Introduction

> In migration contexts, citizenship marks a distinction between members and outsiders based on their different relations to particular states.
>
> *Rainer Bauböck*[1]

> Citizenship is cast as the state's revenge [in] the functioning of the migration law–citizenship law dichotomy ... Citizenship law ... becomes a site to observe a sharp illustration of globalization's paradoxical nature: both inclusions and exclusions are multiplied here.
>
> *Catherine Dauvergne*[2]

The relationship between citizenship and migration is usually seen in terms of sharp distinctions between insiders and outsiders. As Bauböck and Dauvergne show, statist perspectives continue to dominate when thinking and talking about citizenship, even in a recognised postmodern world. This book is an empirically informed theoretical critique of the assumption underpinning such scholarship; namely that we must continue to understand the politics of citizenship in terms of sovereign presenting subjects who can always be defined vis-à-vis their relationship with the state – as included or excluded from it. It seeks instead to highlight the challenges which migration poses to the notion that we can continue to think about subjectivity unproblematically in terms of such a statist (and therefore a modern) framework. This book asks whether the emphasis on mobility and fluidity which migration assumes – which is now a more general feature of a globalised world – does not undermine precisely this idea of a sovereign and autonomous subject which is connected to, but

I

ultimately separate from, political community. Can we really continue to make sense of political subjectivity in terms of the sovereign state and the idea of continuing (if blurred) distinctions between inclusion and exclusion, particularism and universalism, inside and outside? Or, is it not precisely this dualistic framework which needs to be rethought?

Citizenship is understood here as a category which is linked to, but cannot be reduced to, an idealised inclusive status. It is explored instead as a category which is inseparable from questions about 'foreignness', 'strangerhood' and 'otherness' and from experiences through which people participate as members of a political community despite not always being recognised as full members of that community. This is to refuse the dominant story of citizenship: told about a group of people whose identity as citizens is articulated at the same time as another group is defined as strangers, outsiders and Others – lacking properties deemed necessary for citizenship. Instead of conceptualising citizenship as a fully equal and democratic concept which some people inhabit and others fail to inhabit, I explore how it can be understood as a story about *contestation* between understandings of citizenship and non-citizenship which are lived out in people's everyday lives. I specifically explore how such processes of contestation are part of the lives of intergenerational migrants and thus how they embody the ongoing ways in which people engage in be(com)ing political subjects. This alternative story of citizenship is explored by engaging throughout the book with the more dominant story of citizenship, rather than dismissing it, so as to understand what is involved in thinking about citizenship in this alternative manner.

The starting point for this book is the understanding that we live in an age in which migration is widespread and therefore that identity is increasingly fragmented, overlapping and complex. I use this starting point, to problematise the continued reliance in existing citizenship scholarship on the notion of the modern sovereign individual subject as the lowest unit of analysis, who is understood in terms of their continued ability to hold rights against the state. The book turns away from this understanding in favour of a more ambiguous one regarding the in-between, frag-

2

mented and trace-like nature of political identity and belonging, which I demonstrate cannot be reduced to the question of sovereign presence – that is, to the question of inclusion or exclusion via (either beyond or through) the state. The book's overall focus is the following question: 'How can we understand and address the limitations of how political subjectivity is conceptualised in dominant citizenship scholarship?'

Dominant citizenship scholarship is interrogated through the work of Étienne Balibar, Engin Isin and R. B. J. Walker. The work of these theorists can be linked to the emergent field of critical citizenship studies (CCS), which focuses on the need to think about citizenship beyond presence and instead as process. Presence is linked to an understanding regarding status, resolution and sovereign essence. Process, however, is linked to the idea of rupture and difference. Using the work of Balibar, Isin and Walker, state sovereignty is explored in this book as a practice which implicates a particularly modern way of knowing and being. My key argument is that continuing to theorise citizenship vis-à-vis the state prioritises a metaphysics of presence; it does so by reinforcing an assumption about political life and the possibility for citizenship which corresponds with a specific conception of space as independent of its physical content and of time as linear and progressive.

This book explores what a citizenship framework based on a metaphysics of process rather than one of presence would look like. It does so by drawing on the work of Julia Kristeva. It argues that a framework based on the metaphysics of process would allow us to consider how becoming citizen[3] might be based upon disruptions and discontinuities, figuring in indeterminate times and spaces, and not simply conceptualised as extended in time across the absolute space of modern subjectivity. Unlike a metaphysics of presence, which reifies the conception of absolute space, I argue that a framework based on a metaphysics of process would allow us to think about citizenship as trace.

Inquiry into the question of belonging and political identity in citizenship scholarship is normally presented as revolving around an opposition between critical and non-critical approaches to citizenship. This book is directed, however, at highlighting the

3

reliance which certain critical approaches continue to have on modern subjectivity through appeals to sovereignty.[4] It emphasises the need to distinguish between two (broadly defined) types of possible critical attitudes to theorising the politics of citizenship: one which works within a modern conception of what political subjectivity can be, and another which sets out specifically to problematise modern conceptions of time and space within which we have come to *assume* that political subjectivity must be located.

*

Dominant citizenship scholarship defines the politics of citizenship as a clash between particularistic statist ('restrictive') and universal post-statist ('liberal') models of citizenship.[5] Such an approach informs how we should think and talk about citizenship. I am calling this 'the Citizenship Debate'.[6] This scholarship specifically highlights how migration has long been posed as a problem within the context of national borders; fears are expressed about the difficulty for national societies to absorb large quantities of migrants if they are also to maintain a meaningful concept of citizenship which provides for economic, political and social cohesion. Current citizenship scholarship conceptualises this particularistic perspective as that which appeals to an exclusive concept of citizenship by relying on the primacy of the nation-state as the rightful (and only realistic) basis for political community. It argues that this particularistic exclusive model of political membership is increasingly being challenged by a universal model linked to a more inclusive post-national or trans-national understanding of political identity and belonging.

