular spatial frame. It is here that an emphasis on borderzones and irregularity strives to shift away from scalar-thinking in order to think politics in a more dynamic way (cf. Isin 2005; Aradau, Huysmans and Squire 2010; McNevin, forthcoming; Squire 2010). Hence the second part of the subtitle of this introductory chapter: mobilizing politics.

The Contested Politics of Mobility diagnoses and critically intervenes in debates around the governing of irregular migration by exploring irregularity through an approach that I call *mobilizing politics*. Mobilizing politics is conceived of here in a dual sense. On the one hand, mobilizing politics means to *politicise mobility* through examining how the movement of people, in particular the 'irregular' movement of people, is constituted as an object of and as a subject of politics. In politicizing mobility, the collection explores how struggles around migration and control interrelate as distinctive dimensions of a politics of mobility that has irregularity as a key stake. On the other hand, *mobilizing politics* means to render politics mobile through exploring how the 'irregular' movements and activities of people entail a shift in what it means to be political. By considering irregularity as a stake within as well as a product of emergent struggles around mobility, the collection demonstrates both the need for a critical re-thinking of politics through irregularity, as well as the need for a critical re-thinking of irregularity through mobility. Mobilizing politics in this

regard entails both a diagnosis of, as well as a critical intervention into, the contested politics of mobility; a politics in which irregularity is both produced as an object of security and also enacted as subject of citizenship.

Four key moves are central to the diagnosis and critical intervention that is developed in *The Contested Politics of Mobility*, each of which reflects this key emphasis on mobilizing politics. Firstly, by mobilizing politics the collection challenges the assumption that irregularity is a status of individuals and an objective ‘problem’ to be addressed. Instead, it examines irregularity as a condition that is *produced* through various processes of (ir)regularization. Secondly, by mobilizing politics the collection examines irregularity as a *stake* within a wider politics of mobility. In so doing it shows irregularity to be contested, resisted, appropriated and re-appropriated through a series of political struggles. Thirdly, by mobilizing politics the collection examines irregularity as an *ambivalent* condition that is enacted ambiguously both through a ‘politics of control’ and through a ‘politics of migration’, each of which is conceived of here as internally fractured but as coalescing in relation to movement, labour and space. Fourthly, by mobilizing politics the collection approaches irregularity as an *analytical frame* for the analysis of borderzones as dispersed and multi-dimensional sites of political struggle. This, I suggest, is important in understanding the overarching analytical, empirical and political intervention that is made by the essays that come together here in order to analyse *The Contested Politics of Mobility*.

IRREGULARITY AS A CONDITION

To examine irregularity as a condition that is produced through political struggles is to challenge objectivist accounts that presume irregularity to be a status of individuals and a 'problem' to be addressed (see De Genova, 2002). Rather it is to ask a series of questions that allow us to understand more fully irregularity as a condition. How is irregularity produced? By whom and/or by what means is irregularity produced? What are the implications or consequences of irregularization? The essays in *The Contested Politics of Mobility* show irregularity to be produced through various security and policing practices, with migrants (and increasingly citizens) being irregularized through processes of securitization and criminalization. The collection thus questions objectivist accounts of irregularity as a 'problematic' status that individuals hold either due to their illegitimate crossing of borders or due to their illegitimate activities within a state territory. Instead, it shows how irregularity is produced across a range of sites through subjectifications or (ab)normalizations that are, by definition, contested. In contrast, contemporary analyses of irregular migration which uncritically adopt a statist perspective conceptualise irregularity as a 'problem' related to the 'illegitimate' behaviour of migrants, while approaching migration in terms of *immigration* from the outside-in. An approach concerned with mobilizing politics shows this to be problematic in analytical, empirical and political terms.

An emphasis on mobilizing politics contends that an objectivist account is analytically flawed, because it fails to consider the role that national, international and/or transnational agencies play in producing the condition of irregularity (see Goldring, Berinstein and Bernhard, 2009). As many of the essays in this collection suggest, (re)bordering practices that are designed to deny or reduce the rights associated with legal residence and entrance play a central role in determining which movements and

activities are defined as unauthorised, irregular or ‘illegitimate’. For example, the essays by Susan Bibler Coutin, Nicholas De Genova, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Peter Nyers show how practices of deportation, raiding and the ‘unmaking’ of citizenship produce certain movements and activities as irregular, illegitimate or unauthorised. Similarly, Didier Bigo, Kim Rygiel and William Walters indicate that digital border control technologies entail processes of subjectification or (ab)normalization which constitute some migrants as regular and ‘others’ as irregular. In this regard, mobilizing politics means to demonstrate how irregularity is a condition that is produced by the movements and activities of national, international and/or transnational agencies, rather than being a condition that is fixed or pre-given as a simple result of the movements and/or activities of migrants.

An emphasis on mobilizing politics also contends that an objectivist approach is empirically deficient, because it fails to acknowledge the irregular constitution of irregularity itself. While many existing analyses assume that irregularity is a relatively fixed property or status that a given individual holds, the essays in this collection suggest that irregularity is a condition that any given individual can fleet in and out of depending on the relation between his or her movements and activities and the movements and activities of national, international and/or transnational agencies (see Rigo 2005). For example, Peter Nyers’ essay shows how one individual previously constituted as a ‘regular citizen’ is re-constituted as ‘irregular’ when his activities are deemed suspect and when his movement becomes a target of control. Similarly, Jonathan Xavier Inda’s essay points to the way in which irregularity is only produced or activated as a condition through the raiding of workplaces, with the movements and activities of undocumented migrant workers otherwise indistinguishable from those of

workers with citizenship status. What these analyses suggest is that irregularity cannot be conceived of in any simple sense as a fixed property or status that is automatically triggered once migrants come without authorization from the ‘outside-in’ or once they act ‘illegitimately’. Rather, they point to the impossibility of clearly distinguishing between the movements and activities of migrants and citizens (see Bosniak 2000). Indeed, they show how irregular subjects are only constituted as such where their movements and actions become a target of control. Mobilizing politics in this regard means to draw attention to irregularity as a condition that is produced – often in irregular ways – through the (re)bordering practices of national, international and/or transnational agencies.

