

CRAFTING COLOMBIANIDAD: RACE, CITIZENSHIP AND THE  
LOCALIZATION OF POLICY IN PHILADELPHIA

---

A Dissertation  
Submitted to  
the Temple University Graduate Board

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

---

by  
Diane R. Garbow  
July 2016

Examining Committee Members:

Judith Goode, Advisory Chair, Department of Anthropology  
Naomi Schiller, Department of Anthropology  
Melissa Gilbert, Department of Geography and Urban Studies  
Ana Y. Ramos-Zayas, External Member, City University of New York

©  
Copyright  
2016

by

Diane R. Garbow  
All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

In contrast to the municipalities across the United States that restrict migration and criminalize the presence of immigrants, Philadelphia is actively seeking to attract immigrants as a strategy to reverse the city's limited economic and political importance caused by decades of deindustrialization and population loss. In 2010, the population of Philadelphia increased for the first time in six decades. This achievement, widely celebrated by the local government and in the press, was only made possible through increased immigration. This dissertation examines how efforts to attract migrants, through the creation of localized policy and institutions that facilitate incorporation, transform assertions of citizenship and the dynamics of race for Colombian migrants.

The purpose of this research is to analyze how Colombians' articulations of citizenship, and the ways they extend beyond juridical and legal rights, are enabled and constrained under new regimes of localized policy. In the dissertation, I examine citizenship as a set of performances and practices that occur in quotidian tasks that seek to establish a sense of belonging. Without a complex understanding of the effects of local migration policy, and how they differ from the effects of federal policy, we fail to grasp how Philadelphia's promotion of migration has unstable and unequal effects for differentially situated actors. This becomes evermore salient as increased migration wrought through local policy efforts guarantees that Philadelphia will continue to uneasily shift away from its Black-White racial polarity.

Second, I explore how the racialization of Colombians is transformed by the dynamics of localized policy in Philadelphia, where their experiences of marginalization

as Latinos belies the construction of immigrants as a highly valued group, and shaped by the particularities of Colombian history, the imperial nature of US-Colombia relations, and shifting geopolitics among Latin American nations. The dissertation highlights how Colombians seek to meaningfully distinguish themselves from other Latinos by examining the ways changes in Latin America have shaped and continue to shape the politics of race in the US, and thus how Colombians navigate and produce the boundaries between groups.

The dissertation contextualizes Colombian migration within three significant shifts in the contemporary US.: 1) the increasing attempts of states, municipalities and cities to craft their own immigration policies, specifically declining cities attempting to rebound from population loss and deindustrialization, 2) the emergence of Latinos as the largest demographic minority group and their increasing heterogeneity with respect to race, legal status, class and national origin and 3) heightened attention to citizenship as legal status and performances and practices of belonging. This research contributes to the theorization of racial formations and citizenship by providing critical information about local immigration policies as transforming intra- and inter-group relations, thus offering an analysis of Philadelphia as a new immigrant destination.

For my mother, Gladys  
Siempre con amor y gratitud

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My committee at Temple University deserves the utmost thanks, appreciation and recognition for their encouragement and feedback that allowed me to formulate and advance this project. Thank you Judy, Naomi and Melissa. I am indebted to Judy Goode for her guidance and intellectual engagement throughout the years. Naomi Schiller's unwavering commitment to provide me feedback on these pages and other endeavors helped my intellectual development. Melissa Gilbert ensured my work and writing remain truly interdisciplinary and intelligible beyond anthropology. Ana Ramos-Zayas went above and beyond as an outside reader to fully engage with my thoughts, ideas, arguments and sentences, pushing me to think and rethink the material. Her incisive comments have re-inspired my writing.

I cannot possibly lost all of the many, many folks who allowed me into their lives.

Thank you to Deb Thomas, whose courses as an undergraduate at Duke ignited my passion for anthropology, and whose journey also lead to Philadelphia where I was welcomed once again into the classroom. Her encouragement for sharp critical thinking and rethinking are woven in these pages. Ron Webb offered me an intellectual home in Latin American Studies at Temple, which provide the opportunity to think through my ideas as I taught. His kindness and mentorship extended far beyond.

The Graduate School provided the essential support at the beginning and end of my doctoral career in the form of a Future Faculty Fellowship and a Dissertation Completion Grant. Research during the summers was made possible by SROP-AGEP and FSRI fellowships through the Graduate School. The Center for the Humanities at Temple provided financial and emotional support to present my work. The feedback on an earlier

version of Chapter 8 allowed me to incorporate the thoughtful comments and provocative questions from my interlocutors at our bimonthly seminars.

Thank you to Lorraine Savage and the Writing Center. Working there offered me the opportunity to reframe my philosophies and approaches to teaching, writing and editing. Writing retreats offered the much needed physical and mental space to tackle these chapters. My writing group, whose thoughtful and detailed feedback, spirited discussions and wonderful friendship, supported me throughout this experience. Many thanks to Jade Kim, Danielle Scherer, Taylor Benjamin-Britton, Felicidad Garcia and Sendy Guerrier Alcidonis.

My colleagues and cohort members in anthropology Qingyan Ma, Brooke Bocast and Brendan Tuttle contributed to this project in remarkable and occasionally subtle ways for which they may not even be aware. Nydia, mil gracias for always helping me keep things in perspective along the way. Thanks to Eva, Jesse and Autumn for being the consummate colleagues.

To mis colegas de lejos, mil gracias. Our overlapping but distinct interests helped me to think about my work in new ways. Pilar Hernandez Escontrias thank you for your unwavering sense of justice in scholarship. Sharing with you has been so intellectually and emotionally generative! Almita Miranda and Estefania Ponti, our check-ins provided such a wonderful space to vent, be accountable and support one another. I am lucky to get through this together with you both. Melissa Abad, sharing time and research renewed so many resolves about the strange and fascinating place Philadelphia is and how crucial it is to study immigration in “new” destinations. Our too infrequent phone calls always reenergized me when I needed it most.

Love and thanks knows no bounds for the friends I have made during this process. Sharing strength, resilience, perseverance, and joy with my Sister Circle gave me life. Gracias to Shari, Lacinda and Jeana, along with my Fab Five members of Corinne, Laura, Biany and Brittany. To my Doctoras Castro and Porterfield, your success has kept me inspired long after you left Philadelphia and every time I get to see you in person I am so thankful for our friendship. Sahar Sadeghi, your vibrancy and commitment to critical scholarship and conversation are priceless. Karissa Patberg so much appreciation for being my partner in doing what seemed impossible: completing a triathlon. Your patience and faith helped me realize that I could do small things and big things. In training I learned that the biggest hurdle was my own emotions and that has become my go to metaphor for completing the dissertation. Sally Gould Taylor, I have learned perhaps the most from you about never eschewing nonacademic interests and being the consummate anthropologist at every moment and in every space. Your unflappability and perseverance is always astounding. To my anthropologist and frictive kin, Brittany, this journey is and has always been ours. Countless days and nights were spent discussing and debating everything from anthropology (the good the bad and the spectacular) to the profundities of pop culture for which we share an unabashed love. You deserve multiple mentions! Thursday afternoons, after we ended classes for the week, provided the perfect occasion for Sally, Brittany and I to solidify our lifelong friendships beyond Gladfelter/Ritter Hall.

Emily Bauman, Lena Katsnelson and Irina Kobylevsky your enduring friendship means the world to me as our time spent together on my visits to back home to New York

were always the best and brightest. I am lucky to have been able to grow up and to continue to keep growing with such fierce and successful friends.

The unwavering support and encouragement of my family throughout my education compelled me to seek out my doctorate and succeed. Thanks to my father Bruce, for instilling in me hard work and sacrifice and for never being satisfied with simple answers. From my mom, Gladys, I learned most of all about human connection and navigating cultures. I strive to match your warmth, compassion, generosity, and perceptiveness everyday. Thank you for giving me these tools. Brian, my brother and best friend (bffaeabf), every phone conversation, text message and inside joke makes everyday a pleasure. Weekends spent together in Penn's library while we overlapped in Philadelphia are some of my greatest memories. Who would have thought that we would have that much fun studying and writing? Only with you. I could only have done this with you at my side.

To Patrick, mi amor. Your partnership has allowed me to flourish and stay strong through this journey. Your sharp editorial eye has shaped every good sentence that I let you read in these pages. Your patience, kindness and emotional support helped me keep going. Spending time with you is my very favorite thing to do and now we go onward to write our next chapter together.

## PREFACE

In it is common in anthropology to refer to the global movement of people as “migration”, and the people themselves as “migrants” who are compelled to “migrate.” In the dissertation I primarily use these terms when discussing Colombians in Philadelphia. De Genova argues that using the terms migrants and migrations recuperates the processual sense of migration, not as *immigration* with fixed geographic and temporal ends (2005). However I occasionally use “immigration” and “immigration” policy at points throughout the chapters to call attention to the ways that the state, and local actors more commonly refer to these processes and people. In particular, policy is almost always referred to as being “immigration policy” but I purposefully use “migration policy” at points during the dissertation to similarly recuperate the processual sense of migration. Despite the fact that dominant understandings in government and policy posit that “immigration” is a singular, and one-directional event, “migration policy,” particularly the kinds inclusive or welcoming policies that Philadelphia has sought to enact in order to attract migrants, refers to policies that do not simply deal with the entry of migrants and their membership in the nation-state, that encompass the broader social, political, civil and economic rights of migrants.

Similarly throughout the dissertation I refer to my interlocutors and informants as Colombian migrants, Colombians, Colombianos or Colombianas. The use of these multiple terms produces intentional slippages that speak to the ways in which Colombians in Philadelphia are, have always been and continue to be shaped by the circumstances in Colombia before and after they leave.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vi
PREFACE.....	x
CHAPTER	
1. THE NEW MEANINGS OF MIGRATION: COLOMBIANOS EN PHILADELPHIA.....	1
2. GLOBALIZING PHILADELPHIA: IMMIGRATION AND THE POLITICAL ECONOMIC TRAJECTORY OF PHILADELPHIA.....	33
3. STRAINS OF MIGRATION: COLOMBIA HERE AND THERE, THEN AND NOW .....	77
4. FROM THE FEDERAL TO THE LOCAL: NEW STRANDS OF US IMMIGRATION POLICY .....	128
5. WHAT LIES BENEATH: THE SPECTER OF DEPORTATION AND THE HIDDEN REALITIES IN THE “IMMIGRANT FIRENDLY” CITY.....	183
6. CITIZENSHIP BEYOND LEGALITY: PERFORMANCES AND PRACTICES OF BELONGING .....	220
7. CONSTRUYENDO DIFERENCIAS, CONSTRUCTING DIFFERENCES: RACIALIZATION AND LATINO CONTRADISTINCTION .....	265

8. TRANSATIONAL PASSIONS: REINVENTING THE NATION, AFFECT AND COLOMBIANIDAD.....	307
9. CONCLUSION.....	345
REFERENCES CITED.....	357

## CHAPTER 1

## THE NEW MEANINGS OF MIGRATION: COLOMBIANOS EN PHILADELPHIA

*I believe this is the next great international city, a destination city for world travelers, tourists and those looking to make a new life in a great American city. All this points to one single fact, that the immigrants have only enhanced this great city and state, and they were the reason why Philadelphia bumped Phoenix, Arizona back to No. 6 in terms of population. I don't believe it's a coincidence that we surpassed Phoenix as a result of an increasing immigration population. Philadelphia can no longer be viewed with a traditional black and white construct. The spirit of this city and country was born of immigrants, built on a foundation of hard work, fueled by optimism and bolstered by an unwavering belief that our lives can be better here in America and specifically here in Philadelphia. In closing, one thing is clear. If we are to continue our ascent as one of America's great destination cities, we must welcome those coming from a broad cross-section of the world to help comprise our very diverse Philadelphia mosaic. If we want to showcase our great city by hosting a World Cup, an Olympics or other significant national and international event, it is imperative that we present ourselves to the world as a truly great international city.*

Rich Negrin, Director and Deputy Mayor for Administration and Coordination for the City of Philadelphia  
Philadelphia City Council Meeting June 26, 2011

In contrast to the municipalities across the United States that restrict migration and criminalize the presence of immigrants, Philadelphia is actively seeking to attract immigrants as a strategy to enhance the city's competitive position in the global economy. Transformed by decades of post-industrial decline, the loss of manufacturing and six decades of population loss eroded the city's tax base and created ripple waves of concern about reduced federal redistribution of funding, deep poverty and a bifurcated labor market. These economic and demographic woes combined with City Council and Mayoral aspirations to restructure and rescale Philadelphia as a highly competitive global urban economy. Downtown development projects, tourism campaigns, gentrification projects to convince suburbanites to move back to the city, and efforts to draw business

and international capital persisted as the avenues through which local government, city boosters, and public-private partnerships sought revitalize Philadelphia in order to better attract financial and human capital to be and to seem more “global.” These efforts, while particular to Philadelphia, largely mirrored similar neoliberal strategies at work in other major US cities.

In 2000, a novel proposal to seek immigrants emerged through the partnership between Councilman James Kenney and the Pennsylvania Economy League (PEL). In City Council, Kenney called on fellow members and the mayor to create the Office for New Philadelphians as part of a broader “Plan to Attract New Philadelphian” drawing from a research report authored by the PEL five years earlier. While the PEL explicitly advocated for “desirable” high-skilled professional workers, Kenney maintained that all migrants were desirable resident, especially service economy workers could contribute to Philadelphia. In the subsequent City Council hearings, champions of immigration argued that the attraction of migrants offered the most tenable, and economically productive, solution to urban concerns. Though the specifics of the plan, including the Office for New Philadelphians, were derailed by lack of interest from Mayor Street and heightened attention to national security after the attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>, the discourses about the potential of migrants to transform the city persisted.

In 2010, the population of Philadelphia increased for the first time in six decades. This achievement, widely celebrated by the local government and in the press, was only made possible through increased immigration. In the decade in between, the meanings of migration were being reworked by local politicians and public-private partnerships through local policies that protected the rights of immigrants (city employees are

forbidden to ask residents about immigration status) and which oversaw the establishment of institutions (the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians), implementation of services (language access programs for municipal services), and creation of programs (naturalization courses, business training courses) that attract, welcome and incorporate migrants for the sake of economic development. These material strategies constructed a vision of and discourses about an “immigrant-friendly” city. These local policies of Philadelphia are inclusive in the sense that they seek to include, attract and welcome migrants into the social fabric of the city, its institutions and the labor market. The policies and the discourses that support them also valorize immigrants in the sense that attracting migrants to Philadelphia holds unparalleled significance for certain local actors and the presence of migrants becomes constructed as a valuable resource for Philadelphia.

While most scholarly discussions of immigration policy pay careful attention to reform and development of new policies at the national level, this dissertation offers an analysis of the localization of immigration policy. Changes in mid-1990s policy reform granted new authority to local and state governments to partner with the federal government to tackle immigration enforcement. These changes lay dormant for nearly a decade, but growing anti-immigrant sentiment and xenophobia in the post-9/11 moment converged with frustrations at the failure of the federal government to pass comprehensive immigration reform in 2005. After 2005, with a newfound resolution to deal with immigration on their own, states and cities increasingly created their own policies independent from the federal government.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Since 2005, nearly 370 local governments have proposed or implemented policies to address issues of immigration, specifically undocumented immigration (Walker and Leitner 2011).

Though a small number of scholars have examined the rise and consequences of local immigration policies, their analyses are singularly focused on the restrictive measures—laws seek to stop the flow of new immigrants by restricting who can legally be present in a locality—and punitive measures—laws that create punishments for undocumented migrants in order to drive them out—being passed across the US (Jones 2012; Coleman 2007b; Varsanyi 2008a, 2008b; Dick 2011; cf Leitner and Walker 2011). Harsh laws like those passed in Arizona and Alabama are more numerous and draw a justifiable share of media attention, but inclusive policies pass with regularity. Recently, Baltimore, Dayton and Detroit have followed Philadelphia to create their own initiatives to attract immigrants.

While local policies can easily be more inclusive than federal ones, there are both obstacles to their passage and limitations for the migrants who still experience marginalization within these cities. Even though local policies can be more inclusive, restrictive and punitive approaches to immigration that emphasize enforcement have become dominant and retrenched over the past thirty years. While the inclusive policies of Philadelphia offer a modicum of protection, they do not combat the evermore-frightening realities of detention and deportation that prevail. Inclusive policies do not undo the criminalization of undocumented migration and the pervasive racialization of Latinos. Nevertheless, understanding localization fully entails understanding how policies and programs can both include or exclude migrants, can encourage and recruit migrants or restrict migrants and attempt to push them out.

Juxtaposing these efforts of inclusion against the other vein of localization, exclusionary anti-immigrant measures, shows that in Philadelphia the creation of local

policies to encourage migration emerge both out neoliberal strategies for economic development and out of broader changes in federal immigration policy that has allowed for the proliferation of local policies. This dissertation examines of how localization works when cities actively recruit immigrants by focusing on the experiences of Colombian migrants in Philadelphia. The focus on Colombians migration brings a series of complicated processes into sharp relief in order to understand social transformations under new regimes of local policy.

### Colombians in Philadelphia

First, as Colombian migrants are comparatively more middle-class with higher education levels than any other Latino group (Pew Hispanic Center 2010), they have the opportunity to position themselves as upwardly mobile actors in the city's policies and projects aimed at immigrants. While these trends may be true of the whole, Colombian migrants in Philadelphia have varied experiences with class, education and upward mobility in both in their nation of origin and current home. These differences are manifest through variegated experiences in the labor market, different legal statuses, length of residency, and different education levels attained for Colombian migrants who continue or complete their educations in the US. That is to say both characterization hold true, while Colombians may have higher educational attainment and experience the relative safety of middle class status more often compared to other Latinos in the US, their experiences and socioeconomic positions run the entire spectrum from small-business owners to domestic laborers to unemployed or underemployed.

Relatedly many Colombians experienced downward mobility upon migration as work experience, credentials and education in Colombia did not translate to similar

opportunities in the US and accented or non-native English language skills similarly marked them as foreign and hence inferior—a common experience for many migrants. Nevertheless potentially middle-class Colombians can and are conceptualized as the “desirable” kind of migrants but this valorization can also create social distances between them and other Latino groups, specifically Puerto Ricans who are not categorized as migrants and thus left out of the city’s policies to attract migrants while they are also racialized as the “undesirable,” dependent, urban underclass.

### *Race, Space and Settlement*

Second, it is the racialization of space in Philadelphia and the relationships between Colombians and other Latinos in Philadelphia that make Colombians a particularly revelatory group through which to understand social transformations enabled by local policies to attract migrants. The first wave of Colombian migrants arrived in Philadelphia in the late 1970s and throughout the mid 1980s as primarily urban, middle-class and professional migrants escaped the repercussions of the enduring civil war, *La Violencia*. Those from the first wave joined the existing Puerto Rican community in North Philadelphia neighborhoods and joined them in the available positions within the service industry and the last remaining vestiges of manufacturing.