What this book calls into question, however, is the very idea that the latter universal inclusivist model does indeed challenge the former particular exclusivist model. I argue that in the universal inclusivist perspective citizenship continues to be defined in terms of state sovereignty. I do not deny that the universal inclusivist model presents concerted efforts to interrogate separately the notions of 'individuality' and 'the state'. What I point to, however, is that these concepts continue to be taken as analytical categories in their own right by this wider citizenship scholarship.

4

There is an ideal of subjectivity which continues to underpin this universal model: an ideal of subjectivity as autonomous and sovereign in the last instance. I use the word 'ideal' here to emphasise that as well as an attempt to capture how citizenship does work, there is also a normative assumption regarding how citizenship *must* work. Subjectivity continues to be conceptualised as connected to, but ultimately separate from, political community and from others within the political community. Current citizenship scholarship explores how migration challenges where boundaries should be drawn in political life – via the state or beyond the state. It fails, however, I argue, to move beyond the basic idea that the framework itself for politics and political subjectivity should be defined in the first place in terms of the statist framework of boundaries between inclusion and exclusion, inside and outside, 'us' and 'them', which need to be resolved.

The emphasis on a clash between particular exclusivist ('restrictive') and universal inclusivist ('liberal') models of citizenship has been particularly pronounced in recent decades in the context of proposed changes to birthright citizenship provisions, also known as *jus soli* provisions. In the past three decades there have been many such legislative changes – for example, in Australia (1986), India (1987), South Africa (1995), New Zealand (2006) and several European states (including the UK (1981), Belgium (1992), France (1993 and 1998), Germany (2000) and the Republic of Ireland (2004)). There have also been ongoing calls in countries such as the USA for similar changes.[7]

I focus on European legislative changes and experiences in this book. While I concur with many others that there is a need to develop an analytical framework capable of grasping the specificity and complexity of global migrations, I have chosen to locate this book, and more specifically, to locate my exploration of the Citizenship Debate in the context of European legislative changes and experiences for several important reasons. We are witnessing a change in how difference (Otherness) is being articulated in the context of citizenship – albeit to an understanding that was implied in the very beginning of the theoretical and practical work which produced the unity of European space. Traditionally the distinction between citizen and subject has been located at the

borders of Europe and the wider Western world. Subjecthood has been placed outside – in the colonies – and contrasted with the internal homogeneity of the 'universal citizen'. As Enrica Rigo explains, 'Difference resided outside borders, be they the nation's or the community's boundaries, or those extended over an ideal *cosmopolis*.'[8]

Today, it is increasingly understood that the positioning and functioning of borders are no longer located at the margins but have been 'dragged into the heart of Europe because they follow the biographies of those individuals whose mobility is limited'.[9] As Walter Mignolo notes, 'Yesterday . . . difference was out there, away from the centre. Today it is all over, in the peripheries of the centre and in the centres of the periphery.'[10] Put simply, there is fragmentation of political subjectivity within 'the centre' itself which challenges the wider framework of centre/periphery, metropolis/colony, citizen/subject which we have come to rely on in trying to think about the nature of 'global' migration.

This book is part of a wider project, to consider how Europe is being constructed as 'a *heterogeneous space*' producing a 'movement of *selective and differential inclusion* of migrants'.[11] This is a selective and differential inclusion of migrants (a complex overlapping hierarchy of belonging) rather than simply the exclusion of migrants. Informed by the contemporary politics of mobility, the result is a plurality of statuses and experiences which are linked to a variety of hierarchies along ethnic and racial lines.[12] This book is set within a growing awareness therefore regarding the production of different forms of citizenship – 'irregular citizen',[13] 'illegal citizen',[14] 'undocumented citizen',[15] 'alien citizen'[16] – rather than simply the ongoing differentiation of citizens from non-citizens. As Linda Bosniak has highlighted in her work, citizenship is complicated precisely because there is a proliferation in the (often contradictory) *forms* of citizenship, given the important role which it plays in defining 'our' own identities as well as the treatment of 'foreigners'.[17] The result is not experiences of being included or excluded from the state; but rather experiences of being caught somewhere between inclusion and exclusion, citizenship and migration. It is this that I am calling 'ambiguous citizenship'.

6

The question of different forms of political belonging – often referred to as 'substantive' versus 'formal' citizenship – has previously been considered in citizenship scholarship. However, traditionally these discussions have been focused at the level of what Rogers Brubaker refers to as the 'internal politics of belonging'.[18] The internal politics of belonging – 'the politics of citizenship *in* the nation-state' – has been distinguished from the external politics of belonging – 'the politics of belonging *to* the nation-state'.[19] Although there have been attempts to explore how the internal and the external politics of belonging are already (or can be further) interconnected, citizenship continues to be conceived as a national bounded project – 'a nationally situated and nationally framed project'[20] – and thus the division between citizen (inside) and non-citizen (outside) is taken as an often problematic but nonetheless necessary starting point.

The approach taken in this book aims to rethink how global migrations are changing; they are less usefully understood in terms of the exclusion of the non-communitarian foreigner who comes from outside the centre, and better understood in terms of generating exclusions from within the centre(s), via the development of various different types of citizen. What this book seeks to draw attention to is how the Citizenship Debate reinforces a global system of rule which maintains the existing hierarchies of belonging, albeit inadvertently. It draws the 'outside' – the refugee, the second-generation migrant, the asylum seeker, the economic migrant – into the European political sphere, but in such a way that they are also simultaneously expelled because they are considered less than full citizens by continuing to be defined as the Other in need of inclusion.

