

UCL Migration Research Unit

This paper may be downloaded for personal research purposes. However any additional reproduction for other purposes, in hard copy or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), the title, the working paper series, the year and the UCL Migration Research Unit as publisher.

This paper was originally submitted as a dissertation in completion of the requirements for the degree Masters in Global Migration. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of UCL's Migration Research Unit.

© 2012 Helen N. J. McCarthy

UCL Migration Research Unit
UCL Department of Geography
University College London
26 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AP

www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/mru

UCL Migration Research Unit Working Papers

No. 2012/11

New Europeans

Dual Citizenship and Mobility among
Latin Americans.

Helen N. J. McCarthy



Migration Research Unit



New Europeans

Dual Citizenship and Mobility among Latin Americans

This research dissertation is submitted for the MSc in Global Migration at
University College London

Helen N J McCarthy

Supervisor: Dr Pablo Mateos

2012

Abstract

The expansion of dual citizenship has emerged as a challenge to the traditional concept of citizenship. Allowing dual citizenship remains contentious in a number of states due to the perception of divided loyalties. Nevertheless, research indicates that allowing dual citizenship increases naturalisation, and it is increasingly accepted. Using qualitative semi-structured interviews this dissertation seeks the 'view from below' of dual citizens themselves. By focusing on the Latin American community in London, which is comprised of a large number of dual citizens, I explore how citizenship policies in different European states can create hierarchies of access for different groups. These hierarchies can be based on the perceived 'ethnic capital' or on 'earned' points. Using the framework of 'citizenship constellations' helps to focus on how the two states involved create a joint opportunity structure and how individuals negotiate within this. The paper finds that although the dual citizens in the study maintain transnational connections, they usually do not remain politically active in their home countries. In fact, gaining a second citizenship is often not about gaining political rights at all, but instead is seen as a way of increasing an individual's mobility options. In general, the mobility and the security of status that citizenship confers have been overlooked in studies of citizenship, but they remain at the heart of the expansion of dual citizenship. This is because not all passports are equal, instead citizenships are hierarchically arranged, giving some people greater mobility and ease of claiming rights. European passports are higher up this hierarchy because of the 'right to free movement' that EU citizenship provides, a right that 'New Europeans' may be keen to take advantage of. Both EU citizenship and the expansion of dual citizenship suggest that citizenship is becoming disaggregated, raising questions about how we should conceptualise citizenship in the future.

Acknowledgements

Very special thanks go to everybody at IRMO for supporting the project in numerous different ways. In particular, I am very grateful to all those who took the time to talk to me about their experiences of being a dual citizen. I learnt a lot from these interesting conversations and I hope I have done them justice in this dissertation.

Thanks are also due to my supervisor, Pablo Mateos, who helped both in a very practical way, by putting me in touch with people to talk to, and on a theoretical level, by pointing me in the right direction.

Finally, I'm very grateful to a number of people who read and commented on drafts of the dissertation: my parents, Alex O'Connell and Bev Agolini. I really appreciate all your time and effort.

Contents

Introduction.....	5
Literature Review.....	8
Thinking about Citizenship: Dual Citizenship, transnationalism and mobility.....	8
Latin Americans in London.....	15
Research Questions.....	16
Methods.....	18
Table of interviewees.....	21
Chapter 1: Becoming and Being a Dual Citizen.....	22
Dual Citizenship and Transnationalism.....	27
Chapter 2: Rethinking Citizenship.....	36
Passport Hierarchy and Mobility.....	38
EU Citizenship.....	42
Conclusion.....	48
References.....	51
Appendices.....	59
Initial Proposal.....	59
Auto-critique.....	63
Interview Schedule.....	64
Consent Form.....	67
Extract of Interview Transcript.....	68

Introduction

Citizenship, as a concept, captures the relationship between the individual, society and the state. This means that citizenship is fundamentally about who is considered to be *in* and who is considered to be *out* (Bauböck 2006). In the study of migration, this is of fundamental importance.

There are a number of different dimensions to citizenship, often described in different ways. The two which are usually agreed upon are: the legal or formal dimension of citizenship as membership of a state, and the rights and duties that are granted through that membership. Two other dimensions are often expanded upon in different contexts. One is membership and participation in a polity, that is having political voice and some input over how you are governed. The other is the solidarity dimension, which has to do with the re-distribution of goods within society (Bosniak 2001, Kivisto and Faist 2007). These different dimensions come apart to a certain degree (in authoritarian states people may not have a political voice, the question of whether they can still be considered citizens is open for debate); however, most scholars agree that in modern democratic states, citizenship is about these four dimensions (Bauböck 2006).

It is perhaps, in particular, the third (political voice) and the fourth (solidarity) dimension that make the question of whether migrants are in or out so important. Until recently the dominant model concerning migrants' incorporation in a new society envisioned people moving to a new country, slowly adapting to the culture and then naturalising to become citizens of that country renouncing all ties with the previous country (Spiro 1997). This assimilationist model was very much built on the experience of European migrants in the US at a particular moment in history (the turn of the 20th century) although real practices may in fact have varied (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007).

Over the last few decades, changes on a global scale have precipitated major re-thinks on both citizenship and international migration. These changes have included technological advances, greater global economic integration, the rise of supranational organisations and the human rights culture, and increased migration. These changes have affected citizenship,

as previously marginalised groups have begun to be included (Kivisito and Faist 2007). Of perhaps most significance here, is the inclusion of women on equal footing with men, meaning that women are now able to pass on their citizenship in the same way as men and do not automatically lose their citizenship on marriage with a foreigner. This has led to a situation in which more people are entitled to dual citizenship as children are born into mixed families. This has led to another major change in the international arena with regards to citizenship. There has been a shift away from a stance that was specifically *anti* dual citizenship due to fears of divided loyalties in conflicts, to a more pragmatic acceptance of the concept (Faist 2007). The expansion of dual citizenship is now an accepted and growing phenomenon (Faist 2007, Brøndsted Sejersen 2008).

In the last two decades scholars have begun to comprehensively discuss what this expansion may mean. Some have predicted the rise of 'postnational' citizenship, in which the nation-state ceases to be important in the regulation of rights and duties or political engagement (Soysal 1994). Although this idea has received much discussion many have pointed to the continuing salience of the nation-state (Bosniak 2001). Others have termed this new phenomenon 'transnational' citizenship drawing on ideas of 'simultaneity' in transnational studies (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). This argument suggests that migrants living in a new country embrace a new form of citizenship, one which doesn't entail full assimilation nor full rejection of the country of origin. This is rather an engagement on different levels, in two or more countries, a back and forth of participation and engagement (Fox 2005, Bauböck 2006).

This study aims to look specifically at dual citizens, Latin American-Europeans who live in London, with a view to understanding how they themselves perceive and narrate their citizenship. This is a diverse group but their discussion of citizenship can tell us something about what it is like to be a dual citizen, which in turn may help us think through the way citizenship might be changing. This 'view from below' may not necessarily match with the 'view from above'. However, at a time when the occurrence of dual citizenship is undoubtedly increasing, there remains surprisingly little empirical work on the topic. This paper sets out to address this gap in a small way.

In the following section I shall outline some of the key debates and issues that emerge when studying dual citizenship from a migration perspective. This will be followed by a discussion of the methods used in the project, including a summary of the people who took part in the study. The first empirical chapter, 'Becoming and Being a Dual Citizen', will address the issue of accessing citizenship as a migrant, focusing on naturalisation in Spain and naturalisation in the UK. I will discuss some of the ethnic and social hierarchies created through different citizenship policies and how these hierarchies intersect across borders. This chapter will also discuss the realities of dual citizens' transnational engagement arguing that in many cases it is not as simple as a 'here' and 'there', but rather often involves multiple countries. This engagement may also change with time. I will conclude with discussing how citizenship intersects with other forms of societal inclusion.

The following empirical chapter, 'Re-thinking Citizenship', will discuss what the implications of these practices are for how we should think about citizenship. With certain citizenships becoming prized for their position within a global hierarchy, one of the most important features of a passport is what kind of mobility it allows. I will discuss what the implications for the concept of EU citizenship, and whether this should be seen as 'instrumentalising' citizenship. This discussion will highlight how increasingly the four dimensions of citizenship introduced above are coming apart. Finally in my conclusion, I will argue that currently the concept of transnational citizenship remains too imprecise to help us frame empirical work on dual citizenship. I will also conclude that access to mobility remains one of the key drivers of the expansion of dual citizenship and that this factor should not be overlooked in future discussions.

Literature Review

Thinking about Citizenship: Dual citizenship, transnationalism and mobility

Citizenship is a complex concept, and the word itself can mean different things in different contexts¹. Nevertheless, as noted above, there are four main dimensions of citizenship: formal membership status in a particular state, the associated rights and duties that go along with this, membership in the state's polity, and a sense of solidarity among members. In general this is a status that is achieved through birth, either through rules that grant citizenship on the basis of where you were born (*jus soli*) or on the basis of who your parents are (*jus sanguinis*). Usually this status remains with you, unchanging and unquestioned, throughout your life. Nevertheless, what citizenship you have can significantly shape the course of your life, as different citizenships bring with them different possibilities for social and physical mobility. This has led to citizenship being compared to medieval feudal privilege (Carens 1987). This is particularly true in a globalised world in which the ability to move is highly prized (Bauman 1998). However, scholars have noted that citizenship is changing, with the different dimensions coming apart in various ways and the idea that you have a single unchanging citizenship throughout your life being challenged (Kivisto and Faist 2007).

Citizenship can be studied in a number of different ways and at a number of different levels, with the most classic distinction being made between the study of it from a political perspective and the narrower legal perspective (Bauböck 2010). However, a specific focus on *dual* citizenship² has lagged behind, in part due to the fact that the phenomenon was not widely recognised or accepted until recently (Kivisto and Faist 2007). Nevertheless, in recent

¹ The words 'citizenship' and 'nationality' are often used and understood interchangeably both by academics and in common usage. However, technically nationality refers to the formal legal status of membership whilst citizenship describes the rights and duties of membership within a polity (Jones-Correa 2001, Faist 2007). This difference becomes important in certain situations, in which states try to extend formal legal status (nationality) to emigrants without granting all the rights of full citizenship (political rights) (Faist 2000). This was also the status of women before universal suffrage (Joppke 2003). In this paper I will only speak of citizenship, although in my interviews the terms citizenship and nationality were used interchangeably.

²For the purposes of this paper 'dual citizenship' will be used to refer to individuals who hold two *or more* citizenships of states simultaneously.

years, increasing numbers of scholars have turned their attention to the study of dual citizenship. Tanja Brøndsted Sejersen (2008) produced evidence from 115 states around the world showing that dual citizenship is increasingly accepted by states and several edited volumes produced case studies of the debates and changes as they happened in each country (see Hansen and Weil 2001, Hansen and Weil 2002, Faist 2007). Simultaneously, scholars have engaged with the implications of dual citizenship, such as the impact of dual citizenship on theories of democracy (Blatter 2011) and the political engagement of dual citizens (Tintori 2011). Two key areas of interest have emerged out of the study of dual citizenship. One is how we should conceptualise this change, and whether new models of citizenship better capture what is occurring. The other is the implications for states of increasing numbers of dual citizens.

One of the most important changes to have occurred post World War II is the expansion of the global human rights culture. This has led some scholars to argue that many of the rights that were once solely invested in citizens are now invested in personhood, meaning that the state is less relevant in guaranteeing rights (Soysal 1994). Simultaneously, in the wake of large scale migration and with pressure from supranational institutions such as the EU, states have been extending rights to long-term foreign residents, so-called 'denizens' (Hammar 1990). Taken together, this has led some to argue that 'national' citizenship is becoming less relevant. The idea of 'postnational' citizenship captures these developments, as there begins to be a shift away from the state as guarantor of rights and freedoms towards larger supranational bodies (Soysal 1994). This idea has sparked a great deal of debate, with some questioning whether the expansion of dual citizenship could be indicative of the move to postnational citizenship (Bloemraad 2004). However, many have argued that the arrival of postnational citizenship is not imminent, in fact the state retains its position as the major regulatory power (Bosniak 2001, Levitt and Jaworksy 2007).

Since most now agree that the state remains relevant, attention has turned to states' changing approaches to dual citizenship. In some countries changes to legislation allowing dual citizenship has provoked huge debate and controversy (as in Germany, see Gerdes, Faist and Rieple 2007) whilst in others the issue hardly gets mentioned (as in the UK, see Hansen 2002). Often one of the main questions in these debates is the extent to which

allowing dual citizenship promotes migrant incorporation in the 'host' society. Increasingly, it is argued that recognising dual citizenship can encourage migrants to naturalise and so increase their integration in society (Jones-Correa 2001, Faist and Gerdes 2008, OECD report 2011). Thus so-called 'receiving states' that wish to encourage greater integration and political participation among migrants are increasingly accepting dual citizenship. In tandem, there has been an increase in what are known as 'diaspora engagement policies' in traditional 'sending' states (Gamlen 2006). These are policies that states pursue in order to maintain a connection with their emigrants abroad. Of most significance are policies that allow retention of citizenship on naturalisation in another country, and policies that allow external voting. These policies are pursued because it is thought that this will help maintain a link with emigrants and encourage them to remit money home. However, some countries have been reluctant to extend this engagement further (i.e. to the external vote) because of the perceived cost of setting up the infrastructure, as well as the fear that the emigrants are political 'loose cannons' (Jones-Correa 2001).

As can be seen, states' interest in dual citizenship arises out of the pursuit of different interests. Christian Joppke (2003) has named and described the forces that operate behind these different interests and act on citizenship policies as a 'de-ethnicisation' force and a 're-ethnicisation' force. Broadly speaking, de-ethnicisation involves opening up citizenship to resident migrants, while re-ethnicisation involves re-affirming the ethnic identity link of citizenship with the nation-state. These two forces can act simultaneously and in different ways. What is interesting is that dual citizenship can be the outcome of both forces. "While it signifies a 'de-ethnicization' from the point of view of receiving states, dual citizenship entails a 're-ethnicization' from the point of view of sending states" (Joppke 2003: 11). These different forces are a result of the different ways of conceptualising the state, either as a territorial unit or as an ethnic membership unit. It is these different conceptions that influence how dual citizenship is studied, investigated and conceptualised.

More recently, in part as a response to the general public's fears about immigration, many states that previously pursued de-ethnicised models have moved towards re-nationalising citizenship (Joppke 2010). This is to combat the idea that citizenship is being 'instrumentalised', and that migrants are naturalising for the 'wrong' reasons. A number of

measures designed to force migrants to prove their commitment to host countries have been introduced in several European countries, primarily involving integration and language tests (Vink and de Groot 2010). This 'thickening' of citizenship, as Dora Kostakopoulou (2010) calls it, is aimed at encouraging migrants' attachment to the national community (and liberal values) as well as providing a demonstration to the public that their national citizenship is worth something.