Since the 1950s, Philadelphia has maintained the third largest Puerto Rican population of any mainland US city (following New York and Chicago) and remains important destination for Puerto Ricans migrating to the mainland. Between the 1960s and 1980s urban renewal projects displaced Puerto Rican residents from the Spring Garden neighborhood, forcing families to move east and north to join small, existing enclaves in North Central Philadelphia. These enclaves expanded and coalesced around

5th Street, which became the main business corridor in the Latino spaces of North Philadelphia.

While the Puerto Rican population has historically been the largest Latino group in Philadelphia, in the 1970s and 1980s, Cuban, Dominican and Colombian communities grew in both through direct migration and secondary migration from New York. By the 1980s, Colombians became the second largest Latino group behind Puerto Ricans. They settled into the available space on neighborhoods that were rapidly transitioning from predominantly White to Latino, in areas of North Philadelphia that were reeling from the turmoil of the drug epidemic and a shifting urban economy. These circumstances shaped the racialization of Colombians as distinct from other Latinos as they reinforced stigmas of drug trafficking and violence that were associated with Colombia. As Puerto Rican possessed US citizenship and experienced divergent forms of racialization, some Colombians learned to navigate the racial hierarchy of Philadelphia by embracing the notions of Puerto Rican inferiority. Despite similar experiences and shared space, there were limited pan-Latino alliances.

The second wave of Colombian migration began in the late 1990s and early 2000s, coinciding with Philadelphia's first immigration initiatives, as middle and lower-class Colombians left during a period of heightened drug trafficking, paramilitary violence and economic depression. Yet while the Colombian population continued to grow it was eclipsed by the influx of a large number of Dominican migrants in the 1990s, both directly from the island and those relocating from New York City. Dominican migration shifted the demographic balance in North Philadelphia coupled with rapid

Mexican migration to South Philadelphia during the 1990s to position Colombians as the fourth largest Latino group, an often overlooked and largely invisible community.

Both waves of Colombian migrants settled into North Philadelphia neighborhoods of a city that had become increasingly segregated by race and class in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Geographically situated between and Black neighborhoods of North Philadelphia, Latino neighborhoods create literal buffer zone that mirrors the inbetweenness of Latinos' location between Blackness and Whiteness in the US racial order (Goode and Schneider 1994; De Genova 2005). Though Colombians have become anchored in Latino space they remain spread out and diffuse. There is no specific Colombian neighborhood or enclave; Colombians remained sprinkled throughout the North Philadelphia neighborhoods with the largest concentrations in Juniata Park, Feltonville, Hunting Park, Oxford Circle, Lawncrest/Summerdale and Olney. The influxes of other Latin American immigrants have diversified North Philadelphia since the 1990s and the daily routines of Colombians involve the navigation of social space and neighborhood institutions with other Latinos.

#### *US-Colombia Relations*

Finally, Colombians represent a distinctive case of immigration to Philadelphia because of the unusual trajectory US-Colombia relations. While the US has always been intimately involved in the political and economic matters of nations in Latin America, the resolution to fight the “War on Drugs” in the 1980s brought new interest and money to Colombia. The passage of Plan Colombia in 1999 by both the US and Colombian governments made the nation the third-largest recipient of US aid in the world, as the eradication of the drug trade became a prominent concern for Washington (Tate 2007).

Yet as Colombia increasingly becomes a model for free-market economic reform and a staunch US political ally in accordance with aid, this exacerbates political rifts with the leftist governments of nations-states who have sought to combat US interventions in the region (Escobar 2010). As Colombian migrants in Philadelphia were navigating the racial divides and limited labor market, significant political and economic transformations were occurring in Colombia. Structural adjustment programs and neoliberal economic policies in Colombia opened markets to attract foreign capital. The resultant economic growth and intimate relationship with the US not only marked an improvement in material conditions in the nation (for some), but also compelled the Colombian government to create a national brand and marketing campaign in 2005 to change its global perception and reputation.

The research questions at the heart of my analysis bring together several bodies of literature from anthropology and other disciplines that address immigration, race and racialization, citizenship and belonging, and US immigration policy to ask what are the consequences of these localized policies in Philadelphia on the everyday livelihoods and self-making of Colombian migrants?

## Framework

### *Understanding Citizenship*

First, the dissertation examines how the context of localized migration policy shapes notions of belonging and claims to citizenship for Colombians within the city. While citizenship usually refers to formal, legal membership in the nation-state, anthropological analysis expands citizenship beyond political status or juridical rights and draws attention to the experiences of and the range of civil, political, socioeconomic and

cultural rights people have and exercise (Ong 2006). Holston and Appadurai (1996) term those range of rights “substantive citizenship” and contrast it with “formal citizenship” to argue that in practice substantive forms of citizenship can be independent of formal citizenship. In this perspective people can experience and exercise substantive citizenship without possessing formal citizenship. The concept of “cultural citizenship” expands analysis of citizenship to argue that how Latinos as marginalized subjects, deploy cultural claims to demand claim rights and establish a sense of belonging (Rosaldo 1994, 1997; Flores and Benmayor 1997). Ramos-Zayas similarly addresses the performances of citizenship “as “a vehicle for gaining at least partial insertion into US society as citizens who had met their full duties” (2003: 218) in her analysis of citizenship identity.

In the US, immigration policy has dictated who could enter and thus who was allowed to belong (Ngai 2004; Lowe 1996; Zolberg 1999). Transformations in policy engender new possibilities for social and political belonging, and thus in Philadelphia policies that seek to attract migrants can enable, but also constrain, new articulations of citizenship. In the dissertation, I examine citizenship as a set of performances and practices that occur in quotidian tasks that seek to establish a sense of belonging. I show how the valorization of migrants reshapes understandings of what constitutes “good citizenship” as a practice for while giving due attention to the limitations and the denials of those assertions of citizenship and belonging.

### *Examining Race and Racialization*

Drawing from Omi and Winant’s framework of racial formation that emphasizes the social construction of race, this dissertation explores the racialization of Colombia migrants in Philadelphia in the context of the political economic production of the city’s

Black-White racial polarity (see Chapter 2), the growth of the Latino population and the localized policies that seek to attract migrants. Omi and Winant argue “race maintains significance because its forms and meanings are both historically grounded *and* mutable as it is implicated in the production of a hierarchy of social value between groups” (1986: 64–66). Within this framework, racialization refers to the social processes whereby meanings and attributions become conceptualized and defined as inherent characteristics and where racial meanings become attached to previously racially unclassified group, social practices or particular relationships in that hierarchy of social value (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003).<sup>2</sup>

The robust literature within and beyond anthropology illuminates how formal citizenship is an inherently racializing institution by detailing how the exclusionary nature of federal immigration policy has differentially produced migrant legality and illegality for different groups and through different historical moments to racialize Latinos as illegal (De Genova 2002, 2005; Chavez 2001, 2008; Ngai 2004; Massey et al. 2003). Yet how is racialization produced by local inclusive policies in a city that aims to attract immigrants? How do these policies that seek to attract immigrants shape the racialization of Colombians as Latinos? Moreover as immigrants are constructed as a valorized group, and Asian and Latino migrants are praised in the press and city

---

<sup>2</sup> For Latinos in the United States emphasizing their racialization is of critical importance not just because of the ways that federal immigration policy has historically racialized Latinos as criminal and “illegal” but also for ensuring that discussions of race include Latinos who are often left out because of the designation as an “ethnicity” on official forms and government identifications like the US census (see Oboler 1995; De Genova and Ramos Zayas 2003). Official government classifications like the Census have supported the subordination of Latinos to be classified as Black, White or “other” but not as Latino or Hispanic as its own racial category. See also De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003, pages 14-17.

government for their contribution to population increases, do these local policies change the dynamics of race in the primarily Black-White divided Philadelphia?

In Philadelphia the scant attention paid to immigration until the 1990s meant that nativist and anti-Latino sentiments were relatively absent from local public debates and political discussions (Goode 1994; 2011), but decades of Puerto Rican marginalization and displacement (Whalen 2001) and the everyday racism experienced by Colombians speak to a different reality. The dissertation emphasizes how the stigma and associations of drugs and violence created a distinct racialization for Colombians in Philadelphia, while it also shows how Colombians experience racialization as Latinos who are coded as inherently foreign, illegal and criminal aliens. Drawing from the anthropological scholarship that emphasizes the distinct racialization of different Latino national-origin groups (De Genova 2005; Ramos-Zayas 2003; Pérez 2004; Rúa 2012; Aparicio 2006; Mahler 1995) and addresses the politics of racialization amongst Latinos in shared neighborhoods and cities (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2005; Dávila 2004; Ramos-Zayas 2012), I examine how the racialization of Colombians is transformed by the dynamics of localized policy in Philadelphia, where their experiences of marginalization as Latinos belies the construction of immigrants as a highly valued groups. An examination of the dynamics of racialization in Philadelphia in light of localized policies illuminates both the distinctiveness of Colombians' racialization but also the ways in which their racialization overlaps with that of other Latino migrants.

Moreover the chapters that follow explore explores both the racialization of Colombians and how Colombians as social actors in the city produce ideas about race and racial difference amongst themselves and other Philadelphians, especially other Latinos.

While I draw attention to the ways Colombians seek to redress their racialization as the deserving immigrants the city so desperately needs, I also show how the valorization of migrants can re-inscribe and reproduce hierarchies of racialized difference that stigmatize native-born groups of color including African Americans, Puerto Ricans and other US-born Latinos.

### *City as Context*

This project builds on urban anthropology's longstanding commitment to understanding the city not merely context, but as an object of analysis in its own right. Anthropologists have shown how the particularities of each city's political economic trajectory produces distinct pathways for migrant incorporation (Brettel 2003; Goode and Schneider 1994; Lamphere 1992). This dissertation examines how efforts to attract migrants, through the creation of localized policy and institutions that facilitate incorporation, transform assertions of citizenship and the dynamics of race specifically for Colombian migrants in Philadelphia.

Even as local policies attempt to valorize the presence of migrants as a means to its growth and revitalization in its efforts to increase its global recognition, the political economic trajectory of Philadelphia, its deep racial and class divides, often means migrants are differentially incorporated into the city—both as professionals and struggling workers in a city that has global aspiration to overcome post-industrial decline. This dissertation teases out the specific from the generalizable to show how the political economy of Philadelphia, its racial geography and localization of policy shape Colombianos' incorporation both in terms of their experiences with race and racism but also how they develop a sense of belonging.

Yet what is sometimes left out of the equation is how changes within migrants' nations of origin continue to impact their lives in their new place of settlement, a particularly salient issue throughout my fieldwork. A singular emphasis on Philadelphia as the locality of settlement is incomplete as the historic and contemporary dynamics in Colombia, as the nation of origin, have and continue to shape the racialization of Colombians and their claims of citizenship.

### *The Enduring Presence of Colombia in Philadelphia*

Colombians in Philadelphia have a stake in what is happening at "home," not only culturally but also economically and politically. The dissertation examines how the material reality and reputational issues of Colombia shape Colombians' experiences in Philadelphia even decades after they have left (see Chapters 3, 7 and 8). Specifically I highlight how the history of Colombia, the history of US-Colombia relations, and the reputation of Colombia as a failed-state marked by drugs and violence at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, combine with the new dynamics of neoliberal economic reform and a staunchly centrist government, and the state's attempt to change Colombian's global reputation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Throughout the dissertation I draw attention to Colombians' evolving relationship with the nation to consider how the Colombians construct their identities as shaped by both the unexplored effects of both the localization of policy in Philadelphia and the shifting economic, social and political conditions of Colombia.

### *Crafting Colombianidad*

This dissertation focuses on Colombian migrants in Philadelphia and how they come to craft, form and express Colombianidad, or a sense of Colombianness, specifically through ideas about citizenship and race, betwixt and between Philadelphia

and their nation of origin, Colombia. An exploration of Colombianidad emphasized social production of race and citizenship at the nexus of hemispheric, national and local dynamics elucidates how individuals make sense of their racial identity and develop practices and performances of citizenship under shifting structural conditions in both Philadelphia and Colombia. To show how a sense of Colombianidad can serve an imploration to redress the way their specific racialization as Colombians can undermine claims to citizenship and limit their sense of belonging in Philadelphia, I toggle between the local context of Philadelphia, its political economic trajectory and its efforts to attract immigrants, the localization of policy in the US, the deeply entrenched and intimate relationship between the US and Colombia across time, and changes in Colombia.

#### Entering the Field: Building Interests, Building Questions

Spurred by the political mobilization of millions of Latinos who supported immigrant rights and solidarity marches in May 2006, the “Day Without an Immigrant” marches, I entered graduate school the next year newly interested in exploring the stalled efforts for comprehensive federal immigration reform in addition to my commitment to working on issues of Latino immigration. Policy debates over providing guest worker programs during the second term of the Bush administration forced me to realize that these marches and other pro-immigrant political actions in the spring of 2006 emerged from the passage of HR4437 in the House of Representative. Known as the “Border Protection, Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005”, HR 4437 did not pass in the Senate despite its success in the house. I was struck by not only the bill’s punitive nature but also the undeniable response from both supporters and opposition in the face of failed federal immigration reform.

The bill sought to make it a felony for anyone to be in the US “illegally” and for any other person to provide aid or assistance to unauthorized immigrants, including transportation. The failed bill had the potential to deny undocumented migrants the rights to do the very basic things, like go to work. The subsequent community mobilization across the United States linked many Latinos and allies to stake their claims as visible, and essential members of both the national community and their local communities. Yet even after the mass mobilization of the solidarity marches, the particular components of the failed federal bill would eventually become incorporated into local state and municipal legislations.

After the events of 2006, I became highly attuned to the ways that policy in post-9/11 America sought to criminalize the very presence of migrants whose labor the country relied on for the economy to run. The contradictions of the political moment piqued my interest in the relationship between the failures and successes of policies that could dictate the rights and resources, like driving, available to migrants of varying legal statuses. After moving to Philadelphia for graduate school, my time spent living in the city and discussions about local politics drew my attention to the ways that the city sought to attract migrants in contrast to the anti-immigrant sentiments that I was so familiar with at the national level. The desire to attract immigrants felt entirely new to me and I wanted to know why did local government want to promote migration while so many other jurisdictions and politicians sought to restrict it.

When in the 2010 census proclaimed that Philadelphia had experienced its first population increase since 1950 because of immigration, my research questions became focused on understanding the longer trajectory of local efforts and how the policy efforts

in Philadelphia shaped the experiences of Latinos living in the city. During the same period of time, my interest in Latino community organizing, led me to become involved with a broad immigrant-based organization (now defunct) and a Colombian community organization that began from a small network of migrant who met in a computer class offered by the broader organization in the spring of 2008. Forming strong relationships with the director and other members of the Colombian organization, which I call *Colombianos Adelante* (CA) in the dissertation, combined with my own positionality as a second generation Colombiana in the US, compelled me to narrow my focus.

### *On Reflexivity and Rapport*

A specific emphasis to understand the dynamics of Colombian immigration to Philadelphia emerged not only from my experiences in the city as I began to meet more Colombian and Latino migrants, but also from the ease with which my position as a “native”<sup>3</sup> or “halfie”<sup>4</sup> anthropologist allowed me to form relationships with Colombians and other Latinos I met. Perhaps not immediately recognizable as Colombian by name, or by the lightness of my skin, and only partially by my Colombian-accented Spanish, meeting Colombianos in Philadelphia was in some ways easier once I was recognized as a fellow Colombian. Still, introducing myself, and my research, to someone new was

---

<sup>3</sup> Jones (1970) discussing the particularities of a “native anthropology” from within and about the US argues beyond anthropologist-as-outsider that there is an alternative vantage point from which research can be conducted—that of “insider,” the person who conducts research on the cultural, racial, or ethnic group of which they are a member. He argues the native anthropologist should be understood as a person who is in a position to collect information in his own culture to which an outsider does not have access.

<sup>4</sup> Narayan (1993) argues against the fixity of a distinction between “native” and “non-native” anthropologists. She asserts that many anthropologists who have identities spanning racial or cultural groups have always realized that we all exist within and across multiple planes of identification and to several communities simultaneously and argues it is essential to focus on shifting identities in relation to the people and issues anthropologists seek to represent.

occasionally met with skepticism and often questioned, “Why do you want to study Colombians?” After explaining my personal connection to Colombia, and the project more generally some, but not all, offered to help a Colombiana pursuing a PhD.

In many ways my positionality, as a native-born US citizen and native English speaker also helped me to form connections with Colombianos and opportunities for participant observation of everyday life and routines emerged from accompanying individuals to pay municipal bills, revise resumes, tutor children and negotiate the occasional misunderstandings with English speaking landlords. In this sense as a young *Colombiana*, with a white American father, I was also definitely a *gringa* or *Americana* with cultural capital to help some navigate city institution. The identification as a *gringa* however also provided tremendous insight as many Colombianos imagined that I needed to become more familiarized with Colombian culture and offered to explain to me what was *lo Colombiano*, what was “Colombian” in nature, or what made Colombianidad, Colombianness, distinctive.<sup>5</sup>

### *Fieldwork and Methodology*

Fieldwork began through my interactions with CA and focused on participant observation of board meetings, cultural events, and mobile consul visits between 2009 and 2013. Cultural events ranged from Colombian Independence Day celebrations (formal and informal), Latin American holiday festival, a trip to a Fernando Botero<sup>6</sup> exhibit in Delaware, and public events like a gathering for peace during the summer 2010

---

Both Narayan and Jones (and others who followed) challenge the residual baggage of a concept of anthropologist as objective outsider to reorient an understanding of (native) anthropology, anthropologists and the field, in terms of situated knowledges across multiple subjectivities.

<sup>6</sup> A famous Colombian artist noted for his play with volume as his paintings and sculptures often depict large “inflated” figures.

at the height of political tensions between Colombia and Venezuela over border control. Interviews and life histories from board members, their friends and family, as well as Colombians I met through the events expanded my understandings about the difference between migration cohorts and illuminated different reasons for migrating, for choosing Philadelphia, and different experiences upon arrival.

In the spring of 2011 CA began offering its first citizenship workshops, or *talleres de ciudadanía*, a course designed to help prepare individuals for the naturalization exam. The course targeted Spanish-dominant Latinos for a once per week classes held in the basement of a church. I co-taught the course and classroom discussions about American history and personal motivations to seek naturalization revealed how migrants insisted that belonging ought to be assessed through social and economic contributions to the city, not legal status. Follow-up interviews with students in the *talleres de ciudadanía* illuminated how informants understood themselves as “good” or “proper” citizens.

Semi-structured interviews with Latinos of multiple nationalities about their decisions to naturalize as well as the benefits and drawbacks of attaining U.S. citizenship revealed a tension within individuals. Many understood naturalization as aspirational, meaning they believed in the ideals of American freedom, democracy and meritocracy, and simultaneously viewed citizenship as instrumental, providing them with much needed legal legitimacy that would facilitate bureaucratic encounters with the state—such as filing taxes and applying for jobs—but not changing their everyday marginalization. The combination of participant observation and interviews revealed how Colombians questioned the conceptions of citizenship as solely legal status (a thing that someone has

or does not have) and instead sought to assert their belonging in terms of their contributions.