The approach of focusing on European legislative changes in this book does not preclude the necessity of engaging in critical debates on migration outside the context of migration to Europe and its ex-settler colonies and considering other histories and experiences of migration, including migration which can be termed 'South-South'. However, re-evaluating the role of migration in Europe – by questioning and rethinking the presumption that difference and subjecthood continue to be associated with residing outside its borders – is also an important process in

7

enabling us to 'decentre our critical gaze'.[21] It allows us to begin to think about the 'global' in the context of a proliferation of borders everywhere, rather than in terms of neat clear lines drawn under colonialism at the edges of Europe and/or at the edges of the territory of its member states distinguishing inside and outside, centre and periphery, citizen and non-citizen, marginalised and non-marginalised.

While selecting a focus is necessary in any project, the corollary is that all projects must remain aware of their limitations. This study therefore remains self-consciously partial and invites further scrutiny from a range of different critical perspectives on the question of understanding and addressing the limitations of how citizenship is conceptualised.

It is important to note that my argument is not that everyone now lives in an eternal postmodern present dominated by fragmentation, dislocation and process; nor that those who do, do so in the same way. Rather I explore the particular implications in these experiences for certain people's lives, mainly intergenerational migrants but also first-generation migrants. Furthermore, this should not be taken to mean that ambiguity is limited to such groups, who are understood as 'the diasporic and the hybrid'.[22] Coherent presence is impossible for any group in its entirety. By highlighting the precarious boundaries between 'citizen' and 'migrant' here, it should be recognised that 'citizenship' has never been, nor will ever be, a fully bounded and coherent category which opposes itself to 'non-citizenship'. Rather 'citizen' and 'migrant' are categories which constantly challenge and undermine each other, as scholars such as Cynthia Weber as well as Judith Butler and Gayatri Spivak have demonstrated very recently.[23] It is for this reason that exploring the relationship between citizenship and migration helps us to understand the category of 'citizenship' better.

Ambiguity should furthermore not be associated with liberation and freedom from the terrain on which the apparatuses of domination and exploitation operate. Some type of resistance is implicit in the idea of ambiguity on the basis that the 'place' assigned to migrants is always in question; but this resistance is by no means guaranteed or set out in advance. The terrain of ambig-

8

uous political subjectivity is not limited to any particular type of resistance but instead implies many different possible forms – those which are reaffirming of more dominant sovereign power relations, as well as those which undermine and challenge them; they may be yet unthinkable as well as thinkable.[24] Although I highlight the failure of sovereign power to absorb all legitimating power in respect of political subjectivity, it is outside the scope of this book to define the exact nature of new configurations of power in the making or already at play – including those that are currently reconfiguring 'statehood' itself. Rather I focus on the question itself of ambiguity vis-à-vis citizenship and explore how we might understand experiences of ambiguity better. Only with such an understanding can we ask questions in specific contexts as to what constitutes 'innovative practices of resistance and struggle',[25] or new state sovereign power formations.[26]

The 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum and Citizenship as Trace

This book looks at scholarship surrounding two key European legislative changes to birthright citizenship – in Britain in 1981 and France in 1993 – as well as a more recent legislative change in one particular European country: the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum.[27] It uses analysis of the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum as a lens through which to explore and illuminate the limitations of wider citizenship scholarship in more detail.

The 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum has been chosen for a number of reasons. In the first instance, it resulted in the most recent and significant change to legislation in the area of birthright citizenship in Europe and follows similar changes made in countries such as India, South Africa and Australia. It has thus become a focus for many discussions about changes to and attempts to rethink citizenship.[28] It also intersects with 'simmering academic debate' in countries such as the USA, Canada and the Dominican Republic about the need or not to repeal existing constitutional provisions for automatic birthright citizenship.[29]

In the second instance the existing analysis of this referendum

9

very clearly reflects the dominant acceptance within wider citizenship literature about how the politics of citizenship should be posed: in terms of a clash between particular exclusivist and universal inclusivist models of citizenship. It thus provides a focus for exploring the wider global system of rule which defines options for the politics of citizenship in binary statist terms. Thirdly, the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum raises an issue which has been an ongoing topic of discussion globally. This is the question of how the rights of children born to migrants to have their parents live with them in their country of birth conflict with wider national immigration regulations in cases where these migrant parents have irregular status.[30] This question was raised again in 2011 at a European level through the Zambrano case (discussed below). Focusing on the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum thus provides us with a contemporary context in which to consider key issues surrounding citizenship and its relationship to migration which have been raised in the past and which continue to be important today in discussions about citizenship and how it should be regulated.

The 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum

The 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum abolished automatic entitlement to birthright citizenship, which had been in place since the foundation of the Irish state. Automatic entitlement to birthright citizenship had been inserted in 1998 as Article 2 into Bunreacht na hÉireann (the Constitution of Ireland, 1937). Prior to this it was provided for in statute or in the founding Free State Constitution.[31] Article 2 declared that it was both the entitlement and birthright of 'every person born in the island of Ireland . . . to be part of the Irish Nation and to be citizens of Ireland'.[32] The amendment put forward in the 2004 referendum proposed, however, to limit birthright citizenship to a person who 'at the time of his or her birth [. . .has] at least one parent who is an Irish citizen or entitled to be an Irish citizen'. This amendment was proposed by the Irish government. They argued that it was necessary to prevent migrants circumventing the immigration process by applying for residency solely on the basis of being

10

the parents of an Irish citizen child. The government argued that many migrant parents were doing this after their asylum claims had been rejected. Despite significant objections, the government's proposal to restrict birthright citizenship to the children of existing Irish citizens was passed via referendum on 11 June 2004 by a four-to-one majority.[33]

Existing analysis of the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum explores the issue from a variety of perspectives: namely, cosmopolitanism, gender, race, class and human rights. That said, all the existing analysis emphasises the need to understand this issue first and foremost in terms of the role of the modern territorial state, and the question of whether it accurately controls or unfairly limits migration. As in citizenship scholarship more widely, the politics of citizenship is defined here as a clash between particular statist and universal post-statist (or trans-statist) perspectives on political community.[34]

