



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Good immigrants, permitted outsiders

Conditional inclusion and citizenship in comparison

Citation for published version:

Hackl, A 2022, 'Good immigrants, permitted outsiders: Conditional inclusion and citizenship in comparison', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 989-1010. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.2011938>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/01419870.2021.2011938](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.2011938)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Ethnic and Racial Studies

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in Ethnic and Racial Studies. Andreas Hackl (2022) Good immigrants, permitted outsiders: conditional inclusion and citizenship in comparison, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 45:6, 989-1010, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2021.2011938. It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Good Immigrants, Permitted Outsiders: Conditional Inclusion and Citizenship in Comparison

Andreas Hackl

Social Anthropology, University of Edinburgh

Abstract

As states and national majorities often demand 'good immigrants', they designate a narrow space of inclusion that is conditional on fulfilling certain pre-determined criteria of behaviour and identity. Recognition of membership in society is increasingly something that immigrants and their children must deserve through certain efforts, achievements, and actions. This special issue introduction develops a theory of conditional inclusion and good citizenship with a focus on migrant and immigrant-origin minorities in Europe and the Americas. The research in this issue reveals how regimes of conditional inclusion become modes of controlling and rank-ordering minorities. At the same time, it shows how immigrants respond with diverse struggles for inclusion and recognition. These struggles are a hidden battleground of citizenship on which minorities negotiate the parameters that determine who can be included and accepted in a given state or society. Their experience shows that a logic conditionality is inherent to citizenship today.

Keywords: immigrants; migrants; minorities; good citizens; inclusion; recognition.

Introduction

Dominant majorities frequently demand that immigrants and members of minorities fulfil certain stereotypes of behaviour and identity, while expecting them to make undesirable aspects of who they are invisible. This includes widespread demands for 'model minorities', 'good Muslims', 'good immigrants', 'good Arabs', 'civil' citizens, or 'permitted' Indians (Hale and Millaman 2006; Hackl 2020; Mamdani 1998; Shukla 2016; Elias 2008). This special issue of *Ethnic and Racial Studies* sheds light on the lived experiences behind such powerful tropes of conditional inclusion and conditional citizenship, including among migrants, refugees, and minorities of immigrant origin. Given the prospect of acquiring citizenship and being recognized as a member of a society or nation-state, members of minorities are often expected to meet certain pre-determined conditions: they should behave well and be loyal, be politically and religiously moderate, while contributing to the national economy through hard work. They shouldn't become a public burden or demand welfare. Yet even when they meet such criteria, they are frequently illegalized and stigmatized as deportable outcasts, criminals, or clandestine workers.

The minorities who are affected by regimes of conditional inclusion and citizenship respond in various ways, at times striving to fulfil the underlying criteria in the hope of gaining citizenship or residency, and at times rejecting them as a form of co-optation in disguise. Often simultaneously enabling and disabling, conditional inclusion fulfils a dual function. It serves states and their ethnic or racial majorities as a means of controlling and rank-ordering different kinds of immigrants and other minorities. At the same time, it offers minorities limited opportunities for making active citizenship claims and develop strategic responses to the ever-present possibility of exclusion. These often subtle and compromising claims represent a largely hidden and under-represented struggle for citizenship and inclusion.

That this issue focuses on the *inclusion* rather than exclusion of people with migration background may appear counter-intuitive today. After all, the transatlantic state of immigration politics indicates mounting ostracism. This is exemplified by the impact of Brexit in the United Kingdom, a solidifying 'fortress Europe' (Carr 2013), as well as intensifying anti-immigrant sentiments with Donald Trump's election in the US and the pre-emptive exclusion of immigrants (Stephen 2018). These recent developments follow a

longer emergence of an anti-multicultural tide and a politics of white 'restoration' since the late twentieth century, which brought about increasing pressures on immigrant minorities to affirm exclusive 'American' or 'European' values (Hage 2015, 9). Because such overt politics of exclusion has become ever more visible, it has overshadowed a hidden battleground of inclusion: the narrow ground on which migrants and immigrant minorities negotiate the conditions and parameters that determine who can be included, accepted, or be temporarily present in a given state and society. Focusing on inclusion from a critical perspective acknowledges that people's marginality is not only the result of exclusion, but is also due to their inclusion with pre-defined limited entitlements: not as a form of 'outsiderness' but something internal (Di Nunzio 2017). This internal dimension of marginality includes powerful discourses of alterity that define globally dominant frameworks of inclusion, such as citizenship (Schrover and Schinkel 2013).

The contributions in this issue show that conditionality is inherent to citizenship rather than being its outlier. Citizenship should be understood as a broader membership category that invites those who stand at its margins to make claims and struggle for inclusion within pre-determined limits. Integration requirements frequently suggest that some kinds of immigrants must earn their citizenship or residency by acquiring certain competences and by fulfilling certain conditions, all the while native-born citizens of the majority are implicitly perceived as natural possessors of their unconditional citizenship; such integration requirements have proliferated in Europe, the United States, and elsewhere (de Waal 2020, 236). These proliferating regimes of conditional citizenship and inclusion trigger a set of important and urgent questions that this issue answers: Under what conditions are migrants and immigrant-origin minorities recognized as 'good' and worthy of residence, positive recognition, or citizenship? How do individuals and minorities negotiate and respond to the various criteria for inclusion and citizenship imposed on them? And how do we make sense of accommodating struggles for inclusion, alongside the many overt forms of resistance and collective action that reject the underlying principles of conditional citizenship? How, then, does a logic of excluding and dominating national Others operate through processes of inclusion?

The research in this issue suggests that conditional citizenship entails at least the following four positive qualities of 'goodness' and their respective negative inversions: contributing

economically through hard work (vs. being a ‘public charge’), being civic-minded, publicly engaged, and volunteering (vs. being selfish and not contributing to the public good), being law abiding (vs. being criminal), and being loyal while maintaining a politically or religiously moderate position (vs. becoming a political hardliner or religious ‘extremist’). While regimes of conditional inclusion promote many other qualities of good citizenship, these aspects have been particularly prominent across a variety of *minorities with migration and immigration backgrounds*. Using this rather imprecise terminology is intentionally inclusive of the large diversity of statuses covered by the research in this issue. This diversity entails citizens with various immigration backgrounds and their children, non-citizen migrants of different backgrounds, long-term immigrants without citizenship, as well as asylum seekers, refugees, and forced returnees.