Beyond the citizenship courses and CA events, I visited Colombian-owned businesses, started attending mass at a Catholic church in North Philadelphia to expand my relationships with Colombians and other Latinos. I spent time with people in their homes and in their neighborhoods, and unexpectedly ran into to others as I attended events or traveled on the bus. Semi-structured interviews and informal time spent together at a local bakery, over dinner provided information about people's lives, social networks, their perceptions of the city and its racial divisions, and their wants, needs and aspirations for themselves and their families. Other places and spaces included participant observation of ephemerally constructed spaces like soccer games played in parks and understanding the daily rhythms of neighborhood life.

As I continued to meet, interview and accompany folks on daily errands I also became intimately aware of the short falls of the localized policies that celebrated migrants. The 2010 population growth, while widely touted in local politics and in the press, often failed to translate into material changes like better schools, better paying jobs, better public transportation, and freedom from racism. In my interviews with Colombians some only seemed marginally aware of the population growth or the city's attempts to attract more immigrants. Those who were aware expressed indifference or took the population change as a sign that their life in the city might improve. Others applauded the efforts but remained adamant that there was more that could be done to help Latino immigrants in the city, and that if attracting and welcoming immigrants was

truly the aim then there should be municipal ID cards, or access to driver's license, less discrimination in policing or better measures in place not to unduly penalize Latino business owners through the byzantine practices of the Office of Licenses and Inspections.

To capture the broader social and political context of Philadelphia and effort to craft localized immigration policy I conducted archival research for transcripts of past City Council meetings and official reports about past (failed) strategies to attract migrants. These transcripts and reports provided a window into the justification for these strategies as well as shifting discourses around the position of migrants in the city and the construction of “desirable” versus “undesirable” migrants. I began participant observation of City Council meetings in 2010 and attended public events around the city that discussed the role of immigrants in the city and the population increase. Initially, and with some reservations, I anticipated that the localization of policy might translate into expanded rights and resources for migrants in the city. June of 2011 became a pivotal moment to understand the dynamics between City Council, the mayor's office and broader state-level legislature as I traced the passage of the “Pennsylvania Compact” in City Council that urged Mayor Nutter to end the police department's agreement with Immigration and Customs' Enforcement and attempted to push back against punitive state-level policies in Pennsylvania. Analyzing public records of City Council meetings, Mayoral executive orders and media coverage of the population increase, efforts to end the agreements with ICE, and combatting state-level measures became essential components of data collection.

Participant observation of city events that focused on naturalization, immigration and local policies allowed me to consider broader debates about the reception of immigrants and the role of migrants in the city beyond my informants and local politicians. These events included public naturalization ceremonies held at the National Constitution Center and sponsored by the Global Philadelphia Association, a public private partnership, as well as events and presentations from the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians, held around the city, explained their programs and touted their ongoing research projects about immigrant quality of life.

Events co-sponsored by the aforementioned organizations and other immigrant-rights organizations including the Broad Street Ministries, the New Sanctuary Movement, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition, offered a window to understand how these groups collaborate with local government and similarly valorized the presence of migrants in the city. In particular a public debate held in April 2011 at the Broad Street Ministries included both a pro-immigrant presenter, a law professor from the University of Pennsylvania, and an anti-immigrant presenter, a long-time columnist for the Philadelphia Daily News, who discussed the impact of local policies on the relationships between immigrant communities, racial profiling of immigrants, language access and immigrant-friendly schooling and the consequences of information-sharing agreements between local police and ICE. While the majority of the audience attended to support pro-immigrant measures, supporters for both speakers asked questions and expressed their viewpoints. Public events such as these provided a broad spectrum of opinions from advocates, professionals to ordinary Philadelphia residents about the reception migrants and local policies.

During fieldwork as laws similar to Arizona's SB 1070 passed with alarming frequency in other states like Georgia and Alabama. Scholarship in multiple disciplines—ranging from linguistic anthropology, political geography and sociology—began to explore the political and social effects of the localization of policy but remained singularly focused on restrictive and punitive local measures. In contrast, I sought to understand both welcoming and inclusive measures of Philadelphia alongside the restrictive and punitive measures through a broader lens of localization. Both archival research and fieldwork revealed Philadelphia's attempts at local policy emerged as part of broader economic development efforts, which converged with a larger trend of localized immigration policy and enforcement in the United States.

Despite the valorization of immigrants evident in the policies and discourses about immigration in Philadelphia, interviews with many Colombian and other Latino migrants I spoke with expressed deep concerns and fears about the possibility of deportation. This sparked me to reframe the analysis after fieldwork ended in order to incorporate an analysis of the disjunctures of welcoming policies and how continued agreements with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) belied efforts to create an immigrant-friendly city. I began to ask, what possibilities exist for immigrants in a city that valorizes their presence? Does this enable more claims to social, political and economic rights? Does it allow for broader claims for belonging for migrants to live in a city that “wants” them?

In particular, microaggressions of race in public space as well as intensified surveillance from police and the *polimigra*, or ICE, were the issues of concern for many Colombians as legal status did not entirely mitigate fear or frustration. Though many had

papers, either as citizens or legal permanent residents, many also had undocumented family members who lived or temporarily stayed in their homes. Drawing my attention to how Colombians in Philadelphia navigate quotidian challenges and constraints, such as finding work for family members or avoiding police attention, and how the legal statuses of their family members can expose them to unanticipated vulnerabilities, I began to analyze the limitations of the city's localized immigration policies.

Long-term ethnographic research illuminated the disjuncture between the ways in which Colombians immigrants experience daily life in Philadelphia (their limited access to resources such as bilingual classes in public schools, translations assistance for municipal services and city agencies, housing and health-referral services) and the ways policy makers, professionals involved in immigrant-incorporation organizations, attempted to create Philadelphia as an immigrant-friendly or "welcoming" city.

Finally time spent in people's homes, eating dinner, watching the nightly news on Spanish-language media, attending parties, drew my attention to ongoing commentaries about changes in Colombia and the salience of Colombia's geopolitical position relative to other Latin American nations in forming a sense of Colombianidad. These discussions as well as participant observation at CA planned or impromptu events for Latinos, allowed me to realize that Colombians' racialization and ways Colombianidad is understood, expressed and asserted had just as much to do with the racial politics of Philadelphia as it did with the geopolitics of Latin America. Hence throughout the dissertation both the history of Colombia and contemporary changes in the nation, are highlighted as they provide the grounds upon which assertions of Colombianidad are formulated in response to the racial hierarchy in Philadelphia. The broad range of

ethnographic methods elucidated things that might otherwise have remained invisible including: expressions of citizenship beyond legal status, the limitations of city immigrant-friendly policies, and the salience of the history and current circumstances of Colombia.

### *Methodology by the Numbers*

I conducted fifteen months of ethnographic fieldwork across the city of Philadelphia between 2009 and 2013, which is complemented by fieldwork in Bogotá, Colombia during the summer of 2009. Interviews with forty-four Colombian migrants and seven US-born Colombianos offered numerous insights into the multiple ways in which people crafted a sense of Colombianidad through their experiences in Philadelphia, their journeys of migration, and their sense of racial relations in the city. Of those fifty-one semi-structured interviews with Colombianos, I was able to conduct additional extended life history interviews with ten of those individuals, including two Colombians born in Philadelphia.

In addition to my Colombian informants, I interviewed several other Latinos and non-Latinos who lived in three North Philadelphia neighborhoods, Hunting Park, Juniata and Feltonville, neighborhoods with the highest concentration of Latinos and the majority of Colombians who live in the city. As those neighborhoods became where the majority of everyday participant observation occurred. The perspectives of Latino friends and neighbors through semi-structured interviews with four Puerto Ricans, three Dominicans, three Mexicans, two Ecuadorians, one Brazilian and one El Salvadoran, offered undersandings of intra-Latino relations, conceptions of Colombianidad from the outside, experiences with race in Philadelphia and complementary experiences of immigration.

Moreover interviews and time spent with three White and five African-American/Black informants provided important conceptions about immigration to Philadelphia as well as demographic, social and political changes in the city.

Although my principal focus of research was on Colombian immigrants and the organization and events of CA, in a later phase of fieldwork I became involved with the Hunting Park Neighborhood Association (HPNA), through a Colombian informant who was actively involved in the association. Though this research does not appear directly in the chapters that follow it provided important points of comparison about ideas about space, cross-racial alliances and community development in one of the North Philadelphia neighborhoods where many working-class Colombians live. The space of the neighborhood itself, predominantly home to Colombians, Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, African Americans, and to a smaller number of Whites, and the space of the neighborhood association meetings are where I met several of the non-Colombian interviewees. Working with these organizations, coupled with immersion in neighborhood life, allowed me to track discourses about the locality, the inequalities migrants experience and the positions of Colombians in social life.

In addition to interviews and participant observation of *Colombianos Adelante* and Hunting Park Neighborhood Association meetings, participant of other events and spaces were indispensable throughout fieldwork. Through the two citizenship courses I co-taught, I was able to interview sixteen participants from various nationalities including nine of my Colombian informants. Each course met once per week for ten weeks. With permission I recorded the sessions and took additional field notes while not actively teaching. Of the events CA offered, I attended five mobile consular visits, three Latino

Christmas festivals, two Colombian Independence day celebrations. In the summer of 2014 two months of follow-up field work also included watching World Cup soccer games, and interviewing four new Colombian informants.

Textual analysis of sixteen City Council Meetings along with the analysis of five previously passed City Council proposals/resolutions and seven mayoral executive orders, revealed how local politicians framed immigration and immigrants across time. As transcripts of City Council meetings dating back to 2001 are available to the public, I selected all relevant transcripts that dealt with immigration, service and housing needs for Spanish speakers, honoring important Latino individuals, and North Philadelphia neighborhood revitalization for coding. Analysis allowed me to track how ideas about the role of immigration to the city has changed and how proposals to implement have either failed or materialized within the different historical moments and political situations. Participant observation of twelve City Council meetings between April 2010 and December 2013 and interviews with six professionals employed in immigrant advocacy organizations, three white women and three Latinas yielded insights into the ways local politicians and partners constructed immigrants as valuable assets to the economic development of the city and revealed how actors differentially imagined the needs of immigrants.

### Chapter Overview

I have divided the dissertation into three sections in order to be able to toggle between the different scales in order to draw attention to the ways Colombianidad is produced, understood and expressed within and across those scales.

Part 1, “Understanding Philadelphia, Understanding Colombia,” explores how the history of Philadelphia has made migration a key aspect in the ways it has sought to transform itself into a global city at the turn of the millennium alongside how the history of Colombia has created the condition of Colombia migration and how the nation has also sought to transform its reputation and economy. Colombian migrants thus become part of both these places undergoing structural and symbolic reputational change. In Philadelphia, Colombianos represent the immigrants the city is eager to attract. Even though they live outside the borders of Colombia, Colombianos exist as representatives of the nation. Taken together Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 trace the history of Philadelphia and Colombia respectively to show how the political economic trajectory of Philadelphia matters for the incorporation of Colombians and how the history of Colombia helps us to understand the experiences of Colombians as they settled in Philadelphia.

Chapter 2, “Globalizing Philadelphia” situates the political economic trajectory of Philadelphia throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century in order to show how immigrants and immigration have become key symbols in producing a more “global” city. Decades of population loss and deindustrialization led the city to pursue a suite of strategies to increase its competitiveness in a globalized economy, including attracting migrants. Detailing the production of racial segregation through the loss of manufacturing, federal and local policies that encouraged white flight (construction of highways, blockbusting and redlining), and mayoral regimes that favored downtown development over the problems in residential neighborhoods, the chapter reveals how immigration became positioned as a solution to the city’s economic problems. Finally the chapter addresses

how the social, political and economic divides of Philadelphia come to impact the incorporation of Colombian migrants.

Chapter 3, “Colombia: Here and There, Then and Now” traces the history of Colombia in order to understand why and when Colombian migrants chose to leave. After sketching out a profile of Colombian immigration to Philadelphia, a deeper historical examination of the conditions of Colombia in the 20<sup>th</sup> reveals how violence and narco-trafficking—both major factors in decision to emigrate—shape the racialization of Colombians in their new city. I follow how experiences in Colombia and the associations with violence and drug shape social relations amongst Colombians and between Colombians and Puerto Ricans in the 1980s. Finally I examine how changes in Colombia at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century have created new economic and political conditions in Colombia, which comes to affect the ways Colombianos in Philadelphia seek to address their ideas about Colombianidad.

Part 2, traces the changes in federal immigration policy that enabled Philadelphia to create its own local efforts. Though Philadelphia’s efforts are staunchly different than the anti-immigrant efforts of both federal and local policy they retain some elements that weaken incorporation. This section emphasizes how assertions of citizenship, both as legal status and informal citizenship, exist within the tensions of Philadelphia’s immigrant-friendly policies and discourses.

Chapter 4 “From the Federal to the Local” traces the trajectory of US immigration policies to reveal how changes in immigration policy racialized Latinos as “illegal.” The chapter emphasizes post-1965 immigration policy changes, specifically how changes in federal policy in the mid 1990s enabled and expected cities and states to partner with

federal agencies for the sake of immigration enforcement and control. These changes opened up the possibility for localities to create their own policies to deal with immigrants. The chapter traces the attempts of Philadelphia to create policies to attract immigrants in particular political moments, underscoring how post-9/11 concerns with national security undermines the city's efforts in 2000. Illuminating the proliferation of punitive and restrictive local policies after September 11<sup>th</sup> and stalled federal immigration reform in 2005, the chapter draws attention to how more recent Philadelphia policies seek to push back against state level measures that would limit its ability and its authority to pass policies to attract immigrants as a "sanctuary city."

Chapter 5, "What Lies Beneath" shows that in spite of efforts to attract immigrants and become an immigrant-friendly city, anti-immigrant policies remained intact through federal-local enforcement agreements. It emphasizes how Philadelphia's localized efforts substantially differ from anti-immigrant sentiments at the state and federal level as well as how inclusive local policies like Philadelphia's are always entangled or beholden to federal partnerships. While Philadelphia's local policies intend to attract immigrants, they simultaneously maintain channels for increased police surveillance, which weakens migrant incorporation and fractures social alliances. Here I explore how sustained agreements between the Philadelphia Police Department to share information about arrestees with Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, part of the Department of Homeland Security, creates a profound fear of deportation that shapes the ways Colombians understand and experience safety, mobility and interpersonal trust.

Chapter 6 "Citizenship Beyond Legality", building upon the concept of "cultural citizenship" (Rosaldo 1994), focuses attention to how Colombians make claims about

themselves as good citizens in the city regardless of legal status. The attention to both formal and informal citizenship elucidates the ways that Colombians' performances and practices of citizenship are attempts to strategically affirm their social and political rights in the city and create a sense of belonging. This chapter reveals how Colombians' sense of belonging in Philadelphia emerges from understandings of the city as immigrant-friendly—somewhere they matter and are wanted—but also through assertions of their contributions to the city such as being a parent and raising their children in the city.

Part 3, returns to the transnational relations to examine how ideas about race and affect, as part of Colombianidad, come to be shaped within the local. I return to consider how the history of Colombia and social, political and economic changes in Colombia since the 1990s come to impact the ways Colombians fashion a sense of Colombianidad in response to changes and how they come to position themselves with respect to other Latinos in Philadelphia based on changes in Colombia since they have left.

Chapter 7 “Construyendo Diferencias: Racialization and Latino Contradistinction in the Américas” considers how Colombia migrants come to produce ideas about Colombianidad vis-à-vis other Latino migrant groups in Philadelphia. I offer an analysis of Latino of contradistinction, which refers to the process and efforts of Latinos to meaningfully distinguish themselves from one another. Exploring contradistinction illuminates how historic and contemporary relationships among Latin American nations shape the politics of race between and amongst Colombians and other Latinos this chapter shows that distinctions produced between Latinos in Philadelphia are indicative of how racialized groups, they are “compelled to vie with one another for position” (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2005) within the racial hierarchy of the Philadelphia.

Chapter 8 “Transnational Passions: Reinventing the Nation, Affect and Colombianidad” revisits the details of the national branding campaign to consider how government developed programs to re-incorporate Colombian migrants. While the positive changes in Colombia has drawn international attention and the brand seeks to increase foreign direct investment and tourism, *Colombia es Pasión* draws on passion as the so-called “best raw material of our citizens.” In the campaign, passion, is grounded in the rationality of investment, and I argue that branding not only obscures the continued violence and suffering in Colombia in order to attract investment, but also attempts to position Colombian migrants as affective investors in the nation from outside its borders. Drawing from Colombians’ engagement with the campaign and their experiences in Philadelphia I show how affect becomes the substance through which Colombianidad is constructed to both critique and embrace the changes of Colombia.

The conclusion, Chapter 9, provides a summary of overarching framework for understanding Colombianidad as crafted in between the dynamics of Philadelphia and the dynamics of Colombia. Following the recapitulation of the arguments in the previous chapters the conclusion looks at political changes that have occurred in the US and Philadelphia since the conclusion of fieldwork in order to gesture towards new directions for research. Specifically I draw attention to new challenges for federal comprehensive immigration reform and the continued assault against sanctuary cities in national and state politics.

## CHAPTER 2

GLOBALIZING PHILADELPHIA: IMMIGRATION AND THE POLITICAL  
ECONOMIC TRAJECTORY OF PHILADELPHIA

This chapter explores Philadelphia's economic, political and spatial development. The emphasis on its decline after WWII provides the broader context about the shifting importance of migration between 1965 and the present. The rise and fall of industry in the city came to shape the specific denouement of deindustrialization in ways that hardened racial boundaries in space through housing policies, suburbanization, redlining and white flight. In the wake of the loss of industry, capital and residents, successive political regimes attempted to enact policies that would re-attract capital to the city. In this respect various urban renewal projects ultimately became intertwined with attempts to make the city more global, by attracting financial and human capital in the form of desirable residents, and ultimately migrants. Close attention to the political economic trajectory of the city contextualizes why the attraction of migrants became such a vital strategy for Philadelphia in broader changes of neoliberal urban restructuring. Moreover this contextualization illuminates how in spite of the rhetorical valorization of migrants in the 2000s, migrant newcomers and established foreign-born residents become incorporated in variegated ways—both as racialized residents of poor and disinvested neighborhoods with limited resources and as elite, upwardly mobile professionals (Goode 2011).