These different forces of 'de-ethnicisation' and 're-ethnicisation' help to understand how different state policies may lead to tolerance of dual citizenship whilst simultaneously having very different inclusionary or exclusionary motives. These different motivations can act in different ways to produce policies that favour certain people whilst disfavoured others, resulting in the creation of hierarchies of access to citizenship. Mateos and Durand (2012) describe these hierarchies of access in the case of Spain, where migrants try to find the route (through ancestry or residence) that will most quickly allow them to gain citizenship. They develop the notion of 'ethnic capital' to capture the idea that certain migrants will be seen as ethnically more suitable for naturalisation than others. For example both Spain and Italy allow individuals to claim citizenship through ancestry, and Spain offers a favourable residency requirement to individuals from ex-colonies (Moreno Fuentes 2001). In the Spanish case these regulations end up creating differences based on country of origin within Latin America as a result of the different patterns of migration from Spain to these countries in the past (Mateos and Durand 2012). These hierarchies of access exist within a more general stratification of 'hierarchical citizenships' in which certain citizenships are seen to be of more value than others due to the particular state's position within the global international order (Castles 2005). 'Hierarchical citizenships' mean that some citizenships come with more rights (or greater ability to claim rights) than others (Castles 2005). In short, different regulations of access to citizenship intersect with the relative availability of rights associated with that citizenship, creating a complex stratification of access to rights. In this context, it seems logical that migrants may seek to enhance their situation by accessing a citizenship with greater rights attached.

Although this appears to be an obvious conclusion, there is still a relative lack of studies investigating these individual negotiations. This is due, in part, to the lack of empirical data

on dual citizens. This is true at both a quantitative level because dual citizens are often invisible to state bureaucracy (Spiro 1997: 1455 note 199), as well as at a qualitative level. As Thomas Faist comments,

“Little is known about the activities of emigrants and immigrants on the matter of dual citizenship, or about their transnational political behaviour. For example, it is not clear to what extent migrant transnational ties and dual citizenship are congruent. It may be safe to assume that migrant transnationalism is fostered by dual citizenship” (2007: 17).

Notable exceptions to the lack of empirical studies include Aiwha Ong’s (1999) study on ‘flexible citizenship’ among Chinese businessmen and Irene Bloemraad’s (2004) study of dual citizenship in Canada. Ong’s study highlighted how Hong Kong business men capitalised on certain states’ ‘investor citizenship’ regulations, using different strategies of mobility, kin networks and family residency to access citizenship in order to promote their business opportunities abroad and increase their capital accumulation. Bloemraad (2004) investigated the trends of those self-reporting as dual citizens using data from the Canadian census, and found that the number of people claiming dual citizenship has been increasing steadily. Nevertheless, these people are still only a small minority of the total numbers naturalising. She demonstrates that the policies of countries of origin have a significant impact on whether or not people claim dual citizenship.

As Bloemraad’s (2004) study highlights, studying dual citizenship requires theorists to expand their focus beyond simply one nation-state. Scholars of transnationalism have long called for a move away from ‘methodological nationalism’ in which migration and social processes were studied in a way that assumed that they bounded by the borders of the nation-state (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003). The theory of transnationalism was borne out of a critique of the traditional assimilationist model which was used to understand migrants’ lives in ‘settlement’ countries (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004) and recognised that migrants maintain “multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement” (Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc 1994: 263). A focus on transnational social spaces helped scholars to recognise that migration may not be a definitive one-off event (Faist 2000).

Transnational processes cover different domains: economic, political and socio-cultural and may also involve immobile individuals (Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt 1999, Faist 2000). Although the studies of political transnationalism have encompassed a myriad of topics, including hometown associations, lobbying in countries of settlement, and external voting, many have not explicitly engaged with the question of how these political processes intersect with citizenship status. Studies have tended to focus on the impact of emigrant's political voice in the home country whilst political engagement in the so-called 'host' country has been less studied (Jones-Correa 2001). This is, however, addressed in the work of Michael Smith (2007) who investigated political transnationalism in the Mexican diaspora in the US. He describes what he calls the 'Janus face' of transnational citizenship, the fact that politically active individuals can turn to one country or the other (or sometimes both simultaneously). His work reveals how becoming involved in political activities in one country can strengthen political engagement in another country, an idea supported by Cristina Escobar (2004). She argues that maintaining political ties to a home country does not inhibit political engagement in the host country (as has sometimes been suggested in the US context). Smith's (2007) work also highlights the temporal element of transnational political involvement: that these activities may be pursued vigorously at a certain moment in time but be forgotten later on. This temporality makes generalising about transnational processes very challenging.

As indicated above, some theorists have built on ideas from transnationalism to suggest 'transnational citizenship' as a model to theorise political engagement in multiple states. 'Transnational citizenship' "refers not only to migrants' political activities directed towards their countries of origin but also to institutional changes and new conceptions of citizenship in states linked to each other through migration chains" (Bauböck 2006: 28). There is evidence to suggest that states' policies on citizenship can react to each other where there are particularly close ties as a result of migration flows (e.g. Germany and Turkey, see Kadirbeyoğlu 2007). However, although the idea of transnational citizenship is intuitively appealing and has been widely used, Jonathan Fox (2005) has argued that there is a danger of conceptual stretching. How we specify what should be defined as transnational citizenship depends on whether we focus simply on transnational political engagement or whether we instead look at those who are actually granted rights by states. He maintains

that currently the concept of 'transnational citizenship' is best only applied to dual citizenship, and perhaps is superfluous since dual citizenship is more precise. As an alternative, the concept of 'citizenship constellations' (Bauböck 2010) describing the simultaneous connections of individuals in several political entities could prove more useful. A focus on citizenship constellations can help us identify the 'citizenship opportunity structures', the possibilities of gaining and claiming rights that are available to different migrants. Although not inimical to the idea of transnational citizenship, using the idea of constellations in empirical work helps to focus on the specificities (and differences) of different situations of dual citizenship, as well as migrants' agency in negotiating within these structures.

The study of transnationalism has drawn attention to the fact that migration is not a one – off event, but one that can be part of a much larger network of transnational ties and multiple movements. This is of particular significance in Europe where access to citizenship grants individuals mobility rights within the EU. Onward migration of so-called 'third country nationals' within the EU is a relatively understudied area, in part because these 'third country nationals' cease to be such on naturalisation, becoming EU citizens and making them difficult to track. However, recent research has begun to pay attention to the phenomenon of refugees moving after gaining an EU citizenship (Lindley and Van Hear 2007). The cases that have come under the spotlight are refugees of Somali origin moving from the Netherlands and Scandinavia to the UK (Van Liempt 2011) as well as Tamil refugees moving from Germany, Scandinavia and other parts of Europe to the UK (Lindley and Van Hear 2007). What is of particular interest is how this can create a 'transnational triangle' (Van Liempt 2011) in which individuals continue to maintain attachments and links to the other European country. This sort of movement complicates traditional ideas of integration and citizenship within one nation-state, and scholars have questioned whether these 'new Europeans' may be more disposed to migrate again. As Lindley and Van Hear (2007) comment, "Preliminary evidence suggests that some refugees have, in the course of displacement and onward migration, developed a 'culture of mobility' and may be more willing and able than other EU citizens to relocate within the EU" (Lindley and van Hear 2007: 20).

The place of EU citizenship within this discussion is a complicated one. The fact that different citizenships provide differential access to certain countries and different mobility is one of the key features of 'hierarchical citizenships' (Castles 2005). The political union within the EU, which grants EU citizens rights of residence in any EU country, seems likely to have pushed certain states' citizenships up the global hierarchy. However, until now studies of EU citizenship have tended to focus on what this status means for current citizens of Europe rather than for these 'new Europeans'. Many have argued that EU citizenship is an empty concept, since most of the substantive rights are guaranteed by national citizenship (Shore 2004, Perchinig 2006) and that there is not a shared sense of solidarity, nor a shared polity (despite European elections) (Shore 2004). EU citizenship is a form of 'disaggregated' citizenship, in which the different dimensions of citizenship seem to come apart (Benhabib 2002). How this relates to the expansion of dual citizenship has not been fully explored but this may prove to be a useful addition to thinking through the changes to citizenship. This exploration may be particularly fruitful if done from the point of view of those 'third-country nationals' who have gained EU citizenship.

Latin Americans in London

In order to explore some of the issues that have been raised above, I have decided to use a case study of Latin Americans who have dual citizenship (a Latin American and a European passport) and live in London. It is estimated that there are around 110,000 Latin Americans living in London (McIlwaine, Camilo Cock and Linneker 2010). The community is diverse and heterogeneous encompassing many different nationalities, however, the most important countries of origin are Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador and Bolivia (McIlwaine et al 2010). Part of the heterogeneity can be explained by the different migration flows to the UK. Early flows in the seventies mostly consisted of those fleeing political repression particularly from Chile (McIlwaine 2011b). Networks to Colombia were also established in a brief period in which work permits were granted to Colombians in the seventies (McIlwaine 2011b). During the late nineties migration from Latin America increased as a result of political upheavals in Colombia, Ecuador and Bolivia (McIlwaine 2011b). Since 2000 the Latin American community has been growing significantly, particularly from Brazil. Many of these people arrive with secondary or post-secondary education and many experience de-skilling upon

entering the labour market in London (McIlwaine et al 2010). Many work in low paid jobs with poor working conditions, such as cleaning or hospitality, although there has also been an increase in professional Latin American migration (McIlwaine et al 2010).

As outlined above, this research is focused on how dual citizenship is changing our conception of citizenship, in particular with regards to transnational practices and mobility. The Latin American community in London is a suitable community for looking at these issues for a number of reasons. Firstly, the region does not have historic links with the UK, and has been relatively understudied in the British context (McIlwaine et al 2010). Secondly, many Latin American countries allow dual citizenship, and pursue a range of diaspora engagement policies³. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, a large proportion of the community has a European passport (25% British, 19% another European nationality mainly Spanish, Italian or Portuguese) (McIlwaine et al 2010). Many of those who came in earlier flows to Britain have naturalised, whilst others arrive in the UK already holding another European passport, often gained through having European ancestors. Finally, it is thought that almost a third of the community has had experience of migrating before arriving in the UK (McIlwaine et al 2010) and this appears to be increasing as the economic downturn affecting Spain has resulted in many Latin Americans with Spanish citizenship migrating to Britain to explore new options (McIlwaine 2011a).

Research Questions

For these reasons, the Latin American community in London is an excellent community in which to investigate issues around dual citizenship. It seems that perspective missing in these debates is how dual citizens themselves think about the issue. How have they negotiated obtaining a second citizenship? How do they perceive their dual status? What are the perceived benefits of having dual citizenship? How do they engage with each state? In answering these more specific questions I hope to answer three main research questions that will be guiding the study. These are as follows:

³ Countries in Latin America that allow dual citizenship: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay. In addition, some countries such as Argentina and Bolivia, allow it with certain countries based on treaties (Jones-Correa 2001)

1. How do people's perceptions of dual citizenship match with state discourses of dual citizenship?
2. To what extent is citizenship devalued or re-valued through the obtaining of dual/multiple citizenships?
3. To what extent is gaining citizenship (particularly European citizenship) a strategy for mobility?

These questions go to the heart of the debate over how the expansion of dual citizenship might change the way we conceptualise citizenship.

Methods

In order to try to answer the three questions posed above, I aimed to recruit three main groups of dual citizens to participate in the study: Latin Americans who have naturalised as British citizens, individuals who have naturalised as Spanish citizens and individuals who have gained any European passport through an ancestor.

Individuals for the interviews were contacted through different entry points. The most important of these was the community organisation, Indoamerican Refugee and Migrant Organisation (IRMO). IRMO provides a range of services including immigration advice, English classes, parenting support and activities for young people in the Latin American community. IRMO was initially set up by Chilean refugees as a political solidarity group, but in 1998, it changed its name and expanded its remit to offer support to the burgeoning Latin American community (Bermudez 2010). It is ideally located in the borough of Lambeth, where a large number of Latin Americans live (McIlwaine et al 2010). I had been volunteering at IRMO for a few months as an English teacher before I undertook my study, and all the staff were very supportive of my project. Initially many of the interviewees were contacted through my English classes, which meant that participants already knew me as their English teacher. This helped to develop rapport, especially as during the interviews we could joke about the fact that they had become the language teachers, as they helped me with my Spanish.

Interviewees contacted through IRMO were mainly dual citizens with Spanish nationality. Many had recently arrived from Spain; usually they had been in London between 3 months and 1 year. Many of these people were working in low-paid jobs such as cleaning, and were hoping to learn some English in order to improve their economic prospects. A few people with British nationality were also contacted through IRMO, including two interviews with dual citizens who had arrived in Britain as children. Although initially this was not a group that I was specifically aiming to target, since they would not necessarily have personal experience of having gained the second citizenship, these individuals provided a different perspective. Having grown up in the UK they felt differently about some issues to those who had come as adults. At IRMO I also interviewed two community activists, one of whom was also a dual citizen.

Another entry point was through my supervisor's network of contacts. An e-mail introducing the study was sent around and several people contacted me afterwards. These were more often people working in higher level jobs, or people who had diverse and varied migration histories. Finally, some people were recruited through my own personal contacts; once again this was a more varied group.

The aim was to recruit people from a range of nationalities and social backgrounds. This was relatively successful (see table 1 p.21). Colombians, as one of the largest groups in London, feature significantly. Unfortunately individuals from Brazil were not represented in the interviews, despite being one of the main groups in London. This was due to a lack of time and suitable language skills. One of the other main issues that I encountered was recruiting female participants. This is in part because the majority of those who come to language classes at IRMO are men. It is not clear exactly why this is, although staff speculate that the women do not attend classes due to gender norms that see women as the homemakers. It may also reflect the fact that men migrate first. I tried to address this imbalance by specifically targeting females later on in the process. However, particularly when using personal networks or a 'snowball' approach, it is difficult to select who responds.

The data for this study was collected using qualitative semi-structured interviews. These interviews were mostly conducted in public places, meaning that the location was relatively neutral. Some were done in cafes, some on the premises of IRMO and others made the most of the pleasant weather and were conducted outside. The interview schedule (see Appendix 3) guided the interview process, however, there was considerable room for interviewees to raise different issues. I also answered interviewees' questions when they had them, on the basis that the interview process can be viewed as 'a mutual construction of knowledge' (Davies 1998: 109). One of the most common things that I told interviewees in the course of the interview was which elections they had the right to vote in as European citizens resident in the UK. Interviews were conducted in both Spanish and English, and occasionally a mix of both languages and all were recorded. The interviews varied significantly in length, with the shortest being around thirty minutes and the longest ones being around an hour and fifty minutes. Often the shortest interviews were short because of the interviewee's time constraints. Interviews were conducted between late May 2012 and early July 2012.