An emphasis on mobilizing politics contends, moreover, that an objectivist approach is politically problematic, because it brings to bear a normative assumption regarding the status of irregular migrants without addressing the question of how irregularity is produced (see Squire 2009). The essays in this collection suggest that irregularity needs to be approached as a condition that is produced through political struggles rather than as a ‘problem’ to be addressed. Yet collectively the essays do not limit their focus to political struggles that are internal to technologies of control. Rather, they explore such struggles in relation to a broader politics of mobility that I define as constituted in the relations between migration (or movement) and control. In this regard, the essays by Sandro Mezzadra and Enrica Rigo forefront an important dimension of the contested politics of mobility by exploring irregularity in relation to migrations which always-already exceed current (re)bordering practices. On this account, irregularity can be seen as a product of political struggles that emerge where the movements and activities of national, international and/or transnational agencies

come into contact with the movements and activities of migrants and citizens.

Mobilizing politics in this regard moves beyond an objectivist approach to irregular migration in order to develop a distinctly political analysis of irregularity and mobility.

IRREGULARITY AS A STAKE

If irregularity is a produced condition, it is produced both through the movements and activities of national, international and/or transnational agencies *as well as* through the movements and activities of migrants and citizens. More accurately, it is a condition that is produced in the interrelation or collision of these movements and activities. Irregularity is not a legal or social status that an individual holds, in this sense, but rather it is a condition that migrants and citizens move in and out of depending on whether their movements and activities are targeted for control by national, international and/or transnational agencies. Mobilizing politics thus means to shift the focus of attention away from irregular migration as a ‘problem’, and toward a consideration of irregularity as constituted through political struggle. Specifically, it prompts us to ask: How are migrants and citizens constituted as subjects and/or as objects through struggles around irregularity? How is irregularity produced, resisted, contested, appropriated and re-appropriated through such political struggles? What are the possibilities as well as the limitations of a politics of mobility that is organised around irregularity? In addressing such questions, *The Contested Politics of Mobility* does not approach irregularity as the end product of a politics of control, but rather conceives it as a key *stake* within a contested politics of mobility in which migration or movement, as well as its control, plays an active role. This is important, because it

opens up our analysis to a consideration of the ways in which irregularity itself can be seen as a shifting ground of contestations and resistances.

To suggest that irregularity is merely produced through a politics of control, as so many contemporary analyses of border technologies imply, is to erase the struggles inherent to what I call here the contested politics of mobility. That is, an emphasis on the way in which irregularity is produced through technologies of control risks overlooking both the struggles inherent to such productions, as well as the different ways in which irregularity is contested, resisted, appropriated and/or re-appropriated – often by those who are constituted or categorised as such. The essay by Didier Bigo, for example, shows how technologies of channelling which filter the irregular from the regular can be seen as part of a wider struggle to govern mobility through freedom. Such struggles for control are precisely that – *struggles* – which fulfil neither a utopian dream of absolute freedom nor a dystopian nightmare of total control. This is evident in William Walters’ analysis of the development of the e-passport in terms of technological zones, which draws attention to the ways in which security technologies are crossed by a range of political struggles in their very formation. Even a politics of control, it would seem, is a less certain and uniform politics than one might presume.

Similarly, to reduce irregularity to a politics of migration or movement would be to overlook the struggles inherent to the formation of irregularity as a condition. This is an argument developed in the essay by Sandro Mezzadra, which suggests that irregularity can be interpreted as a condition that is produced where practices of control meet ‘autonomous migrations’ (see Mezzadra and Nielson, 2008). This is

clearly not to say that irregularity can be viewed as a condition of unrestrained freedom, as a liberal account of autonomous migration would imply. A critical account of the politics of mobility that takes seriously the argument that migration can be seen as a social movement instead highlights political struggles which are integral to the very practices of control through which irregularity is produced. Irregularity in this respect is not a story of subjection or abjection, although movements and activities that lend themselves to abjectification are certainly evident. Moreover, irregularity is not necessarily pre-defined as a condition of precarity or marginality, although a range of institutionalised or sedimented practices and relations certainly condition its frequent production and experience as such. Despite the predominance of practices of control that lean toward subjection and abjection, and despite the predominance of practices of control that have tendencies toward precaritization and marginalization, an approach which takes migration as a critical starting point suggests that political struggles which exceed the reach of control are at the same time constitutive of the condition of irregularity. Taking this argument on board, mobilizing politics means to approach irregularity as a political condition that is experienced and enacted in heterogeneous ways through divergent struggles that cross between migration and its control. It is in critically examining this condition from the perspective of migration that the essay by Sandro Mezzadra suggests irregularity to be a key stake within, as well as a product of, the contested politics of mobility.

IRREGULARITY AND AMBIVALENCE (THE POLITICS OF MIGRATION AND
THE POLITICS OF CONTROL)

If irregularity is a stake within a politics of mobility that is constituted in struggles around migration and control, it is also an *ambivalent* condition that is not simply produced through processes of (ab)normalization but that is also ambiguously resisted, contested, appropriated and/or re-appropriated through divergent political forms. To say that irregularity is an ambivalent condition is thus both to draw attention to the limitations or instability of any singular politics of irregularity, as well as to draw attention to the potentialities of emergent struggles around irregularity in re-enacting 'the political'. Indeed, to focus on the ambivalence of irregularity is to draw attention to the ways in which irregularity can be engaged both in a politics of control *and* in a politics of migration or movement. This is something that Peter Nyers' essay regarding different forms of 'irregular citizenship' subtly demonstrates through its examination of irregularity both as a condition of autonomy as well as a condition of control. Going further, one could suggest that irregularity is frequently enacted or experienced in different forms simultaneously. As Susan Bibler Coutin's interrogation of the dislocated subjectivities of deportees so clearly demonstrates, irregularity is much more than a singular and coherent experience. Rather, irregularity is rife with ambiguity, just as the lines between regularity and irregularity are notoriously obscure (see also Coutin 2005).