Many of the issues raised in the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum have come to the fore in a recent 2011 ruling in the ECJ known as the Zambrano case.[35] The Zambrano case once again places a spotlight on the rights of citizen children born to migrant parents; in particular, the question of whether these rights can come into conflict with national immigration laws. The Zambrano ruling involved a couple of Colombian nationality who had applied for asylum in Belgium. Their application was rejected. However, while awaiting a decision on their application, Mrs Zambrano gave birth to two children, who acquired Belgian citizenship. Mr and Mrs Zambrano attempted subsequently to apply for residency as the parents of Belgian citizens. Although this application was also initially rejected, Mr and Mrs Zambrano challenged the rejection and their case subsequently came before the ECJ. The ECJ eventually ruled that EU law precluded national measures which might have the effect of depriving citizens of the union of 'the genuine enjoyment of the substance of the rights conferred by virtue of [their] status as citizens of the union'.[36] According to the court, the refusal to grant residency and a work permit to the parents of Belgian (and therefore European) citizen children amounted to such deprivation. The court, as such, ruled that the Belgian authorities must grant Mr and Mrs Zambrano

11

a residency permit given that they were the parents of Belgian citizen children.

This book does not attempt to provide a new solution to the Zambrano case and say how it should be understood. What it does attempt to do is to consider how the Zambrano case and similar cases in the future might be approached from a different starting point to the current emphasis on particularism and universalism, inclusion and exclusion vis-à-vis the state. This book emphasises that subjectivity theorised in terms (always) of an ability to resist against and/or transcend the boundaries of the state reinforces a particular assumption about what and where political life (citizen-subjectivity) can be; this is an understanding which is associated with a neutralised, yet nonetheless persistent, dualism of us/them, inclusion/exclusion, marginalisation/non-marginalisation.

The subjectivity of citizen children born to migrant parents is an example of the complex ambiguous subjectivity which is denied a place in the politics of citizenship as currently theorised in cases such as the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum and potentially the Zambrano ruling. This is because such children are neither 'included in' or 'excluded from' the state as individuals, but in between both positions. The experiences of such children at the centre of these disputes therefore challenge the absolute spatial and linear temporal understanding of moving from outside the state as migrant, towards the inside of the state and becoming citizen. These children born to migrants experience citizenship in disjunctive spaces and at particular, mostly inconsistent moments, rather than as individuals who either are or are not included in the state and eventually become full citizens of the (pre-existing) political community.

I consider how such experiences of political subjectivity undergone by these children share similarities with their parents' experiences. These are increasingly understood in CCS literature as linked to ambiguity ('irregular'[37]) given that they too get caught between inclusion and exclusion, between belonging and non-belonging as they are often neither strictly legal nor illegal but move between these positions. However, I also emphasise that the experiences of these children need to be differentiated from those of their parents in terms of how this ambiguity is experienced.

12

I challenge in this book the idea that we need to conceptualise citizen-subjectivity as always figuring in temporal progression within coexisting spaces – moving from exclusion to inclusion, from outside to inside – as is emphasised at present in existing inclusivist citizenship scholarship. I argue that we need to consider how citizenship can be experienced beyond the exclusive realm of sovereign dualistic space and instead in terms of trace.

Citizenship as Trace

A trace is a mark. It is defined by its incompleteness, its partial nature. We talk about traces which are left behind by people, objects, history, events. Trace is always therefore less than; it always refers to something else and is incomplete in itself. I argue that conceptualising citizenship as trace allows us to consider political identity and belonging beyond the idea of a coherent 'who', a sovereign individual. It provides us with a way of thinking about citizenship other than through endless discussions about who is or who is not abusing citizenship, who is or who is not entitled to citizenship or who is and is not resisting citizenship, which currently dominate the Citizenship Debate.

Theorising citizenship as trace permits us instead to concentrate on the increasingly momentary fragments of self through which citizenship can operate beyond the idea of a sovereign presenting subject that is included or excluded from the state. Theorising citizenship as trace allows us to imagine how political identity and belonging can be similar to but also fall short of the understanding of modern political subjectivity defined in terms of coherent dualistic spaces associated predominantly with a bounded exclusionary 'migrant' space or inclusionary 'citizen' space. Instead it emphasises how citizenship can be experienced in terms of overlapping, fragmented and incomplete experiences which combine elements of both inclusion and exclusion, belonging and not belonging, past and present – in more and less permanent ways – without being reducible to either.

This book interrogates existing citizenship scholarship in order to arrive at the notion of citizenship as trace by drawing on and, most importantly, drawing out the implications of

13

the work of Étienne Balibar, Engin Isin and R. B. J. Walker.[38] The work of these theorists in their own separate ways has been integral to contributing to a new emergent field of critical citizenship studies; however, such work has not yet necessarily been considered together. This emergent field is one which emphasises the need to think about how citizenship can be experienced beyond status, resolution and sovereign presence linked to dualisms, and instead in terms such as 'irregularity',[39] 'contestation',[40] 'disruption'[41] and 'encounter'.[42] In this book I draw out the implications of the arguments made by Balibar, Isin and Walker and consider how their ideas can complement each other. I discuss how these ideas can in turn be linked to and understood in the context of a more general challenge against a state-orientated focus, associated with the (loosely defined) field of poststructuralism. I engage at length with Balibar's, Isin's and Walker's work – including by contextualising it within the wider field of poststructuralism – in order to highlight the limitations of the existing dominant citizenship literature.