Once the interviews were completed, I typed up detailed summaries of each interview in English, in two to four minute segments. I then re-read the summaries and identified areas of particular interest. I would re-listen to these sections of the interview and transcribe them fully⁴. This method was time efficient, in that it allowed me to have a full overview of the interview including my inputs, but did not require me to transcribe sections of interviews which were background information. This process also in many ways formed part of the analysis. In practice, as Peter Jackson (2001) has pointed out, it is almost impossible not to think about the themes and issues during the process of transcribing and summarising, and whilst I was re-listening to interviews I would think about convergences in what my participants were saying. Thus when it came to the coding I had considerable familiarity with my data. Analysis was carried out using the software package, NVivo 9, and the summaries and partial transcripts were initially coded according to key issues. Most of these issues were ones addressed by questions in the interview schedule, however, as other issues emerged from the transcripts these were included too⁵. This produced around 30 codes. Over several days these were then re-examined and organised into around ten themes that were picked from the literature. The structure for the chapters was then organised around these themes.

⁴ A couple of the interviews were fully transcribed, including one by a research assistant.

⁵ For example, I had not asked people about their interaction with the Latin American community in London. However, as this came up in several interviews it was included.

Name	Gender	Contact	Date	Citizenship (1)	Citizenship (2)	Access to 2 nd citizenship	Time in Spain	Time in UK	Current area of work
Rodrigo	male	IRMO	17/05/2012	Peruvian	Spanish	Residency	12 yrs	2 yrs	welder
Juan Pablo	male	IRMO	17/05/2012	Colombian	Spanish	Residency	12 yrs	2 months	cleaner
Beatriz	female	IRMO	19/05/2012	Ecuadorian	Spanish	Residency	15 yrs	2 yrs	cleaner
Juan	male	IRMO	20/05/2012	Dominican Republic	Spanish	Family (through residency)	13 yrs	2 months	cook
Ana	female	IRMO	21/05/2012	Ecuadorian	Spanish	Residency	8 yrs	3 months	cleaner
José	male	IRMO	23/05/2012	Colombian	Spanish	Residency	11 yrs	5 months	cleaner
Luis	male	IRMO	23/05/2012	Colombian	Spanish	Residency	12 yrs	2 months	cleaner
Javier	male	IRMO	24/05/2012	Dominican Republic	Spanish	Residency	13 yrs	6 months	cleaner
Pedro	male	IRMO	25/05/2012	Bolivian	Spanish	Residency	9 yrs	1 yr 2 months	cleaner
Jorge	male	IRMO	23/05/2012	Colombian	British	Asylum-residency	-	19 yrs***	construction
David	male	IRMO	23/05/2012	Colombian	British	Discretionary	-	15 yrs***	law student
Manuel	male	supervisor	24/05/2012	Mexican	British	Residency	-	22 yrs***	lecturer
Alberto	male	supervisor	29/05/2012	El Salvadorian	British	Residency	-	34 yrs	engineer (now retired)
Lucía	female	IRMO	29/05/2012	Colombian	British	Discretionary	-	20 yrs***	cleaning (now unemployed)
Paula	female	IRMO	11/07/2012	Colombian	British	Asylum-residency	-	24 yrs	community activist
Nicolás	male	personal	18/07/2012	Peruvian	British	Residency	-	9 yrs	international development NGO
Emilio	male	supervisor	30/05/2012	Mexican*	French	Ancestry	-	2 yrs***	PhD student
Irene	female	personal	10/07/2012	Argentine	Italian	Ancestry	-	5 yrs	psychologist
Amira	female	personal	12/06/2012	Colombian**	Belgian	Birth	-	2 yrs	sales
Alba	female	IRMO	29/05/2012	Argentine	-	-	-	4 yrs	community activist

*Emilio had naturalised as Mexican after growing up there. **Amira also had Moroccan citizenship *** not continuous

Table 1: Details of interviewees (all names have been changed)

Chapter 1: Becoming and Being a Dual Citizen

“I think in immigration also it depends on the social background, you know? Because immigration, it’s nothing the same my experience, as the ones who have to work very hard in order to have, to get out of the country, and to have the nationality.”

Amira, 12/06/2012

In the quote above, Amira clearly identifies that an experience of migration and access to citizenship can be dramatically different depending on your social background. As is clear from the preceding literature review, to date most research on dual citizenship has been undertaken from the perspective of states, analysing strategies or policies. However, this chapter seeks to lay out some of the foundations of what it is like to be a Latin American- European in London. It begins by looking at how these differences are created for Latin Americans through the way a second citizenship is accessed. It then continues with a discussion of the transnational lives that dual citizens maintain including their political participation in multiple countries. The chapter closes with a discussion of how citizenship policies intersect with other spheres of inclusion or exclusion.

In a changing world, the traditional model of citizenship⁶ no longer seems to capture the realities of what is happening. Whilst various alternative concepts have been suggested, such as postnational or transnational citizenship, Rainer Bauböck (2010) has suggested the idea of citizenship constellation as an analytic tool to study new developments in citizenship traditions. ‘Citizenship constellations’ refers to the structure of joint legal statuses, rights and obligations that a dual citizen is subject to. As Bauböck points out, a focus on this “helps... to better understand individual interests in relation to alternative citizenship statuses” (2010: 849). On the one hand, states determine the general rules and take decisions on how they apply to individuals. On the other hand, migrants and their family members are also agents who choose

⁶ I say the ‘traditional’ model, however, there have always been differences between the specificities of states’ models based on different cultural and historical circumstances. Nevertheless, I am referring to the broad understanding of single citizenship that prevailed particularly between the Bancroft treaties and the 1997 European Convention on Nationality (Kivisto and Faist 2007).

between alternative citizenship options. Thus a focus on constellations can allow us to focus on individuals' agency without obscuring the constraints and restrictions imposed on them by state regulations. Using this framework I will attempt to sketch some of the different citizenship constellations that Latin American-Europeans inhabit and examine the different bundles of rights and obligations that they are subject to. These are necessarily rough sketches, in that the breadth of backgrounds represented and the time available on the project did not allow a detailed picture to emerge. However, this could be a starting point for further research.

The first point in helping us to understand the features of a particular citizenship constellation is to understand how the status of citizenship is accessed. There are two main routes for Latin Americans to access European citizenship: ancestry or residency. Residency requires an individual to migrate first and then seek citizenship, whereas citizenship through ancestry can be obtained before migration or by people who will never move. Citizenship through ancestry is granted by a number of European countries, including: Spain, Italy, Germany, France, Portugal and Ireland. Due to the large-scale migration of people from Europe to Latin America during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, there are many descendants of migrants who can make claims to European citizenship. This is particularly true in certain countries, such as Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil (Moreno Fuente 2001, Tintori 2011). Nevertheless, regulations for each country vary, with Italy having perhaps the most open policy, as they do not have a generational limit on the ancestor who was Italian⁷ (Tintori 2011). This creates a situation in which certain individuals due to their family tree are more likely to have a European citizenship and thus are more likely to be able to travel. Accessing this passport may still require some effort and individuals will have to mobilise what Mateos and Durand (2012) have called their 'ethnic capital': a combination of genealogy, phenotype and surnames. States, through their citizenship policy, create a hierarchy of access to individuals from other countries based on this ethnic capital (Mateos and Durand 2012).

⁷ Usually a male ancestor, although a female ancestor is considered post 1948 (Tintori 2011).

Simultaneously this 'ethnic capital' is often linked to a higher social status in Latin America, as a result of the particular colonial histories of these countries. Amira, who was born in Belgium but who had spent much of her youth in Colombia and came from a middle-class background, commented, "If you have a European background, even if you don't have the passport, it gives you already some sort of er... higher standard." Although these differences occur within countries, they are also concentrated between different Latin American countries to varying degrees, a result of the patterns of migration flows from Europe. This means that within the Latin American community abroad, country of origin can also become a factor by which people get judged. Alberto told me that some people within the community see Latin-Americans with European passports as less Latin-American. A few people commented that Argentines were disliked in other South American countries due to their perceived arrogance, which some linked to their feelings of superiority at being more 'European' than other Latin Americans. As Amira told me, "That's why in Colombia, they hate Argentinian people because it shows, [...] already this kind of superiority just because they are...they are different, physically. They are like Europeans."

The ethnic capital that an individual has will have implications both for their possibility of accessing a European passport, and often the social capital that they have on arrival in Europe. As with other forms of capital, ethnic capital has the potential to be converted into other forms (Mateos and Durand 2012). Thus it was with Nicolás, who came from a middle-class family in Peru. His wife, also from Peru, had German grandparents, and so with German citizenship was able to move to the UK. Nicolás was thus able to move to the UK relatively easily on a spouse visa. After a few years of residency, he was able to naturalise as a British citizen. This also, to some degree, has implications for the kind of communities that these individuals create and the social groups they inhabit. Thus as an Italian-Argentine, Irene, commented to me that it was difficult in the UK to find groups of Argentines to hang out with, and that in this respect the Argentines were not like the Colombians or the Bolivians. She attributed this to the fact that the Argentines arriving in the UK had a higher social capital, "Whereas the Argentines that come here they already come with university degrees, and they come already trained and they get

good jobs, so.... [...] I guess it's people at another level, let's say. So that makes a difference as well."

Those, such as Irene, who had gained her citizenship through ancestry, are contrasted with those who have gained citizenship through residency. In this project this comprised two main groups, the Latin American-Spanish and the Latin American-British. Latin Americans with Spanish citizenship have started arriving in London following the economic crisis in Spain although it is extremely difficult to estimate numbers (McIlwaine 2011b). Of those I interviewed, eight had previously lived in Spain for between eight and fifteen years and had gained Spanish nationality through residency. The majority had been in the UK for less than six months (see table 1). These individuals had made the most of generous naturalisation policies towards Latin Americans in Spain. Under this policy, Latin Americans can apply to naturalise after two years of legal residence (the requirement is 10 years for all other countries), and are not required to renounce their previous citizenship on taking Spanish citizenship (due to a number of treaties signed with Latin American countries) (Moreno Fuentes 2001). In fact, Spain's stance on dual citizenship originates in the republican government of the thirties when it was considered desirable to maintain links with Spanish emigrants in Latin America - an idea subsequently re-introduced in the fifties – and to this day Spain only allows dual citizenship with its former colonies⁸. The argument is made on the basis of cultural and linguistic similarity as well as shared historical ties (Mateos and Durand 2012). Since the mid-90s Spain has experienced a massive wave of immigration of which around 60% was from Latin America (Mateos and Durand 2012). Of those who have naturalised in Spain between 1980-2009, 80% were originally from Latin America (Mateos and Durand 2012) suggesting that many made the most of this opportunity to naturalise.

The process of naturalising in Spain was described to me as extremely long and bureaucratic but relatively straightforward. It is conditional upon having been legally resident, working and

⁸ Known as the Ibero-American countries it includes any country in the Americas in which Spanish or Portuguese is an official language. Other countries included are the Philippines, Andorra, Portugal, and Equatorial Guinea. See <http://www.mjusticia.gob.es/cs/Satellite/es/1215198282690/EstructuraOrganica.html> for full details.

paying social security contributions, and without a criminal record (Mateos and Durand 2012). It usually takes around two years for the request to be processed and in the meantime some people fall into a state of irregularity (Mateos and Durand 2012: 38). This was the case for Beatriz whose visa expired whilst she was waiting for her application for citizenship to be processed. After presenting all the papers, there are a series of different appointments with officials over a number of months. Then a letter arrives inviting the applicant to an appointment at which they must swear an oath of allegiance to the Spanish state. At this point they are asked whether or not they wish to renounce their previous citizenship. They are then able to collect their DNI (national identity card) and apply for a passport. None of the people I spoke to claimed to have had any idea about the process of naturalising before they arrived in Spain. Many had arrived in Spain without a job offer, simply having come on a tourist visa. Only once there had they pursued work papers and citizenship. It seemed that people learnt of the possibility of naturalising only once in Spain. Only Pedro from Bolivia told me that he had received immigration advice from a lawyer, however, many more may use informal networks to gain advice on the procedure (Mateos and Durand 2012).

Although the bureaucratic process is very long in the Spanish case, the narratives of naturalisation were broadly similar. In contrast, there was more diversity in procedures for those who had naturalised in the UK. This reflects the differences in flows from Latin America to Britain and the longer time frame that Latin Americans have been in the UK. The Latin American-British in this study reflected this diversity. Nicolás who had naturalised most recently described the process as, “En teoría sencillo pero muy complicado” (in theory simple but very complicated). Nicolás complained that the process had been complicated by the fact that the Home Office had lost his documents, a problem Lucía had also encountered. In theory, after five years⁹ of legal residence, assuming you are of ‘good character’ (without a criminal record) and after passing an integration test, it is possible to apply for permanent residency or Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) (Hansen 2001). One year after getting ILR an individual can

⁹ The time period before which you can get ILR depends on the visa that you are on. This is the length of time for the work visas.

apply for citizenship. Nevertheless, granting of citizenship is entirely discretionary (Hansen 2001). On applying for citizenship an individual must produce two referees at least one of whom is British¹⁰. Individuals then go to a citizenship ceremony where they swear an oath of allegiance and sing the national anthem (Kostakopoulou 2010). Applicants are not required to renounce previous citizenships (Hansen 2002). Although this naturalisation policy does not explicitly favour any groups, integration tests create a barrier to those from non-English speaking countries who are not well educated.

Dual Citizenship and Transnationalism

In the past, naturalising in another country would have meant automatic renunciation (or expatriation) of your previous nationality. Thus migrants would have been required to fully commit to the new country. This classic model of citizenship which matched models of assimilation viewed the maintenance of ties with the home country with suspicion. Nevertheless, as much recent research has shown, maintaining transnational ties and integrating into a new country are not mutually exclusive, an idea which is captured in the concept of 'simultaneity' (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). However, a big question remains as to the degree to which being a dual citizen fosters the maintenance of transnational ties (Faist 2007). Traditionally studies of transnational practices have not focused on the legal status of the individuals in question (despite this having serious implications for the possibility of acting), although it is assumed that dual citizenship is likely to encourage transnationalism (Faist 2007). However, as Linda Bosniak (2001) points out, not all transnational actors are dual citizens, and not all dual citizens are transnationals.

The question of what should be considered a transnational link and how this should be quantified is problematic, as there is a danger that the word is so widely used that it becomes meaningless (Portes et al 1999). Several scholars have attempted typologies including 'core' and 'expanded' transnationalism but assessing this usually requires in-depth, long-term

¹⁰ Interview with Paula 11/07/2012

ethnographic engagement (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). This was not possible in this project, however, I asked my participants whether they maintained contacts with people in other countries. Unsurprisingly, those who had moved from Spain often talked of very significant links back to Spain as well as to their home country. Of those who had moved from Spain, most had close family members there, who had often come through a process of chain migration. For those who were British, the links were usually straight back to the home country. However, many people also had links with the US, as different family members had migrated there. Often people maintained family life across huge distances, via e-mail, telephone calls and internet chatting, with many people having children in two different countries whilst they were in a third. With today's electronic communications maintaining contact is usually quite easy, although this did not mitigate the significant pain that several people expressed at being apart from their loved ones¹¹.