So how are we to make sense of the ambivalences of irregularity? On the one hand, we can see that a politics of control simultaneously regularises and irregularises subjects 'on the move'. Irregularity, illegality or illegitimacy in this regard can be conceived of as conditions that are produced through various processes of (ab)normalization, and as having regularity, legality and legitimacy as their counterparts. This is evident in Didier Bigo's essay, for example, which shows how

processes of dataveillance constitute some subjects as qualified to move with comfort and speed, while others are held up for investigation. However, it is critical to note that, when viewed through the lens of (ab)normalization, processes of (ir)regularization are not conceived of in terms of subjection or subjectivation, which implies a totalising form of power. Rather, irregularity as a condition that is produced through (ab)normalization is more adequately conceived of in terms of processes of *subjectification*, which have power and resistance or contestation at their core (see Aradau 2008). Thus, on the other hand, a politics of migration or movement enacts a politics of mobility through appropriating or re-appropriating irregularity through and against such (ir)regularizing practices. For Bigo, this is experimented with in terms of the tactic of 'data overload', whereby activists struggle to manipulate dataveillance systems through the over-production of data. Yet irregularity cannot in any simple way be conceived of in subjectivist terms, just as it cannot be conceived of in objectivist terms. Rather, irregularity is better conceived of in terms of ambivalent political subjectivities that are constituted as such through a multiplicity of struggles. To focus on irregularity as an ambivalent condition thus requires the development of an analytical approach that can explore how productive powers of (ab)normalization continuously encounter resistances, contestations, appropriations and re-appropriations of irregularity.

An analysis of irregularity as an ambivalent condition raises a series of theoretical and empirical questions. How can resistances, contestations, appropriations and/or re-appropriations of irregularity be conceptualised? What different types of struggles feature in a politics of mobility in which irregularity forms a stake? How are such struggles mobilized? The essays in *The Contested Politics of Mobility* answer these

questions in a variety of ways, indicative of the multiplicity of struggles that constitute a politics of mobility in which irregularity forms a stake. For example, Kim Rygiel brings to bear a feminist politics of embodiment to our understanding of e-borders, while Nicholas De Genova and Peter Nyers draw attention to the processes of racialization that are invoked in contemporary (re)bordering practices. Drawing on these rich and varied accounts, mobilizing politics means to explore the politics of mobility as internally differentiated. This internal differentiation is conceptualised here in two ways. First, the politics of mobility is conceived to be internally differentiated because it is constituted through two divergent political forms: a politics of migration or movement and a politics of control. As the essays by Sandro Mezzadra and Didier Bigo suggest, these political forms are counter-posed in terms of their relation to irregularity. From Mezzadra's perspective, we might interpret irregularity as a stake within a capitalist formation that is founded on autonomous migrations. From Bigo's perspective, we might interpret irregularity as a condition that is produced through the channelling technologies employed as part of a liberal mode of governing through freedom.

Nevertheless, mobilizing politics also brings to bear a second form of internal differentiation, which indicates that the divergent forms of migration and control are fractured in and of themselves. As the essays in the collection clearly show, neither a politics of control nor a politics of migration or movement can be clearly defined. For example, technologies of channelling, individualization and standardization; border spectacles; practices of raiding, deportation and the deprivation of citizenship – these are all diverging dimensions of a politics of control that constitutes irregularity as a condition of abjection, precaritization and/or marginalization, but which are

contested or resisted in various ways (see the essays by Bigo, Coutin, De Genova, Inda, Nyers, Rygiel, Walters). Similarly, acts of non-compliance or refusal; enactments of illegal or irregular citizenship; acts of solidarity and collective mobilization – these are all diverging dimensions of a politics of migration that constitute irregularity as an ambivalent and contested condition, but which can be appropriated or re-appropriated in various ways (see the essays by Coutin, De Genova, Inda, Mezzadra, Nyers, Rigo, Rygiel,). Mobilizing politics in this regard means to explore a multiplicity of struggles which are inherent to the politics of mobility, yet which can be tentatively distinguished in terms of the fractured political forms of migration and control.

To further understand the distinctiveness of a politics of migration or movement and a politics of control, it may be helpful to consider how each fractured political form relates to the categories of movement, labour and space. From the first direction, a ‘politics of control’ is interpreted here in terms of struggles to master movement; extract labour; and enclose space. In terms of the mastery of movement, the essays by Didier Bigo, Kim Rygiel and William Walters come together in showing how the development of biometrics entails a struggle for the mastery of movement through digital technologies. Similarly, the essays by Susan Bibler Coutin, Nicholas De Genova, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Peter Nyers collectively demonstrate how the extension of security and policing technologies ‘beyond’ border regions as well as the diffusion of security and policing technologies ‘within’ state territories entails an expansive struggle to master the movement of those defined as ‘irregular’ or ‘illegitimate’. Immobility is not the inevitable aim or outcome of struggles to master movement, one might conclude, but rather the struggle to master movement entails

enforced mobilities as well as enforced immobilities. Moving on to the extraction of labour, the essays by Nicholas De Genova and Sandro Mezzadra are helpful as conceptual interventions that allow us to see how the production of irregularity can be understood in both material and ideological terms as part of the struggle to exploit labour power by capital and state agencies. Focusing on subjects 'on the move', the essays by Kim Ryziel and Susan Bibler Coutin similarly show how bodies are rendered disposable and exploitable through techniques such as screening and deportation that are used prior to and after an individual's movement across borders. In terms of the enclosure of space, the essays by Enrica Rigo and Peter Nyers are instructive in showing how a politics of control struggles to delimit space in exclusionary ways. While Rigo's essay implies that a politics of control struggles to enact a territorialising conception of citizenship through the containment of legal and physical space, Nyers shows how a series of exceptionalist measures both reinforce and problematise this territorialising process. Similarly, the essays by Susan Bibler Coutin, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Nicholas De Genova show how technologies of control such as deportation and raiding struggle to maintain (an illusion of) enclosed space or territory. In this regard, the enclosure of space can be interpreted as central to a politics of control.

From a second direction, a 'politics of migration or movement' is interpreted here in terms of struggles that mobilize movement, labour and space against, or in excess of, the processes of mastery, extraction and enclosure (or containment) discussed above. In relation to movement, the essays by Sandro Mezzadra and Enrica Rigo conceptualise migration as always-already 'preceding' a politics of control that struggles to master movement, and in this regard an autonomous account of migration

as a social movement can be distinguished from that which emerges from analyses of the governing of mobility. Similarly, the essays by Peter Nyers, Enrica Rigo and Kim Rygiel point to the ways in which movement (particularly cross-border movement) can form part of a contending political form in which irregularity is appropriated or re-appropriated in 'irregular' ways. Paying attention to movement in this regard opens up possibilities for the examination of alternative ways of being political, as well as facilitating an understanding of how mobility is governed. In relation to labour, the essays by Nicholas De Genova and Jonathan Xavier Inda show how the struggle to extract labour is disrupted by migrant workers who mobilize against their exploitability and disposability by mobilizing their labour power. Likewise, the essays by Sandro Mezzadra and Enrica Rigo point to alternative enactments of citizenship which mobilize labour power based on the informal citizenship practices of migrant workers. In relation to space, the essays by Susan Bibler Coutin, Peter Nyers and Enrica Rigo, all prompt us to think beyond the confines of a contained spatial frame. Peter Nyers' and Enrica Rigo's theorizations of citizenship in its irregular or illegal forms are critical in this regard, because each bring to the fore political subjectivities which do not fit with the territorial legal or physical frame of the nation-state.