As a first step, this introduction will conceptualize conditional inclusion and good citizenship. It will then discuss three domains in which affected minorities negotiate the underlying parameters of inclusion: public discourses of good citizenship, the spheres of education and integration, as well as responses to legal regimes and immigrant bureaucracies. The subsequent section will approach these responses as claims for citizenship and inclusion, while outlining the main criteria and qualities immigration regimes and national majorities demand from migrants and immigrant-origin minorities. This will be followed by a discussion of deportations and citizenship revocations, which reveal the flawed and often unfulfilled promises of conditional inclusion and citizenship. The final part of this introduction provides succinct summaries of the nine individual articles in this special issue.

Divide and Rule: Conditional Inclusion and Good Citizenship

Citizenship has many dimensions, among them its meaning as a particular status, as a set of rights, and as an aspect of people’s identity (Goodman 2020, 3). A fourth dimension is citizenship in the Aristotelian sense of political participation: an active kind of ‘good’ and virtuous citizenship (Horst, Erdal, and Jdid 2020). Citizenship is then not only a normative construct but is defined by the claims people put forward and the ‘citizenship acts’ they make in their everyday lives (Bloemraad 2018). This multi-dimensionality does not always go without tension. While citizenship is often seen as a signifier of ostensibly universal

attachments and claims, group identities and group claims are seen as particularistic (Isin and Wood 1999, 14). In this sense, modern citizenship may be one among many identities individuals can adopt, but it is often distinguished by a demand for 'moral maturity' and by a potential for moderating or 'taming' the divisiveness of other identities, such as gender, religion, race, class, and nation (Heater 1990, 184; Isin and Wood 1999, 14).

It follows that citizenship is a kind of group identity too, because it's never neutral and rarely universal in practice. The widespread process of 'taming' differences of identity in the name of citizenship becomes a process of attempted domination of internal and external outsiders by means of conditional inclusion. Certain minorities' access to what is ostensibly universal is then always already prefigured as racialized and conditional. Although multicultural policies and Western liberalism have promised pathways to citizenship and equality that transcend racial and ethnic difference, they have widely reinforced durable inequalities and have racialized the recognition of indigenous or immigrant minorities (Hale 2005; Hage 1998).

Citizenship may have a unifying dimension, but it is also divisive internally and externally. Citizenship regimes tend to apply a distinction between citizens and other 'men', which in turn derives from a series of divisions including those between coloniser and colonised, the occident and orient (Isin 2012, 564). Legal and political discourses of citizenship produce differences between and amongst worlds and then rank-order these differences (Isin 2012, 568). Crucially, citizenship is not only divisive between 'us' and 'them' – between citizens and noncitizens – but also divisive in the sense that some of 'us' belong only as long as they continue to meet certain conditions. A logic of conditionality therefore defines citizenship as 'good' citizenship. Such *good citizenship* implies the responsibility of citizens to help assure the quality of public life through civic participation. It not only requires obeying a country's laws but also demands 'virtuous behavior' (Ricci 2004, 3–8). This is a moralizing kind of citizenship because being recognized as a *real* citizen requires being classified a *good* and *virtuous* citizen. The resulting implications for migrants and immigrant-origin minorities are that they are pressured to adapt and integrate in accordance with what the state and the dominant majority deem as 'good' (Schinkel 2010). Many inherent rights and privileges of citizenship therefore don't apply in the same way to certain minorities.

This internal differentiation of citizenship extends into the transnational space of migration, defining not only who among 'us' is more or less deserving, but also who among 'them' should be permitted to come or stay despite not being part of 'us'. Migrants and refugees are often confronted with regimes that make their presence and positive recognition conditional on the fulfilment of cultural or religious criteria, administrative and legal requirements, economic indicators, and pre-defined standards of identity and behaviour. This includes forms of 'cultural' adaptation and integration even if the prospect of citizenship and equality remains foreclosed (Schinkel 2010, 269). Conforming with these standards of inclusion and behaviour can become a precondition for immigrants' inclusion, their socio-economic access, and their right to remain.

A recent analysis of citizenship manuals printed between 1921 and 1998 in the United States revealed the deep historical roots of making immigrants into good citizens (Goodman 2020). Good citizenship now increasingly involves pressures on newcomers to adopt a 'common culture' in order to be eligible for citizenship (Fargues and Winter 2019, 198). At times, good citizenship can be about neutralizing the Otherness of the immigrant or minority citizen (Hoekstra 2015). At other times, it demands conformity with a racialized authentic image of one's identity in line with an externally ascribed Otherness. While some integration requirements deem the arrival or naturalization of certain immigrants as entirely unwanted, others proscribe that persons with immigrant backgrounds are welcome but only under certain conditions; they must *deserve* their residency or citizenship rights (de Waal 2020, 238). Indeed, 'unwanted citizens' are certain groups of immigrants that do not truly belong and never will, which is why an impermissible social inequality defines the difference between 'wanted' and 'less-wanted' or even 'unwanted' citizens (de Waal 2020, 239). 'Conditional belonging', on the other hand, pre-determines the entitlement of citizenship among certain immigrant minorities as contingent on certain competences, characteristics, and efforts. This growing trend signifies a broader shift to models of 'earned citizenship' for immigrants in Europe and beyond (de Waal 2020, 239). This, too, has consequences for social equality. As de Waal writes (2020, 240):

If mandatory integration requirements as conditions to obtain access to certain rights are defended as measuring deservingness of belonging and citizenship, this suggests

that the citizenship that citizens with migration backgrounds possess is of a different kind than the citizenship that people without immigrant backgrounds have.

Conditional citizenship is then essentially about the differentiation of membership and citizenship into a hierarchical order. At its root, liberal citizenship implies that this order is flexible if those who are suspected of being 'bad' can improve and evolve to become 'good' through concrete actions. However, in practice, such achievements often remain conditional on the continuing validation of 'goodness', which is why true equality remains foreclosed.

The articles in this issue show that the various patterns of conditional inclusion and citizenship around the world feature striking resemblance. The global relevance and urgency of conditional inclusion has become evident in the enthusiastic public reception of the volume *The Good Immigrant* and its follow-up volume *The Good Immigrant USA* (Shukla and Suleyman 2019; Shukla 2016). In these collections of essays, the editors describe 'The Good Immigrant' as a 'response to the narrative that immigrants are "bad" by default until they prove themselves otherwise. They are job stealers, benefit scroungers, girlfriend thieves, and criminals. Only when they win an Olympic medal, treat you at your local hospital, or rescue a child from the side of a building do they become *good*' (Suleyman and Shukla 2019). Between demands for 'good immigrants', 'good Muslims', and 'good citizens', the world is ripe with metaphoric tropes that designate spaces of conditional inclusion for 'deserving' minority citizens and 'permitted' outsiders.