People also maintained contact with home through the news or other popular media such as radio and TV. For many, the internet, as well as different pages available on Facebook and people's mobile phones were extremely important. An important resource was the Latin American community newspaper circulated in London for free, particularly for those who had recently arrived and were struggling with money. Watching TV or listening to the radio from home countries was less frequent, and when it was reported, it was usually achieved through the internet. I also asked those who had come from Spain whether they followed the Spanish news. Several people told me that they were no longer interested in Spain now that they were living in the UK, but some, especially those whose family was still there, were interested in maintaining that link. Simultaneously some of the Latin American-Spanish were making efforts to follow British news, because now it affected them. Of the Latin American-British, most said that they followed British news and once again free newspapers were often a convenient way of doing this. Some respondents did report a more serious engagement with the British media. Thus a complicated picture of transnational connections emerges. Not only is this often 'a transnational triangle' (Van Liempt 2011) with a lot of travel and regular contact to a country

¹¹ Interviews with Juan Pablo 17/05/2012, Beatriz 18/05/2012, Ana 21/05/2012, José 23/05/2012.

which is not the country of origin, but also that transnational links, like other social connections, are very context dependent. Different factors, such as the amount of money available or the length of time people have lived somewhere, affect people's engagements and these change over time. This shows that 'simultaneity' operates in a number of different ways and can change over a lifetime (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004).

A variety of transnational processes have been studied, from the maintenance of social networks to economic remittances. However, of particular importance to the study of citizenship is the question of transnational political participation. Dual citizens often have the right to vote in both countries of citizenship, and in this study some participants had the right to vote in three different countries. The question of whether the franchise should be extended to citizens living abroad is a fraught political and philosophical issue. However, many Latin American countries do offer external voting, and most of my respondents were able to vote externally for their home countries. I asked people about their engagement in politics in their home country both before they left and whilst living abroad. Although most people had participated in elections at some stage virtually no one had voted for their home countries externally despite many knowing this was possible¹². This reflects a trend for low turnout in external votes as has been reported elsewhere (Escobar 2004). A number of my respondents expressed a deep cynicism about the political system in their home countries¹³. This was perhaps particularly marked in the case of the Colombians, several of whom spoke of the fact that politics in Colombia was so influenced by the US (as has been found elsewhere, see Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003). However, others such as Lucía and José explained their lack of participation by saying that they no longer knew about the political situation in their home countries, saying, 'how can I vote if I don't know who anybody is?'. Another factor in low external voting is the requirement to travel to the consul to vote. Although attitudes to political participation varied considerably, it seemed that some home country policies influenced

¹² Irene and Manuel were the two exceptions.

¹³ Interviews with Juan Pablo 17/05/2012, Juan 20/05/2012, Luis 23/05/2012, Jorge 23/05/2012, Javier 24/05/2012, Amira 12/06/2012, Paula 11/07/2012.

attitudes. In the case of Ecuador, voting is compulsory and non-participation is sanctioned with a fine. Thus Ecuadorians talked about participation in a slightly different way, as something that had to be done, although that didn't necessarily transfer into actual greater levels of participation from abroad¹⁴.

Rates of political participation in the country of naturalisation also varied. The most significant question in this regard is whether people who are still engaged in homeland politics will be less likely to engage with host country politics. Here I agree with other work on the subject that the two are not mutually exclusive (Escobar 2004, Bermudez 2010). In fact it does seem that individuals may be encouraged to participate through naturalisation (Faist and Gerdes 2008). Some respondents told me that they had voted immediately after getting their passport in Spain as a thank you to the government. As Juan Pablo put it, "Yo voté por Zapatero por agradecimiento que me dieron la nacionalidad" (I voted for Zapatero out of gratitude that they gave me nationality)¹⁵. Nevertheless, although many people had participated at least once in Spain, it does not appear that this participation was sustained (although this may be because many subsequently migrated). Of those who had naturalised as British, around half reported regularly voting in the UK. Others expressed the future intention to vote, or appeared more interested in specific elections (such as the mayoral election)¹⁶. The question of political participation in the host county is further complicated by onward migration. In this case, those who had migrated from Spain to the UK often have the right to vote in both countries of their citizenship and, as Europeans, the right to vote in the UK in local and European elections. I asked Latin American-Spanish whether they intended to vote in the UK in the future. Although many said they would be interested, others told me that they had more pressing issues than voting. I did not explicitly ask about future external participation in Spain, although when it

¹⁴ Interviews with Beatriz 19/05/2012, Ana 21/05/2012.

¹⁵ The Spanish Socialist party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español PSOE) won the national elections in 2004 and 2008 with Zapatero leading the party. Three people specifically told me that they had voted for Zapatero.

¹⁶ The interviews were conducted shortly after the London mayoral election which often proved a useful way of moving the conversation to politics.

came up in a few conversations participants did not express the intention to vote again in Spain. This is an area that warrants further investigation.

Overall, however, I was struck by the high levels of disenchantment that many people expressed with formal politics. Javier told me that, “Eso es para los ricos ... Los únicos que ganan con la política son los ricos” ([politics] that’s for the rich... the only people who gain anything from politics are the rich). This disengagement was not confined to those of lower social status. Many of those who had higher status jobs and were more mobile also admitted to very low levels of participation over their lifetime, sometimes with some embarrassment. Of the nineteen people I spoke to, five had never voted anywhere, whilst three people had only voted once in their lifetimes. There were two stand out exceptions to a trend of low participation. One was Manuel who had naturalised as British in order to be able to vote and who told me that he always voted in every election both in the UK and in Mexico. The other was Irene, who told me that voting in both Argentina and Italy was compulsory so she always did it. She also told me that she always voted in the UK, despite having little interest, because she felt she should make the effort.

This brief overview shows that there are often a number of complicated intersecting reasons affecting whether or not people participate politically. One is life stage - what is going on in an individual’s life, even down to the particular day. Ana told me that when she lived in Spain, she had planned to vote but her daughter was sick on the election day so she hadn’t gone out. Similarly a few people told me that they had been involved in political parties or trade unions in their home countries before migrating, but that kind of engagement was for young people¹⁷. The other is the degree to which participation is facilitated by the government in question. Finally, a whole range of attitudes towards politics affect participation and not always in straightforward ways. Thus Irene told me she voted in everything but also said that she was not interested in politics at all. In contrast, Amira told me she was interested in following politics but she didn’t believe in the system so she never voted.

¹⁷ Interviews with Rodrigo 17/05/2012, Beatriz 19/05/2012.

Political inclusion is one of the key features that differentiates citizens from denizens. Although formally this is very important, this does not always translate into greater participation or having a greater voice in society¹⁸. Kostakopoulou (2010) has argued that it is the ‘conditions of reception’ that affect the level of attachment migrants develop to a society. However, conditions of reception can operate on a number of different levels. At a policy level, we can see a divergence in the way that naturalisation policies favour certain categories of people in Spain. In Spain, a classically ‘ethnic’ view of citizenship is created in which those who are closest are granted citizenship most easily (those with Spanish ancestors) followed by those who are culturally similar (former colonial subjects resident in Spain) (Mateos and Durand 2012). In Britain, the naturalisation law does not specifically create favoured categories of people (despite common perceptions) (Hansen 2001), however, the system is designed in such a complicated way, that those who are well educated and have money are more likely to succeed¹⁹. However, beyond the policy, there is the reception that migrants (or ‘new citizens’) receive from society and at the more formal level of contact with immigration authorities.

In order to try to address this I asked people about their subjective experiences of discrimination. In Spain, most Latin American-Spaniards had faced verbal abuse at some stage. If they had not directly encountered it, they knew of people who had. Respondents reported being told to “vete a tu puto país” (go back to your fucking country) or being called “sudaca²⁰ de mierda” (South American of shit)²¹. They contrasted their experience with London, where there was much greater ethnic diversity and they perceived discrimination to be less. Some

¹⁸ The Latin American community in London is often described as an ‘invisible’ community (McIlwaine et al 2011). A current campaign to get recognition as an ethnic group hopes to help address this problem. For more information see <http://www.larcuk.org/>.

¹⁹ Currently the cost of applying to naturalise in the UK stands at around £850 with another £80 to attend the citizenship ceremony. The cost for applying for ILR is £991 (see <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/britishcitizenship/applying/cost/> for the full details for the UK and Vink and de Groot (2010) for an overview of naturalisation costs in other European countries).

²⁰ The term ‘sudaca’ is a pejorative way to describe someone from South America, which does not have an equivalent translation in English.

²¹ Interviews with Juan Pablo 17/05/2012, Rodrigo 17/05/2012, Beatriz 19/05/2012

commented with some surprise that blacks worked in banks and post-offices²², an indication that in London, ethnicity was not necessarily a barrier to the labour market. However, a few respondents thought there was discrimination or resentment towards people who did not speak English²³ (as also found by McIlwaine 2011b).

I also asked people specifically about their contact with authorities when using their European passport. Javier, commented that in London in contrast to Spain, he had never being stopped by the police. None of the 'new' Spanish had had their identities as Spaniards questioned. However, many Colombian-British had had the validity of their British passports questioned²⁴. However, this usually did not seem to be at the hands of British immigration officials but rather by US immigration officials. Colombians complained of being negatively stereotyped whenever they travelled due to the association of Colombia with the drugs trade (as also reported by McIlwaine 2011b). Several Colombian-British told me stories of being asked numerous questions by US immigration officials as to how they got their British passport and why they were entitled to it, an experience which left many feeling demoralised²⁵.

Thus it is clear that processes of inclusion and exclusion work in complex ways, creating different hierarchies. In the case of the Spanish-Latin Americans, their legal documents were not questioned because they fulfilled cultural, linguistic and ethnic expectations. However, in the context of Spain, they were ethnically and/or socially marked as 'other' whether citizens or non-citizens. In contrast, British-Colombians do not fulfil expectations of what it is to be British, and so the use of their British passport was sometimes questioned. However, in multicultural London, Latin Americans generally perceive that they are not marked as 'other' and do not report receiving verbal abuse, though they were more likely to feel excluded because of language. Thus exclusion can operate on many different levels. Even things such as the sound of

²² Interviews with Juan Pablo 17/05/2012, Juan 20/05/2012

²³ Interviews with Juan Pablo 17/05/2012, Juan 20/05/2012, Ana 21/05/2012, Alberto 29/05/2012.

²⁴ Interviews with Lucía 29/05/2012, Paula 11/07/2012, Jorge 23/05/2012, David 23/05/2012.

²⁵ Ibid

your name can impact how you will be received, as Amira told me. Amira, whose father was Moroccan and mother was Colombian, was born in Belgium and had three nationalities²⁶. She explained the only time she suspected she had experienced discrimination was job-hunting in Belgium, where her Arabic sounding name had put potential employers off. As her mother's surname was Italian, by including it as well (as is traditional in many Spanish-speaking countries) she had sought to mitigate this effect, distorting potential employers' expectations of her.

Citizenship policy is closely linked to immigration policy and consequently issues of ethnicity and class come into play. These factors intersect in different ways in different situations but ultimately affect the ease with which an individual will have access to another citizenship. Through a number of re-ethnicising citizenship policies, large numbers of individuals in Latin America have become eligible for European citizenship. Those who are not may try their chance in Europe either irregularly, claiming asylum or coming on work visas. Their opportunities to naturalise depend on the destination country, where we have seen that Spain offers favourable conditions to its former colonies due to their perceived cultural similarity. The question of whether dual citizenship fosters transnationalism is a complex one, but all the dual citizens in this study had some level of transnational engagement. Often individuals will simultaneously be maintaining social relationships in several countries, although the intensity of this transnationalism often varies over time. Similarly most of my respondents had voted in more than one country despite many expressing a deep apathy towards the political system. Once again participation may fluctuate over life course. However, being included formally in the political sphere does not necessarily mean that migrants face better social conditions. Instead poor working conditions were a feature of many people's lives in both Spain and the UK. However, in London open discrimination whether on the grounds of being an immigrant or on the grounds of ethnicity is rare, in contrast to the verbal abuse many Latin Americans

²⁶ In the course of my research several people expressed the view that it was not possible to have three citizenships. As far as I am aware, this is actually entirely dependent on each state's policy, but it seems that this idea may be becoming an 'accepted truth'. Interestingly this reflects a traditional two state focus in migration studies and could be an area for further research.

experienced in Spain. Thus inclusion, both formal (in terms of citizenship), and informal, are stratified according to a number of different factors: ethnicity, class, education level, linguistic knowledge and perceived cultural distance. In the next chapter I will discuss what the implications of this are for the way we think about citizenship and how this might change in the future.

Chapter 2: Re-thinking Citizenship

“Al usar las dos nacionalidades, he podido tener acceso a distintas cosas, que un francés solo no hubiera podido acceder, o que un mexicano solo no hubiera podido acceder” (By using the two nationalities, I’ve been able to access different things, that just a French citizen or just a Mexican citizen would not have been able to.)

Emilio, 30/05/2012

As we saw in the previous chapter, access to citizenship is cut across by class and ethnic differences, which subsequently affects how one experiences migration. However, gaining dual citizenship can be used as a strategy to improve one’s social mobility, as suggested by Tintori (2011) who comments, “Migrants have learned to use the transnational space as a way to circumvent regulatory obstacles to their social mobility” (173). This was certainly the case for Ong’s (1999) Hong Kong businessmen, who used citizenship flexibly as part of a range of strategies for furthering their business interests. Certainly the increase in dual citizenship provides more individuals with options that they might not have had available. This is nicely illustrated by the opening quote from Emilio, who is Mexican-French. In his case, a Spanish government grant for students from Latin America financed his study in Europe, whilst French citizenship granted him freedom of movement and settlement within Europe. In this chapter, I will argue that it is particularly the benefit of mobility that many people are seeking and that this dimension of citizenship has often been neglected in the literature. Mobility is dependent on the citizenship you hold, and citizenships are hierarchically arranged according to the international order. I will discuss how this fits in with discussions about EU citizenship. Finally, I shall explore the decoupling of rights from identity and what this means for the way that we think about citizenship going into the future.

As Christian Joppke (2010: 9) has noted, there is currently a paradox in citizenship. Objectively access to (certain) citizenships has never been more valued by those who are seeking new opportunities to improve their lives. The value of a European passport, giving access to the whole EU labour market has never been greater. However, simultaneously, the subjective value

of citizenship for those who actually hold that status seems to be diminishing. This diminishing subjective importance of the status of citizenship comes in part from the expansion of rights granted to so-called 'denizens' (Hammar 1990), the effects of globalisation in reducing the meaning and importance of territorial boundaries, and an overall slimming down of social rights associated with citizenship (Kivisto and Faist 2007). Increasingly, so the argument goes, there are few rights exclusively granted to citizens and few duties exclusively expected of citizens (Kivisto and Faist 2007). This process could be said to be increasing with the expansion of dual citizenship, in which individuals gain citizenships simply to pursue their own personal interests (Ong 1999). These developments have been greeted by some commentators as socially catastrophic (Kivisto and Faist 2007).