An emphasis on the way in which the territorial frame of the nation-state is challenged by migration or mobility is also evident in the essay by Susan Bibler Coutin. She shows how deportees from the US to El Salvador disrupt a frame of national belonging by enacting 'Americanness' beyond the borders of the US. Nevertheless, Bibler also draws attention to the ambivalence of such enactments as challenges to national belonging. On the one hand, her discussion of 'misplaced' Americanness would seem to form part of a politics of migration or movement that enacts politics in

a non-territorial form while, on the other, it would seem to reinforce a territorialising politics that has national belonging at its heart (albeit one where the location of nationals and nationalism is dispersed). Ambivalence in this regard runs through the politics of migration and the politics of control in ways that demonstrate the impossibility of their separation. Indeed, one could go further in addressing the ambivalences of irregularity as a condition that is run through with struggles over control and migration; perhaps even so far as to say that the contested politics of mobility is marked by the colonization of a politics of migration by a politics of control. This is a point that can be read from the essay by Kim Ryegeel, which shows how biometric technologies move with bodies as part of a struggle to master movement or 'capture' irregularity. The mastery of movement in this regard works against the enclosure of space as well as towards it, indicative of the way in which a contested politics of mobility takes us ambivalently, yet only partially, beyond the territorial and territorialising frame of the nation-state.

IRREGULARITY AS AN ANALYTIC

One of the critical strengths of analysing the politics of migration and the politics of control as distinctive (yet intimately bound) dimensions of a politics of mobility is that neither political form is automatically equated with specific agents or pre-given subject positions. While migrants often enact a politics of migration and while national, international and/or transnational agencies often enact a politics of control, the essays in this collection point to a much more complex series of interrelations in which subjects are constituted as subjects of migration and as subjects of control

through a range of struggles over mobility. It is in this regard that *The Contested Politics of Mobility* allows us to see both how mobility is politicised and how politics are mobilized through struggles over migration and its control. Indeed, the essays show how the subjects and objects of migration, like the subjects and objects of control, are constituted as such through a differentiated, fractured and shifting politics of mobility, which render indeterminate the spatializations and subjectivities through which borderzones and irregularity are produced. By distinguishing between different struggles analytically rather than juridically or according to scale, the essays collectively examine a multiplicity of struggles through which irregularity is constituted as an ambivalent and contested socio-political condition. Mobilizing politics in this regard means to bring into view movements and activities that disrupt sedimented subject positions and scales of reference – often in unexpected ways. Such an approach thus intervenes analytically in contemporary debates around the contested politics of mobility in terms that potentially challenge contemporary assumptions regarding what it means to be political.

If irregularity is a key stake in a politics of mobility that is run through with struggles around migration and its control, then any critical account of such a politics requires an analytical frame that has both mobility and politics at its core. It is with this in mind that an emphasis on mobilizing politics is developed here in terms that promote irregularity as an analytic for the critical diagnosis of, and critical intervention into, the contested politics of mobility. But how does such an analytic add to, or differ from, existing analyses of such a politics? In what ways does it facilitate an analysis in which migrant agency is taken seriously? And how does it allow us to further our critical understanding of borderzones and irregularity; of migration and its control?

An analytics of irregularity entails several critical moves, each of which might be interpreted as distinguishing it from an Agambenian account of borderzones. Above all, an analytics of irregularity approaches (re)bordering practices as irregular in their spatial and political formation. As many of the essays in this collection show, irregularity is produced through various processes of (ab)normalization and subjectification that are practiced across diffuse and heterogeneous sites. For example, the workplace is just as easily conceptualised as a borderzone that divides the ‘legitimate’ from the ‘illegitimate’ worker (Inda) as the ‘technological zone’ through which the e-passport is constituted (Walters). Borderzones in this sense are neither conceived of in conventional terms as the borderline, nor necessarily in the Agambenian sense as ‘zones of exception’ (see Walters’ essay in this collection). An examination of borders is thus displaced analytically through the examination of dynamic (re)bordering practices (see Andreas 2001), while ‘borderzones’ are conceived of as sites marked by the intensification of political struggles over the condition of irregularity. (Re)bordering practices in this sense might be locatable in time and space, but are constant neither in their temporal nor in their spatial concentration (see also Rajaram and Grundy-Warr 2007). Moreover, borderzones may be marked by struggles around abjectification, but do not necessarily produce abject subjects (see also Squire 2009).

Going further, an analytics of irregularity develops a multi-dimensional perspective on the securitization and criminalization of migration, which can account for the irregularizing consequences and effects of contemporary (re)bordering practices, as well as for their irregular formation. While Agambenian analyses of border practices generally focus on the exceptional moments of a politics of control, an analytics of

irregularity examines a range of processes of irregularization that are manifest across various sites in various rhythms and in various forms – the standard and the everyday, as well as the extraordinary and the spectacular. What the collection of essays in *The Contested Politics of Mobility* suggests is that irregularity is primarily produced through *divisive* processes; processes which seem to bring into alignment what Didier Bigo and others have distinguished as a ‘politics of exception’ and a ‘politics of unease’. On the one hand, the essays by Peter Nyers and Nicholas De Genova point to the centrality of spectacular movements and activities that fit within the frame of the ‘politics of exception’. On the other hand, the essays by Didier Bigo, Kim Rygiel and William Walters point to a series of more mundane, everyday and standardised movements and activities that fit more comfortably with what Didier Bigo calls a ‘politics of unease’. In order to account for the multiplicity of these (re)bordering practices, an analytics of irregularity is proposed here as a bridge between an analytics of exceptionalism and an analytics of unease. While these are often conceived of as having a divergent logic or form (see Buonfino and Huysmans, 2008), an analytics of irregularity allows us to see how such practices are intertwined as dimensions of a politics of control that continually struggles to divide regular subjects from their irregular counterparts.