Broader global forces shaped the political economic trajectory of Philadelphia after the post-WWII loss of industry and manufacturing. As deindustrialization and population loss transformed Philadelphia into a city of limited regional economic and political importance in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, its disadvantaged geography along the East Coast contributed to its decline. Its location, between the national political

seat of Washington DC and the locus of commerce and finance New York City, made it difficult to establish a foothold as a definitive regional economic center as international trade often bypassed Philadelphia.<sup>7</sup>

Significant changes in the flow of global capital also marked a shift in the organization and function of cities particularly in the final three decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Harvey 1989). The formerly managerial mode of urban governance was replaced by a necessarily more entrepreneurial function in an increasingly competitive globalized world. These dramatic shifts of the global flow of capital intensified the interconnection of material and social flows in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, and caused cities in the United States to compete in new ways for economic investment *and* desirable residents in a context of unevenly distributed resources (Sassen 2001; Brash 2011; Brenner 2004).<sup>8</sup>

Thus in cities, several actors including policymakers, politicians, private sector stakeholders and public-private institutions, seek to attract foreign capital in order to market their cities as centers of consumption, knowledge, finance, and/or tourism (Rutheiser 1996; Chesluck 2008; Hackworth 2007; Holland et al. 2006; Zukin 1995; Goode 2011). Nina Glick Schiller notes that for many cities, “by the millennium, urban politicians, planners and boosters began to characterize their cities as cosmopolitan as a way of attracting ‘global talent,’ financial capital, and tourism and revaluing urban space” (2015: 106). Yet unsurprisingly, the strategies used to make cities more globally attractive and competitive—city planning and local policies—incur uneven effects for

---

<sup>7</sup> Goode and Schneider also note that Philadelphia in contrast to other deindustrialized cities like Pittsburgh did not have a definitive region to serve (1994).

residents, where the marginalization of the poorest and most disenfranchised become retrenched (Castells 1989; Zukin 1991; Williams 1988; Holston 1989; Smith 1996; Fairbanks 2009). It is within this context of the competition for capital that the attraction of migrants to Philadelphia began to hold unparalleled significance as a means to a more global city.

The particularities of a place have always shaped the incorporation of migrants, however the forces that shape urban life extend beyond conditions of the city or even the nation-state of settlement. Thus understanding how global forces shape the local, and how the local seeks to position or reposition itself within hierarchies of power and capital is essential to understand how the effects of post-industrial rendered Philadelphia in a position to want to attract migrants (Goode 2011). Though historically Philadelphia has been a destination for some migrants, it has never been a major immigrant gateway like New York, nor is it an entirely new immigrant destination like many areas of the US South.

In Philadelphia, strategies to attract global capital for the sake of urban revitalization and growth include the common strategies of expanding the service industry and creating landscapes of consumption for both professional class resident and tourists, and the less common strategy of attracting migrants in order to increase the population and to have both a readily available labor pool for these service industry jobs and “immigrant entrepreneurs” to ensure the right kind of growth. Illustrating the political economic trajectory of Philadelphia and its consequences for city residents and contextualizing these changes within broader transformations in the flow of global capital

and the new roles of cities reveals how the city's attempts to attract migrants are part of broader suite of strategies for growth.

### The Rise of the Industrial City

As Philadelphia became an important industrial city in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, increased immigration and economic changes in service of large-scale industrial production created new social and political dynamics alongside demographic shifts. Industry grew, expanding the city beyond its colonial core and attracted European migrants into its diverse manufacturing economy. The rise of industrialization left a lasting mark on the city as it shaped the settlement of migrants, promoted the emergence of a centralized government by expanding the city to the county line, maintained ethnic brokerage in the Republican machine, while supporting social divided that hardened the boundaries of whiteness, and strengthened the Black-White binary in the city.

During the colonial period Philadelphia was an important port city and a major economic hub for trade in the Atlantic. Its position as the center of politics coupled with its economic importance made it one of few densely populated cities in the nascent nation. Early industrial textile factories created economic, social and political ties that were local, while the more capital-intensive industrial system of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century made possible national and international ties.<sup>9</sup> By 1880 Philadelphia had become a true industrial center.

---

<sup>9</sup> Yet as Warner notes for the unskilled workers and artisans in the early period of industrialization (pre-civil war) the crucial feature was the reorganization of their work conditions but for business and political leaders the crucial change was their "relation to the city and the world beyond the city" (1968:64). Later businessmen and politicians both lobbied for and financed state and federal aid like railroads and canals, making industrial expansion possible "the resulting size and reach of the city meant that specialization would yield large gains in money and power" (1968:79). These changes brought on specialization for both business and political leaders

Though not a primary destination for migrants, immigration throughout the 1800s allowed Philadelphia to grow from a mercantile city of 30,000 people during the Revolutionary War to a prominent industrial center of 400,000 by 1850 (Miller 1988). The expansion of industry made Philadelphia a significant destination for initial Northern and Western European migrants, namely Brits, Germans and Irish, entered in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in the period of early industrialization. These earlier migrants settled in areas wherever housing was available and experienced substantially lower levels of segregation than the later arriving migrants from Southern and Eastern Europe including Jews and migrants Italy, Poland and Russia who arrived in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the dawn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century at the height of industrialization (Warner 1968; Hershberg 1981; Goode 1994; Adams et al. 1991).<sup>10</sup>

#### *Industrial River Wards and Political Consolidation*

Beginning in the 1830s, major economic and population growth occurred in municipal districts and boroughs located within the boundaries of Philadelphia County but outside of the city. The boroughs and districts located along both the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers, known as river wards, became important spaces to the rise of industrial production and they attracted both of European migrants and US-born workers. The eventual incorporation of these areas into the city shaped the socio-political dynamics of

---

and by 1850 these needs and perspectives of specialists would come to shape the city's political and economic path.

<sup>10</sup> Immigration increased steadily through the 1800s. While Philadelphia's immigrant port was the fourth largest in the nation many people were arriving via New York rather than directly to the city (Miller 1988). By 1850 three out of ten city residents were foreign-born. In sharp contrast to the sheer number of immigrants and their proportion of the urban demographics Philadelphia's overall share of national immigration fell to five percent and remained stalled until well after the Civil War.

migrant incorporation in ways that increasingly became tied to spatial settlement. Social institutions like civic associations, Catholic parishes, schools banks and retail stores provided opportunities for ethnic groups to cluster socially in the absence of spatial segregation. These social institutions, through systems of exchange and mutual aid, became tied to the political structure of ethnic ward patronage of the Republican machine through the consolidation of the county and city (Goode and Schneider 1994).

In 1854, political restructuring expanded the boundaries of the city to meet the county line, thus incorporating the industrial towns along the rivers into the political structure and led to the centralized governance of a larger Philadelphia. This consolidation combined with industrialization and sustained migration to grow Philadelphia's population to over half a million residents by the 1850s (Warner 1968). Ethnic brokerage became an important feature of social and political life as many of these industrial areas were predominantly Catholic and filled with not-yet-fully white European migrants. The Republican machine brokered relations between the ethnic workers and elite business owners as the centralization of governance linked financiers and industrialists with national political interests and they passed the rights to distribute favors, including jobs, to local ward brokers in return for votes.

#### *Securing Whiteness and Racial Segregation*

Philadelphia is in many ways an exemplary city for understanding the intertwined processes of race and class formation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As a major industrial city it drew workers from within the US and from outside the nation, which contributed to substantial demographic change between 1830 and 1880 (Goode 1994). Though in the early part of 19<sup>th</sup> century employment opportunities and economic activity rather than

ethnicity shaped residential patterns, during the late industrial period the incorporation of immigrants strengthened racial divides as whiteness emerged as the predominant social boundary that increased racial segregation in workplaces and neighborhoods (Ignatiev 1995; Roediger 1990).

Nativism, intense opposition to migrants or internal minority on the grounds of their foreignness and a preference for those considered native, grew both nationally and locally with increased immigration (Perea 1997; Feagin 1997). Between the 1840s and the 1920s, increased immigration coupled with pervasive prejudice against immigrants produced a variegated whiteness where some groups previously considered not-fully-White were able to move up in the ethno-racial hierarchy through their ability to distance themselves from Blacks. The late period of industrialization in Philadelphia became a critical moment for formerly racialized groups, in particular the Irish, to become white (Roediger 1990). Philadelphia's industrial labor market pitted European immigrants against each other and Blacks for jobs and wages. Irish migrants secured and maintained their employment by systematically excluding Blacks from workplaces through the threat of violence against Blacks seeking work or by going on strike. In the later half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the growth of nativist politics, violence against Blacks and anti-Catholic riots along the Delaware industrial zones revealed growing racial tensions and divisions.

Northern river wards were more segregated by race and ethnicity than the lower river wards, which retained segregated blocks but had more diversity as a whole as South Philadelphia became residential "slum" for poor immigrants and Blacks. In these more diverse spaces the petitions for whiteness, whereby Irish and other non-white Europeans came to define themselves against what they were not, i.e. Blacks, became the wedge that

divided the Irish from Blacks even though they previously shared residential space, workplaces and endured exploitation. Whiteness became a social and economic position with the power to define and exclude the other, not only in the shared spaces of Southern Philadelphia but also in the predominantly ethnic European migrant spaces of Northern sections. Moreover as whiteness not only required but also demanded the protection of its boundaries and the privileges it conferred, the social and economic boundaries of race hardened in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century.

*Spatialization, Work and Housing Stock*

In the early period of industrialization, the absence of significant public transportation meant that a majority of Philadelphia residents, regardless of class and origin, lived within walking distance of their jobs (Adams et al. 1991; Scranton 1989). Marginalized groups like new immigrants, Blacks, and low-skilled workers, clustered in sections of the city with available and cheap but old housing. Sections of the city that had been suburban prior to consolidation became spaces for the emerging middle class to leave the dense industrial centers with rundown housing for larger, newer residences (Goode and Schneider 1994: 33).

The advent of electric streetcars allowed for the development of “streetcar suburbs” where the white middle-class and successful working-class moved to bedroom communities in North and West Philadelphia. The move to streetcar suburbs between 1860 and 1930, shored up differences between those who still walked to work and those who could commute, as residential segregation in Philadelphia became more organized around income and ethnicity (Warner 1968, Goode and Schneider 1994; Hershberg 1981). By 1930 these dynamics were reflected in the residential patterns of the city. The

center housed poor, low skill and marginalized racial and ethnic groups and was surrounded by a ring of working class and middle class homes.

As manufacturing thrived, jobs across multiple industries attracted immigrants not only from Europe but also internal migrants from elsewhere in the US to Philadelphia. While European immigration helped the city to grow in term of both population and economy into the 1920s, nativist sentiments found legal justification in federal immigration policies that curtailed the flow of Southern and Eastern European immigrants (those still considered less-white) through the enactment of racially-biased national origin quotas in 1924. Moreover, after the Civil War and continuing through the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century, push and pull factors contributed to Black migration to Philadelphia which would change the dynamics of race and space in the city.

#### Increased Racial Segregation and the Great Migration North in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

While there were established Black communities in Philadelphia, including those whose roots extended back to the city's colonial era and those who came to the city because of its significance as a stop on the Underground Railroad,<sup>11</sup> they were a relatively small group that was spatially clustered in a handful of neighborhoods. Nevertheless Blacks in Philadelphia endured economic marginalization, overt racism and

---

<sup>11</sup> The largest free Black community resided in Philadelphia as freed slaves in Pennsylvania came to Philadelphia to join those in the city who had been freed by manumission (Nash 1988). Institutions in Philadelphia like the Free African Society, the first independent Black organization in the US formed in 1787, and the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, provided important spaces for many to advocate for the improved conditions. The Philadelphia chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) formed in 1912. Though limited employment opportunities existed for Blacks in the city as a whole entrepreneurial economic development gave rise to a small but growing Black middle class. Philadelphia's reputation as a political (especially because of strong abolitionist activity), cultural and economic center for Blacks also contributed to the influx of Southern Blacks during the Great Migration (Countryman 2007).

violence throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries (Nash 1988).<sup>12,13</sup> As Blacks began to arrive in larger numbers during the Great Migration, the exodus of Blacks from the South to the North during World War I and the 1920s, racial segregation intensified within the space of the city and between the city and the suburbs. The Second Great Migration continued in the decades after World War II until the Vietnam War, and continued to shape the dynamics of race throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

For those who came during the Great Migration, racial discrimination limited employment opportunities, which contributed to residential segregation. For Blacks already in Philadelphia and for newly arriving folks from the South, employment prospects “were restricted by a racially and ethnically defined occupational queue that channeled them into the lowest status, least-remunerative positions” (Tolnay 2003: 221; Lieberman 1980). Both native Philadelphian and newly arrived Southern African Americans were residentially and economically segregated more than European migrants during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Though demographic numbers cannot account for the full experience of Blacks to Philadelphia they nonetheless offer a glimpse of the scale of migration and its impact on the city demographics. In 1930 Philadelphia's Black population was 11% and grew to 13% by 1940. The percentage of Black residents steadily increased in after World War II growing to over 18% in 1950, 26% in 1960 and over 33% by 1970 (Gibson and Jung 2005). Despite the growth of the city's Black population in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it did not

---

<sup>12</sup> Prior to WWI Blacks in Philadelphia were primarily either part of the small portion of elite professionals, business owners, and domestic servants for wealthy Whites or the larger group of low-skilled laborers (Countryman 2006).

<sup>13</sup> In 1834, 1842, and 1849 race riots emerged as competition for low skill jobs between arriving European immigrants and Blacks exacerbated tensions (Countryman 2006).

ensure economic incorporation as those who came to post-WWII Philadelphia settled into a shrinking economy marked by deindustrialization and a racially divided city marked by white-flight and suburbanization.

*Push and Pull Factors: Labor, Economic Opportunity and Racism*

The growth of Philadelphia's economy made it a viable destination for Blacks leaving the South. World War I created a political economic moment where Black migration to the North became vital for industrial production. First, the onset of war in Europe diminished the steady flow of European migrants who had moved to the US for decades and became industrial workers. Second, many white working-class men left to serve the war efforts in Europe thus creating job vacancies. Third, the demand for labor also grew as wartime production created economic growth. These factors combined to make jobs previously unavailable to Blacks available and economic opportunity became another draw for Blacks looking to leave the South.

The restrictive immigration policies passed in 1924 curtailed migration from Southern and Eastern Europe, which extended the labor shortage. Employers in Philadelphia and other Northern cities sought Blacks from the South as the main source of inexpensive labor to replace low-skilled European migrants. With labor in demand, businesses in the North also sent agents to recruit potential workers in the economically depressed South.<sup>14</sup> During WWII industrial mobilization and labor shortages similarly created a draw and during the 1940s Philadelphia's Black population doubled (Countryman 2006: 13-15). These "pull factors," dynamics that draw migrants to a

---

<sup>14</sup> In particular railroads needed wartime workers to aid in transportation and line maintenance as such many arriving Blacks became employed by the railroad industry in addition to metallurgy and steel industries in Philadelphia (Wolfinger 2007: 25). Even as many Blacks became the city's working poor, whitening European immigrants continued to view Blacks as competition for decent housing and jobs.

particular place, combined with the small but growing existing Black population made Philadelphia a significant destination during both periods of the Great Migration.

Additionally “push factors,” dynamics that compel people to leave, made migration a desirable option and a necessity for many. Emancipation did little to change the conditions of occupational segregation in the South and men were disproportionately concentrated into unskilled jobs, especially agriculture, and women often only found work in domestic service (Bose 2001, Jones 1992).<sup>15</sup> De facto economic segregation joined de jure legally sanctioned segregation. Anti-Black racial violence, political disenfranchisement, Jim Crow laws, limited education and access to resources created conditions of vulnerability and exploitation for Blacks in the South. For those who were able to leave, or those who were recruited for labor, Northern cities like Philadelphia provided a place for (limited) opportunities not available in the South (Sugrue 1998). Few business owners were willing to employ Blacks after the end of WWI. Though Black migration stalled during the Great Depression, those who arrived in the Second Great Migration entered a Philadelphia that would change substantially post-WWII in terms of economics, politics and residential segregation.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Marks (1989) shows that the taken-for-granted notion that Blacks who left during the Great Migration were from rural areas and employed in agriculture is too homogenizing as many Blacks hailed from towns and cities and had extensive employment outside of agriculture. Recognizing the broad range of experiences and backgrounds then is also essential for better understanding the constellation of factors that compelled people to leave and the human capital they had and brought with them.

<sup>16</sup> Chain migration established flows between Philadelphia and common points of origin in Virginia and South Carolina (Wolfinger 2007). Women played a critical role in creating communal and kin networks that funneled Blacks to Philadelphia. Family members pooled resources to send folks North and kin networks disseminated information to others “back home” in the South about the availability of jobs and housing and facilitated the journey and settlement for new arrivals.

*Spatial Settlement From 1830s-1950s*

The seventh ward, bounded by Spruce Street on the north, South Street on the south, Sixth Street on the east, and Twenty-Third Street on the west, was both home to the largest Black population in the city and the main entry point for new migrants.<sup>17</sup>

Blacks who attempted to move out of the Seventh Ward and into adjacent neighborhoods found resistance from recently established Italian and Irish enclaves as “the mere suggestion of African Americans looking for homes in the area touched off riots” (Wolfinger 2007:2).

Housing options outside the dense and dilapidated slums of South Philadelphia and overcrowded rowhomes in North Philadelphia were virtually non-existent for the majority as residential mobility at the time remained a privileged position of class, maintaining the Black core and White periphery of the urban landscape. In the 1940s and 1950s, Blacks began to migrate out of the seventh ward and into several neighborhoods in North Central Philadelphia roughly bounded by Spring Garden Street on the south, Lehigh Avenue on the north, Ninth Street to the east and the Schuylkill River to the west. Still the low vacancy rate, high demand and deteriorated housing made this option both untenable and undesirable.

At the same time, the Black middle class began to look for housing outside the rapidly crowding spaces of North Philadelphia. As Whites left for the suburbs the former streetcar suburbs in Germantown and West Philadelphia drew middle and working class

---

<sup>17</sup> Based on fieldwork in the seventh ward W.E.B. DuBois’ seminal work, *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) showed that the struggles of Blacks lie with racial discrimination and unequal opportunity rather than Black pathology.

Blacks, especially in the areas below Market Street.<sup>18</sup> During the 1950s as urban renewal projects to redevelop the city center into a business district relied on “slum clearance” of blighted neighborhoods, which removed residential housing from poor and often Black neighborhoods in the downtown area. Displacements via urban renewal programs, residential segregation and high rents made it even more difficult for displaced families to find new housing, which intensified overcrowding.

### *Changing Political Alliances*

Working-class and poor Blacks in Philadelphia voted to keep the Republican political machine in power until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century even if its politicians acted outside of their interests. Moreover for many Blacks migrating from the South, Republicans remained the party of Lincoln while many leaders and elected officials of the Democratic Party in the South stridently supported segregation. In Philadelphia, with a more tenacious political machine than other large cities, the growth of the Black population did not matter much to the Republican Party as the machine maintained relationships through patronage as ward leaders organized the political support from ordinary residents in exchange for jobs, favors or financial assistance.

The conditions of the Great Depression and opportunities of the New Deal programs garnered Black support from ordinary voters and emerging political leaders. In the 1930s, Republicans leaders knowingly used racial divisions amongst the city’s working class to shift their focus to become the protectorate of White working-class

---

<sup>18</sup> Neighborhoods in Northwest Philadelphia also drew middle class Blacks in part because of their perception as a socially liberal space. Post WWII Black settlement grew in the middle class neighborhoods Germantown and West Mount Airy. Well-educated and politically conscious White residents of Mount Airy and Germantown organized themselves to integrate Black residents in the years after WWII and resisted white flight into the 1970s, remaining racially mixed space while many other neighborhoods did not (Adams et al. 1991; Goode and Schneider 1994; Countryman 2006).

interests. During the same decade, local democratic leaders built stronger alliances with Black political leaders and voters in order to wrest political control from the Republicans in power. Yet the strength of patronage and tenuous ties between local Democrats maintained Republican control of city politics and the mayor's office until the late 1940s. After WWII, Black support for the Democratic Party helped form a coalition to challenge Republicans for the sake of reform and to eliminate corruption.