What I argue in this book is that the work of Balibar, Isin and Walker presents a very different approach for theorising political possibility to that of the 'particular statist versus universal post-statist' focus presented in dominant citizenship analysis. Their work points to the constructed nature of how citizenship and citizenship-subjectivity have come to be understood in terms of an opposition between statist and post-statist forms of community which needs to be resolved, rather than taking this opposition for granted as the way we must understand citizenship. This work historicises the assumption that political subjectivity has to be defined vis-à-vis its relationship with the sub-, supra- or transnational state in this manner.

I draw on Julia Kristeva to consider how to conceptualise subjectivity beyond a modern sovereign-bounded understanding. Her work complicates the clean lines which have been imposed by modernity between inclusion and exclusion, inside and outside, identity and difference. It does so by developing a notion of subjectivity which is ruptured in itself; this is a subject which is constructed by virtue of exile, separation and foreignness as that which is always already within the subject, as opposed to that

which it is defined against. I argue that Kristeva's work provides an alternative basis for exploring citizenship by conceptualising a different way of thinking about human Being. This is an understanding of being human which is no longer based on a metaphysics of presence vis-à-vis the state – as inside or outside, included or excluded – but is instead based on an ontology of plurality and hybridity.[43] This allows for a different conception of time and space for how the politics of citizenship could be articulated.

One of the major contributions of this book therefore is that it provides a way of recognising the significance of, yet rethinking, the truth that citizen-subjects hold rights against the modern bounded territorial (sub-, supra- or super-) state. It does so by re-engaging with the way in which we have been told the 'self' must be conceptualised; it challenges the idea that this must be conceptualised in terms of absolute spatial and linear temporal boundaries between inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion, past and present. It emphasises instead the alternative ways in which political subjectivity is being experienced and how its possibilities can be reimagined in order to take such experiences into account.

Dominant citizenship scholarship has in recent times moved towards ever more 'nuanced, variegated and dynamic perspectives' on the question of determining who is included in the concept of 'the people', and accordingly who is excluded.[44] This literature no longer focuses on the question of inclusion versus exclusion, but instead on a more sophisticated understanding of 'the symbiotic processes of inclusion and exclusion, which form the kernel of citizenship as a concept and a practice'.[45] It considers how restrictive measures directed towards certain people, namely migrants, work within liberal citizenship models. Yet, this more nuanced emphasis remains dictated by the sovereign dualistic parameters of inclusion and exclusion. This citizenship literature explores an ever-increasing range of people who are excluded from citizenship: this includes refugees, asylum seekers, the stateless, aliens, migrant women, migrant children and the descendants of migrants.[46] Nonetheless, it continues to focus on the notion of a coherent subject who *can* be included and excluded from citizenship.

Such citizenship scholarship can be contrasted with a growing

body of literature which points to the fragmented and disjunctive nature of politics linked to the increasing fluidity of borders.[47] Deriving its inspiration from the latter, what this book does is to put the included/excluded modern bounded territorial framework itself under scrutiny. Rather than taking for granted that such a modern sovereign framework needs to be adopted as a necessary starting point, this book explores the way in which some groups often experience citizenship in spatially fragmented and temporally inconsistent ways. It argues that these are not experiences of being citizen which require redrawing the boundaries of political community and identity more inclusively. Rather, they are experiences which challenge the idea that citizenship must be conceptualised in terms of territorial spaces intersected by coherent boundary lines – between 'us' and 'them', inside and outside, past and present, particular and universal – in the first place.

The line of inquiry pursued in this book acknowledges and aims to build upon the new emergent field of CCS, which emphases the need to think about how citizenship-subjectivity can be experienced beyond sovereign status. It considers citizenship-subjectivity from a perspective currently under-addressed within the CCS literature however: intergenerational migration. Thus far the CCS literature has focused, with a few notable exceptions,[48] mostly on how first-generation irregular migrants undermine the existing statist spatio-temporal political discourse on citizenship by acting as political subjects in ways which challenge the statist monopoly on understandings of who can and who cannot be considered part of the political community. This includes migrants who have crossed borders illegally, have over-stayed visas, have fled conflict and disaster or are seeking asylum from political persecution.

As demonstrated, for example, in Anne McNevin's recent book, this literature explores how first-generation migrants 'whose ongoing presence is not officially sanctioned by the state in which they reside' nonetheless play a role in shaping the society from which they are excluded; they seek and obtain political rights in places they do not belong.[49] The CCS literature emphasises how irregular migrants complicate ('contest') the boundaries of the community in which they reside and the territorial bounded framework of citizenship more generally, given the way in which

16

they constantly vacillate between the categories of 'us' and 'them', insider and outsider – inhabiting both and neither.

This book emphasises, as such, the need to widen the focus from first-generation migrants if we want to understand citizenship in an age of global migration. It explores the question of intergenerational migration experiences of political subjectivity associated with rupture, difference and process. This focus on intergenerational migration allows us to consider a wider variety of ways in which citizenship can be understood beyond status and presence. What this book seeks to demonstrate is that it is not only irregular migrants but also their children who undermine the traditional boundaries of citizenship and the parameters of political belonging by mobilising alternative forms of subjectivity – neither citizen nor non-citizen, neither fully nationals nor fully non-nationals. It explores how they too reside in what Sandro Mezzadra refers to as the 'elusive borderzone' between inclusion and exclusion, between inside and outside.[50] As Mezzadra notes, exploring these latter experiences which are linked to more 'regular' migrants is useful to ensure that we continue to challenge the dichotomy between regularity and irregularity inherent in the historical discourse of citizenship.[51]

Theorising less-than sovereign political identity as 'trace', as I do in this book, further contributes to the existing CCS literature by providing a much-needed alternative metaphorical starting point for thinking about such experiences of citizenship. Trace is a metaphorical starting point which emphasises discontinuity, process and fragmentation linked to the importance of tension and lines; it thus presents an alternative way of thinking about citizenship (as has been increasingly called for[52]) to the determinative dominant logic of the dualistic space of inclusion/exclusion, particularism/universalism, which emphasises ideas of essence, regularity and consistency.