Moreover, an analytics of irregularity does not write the agency of migrants out of the politics of mobility (see also Huysmans, Dobson and Prokhovnik 2006). Neither does it sanitise borderzones of politics. An approach that examines the constitution of borderzones and irregularity through a frame of mobilizing politics thus differs from many Agambenian accounts because it approaches borderzones as relational sites of political struggle, rather than simply as sites of biopolitical control (see Kim Rygiel’s

essay in this collection; see also Rajaram and Grundy-Warr's 2007 text on 'borderscapes'). Securitizations and criminalizations of migration are challenged when irregularity is mobilized against, or in excess of, the masteries, extractions and enclosures of a politics of control. In this regard, migrant agency often becomes a central focus of an analytics of irregularity. However, migrant agency is not pre-defined as mobilizing irregularity in ways that necessarily defy processes of securitization and criminalization, but is rather examined in so far as it entails an intervention in struggles over mobility. As the many of the essays in this collection suggest, these struggles implicate citizens, as well as security professionals and migrants – regular and irregular alike (see in particular essays by Didier Bigo, Sandro Mezzadra, Peter Nyers and Enrica Rigo). It is in the intensity of such struggles over mobility that an analytics of irregularity identifies borderzones, rather than in any paradigmatic geographic or spatial location. If the constitution of irregularity entails various powers, resistances, contestations, appropriations and re-appropriations of such a condition, then borderzones are also contested in their very constitution. Mobilizing politics thus means to critically engage an analytic of irregularity through the examination of borderzones as sites of intensified political struggles over mobility.

To propose irregularity as an alternative critical analytic to that of an analytics of exceptionalism or an analytics of unease does not only entail a shift in focus to irregular and irregularising (re)bordering practices. So also does it entail a refusal of the privileging of security over citizenship, of government over politics, and of domination over resistance or contestation. Each of the essays in this collection engages in such a task by developing a distinctively critical analysis of the contested politics of mobility. Indeed, in its own way each of the essays in this collection

analyses irregularity both as a product of, and as a stake within, a contested politics of mobility. Collectively, the essays point to the contemporary importance of a body of research that examines how irregularity is produced both as an object of security *and* as subject of citizenship. Indeed, they go further in order to point to the political dangers of assuming such a distinction as given. For, if irregularity is viewed simply as an object of security, mobility tends to be reduced to circulation and citizenship invoked as a regime of control. Conversely, if irregularity is simply viewed as a subject of citizenship, mobility may be transformed politically but often at the expense of rendering migration suspect for security. In order to evade such a trap, an analytic of irregularity works at the intersections of mobility, security and citizenship, in order to expose struggles that allow for a re-thinking of politics through irregularity, as well as for a re-thinking of mobility through irregularity. To put it simply, an approach that proposes an analytic of irregularity diagnoses and critically intervenes in a politics of mobility both through *politicizing mobility* and through *mobilizing politics*.

THE CONTESTED POLITICS OF MOBILITY

This book is divided into two parts, each of which is introduced by a short editorial summary. The first part of the book addresses the thematic of politicizing mobility, while the second part addresses the thematic of mobilizing politics.

Part I: Politicizing mobility

Didier Bigo

Freedom and speed in enlarged borderzones

Didier Bigo opens the collection by exploring irregularity, mobility and control through the lens of liberal governmentality. Focusing on the development of ‘smart borders’, he suggests that dataveillance has emerged as a form of governing mobility in which mobility and freedom are amalgamated. This, Bigo shows, is articulated as a smart solution that differs from the temporary reinvigoration of exceptionalist border controls since 11 (or 14) September 2001, where the first predicate was to ‘stop’ or obstruct travellers deemed threatening or risky. From the perspective of proponents of ‘smart borders’, movement (even under surveillance) is a form of freedom in contrast to obstruction; a ‘free pass’ that does not generate traveller unrest in the same way as do exceptional controls. Bigo claims that ‘smart borders’ can thus be interpreted as continuing a longer trajectory of governing of mobility through freedom, which is based on the production of unease. Drawing on Foucault’s insight that security and liberty are not opposed values and showing how mobility serves as the limit of freedom rather than as its ‘unique dimension’, Bigo shows how ‘smart borders’ operate within this rationale through inducing travellers’ compliance based on the promise of speed and comfort. While pastoral, sovereign, disciplinary and biopolitical forms of power invest such technologies of control, he claims that smart borders primarily reframe our conceptions regarding the freedom of citizen and consumers in their push for speedy movement. This entails the production of irregular subjects in new ways: not only is irregularity produced through obstruction, but so also is irregularity produced through programmes that are designed to maintain the speed of travel by tracing all and preventing some people’s travel. Distinctive to ‘smart

borders', Bigo thus demonstrates, is that irregularity is produced through 'data doubles' that take on a life of their own amidst a burgeoning system of dataveillance.

William Walters

Rezoning the Global: Technological Zones, Technological Work, and the (Un-) Making of Biometric Borders

William Walters focuses on the emergence of the e-passport in his essay, and in so doing prompts us to shift our analytical focus from the production and contestation of irregularity to the irregular formation of borders and zones. Intervening in debates regarding the global reach of contemporary security practices, he demonstrates the limitations and political shortcomings of uncritically accepting what he calls a 'global security hypothesis'. Walters suggests that this hypothesis portrays the image of an all-encompassing networked-borderzone of surveillance, which is problematic in two senses: first, it risks exaggerating and oversimplifying a complex picture of the security practices through which cross-border mobilities are governed and, second, it risks overlooking the painstaking work that goes into the making (and unmaking) of such practices. In order to counter the image of the 'technological sublime' which is implied by a global security hypothesis that reifies technology as the driving force of globalization, Walters develops his analysis of the emergence of the e-passport through emphasising the importance of standards. This allows him both to examine the complex formation of 'technological zones', as well as to draw attention to the critical importance of highlighting the politics embedded in mundane 'technological work'. Walters does this through exploring the International Civil Aviation Organization's specification of international technical standards for the e-passport,

which allows him to show how spaces of security and landscapes of control are formed through various networks of power and contestation. Specifically, Walters draws our attention to the strategic decisions, the technical subtleties and the unexpected moments that go into the making and unmaking of standards for the e-passport. This technological work, he claims, brings to the fore an often overlooked dimension of the politics of control: namely that the normalization of migration finds its counterpart in a series of mundane struggles over ‘the standardization of things’.