The robust Black civil rights movement in Philadelphia in the 1940s and 1950s secured a major wins in immediate postwar years. In 1948 Black activists persuaded the Republican-controlled mayor's office and City Council to enact one of the first municipal fair employment practice laws. In 1951, in alliance with the Democratic liberal reform movement, the Republican mayor changed the city's home rule charter to include human rights provisions that banned racial discrimination in municipal employment, services and contracts. In the same reform, the city government established the Commission on Human Relations tasked with the enforcement of the antidiscrimination laws.

By the 1950s Black Civil Rights leaders established alliances among city Democrats to support municipal policies for economic and political equality, but the momentum of reform was short-lived as the Commission was often unable to deal with racial inequality in city labor markets, housing, and public schooling. Yet failure of such antidiscrimination remedies to change patterns of disadvantage lie also with the institutionalization of white privilege in federal and local policies (Countryman 2006).<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Countryman asserts that for Black civil rights activists, the reform of the home rule charter was seen as an opportunity to get equality written into to policy and allow Blacks to partake in the postwar economic expansion. Moreover he argues that these movements in Philadelphia were not only more intertwined than usually recognized but shaped by difficult battles over the strategies to realize racial justice and the tensions between different actors and interests in the reform coalitions.

As the city lost manufacturing jobs and shifted away from industrial production these economic changes combined with local and state policies that concentrated jobs, wealth and housing for the white suburbs, hollowing out the city and opportunities for people of color.

### Post WWII: Shifting Economy, Shifting Demographics

Beginning in the 1920s, economic activity and city residents began to relocate to the suburbs, yet not until after World War II was the city's regional economic dominance under threat. The onset of the Great Depression destabilized the strength of industrialization in Philadelphia. Once the backbone of the economy, large-scale industrial production began a decades long decline that shifted dramatically in the postwar period. Adams et al. (1991) note that technological innovation reduced the number of industrial workers needed, which reduced industrial jobs for city workers. Jobs and industry moved from the city to the surrounding suburbs, to the US south or west, and eventually overseas. Large multinational firms bought out Philadelphia-owned firms and executives relocated production to the Sunbelt or outside the US in order to find cheap, nonunionized labor.

While quantifying the loss only reveals a partial view of the scope of deindustrialization it contextualizes the vastness of the changes. The manufacturing sector of Philadelphia's economy lost 75% of jobs between 1955 and 1975 (Goode and Schneider, 1994: 35). The once robust textiles and apparel industries—the largest employer since the industrialization—accounted for 79% of the overall losses (Adams et al. 1991: 31). Whalen (2001) suggests that the diversity of Philadelphia's manufacturing sector made deindustrialization particularly devastating because it translated to broad

---

losses across a variety of industries without a singular anchor that could have remained. Additionally manufacturing relied on the production of nondurable goods which were more “sensitive to labor costs and had more movable infrastructures than durable good producers” (Goode and Schneider 1994: 30). Philadelphia’s reliance on nondurable goods, extensive suburbanization and its dependence on state and federal resources was greater than many other cities and exacerbated economic decline (ibid).

*Economic Restructuring: FIRE and the Service Economy*

After World War II, Philadelphia transitioned from a city with an industrial base to a restructured service economy based on FIRE industries (finance, insurance and real estate) and lower-skilled service sector jobs. The rise of contingent jobs in the service sector, specifically temporary and part time employment, continued to replace the full time, often unionized manufacturing jobs that had existed decades earlier. These shifts made employment tenuous as both high-wage jobs and low-wage jobs increased with many residents only able to access the low-wage jobs. Like other urban centers in the United States, the former manufacturing base of the economy was steadily replaced by the growth of lower paying service-based employment opportunities between the 1960s and 1980.<sup>20</sup> At the same time economic deprivation grew, the loss of industry and the shift towards a service-based economy further diminished the tax base as jobs and residents left the city in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

In addition to the growth and prominence of FIRE industries, various service industries in diverse fields like business, legal, health, and education, wholesale and retail

---

<sup>20</sup> While many note that the deindustrialization of the postwar economy gave rise to the growth of the service industry, Adams et al. argue “the transition from manufacturing to service employment occurs within manufacturing as well as outside of it” (1991: 33).

trade, construction and healthcare became the economic base. An important center for healthcare, professional services and higher education, Philadelphia's economy and attraction of higher-skilled workers, including immigrants, is centered on "Meds and Eds," those associated with universities and healthcare (Goode 2011). Numerous hospitals, medical school and institutes of higher education employ a broad base of city workers who are anchored in industries that are tied to the city and cannot relocate. For instance the two largest city employers are the two largest universities, the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University. Business and legal services continue to grow however they are subject to the threat of the relocation of capital. A shrinking tax base and job market limits the growth of the credit market for these industries ultimately leading to increased consolidation. This lead to the loss of local control of capital and the number of corporate headquarters in Philadelphia declined (Goode and Schneider 1994:35- 38).

The shifts from manufacturing-based economy to one centered on service work, also produced a bifurcated labor market within these fields. Industries like FIRE and services (health, education, business, legal and professional) produce two streams of labor and mobility. On the one hand professional, managerial and technical workers require higher skills, education but provide opportunity for career growth and employ smaller percentage of workers in these industries. On the other hand the bulk of employment opportunities lie in "increasingly deskilled white- and pink-collar workers" (Goode and Schneider 1994:36) in clerical and information processing positions. These deskilled clerical jobs provide lower pay, less job security and fewer options for

advancement than did the unionized skill work of the industrial economy and service work then creates different sources of interest fragmentation than did manufacturing.

*Displacement of Black and Puerto Rican Workers*

The second wave of the Great Migration North of Blacks and the significant migration of Puerto Rican between the 1940s and 1970s contributed to post-WWII Philadelphia demographic shift as the city became less White. Yet both groups experienced discrimination and limited opportunities both in the labor market and in the housing market. Puerto Ricans came to Philadelphia beginning in the late 1940s and early 1950s under US-Puerto Rican labor contracts as the economy of Puerto Rico shifted from agriculture to manufacturing. A major destination for Puerto Rican migrants, the community in Philadelphia grew rapidly in the 1950s from less than 2,000 to over 14,000 by the decade's close.

As US citizens, Puerto Ricans possess the full scope of legal rights and protections, often experienced a second-class citizenship. Whalen notes that many Puerto Rican workers in Philadelphia, like Blacks, were often “the last hired, the first fired” in industry, meaning their recent entry into manufacturing jobs meant they were laid off more quickly than whites who had these jobs for longer (2001). After WWII, Puerto Ricans and Blacks remained in the inner cities and continued to endure the adverse conditions of difficulty finding housing and jobs, enduring racism and resentment from White residents.

Forced to settle in deteriorated housing and hollowed out areas along the Spring Garden Street corridor, Puerto Ricans and White tension resulted in a 1953 race riot over space in the Spring Garden neighborhood. At the height of the Civil Rights Movement, in

the summer of 1964, police brutality and the exploitation of Black renters in the White-owned housing and White-owned business of North Central Philadelphia provoked a riot on Columbia Ave. in response to those forms of institutional racism as Philadelphia similarly experienced riots as did Harlem, Detroit, Newark, Chicago and Watts.

Later urban renewal projects would displace Puerto Ricans and Blacks further away from the city's center. While areas in North Philadelphia west of Broad became increasingly Black, Puerto Ricans, who were later joined by other Latino migrants, increasingly settled east of Ninth Street in North Philadelphia. Individuals from both groups found employment in the lower level of service industry and direct social services to the local population like public sector or nonprofit employees like social workers, teachers, street and sanitation workers, police officers and firefighters, public transportation workers and government employees. Still Puerto Ricans and other Latinos are underrepresented in public-sector employment (Goode and Schneider 1994: 37) and both Blacks and Latinos experience underemployment and unemployment as race and class increasingly segregated city space and the labor market.

#### *Suburbanization and White Flight*

Philadelphia's population dropped from its peak of over 2 million residents in 1950 continuously for the rest of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as both local and federal policies fueled the demographic changes of the city. Abetted by federal policies, the suburbs became whiter and the city less white and increasingly segregated. Increased job opportunities and newer housing stock that was affordable for middle and upper class changed the face of the suburbs. Wealthier, younger, Whites with high educational attainment left the city for neighboring Bucks and Montgomery counties throughout the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s and

1980s.<sup>21</sup> These were people who could find jobs in new FIRE sector and other burgeoning industries or follow the manufacturing jobs that relocated to the suburbs. Blacks increasingly found that discriminatory housing practices meant they could not follow the jobs to the suburbs, as it became more difficult to leave poor inner-city neighborhoods with limited jobs and resources. As a result, suburban homeowners became physically, economically and politically separated from the city.

White flight shifted the urban tax base and the balance of political power to favor the White suburbs, which contributed the disinvestment in US cities (Sugrue 1996). Investments in highways at the expense of improving public transportation in the city also facilitated suburban growth. Federal mortgage subsidy programs, which included many practices that discriminated against residents of color, favored the construction of new housing in the suburbs over improvements on existing city residences. In Philadelphia the substantial demographic shifts and dramatic economic restructuring lead to decades of population loss, which diminished the city's tax base and further increased racial and class based segregation.

### *Redlining and Block Busting*

Suburbanization is in many ways the spatial and political outcome of economic restructuring and public policies that promoted the economic mobility of Whites at the expense of non-whites. In Philadelphia and across the US, White flight was intertwined with real estate interests both through large-scale developers and local realtors. In particular redlining and block-busting, tactics tied to the growing power of the real estate

---

<sup>21</sup> Relatedly these federal policies post-WWII were the driving force that expanded the boundaries of whiteness to now include Eastern and Southern Europeans, including Jewish populations, who were able to take advantage of programs like the GI Bill (job preference, support and college tuition assistance), and affordable home loans in the development of the suburbs.

industry, kept Blacks and Puerto Ricans out of the suburbs and White city neighborhoods.

The Federal Housing Administration, created in 1934, inherited a neighborhood ranking system from its predecessor, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, that used a color-coded system to rate property values and mortgage investments based on a neighborhood's racial and class composition. The system deemed White, middle class neighborhoods as the soundest financial investments, which earned those spaces a green rating. Racially integrated or predominantly nonwhite, working class neighborhoods were coded as red—poor or risky investments. The FHA would not guarantee loans or insure mortgages for homes or businesses in redlined neighborhoods, but local realtors and banks were responsible for rating the blocks in the cities themselves thus tying assessments to the particular racial dynamics of Philadelphia. As the FHA was created by and for banks and the housing industry, banks and real estate profited at the expense of city residents. Blacks and nonwhites could not move to the suburbs because their rating as loan applicants was lower than that of Whites. The racially-biased rating of loan applicants also mean people of color could not borrow money to purchase homes in the neighborhoods they lived in or borrow money to repair homes they owned.

Strategies to keep White neighborhoods racially homogenous did not end with redlining. Blockbusting strategies used by local real estate agents encouraged White homeowners to refuse to sell to or to prevent Blacks and other nonwhites from moving into the neighborhood which would decrease property values as racial changed became tied to money. Realtors warned of potential racial hostility if Black families moved into white neighborhoods and real estate agents also exploited racial anxieties in White

neighborhood where selling prices declined by encouraging Whites to sell en masse. Realtors bought the homes at undervalue and then sold those houses to Black families eager for homeownership at a markup, further entrenching residential segregation, White flight and housing discrimination (Smith 1979). These tactics of blockbusting became particularly entrenched in White neighborhoods that bordered Black neighborhoods and in working-class spaces where White home owners could not afford to move when their property values declined or where White renters could not afford to buy or move (Sugrue 1996). While some Whites moved from neighborhoods where racial makeup was changing, other working class Whites who were unable to move “closed ranks” in city neighborhoods to keep their spaces as White as possible.<sup>22</sup>

The policies and practices by local, state, and federal governments came together to create a system of legally sanctioned residential segregation. White flight coupled with redlining and block busting, also increased abandoned housing, gentrification and homelessness in the decades after WWII. At the beginning of the political reform movement in Philadelphia, urban renewal and the redevelopment of downtown as a business center further fueled the displacement of Blacks, Puerto Ricans and other nonwhites.

*Political Shifts: Reform Coalition and Urban Renewal in the 1950s and 1960s*

The Democratic reform coalition shifted the alliances of city politics and defeated the Republican machine in the 1951 mayoral election, though those progressive victories were short lived. In addition to Black voters and ascending Black political leadership, the Philadelphia chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action, a recently formed

---

<sup>22</sup> In present day Philadelphia, several neighborhoods remain working-class, White ethnic enclaves, in particular the Eastern and Northern parts of the city that overlap with the original mill towns in neighborhoods like Port Richmond and parts of Kensington.

anticommunist organization that promoted liberal values, joined Quaker and Jewish groups in the reform movement who focused on ending political corruption. The Greater Philadelphia Movement (GPM), a nonpartisan group and a public-private interest alliance, aimed to expand the city's business and service sector, was a driving force of the coalition. As these organizations and actors came together they also influenced the trajectory of city policies in the aftermath of victory.

The leaders of the GPM, unlike the industrialists that supported the Republicans, came from new burgeoning corporate sectors like law and FIRE industries and were primarily concerned with how the reputation of corruption in city politics could impede investment in the city's downtown business center (Countryman 2006:45). The GPM represented a body of progressive technocrats (Goode and Schneider 1994) and in concert with the other groups the coalition strengthened the city charter and brought local government into Democratic control.

In addition to new home rule charter passed in April of 1951 that instituted nondiscrimination policies and human relations commission, in November of 1951 Joseph Clark became the first Democratic mayor elected in nearly a century. In the reform administrations of Clark and Dilworth (Clark's successor), government reform and urban planning were deeply intertwined as both mayors sought to revive the central business district. Both the GPM and the newly Democratic mayor's office believed in the ability of technocracy to reverse economic decline throughout the 1950s and 1960s (Goode and Schneider 1994). Representing the interests of corporate elites of growing economic sector—banking, insurance, real estate development and large-scale retail—plans to rebuild Center City as the site of modern office buildings for financial, business

and service institutions and upscale residences was the pathway chosen for economic growth (Countryman 2006).

Yet the reform movement represented not just a reaction to deep-seeded corruption in the Republican machine but also “the assumption of control by emerging forces produced by the shift from industrial capital to corporate services” (Goode and Schneider 1994: 45). At the same time the confidence of technocrats that economic revitalization could come from rebuilding the downtown underestimated the magnitude of the national and global economic shifts that prompted deindustrialization and the loss of capital. The main agenda of the policies was to bring business back to the city, yet in many ways, the changes could not be reversed.

For instance, the plan to revitalize the Society Hill neighborhood emerged in the late 1950s and was novel insofar as it relied on public mortgage financing and the a combination of public, quasi-public and private institutions to orchestrate its financing. The gentrification project “brought about an intricate intertwining of state and financial institutions together with an early an influential prototype of the public-private development corporation” (Smith 1996: 119). Neil Smith’s analysis showed how local government supported the development interests of local and global groups, like the GPM, and New York-based Madison Avenue real estate development firm, by permitting zoning changes and creating incentives for banks to provide finance (1979). As the project brought capital and interest from beyond Philadelphia it also found support from national policy to dislocate poor, Black residents in Society Hill, a neighborhood that formed the eastern portion of the seventh ward.

Projects like Society Hill supported the “back to the city” model of urban revitalization prevalent in the reform regimes of early Democratic mayors. Local government sanctioned gentrification favored the built environment, attraction of capital and interests of elites over the needs of ordinary people. Project backers believed the rehabilitation of the original, historic architecture of the neighborhood could draw back (White) middle class residents who left for the suburbs. In reality the project drew middle-class residents from other city neighborhoods, amounting to a “recentralization and reconsolidation of upper and middle class white residences in the city center” (Smith 1996:54).

Urban reform became expressed as urban renewal as the interests of business elites shaped the political regimes and policies of city Democrats during the 1950s and 1960s. The ousting of the corruption of the Republican political machine was replaced with a paradigm of neoliberal economic development backed by the reformers—Black and White middle class professionals—who fought for the interests of finance and capital to dictate the city’s restructuring. Countryman notes that in the early reform government, politicians believed the best economic action local government could take was to foster private enterprise (2006:51). As such, urban renewal projects created new linkages of capital and focused on the revitalization of downtown at the expense of residential neighborhoods.

The promise of Democratic reform did not improve the lives of people of color or immigrants in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Philadelphia. Nondiscrimination laws in the city charter and Democratic-lead government could not curtail the loss of industrial jobs, discrimination in employment or in housing and exacerbating residential

segregation for poor and working class Philadelphians, especially Black, Puerto Ricans and other nonwhite residents.<sup>23</sup> The deeply intertwined nature of the economic and demographic changes reveals how Philadelphia became physically and metaphorically hollowed out during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The emphasis on downtown development policies and projects continued through decades of mayoral regimes as the importance placed on economic development and high-skilled residents eventually shaped the creation of pro-immigration policies in the 2000s.

A Beleaguered City: Redevelopment, Politics and Population Loss in the 1970s and  
1980s

The predominance of FIRE industries and the limitations of Democratic reform continued to shape urban politics in the 1970s and 1980s as economic decline continued. Yet as more renewal projects continued to be proposed in the late 1960s and into the 1970s, the city cut services including public school funding, law enforcement, and sanitation (Goode and O'Brien 2006). The patterns of uneven development in Philadelphia continued from the 1970s into the 1990s as development of the downtown took precedent over residential neighborhoods.

*The Downtown/Neighborhood Divide*

During the decades of urban renewal projects, where the downtown district

---

<sup>23</sup> Countryman notes that Black civil rights activists were particularly interested in the potential of the Commission on Human Relations (CHR) to finally address the racial discrimination in public and private sectors. The liberal reforms produced visible benefits as the CHR investigated cases of employment discrimination (an average of 121 from 1953-1960) and opened up jobs in industries that had been exclusive to whites through patronage. The dismantling of patronage increased Black employment in the overall municipal workforce in particular sectors, like public school teaching, and public sector employment held higher wages. Yet Countryman shows that while these changes meant the CHR made inroads against racial discrimination in hiring it did not necessarily translate to increased number of job opportunities for Black workers (2006).

received tremendous public and private financial investment, working class people who lived in residential neighborhoods witnessed the loss of factories and jobs in their neighborhoods alongside the deterioration and abandonment of housing. Public debate coalesced around “downtown interests” versus “neighborhood interests” where the development of the city center was framed as diverting needed funds from neighborhoods. In the 1970s a major polemic in the debate centered on two proposed commuter rail lines that would link downtown to the airport and Amtrak and in the 1980s the debate dealt with the construction of a downtown convention center (Goode and Schneider 1994: 47). The projects were seen as favoring elite city residents, suburban residents and tourists at the expense of city residents.