Outline of the Book

Discussions surrounding legislative changes generate mountains of analysis and reportage as well as forests of texts. As such, the

source material consulted for the purposes of this book is wide and varied. It includes parliamentary debates; government publications and information documents; government party speeches and press releases; European legal ruling reports; civil society organisation reports and statements; media coverage; and finally extensive academic analysis.

The book is divided into six chapters. Chapter 1 provides a new framework for thinking about current citizenship scholarship. It argues that such scholarship does not present an infinite array of possibilities (a series of debates) for how citizenship can be conceptualised. Rather it presents a spectrum of *limited* possible interpretive choices (what I'm calling 'the Citizenship Debate') which is defined by a certain 'reality' of what it means to be a political subject in terms of sovereignty and autonomy. Chapter 2 considers how the Citizenship Debate can be explored in more detail at a national level through the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum.

Chapter 3 turns specifically to focus on the universal (post-statist/trans-statist) model which has dominated critical approaches to citizenship in the Citizenship Debate. This chapter outlines how exactly this model tries to but ultimately fails to rethink citizenship anew. I look at how it widens the scope of existing sovereign territorial dualisms but without thinking about time and space beyond sovereign dualistic politics; that is, beyond linear progressive time and absolute space.

Chapter 4 contextualises the work of Balibar, Isin and Walker within the broader theoretical field of poststructuralism to consider how we might challenge an ontology of presence based in sovereign politics.[53] I subsequently outline in this chapter how Julia Kristeva's work provides an alternative understanding of political subjectivity as called for here, based on an ontology of process.

Chapter 5 reflects on a Kristevan conception of maternal time in order to discuss how we might conceptualise the question of political identity and belonging beyond sovereign national dualistic time and space. National time is progressive (teleological): it has a clear start, middle and end point, which is normally used to distinguish the self from (an) Other temporally and spatially – for example, to distinguish the migrant who has arrived in the

country recently from a citizen whose ancestors were born there in the past. This chapter considers how maternal time undermines the ability to base the idea of 'I' in a particular moment in time (the present) which can be distinguished from a similar moment (in the future or the past) and thereby reaffirm the idea of an 'Other' which is distinct from the 'self'. Kristeva's notion of maternal time is used here to destabilise, rather than to replace, the prominence of national time and to explore how we can think about alternative temporal possibilities more generally. The experiences of migrant youth are recast in this chapter through the possibility that the political subject itself is fragmented in terms of many different types of contingent space and fragmented temporality, rather than located only in dualistic space and linear progressive temporality without limits.

Chapter 6 explores the implications of challenging the Citizenship Debate in this manner and of opening up the question of political subjectivity beyond temporality contained within absolute space to that of fractious process-oriented space-time. The notion of 'trace' is introduced in this chapter to conceptualise the shift which is made here: away from thinking about citizenship in terms of inclusion and exclusion and therefore in terms of absolute space, and towards thinking about citizenship as that which is also based upon disruptions and discontinuities, figuring in indeterminate and incalculable times and spaces outside modern subjectivity and its emphasis on located presence.

The conclusion of this book shows the importance of recognising that migration not only challenges the various ways in which citizen-subjects are included and excluded from the imagined political community: as partial, full or denizens. Migration also challenges the idea of the sovereign autonomous subject who *can* be included or excluded from political community as the only way in which being citizen can be imagined or experienced. Through the notion of trace we can imagine citizenship as a form of subjectivity which can also manifest as a cluster of time-space coordinates which are constantly changing within and across what is normally conceptualised as the absolute space and horizontal time of sovereign political community. It allows us to consider how experiences of citizenship are also defined through

boundary lines, creating and re-creating fragmented and overlapping combinations of us/them, inside/outside, inclusion/exclusion, nationality/humanity which defy calculation and easy categorisation. As such, this book contributes not only to our understanding of dominant citizenship scholarship and the manner in which subjectivity is conceptualised here; the impact of migration on conceptions of belonging and how this tests the limits of political identity; and the politics of critical approaches to citizenship; but finally to broader theoretical attempts to recognise how political subjectivity is experienced outside a statist political discourse.[54]

This concern with the question of what it is to be a citizen in the context of globalisation is a timely one. It is commonly accepted that we now live in a world in which discussions about belonging and the nature of political community are dictated by understandings of cultural diversity rather than cultural homogeneity.[55] This book recognises the importance of such questions. However, it considers what a mistake it would be to assume nonetheless that the *only* possible ground for a different politics of citizenship is that which continues to be based on sovereign autonomous subjectivity in the last instance. Instead it points out how this serves to ignore citizenship experienced through ambiguous, less coherent subjectivity which cannot be tied to a located presence – one either 'inside' or 'outside' the state, in terms of particularism or universalism. Whereas many theorists argue that belonging must be based on understanding how subjects hold rights always in opposition to (that is, as connected to, but ultimately separate from) political community, what is emphasised in this book is the importance of recognising the evolution of subjectivity beyond this existing spatio-temporal ideal of modernity. This is vital if we are, as Judith Butler notes, to 'take into account the full ambivalence of the conditions of its operation'.[56]

As Vicki Squire points out, a refusal to engage in an analytical framework that automatically supposes the logic of an inside/ outside binary in relation to the question of citizenship is not to ignore moments when this type of logic does come into play. It is rather to avoid 'automatically presum[ing] such a logic to be manifest' and instead to allow for the possibility that marginality can be conceived of via processes of differentiation which are 'irregu-

20

lar, abnormal, strange' as well as sovereign and autonomous.[57] Sovereignty may be a necessary strategy under certain conditions; but to pursue sovereignty to the exclusion of other strategies is 'both insufficient and potentially dangerous' as it limits our political horizons.[58] It prevents us from seeing how experiences of political subjectivity could be and are already being experienced other than (only) through the dualistic time and space of modern territorial sovereignty.