Jonathan Xavier Inda

Borderzones of Enforcement: Criminalization, Workplace Raids, and Migrant Counter-Conducts

Jonathan Xavier Inda switches our attention to the ‘internal’ policing of migration in his essay, focusing in particular on workplace raids in the United States.

Conceptualising the increase in workplace raids during the mid- to late-2000s in terms of the emergence of a wider neoliberal governmentality of governing through crime, he argues that the punishment and apprehension of ‘illegal immigrants’ as irresponsible deviants runs parallel to wider processes of ‘responsibilising’ citizens.

Inda shows how this mode of ‘governing immigration through crime’ is bound up with concerns regarding ‘homeland security’ in the post-9/11 context, and draws attention to the ways in which irregular migration has been represented as associated with terrorism in US public and political discourse. He suggests that this serves to legitimise the criminalisation of migrants, with workplace raids emerging as a key technology of criminalisation in this regard. Inda goes on to explore the rationale and

operation of workplace raids, while at the same time addressing the implications of such exclusionary and punitive techniques both for migrants and migrant families, as well as for the communities within which they live and work. In particular, he draws attention to the ways in which raids leave migrants and migrant families facing the challenges of material hardship, unstable familial relations, social isolation and psychological trauma. He also draws attention to the wider ramifications of raiding for migrant communities, focusing on the way in which the developments that he charts can be seen as producing unease amongst Latino migrant communities in particular. However, Inda does not accept that workplace raids necessarily entail the abjectification of irregular migrants. Rather, he draws attention to the ways in which such migrants and their allies reject the exclusionary and punitive mechanisms that emerge in the institutional context of ‘governing immigration through crime’. Specifically, he focuses on migrant demonstrations and court actions as examples of migrant ‘counter-conducts’ in which political subjectivity and citizenship is strategically enacted by those without status in terms that potentially reverse existing power relations. Such counter-conducts, he concludes, entail a questioning of the criminalization of migrants and thus allow us to see how the workplace as a dispersed ‘internal borderzone’ also functions as a site of political struggle.

Nicholas De Genova

Alien Powers: Deportable Labour and the Spectacle of Security

In his essay Nicholas De Genova examines the condition of irregularity through the lens of what he conceives of as a central technology of an ‘incipient Global Security

State', which is constituted through the antiterrorist policies of the US Homeland Security as well as through an emergent global regime of deportation. De Genova develops our understanding both of irregular migration and of the 'War on Terror' by theorising the link between antiterrorist security measures and the subordination of migrant labour power. Specifically, he examines the US Homeland Security State's struggle to render migrants deportable as an epistemic struggle through which migrants are constructed as an enemy figure. Drawing on Debord's theorisation of the spectacle, he argues that this process is an ideological one which is mediated through a 'debilitating onslaught of images' designed to render us passive in the face of our alienation from the creative force of our labour. That this process is one that racializes Muslim migrants and citizens in particular, he suggests, adds a nativism to the political mix and serves to conceal a global apartheid based on the division of labour power. De Genova thus argues that the incipient Global Security State needs to be understood as a struggle to secure the regime of capital accumulation by alienating labour from its own creative power. Migration and irregular migration in particular, De Genova argues, serve as the prime targets of this process. This is because the deportability of undocumented migrants both serves to conceal from view our alienation from the creative force of our labour, while at the same time as functioning as an on-going reminder that labour of all forms is essentially disposable. Irregularity as a condition that is produced through deportability is thus central to the subordination of labour because it entails wider processes of precaritization and alienation. Despite this, the subordination of labour and the irregularization of migration is, De Genova shows, always part of a struggle rather than an all-consuming power. In this regard, he shows how struggles of migrants can be read as moments in which the creative force of labour is mobilized.

Part II: Mobilizing Politics

Sandro Mezzadra

Capitalism, migration and social struggles: Towards a theory of the autonomy of migration

The essay by Sandro Mezzadra examines the politics of mobility from the perspective of migrant subjectivity. Situating such a politics in relation to the transformation of capitalism under contemporary conditions of globalization, Mezzadra conceptualises irregularity as a key strategic stake for an autonomous migration approach that seeks to shift our gaze toward a migrant-orientated perspective. Such an approach, he suggests, entails a consideration of the ways in which migrants – both regular and irregular – act as citizens, regardless of their juridical status. It also entails a consideration of the ways in which migrant practices are politically mobilized in relation to the struggles, tensions and violences that run through a politics of mobility. In developing a migrant-orientated perspective on the politics of mobility Mezzadra contributes to a body of work on autonomous migration both through fleshing out its Italian autonomous Marxist impulse as well as through drawing on the radical democratic theories of Jacques Rancière and Bonnie Honig. He poses the autonomous migration approach against what he describes as a ‘new orthodoxy’ in migration studies, which privileges the migrant in terms of the communitarian values that migration revives. In so doing, Mezzadra exposes managed migration as a struggle to exploit the productive powers of living labour, conceived of as the ‘excess’ or

'autonomy' of migration. Situating this politics of control as part of a longer history of tension and conflict between capital and living labour, Mezzadra shows how migrancy itself features as a driving force not only in the restructuring of social and economic relations but also in the formation of political community. He does this by drawing attention to the centrality of migrant struggles within the contemporary politics of mobility, and by suggesting that an understanding of autonomy of migration potentially allows us to move beyond our current imaginations of political community. Irregularity from this perspective, he suggests, cannot be separated out from migration at large, nor can it be viewed simply as a stake that emerges in the struggle between a politics of migration and a politics of control. Rather, Mezzadra claims that irregularity concerns the common conditions of social cooperation and production, and thus forms a key stake around which heterogeneous coalitions can be constituted.