The use of public funds for large-scale economic development projects continued as both local government and public-private partnerships alike held on to the idea that downtown redevelopment would spur economic growth. Neighborhood activism grew in spaces that hugged the city center as a means to push back against encroaching gentrification and displacement.<sup>24</sup> While some neighborhood-based organizations and

---

<sup>24</sup> The Community Action Program, part of 1964’s Economic Opportunity Act to fight the War on Poverty, initiated the emphasis on community-based action. In the 1970s, the expansion of federal antipoverty and community development funding bolstered the neighborhood movement by granting funds to community based organizations. The creation of the Community Development Block Grant in 1974 and the allocation of funds compelled the city to create Community Development Corporations and Neighborhood Action Committees (Goode and Schneider 1994). These place-based groups, several of which are still active, primarily competed for funding allocated by Philadelphia Office of Housing and Community Development for (Goode and O’Brien 2006). In CDC redevelopment emphasized that community residents and local stakeholders best understood their own needs and should have more say in local revitalization, the provision of social services and housing decisions. Community activism grew through both Black Civil Rights organizing throughout the 1960s and 1970s in neighborhoods (see Wolfinger 2007 and Countryman 2006) and through Alinsky-style community organizing and training, with both forms of activism overlapping in certain spaces. Goode and Schneider note that the shift to federal funding emphasized citizenship participation, self-sufficiency and volunteer work in community based organizations (CBOs).

community development corporations successfully fought off urban renewal projects that would have displaced residents, for instance community opposition squelched plans for an expressway on South Street, others fought and lost. The contentious proposal for the Pennsylvania Convention Center in 1983 took over 6 years to gain the approval of City Council and the Pennsylvania state legislature. As the project became a touchstone for public debate, symbolic of the continued downtown/neighborhood divide, the Chinatown Development Corporation fought hard to resist the Convention Center. The project was set to further constrict the already hemmed-in neighborhood that had been bisected by the construction of the Vine Street Expressway and the Gallery Mall. Even though neighborhood organizing grew and gained momentum, gentrification and urban renewal persisted in shaping neighborhoods and physically expanding the city center. Despite mayoral changes the prioritization of downtown revitalization, with different emphases, persisted throughout the 1970s and through the 2000s.

#### *Law and Order Politics*

The flight of capital brought economic decline, which increased poverty, crime, abandoned housing, homelessness and panhandling. In the context of growing “urban ills” Frank Rizzo, the city’s former police commissioner, was elected two term mayor from 1972-1980. Police brutality, especially against civil rights and Black power activists in his time as commissioner, and a strong penchant for tough-on-crime politics as mayor, including accusations of racially targeted police crackdowns in Black neighborhoods, made Rizzo a polarizing figure. Criticized for his oppressive governance and a large city payroll, which increased the size of the police force and awarded police significant raises

and pensions, at the same time Rizzo was popular precisely for his version of law and order politics that drew on White, working-class support and fear of the city's crime rate.

After two terms of Rizzo, city Democrats elected Bill Green to the mayor's office in 1980, even as Rizzo sought to amend the city charter to run for a third term. Green left after a single term and Rizzo once again sought office but lost the Democratic nomination in 1983 to Wilson Goode. Goode, elected with the support of Black Democratic leadership, became the city's first Black mayor. Downtown revitalization remained at the fore of local politics and development during Goode's time in office (1984-1992) with his intention to "aggressively market Philadelphia as a place to do business" (Goode quoted in Bauman 1992: 149).

Yet racial tensions persisted as residents of marginalized neighborhoods became increasingly isolated. Goode's order to bomb the house of the Black politically radical group, MOVE, in West Philadelphia's residential Powelton Village in 1985 represents the most resonant example of local government's exacerbation of racial tension. Eleven people, including five children, died in the confrontation with police. A fire sparked by the bomb destroyed most of block's housing, which was primarily occupied by middle class Black homeowners. Outrage about the disregard for neighborhood interests and institutional racism magnified in the wake of the bombing.

Sharp political divides existed alongside policies that feed growing racial and class divides. Neighborhoods, especially where poor people of color were concentrated, suffered from poorly funded public schools, high crime and police activity. Working Philadelphians across the city had high tax rates and crumbling infrastructure while the downtown projects continued to draw financial backing.

*Population Loss and Growing Inequality*

Economic decline and suburbanization and white flight continued to draw middle-class residents out of Philadelphia and the remaining population became increasingly older, Blacker and poorer between 1970 and 1980 (Bauman 1992; Robbins 1983).<sup>25</sup> US-born internal migration slowed, as Philadelphia no longer held the economic draw and opportunity for employment it once did. In the 1970s alone the population dropped 260,000 (Simon and Alnutt 2007). Between 1970 and 1990 the city lost twenty percent of its population (Goode 1998).

Population loss and the shrinking of the tax base were compounded by federal funding cuts in the 1980s. Hackworth notes that the loss of industry during the 1960s and 1970s exacerbated Philadelphia's budget shortfall in 1980s when the city "first through a \$2.5 billion pension debt (Hayllar 1999) then led to the layoff of 2,400 employees, selling off city properties, and borrowing money to cover the budget shortfall caused by the lack of industry taxes" (2007: 36-37). While in 1979 federal funding provided over a quarter of the city's tax base by 1988 it less than one-tenth under the cuts of the Reagan administration. A fiscal crisis in 1990 was not only the result of the reduction of federal funds and lack of state support but also attributable to "the fact that Philadelphia relies more on its local tax base (as opposed to state or federal money) than any of the other

---

<sup>25</sup> Bauman, drawing from the newspaper article written by Robbins based on report from the Philadelphia Planning Commission. Bauman explains that the report showed that by 1980 25 percent of the city's households were headed by a person over age 65, 39 percent of the population was Black (up from 33% in 1970) and the rate of poverty increased from 15.4 percent in 1970 to 20.1 percent in 1980. The report also noted that the median age of the city's population had increased in the decade, contributing to the older population. In terms of racial segregation the report noted that Black residents were even more concentrated in areas of North and West Philadelphia than they had been in 1970s and neighborhoods that had been predominantly white retained that characteristic over the decade.

largest cities in the United States” (Goode and Schneider 1994: 30-31).

By 1970 Philadelphia ranked first of the fifty largest US cities in terms of “urban deprivation” (Hughes 1989). The unequal distribution of minor economic growth in the 1980s meant that the racial and class divides of Philadelphia ensured that education, housing, employment and economic restructuring not only did not help those most in need but exacerbated the existing patterns of inequality (Adams et al. 1991).<sup>26</sup> By 2012 the rate of poverty in Philadelphia was 26.2%. In comparison statewide poverty in Pennsylvania was 13.1% and the nationwide average was 14.9% (US Census Bureau 2012). In 2013 Philadelphia’s percentage of residents who live in deep poverty, people with incomes below half of the poverty line, was 12.9% making it the highest rate of deep poverty among the 10 largest US cities (Lubrano 2013). What the political and economic statistics tell are a broad numerical account of change, but the ethnographic detail in the subsequent chapters reveal how these patterns of inequality within the city shape the ways that migrants experienced the residential, racial and classed divides.

### *Limited Migration*

Federal immigration reform in 1965 eliminated national quota preferences in favor of visa allocation to family members of those already in the US and for high-skilled workers. The eradication of national quotas opened up migration and brought successive waves of immigrants from Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. Mirroring national trends, post-1965 migration to Philadelphia primarily came Latin America, the Caribbean and Asia even though the city was not a major destination for migrants.

Even after the 1965 immigration reform, many cities across the United States saw

---

<sup>26</sup> Adams et al. (2008) show that in the twentieth century, Philadelphia suburban development after World War II consisted of two main waves; one immediately following the postwar era, and the other during the 1980s and 1990s.

their populations decline as residents continued to leave for the suburbs and migrants disproportionately settled into just a handful of major metropolitan areas. Immigrant gateway cities, like New York, offset their population loss and preserved their economic base through foreign-born migrants during the 1970s and 1980s. Like so many other consequences of economic decline, Philadelphia's shrinking tax base and limited labor market did not provide many opportunities for foreign-born migrants (Goode and Schneider 1994).

Yet there were several waves of immigrants during the 1970s and the 1980s that made Philadelphia home. In the 1980s, Koreans and Puerto Ricans were the largest migrants groups (Goode and Schneider 1994; Goode 1998)<sup>27</sup>. Colombians constituted the second largest Latino group after Puerto Ricans during the 1980s and migrants, documented and undocumented, came from Latin America and Central America to settle in the city. Vietnamese, Cambodian, Chinese and Indian migrants also migrated during the 1980s and 1990s settling in neighborhoods in South and North Philadelphia. Migrants from the Caribbean, especially from Jamaican and Haitian, arrived and settled into mixed spaces in North and West Philadelphia while Ukrainian, Polish and Russian migration, particular Soviet refugees in the early 1980s, settled in the Northeast (Patusky and Ceffalio 2004; Goode 2011).

While Philadelphia's foreign-born did not grow in the 1970s or 1980s (Patusky and Ceffalio 2004), migration was still a formative force in shaping social alliances and

---

<sup>27</sup> Goode (1998) notes that Philadelphia Puerto Ricans and Koreans both forged strong links to their place of origin and strong links with other co-nationals in the US through kinship networks, political participation and exchange. Both groups developed social service institutions based on language and ethnicity and experience strong community formation where poorer, more marginalized people have links to others with more economic, political and cultural capital.

neighborhoods.<sup>28</sup> Despite the growth of both Asians and Latinos in the city, migration to Philadelphia received little public attention or media coverage until the very late 1980s (Goode and Schneider 1994: 49; Goode 2011). This relative invisibility of post-1965 newcomers was due, in part, to the relatively small number of migrants and their spatially clustered settlement in neighborhoods that had been hard-hit by the loss of industry and residents (Goode 2011). Philadelphia's limited global links to capital also meant that it did not attract migrants at the same rate as its urban counterparts with more global links like New York, Los Angeles, Miami and even Houston.<sup>29</sup> Still waves of foreign migrants continued to diversify the long-standing Black-white racial divisions. During the 1990s even though the overall population, particularly the US-born population in Philadelphia, continued to decline the number of foreign-born residents in Philadelphia increased (Ceffalio and Patusky 2004).

*City as Site of Consumption, City as Business: Philadelphia in the 1990s*

Mayor Ed Rendell continued the emphasis on downtown development as a site of consumption aimed at attracting professionals, tourists and suburban consumers in the 1990s. Architectural projects like the Convention Center, and transforming Broad St into the Avenue of the Arts, joined large office buildings to create an image of a modern city on the rebound. Moreover these projects sought to spur the construction of hotels, retail space and restaurants in order to fuel the expansion of the service economy and

---

<sup>28</sup> Underscoring how migration to a predominantly Black-white city can change the landscape of racial (and ethnic) experiences and meanings, Goode and Schneider (1994) detail how the political economy of Philadelphia, neighborhood demographics and institutions, community organizations as well as everyday interactions and events shaped understandings of race and ethnicity for newcomers (Puerto Rican, Korean and Polish migrants) and established residents in three North Philadelphia neighborhoods in the late 1980s.

<sup>29</sup> Goode (1998) notes that relative invisibility of migrants in Philadelphia in the media contrasted the attention to migrants in other cities such as New York, Los Angeles and Miami.

hospitality industry. Yet despite the physical remodeling of downtown, the fiscal crisis limited city growth. The inability of city government to borrow money through municipal bonds to address its debt further entrenched neoliberal governance in Philadelphia when Rendell opted to cut city services in order to improve the city's bond rating. Hackworth notes with that move "Rendell successfully dismantled the local welfare state in Philadelphia with relatively few political consequences by framing the problem within the sufficiently narrow ideological confines of fiscal responsibility" (2007: 37). Representing one aspect of neoliberalization of governance,<sup>30</sup> Rendell cut city services in order to better access capital, favoring the maintenance and expansion of the city's entrepreneurial role over providing resources to residents.

The city maintained tax breaks and tax incentives to keep large business in the city and to try and attract new businesses during the 1990s. Local government's role became increasingly defined by its ability to encourage business and capital from the region and from the globe to return to the city. The notion of selling the city as an attractive, welcoming site for businesses, joined the focus on downtown revitalization as a draw for tourism, culture and hospitality in the 1990s and is reflected in the initial pursuit of migrants in the late 1990s and the efforts for a more "global" Philadelphia in the 2000s.

Mayor John Street's time in office, 2000-2008, likewise focused on producing "aesthetic and safe sites for outside private investment" (Goode and O'Brien 2006: 168).

---

<sup>30</sup> Peck and Tickell refer to neoliberalization, rather than neoliberalism, to emphasize the processual unfolding of decisions and to emphasize how these processes often have uneven and variegated consequences (2002). Similarly Kingfisher and Maskovsky note that any analysis of neoliberalism requires an approach that looks at how specific processes are articulated and take shape in different localities, through an examination of "concrete projects that account for specific people, institutions, and places" (2008:118).

Yet in contrast to Rendell, Street ran and was elected on a commitment to being the mayor of Philadelphia's neighborhoods. Street, a twenty-year veteran of City Council who represented North Philadelphia, focused attention on residential neighborhoods and emergent demographics, in particular Latinos who were incorporated into the upper levels of city management in Street's transition team. The mayor's Neighborhood Transformation Initiative (NTI), sought to combat neighborhood blight as it also addressed the growing resentment of city residents who were left out of improvements that solely focused on downtown.

The project focused on developing new housing and rehabilitating housing by addressing the physical consequences of population loss and city disinvestment in neighborhoods: abandoned buildings and lots. The NTI plans for development identified the margins of gentrifying neighborhoods as sites of targeted renewal, rather than focus on the gentrified neighborhoods in the city center. Still, perceived similarities to earlier urban renewal policies that lead to eviction and gentrification concerned residents. The plan, though seeking to restructure city housing, fell short of expectations, but was indicative of the growing partnerships between public and private interests. While the NTI's focus on long neglected neighborhoods represented a distinctive break from the dominance of downtown development, it sought to leverage private investment to aid its redevelopment. Implicit in Street's plan was the notion that the best hope for success was for the public sector to acquire, and occasionally assemble, contiguous tracts of land in blighted areas, but only those areas that had marketable potential as a means to attract private investment and private developers (McGovern 2006). Similarly during the Street

administration the “knowledge industry” became increasingly important part of urban revitalization as universities also became sites of development (Goode 2011).<sup>31</sup>

Even though organizations like the GPM once held great power in redevelopment each successive board of the GPM comprised of locally committed business elites had fewer and fewer individuals invested in the local and these individuals increasingly came from heavily localized fields (local real estate, law firms and corporations headquartered in the city) with limited connections to global capital. Instead over the decades, business elite who maintained a stake in the city exercised interest through proliferating non-profit corporations and through the public-private partnerships—thus operating outside a system of “electoral accountability” (Goode and Schneider 1994: 46) but continuing to play a major role in policy development (Adams et al. 1991). The growth of public-private partnerships—that is coalitions of local government actors who represent the public sector, business and corporate actors who are part of the private sector—in the urban revitalization of Philadelphia would become key to projects that sought to make Philadelphia more “global.”

In the 1990s, the increasing clout of multinationals in business combined with proliferating the discourses about globalization, global trade and capital in the middle of the decade likewise contributed to new ideas for growth. Both government and the private sector, and their partnerships, maintained that the best approach was to facilitate private enterprise for growth, but began to look globally for more solutions. Previously the focus had been on bringing things back to the declining city: the suburbanites and

---

<sup>31</sup> Goode (2011) explains that the emphasis on university development is important in two main ways. First universities border residential neighborhoods and the university-associated health care facilities are located in residential neighborhoods providing important links for Street’s emphasis on neighborhoods. Second the universities and their health care facilities also employ many migrants in the city and thus become important institutions for migrant incorporation.

their middle class tax base (as in the case of Society Hill), the factories, the banks and financial institutions. Population loss, for the most part, had never been discussed as requiring global relations except by aspiring multinationals during the 1990s in the moment when both discourses about and policies to facilitate globalization took off. Yet during this time public discourses focused on how to make Philadelphia a “world class” or “global” city in order to attract visitors and capital (Goode 2011).

#### Global Philadelphia and the Significance of Immigration in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

The emphasis on global capital and globalization found new expression in the 2000s as demographic changes in Philadelphia took on new meaning. In the 1990s alone the city lost 4.3% of its population but foreign-born residents of the city grew 30% during the same period (Patusky and Caffalio 2004). In the late 1990s, through public-private partnerships and local city government politician began to identify migrants as a key resource to increase Philadelphia’s competitiveness in the global economy. At the end of the decade, Councilman-at-large James Kenney and the Pennsylvania Economic League began to collaborate on a plan that would introduce the idea that Philadelphia should seek to attract migrants as a means of revitalization. The collaboration developed an economic-based argument as to why Philadelphia, a city with a hollowed out tax base, should look to migrants as a source of connection to international markets. The plan also implicitly advanced the idea that these migrants would be high-skilled professional migrants with an entrepreneurial disposition (see Chapter 4).

The strategy to attract migrants became the novel means by which the city and its economy could grow. Presented to the entirety of City Council in October of 2000 the justifications in their testimony at the hearing and in the solutions and strategies outlined

in the report constructed migrants as engines of much needed economic growth and population replenishment. Kenney noted that the larger East Coast cities of New York and Boston that experienced no overall population decline in previous decades has something to their advantage—the influx of foreign-born migrants had offset the loss of native-born residents. He noted that the overall growth masked two streams of change: the loss of native born resides was offset by the influx of new immigrant residents. The plan attempted to discursively transform the meanings of migration to the city by linking migration to urban economic development.

Following Kenney’s initiatives, the City Council considered creating an Office of New Philadelphians in 2001. Concerns over funding, lack of mayoral support from Street, and anxieties over immigration after September 11<sup>th</sup> pushed pro-immigrant initiatives to the background. Nevertheless in the mid-2000s there were small steps toward promoting migration to the city through public-private partnerships. For instance the creation of the non-profit Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians,<sup>32</sup> which receives city funding city and currently has one City Council person on its board, at-large councilman David Oh.<sup>33</sup> The city has also implemented language access services to make

---

<sup>32</sup> The Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians (WCFNP) began as the Philadelphia Area Immigration Resource Center (PAIRC). Founded in 1998 the PAIRC’s initial focus was the provision of services to the Irish immigrant community in Philadelphia. According to the Welcoming Center’s origin story on their website a study conducted by the PAIRC revealed that the landscape of immigrant services in Philadelphia was inadequate because of difficulty of access and fragmentation. The study results prompted the director of PAIRC to collaborate with other immigrant organization to collaborate and establish a central and broad-based organization and the WCFNP opened in 2003 and focused as an employment center.

<sup>33</sup> It is interesting to note the political dynamics of councilman at-large positions in Philadelphia given the predominantly Black-white dominance in local politics. Goode notes that the strong collaboration between Black and white powerbrokers in the city made the incorporation of new immigrant groups limited. As it has been difficult to garner enough support for geographically-based district seats, first and second generation Puerto Ricans and Koreans in the 1980s and 1990s (and in the present), have pursued at-large seats and have only been successful through

all city departments accessible to non-English dominant immigrants. The efforts of localized policies and institutions such as the Welcoming Center represent efforts to not only attract but also incorporate migrants into the social fabric of the city yet are also as part of larger goals of making the city more global.