Thinking about political subjectivity in terms of the strategy offered in this book is intended to provide an alternative starting point for thinking about the politics of citizenship to the existing dominant one: this is a dominant starting point which tries to replace notions of 'excluded immigrant' and 'included citizen' with other coherent and self-contained understandings such as 'host' and 'newcomer' or 'old citizen' and 'new citizen'. Instead, this book subjects the discourses and practices of state sovereignty to scrutiny. In doing so, it moves away from the question of what 'makes sense', as to rethink citizenship without the modern subject is precisely not to make sense in the normal way. It is rather to think contemporary politics in terms of how we might 'exceed the discursive space made available by an apparent binary but in effect mutually constitutive choice between state/nation/republic and some half-remembered, half-forgotten cosmopolis'.[59]

Sara Salih argues that 'making the ordinary world seem strange (rather than unintelligible) constitutes a move towards a more capacious understanding of otherness'.[60] Our task, she explains, is not to emancipate ourselves from existing understandings of who we are but rather to 'replay and recite them in order to reveal the[ir] instabilit[ies]'.[61] The argument made in this book should not therefore be taken to imply that we can move beyond the state, nor beyond a modern conception of subjectivity linked to sovereignty and autonomy. Indeed this book does not set up a new dichotomy between modern and postmodern subjectivity. To do so would simply be to reproduce the clear divisions of modernity anew. Rather, it seeks to emphasise how modernity (state sovereignty) and postmodernity (challenges to state sovereignty) are mutually constitutive categories involved in the process of dissolving each other. As Isabelle Stengers notes, modernity is

21

not one thing; it refers instead to a web of conflicting defini-tions.[62] Therefore we can never escape 'modern territory' as this is constantly redefining itself.[63] The imminent critique presented in this book needs to be understood as such as 'an ingredient of the assemblage' which helps to reconfigure the assemblage, 'not as critically dismembering the assemblage itself'.[64]

This book takes seriously Michel Foucault's observation that 'the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state and from the state's institutions, but to liberate us both . . . from the type of individualisation which is linked to the state.'[65] What is pro-posed in this book is the refusal of a certain kind of subjectiv-ity which has monopolised our understanding of ourselves – as beings which exist in terms of our relationship with the state – as the only kind possible. It explores what a less-than state sover-eign spatio-temporal understanding of subjectivity would look like (which is based on process). In doing so I do not deny that this type of alternative subjectivity works in conjunction with a state sovereign spatio-temporal understanding of subjectiv-ity. There is no suggestion in this book that the former replaces (either now or in the future) the latter. What I do emphasise is instead our need to consider how ordinary concepts such as foreignness do not only confirm existing assumptions regarding sovereign marginalisation. Rather, they can be repeated and replayed to reveal instabilities in existing understandings about where 'the margins' are located, how they are negotiated, and what they imply.

Notes

1. Bauböck, 'Introduction', p. 15.
2. Dauvergne, 'Citizenship with a Vengeance', p. 506.
3. 'Citizen' is written here and elsewhere in this book without an article – either 'a' or 'the' – to allow for the possibility that it need not necessarily be a sovereign autonomous entity.
4. See for example Closs Stephens, *The Persistence of Nationalism*. Closs Stephens similarly challenges this broader critical/less-than-

22

critical opposition, emphasising instead limitations within existing critical approaches.

5. Bauböck, *Migration and Citizenship*; Cohen, *Migration and Its Enemies*; Goldberg, *The Racial State*; Honohan, *The Theory and Politics of Ius Soli*; Howard, *The Politics of Citizenship in Europe*; Hutchings and Dannreuther, *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*; Joppke, *Citizenship and Immigration*; Kabeer, *Inclusive Citizenship*; Lister and Pia, *Citizenship in Contemporary Europe*; Mohanty and Tandon, *Participatory Citizenship*; Sawyer and Blitz, *Statelessness in the European Union*; Yuval-Davis and Werbner, *Women, Citizenship and Difference*.

6. I do so following R. B. J. Walker's use of the term in Walker, 'Citizenship after the Modern Subject'.

7. J. M. Mancini and Graham Finlay note ten amendments introduced in the US Congress between 1993 and 2005 which proposed to introduce conditionalities to the existing automatic constitutional birthright citizenship entitlement enshrined in the Fourteenth Amendment of the US Constitution (Mancini and Finlay, '"Citizenship Matters"', pp. 578–9; see also Huang, 'Anchor Babies, Over-breeders, and the Population Bomb', p. 400). Rachel Rosenbloom argues that such efforts are not restricted to the contemporary period but go back as far as the early eighteenth century (Rosenbloom, 'Policing the Borders of Birthright Citizenship').

8. Rigo, 'Citizenship at Europe's Borders', p. 18.

9. Ibid.

10. Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs*.

11. Mezzadra, 'Citizen and Subject', p. 39, original emphasis; see also Balibar, 'Europe as Borderland'.

12. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*; Raissiguier, *Reinventing the Republic*.