Kim Ryziel

Governing Borderzones of Mobility through E-borders: The Politics of Embodied Mobility

Kim Ryziel critically examines the operations of e-borders in her essay, and in so doing brings feminist theorisations of embodiment to the centre of her analysis of the politics of mobility. Drawing attention to the conceptual limitations and political problems of Agambenian accounts of a politics of control, Ryziel stresses the importance of approaching the body in motion as a positioned body, rather than as the abstract and depoliticised body such as that associated with *homo sacer*. This, she

claims, is critical given that e-borders work according to a similar logic of depoliticization to that which an Agambenian approach often evokes. As an alternative to such an approach, Rygiel makes the case for the development of a relational ontology that draws on feminist theorisations of embodiment and power. In so doing, she develops both a critical diagnosis of the contemporary politics of control, as well as a critical intervention into the contested politics of mobility. In terms of her critical diagnosis, Rygiel exposes the way that e-borders govern bodies in motion, showing how these both intensify surveillance over borders and bodies while also paradoxically ‘disappearing’ borders and bodies through their digitalization. The abstract one-way ‘gaze’ of e-border technologies, she demonstrates, entails both the irregularization of borders and the irregularization of bodies. Most critically, however, e-borders entail processes of discrimination that are concealed by the abstract individualized linkages that are drawn between biometric and personal data. This, Rygiel argues, removes the mobile body from the body politic and replaces a discourse of rights with one of authority. As an intervention into this problematic politics of control, Rygiel makes mobility visible as an embodied mobility from the perspective of movement or migration. She does this by exploring how ‘unruly’ bodies transgress a politics of control, and by exploring a series of such movements and counter-acts that constitute an ‘insurrectional’ politics of movement or migration. While strategies of invisibility are often central to such struggles, Rygiel concludes, strategies of visibility are particularly important for an intervention that seeks to challenge a disembodied discourse of authorisation.

Susan Bibler Coutin

Legal Exclusion and Dislocated Subjectivities: The Deportation of Salvadoran Youth from the United States

In examining the dislocated subjectivities of Salvadoran youth who have been deported from the United States, Susan Bibler Coutin's essay brings to the fore the ambivalences of irregularity as a legally-produced social condition. Showing how removal leads to the production of underground and liminal spaces, Coutin explores both how irregular migrants *qua* unauthorised residents are exiled through their deportation, as well as how deportees resist their banishment from family ties, citizenship and territory. On the one hand, the essay draws attention to the process of compound exclusion as central in understanding the experiences of deportees. Specifically, it shows how repressive practices used during the Salvadoran civil war, U.S. border enforcement tactics, structural racism, the economic exploitation of U.S. migrant populations, the criminalization of many aspects of youth culture in the United States, and the current deportation regime come together in terms that produce deportees as quasi-stateless subjects. In this context, Coutin suggests that deportee exiles are often attached to national identity rather than transnational citizenship, with deportees resisting criminalization, discrimination and exclusion through various struggles over (and claims to) membership. On the other hand, the essay demonstrates that deportees resist criminalization and discrimination by navigating the liminal space of 'neither belonging nor *not* belonging'. In El Salvador, they do this either through engaging in activities that maintain their cultural ties with the U.S. or through engaging in activities in terms that emulate El Salvadoran norms. Away from El Salvador, deportees do this by undertaking the difficult return journey to the U.S. from El Salvador. Coutin shows how the latter entails a resistance to the exclusions of

U.S. migration controls, demonstrating both the limitations and the power of such controls through return-deportees' entering of an 'underground' that is characteristic of the experience of irregularity. With this in mind, Coutin concludes her essay by considering the limitations as well as the possibilities raised by the resistances of deportees that she interviewed. In particular, she draws attention the potential of legal actions as compound resistances that work against those processes of compound exclusion which condition the dislocated subjectivities of deported youth.

Peter Nyers

Peter Nyers' essay introduces the concept of irregular citizenship in order to address questions regarding political subjectivity. He approaches this through Arendt's concept of claiming the right to have rights, and draws attention to the way in which irregular citizenship can be viewed both from a perspective of control and from a perspective of autonomy. Nyers demonstrates the importance of these two forms of irregular citizenship through developing a detailed analysis of the case of Abousfian Abdelrazik, a Canadian citizen whose citizenship became the subject of a significant political struggle between the Canadian state, on the one hand, and Abdelrazik and his supporters, on the other. This case is important, Nyers suggests, because it allows us to see how the dividing line between 'secure citizen' and 'threatening migrant' is beginning to break down, with citizens increasingly finding their citizenship unmade through state practices of irregularization. The first form of irregular citizenship that Nyers examines is the unmaking of Abdelrazik's citizenship by the Canadian state. Here, he highlights the denial of consular assistance and the denial of emergency

travel documents as central dimensions of the state's struggle to performatively unmake Abdelrazik's citizenship where legal revocation was not possible. Nyers charts a range of exclusionary, exceptionalist and racializing practices central to this process of irregularization. The second form of irregular citizenship that Nyers examines relates to acts of self-irregularization. While the civil disobedience of those acting in solidarity with Abdelrazik do not effectively qualify as acts of irregular citizenship, Nyers argues that self-irregularization raises the possibility of a rejection of citizenship in favour of another mode of being political. Going further, he suggests that such acts open up the paradoxes of liberal citizenship through 'contestatory irregularizations' that challenge the racialized disaggregation of citizenship and the exceptionalist practices of control invoked by the Canadian state in the Abdelrazik case. Not only is irregularity a condition that is increasingly experienced by citizens as well as migrants, Nyers thus concludes, but so also is irregularity a condition that is enacted in multiple forms.

Enrica Rigo

Citizens despite borders: Challenges to the territorial order of Europe

Enrica Rigo closes the collection by provoking us to think through the paradoxical subject of 'illegal citizenship', which she addresses in relation to a contested European legal and political space. Examining migration from the perspective of critical legal theory, Rigo demonstrates how the informal citizenship of migrants troubles conventional assumptions about citizenship as a territorially-delimited category. She counters the naturalistic assumptions of many ascriptive and consensual conceptualisations of citizenship by making the case for an approach that draws out

the ambivalences that run between the prescriptive and descriptive dimensions of citizenship. This, Rigo argues, allows us to see that human mobility continuously exceeds a prescriptive model of citizenship, with the ‘obedience’ and ‘bonds’ of migrants’ informal citizenship practices becoming ‘weapons that continuously destabilize the exclusiveness of existing communities’. In adopting this account of illegal citizenship, Rigo not only lays bare the processes of criminalization and illegalization that run across European domestications of mobility, but so also does she forefront the political struggles of migrants whose informal citizenship practices are targeted by restrictive policies. These struggles, she suggests, expose an irresolvable contradiction at the heart of European citizenship, which institutionalises free movement while differentiating between subjects who are located within the same legal and political space. Demonstrating the workings of this process of differentiation with regard to labour relations, Rigo shows how the connection between labour status and right to residence in recent EU and European policies entails a refusal of the right to territory along with the denial of migrants’ claims to being free and equal subjects. In so doing, Rigo reminds us both of the artificial nature of territoriality as well as of the importance of viewing struggles around migration and control as constitutive of the very core of citizenship (European and non-European alike). Beyond extending rights to irregular migrants through an expansive citizenship project, this means to view irregularity through mobility as part of a conflicting order of citizenship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andreas, P. (2001) *Bordergames: Policing the US-Mexico Divide* Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Andrijasevic, R. (2010) *title tbc* forthcoming with Palgrave.