As part of broader initiatives, the desire for migrants became about better positioning the city towards the “global scale of financial and human capital circulation” (Goode 2011: 262). Thus the emphasis of many local political actors in attracting migrants was attracting upscale populations, in particular for medical and educational institutions. For the purposes of the city as a political entity the crucial migration stream to Philly was the university-based “Meds and Eds,” the professional and potential entrepreneurs, who constitute a significant portion of newcomers. However in the earliest years of the attempts to attract migrants as potential global human capital, lower wage service workers, some of whom are migrants that experience downward mobility upon entry due to exclusion, were simply not part of the equation. Yet in the face of increased anti-immigrant sentiments in Pennsylvania and the nation more generally, future attempts to create localized policies became more inclusive and oriented toward welcoming all kinds of migrants (see Chapter 4).

Elected in 2008, Mayor Nutter’s political regime continued to emphasize the city’s need to promote economic development by attracting globally linked industries and people to Philadelphia. Within one month of his election to mayor, Michael Nutter

---

cross-group coalitions (1998). Here David Oh’s position on City Council was also facilitated by being a Republican candidate, as the minority party is guaranteed at least 2 spots on the 17 person council. Seven seats are reserved for at-large council members. The first Puerto Rican elected to City Council, Angel Ortiz, was elected to his at-large seat in 1983 through the support of a coalition among progressive organizations, Black and Puerto Rican voters.

declared to City Council a goal to grow the city by 75,000 residents within ten years (City of Philadelphia 2008). In June of that year Mayoral Executive Order further cemented the goal of attracting immigrants as a solution to urban struggles as Nutter underscored the need to retain and attract immigrants. The Executive Order implored city stakeholders to “develop strategies and policy recommendations for improving the integration of immigrants and language and cultural minorities into the social and economic fabric of the city” (City of Philadelphia, 2008). Moreover in 2008 the city created a task force International Philadelphia Work Group to develop strategies “to raise Philadelphia's international profile and its role in the global economy.” The task force was also responsible for improving language access in city agencies as part of its broader mission to simultaneously making the city an international destination and immigrant-friendly by incorporating immigrants through job creation and business development.

Prior to the task force and the mayoral executive orders, the city of Philadelphia in conjunction with the Pew Charitable Trusts and the state legislature of Pennsylvania created the Greater Philadelphia Tourism Marketing Corporation (GPTMC) in 1998. Through the passage of House Bill 2858, Act 174 the creation of the GPTMC served as the region's de facto marketing agency to specifically increase tourism, the hospitality sector, international travel and international business through the creation and marketing of the city as a brand. Tied into the competition for residents and tourists the aims of the GPTMC, now called Visit Philly, sought to make the city a landscape of consumption for visitors and residents alike.

The Global Philadelphia Association emerged in 2010 to promote development of an “international consciousness” in the region, and enhance the region's “global profile.”

In 2009 the organization existed merely as a discussion group among organizations with similar interests or investments in promoting the international profile of Philadelphia. Formalized in 2010, its first annual report described the need to move beyond the non-profit community of its founding members to operate as a public-private partnership to expand the organizations impact.<sup>34,35</sup> Shortly thereafter GPA sought corporate sponsorship (including Lockheed Martin), included governmental bodies (the Philadelphia city government), private businesses, chambers of commerce, academic institutions (including Drexel University), international institutions with similar mission and private citizens in order to support growth of economic activities, events, cultural offerings, tourism (specifically from international visitors) and greater international visibility for the region. In conjunction with policies and institutions aimed at attracting and incorporating migrants both the GPA and the GPTMC reveal the tremendous investment of numerous stakeholders in creating a more “global” city.

The Pennsylvania Economy League, maintains similar goals and it focused on attempting to make Philadelphia more global by establishing an international brand. This emphasis on establishing the city as a “significant global actor” and in 2009 the Economy League established their World Class Greater Philadelphia to expand Philadelphia’s global reputation and presence. These newly established programs seek to increase global exports, and advocate for increased immigration, recruiting more international college

---

<sup>34</sup> The organizations include the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Global Interdependence Center, International House Philadelphia, International Visitors Council of Philadelphia, Japan-America Society, the UN Association of Greater Philadelphia, Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians, Women’s Campaign International, and World Affairs Council of Philadelphia.

<sup>35</sup> The GPA became incorporated as a member-governed nonprofit corporation in June 2010.

students, growing tourism to the area, attracting foreign investment and connecting to international markets through specific trade missions to global economic centers.

### Conclusion

By 2010, the population of Philadelphia increased for the first time in six decades. This achievement, widely celebrated by the local government and in the press, was only made possible through increased immigration, in particular increased Latino immigration. The gains are the fruits of efforts that span over a decade. In Philadelphia the desire to increase the city's international profile converges with the need to attract migrants stands in larger contrast to the predominant anti-immigrant sentiments that exist at the national level and at other local levels, including elsewhere in Pennsylvania (see Dick 2011). Even as local policies attempt to valorize the presence of migrants as a means to its growth and revitalization in its efforts to increase its global recognition the political economic trajectory of Philadelphia, its deep racial and class divides, often means migrants are differentially incorporated into the city—both as elite professions or workers trying to survive in declining city.

Even as the city has sought to attract migrants, these efforts have their limitations as the post WWII political and economic transformation of Philadelphia means that Colombian immigrants have been entering a city of deeply entrenched Black-white relations, of segregated geographies, economies, politics and neighborhoods. For the Colombians who came in the earlier wave of migration in the 1970s and 1980s continued to navigate the changing politics of race in the city for decades. For those who came in the later wave since the 1990s they still encountered a divided city and more recent immigrants face similar conditions. This chapter has examined how significant changes

in Philadelphia produced the stark spatial, social, and economic divides in the city, and the chapter that follows will explore specifically how Colombians migrants settled into the city.

Yet, in order to understand the experiences Colombian migrants living in Philadelphia we must not just understand the political economic trajectory of the city, but also how changing political, economic and social conditions in Colombia compelled them to leave and continue to impact their livelihoods even decades after they have left. Colombian migrants are and continue to be shaped not only by their livelihoods in Colombia in the past but also by important political, social and economic transformations in Colombia in the present. In the chapter that follows I also offer a historical overview of Colombia, exploring the conditions that prompt immigration and transformations that continue to impact the conditions for Colombianos in Philadelphia. Drawing on the history of Colombian political change throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, I explore the causes of migration to show how they impact experiences in Philadelphia and contextualize how significant transformations in Colombia in the 21<sup>st</sup> century shape the lives of Colombianos in Philadelphia.

## CHAPTER 3

## STRAINS OF MIGRATION: COLOMBIA HERE AND THERE, THEN AND NOW

The intertwined dynamics of political instability, violence and a burgeoning drug trade in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have been and continue to be the main impetus for Colombian migration. Vulnerabilities to these issues created successive waves of emigration to other nations in Latin American, especially Venezuela, and to the United States. In fact, emigration from Colombia has become a defining feature of its nationhood as an estimated one out of every ten Colombians have left to permanently settle elsewhere (Bérubé 2005; Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores 2009).

The veneer of postcolonial regime stability from the mid-18<sup>th</sup> to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century masked significant periods of political violence and its social effects. The contours of Colombian history reveals how conflict between political parties became expressed at different historical moments in order to more fully understand the causes of migration. This chapter traces the longer political, economic and social history of transformations of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and their partial roots in the earlier decades, come to shape Colombian migration—who left, when they left and why they left. Next the chapter focuses on Colombian migrant incorporation in Philadelphia at the height of the two main waves of migration during the mid-1980s and late 1990s, to illuminate spatial settlement, community formation, experiences of racial discrimination, and relationships to other Latinos in the city. The chapter closes by emphasizing the 21<sup>st</sup> century social, economic and political changes in Colombia and how these dynamics not only represent evolving

relationships towards their nation of origin but also how these dynamics come to shape ideas about Colombianidad in Philadelphia.

Understanding struggles with everyday violence, drug trafficking, economic uncertainty and steps towards improvement in Colombia throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and into the 21<sup>st</sup> century illuminates not only the reasons why many Colombians left their homes, but also how these experiences shaped the ways Colombians in Philadelphia would become incorporated and enmeshed in larger structural changes like global neoliberal economic reform and US intervention in Latin America. As Colombian migration continues to steadily grow in the United States it becomes increasingly important to understand and address the social, economic and political ties migrants create in Philadelphia and the maintenance of existing and the creation of new ties to Colombia. Though violence and drug trafficking came to define Colombia in the eyes of others, significant changes including decreased guerilla activity (specifically kidnapping and other forms of violence), steady economic growth (marked by foreign direct investment and tourism), and an overall sense of “national progress” in the 21<sup>st</sup> century shape new expressions of Colombianidad in Philadelphia that draw on these changes as a way redress their racialization.

#### Colonial Legacies and Racialized Geography in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries

While academic scholarship, public discourses, and media representations present violence in Colombia as the inevitable outcome in the struggles of a weak or failed state, expressions of violence in different historical moments emerge from complicated sets of internal and external dynamics that are overlapping, rather than the manifestation of inherent characteristics. After independence from Spain, efforts to create an integrated

polity created significant partisan divisions where complicated by the natural geography of Colombia which further complicated the political and social divisions of the agricultural based economy. Divided by three major mountain ranges, *cordilleras*, that divide the land into numerous valleys and a major river, the Magdalena that bisects the country, the topography of Colombia created pockets of population separated by difficult physical terrain and insufficient infrastructure. The Magdalena River, despite its centrality in transporting goods to the coasts for import and export, proved difficult to navigate. These features hindered transportation, which rendered communication, trade, and travel extremely difficult.

Spanish colonial rule exacerbated the spatial divisions, creating political divisions between the eastern portion, which contained the bulk of the population and held the political power, and the western regions that contained gold and other natural resources central for export. The interior regions, often more inland and to the east, were comprised of mestizos and indigenous communities and sustained economy anchored by agriculture. Along the Caribbean and Pacific coasts, where chattel slavery gave rise to gold-mining, Afro-Colombianos survived despite political and economic marginalization alongside wealthier mestizos. These divisions created not only political and economic divides, but racial and cultural ones as well.<sup>36</sup> Geography produced a profound sense of regionalism that became complicated by the agricultural based economy and land tenured-based

---

<sup>36</sup> Appelbaum (2003) argues that 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century elite intellectuals mapped race onto the topography of Colombia and solidified regions (often physically separate by mountainous terrain) as racially and culturally distinct. Mapping regions in racial terms concretized certain places and their populations as “white” and “modern”, while others were categorized as inferior and backwards by virtue of their non-whiteness and location. Race and racialization thus shaped regional identities and regional identities that became part of nation-building projects. These characterizations shaped the legacy of violent conflicts, especially political divisions, and continued to inform conceptions of identity. See also Wade 1993, 2000.

classes. Spatialized fragmentation shaped the development of regional differences that have proved to be an obstacle to a cohesive national politics and identity (Safford and Palacios 2002; Bushnell 1993; Roldán 2002; Wade 1997; 2000; Appelbaum 2003).

After independence in 1810, the hacienda system continued to concentrate landownership in the hands of elites as the landholding structure relied primarily on *latifundios*, large land holdings that depended on large numbers of agricultural laborers.<sup>37</sup> Land-owning elites, also controlled the emergent political parties as party clientele networks maintained control of rural political affiliations. Strong clientelism, the asymmetrical political and social relationship that depends upon patronage, pressured large swaths of the peasantry to support the political leaders and the political party of their land-owning patrons.<sup>38</sup> The political disenfranchisement and unequal land distribution in rural areas shaped the experience of violence in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Partisan divides strengthened in different political moments during the 19<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *Minifundios*, smaller peasant or indigenous held plots based on subsistence farming, also existed but were not as prevalent as the larger *latifundios*. The labor forces on larger properties were a mix of sharecroppers, renters, day laborers and other contract-based laborers, who were susceptible to various forms of debt peonage, which made patron-client political relationships even more critical to the unfolding of partisan politics and civil wars in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>38</sup> There have been several scholarly critiques about the conceptualization of patronage and clientelism in connection to Latin American nation-state formation. One critique is that an overemphasis on clientelism conceptualizes poor peasants as having no political agency outside of their roles as clients, reducing the complex experiences of peasants to the largely empty exercise of obligation. A second critique argues that instead of conceptualizing clientelism as part of a weak or failed state, these networks and relationships historically and contemporarily are essential features of government including democratic governments (Lomnitz 1992). Assertions of Colombia as a failed or weak state by scholars, especially in political science, usually derived from corruption, violence and failure to control rural *departamentos* in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which in part is owed to a larger history of patron-client arrangements in the primarily agricultural based economy. Furthermore during and after *La Violencia*, agrarian peasant movements fought back against the state and these systems of patronage and unequal wealth distribution.

century.<sup>39</sup> From 1831 until the mid 1840s, the Conservative-led government created strong political centralization and concentrated power in the capital of Bogotá during a period of economic stagnation.<sup>40</sup> The Liberal-dominated period of political decentralization and the rise of regional economic and political autonomy, from 1845 to 1876, lead to both more external economic opening and regional isolation. Through these decades the eruption of politically motivated civil wars undermined regime stability as periodic violence disrupted daily life for those most vulnerable: indigenous, Afro-Colombians, peasant and non-land owning communities and families (Safford and Palacios 2002). The social and political marginalization of rural peasantry not only contributed to rural to urban migration in the 20<sup>th</sup> century but also made those who remained in rural area most vulnerable to violence in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The intense political partisanship between Liberals and Conservatives, fueled by traditional patron-client relationships, lead to eight civil wars in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Bushnell asserts that these disputes set the stage for the political vulnerability of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (1993). At the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century a deadly civil conflict spurred by a national election dispute, encroaching US imperialism, and the emergence of coffee as

---

<sup>39</sup> Safford and Palacios argue that the Liberal and Conservative parties and their ideological divergences coalesced between 1830 and 1832. In the early years while there were no outright party organizations, networks of friends and colleagues in similar stations of life (occupation, education and family history) recognized shared values and orientations, which evolved into overt political alignments. Even with differing ideological perspective on the role of the Church, access to education, voting rights, centralized versus regional-focused government, and economic policies (specifically protectionism and free trade), both Liberals and Conservatives maintained elitist, upper-class identities and maintained paternalistic relationships to the broader populous (Safford and Palacios 2002: 134-156).

<sup>40</sup> The dissolution of Gran Colombia, the state which included all of modern Colombia, territories in Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama which corresponded to the Spanish colonial territory of Nueva Granada. In 1830 the Republic of New Granada became the centralized federal government but maintained territories of other nations, which would eventually become the modern day nation-state Republic of Colombia in 1886.

cash crop, portended both periods of economic growth and instability and periods of political instability.<sup>41</sup>

### Dynamics of Violence in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

Substantial political, social and economic transformations in Colombia during the 20<sup>th</sup> century illuminate struggles of state sovereignty. While in the first half of the century the loss of Panama to US political and economic interests diminished state power, the growth of the coffee industry catapulted the national economy into global economic exchanges more than ever before. In the second half of the century, the growth of the drug trade and violence thrust Colombia on the world stage anew, but as a nation in need of intervention. Internal changes like intense urbanization, combined with external dynamics such as the wax and wane of US interventions, to contribute both to emigration and to internal displacement within Colombia.

#### *Coffee, US Involvement and Colombia on the World Stage 1900-1940*

While during the 19<sup>th</sup> century Colombia “lagged behind” other Latin American nations in terms of economic and industrial development because of minimal exportation, the growth of the coffee industry more fully integrated Colombia into the world market. By the 1880s coffee became a principal export and 1910-1940 witnessed a veritable

---

<sup>41</sup> The War of a Thousand Days or *Guerra de los mil días*, lasted from 1899 until 1902. A severe drop in the export price of coffee in the 1890s joined political discontent over accusations of elections fraud that favored Conservative elected officials and forced Liberals to lose the presidency in 1885. Dissent from the Liberal party contesting their political exclusion and tensions between the Liberal party and radical factions within it, joined longstanding frictions between Conservative and Liberal parties. The conflict grew into an armed civil war that threatened the ruling government. Over 100,000 died making it the largest and most violent of the 19<sup>th</sup> century civil wars (Roldán 2002; Bushnell 1993).

coffee boom.<sup>42</sup> Industrial development in the 20<sup>th</sup> century depended on income from exports, coffee in particular.

The United States was the largest market for Colombian coffee and US government involvement shaped a series of agreements amongst Colombian growers and landowners. By extension between these agreements shaped the relationships between Colombian producers and US consumers, which further entrenched US interests. Moreover, coffee cultivation maintained structural inequalities that mirrored colonial agricultural arrangement—intense labor of non-landowning peasants and workers, in service of land owning elites—though coffee farming was done on both large and small land plots.

The US continued to extend its political and economic influence, though not without conflicts. In 1903, the US had backed the independence of Panama from Colombia because of interests in canal building, petroleum deposits and potential for a strategically positioned naval base. With the growth of coffee, the US heavily invested in Colombia's economic development through loans and payments as settlement for Panama. As geography and lack of infrastructure had always been the main obstacles for internal and external trade, this US-backed foreign investments and international credit that followed the coffee boom offered the first opportunity to develop substantial infrastructure for transportation and communication.

Though US involvement in Panama and Colombia at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century marked a longer period of strong military intervention and coercion in Latin America the direct involvement approach would shift in the 1930s. The 1930s the “Good Neighbor

---

<sup>42</sup> Palacios and Safford identify three main phases of coffee cultivation: 1) the rise of coffee between 1910-1940; 2) stagnation between 1940-1975; 3) reactivation between 1975-1994 (2002: 267).

Policy” of non-interventionist political strategy in Latin America pulled back the heavy hand of the United States. Yet the onset of the Cold War after WWII diminished the propensity for non-interventionist stances. With Colombia’s relationship to the US evolving and its economy growing, partisan divides remained beneath the surface and would become reanimated in new ways in the beginning in the 1940s.

*Political Tensions and La Violencia 1940s-1960s*

Despite the multiple civil wars of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, on the surface Colombia seemed like a stable democracy with electoral and institutional continuity in the first half 20<sup>th</sup> century. Yet the fierce partisan divides of the Liberal and Conservative parties undermined that stability as tension reached a breaking point in the 1940s, triggering the growth of social violence. Instead of military coups that Latin American neighbors endured, Colombia’s political parties divided power among their constituents’ interests and clashed with each other.