State governments have reacted to this evolution by re-nationalising, and in some cases, re-ethnicising citizenship policies (Joppke 2010). This has been described as a 'thickening' of citizenship (Kostakopoulou 2010) with many European countries introducing history, 'culture' and language tests as well as citizenship ceremonies (Vink and de Groot 2010). These measures are part and parcel of this effort to try to create the subjective sense that membership of the citizenship 'club' has some real meaning. In the UK, the government consistently speaks of migrants 'earning' their right to citizenship and it is hoped that those naturalising will feel more engaged with the national society. Nevertheless, as Kostakopoulou (2010) points out, there is no evidence that this is effective, instead this is a display designed for consumption by the public. However, these policies of re-nationalisation are undermined by concurrent government policies in both immigration and citizenship, in which states vie for the 'brightest and the best' of the international migrants. 'Investor' citizenship, in which individuals can fast-track their way to naturalisation in return for a sizeable investment or the creation of jobs in the country, are offered by most Western states and suggest that states are equally good at 'instrumentalising' citizenship (Joppke 2010).

When I asked people about why they had decided to naturalise, the answers invariably reflected mobility and immigration regimes. Thus the main reason that people gave for

investing the time in gaining another citizenship was in order to be able to travel and move around more freely. When I asked Paula, an immigration adviser at IRMO about the advantage of having British citizenship over having ILR she said, “[Uno] tiene mas movilidad. Eso es todo para mí. Porque derechos no tiene mas,” (one has more mobility. That’s all for me. Because one doesn’t get more rights). In response to my question, why did you decide to naturalise, Javier from the Dominican Republic put it simply, “Claro para viajar a otros países” (obviously, to travel to other countries). Similarly Nicolás elucidated the difficulty of visa regimes for those from some Latin American countries, “En verdad el pasaporte británico ... es útil especialmente en el tema de visas. Como peruanos, no es tan complicado como los colombianos, pero necesitamos visas para casi todos los países” (truthfully the British passport ... is useful especially in the area of visas. As Peruvians, it’s not quite so complicated as for the Colombians, but we need visas for almost all countries). This comment highlights how the freedom to be able to travel without visas is not to be trivialised. It also draws attention to the fact that, once again, this advantage is differentiated by country of origin, with those from the Andean region – Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador – usually experiencing greater barriers to travel than other Latin American countries such as Argentina, Mexico and Brazil. It also illustrates that the mobility advantage is beneficial for both those with higher social status (as Nicolás was) and those of lower social status. The participants in this study intended, at least in the short-term, to build their lives in the UK. However, gaining a second passport is still seen as a way of keeping options open for the future, sometimes even for those who never intend to move. Irene’s description of people’s views of citizenship in Argentina echoes Tintori’s (2011) description that Argentines living in Argentina see their European passport as a ‘just in case’ passport, as an insurance policy in the event of another economic crisis.

Passport Hierarchy and Mobility

In today’s world Zygmunt Bauman argues that, “Mobility has become the most powerful and most coveted stratifying factor,” (1998: 9) as global economic forces require people to behave flexibly and follow economic opportunities. Many people perceive that the opportunities for

improving their lives are to be had through migration. However, mobility is severely restricted depending on the passport that you have, with certain passports providing more rights and more possibilities to move than others. Stephen Castles (2005) calls this 'hierarchical citizenship' and argues that this is a result of the varying power that different states hold in the world system. The significance of this hierarchy is more prominent now, since until recently a much more important distinction was still being made between those who were citizens and those who were not. Today, although (almost) everyone is a citizen, citizens from different countries have different rights and legal protections depending on their state's position in the global system. Although theoretically everyone has the same global human rights, there is actually relativism in the rights available to different people. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the right to movement. Castles argues, "Most people can get a passport, but not all passports are equal" (2005: 217). Where a state is placed in the hierarchy depends on a combination of factors, but of particular importance for its citizens is the visa requirements citizens are subjected to. As indicated above, there are significant differences across Latin America in terms of the visas required for different countries.

This idea that 'not all passports are equal' was clearly expressed by several of my respondents. A number of people told me that their Colombian, Bolivian or Peruvian passport wasn't worth anything in Europe. When asked about the advantages of having dual citizenship, Javier from the Dominican Republic said, "Pero la doble no... porque el pasaporte dominicana no me vale para entrar aquí o para entrar a cualquier sitio" (but the dual no... because the Dominican passport is no good for entering here or anywhere else). Similarly Lucía who had both British and Colombian passports said, "Yo pienso con uno [pasaporte] es suficiente, pero no es el colombiano" (I think one [passport] is enough, just not the Colombian). David, Colombian-British was the most explicit and used the metaphor of strength:

"I don't see many practical advantages [in having two passports] if one of the passports isn't a very strong passport. I'm talking strong as in the rights, the rights you have with that passport. [...] For me I don't see many advantages in having one strong one, as in one European one, and one weak one."

Once again the rights he was referring to, that seemed important to him, were rights associated

with mobility. In fact it wasn't the *dual* citizenship that gave them benefits, but rather having gained a passport higher up the hierarchy - a 'stronger' passport. For Alberto this was quite a disagreeable idea, but one that he could not escape. After telling me at some length that his El Salvador passport was perfectly fine for travelling everywhere in Europe, he conceded that he actually used his British passport when travelling in Europe. Later in the interview he reflected,

“Porque el reino unido tiene mas poder en el mundo, no? Y ese protege uno. El Salvador no me protege. [Short pause] Tiene ... aunque no... quizás no sea muy agradable la idea, pero tener el pasaporte británico le da cierto estatus fuera de Inglaterra,” (Because the United Kingdom has more power in the world, no? And that protects one. El Salvador doesn't protect me. [Short pause] It has... even though ... maybe it's not a very agreeable idea, but having a British passport gives one a certain status outside of England).

Obtaining a passport higher up the passport hierarchy gives people the freedom to come and go as they please. Several people mentioned going home for significant events, a death in the family for instance, or in order to get married, even if they were living abroad. But in many cases a visit home was only undertaken when an individual's legal status had been established. Having both passports made moving back and forth between countries easier (as also found in the US context by Escobar 2004). The majority described using their passports in this way, entering with the passport of the country in question. In fact, some Colombians told me you had to enter with your Colombian passport because if you entered with a British or a Spanish passport, immigration officials could make life difficult for you²⁷. For my respondents, using the passport of the country they were returning to, meant that they were no restrictions on the time that they could stay there. In some cases, my respondents had travelled back for longer periods of time. This was more often the case with the British-Latin Americans than with the Spanish-Latin Americans, perhaps because the former had spent a longer time abroad. Manuel had come as a student, then returned home and spent some years before returning to the UK. Lucía had been in the UK irregularly for many years, but had returned to Colombia for several years only to find that she could not readjust to life there. David and Jorge, who had both come

²⁷ Interviews with Paula 11/07/2012, Lucía 29/05/2012, Jorge 23/05/2012. And Mexico requires that Mexican nationals use their Mexican passport in Mexican territory.

to the UK as children, had also both returned to Colombia for a year or more, to see what life was like there. So returning to the country of origin for extended periods of time was not uncommon. Nevertheless, people talked of the fact that after having been away they could not readjust to life 'at home' and sometimes felt like foreigners. Some people also said that although they were not intending to return home in their lifetime, they would like to return to die. Manuel even told me that he had bought his grave plot in Mexico. Although this sentiment is quite common, it was not across the board, and those who were more mobile and who had lived in several countries were less likely to express this sentiment.

Having a passport higher up the passport hierarchy also facilitates travel and future migration within the EU. Around half of the people I interviewed had moved from Spain to the UK. This kind of mobility is known as 'onward migration' (Lindley and Van Hear 2007). For the majority, this was not a completely voluntary decision, but one made out of necessity. People talked of the terrible economic situation in Spain, with companies going bankrupt and no work available, and many had mortgages in Spain that needed paying off. The majority had also left family behind, sometimes for practical reasons (family members may still have had a job), sometimes because those individuals did not have Spanish citizenship and therefore were unable to come to Britain. This onward migration was not planned, but rather was part of a strategy of dealing with an economic downturn.

Onward migration within the EU of so called 'third country nationals' after they have naturalised as European citizens is an under-researched phenomenon. This is in part because once people have naturalised in a European country they disappear in the statistics. Lindley and Van Hear (2007) and Van Liempt (2011) have drawn attention to the case of refugees who, after gaining European passports, move to another European Union member state. In particular these two articles focus on two groups which have caught some attention; Sri Lankan Tamils and Somalis, moving from Germany, the Netherlands and Scandinavia to the UK. They discuss the range of motivations that cause people to move. These include the prospect of better economic opportunities with easier access to the labour market, educational motivations such

as the desire to educate their children in English, social and family regrouping, and the perception of a more welcoming society with less racism (Lindley and Van Hear 2007, Van Liempt 2011).

For Latin Americans coming from Spain to the UK, the main motivation appears to be the job prospects. Generally the UK was picked because they heard there was work, but often people said that they knew someone who might be able to help them. Some people told me that they had thought of other options such as Switzerland or the United States²⁸. Interestingly, many people also commented that from the UK it was easy to travel back to Spain. As mentioned above, most had left some family behind in Spain, and so returning there regularly was important. These transnational connections were also maintained through regular phone calls and electronic correspondence as discussed in the previous chapter. This is what Van Liempt (2011) describes as the 'transnational triangle'. In her study, Dutch Somalis living in the UK maintained links with the Netherlands, going on holiday, speaking with friends at home and eating Dutch food. Similarly for the people in Lindley and Van Hear's (2007) study, "connections with friends and relatives in the former country of residence ... were maintained assiduously – perhaps to maintain possibility of return should things not work out in the UK" (16). This form of circularity is facilitated with an EU passport. For the Latin American-Spanish in London, the possibility of returning to Spain seemed remote given the economic situation. However, the existence of strong networks of friends and families meant that some clearly would like to. Others were more interested in their new life and challenges.

EU Citizenship

The freedom of movement granted by a British or a Spanish passport is based on two things: one, the particular agreements that each country has with other countries with regards to visa requirements; and two, the rights of free movement and settlement within EU countries granted to EU citizens. To what extent is this second facet important for Latin Americans? The

²⁸ Interviews with Juan 20/05/2012, Ana 21/05/2012, Javier 24/05/2012, Pedro 25/05/2012

question of European citizenship has received increasing attention since the concept was first introduced in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 (Perchinig 2006). The implications of this status which is dependent on national citizenship and which has very few rights attached to it has been questioned by many scholars (Shore 2004). According to these accounts, the right to free movement, the only substantive right to be guaranteed in the treaty, was not actually a new right at all (Perchinig 2006). Indeed, the right of free movement was originally designed for workers, and it was simply a rhetorical manipulation to call this a right of citizens. Numerous scholars have questioned whether the concept of European citizenship is empty, given that the status depends on national citizenship, political involvement at the level of the EU is limited and there is no common sense of solidarity (Nic Craith 2004, Shore 2004). However, my contention is that the right of free movement is not insignificant, and should not be ascribed the somewhat secondary status that it so often is. This is particularly important since although other rights for long-term residents may be coming into line with EU citizens, the right to free movement remains the sole preserve of citizens (Perchinig 2006). Joppke argues that, "The one exception to non-EU immigrants' near-equality with EU citizens is free movement rights, which accrue to EU citizens unconditionally, but to third-country nationals only after five years of legal residence, and then with further strings attached" (2010: 27). If the call for a re-conceptualisation of EU citizenship based not on the traditional nation-state model is to be heeded (Neveu 2005) we need to think more seriously about what this unconditional right to mobility means to people.

It seems that the implications of this unconditional right were clear to many Latin American-Europeans. Emilio, who was Mexican-French, commented that it was, "La primera discriminación de Europa es contra el no-europeo" (the first discrimination of Europe is against the non-European) and it was clear that to a certain degree, the value of a 'European' passport is in it being an EU passport. Irene told me that her friend in Argentina with Croatian ancestors was waiting for Croatia to join the EU before applying for her passport. The value of an EU passport seemed to be better understood by the Spanish-Latin Americans who had moved to Britain. As Juan Pablo told me, "Lo bueno es que, como estamos en la unión europea, entre mas

países se agregan, mas espacio tenemos para movernos” (the good thing is, since we’re in the European Union, the more countries that join, the more space we’ll have to move). This is undoubtedly because Spanish-Latin Americans had already exercised their ‘right to free movement,’ but it may also reflect the general attitude towards the EU in the respective countries. To some extent, the Latin American-Spanish expressed a sentiment similar to that described by Van Liempt (2011), declaring that they were Europeans and they could move where they liked. From the outside then the perception of EU citizenship is quite different. Objectively it is EU citizenship that is valuable, not the particular national citizenship in question. Rodrigo and Irene both told me that there was no point in having more than one European passport. In fact, David thought that it wasn’t even possible to have two EU passports, and expressed quite a lot of surprise when I told him of my dual Luxembourgish-British status. This comment and one by Manuel, who wondered whether he could swap his British passport for an Italian one, highlight that some of my respondents assumed the system was more coherent than it is. Nevertheless, the paradox is that, subjectively, for current EU citizens (‘old Europeans’), the status may not hold much meaning or significance, a variation on Joppke’s (2010) citizenship paradox described above.

Nevertheless, the belief in the stability of the EU project was not to be found across the board. In fact, Alba, a community activist, told me how people with European passports were coming and asking about changing their EU passports to British because they were concerned about what their status would be should the UK decide to leave the EU. This fear was echoed by Irene, who half jokingly told me that she worried that if the EU fell apart her Italian passport might not be enough to stop her being kicked out. These worries are perhaps unsurprising in the current climate, in which the UK is constantly trying to distance itself from the EU and the Euro-crisis, and at a time in which politicians have publicly announced that they are drawing up immigration contingency plans should Greece exit the Euro (BBC News 2012). Thus despite the value of EU citizenship being more obvious to previous third-country migrants, the current political and economic crisis gripping Europe risks undermining the status of EU citizen and demonstrates once again, that the nation-state remains the most important regulatory

framework for individual experience (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007).

For some social commentators, the whole project of EU citizenship is a negative development, and one that risks undermining the importance of national citizenship. The argument is that concept of citizenship rests on a sense of solidarity that is shared among a population. Although not always spelt out, this sense of solidarity is assumed to rest on a common cultural understanding (Nic Craith 2004). EU citizenship and the rise of dual citizenship risk destabilising this solidarity. There is a fear that the decoupling of rights from national identity and shared culture poses serious problems for models of democratic sovereignty (Benhabib 2002). However, this decoupling is clearly already taking place as a result of changes such as the spread of the global human rights discourse and the rise of supranational organisations that protect these rights (Benhabib 2002).