Aradau, C. (2008) *Rethinking Trafficking in Women: Politics out of Security*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Aradau, C., Huysmans, H. and Squire, V. (2010) “Acts of European Citizenship: A Political Sociology of Mobility”, forthcoming in the *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48: 4 (forthcoming September 2010).

Bigo, D. (2004) ‘Criminalization of ‘migrants’: the side effect of the Will to control the frontiers and the Sovereign Illusion’, in Barbara Bogusz, Ryszard Cholewinski, Adam Cygan, Erika Szyszczak (Eds.), *Irregular Migration and Human Rights: Theoretical, European and International Perspectives*, Leiden, Martinus Nijhof Publishers, pp. 61-92.

Bloch, A., Sigona, N., and Zetter, R. (2010) *No right to dream: The social and economic lives of young undocumented migrants in Britain* Paul Hamlyn Foundation: UK.

Bosniak, L. (2000) ‘Universal citizenship and the problem of alienage’, *Northwestern University Law Review*, 94 (3): 963–982.

Brah, A. (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora* London: Routledge

Buonfino, A. and Huysmans, J. (2008) 'Politics of exception and unease: Immigration, asylum and insecurity in parliamentary debates on terrorism in the UK', *Political Studies* 56 (4), 766-788.

Côté-Boucher, K. 2008, "The Diffuse Border: Intelligence-Sharing, Control and Confinement along Canada's Smart Border", *Surveillance and Society*, 5 (2-3): 142-165, [http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles5\(2\)/canada.pdf](http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles5(2)/canada.pdf)

Coutin, S. B. (2005) 'Contesting criminality: Illegal immigration and the spatialization of legality', *Theoretical Criminology*, 9 (2): 5-33.

De Genova, N. (2002) 'Migrant 'illegality' and deportability in everyday life', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 419-47.

Dikec, M. (2001) 'Justice and the spatial imagination' *Environment and Planning A* 33, 1785-1805.

Europa (2009) *European Commission outlines its vision for the area of freedom, security and justice for the next five years*

<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/09/894>

Commission of the European Communities (2008) 'Strengthening the Global Approach to Migration: Increasing coordination, coherence and synergies' COM(2008) 611/3.

Cornelius, W. A. (2001) 'Death at the Border: Efficacy and Unintended Consequences of US Immigration Control Policy', *Population and Development Review* 27(4): 661–81.

Goldring, L., Berinstein, C., and Bernhard, J. K. (2009) 'Institutionalizing precarious migratory status in Canada', *Citizenship Studies* 13 (3): 239-265.

Grabbe, H. (2000) 'The sharp edges of Europe: Extending Europe eastwards', *International Affairs* 76(3) pp. 519-536.

Hoefer, M., Rytina, N. and Baker, B.C. (2010) 'Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2009', Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security Office of Immigration Statistics.

Huysmans, J. (2006) *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*, London: Routledge.

Huysmans, J., Dobson, A. and Prokhovnik, R. (2006) *The Politics of Protection: Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency*, London: Routledge.

Isin, E. (2005) 'City.State: Critique of Scalar Thought', *Citizenship Studies* 11 (2): 211-228.

Lavanex, S. (1999) *Safe Third Countries: Extending the EU Asylum Policies to Central and Eastern Europe*, Budapest: Central European University Press.

Lavanex, S. (2004) 'EU external governance in 'wider Europe' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11(4), 680-700.

Lavanex, S. (2006) 'Shifting up and out: The foreign policy of European immigration control' *Western European Politics*, 29 (2), 329-350.

McNevin, A. (forthcoming)

Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2008), *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Online. Available HTTP: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0608/mezzadraneilson/en> (accessed 27 March 2010).

Nevins, J. (2002) *Operation gatekeeper: The rise of the 'illegal alien' and the making of the U.S.-Mexico boundary*, New York: Routledge.

Napolitano, J. (2009) *Prepared Remarks by Secretary Napolitano on Immigration Reform at the Center for American Progress* Release Date: November 13, 2009
http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/speeches/sp_1258123461050.shtm

Pickering, S. (2005) *Refugees and state crime*, Sydney: The Federation Press.

Rajaram, P. and Grundy-Warr, C. (2007) 'Introduction' in Rajaram, P. and Grundy-Warr, C. (eds) *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at territory's Edge* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Rigo, E. 'Citizenship at Europe's borders: Some reflections on the post-colonial condition of Europe in the context of EU enlargement', *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 3-22.

Salter, M. (2006) 'The global visa regime and political technologies of the international self: Borders, bodies, biopolitics' *Alternatives: Global, local, political* 31(2), 167-189.

Soysal, Y. (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Squire, V. (2009) *The Exclusionary Politics of Asylum*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Squire, V. (2010) "From Community Cohesion to Mobile Solidarities: The *City of Sanctuary* network and the *Strangers into Citizenship* campaign", *Political Studies* (forthcoming, 2010).

Terry, D. F. and Wilson, S. R. (Eds.) (2005) *Beyond Small Change*, Washington: Inter-American Development Bank.

¹ I am most grateful to Karine Côté-Boucher, Nicholas De Genova, Engin Isin, Anne McNevin and Mark Salter for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter. Thanks also to Karine Côté-Boucher, Peter Nyers and Kim Rygiel for their helpful suggestions and pointers in getting to grips with the Canadian case.

² At the time of writing, the development of a green card system through which ‘illegal aliens’ could be regularised was not forthcoming, though there was a promise of this during the Obama presidential campaign.

³ See <http://clandestino.eliamep.gr>