Despite the prevalence of this phenomenon, the effects of *conditional citizenship* and *conditional inclusion* on migrants and immigrant-origin minorities remain poorly understood. To be sure, there is important research on citizenship policy and conditionality for status acquisition, and on the various cultural requirements of entry and settlement in integration policies (Degolyer 2001; Goodman 2020; de Waal 2020). Taking one step further, the contributions in this issue allow us to grasp how a logic of conditional rights and belonging are at the heart of what citizenship means among many minorities today. They show how a logic of conditionality is both locally specific and globally similar across a large variety of cases. Offering an empirically thick and conceptually rich discussion, the body of research in this issue reveals how individuals and minorities negotiate regimes of conditional inclusion in relation to at least three domains: public discourses of good citizenship, the sphere of

education and integration, as well as responses to legal regimes and immigrant bureaucracies. Through these interlinked spheres we can understand how public discourses interpret and interact with government policies to draw or solidify symbolic boundaries (Winter and Previsic 2019). In exploring the interplay between powerful discourses, legal regimes, and individual agency, this issue demonstrates that conditionality ultimately determines all domains of citizenship for migrants and immigrant-origin minorities: citizenship as a particular status, a set of rights, an aspect of people's identity, and as a form of civic participation.

Metaphors and Discourses of Good Citizenship: Powerful Labels with Colonial Roots

Regimes of conditional inclusion are backed up by powerful discourses about societal integration, which promote forms of 'civicness' that are inherently cultural and national (Mouritsen et al. 2019). The specific socio-political categories, such as the 'good immigrant', are metaphoric and stereotypical node points of these discourses. Such categories, or labels, entail specific classifications of identity used in a powerful top-down process of 'making up people' (Hacking 1981). People and institutions might use such ascriptions intentionally to mark out an ideal-type minority *figure*: an exemplary role model that stands for a whole set of behaviours and senses of identity (Lindquist 2015, 163). Powerful tropes such as 'the good immigrant' thereby become part of a national protocol of recognition, a form of 'national intelligibility' of dominant socio-political role scripts (Stein 2008, 2–3). Together with official policies and educational efforts, these scripts pressure or inspire affected migrants and immigrant-origin minorities to respond through concrete actions.

Discourses around 'good' and 'bad' citizens, or immigrants, build on how colonialism and settler colonialism have encompassed indigenous peoples under restrictive conditions, exemplified by the 'permitted Indian' in Latin America or the 'good Arab' in Israel/Palestine (Hale and Millaman 2006, 284; Hackl 2020). These colonial patterns invoke a dichotomy between good and bad colonized subjects, such as that of 'good nobles' and 'bad savages', or that between the docile indigenous labourer and the treacherous insurrectionary Indian (Stavenhagen 1992; Berkhofer 1978). In a similar vein, the 'taming' of Algeria and Algerians implemented a classic divide-and-rule politics that separated good assimilable subjects from bad subjects, Berbers from Arabs (Prochaska 2004, 3, 234). The affinity between this colonial

logic of division and the national governance of migrant and immigrant-origin minorities today may seem surprising. Yet, colonialism played a crucial role in the nineteenth-century consolidation of liberal thought, thereby inscribing an incapacity to respect the unfamiliar into liberal ideology and citizenship (Bell 2016; Mehta 1999). This incapacity to respect unfamiliar Others as equal citizens is the lasting legacy of colonial domination within post-colonial metropolises, while defining the way settler colonial states hierarchically encompass indigenous peoples and immigrant minorities (Povinelli 2002; Hackl 2018). By definition of their indigeneity, indigenous peoples are not immigrants, but they have been subjected to similar regimes of conditional inclusion.

This divisive logic of colonial encompassment has been translocated into liberal tropes of 'good' citizenship. This plays out visibly in how Muslims and Arabs in the US have been categorized as suspicious and dangerous Others. In doing so, the state builds on a securitized logic of 'good' versus 'bad' Muslims linked to American imperialism, which in turn builds on a history of Orientalism: 'good Arabs' are the ones who do as they are told and bad Arabs are those who do not, and are therefore terrorists (Said 2003, 306; Mamdani 1998). Moreover, powerful nationalist discourses turn conditional inclusion into a form of controlling suspect communities and enemies, whereby political Others are invited to prove their loyalty. North Koreans living in South Korea, for example, are invited to gain social status by speaking publicly about their lives and denouncing the North Korean regime. Rather than offering unconditional equality, this selective inclusion becomes an extension of South Korea's claim of sovereignty over all Korean people (Hough and Bell 2020). The powerful discourses of conditional inclusion therefore express hierarchical claims of sovereignty over political, ethnonational, or cultural Others: a kind of pacifying encompassment without the prospect of real equality. Such encompassment is always hierarchical, as the putatively subordinate category of difference is subsumed or co-opted into the identity category defined and 'owned' by those who do the encompassing (Baumann 2004, 26). 'Good immigrants' can thereby be recognized as citizens, but only if they accept the co-optation of their difference and identity under the dominant framework.

Many ideal-type categories of conditional inclusion have become simplistic reference points in daily life. But the experiences behind these categories take place in a social space of conditional inclusion that is ultimately far more complex and ambivalent than the idealized

metaphors suggest. This 'social space' of interaction is hierarchic and mediates the distribution of socioeconomic access and inclusion unequally among citizens and between citizens and non-citizens (Bourdieu 2018; Lefebvre 1991). When migrants and immigrants navigate this social space of conditional inclusion, they interact with legal-political regimes and with discourses of good citizenship. Their experiences allow us to see how conditionality defines citizenship in all its meanings.

A Civilizing Process: Integrating Migrants, Educating Citizens

Two sites where states attempt to engrain dominant notions of behaviour and identity in citizens and non-citizens are education and integration. From the perspective of good citizenship, education is not just for acquiring vocational skills but 'should prepare "the people" both morally and intellectually to exercise their sovereignty' (Ricci 2004, 12). Immigrants may find that this educational component of good citizenship is less concerned with enabling them to exercise sovereignty than with discouraging certain forms of behaviour and identity that are deemed undesirable. The pressures on Muslim pupils in schools to perform as a moderate and 'relaxed' Muslims are a case in point (Gilliam 2021 in this issue). States and civil society have long aimed to educate immigrants. The United States has been practicing immigrant civic education for over a century, whereby different political ideologies and approaches have shaped different kinds of immigrants as 'good citizens' over time. This included promoting qualities such as English literacy, steady work, being useful and loyal to your community, state, and nation, while casting your vote and abiding by the law (Goodman 2020).