Many of my respondents made a distinction between their legal identity and what they felt. Thus Amira, who had three nationalities, Moroccan, Colombian and Belgian, told me, “If it’s a legal thing I would always say Belgian. If it’s a cultural thing I would say Colombian.” Many people echoed this sentiment, and said that identification was based on context and who was asking the question. Because for most people being in the UK required using their European passport, they would use that in all legal situations, but by writing their country of birth they would mark out what they ‘really’ were. People choose different strategies, some always saying dual nationality, some only using one or the other depending on the situation. Some people obviously felt stronger connections to the home country nationality, as Beatriz said to me “A veces no me siento muy bien diciendo soy Española porque solo tengo los documentos” (sometimes I don’t feel right saying I’m Spanish because I only have the documents) and Paula similarly said “Aunque tenga pasaporte británico no quiere decir que uno es británico” (even though one has the British passport that doesn’t mean that one is British). Slightly counter intuitively, this was also an argument that some respondents gave me as to why they *would* have been prepared to renounce their previous citizenship, had it been necessary. Because what they *really* were wouldn’t have changed, just their legal status. Ana told me that she

would have been prepared to renounce her Ecuadorian passport since being Ecuadorian was in her blood, a sentiment echoed by José who said he could always go back to Colombia to become Colombian again. These comments suggest that naturalising in of itself is not enough to make one 'feel' that nationality and that usually naturalising was done for practical reasons and not for symbolic or sentimental reasons.

That being said, a couple of respondents felt differently. Jorge told me that, "You feel more like you're not part of this country without it [passport]... [Having a passport] you feel that you're part of something, that you belong somewhere". Jorge's case is perhaps somewhat different, given that he had come to the UK as a child. There is a strong argument to be made for the fact that spending your formative years in a country significantly contributes to feeling that you belong there (Roca iCaparà 2011). Somewhat similarly Emilio had naturalised as Mexican after having grown up in Mexico. However, having parents born in Argentina, and French ancestors, his relationship to each country was complicated. He expressed ambivalent feelings about whether naturalising had made him more Mexican, however, he was unequivocal about his desire to participate politically. Manuel had also naturalised as British in order to 'belong' after eight years living with ILR in the UK²⁹. It seems that although the document doesn't count for everything, legally being included does impact on some people's sense of belonging. It is likely that this is even more important for those who have spent a considerable amount of time as a resident.

Although migration is often discussed in relation to the expansion of dual citizenship, much of the citizenship literature remains focused on the political rights that accrue to dual citizens and the implications for theories of democracy. However, as I have tried to show, for individuals the value of their second passport is linked to its status in the global hierarchy, and the mobility that allows them. Often this mobility is very much lived, in long visits home, circular migration or onward migration. However, sometimes the value of the second citizenship remains simply

²⁹ Manuel's example is also interesting, since he did not naturalise as British until Mexico changed the law to allow dual citizenship.

in the potential of mobility, whether returning to the home country, or future migration for better opportunities or even just easier, visa free travel options. This perspective places more importance on EU citizenship which grants freedom of movement and settlement in any EU country. Gaining an EU passport can be an easy way of avoiding complicated immigration regimes, leaving open the option of living and working in any EU country (Tintori 2011). Nevertheless, this discussion of citizenship based on movement rather than rights and duties is exactly the sort of instrumentalisation of citizenship that some commentators and governments rail against. But it is not simply the expansion of dual citizenship that has led to this view of citizenship 'light'. It is also government policies that promote differential access to citizenship to either the wealthy or those they consider 'desirable' in some other way. Ultimately the decoupling that has been occurring between the identity aspect of citizenship and the legal membership is likely to continue. Although there are different forces contributing to this in different ways, it is likely to be necessary to re-imagine what citizenship will mean in the future.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed the implications of dual citizenship for Latin Americans living in London, focusing on three main areas: how the 'view from below' matches the 'view from above', how citizenship is devalued or re-valued, and how citizenship is a tool for mobility. As we have seen, the 'view from below' is often quite different to the 'view from above' with individuals gaining a second citizenship for mobility and not necessarily being interested in political rights. It is in the possibility for mobility that the value of dual citizenship lies, with political participation and a sense of belonging lower down the list of importance.

In the first empirical chapter, I investigated how people had accessed their second citizenship, exploring the differences created by citizenship by ancestry and citizenship by residence. Citizenship policies in many European countries favour an ethnic identification thus allowing descendants to reclaim European citizenship status. These policies end up intersecting with already existent hierarchies of ethnicity and class within Latin American sending countries to create a category of people who have been able to mobilise their 'ethnic capital' to gain a European second citizenship as an 'insurance policy' (Tintori 2011, Mateos and Durand 2012). Other dual citizens have gained their second status through residency and naturalisation. This was the more common route for participants in my study, with the most common countries being Spain and Britain. Once again, Spain's citizenship policy produces hierarchies of access, putting Latin Americans in a privileged position with regards to Spain's other large immigrant group, North Africans. In Britain, naturalisation policy operates in the same way for everybody. However, since 2006 would-be citizens must undertake integration tests as well as attend citizenship ceremonies (Kostakopoulou 2010). They must also negotiate the complicated bureaucratic rules and hefty fees that are imposed. Whilst Spain pursues what could be called an 'ethnic' citizenship policy, the UK has de-ethnicised its procedures. Nevertheless, the British government has felt a need to re-nationalise its policy through the introduction of integration tests.

Gaining dual citizenship is a reflection for many people of living a transnational life. People maintained contacts both with their 'home' country, their 'adopted' country (in this case Spain) and their 'host' country. Gaining citizenship often allowed people to vote in both countries, but in general, this was not the main motivation for naturalising, contradicting popular state representations of naturalisation. Although people were mostly able to vote in their home countries, most felt disengaged from the process, either due to a lack of belief in the political system or because of having lived abroad for many years. Many had voted in their adopted country (the UK and Spain) although this participation was patchy and not necessarily sustained. Political participation is one of the key inclusions that gaining citizenship grants an individual, nevertheless, inclusion in society is more complex than that. In Spain, many Latin Americans had experienced discrimination, which was reportedly less in the UK. In London, discrimination or resentment on the grounds of not speaking English was much more common. However, questioning of British-Latin Americans identity as 'real' British was much more common than the equivalent questioning of Spanish-Latin Americans. This may be a result of the linguistic, cultural and ethnic expectations that are tied up with specific citizenships. Dual citizenships challenge and subvert these expectations.

Naturalisation, in any country, is by no means a straightforward process. In the second chapter I explored what the motivations for naturalising were, and what implications this might have for how we think about citizenship. Many commentators in Western countries have criticised what they see as the instrumentalisation of citizenship, with individuals naturalising for the 'wrong' reasons (although the assumption that once people naturalised for the 'right' reasons is questionable, see Escobar 2004). For many Latin Americans gaining a European passport can be seen as moving up the passport hierarchy, as different citizenships grant different rights (Castles 2005). Nowhere is this more obvious than in the right to mobility, and this was the overwhelming advantage people saw in having dual citizenship. This mobility was taken advantage of by many who returned home for long visits, or by those who had migrated a second time within the EU. Citizenship provides a security of status, a guarantee that you will be able to return. Thus the objective value of citizenship is enhanced whilst subjective value is

diminished, since the important thing was that it was an EU passport, not a passport of a particular state. This can partially undermine attempts at 're-nationalising' citizenship policies. Some have argued that EU citizenship challenges conventional models of citizenship since it decouples forms of identification and solidarity within a community from rights and duties associated with that membership (Benhabib 2002). This process also seems to occur to some degree with dual citizenship, with many disassociating their formal membership from what they really 'felt'.

Thus increasingly formal legal membership is disaggregated from both a sense of solidarity (what you feel) but also from rights and duties (since many extend to denizens). This appears to be an inevitable development, although as recent political turmoil in the EU has shown, nation-states still remain at the heart of citizenship policies. Nevertheless, the different dimensions do still affect one another. So formal inclusion, and inclusion in the political arena, will in the long-term affect the other dimensions, such as feelings of solidarity. In the long-term, the expansion of dual citizenship will lead to more genuinely 'dual' people (such as Jorge, David and Amira) who don't feel a single identification with one country. This will require societies to engage with what this means for ideas about democracy and belonging. In the short-term, however, it is worth remembering, that although dual citizenship is increasing, it may not be increasing quite as much as might be expected (Bloemraad 2004). There are still many people who do not identify as duals or who over time will return to a single identification.

This study has attempted to explore what it means to be a dual citizen and which framework is best used to try to understand this. At the outset, I discussed the idea of transnational citizens, a category which I believe all my respondents fall into. Not only do all of them lead transnational lives to some degree, they also all have full citizenship rights in two countries. The expression 'transnational citizen' is very good at capturing the reality of someone whose life is not focused in one nation-state. However, in general, I would agree with Fox (2005) that the term is not precise enough to tell us much more than that. Instead I maintain that the concept of 'citizenship constellations' remains more potentially useful. Thus using this framework, we

have seen how a British-Colombian has different possibilities of acceptance within society, and potentially different possibilities for political engagement and mobility than does a Spanish-Colombian. And again whether a Spanish-Colombian gained his Spanish citizenship through ancestry or residency may have different implications on the opportunities available to him/her. This conceptualisation better captures the fact that there are two or more states involved in creating the opportunity structure and focuses on specificities whilst simultaneously allowing us to generalise at different levels.

Perhaps most importantly, this study has highlighted that in a world with a globally integrating economy, in which restrictions on both physical and social mobility remain stratified according to country of origin, gaining another passport is going to continue to be seen as an option for long-term, transnational strategies of betterment. Gaining greater mobility and security of return is of fundamental importance for many people in gaining a second citizenship. This suggests a need for further research including into the onward migration of 'new Europeans' and the long-term changes in dual citizens' transnational engagements and identifications. Perhaps more importantly, it might be time to have a more honest debate about how the right to free movement should be regulated in a world of global geographic inequalities.

References

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N. and Szanton Blanc, C. 1994, *Nations Unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*, Langhorne PA: Gordon and Breach.

Bauböck, R. 2006, 'Citizenship and Migration – Concepts and Controversies,' in R. Bauböck (ed.) *Migration and Citizenship: Legal Status, Rights and Political Participation*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 15-32.

Bauböck, R. 2010, 'Studying Citizenship Constellations', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36, 5, 847-859.

Bauman, Z. 1998, *Globalization: the human consequences*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

BBC News 2012, *Euro Crisis: UK plans for rise in immigrants*, 26/05/2012, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18216538> accessed 28/08/2012.

Benhabib, S. 2002, 'Transformations of Citizenship: the Case of Contemporary Europe,' *Government and Opposition*, 37, 4, 439-465.

Bermudez, A. 2010, 'The Transnational Political Practices of Colombians in Spain and the United Kingdom: Politics 'Here' and 'There,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33, 1, 75-91.

Blatter, J. 2011, 'Dual Citizenship and Theories of Democracy', *Citizenship Studies*, 15, 6-7, 769-798.

Bloemraad, I. 2004, 'Who Claims Dual Citizenship? The Limits of Postnationalism, the Possibilities of Transnationalism, and the Persistence of Traditional Citizenship,' *International Migration Review*, 38, 2, 389-426.

Bosniak, L. 2001, 'Multiple Nationality and the Postnational Transformation of Citizenship,' *Virginia Journal of International Law*, 42, 979-1004.

Brøndsted Sejersen, T. 2008, 'I vow to thee my countries – The expansion of dual citizenship in the 21st Century,' *International Migration Review*, 42, 3, 523-549.

Carens, J. H. 1987, 'Aliens and Citizens: the Case for Open Borders,' *The Review of Politics*, 49, 2, 251-273.

Castles, S. 2005, 'Nation and Empire: Hierarchies of Citizenship in the New Global Order,' *International Politics* 42, 203-224.

Davies, C. A. 1998, *Reflexive Ethnography: a guide to researching selves and others*, London: Routledge.

Escobar, C. 2004, 'Dual Citizenship and Political Participation: Migrants in the Interplay of United States and Colombian Politics,' *Latino Studies*, 2, 45-69.

Faist, T. 2000, 'Transnationalization in International Migration: implications for the study of citizenship and culture,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23, 2, 189-222.

Faist T. 2007, 'The Fixed and Porous Boundaries of Dual Citizenship', in T. Faist (ed.) *Dual Citizenship in Europe: from Nationhood to Societal Integration*, Aldershot UK: Ashgate, 1-44.

Faist T. and Gerdes J. 2008, *Dual Citizenship in an Age of Mobility*. Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Fox, J. 2005, 'Unpacking "Transnational Citizenship",' *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 171-201.

Gamlen, A. 2006, *Diaspora Engagement Policies: What are they, and what kind of states use them?* COMPAS Working Paper No. 32.

Gerdes, J., Faist, T. and Rieple, B. 2007, 'We are all "Republican" now: the Politics of Dual Citizenship in Germany,' in T. Faist (ed.) *Dual Citizenship in Europe: from Nationhood to Societal Integration*, Aldershot UK: Ashgate, 45-76.

Guarnizo, L. E., Portes, A. and Hammer, W. 2003, 'Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants,' *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 6, 1211-1248.

Hammar, T. 1990, *Democracy and the Nation State: Aliens, Denizens and Citizens in a World of International Migration*, Aldershot: Avebury.

Hansen, R. 2001, 'From Subjects to Citizens: Immigration and Nationality Law in the United Kingdom,' in R. Hansen and P. Weil (eds) 2001, *Towards a European Nationality: Citizenship, Immigration and Nationality Law in the EU*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 69-94.

Hansen, R. 2002, 'The Dog That Didn't Bark: Dual nationality in the United Kingdom,' in R. Hansen and P. Weil (eds) 2002, *Dual Nationality, Social Rights and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe*, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 179- 191.

Hansen, R. and Weil, P. (eds) 2001, *Towards a European Nationality: Citizenship, Immigration and Nationality Law in the EU*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hansen R. and Weil P. (eds) 2002, *Dual Nationality, Social Rights and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe*, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Jackson, P. 2001, 'Making Sense of Qualitative Data' in M. Limb and C. Dwyer (eds) *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers*, London: Arnold, 199-214.

Jones-Correa, M. 2001, 'Under Two Flags: Dual nationality in Latin America and its consequences for naturalization in the United States,' *International Migration Review*, 35, 4, 997-1029.

Joppke, C. 2003, *Citizenship between De- and Re-Ethnicization*, *European Journal of Sociology*, 44, 3, 429-458.

Joppke, C. 2010, 'The Inevitable Lightning of Citizenship,' *European Journal of Sociology*, 51, 1, 9-32.