13. Nyers, 'Forms of Irregular Citizenship'.

14. Rigo, 'Citizens despite Borders'.

15. McNevin, 'Undocumented Citizens?'.

16. Bosniak, 'The Citizenship of Aliens'.

17. Bosniak, *The Citizen and the Alien*.

18. Brubaker, 'Migration, Membership, and the Modern Nation-State'.

19. Ibid., p. 64, original emphasis.

20. Bosniak, 'The Citizenship of Aliens', p. 32.

21. Mezzadra, 'The Gaze of Autonomy', p. 122.

22. Lee, 'Passing as Korean-American', p. 283.

23. See for example Butler and Spivak, *Who Sings the Nation State?*; Weber, '"I Am an American"'.

23

24. See for example McNevin, 'Ambivalence and Citizenship'.
25. Mezzadra, 'The Gaze of Autonomy', p. 128.
26. For example, I do not deny that statehood itself is increasingly working through ambiguous and fragmented forms of power. However, I would point out that we need further understanding of the complex processes and workings of ambiguity in order to understand the way in which such processes work at the level of citizenship.
27. 'The Republic of Ireland' and 'Ireland' will be used interchangeably throughout this book to denote the 26-county Irish state. 'The island of Ireland', on the other hand, refers to the 26-county Irish state along with the six counties of Northern Ireland, the latter forming part of the UK. References to 'the Irish government' should be understood as referring to the government of the 26-county Republic of Ireland.
28. See for example Bhabha, 'The "Mere Fortuity of Birth"?'; Luibhéid, *Pregnant on Arrival*; Smith, 'The Irish Citizenship Referendum (2004)'.
29. Culliton-Gonzalez, 'Born in the Americas', p. 24; Lacey, 'Dominican crackdown leaves children of Haitian immigrants in legal limbo'; Mas, 'Canadian citizenship rules face broad reform in 2014'.
30. Rosenbloom, 'Policing the Borders of Birthright Citizenship'; Schuck and Smith, *Citizenship without Consent*.
31. Saorstát Éireann (The Irish Free State) was founded in 1922. From 1922 until 1937 automatic entitlement to birthright citizenship on the island of Ireland was enshrined constitutionally. In 1937 the Irish Free State was abolished and a new Constitution (Bunreacht na hÉireann) was passed. From 1937 until 1998 automatic entitlement to birthright citizenship was enshrined in statute until it was enshrined once again constitutionally in Article 2 of Bunreacht na hÉireann under the Good Friday Agreement.
32. *Bunreacht na hÉireann*.
33. The following are the exact figures for the referendum: Electorate: 3,041,688; turnout: 1,823,695 (59.59%); spoilt votes: 20,219; valid poll: 1,803,215; yes vote: 1,427, 520 (79.17%); no vote: 375, 695 (20.83%) (McVeigh, 'United in Whiteness?', p. 272).
34. Brandi, 'Unveiling the Ideological Construction of the 2004 Irish Citizenship Referendum'; Fanning and Mutwarasibo, 'Nationals/Non-nationals'; Lentin, 'From Racial State to Racist State'; Lentin and McVeigh, *After Optimism?*; Mancini and Finlay, '"Citizenship Matters"'.

24

35. *Gerardo Ruiz Zambrano* v. *Office national de l'emploi* (C/34/09), 2011.
36. Coulter, 'Non-EU parents of citizens entitled to residency'.
37. Squire, *The Contested Politics of Mobility*, 2011.
38. Balibar, *Politics and the Other Scene*, pp. 75–87; Balibar, *We, the People of Europe?*; Isin, *Being Political*; Isin, 'Theorizing Acts of Citizenship'; Walker, 'Citizenship after the Modern Subject'; Walker, *Inside/Outside*; Walker, 'Polis, Cosmopolis, Politics'.
39. Squire, *The Contested Politics of Mobility*.
40. McNevin, *Contesting Citizenship*.
41. Isin and Neilson, *Acts of Citizenship*.
42. Closs Stephens, 'Citizenship without Community'; Shapiro, 'National Times and Other Times'; Shapiro, *The Time of the City*.
43. Kristeva, *Julia Kristeva, Interviews*; Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*; Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism*; Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*; Kristeva, 'Women's Time'.
44. Howard, *The Politics of Citizenship in Europe*, p. 149.
45. Lister, *Citizenship*, p. 44.
46. Bauböck, *Migration and Citizenship*; Lister, *Citizenship*; Dobrowolsky and Lister, 'Social Exclusion and Changes to Citizenship'; Sawyer and Blitz, *Statelessness in the European Union*, p. 117.
47. Balibar, 'The Borders of Europe'; Ong, 'Graduated Sovereignty'; Weber, *'I Am an American'*; Westwood and Phizacklea, *Trans-nationalism and the Politics of Belonging*.
48. For example Nyers, 'The Accidental Citizen'; Nyers, 'Forms of Irregular Citizenship'.
49. McNevin, *Contesting Citizenship*, p. 1.
50. Mezzadra, 'The Gaze of Autonomy', p. 130; see also Balibar, *Politics and the Other Scene*, pp. 75–86; Balibar, 'Topology'.
51. Mezzadra, 'The Gaze of Autonomy', p. 124.
52. Anderson et al., 'Editorial: Why No Borders?'; Closs Stephens and Squire, 'Politics through a Web'.
53. Key texts within this field to which their work is linked include Ashley and Walker, 'Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline'; Cruikshank, *The Will to Empower*; Doty, 'The Double-writing of Statecraft'; Edkins, *Poststructuralism and International Relations*; Edkins et al., *Sovereignty and Subjectivity*.
54. Walker and Mendlovitz, *Contending Sovereignties*, 1990.
55. Castles and Davidson, *Citizenship and Migration*; Gray, 'The Irish Diaspora'; Yuval-Davis et al., *The Situated Politics of Belonging*.

56. Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power*, p. 15.
57. Squire, 'On Marginality'.
58. Shaw, 'Feminist Futures', p. 229.
59. Walker, 'Citizenship after the Modern Subject', p. 198.
60. Salih, 'Introduction to "Changing the Subject"', p. 326.
61. Ibid.
62. Strengers, 'Experimenting with Refrains'. On these conflictual definitions see for example Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*; Muecke, *Ancient and Modern*.
63. Strengers, 'Experimenting with Refrains', p. 44.
64. Ibid.
65. Foucault, 'Afterword: The Subject and Power', p. 216.