Such integrative education is part of a wider 'civilising process' that makes citizenship unequal (Elias 2008). Civility denotes duties of citizenship, while also defining impersonal public codes of social conduct. Civility entails a set of rules and behaviours that may make individuals and communities conform to a social order deemed 'civilised', including 'the dark side of the process' through which a state polices its citizenry (Volpi 2011, 828). Civility thus implies that only some identities are 'sanctioned' by modern nation-states, because citizenship has often 'constituted ethnic minorities and migrants as different from and incompatible with members of the dominant culture' (Collier, Maurer, and Suarez-Navaz 1996, 18). Implemented through

active policies of educational conversion, civility is a sphere of ‘structural power’ that shapes the social field of action as it renders some kinds of behaviour possible and others less or impossible (Wolf 2006, 223). A civilizing educational process is often where the children of immigrants first encounter that ‘good’ behaviour has different implications for them than for non-immigrant citizens. In this sense, educational spaces help produce differentiated and partial forms of citizenship. Integration courses delivered to adult migrants and refugees in Europe and elsewhere also fulfil this function, often without directly foreshadowing the possibility of becoming a citizen. In these integration and language courses, refugees must learn what it means to be recognized as a contributing and deserving ‘good refugee’ (Etzel 2021 in this issue).

Executing Good Citizenship: Legal Regimes and Immigrant Bureaucracies

Legal regimes and the implementing state bureaucracies are a key factor in shaping immigrants and migrants’ experiences with conditional inclusion. The inclusion of immigrants under certain conditions is often authorized by law, such as the policies that make immigrants deportable if they become a ‘public charge’ or ‘criminals’ (Zeweri and Gardea 2021; Nyberg Sørensen 2021 in this issue). Deportation and citizenship revocations reveal this conditionality of citizenship in its most extreme form (Fargues and Winter 2019). Some effects of legal regimes illegalize migrants categorically and force them to be publicly invisible (Coutin 2005). Here invisibility becomes a precondition for their ability to remain, although this is not officially permitted.

State-run immigration agencies and other non-state actors, which execute conditional inclusion in practice, are often influenced by the wider discourses that promote a distinction between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ immigrants. Indeed, immigration administrators draw on predefined moral assumptions about deserving and non-deserving asylum seekers in their decisions (Kalir and Wissink 2016). Situated at the frontier between law and the nation, or between legal rules and political execution, immigration bureaucracies are powerful actors that not only evaluate the conditions of permitted presence but actively shape them. The processing of naturalization applications, including their intentional delay, is increasingly a political and securitized question and a strategic tool of selective exclusion (Lori 2021 in this

issue). Naturalization can be an expensive and bureaucratically demanding process with conditions and requirements that are difficult to meet. Rather than being the 'culmination of a normative path to integration for foreign residents', naturalization, as in the case of EU citizens in the wake of Brexit in the UK, can become 'a pragmatic, instrumental and defensive mechanism' that aims to mitigate future risks and preserve future options for families (Godin and Sigona 2021 in this issue).

Laws and policies can even trigger adaptive actions among immigrants before they are implemented. This happened during changes to the public charge policy in the US, which intimidated immigrants against accepting welfare benefits and other state aid even if they were entitled to it (Zeweri and Gardea 2021 in this issue). Laws and policies are often designed to have pre-emptive effects by triggering changes in behaviour among immigrants that push them towards fulfilling the criteria and conditions of inclusion imposed by the state. The laws of citizenship, alongside laws and policies that specifically govern migrants and immigrants, make up the core structure of regimes of conditional inclusion. Yet, together with discourses and educational processes, these regimes become much more than structural context: they demand concrete actions from affected individuals who try to mitigate their exclusionary effects.

'Good' Qualities to Strive For? Responses to Conditional Inclusion as Citizenship Claims

The civilizing process of education, together with public discourses and legal regimes, instils a variety of aspirations in migrants and immigrants that mirror some of the underlying criteria for inclusion. When a citizenship regime foreshadows the possibility of inclusion or membership for immigrants if certain conditions are met, it promotes a set of qualities that individuals can feel pressured to strive for. These qualities of 'goodness' include contributing economically, being civic-minded, being law abiding, and being loyal while maintaining a politically or religiously moderate position. For example, minorities with immigrant origins in the United States invoked a sense of 'law and order citizenship', meaning that 'you shouldn't break the law', while others spoke of ideals about civic participation or economic

contributions through working and paying taxes (Bloemraad 2021 in this issue). These and other economic arguments are at the heart of national debates around the deservingness of immigrants: they must *labour for inclusion* and earn it (Sheehan 2021 in this issue). Social upward mobility, which is ostensibly universal in the American Dream imaginary, demands from racial and ethnonational minorities to overcome stigmatization as a 'problem' and work hard to prove they are not (Bayoumi 2009). Consider, for example, the Jamaican American novelist Nicole Dennis-Benn, who was left outside a US college by her Jamaican father with the words: 'Know yuh place, keep quiet, an' work hard' (Dennis-Benn 2019, 16).

Some immigrant-origin citizens may be expected to vote and contribute to the wider national community, but they are also expected to keep particular aspects of their public life hidden. They should be political but not too political; they should contribute to the community but not only to their 'own' ethno-religious minority. They can be openly Muslim, as long as they demonstrate their loyalty to the state and adhere to its laws and policies, symbolically wrapping themselves in the national flag (Ghaffar-Kucher et al. 2021 in this issue). Immigrants and migrants' aspirations to fulfil the criteria of good citizenship and permitted presence are always simultaneously a process of inclusion and exclusion. As some rights are acquired and achievements are made, others must be ignored or erased.

As regimes of 'good' citizenship and conditional inclusion produce hierarchies, they can harden durable inequalities between minorities and the majority. Yet, despite the implicit acceptance of losses, migrants and immigrants' struggle withing regimes of conditional inclusion and citizenship allow them to respond to the stigmatization they experience by articulating claims to membership and access (Lamont et al. 2016). These diverse responses designate a hidden battleground of inclusion on which minorities negotiate access and membership within certain pre-determined limits. Minorities of status or identity can struggle to claim rights, or to expand or maintain their existing rights within citizenship (Isin and Wood 1999, 14–15). This struggle necessarily involves accommodating and compromising strategies too.

These often accommodating responses are unlike visible resistance struggles for justice and recognition, which often side-line controversial compromises and concessions (Theodossopoulos 2014). Conditional inclusion triggers 'quiet claims' to citizenship from the

margins of society, challenging dominant approaches in researching power struggles among minorities (Canepari and Rosa 2017). Such an approach certainly recognizes the practices, laws, and ideologies of outright exclusion and marginalization that affect minorities and immigrants (Wacquant 2008; De Genova 2013; Peutz and De Genova 2010). However, it puts the main focus on how unfolding processes of incorporation and 'identity-making' express a particular dialectic between domination and 'autonomous subaltern' action (Wolf 2006). Within the framework of conditional inclusion, 'subaltern' actions actively respond to attempted domination, but they often do so in the absence of individual sovereignty and autonomy. Regimes of conditional inclusion aim to dominate minorities, and the minorities' accommodating responses are in a mutually reinforcing relationship with such domination.