Kadırbeyoğlu, Z. 2007, 'National Transnationalism: Dual Citizenship in Turkey,' in T. Faist (ed.) *Dual Citizenship in Europe: from Nationhood to Societal Integration*, Aldershot UK: Ashgate, 127-146.

Kivisto, P. and Faist, T. 2007, *Citizenship: Discourse, Theory and Transnational Prospects*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Kostakopoulou, D. 2010, 'Matters of Control: Integration Tests, Naturalisation Reform and Probationary Citizenship in the United Kingdom,' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36, 5, 829-846.

Levitt, P. and Glick Schiller, N. 2004, 'Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society', *International Migration Review*, 38, 3, 1002-1039.

Levitt, P. and Jaworsky, N. 2007, 'Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 129-156.

Lindley, A. and Van Hear, N. 2007, *New Europeans on the Move: a preliminary review of the onward migration of refugee with the European Union*, COMPAS Working Paper no 57.

Mateos, P. and Durand, J. 2012, 'Residence vs. Ancestry in Acquisition of Spanish Citizenship: a Netnography Approach,' *Migraciones internacionales*, 6, 4, 9-46.

Mcllwaine, C. 2011a, 'Introduction: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Latin American Migration across Borders' in C. Mcllwaine (ed.) *Cross-Border Migration among Latin Americans*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1-20.

Mcllwaine, C. 2011b, 'Superdiversity, Multiculturalism, and Integration: An Overview of the Latin American Population in London, UK,' in C. Mcllwaine (ed.) *Cross-Border Migration among Latin Americans*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 93-117.

Mcllwaine, C., Camilo Cock, J. and Linneker, B. 2010, *No Longer Invisible: the Latin American Community in London*, Queen Mary, University of London. Available from <http://www.geog.qmul.ac.uk/latinamericansinlondon/publications/index.html> accessed 20/02/2012.

Moreno Fuentes, F. J. 2001, 'Migration and Spanish Nationality Law,' in Hansen, R. and Weil, P. (eds) 2001, *Towards a European Nationality: Citizenship, Immigration and Nationality Law in the EU*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 118-142.

Neveu, C. 2005, 'Discussion: Anthropology and Citizenship,' *Social Anthropology*, 13, 2, 199-202.

Nic Craith, M. 2004, 'Culture and Citizenship in Europe. Questions for Anthropologists,' *Social Anthropology*, 12, 3, 289-300.

OECD 2011, *Naturalisation: a Passport for the Better Integration of Immigrants?* OECD Publishing.

Ong, A. 1999, *Flexible Citizenship: the cultural logics of transnationality*, London: Duke University Press.

Perchinig, B. 2006, 'EU Citizenship and the Status of Third-Country Nationals,' in R. Bauböck (ed.) *Migration and Citizenship: Legal Status, Rights and Political Participation*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 67-82.

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E. and Landolt, P. 1999, 'The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22, 2, 217-237.

Roca iCaparà, N. 2011, 'Young Adults of Latin American Origin in London and Oxford: Identities, discrimination and social inclusion,' COMPAS Working Paper no. 93.

Shore, C. 2004, 'Whither European Citizenship? Eros and Civilization Revisited,' *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7, 1, 27-44.

Smith, M. P. 2007, 'The two faces of transnational citizenship,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30, 6, 1096-1116.

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

Spiro, P. J. 1997, 'Dual Nationality and the Meaning of Citizenship,' *Emory Law Journal*, 46, 4, 1412-1485.

Van Liempt, I. 2011, 'Young Dutch Somalis in the UK: Citizenship, Identities and Belonging in a Transnational Triangle,' *Mobilities*, 6, 4, 569-583.

Vink, M. P. and de Groot, G. R. 2010, 'Citizenship Attribution in Western Europe: International Framework and Domestic Trends,' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36, 5, 713-734.

Wimmer A. and Glick Schiller N. 2002, 'Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences,' *Global Networks: Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 2, 4, 301-334.

Appendix 1

Dissertation Proposal

Being a Dual Citizen: the Case of Latin Americans in London

Aims and Objectives – value of research

Over the last few years there has been a recognition that the traditional model of one person with one citizenship is increasingly being distorted. As people migrate and settle in a new country they will often seek to naturalise without necessarily renouncing their old citizenship and children born into migrant families often have access to multiple citizenships. Furthermore, citizenship through ancestry is seen as one strategy for increased mobility especially within Europe. Thus there are increasing numbers of people with dual or even multiple citizenships. The rise of this phenomenon is in part mediated by state policies that seek to maximise the benefits for states of the relationship with their emigrants. These have included traditional ‘sending’ countries trying to encourage diaspora communities to maintain a link with the national community through remittances, investment, or political engagement.

Nevertheless, dual citizenship does not fit traditional understandings of citizenship and there are still many who remain sceptical about the loyalties of dual citizens. Despite an emerging literature on ‘top-down’ views of multiple citizenship, empirical research on the citizenship practices of the individuals in question remains limited. This is a gap that this dissertation seeks to address.

This research will begin to address this gap by presenting a case study of the citizenship practices of the Latin American migrants living in London. The intention is to investigate individuals’ levels of political engagement through a broad range of citizenship practices such as: voting, political campaigning, lobbying, writing letters to MPs or newspapers, protesting, signing petitions; both in the country of origin and in the UK, in order to understand how or whether gaining another citizenship affects political participation. The ways that these practices are narrated and rationalised by the actors will also be analysed, in order to assess to what extent the ‘view from below’ matches the ‘view from above’.

Working with a Latin American migrant organisation, I will conduct in-depth, semi-structured interviews with people who have dual (or multiple) citizenship. The interview will cover both questions about their citizenship practices in their home countries and in the UK, but also questions as to how and why they decided to take on another citizenship.

Research questions

In this context, the questions that this research will seek to answer are:

- To what extent is citizenship devalued or re-valued through the obtaining of dual/multiple citizenships?
- Are people likely to become more or less politically engaged after gaining another citizenship?
- How do individuals conceptualise their belonging in two political communities? Do their conceptualisations match with state discourses?

- Do people see citizenship as contributing to integration? In which ways?

Brief discussion of literature

For scholars of citizenship the questions raised by dual or multiple citizenship are increasingly important (Faist 2007). In an ever globalising world, the way citizenship is conceptualised is undergoing a transformation (Joppke 2003). The traditional model of people-nation-territory, represented by one citizenship, is increasingly under pressure. Although there have always been different ways of conferring citizenship (broadly based on the *jus sanguinis* or *jus solis* models) there was in the past an acceptance that only having one citizenship was the desired norm (Faist 2007). However, in the last few decades, we have moved from explicit state policies that sought to reduce the occurrence of multiple citizenship, to many places opening up of access to citizenship and allowing multiple membership (Faist 2007). Nevertheless, although a tendency toward more acceptance of dual citizenship does seem to be discernible, states still show a wide variety in their responses to this phenomenon (ibid). Broadly speaking, there are those who see it in a positive light and those who see it as a negative development. The latter argument states that the increased availability of citizenship undermines the value of having political rights in a community, especially when some citizens have an 'exit' option (Blatter 2011). The other side has argued that actually going through the process of gaining another citizenship may actually lead people to become more politically engaged both in their country of origin and in their country of residence (ibid). However, empirical evidence for both arguments remains rather limited (ibid). In part this is because in most countries, due to the way citizens are measured and counted, it is difficult to get an accurate idea of how many people have dual or multiple citizenships (Morjé Howard 2005).

The responses of states usually fall under what is known as diaspora engagement policies (Gamlen 2006). These are policies that extend certain rights to the state's emigrants (such as an external vote) in an attempt to maintain diasporas' engagement with the home country through remittances, or the encouragement of foreign investment (ibid). Although this is usually conceived as a strategy deployed by the developing world, Gamlen (2006) highlights that in fact it these policies are to be found in many different states. This reflects a transnationalisation of both citizenship policies and citizenship practices (Faist 2000), perhaps reflecting the growing interest in transnational identities (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). Similarly in some 'receiving countries' (especially those that espouse multicultural politics) there has been a shift towards seeing naturalisation as a way of promoting integration (Kejzar 2009). Nevertheless, the way this is conceptualised varies between contexts; some see citizenship as the end goal of integration – something that migrants earn through showing their commitment to the community in question (by learning the language, or passing 'cultural' knowledge tests), while others conceptualise the granting of citizenship as a step in the process of engaging people in the polity (Kejzar 2009). Finally, studies on both access to citizenship through ancestry laws (Mateos and Durand 2012), or 'investor' citizenships, provides yet another lens through which we can view multiple citizenship. The concept of 'flexible' citizenship, - of investing in citizenship as a flexible strategy of capital accumulation - undermines ideas of political belonging (Ong 1999). This approach has perhaps more clearly drawn attention to the different hierarchies of ethnicity and cultural difference that are implicit in state policies on citizenship. What is interesting in the case of multiple citizenship is how these different hierarchical regimes intersect and interact.

The Latin American community in London provides a fertile ground for an investigation into multiple citizenship in Britain. This is due to the fact that several countries in Latin America have granted their diaspora the right to vote in national elections, as part of their diaspora engagement policies (McIlwaine et al 2011). Furthermore, McIlwaine, Camilo Cock and Linneker (2010) found that in this community approximately 50% of people had some form of EU citizenship, often British, Spanish or Italian, among others. This raises the interesting dynamic of European citizenship and the mobility that it grants. This group is also of interest in a British context, in that, it falls outside the traditional interest group of Britain (former colonies and commonwealth countries). However, a campaign to have Latin American included as an ethnic category in the census as way of getting more rights and recognition for the community, shows a level of political engagement and a desire for increased visibility (McIlwaine et al 2011). Finally, this study will hopefully build on and contribute to the currently relatively small literature on this group in London (McIlwaine et al 2010, Guarnizo 2008).

Thus this project will seek to contribute to the growing literature on dual/multiple citizenship through an empirical case study of Latin American communities in London. Since many people have to clear considerable bureaucratic hurdles in order to obtain another citizenship, I will be interested to see whether this results in greater participation in either the home country or in Britain. I will also be interested in discovering how this participation (or new membership) is rationalised and narrated by individuals. Additionally, I will investigate to what extent individuals feel that acquiring citizenship has contributed to their integration, particularly if we contrast individuals with Spanish citizenship (where the cultural and linguistic barriers are assumed to be lower) compared to British citizenship. Finally, the research may be able to contribute to the debates around the value of European Union citizenship.

Methods and Timeline

This research will be primarily conducted through the Indo- American Refugee and Migrant Organisation (IRMO), which offers language classes, immigration advice as well as other cultural activities to the Latin American community in South London. Using this organisation as a starting point, I aim to recruit participants with dual citizenship in order to conduct individual semi-structured interviews. These will allow an in-depth exploration of individual practices and the rationalisations or explanations thereof. Hopefully more informal repeat interviews with the same people may be possible. In addition, it may be possible to run one or two focus groups, perhaps on citizenship more generally. In this it may be possible to include those who perhaps do not have an EU-passport but who do have permanent residency, along with those who do have an EU passport, in order to discuss the value of the extra membership.

Since I am already volunteering with this organisation it should be possible to make contacts with potential participants in the next few months. In late May – early June I would begin data collection in earnest. I would aim within a four or five week period to conduct approximately 20 interviews supplemented by more informal conversations. In this period I would also aim to run the focus group. This would leave July and August available for analysis and writing-up.

Potential Supervisor: Pablo Mateos

References

- Blatter, J. 2011, 'Dual Citizenship and Theories of Democracy', *Citizenship Studies*, 15, 6-7, 769-798.
- Faist, T. 2000, 'Transnationalization in International Migration: implications for the study of citizenship and culture,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23, 2, 189-222.
- Faist T. 2007, 'The Fixed and Porous Boundaries of Dual Citizenship', in Faist, T. (ed) *Dual Citizenship in Europe: from Nationhood to Societal Integration*. Aldershot UK: Ashgate, 1-44.
- Gamlen, A. 2006, *Diaspora Engagement Policies: What are they, and what kind of states use them?*, COMPAS Working Paper No. 32.
- Guarnizo, L. E. 2008, *Londres latina: presencia colombiana en la capital británica*. Universidad Zacatecs: Mexico.
- Joppke, C. 2003, *Citizenship between De- and Re-Ethnicization*, Russell Sage Foundation, Working Paper no. 204, 1-28.
- Kejzar, B. 2009, 'Dual Citizenship as an Element of the Integration Process in Receiving Societies: the Case of Slovenia' in Guild, E., Groenendijk, K. and Carrera, S. (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*. Farnham: Ashgate. 129-147.
- Levitt P. and Glick Schiller, N. 2004, 'Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society', *International Migration Review*, 38, 3, 1002-1039.
- Mateos, P. and Durand, J. 2012, 'Residence vs. Ancestry in Acquisition of Spanish Citizenship: a Netnography Approach', *Migraciones internacionales*, 6, 4, 9-46.
- McIlwaine, C., Camilo Cock, J. and Linneker, B. 2010, *No Longer Invisible: the Latin American Community in London*, Queen Mary, University of London. Available from <http://www.geog.qmul.ac.uk/latinamericansinlondon/publications/index.html> accessed 20/02/2012.
- McIlwaine, C., Bermudez, A., Camilo Cock, J., Bejarano Soto, M. C. and Calderon, M. 2011, *Transnational voting practices among Colombian migrants in London and Madrid: The Colombian 2010 Elections from the UK and Spain*, Queen Mary, University of London. Available from <http://www.geog.qmul.ac.uk/latinamericansinlondon/publications/index.html> accessed 20/02/2012.
- Morjé Howard, M. 2005, 'Variation in Dual Citizenship Policies in the Countries of the EU', *International Migration Review*, 39, 3, 697-720.
- Ong, A. 1999, *Flexible Citizenship: the cultural logics of transnationality*, London: Duke University Press.

Appendix 2

Auto-Critique

The idea for this dissertation developed out of my engagement with the Latin American community and a long-standing interest in citizenship and the expansion of dual citizenship. As I began to read up on dual citizenship, it became very apparent that although much was being written about how policies in different states were changing, little was known of why more people were interested in becoming dual citizens nor about the numbers involved. Thus I was interested in trying to capture the 'view from below' and explore how it converged with or contradicted the 'view from above'.

The dissertation that I actually produced ended up moving away from my initial proposal in a number of ways. First the focus shifted from a very specific interest in political activities to a more general interest in the process of naturalising. Although I did ask my participants a number of questions about formal political engagement, it appeared from the pilot interviews that many people were disengaged from formal politics. I wanted to try to uncover other more informal political practices (such as demonstrating) and although with some people this was possible, I felt at the end that one would need a longer time frame or multiple discussions with individuals to try to draw out this engagement. Interestingly, although I had always intended to discuss the procedure of naturalisation, in some cases this line of questioning ended up producing much reflection on immigration policy and the state.