What, then, do migrants and immigrant minorities lose by striving towards inclusion as 'good' citizens or permitted outsiders? Conversely, what can they gain despite accepting the compromises and sacrifices that make up such loss? The contributions in this issue reveal both the losses and potential gains that such claims to inclusion and citizenship entail. While some members of immigrant minorities do what they can to meet the imposed criteria for citizenship, others have awakened from the mirage of conditional inclusion and reject calls for being good citizens or good Muslims (Ghaffar-Kucher et al. 2021 in this issue). Whatever their direction, these claims are made through a kind of agency that is always structured and constrained because claims in the name of citizenship must resonate with normative ideas, and they face constraints in legal structures, public perceptions, and institutional practices of society (Bloemraad 2018).

Deportation, Return, and the Transnational Dimensions of Conditional Inclusion

The conditional nature of inclusion and citizenship becomes highly visible in deportations and citizenship revocations. Revoking citizenship, or 'denationalization', is a punishment for certain types of behaviour such as disloyalty or serious crime (Gibney 2013, 646). This connects conditional citizenship today with ancient practices of banishment or exile that forcibly displaced persons from a particular polity or state (Starn 1982; Said 2001). Although legally sanctioned, such banishment is always a political act of removal (Hackl 2017).

Alongside the deportation of migrants, citizenship revocation continues to be practiced in many Western democracies in the name of national security, as an official act of legally and symbolically 'un-belonging' certain people (Winter and Previsic 2019). The discourses around who can and should be exiled in Europe or North America have often targeted Muslims and other 'suspect' minorities.

The predicament of conditional inclusion among immigrants and migrants does not end with their forced removal from a nation state. Forced returnees, who are often stigmatized as failures in their country of origin, may find a whole new set of conditions they must fulfil in order to reclaim membership in a 'home' country. This is illustrated by the case of Dominican forced returnees from the United States, who continue to be stigmatized in their country of origin after being deported as 'criminals' (Nyberg Sørensen 2021 in this issue). The double exile of a migrant who is not fully accepted in the host country and equally unable to reintegrate fully into the society of origin has been discussed prominently in the Algerian and Palestinian cases (Sayad 2004; Said 2001). Here conditional inclusion is not necessarily a national process but extends into a transnational continuum across borders. Scales of belonging for individuals often simultaneously include one or more national communities, and this is articulated through sense of good citizenship that crosses borders too (Horst, Erdal, and Jdid 2020).

This transnational dimension of conditional inclusion further becomes evident in nation states that have had adverse relations with their neighbours, which often triggers a foreign policy approach that differentiates between 'good' and 'bad' neighbours and by extension, friends and enemies. One example for this dynamic is the case of North Korean defectors who end up in South Korea, where they must conform to a particular role model in order to demonstrate a transformation from suspect enemy to loyal friend (Hough and Bell 2020). In the case of Israel, the concept of the 'good Arab' has informed the approach of the Jewish Israeli majority to Arab citizens within, and to Arab nations it has had historically adverse relations with (Hackl 2020): 'good Arabs' are those that do not question the legitimacy of the Israeli State and prioritize pragmatic goals over identity politics, such as the peace treaty signatory Jordan and more recently, normalization with the UAE and Bahrain. Conditional inclusion serves states and national majorities as a resource for filtering out potentially loyal

and docile subjects of national and international governance from within broader populations that are deemed categorically suspect until proved otherwise.

Conditional Inclusion in Comparison: Overview of Contributions

Claiming Membership: Boundaries, Positionality, US Citizenship, and What It Means to be American

What does it mean to be American and a 'good citizen' for immigrants in the United States? Irene Bloemraad answers this question among Mexican, Vietnamese and Chinese immigrants and their children who evaluate being American and being a good citizen very differently. While they associate membership as a citizen with legal, moral, civic, and economic actions, many link being American to racial background, being born in the United States, and cultural behaviours: characteristics that could place them outside a membership circle. Some interviewees invoked a sense of 'law and order citizenship', such as a Vietnamese-born mother who said that being a good citizen means that 'you shouldn't break the law'. Others conveyed an ideal of civic participation and volunteerism. Good citizenship was widely seen as a form of economic contribution through paying taxes, not using social benefits, and holding a job.

Americanism invoked a sense of distance from an imagined cultural mainstream and sometimes an unsurmountable boundary, determined by racial and cultural barriers and the place of birth. In emphasizing the 'citizenship acts' people take and envision, Bloemraad illuminates pathways for noncitizens, including undocumented residents, to claim membership, even as inclusion may be contingent on being law-abiding or hard-working. The research underscores how metaphors of boundary-drawing and dichotomous categorisation into 'in' or 'out' groups – being a citizen or not, being American or not – must be supplemented with attention to multiplicity in membership characteristics, claims-making, and gradient positionality.

*"Muslims are Finally Waking Up": Post-9/11 American Immigrant Youth Challenge
Conditional Citizenship*

Muslims in the United States are seen as alien humans and have been relegated to the margins of citizenship. They are permitted tenuous forms of conditional belonging as long as they perform their Muslimness in ways that align with tropes of the liberal, multicultural state. Drawing on a nation-wide qualitative study with youth from diverse Muslim immigrant communities, Ameena Ghaffar-Kucher, Thea Abu el-Haj, Arshad Ali, Michelle Fine and Roozbeh Shirazi show how Muslim American youth have awakened from this mirage of conditional inclusion and often reject demands for being 'good Muslims'.

The youths linked their struggles with those of other racially minoritized, aligned with a radical politics of belonging and self-conscious Muslim visibility. This emerging critical position is rooted in an understanding of shared histories of Arab and Black struggles against imperialism, slavery, and systematic racism. They must often wage another struggle within their own families, as their insistence on being publicly visible as Muslims contrasts how some of their parents navigated public life by sweeping things 'under the rug', as one young Arab-American woman put it. The authors show that Muslim American youth no longer want to sweep things under the rug, as they recognize themselves as people of colour within a broader community of racially minoritized groups.

Cultivated Intuition: Reframing Migrant Responses to the "Public Charge" Policy

Against the background of the Trump administration in the United States, Helena Zeweri and Eloy Gardea explore Central American and Mexican migrants' responses to changes in the 'public charge' policy of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, before its official implementation in August 2019. This policy makes migrants seeking to apply for permanent residence less likely to get their applications approved under grounds that they are 'unable to care for themselves without becoming a public charge'. This pre-emptive policy intervenes against the potential threat of migrants becoming a future public burden. The migrants must demonstrate that they do not claim recognition and citizenship as a right but see it as a privilege or as a 'gift', one that is precarious and can be taken away at the discretion of the state. This underlines that migrants inhabit a submissive relationship to citizenship that they become aware of its conditionality.

Migrants' responses to the policy included foregoing medical benefits and food stamps for their children. Shortly after the proposed changes to the policy were announced, a grief-

stricken client had a consultation with a refugee and immigrant centre to explore her immigration case. Saying that everybody in the community was now talking about ‘a new law where you can’t use benefits’, this woman insisted that she no longer wanted to use any government benefits, including those that her US children could benefit from. Even though her particular situation was not subject to the public charge rule, the client considered the \$200-\$300 monthly payment she would receive as too risky. This and other important cases discussed in this article highlight migrants’ pre-emptive deliberations in response to conditional paradigms of citizenship. Having cultivated a particular ‘intuition’ that informs their decisions, they become active agents in their citizenship futures, even if that means they take steps that put their own and their children’s lives in danger.

The Transnational Continuum of Conditional Inclusion: From Marginalised Immigrants to Rejected Returnees

Demands to be law-abiding have been central to definitions of the ‘good immigrant’. US-legislation makes it possible that noncitizens, including legal residents, can face mandatory deportation as a result of criminal conviction. Ninna Nyberg Sørensen explores the criminalization and forced returns of Dominican immigrants who lived in the Washington Heights neighbourhood of New York. Alongside having been a long-standing centre of Dominican settlement and culture, the neighbourhood has been fraught with inequalities, drug problems, and crime. Many young Dominicans there became involved in criminal activity and thereby became deportable ‘bad immigrants’. The structural conditions shaping their criminalisation foreshadowed the pathways along which rising numbers of Dominicans would later contravene the conditions of a ‘good immigrant’ and become ‘bad deportees’ in the Dominican Republic.

Sørensen writes about Hector, who was forced to return to Santo Domingo with a serious drug problem obtained in prison. He soon realized that people on the island excluded him for this crime committed long time ago and paid for elsewhere. The case of Dominican returnees reveals how regimes of conditional inclusion operate transnationally and extend into the reverse direction of migration. From departure to arrival, through deportation and the struggle for reintegration, conditional forms of inclusion function as the key logic

through which citizenship – as both a national and transnational framework for inclusion – differentiates between ‘good’ assimilable subjects of a diaspora and ‘failed’ migrants.

Citizens-in-Waiting: Strategic Naturalization Delays in the USA and UAE

One of the key conditions for immigrants to gain access to citizenship and the right to remain has been time. Noora Lori explores the temporal aspects in regimes of conditional inclusion in the strategic postponement of naturalization cases in the United Arab Emirates and United States. The US has deployed delays that primarily target Muslim lawful permanent residents by investigating links to terrorism, within the framework of the ‘Controlled Application Review and Resolution Program’ (CARRP). This policy often means that the entire adjudicative process becomes oriented towards finding any conceivable basis to deny the application. The UAE, as a highly exclusive citizenship regime, has postponed naturalization cases of ethnic minorities for years and sometimes decades. As a 66-year-old former immigrant in the UAE told Lori: ‘No one said “no,” they just said “it’s processing.” So we were waiting...For 40 years we lived with hopes. Those who live with hopes die in despair.’

Despite crucial differences between the two citizenship regimes, their comparison shows how time becomes an instrument of exclusion and suspension of claims to citizenship. Rather than being fully included or excluded, the targets of strategic deferrals are conditionally and precariously included in the national body politic. Lori argues that conditional inclusion is therefore a strategic political tool that enables states to legalize certain dimensions of a population’s residency (like labour) without allowing those individuals to accrue full citizenship rights.

Laboring for Inclusion: Debating Immigrant Contributions to Chile

The Chilean state’s response to incoming migration from Latin American and Caribbean countries has been emblematic of how conditional inclusion pre-figures certain kinds of outsiders as ‘good’ contributing migrants. As Megan Sheehan shows, foreign citizens can be barred from entry in Chile if they engage in acts ‘contrary to morality’, are union members, or become a ‘social burden’. This regime juxtaposes contributing migrants vis-à-vis

undesirable additions to the national community. Migrants must work for recognition of the value of their labour amidst an elusive promise of being validated as a 'good citizen'. As Chileans elaborate expectations of migrant labour, while migrants either seek to embody or find ways to reject the parameters of conditional recognition, they dialectically craft a notion of what it takes to be a contributing migrant.

One Venezuelan woman in Chile emphasized labour as a contribution to Chile, adding that, 'we are very respectful, diligent, hardworking.' The stereotypical trope of the Peruvian nanny exemplifies racialized notions of domestic labour, as one Peruvian domestic labourer explained, they are expected to be silent and 'do everything' without complaint. Migrants in Chile often adopt an ethos of proving themselves through hard work and docility, thereby echoing the laws, policies, and discourses that pressure them to do so. In this sense, they reproduce the idea of contribution through labour, further solidifying this pathway as the norm for those seeking economic and social inclusion.

Intergenerational Narratives of Citizenship among EU Citizens in the UK after the Brexit Referendum

As British naturalization applications by EU citizens increased in the aftermath of the 2016 EU referendum, Marie Godin and Nando Sigona offer unique insights into the motivations that informed their decisions to become British or not. Examining the various 'citizenship narratives' among EU families, the authors find that naturalization was not a 'premium' or privilege for many EU citizens in the UK. Rather, they employed 'defensive narratives' in response to a perceived loss and 'protective narratives' in response to a potential future threat. Eligible EU citizens saw naturalization primarily as a family consideration to prevent their children from becoming second-class citizens. These decisions are often perceived to be the result of forced circumstances, motivated by a desire to take back control over one's family life. For others, among them many Central and Eastern Europeans, becoming British was motivated by the desire to overcome the negative stigma associated with the label 'immigrant'.

The authors show that naturalization is more than the culmination of a normative path to integration for foreign residents. Indeed, naturalization in the narratives of EU citizens emerges as a pragmatic, instrumental and defensive mechanism to mitigate and cope with

the impact of Brexit on themselves and their families, and to preserve future options for their children. The citizenship narratives not only differ between families but also within them, and especially between parents and children, which highlights the inter-generational dimension of immigrants' diverse responses to conditional regimes of citizenship.