In my initial proposal I had also intended to consider to what extent naturalising contributed to feelings of integration. Although this is an extremely interesting and important area for future research, I decided in discussion with my supervisor, that it would be too much to cover in the scope of this project. In general, as the project continued I had to think carefully about which debates on citizenship I could contribute to. There are numerous different debates, in part because citizenship is written about from so many different disciplinary perspectives. These debates often intersect or overlap but may not always use the same language.

The thesis ended up focusing particularly on citizenship and mobility, a focus which does not appear to have featured very often in discussions on citizenship. With hindsight it would have been interesting to talk to people more specifically about the statuses of different members of their families. This came up in a number of conversations and it seems that dual citizenship as part of a familial strategy of chain migration may be another important and overlooked part of the discussion.

On a practical level, I did not manage to recruit as many people who had citizenship through ancestry as I would have liked. This is because there was not such an obvious entry point for these individuals. Finally, towards the end of the process, I changed the title of the project in order to better capture what I thought the key features of the dissertation were.

Appendix 3

Interview Schedule

Where are you from?	De dónde es?
Where were you born?	Dónde nació?
Are you married?	Esta casado/a?
Who do you live with here in London?	Con quien vive aquí en Londres?
What do you do?	En qué trabaja?
How long have you lived in England/London?	Hace cuanto que vive en Inglaterra/Londres?
Why did you move to England?	Por qué se mudo a Inglaterra?
Do you have family here? Who?	Tiene familia aquí? Quien?

Transnationalism and Mobility

Do you still have family in X? (X=country of origin)	Tiene todavía familia en X?
How do you maintain contact with your family in X? How often do you speak to/write to them?	Como mantiene Ud. contacto con su familia en X? Con qué frecuencia habla/se escribe con ellos?
Do you send money or gifts to your family in X?	Manda Ud. dinero o regalos a su familia en X?
Have you lived in another country (apart from X) before coming to England? If so, where? For how long? Why did you leave Y? (Y=previous third country of residence)	Ha vivido en otro país (aparte de X) antes de venir Inglaterra? Dónde? Por cuanto tiempo? Porqué se fue de Y?
Do you still maintain contact with people in Y? Do you visit Y?	Todavía mantiene contacto con gente en Y? Va de visita a Y?
Do you intend to stay in England permanently? (or to go back to X, or go to another country?)	Tiene Ud. la intención de quedarse permanente en Inglaterra? (o de volver a X, o ir a otro país?)
Where do you want to live when you retire?	Dónde quiere vivir cuando se jubile?

Citizenship

How many Passports do you have? From where?	Cuantos pasaportes tiene? De dónde?
What advatanges are there in having 2 passports? OR (are there advantages in having two passports?) <i>Accessing social security, pension</i>	Qué ventajas tiene tener dos pasaportes? (Hay ventajas en tener dos pasaportes?) <i>acceso a asistencia social o pensión/jubilación</i>
When did you get British/Spanish nationality?	Cuando obtuvo la nacionalidad británica/española..? [→ Nacionalizarse?]
Why did you apply for British/Spanish/Italian citizenship?	Por que solicitó la ciudadanía británica/española/italiana?
How did you get nationality? By residency?	Como obtuvo la nacionalidad? Por residencia o..?
How easy or complicated was the process?	Como de fácil o complicado fue el proceso?
Did you consider giving up your X citizenship?	Ha pensado en renunciar a su ciudadanía de X?
What nationalities do your children have?	Qué nacionalidad/es tienen sus hijos?
Would you have still got British/Spanish.. citizenship if it had meant giving up X citizenship?	Si hubiera tenido que renunciar a su ciudadanía de X para obtener la ciudadanía británica/ española, lo habría hecho?
When/ in which occasions do you use your British passport? When do you use your X passport?	Cuando/ En que ocasiones utiliza Ud. su pasaporte británico? Cuando utiliza Ud. su pasaporte X?
Have you ever had any difficulties using your British/Spanish passport?	Ha tenido alguna vez problemas o dificultades utilizando su pasaporte británico/español ..?
When asked for your nationality (for example on a form) what do you say?	Cuando le preguntan por su nacionalidad (por ejemplo en un formulario) qué pone Ud?

Political-media engagement

Do you read the British news? -listen to (British) radio? -watch British TV? How often?	Lee Ud. las noticias británicas? Escucha la radio británica? Ve la televisión británica? Con qué frecuencia?
--	---

<p>Do you read the news from X?</p> <p>-listen to the radio from X?</p> <p>-watch X TV?</p> <p>How often?</p>	<p>Lee Ud. las noticias de X?</p> <p>Escucha la radio de X?</p> <p>Ve la televisión de X?</p> <p>Con qué frecuencia?</p>
<p>Are you interested in politics here or in X?</p> <p>Why? Why not?</p>	<p>Le interesa la política en Inglaterra o en X?</p> <p>Por qué /por qué no?</p>
<p>Have you ever voted in England? Why?</p> <p>Did you vote in the mayoral elections</p>	<p>Ha votado alguna vez en Inglaterra? Por qué?</p> <p>Votó en las elecciones de alcalde de Londres?</p>
<p>Have you ever voted in X?</p>	<p>Tiene experiencia de votar en X?</p>
<p>Are you a member of a political party or trade union the UK or X?</p>	<p>Es Ud. socio de alguno partido político o sindicato aquí o en X?</p>
<p>Are there any specific political issues that concern you?</p> <p>OR (Which political issues concern you the most?)</p> <p><i>E.g. housing, minimum wage, immigration policy, school/education quality,</i></p>	<p>Le preocupan algunos temas/cuestiones políticas específicas?</p> <p>OR (Cuales son las temas/cuestiones de política que mas le preocupan?)</p> <p><i>Vivienda, salario mínimo, política de inmigración, calidad de educación</i></p>
<p>How do you find life in London?</p> <p>Have you ever experienced discrimination?</p>	<p>Cómo le parece la vida en Londres?</p> <p>Tiene experiencia de discriminación?</p>
<p>Is there anything you would like to add?</p>	<p>Algo mas que quiere decir?</p>

Appendix 4

Consent form

Esta investigación es para mi tesis de máster en 'Global Migration' en UCL (University College London). Esta investigación trata sobre migración, ciudadanía, y participación política.

Como parte de mi análisis, es posible que cite cosas que Usted dice en mi tesis. Pero omitiré su nombre así que no será posible relacionar su cita con Usted.

Si tiene alguna duda o pregunta, o si quiere retirar de la investigación, me puede contactar en cualquier momento.

Por teléfono: 07929 566 020 o por correo electrónico: h.mccarthy.11@ucl.ac.uk.

Muchas gracias por su participación!

Nombre y

Apellido:.....

Correo

electrónico

Teléfono

Si, quiero participar en la investigación.

Firma:

Appendix 5

Extract of Interview Transcript

Ana, Ecuador-Spain, 21.05.2012, cafe in Vauxhall

H = Helen, I = Interviewee

[conversation started outside the café in which she told me she was going to visit Spain in a week's time to see her husband and her baby daughter]

00.00

H: Is your mother also in Spain?

I: Yes.

H: The whole family is there?

I: No, my father is here in London. Me and my father.

H: So how did you decide that the two of you would come here?

I: So we came originally from Ecuador to Spain. So for a while we were all together. Then 12 years ago my parents got divorced and then my dad for a while went back to Ecuador. But then from Ecuador he decide to come to London because the situation wasn't good in Spain. So the rest of us, my sister, and me and my mum carried on living in Spain. But then I got married and I had my little girl. And the situation in Spain got worse. I took maternity leave and when I wanted to go back to my job my company had gone bankrupt.

01.44

I: And it was difficult to find work. And since my dad was here, I thought I would take the opportunity. And he said he could help me start off here and find some work. And that was the decision. My husband is not here with me because he doesn't have a Spanish passport. My daughter yes, she's Spanish.

H: How long were you in Spain?

I: 8 years.

H: Did everyone come to Spain together?

I: No, my dad came first in 2000 and then the rest of us came in 2004.

H: So he was there, and he got citizenship?

I: Yes.

H: And then he was able to do...

I: Family re-unification. So we all came to Spain. And then we all did the application for citizenship apart from my mum. My mum doesn't have Spanish nationality.

02.56

H: Why not?

I: "Porque ella, siempre su idea era ya no irse a ningún otro parte. Decía de España volveré solo a mi país, volveré a Ecuador. No quiere ir a otro sitio."

H: So she's happy only having comuntaria

I: She doesn't have 'comuntaria' just legal residency. The comuntaria is another application. It's when, if I'm Spanish and a foreigner marries me then they would have the comuntaria.

H: Ok

I: Yes. We as Ecuadorians or Colombians or whatever we have legal residency and work visa.

03.40

H: And your husband is from Ecuador?

I: Yes.

H: And you met in Spain?

I: Yes, we met in Spain. He's from the capital of Ecuador, and I'm from the south of Ecuador, 13 hours away, very far (laughs)

H: the distances in South America are very far.

[pouring the tea, talking about the type of tea]

H: And did you grow up in the south of Ecuador?

I: No, my mum's from the south but my dad's from the north-east. I was born in the south but I grew up in the north-east, where my father's from.

05.13

H: How long been here?

I: I arrived the 21st of February, exactly 3 months today. I'm getting lost in time.

H: And your daughter is still little?

I: Yes my daughter, she's a year and a half, so she's very little. That's why I didn't bring her because there are not crèches and it's very difficult.

H: here crèches are all ..

I: private

H: and expensive..

I: Yes very expensive! (pause) It's nice my tea.

H: Where do you work?

I: I work in a hotel in the nights, checking the bathrooms, when people go out partying, very drunk, so I have to be there alert in case anything happens. So that's why I said I don't really like it.

H: and it's nighttimes?

I: Yes, so I work 6 in the evening till 1 or 2 in the morning.

06.59

H: And the reason you picked England was because of your dad being here?

I: Yes it's always easier to have someone to give you a hand at the beginning. It's important. And with work it's the same. Someone he knew helped me get the job in the hotel. (Pause) Before I would never have thought of coming to England. But because of the crisis and also because I wanted to learn in English, I took the opportunity.

H: So you didn't really think of going anywhere else?

I: The truth is no. Maybe at one moment I thought of Switzerland because there are lots of opportunities but not having anyone there. Or else maybe the US, but my husband doesn't like it. In the US, yes, I have lots of family there but my husband doesn't like it. Maybe to visit, but not to live.

08.12

H: Is your husband working in Spain?

I: No he's unemployed which is why I came.

H: difficult times at the moment in Spain.

I: Yes Spain is really in the crisis badly. I know a lot of my people who have lost everything. They paid 70,000 -80,000 in mortgages and now they've taken the houses and they're left with the debt. It's very difficult.

H: Is your husband living with your mother?

I: No my mother is very, very sick. She lives in a home with special care. My brother is living with my father-in-law and my husband is living separately with my daughter.

H: Do you other family here?

I: No just my dad. We're a small family. I don't have many aunts and uncles. We're a very small family. And the others are all in Ecuador or in the US.

H: Do you keep in touch with them?

I: With those in the US? Yes we keep in touch via skype or facebook with my cousins.

H: and those in Ecuador?

I: Yes. We also ring them or they ring to find out about my mother. So we speak a lot. At least we give each other a bit of moral support.

10.22

H: Do you ever send money to them in Ecuador?

I: No, money, no.

H: Presents?

I: Yes. We send presents for special occasions or when someone we know is travelling we send something with them, souvenirs or clothes or postcards. But money, no. They don't need it.

H: And is it the first time..

I: Yes, it's the first time I'm going back to Spain in 3 months and really looking forward to seeing my daughter. I'm so excited, I don't know how I'm going to feel when I see her. I'll die of emotion.

H: And your husband is applying for Spanish nationality?

I: Yes but he's still got a long, long time to wait. It takes about 2 years and he submitted his papers at the end of February of 2012. But we're trying to get him a permission to work in the European Union. But they say that London is not included.

H: It's included in the Union, but maybe because it's not in Schengen. England isn't in the Schengen area

I: This is a negative point. The idea was that he would submit his papers and then he could come. But if they're going to ask for his papers, he doesn't have them.

H: But maybe he can come with a visa through you?

I: But if he comes with a visa from me, he can't get a national insurance number nor open a bank account. So he wouldn't be able to work. I already asked about that in many places. There are also these little notes, exceptions, he could come.. but he wouldn't be able to work.

H: It's complicated.

13.23

I: Yes because if he came what could he do if he couldn't work? Well study, which also would be good, but to study you need money.

H: Is he applying for nationality on the basis of residency or because of being married to you?

I: "Por las dos cosas. Por un lado, estamos tramitando la comuntaria. Pero primero teníamos que traer nuestra partida de matrimonio de Ecuador y registrarla en España. Entonces esta haciendo eso de momento."

H: You got married in Ecuador?

I: Yes. "la ilusion de casarnos en Ecuador sin pensar que la consecuencia era que el no pueda obtener la comuntaria. Ahora en Noviembre se hacen los dos años de haber metido ese papel, esperaremos. Y aparte esta tramitando por ser residente legal en España la doble nacionalidad, aparte."

H: But it takes a while.

I: Yes it does. 2 years the nationality, and it will have been 2 years since we gave in the marriage certificate. "no sé que pensar. Hay veces que todo se pone tan complicado. Ya buscaremos la manera". But he's received two offers of work in Holland. So maybe after we'll go to Holland. I don't know. Maybe I'll have to go. My husband is a welder, and he's very good. It's his profession but he's been studying and getting postgraduates.

15.29

H: And the process for you to get nationality, how was it?

I: "No, no fue complicado. Porque la ley manda si uno ya lleva residiendo en España 2 años sin cometer ningún delito ni nada, tu puedes comenzar a tramitar. Entonces pedimos la cita, presentamos todo la documentación necesario y fue esperar dos años. Ya llego la carta diciendo que estaba aprobado y llega el día de ir. Y luego sacas el DNI español y pasaporte español y ya... Fácil, es fácil."

H: so it's 2 years of residency and 2 years of waiting.

I: Yes but there are many of us, I have a friend who's been living in Spain 12 years and only recently applied for it. So there are people who either they don't have time or they don't want to get it many reasons. So not everyone has the double nationality. Not everyone.

16.44

H: what advantages are there?

I: "La doble? Por ejemplo en este caso nos han abiertos nueva puertas de poder viajar a otro países. Porque muchas personas que han estado mal en España si no tenían la doble, les han tocado volver a

Ecuador porque no tenían otra posibilidad. No podían irse ni a Estados Unidos ni a otra parte. Eso son las ventajas. O si quiero estudiar en otro país. También. Mas fácil.”

H: And did you think about getting nationality before you came to Spain?

I: “No, no. Una vez que estuvimos en España averiguamos todo. Porque mi padre un poco descuidado. No averiguó bien. Entonces cuando estuvimos todos, preguntamos y ya de ahí la decisión de sacarnos la doble. No en Ecuador no sabia nada.”