Being Muslim 'Without a Fuss': Relaxed Religiosity and Conditional Inclusion in Danish Schools and Society

Education is a key site for producing ideals of 'good citizenship'. Laura Gilliam shows how Muslim pupils in Danish schools learn about kinds of behaviour deemed as good and acceptable, and others as bad and problematic. They come under pressure to be Muslim 'without a fuss': to adopt a 'relaxed' attitude to their own religiosity. The teachers in these schools emphasize the need for harmony, which emerges as shorthand for avoiding any possibility of religious conflict or disagreement. Being 'relaxed' about your religion is about being governable.

Some pupils shared their religious devotion at their mosque but did not discuss religion at school. As the pupil Ahmad told Gilliam: 'Me and Khalid, we both know we're Muslims. (...) but we don't talk about it.' Another pupil, Karim, explained that he tried to 'fit in' at school without being 'this exaggerated Muslim'. The pupils' experiences foreshadow the wider conditions of inclusion for young Muslims in Denmark and beyond, indicating the intrinsic connection between conditional citizenship and education. The result is a number of evasive practices, taboos, ambivalences and avoidance strategies. Through their experience of balancing the private Muslim self with the public one, pupils learn that religious devotion, religious symbols and markers of religious differences cast them as outsiders and upset an ostensibly 'harmonious' community defined by the Danish majority.

New Models of the "Good Refugee": Bureaucratic Expectations of Syrian Refugees in Germany

Refugees are often at the centre of debates around deservingness and their right to remain is conditional on fulfilling a range of legal and administrative criteria. Morgan Etzel explores the conditional inclusion of 'good refugees' in the state-run German integration regime. This

regime has prioritized German language proficiency as the cornerstone of integration, alongside other bureaucratic requirements and challenges, such as finding adequate housing, joining integration courses, and finding work. Within this regime, the immigration administration comes to act as a gatekeeper that implements powerful social imaginaries about the deservingness of 'good refugees', who are rewarded with certificates from language and integration courses as symbolic markers of their acceptance.

However, the hope for acceptance that these rewards instil in individual refugees often remains elusive even if they fulfil the underlying conditions of integration. Etzel's analysis of refugees' experience in the German integration regime reveals how streamlined criteria of conditional inclusion often do not account for racial and economic inequalities, thereby systematically disadvantaging some over others. This ostensibly uniform regime is biased and does not sufficiently address different individual needs, creating vastly diverging and often arbitrary outcomes that result in a multi-tier hierarchy of 'good' and 'not-so-good' refugees.

References

- Baumann, Gerd. 2004. "Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach." In *Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach*, edited by André Gingrich and Gerd Baumann, 18–52. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Bayoumi, Moustafa. 2009. *How Does It Feel to Be a Problem?: Being Young and Arab in America*. New York: Penguin Group.
https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/How_Does_It_Feel_to_Be_a_Problem.html?id=zo8kAQAAMAAJ&pgis=1.
- Bell, Duncan. 2016. "The Dream Machine: On Liberalism and Empire." In *Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire*, Online, 19–31. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berkhofer, Robert. 1978. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2018. "Theorising the Power of Citizenship as Claims-Making." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (1): 4–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1396108>.
- . 2021. "Claiming Membership: Boundaries, Positionality, US Citizenship, and What It Means to Be American." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, October, 1–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1986225>.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2018. "Social Space and the Genesis of Appropriated Physical Space." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12534>.
- Canepari, Eleonora, and Elisabetta Rosa. 2017. "A Quiet Claim to Citizenship: Mobility, Urban Spaces and City Practices over Time." *Citizenship Studies* 21 (6): 657–74.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2017.1341654>.
- Carr, Matthew. 2013. *Fortress Europe : Dispatches from a Gated Continent*,. New York: The New Press.
- Collier, Jane F, Bill Maurer, and Liliana Suarez-Navaz. 1996. "Sanctioned Identities: Legal Constructions of Modern Personhood." *Identities* 2 (1–2): 1–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.1997.9962524>.
- Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2005. "Being En Route." *American Anthropologist* 107 (2): 195–206.

- Degolyer, M. E. 2001. "Conditional Citizenship: Hong Kong People's Attitudes toward the New Motherland." *Citizenship Studies* 5 (1): 165–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020120053572>.
- Dennis-Benn, Nicole. 2019. "Swimmer." In *The Good Immigrant USA*, 16–27. London: Dialogue Books.
- Elias, Norbert. 2008. "Power and Civilisation." *Journal of Power* 1 (2): 135–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17540290802309540>.
- Etzel, Morgan. 2021. "New Models of the 'Good Refugee' – Bureaucratic Expectations of Syrian Refugees in Germany." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, August, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1954679>.
- Fargues, Émilien, and Elke Winter. 2019. "Conditional Membership: What Revocation Does to Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 23 (4): 295–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2019.1616446>.
- Genova, Nicholas De. 2013. "Spectacles of Migrant 'Illegality': The Scene of Exclusion, the Obscene of Inclusion." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (7): 1180–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783710>.
- Ghaffar-Kucher, Ameena, Thea Abu El-Haj, Arshad Ali, Michelle Fine, and Roozbeh Shirazi. 2021. "'Muslims Are Finally Waking up': Post-9/11 American Immigrant Youth Challenge Conditional Citizenship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, August, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1957491>.
- Gibney, Matthew J. 2013. "Should Citizenship Be Conditional? The Ethics of Denationalization." *The Journal of Politics* 75 (3): 646–58. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022381613000352>.
- Gilliam, Laura. 2021. "Being Muslim 'without a Fuss': Relaxed Religiosity and Conditional Inclusion in Danish Schools and Society." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, September, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1971733>.
- Godin, Marie, and Nando Sigona. 2021. "Intergenerational Narratives of Citizenship among EU Citizens in the UK after the Brexit Referendum." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, September, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1981964>.
- Goodman, Sara Wallace. 2020. "'Good American Citizens': A Text-as-Data Analysis of Citizenship Manuals for Immigrants, 1921–1996." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, June, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1785852>.

- Hacking, Ian. 1981. "Making Up People." In *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, edited by Thomas C. Heller, Morton Sosna, and David E. Wellbery, 222–36. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hackl, Andreas. 2017. "Key Figure of Mobility: The Exile." *Social Anthropology* 25 (1): 55–68.
- . 2018. "Immersive Invisibility in the Settler-Colonial City: The Conditional Inclusion of Palestinians in Tel Aviv." *American Ethnologist* 45 (3): 1–13.
- . 2020. "The Good Arab: Conditional Inclusion and Settler Colonial Citizenship among Palestinian Citizens of Israel in Jewish Tel Aviv." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 26 (3): 594–611. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.13316>.
- Hage, Ghassan. 1998. *White Nation Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2015. *Alter-Politics: Critical Anthropology and the Radical Imagination*. Melbourne: MUP Academic.
- Hale, Charles. 2005. "Neoliberal Multiculturalism : The Remaking of Cultural Rights and Racial Dominance in Central America." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28 (1): 10–28. <https://doi.org/10.1525/pol.2005.28.1.10>.
- Hale, Charles, and Rosamel Millaman. 2006. "Cultural Agency and Political Struggle in the Era of Indio Permitido." In *Cultural Agency in the Americas*, edited by Doris Sommer, 281–301. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Heater, Derek. 1990. *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics, and Education*. London: Longman Group.
- Hoekstra, Myrte. 2015. "Diverse Cities and Good Citizenship: How Local Governments in the Netherlands Recast National Integration Discourse." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38 (10): 1798–1814. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1015585>.
- Horst, Cindy, Marta Bivand Erdal, and Noor Jdid. 2020. "The 'Good Citizen': Asserting and Contesting Norms of Participation and Belonging in Oslo." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 43 (16): 76–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2019.1671599>.
- Hough, Jennifer, and Markus Bell. 2020. "North Koreans' Public Narratives and Conditional Inclusion in South Korea." *Critical Asian Studies* 52 (2): 161–81.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2020.1740606>.
- Isin, Engin F. 2012. "Citizenship after Orientalism: An Unfinished Project." *Citizenship Studies* 16 (5–6): 563–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2012.698480>.
- Isin, Engin F, and Patricia K Wood. 1999. *Citizenship and Identity*. London, UNITED KINGDOM: SAGE Publications. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ed/detail.action?docID=1024043>.
- Kalir, Barak, and Lieke Wissink. 2016. "The Deportation Continuum: Convergences between State Agents and NGO Workers in the Dutch Deportation Field." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (1): 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1107025>.
- Lamont, Michèle, Graziella Moraes Silva, Jessica S. Welburn, Joshua Guetzkow, Nissim Mizrahi, Hanna Herzog, and Elisa Reis. 2016. *Getting Respect: Responding to Stigma and Discrimination in the United States, Brazil, and Israel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space. Production*. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000129>.
- Lindquist, Johan. 2015. "Of Figures and Types: Brokering Knowledge and Migration in Indonesia and Beyond." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 21 (S1): 162–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.12172>.
- Lori, Noora. 2021. "Citizens-in-Waiting: Strategic Naturalization Delays in the USA and UAE." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, August, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1962937>.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1998. *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror*. Pretoria: UNISA Press.
- Mehta, Uday Singh. 1999. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mouritsen, Per, Daniel Faas, Nasar Meer, and Nynke de Witte. 2019. "Leitkultur Debates as Civic Integration in North-Western Europe: The Nationalism of 'Values' and 'Good Citizenship.'" *Ethnicities* 19 (4): 632–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819843538>.
- Nunzio, Marco Di. 2017. "Marginality as a Politics of Limited Entitlements: Street Life and the Dilemma of Inclusion in Urban Ethiopia." *American Ethnologist* 44 (1): 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12428>.
- Nyberg Sørensen, Ninna. 2021. "The Transnational Continuum of Conditional Inclusion: From

- Marginalized Immigrants to Rejected Returnees." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, September, 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1977364>.
- Peutz, Nathalie, and Nicholas De Genova. 2010. "Introduction." In *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, edited by Nicholas De Genova and Nathalie Peutz. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822391340-001>.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2002. *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822383673>.
- Prochaska, David. 2004. *Making Algeria French: Colonialism in Bône, 1870-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ricci, David M. 2004. *Good Citizenship in America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511617386>.
- Said, Edward. 2001. "Reflections on Exile." In *Reflections on Exile: And Other Literary and Cultural Essays*, 136–49. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40156768>.
- . 2003. *Orientalism*. London and New York: Penguin.
- Sayad, Abdelmalek. 2004. *The Suffering of the Immigrant*. Cambridge: Polity.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=gNX9xVbxsLgC&pgis=1>.
- Schinkel, Willem. 2010. "The Virtualization of Citizenship." *Critical Sociology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920509357506>.
- Schrover, Marlou, and Willem Schinkel. 2013. "Introduction: The Language of Inclusion and Exclusion in the Context of Immigration and Integration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (7): 1123–41.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783711>.
- Sheehan, Megan. 2021. "Laboring for Inclusion: Debating Immigrant Contributions to Chile." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*.
- Shukla, Nikesh. 2016. *The Good Immigrant*. London: Unbound.
- Shukla, Nikesh, and Chimene Suleyman. 2019. *The Good Immigrant USA: 26 Writers Reflect on America*. London: Dialogue Books.
- Starn, Randolph. 1982. *Contrary Commonwealth: The Theme of Exile in Medieval and Renaissance*

- Italy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. 1992. "Challenging the Nation-State in Latin America." *Journal of International Affairs* 45 (2): 423–40.
- Stein, Rebecca. 2008. *Itineraries in Conflict: Israelis, Palestinians, and the Political Lives of Tourism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Stephen, Lynn. 2018. "Creating Preemptive Suspects: National Security, Border Defense, and Immigration Policy, 1980–Present." *Latin American Perspectives*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X17699907>.
- Suleyman, Chimene, and Nikesh Shukla. 2019. "Editor's Note." In *The Good Immigrant USA*, edited by Chimene Suleyman and Nikesh Shukla, xi–xii. London: Dialogue Books.
- Theodossopoulos, Dimitrios. 2014. "On De-Pathologizing Resistance." *History and Anthropology* 25 (4): 415–30.
- Volpi, Frédéric. 2011. "Framing Civility in the Middle East: Alternative Perspectives on the State and Civil Society." *Third World Quarterly* 32 (5): 827–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2011.578954>.
- Waal, Tamar de. 2020. "Conditional Belonging: Evaluating Integration Requirements from a Social Equality Perspective." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 41 (2): 231–47.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2020.1724906>.
- Wacquant, Loïc J. D. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Winter, Elke, and Ivana Previsic. 2019. "The Politics of Un-Belonging: Lessons from Canada's Experiment with Citizenship Revocation." *Citizenship Studies* 23 (4): 338–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2019.1616450>.
- Wolf, Eric. 2006. "Incorporation and Identity in the Making of the Modern World." In *Inclusion and Exclusion in the Global Arena*, edited by Max Kirsch, 209–24. New York: Routledge.
- Zeweri, Helena, and Eloy Gardea. 2021. "Cultivated Intuition: Reframing Migrant Responses to the 'Public Charge' Policy." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*.