Sparked by the assassination of Jorge Eliécer Gaitán, a populist Liberal with widespread support, pervasive rioting in Bogotá in 1948 became known as the *Bogotazo*. This event marked the beginning of *La Violencia*, the undeclared civil war that lasted until the mid-1960s, which drew upon larger existing political fault lines between Liberals and Conservatives and wrought political instability, violence and social repression. Between 1946 and 1966 an estimated 200,000 and up to 400,000 Colombians died as a result and another two million are estimated to have migrated or been forcibly displaced from their homes. The impact of *La Violencia* changed the course of political power in the nation as it created Colombia’s only military coup in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (1953-1957) which was temporarily quelled by the Liberal and Conservative factions who

agreed to alternate control of the presidency and share political power for two decades in order to prevent the possibility of a populist dictatorship. Nevertheless political violence persisted and created profound social upheaval.<sup>43</sup>

### *Rural to Urban Migration and Violence*

Prior to *La Violencia*, rural to urban migration changed the social and political dynamics of the nation. Urbanization occurred quickly; by the 1950s nearly half the population lived in urban areas, whereas in the 1920s less than a third lived in urban areas. The rapid growth of cities led to increased demands on public services, higher cost of living and the surfacing of “an increasingly vocal underclass” in the largest cities of Bogota, Medellín, Cali and Barranquilla (Roldán 2002:15). This redistribution of the population solidified cities as centers of social, economic and political programs, which further marginalizing those in rural areas from the benefits of economic growth during the same period. *La Violencia* accelerated the migration out of rural areas to cities significantly transforming the social geography of the nation.

Still *La Violencia* disproportionately affected those in rural areas despite migration. Violence across *departamentos* made political support for a particular party a life-risking endeavor, especially in rural areas, as “partisan cleansing operations were carried out in settlements dominated by the minority party in municipalities” (Safford and

---

<sup>43</sup> The idea to alternate power between the two parties began in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and in 1946, Conservative President Ospina proposed the reinstatement and the half the ministries and departamentos governors appointed were Liberals. Yet in 1948, the Liberal Party, under the leadership of Gaitan decided to pull out of the agreement, and Gaitan was killed a few months later. In 1957 the two parties reached an agreement where each would alternate the presidency, called the National Front. Still the Conservative party reaction to the *Bogotazo* a decade earlier in many ways ensured the endurance of political tension. The president sought to dismantle the Liberal political power by suspending the congress, removing Liberals from the police force, reorganizing the cabinets of government and re-establishing a partisan government, which exacerbated violence and instability.

Palacios: 2002: 348). As the majority of violence persisted in the rural areas, in particular the coffee-growing zone, peasants remained the main targets and main casualties who became displaced from their homes. Those who could leave left rural areas for cities in search of work and relative safety from everyday violence.

*The 1960s and 1970s: Revolutions, Guerilla Movements and the Cold War Context*

Complicating the rural violence in Colombia were larger hemispheric dynamics including the proliferation of political revolutions across Latin America, especially the Cuban revolution, and US Cold War concerns and fear of the spread of communism. While *La Violencia* did not have a definitive end, presidential order was restored in 1958 as political power again returned to the elites, but violence persisted in rural areas. At the same time momentum for agrarian land reform among the rural peasantry joined larger ideological movements like liberation theology and the international Communist party. Violence continued under new conditions, in part, as a fight for social and political change.

Guerilla organizations emerged during the partisan violence in the midst of displacement, dispossession, political repression and government-sanctioned violence of agricultural workers, peasants and other citizens during *La Violencia*. Peasant self-defense groups formed in response but the national army's attempt to wipe out the armed bands of self-defense groups transformed them into fully formed guerilla organizations with new goals of revolutionizing the social and political order. One of the most infamous guerilla groups, the *Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia* (FARC) began as an agrarian-Communist group who fought for peasants' rights to land, better conditions for workers in an overall platform of land reform. In the context of the Cold

War, communist-oriented organizations were considered an eminent threat to national sovereignty and security, and while the state sought to violently dismantle FARC in 1964 it did not succeed. Other revolutionary groups like the ELN, *Ejército de Liberación Nacional*, were inspired by the events of Cuban revolution and similarly focused on the rights of the rural peasantry. The political resolve of ELN for agrarian reform was further supported by the growing popularity of liberation theology, the religious moral reaction to social and material inequality and injustice in Latin America. Rural violence was also complicated by guerillas groups' efforts to garner support, sometimes through violent means, and their opposition to state attempts to subdue their political movement.

During the same period the United States became increasingly concerned with the possibility of more Communist revolutions in Latin America. The "Alliance for Progress" policy flowed from the Kennedy administration as part of larger Cold War effort to create political stability and economic development that favored US interests in promoting capitalism and would dampen revolution in Latin America. Rather than the interventionist strategies with more overt and coercive tactics of earlier political moments, the Alliance for Progress focused on international aid projects that emphasized housing and education, especially for the urban poor. Housing projects in Colombian cities that stemmed from these international aid projects, like the Techo Housing project in Bogotá where President Kennedy gave a speech in 1961, likewise contributed to urban migration.<sup>44</sup>

Though the government welcomed the millions in US aid, Colombia still maintained protectionist tariffs to grow self-sufficient industries for most of the 1950s and 1960s. These protectionist tariffs comprised part of a larger import-substitution

---

<sup>44</sup> The neighborhood itself is now known as Ciudad Kennedy.

industrialization program that oriented manufacturing for domestic consumption in order to replace a reliance on imports. These policies fueled the development of regional economies and industrialization of certain departamentos while many rural areas failed to see industrialization.

*The Rise of Narcotrafficking and Drug Cartels in the 1970s and 1980s*

The end of *La Violencia* was marked by the rise of guerilla violence in the 1960s, but by the 1970s it was the rise of narcotrafficking and its related violence that created instability and vulnerability. Though it may seem like a neat succession of *La Violencia* giving way to other sources of violence, Safford and Palacios argue against conceptualizing the violence as teleological or even continuous, instead insisting that there were distinct but often overlapping causes impacted by both regional division within Colombia and larger global forces (2002).

The growth of drug production and trafficking lead not only to major wealth production but also the creation of cartels who employed violent tactics to maintain wealth and control of the drug trade. With the growth of the drug trade, violence became a criminal economic enterprise (Safford and Palacios 2002). Between the 1960s and the 1980s FARC, its composition and its goals, transformed in light of political economic shifts and the lucrative rise of the drug trade. They moved from small-scale organization fighting against national military forces in rural areas to become a large-scale organization with its own standing army that with regularly clashed with the national military as drug money allowed them to expand operations.<sup>45</sup> It was not until the 1990s

---

<sup>45</sup> In Colombia small-scale marijuana cultivation began in the 1960s while in the 1970s large-scale production took over with the eradication of Mexican plantations and the importation of coca from Peru and Bolivia for processing in Colombia began. As cocaine consumption in the United States grew in the late 1970s and 1980s, production replaced processing as coca planting

that FARC became full enmeshed in the narcotics trade its established strongholds in rural areas became essential to those enterprises.

In the 1980s with the ascendance of the Medellín and Cali drug cartels, violence that had been mostly confined to rural areas and non-urban areas, began to encroach into the cities of Bogotá, Medellín and Cali. The rise of the drug trade came hand in hand with organized crime as guerilla violence became harder to disentangle from the general social violence. Safford and Palacios note that the long history of violence in Colombia created an export economy that rested upon a “tripod of illicit drugs (principally cocaine and heroin), coffee and oil” between 1980 and 1995 (2002: 222), and the rise of the drug trade not only brought in new influxes of capital to the economy but also increased violence. The drug economy and its influence permeated social and political institutions including the government (especially local and regional politics), the army, the church and the judicial bench. As small level drug trafficking of the 1960s became a major economic export by the 1980s, international attention to Colombia as the locus of illicit drug production in the Western hemisphere solidified drugs and violence as the national image.

Violence and political instability created by the fighting between the state and guerilla groups was augmented by the growing power of paramilitary groups who clashed with both. The development of paramilitary groups formed with the support of drug cartel leaders and wealthy landowners who wanted protection against guerilla groups and with

---

in rural areas, under protection of cartels and some guerilla groups. Through those decades Colombia steadily became the leading global exporter of cocaine. In the 1990s heroin consumption grew and thus it joined cocaine as a major illicit export. Because drug planting and processing needed to occur beyond the reach of the state, rural areas with their less dense population and general social marginalization provided the ideal locations for these enterprise. Yet as cartels and guerilla groups grew in strength because of the lucrative nature of the drug trade these rural areas also became subjected to even more violence.

the intention to wrest control of production and distribution of narcotics from guerilla groups. Paramilitary groups gained territorial control by displacing smaller landowners from their land, which served as a way to challenge the power of guerillas in the same regions. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s these groups sought to gain power in new areas, including the coffee growing region and major cities as both guerilla and paramilitary of groups attempted to garner support and new members through coercion, threat, and murder in areas where they maintained control.<sup>46</sup>

*The Life History of Elvira*

In the 1980s and into the 1990s violence related to the drug trade spread into regions that were relatively unaffected by violence in the 1950s and 1960s. The regions along the Caribbean coast and in the coffee growing region between Medellín and Cali, because of their strategic location, became key points in the drug trade and thus violence became a more recent reality. Displacement from both work and land in rural Colombia prompted urban migration and encroaching violence from the drug trade compelled many to leave the country all together in the 1970s and 1980s. The life history of Elvira, a woman whose family in Colombia was displaced in the coffee growing region during a heightened period of guerilla violence, illuminates several shifting social, political and economic dynamics in Colombia—including both the importance of coffee as a commodity, the growth of the drug economy, and rural to urban migration.

Elvira, a woman in her mid-fifties who moved to Philadelphia in 1986, explained

---

<sup>46</sup> The government sought to address the violence and regain control through increased militarization, which only further alienated peasants. As disparate paramilitary groups grew they sought more political status and attempted to gain it by opposing or undermining peace negotiations between the government and guerillas.

the link of growing guerilla power as shaping her migration trajectory and that of her family before her. Elvira was born in Manizales, the capital of Caldas, in the heart of the coffee-growing region. Before her birth in 1954 her family lived in a smaller town in Caldas as her father worked in a coffee-processing factory. Growing unrest within the town caused her mother to become even more fearful about guerillas after someone followed Elvira's father home from work one evening and asked to speak to him about his political support. Her family decided to relocate to the more urban Manizales and while Elvira grew up in the city, as a young adult she sought economic opportunity in Bogotá, because of the "limitations of Manizales" and because "the big city could offer me more."

Moving in her early twenties with limited job experience in Manizales and without a college degree, Elvira hoped to fare better in Bogotá. She moved in 1978 to the capital and after living for seven years without much success in establishing her career, she was prompted to consider leaving Colombia all together in 1985 after guerilla attackers stormed the Supreme Court in Bogotá. She said

After that I thought to myself, nowhere is safe her any more. I have to get out. I used to think I was better off in the city, safer than anywhere else, but after that, they had so many guns and they [guerillas] were able to get in [the Palace of Justice]. I did not want to stay. I could not stay. I made plans with a friend of mine to leave. She had cousin in Philadelphia and we left in January of 1986, as soon as we could.

Elvira's life history reveals the circuitous route she and her parents had to navigate in order find a semblance of safety though they were never directly affected by the violence. Many Colombians who came from rural areas and sought economic employment in the city encountered instead disappointment and thus emigrated again in search of economic

opportunities. Elvira sought to start her life over, as her parents had before, choosing a different city each time with the hopes of economic stability and an escape from violence.

As the violence of the 1980s and 1990s involved more actors and became more widespread, reaching both cities and previously quiet regions, more and more Colombians migrated. In the mid-1990s the onset of serious economic stagnation in response to structural adjustment programs in Colombia resulted in high unemployment and the reduction of social benefits. Migration to cities continued and at the same time strained already limited resources. Suárez-Orozco and Páez note that, “globalization and economic restructuring have intensified inequality in Latin America, generating unemployment and underemployment—and hence new migratory waves.” (2009: 12). The entwined nature of economic restructuring and globalization in Colombia during the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the subsequent migration of Colombians illustrate that very notion.

*War on Drugs, US-Partnerships and Neoliberal Economic Reforms in the 1990s and 2000s*

In Colombia new waves of migrants in the mid-1990s sought to leave behind the nation’s most serious economic crisis and the deepening militarization of the international War on Drugs. As the United States became more concerned with the production and distribution of narcotics in Colombia it sought to form a political and economic alliance with the nation in order to eradicate coca cultivation and the remaining vestiges of cartel control. Neoliberal economic reforms enacted in the mid 1990s opened the economy to international markets, the privatized state-owned businesses, and reduced both public spending and social welfare programs (Guarnizo and Díaz 1999: 400).

Through talks with the Colombian government during the 1990s, President Clinton of the US with President Pastrana of Colombia launched Plan Colombia a multibillion-dollar aid package, which sought to boost the economy by eliminating the drug trade and violence. A new phase of controlling the drug trade through foreign policy emerged in the early 2000s as the majority of money within Plan Colombia was earmarked for military spending, which made Colombia the largest recipient of aid in the Western Hemisphere.

During 1999, nearly at the same time the US Congress was voting to pass Plan Colombia, the Colombian government was applying for its first loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While political instability and violence had some to shape the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Colombia its economy had surprisingly remained stable throughout that time, especially compared to other Latin American nations. In the mid-1990s Colombia's economy began to stagnate, compelling the state to apply for the loan in 1999, as the stagnation worsened into a full economic crisis with the highest unemployment rate in the nation's history. Conditions of the loan required fiscal austerity measures including the revision and reduction of the public pension system and the downsizing of the public sector. These mandated measures eroded social services including health care and education, which led to the layoff of thousands of workers in all economic sectors. Deteriorating economic conditions contributed to decisions to migrate, forming the second main wave of Colombian migration to Philadelphia.

## Waves of Migrations and Making Philadelphia Home

The first substantial wave of migration of Colombians to Philadelphia began in the mid 1970s and lasted through the 1980s.<sup>47,48</sup> Though by no means heterogeneous, the first wave was comprised of many urban middle-class and professional migrants who sought to escape the repercussions of decades long civil war, *La Violencia*, and contemporary issues of drug-related violence. By the early 1990s, Colombians were the second largest foreign-born group in Philadelphia and second the largest Latino group. The second wave of Colombian migration to Philadelphia began in the mid 1990s as increased drug

---

<sup>47</sup> I have categorized the first and second wave of Colombian migration based on fieldwork and interviews as well as the available census data. While an earlier cohort of Colombian migrants trickled in to Philadelphia prior to my categorization of the first wave, they represented a handful of individuals who chose Philadelphia over larger cities with established Colombian enclaves like New York City. In fact only one of my informants, a second-generation Philadelphia-born Colombiano, could trace his roots to an earlier wave of migration as his mother migrated to Philadelphia in the 1950s from a small town outside of Cali as an escape from the disruptions of *La Violencia* and in search of employment opportunities in Philadelphia. She married an Italian man and they raised their family in South Philadelphia, for many years without many Colombian neighbors or friends but maintained Colombian cultural traditions within their household.

<sup>48</sup> While Colombian migration to the United States is often characterized as beginning in 1950s with small but substantial numbers, very few Colombians in this period made their way to Philadelphia, instead choosing to settle in New York and to a lesser extent Los Angeles (Guarnizo, Portes, Haller 2003). Though the main waves and root causes of Colombian emigration to the US overlap substantially there are some characteristics of migration to Philadelphia that distinguish it from the larger patterns.

Several scholars who mark migration to the United States as beginning in the 1950s, categorize the first wave of migration as lasting from the 1950s-1970s (Collier and Gamarra 2001; Nasser 2013). Overall the Colombians who came in the 1950s are described as generally being upper and middle class professionals who had the capacity to escape during *La Violencia* and seek out economic opportunities (Cardona et al. 1980). For scholars who categorize the first wave as beginning in the 1950s, the second wave is categorized as beginning in the late 1970s and lasting until the mid 1990s, and the third wave lasting from the mid 1990s to the present. Yet there is some disagreement in the literature about how best to periodize migration waves. Sanchez (2003) suggests the three periods of immigration to the United States were from 1945–1965; 1966–1990; and 1991–2000. Guarinzo (2006) asserts that the first substantial wave begins in the 1960s resulting in substantial brain drain. Although there is a consensus in the available literature about the immigration patterns of Colombians to the United States unfolding in three waves, the discrepancy regarding the exact periodization, limited information about the reasons that led to these patterns, and a focus on levels of migration to the United States as a whole, makes comparative analysis difficult.

trafficking activity and increased guerilla activity converged with significant economic stagnation as Colombians from all different socioeconomic classes and non-urban areas. This mirrors the broader characteristics in terms of class as well as region of more recent Colombian migration to the United States since the mid 1980s (Cepeda 2010; GUarnizo and Espitia 2007; Nasser 2013).

Distinct among Latin American migrants in the US, most Colombians come from cities (Cardona et al. 1980) a feature also confirmed by the Colombian census which reported that 88% of the 1.3 Colombians living outside the country come from urban areas (DANE 1996a, noted in Diaz and Guarnizo 1999: 399). Matching the larger profile of Colombians in the United States, Colombianos in Philadelphia predominantly come from cities, especially the three largest cities of Bogotá (the national capital in the interior), Medellín (the capital of Antioquía, an interior department) and Cali (the capital of Valle de Cauca, a department that stretches from the Pacific coast deep into the interior of Colombia).<sup>49</sup> Similar to other Colombians who migrated to the US during the same time period, who were primarily from the same urban areas, many Colombianos who came in the late 1970s and 1980s were middle-class and urban made up of both skilled workers and educated professionals (Cardona et al. 1980).

For many Colombians who settled in Philadelphia, the city was not their first destination upon arrival to the United States. As nearby New York and Washington DC are primary magnets for immigrants, Philadelphia's foreign-born population is more likely to be secondary migrants who migrated after first settling elsewhere; this distinct

---

<sup>49</sup> Many of my informants also came from smaller but notable cities including Bucaramanga, Valledupar, Armenia, Buga, Manizales, Baranquilla, and to a lesser extent secondary cities in departamentos like Girardot (near Bogota). Yet most came from the three major cities, in part because of the urban migration throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

feature remains in contrast for the foreign born populations of other major cities. Family connections, social networks and existing Colombian communities become important draws.

Colombianos arrived in Philadelphia starting in the 1990s came from more diverse socioeconomic statuses, especially compared to the first wave. Those who migrated during the second wave to Philadelphia experienced the expansion of the drug cartels' economic and political power as violence escalated across urban areas in Colombia, directly and indirectly affecting their lives. Economic stagnation during the combined with the growing power of the drug cartels and became the catalyst for middle and lower class individuals from both of rural and urban areas to leave the country. As the political, economic and social disarray became the motivation to leave the country, the stigmas of violence and drugs shaped the racialization of Colombians as they settled into Philadelphia and the US more generally.

Both the conditions in Colombia that compelled individuals to leave and the conditions of Philadelphia when they arrived shaped how Colombians came to understand themselves in a new city. Many Colombia immigrants who came to Philadelphia during the first wave were born during *La Violencia* and its aftermath, during the 1940s and 1960s. These experiences become not only a formative factor in their decisions to leave but this fostered a sense of political and social mistrust as they settled in a Philadelphia marked by racial divides, economic transformation and concerns of poverty in mid 1970s and throughout the 1980s. Driven to emigrate for reasons of personal safety as well as the crushing economic recession of the late 20th and early 21st

century, Colombians who arrived in the second wave encountered a similarly divided city, although once with a larger and more diverse Latino population.

I seek to emphasize violence, drugs and political vulnerability less as essential features of Colombia but more to emphasize how their reification as the definitive characteristics of the nation shaped the experiences of Colombianos in Philadelphia.<sup>50</sup> It is essential to understand how violence, economic difficulties, class stratification, political corruption, permeated peoples' everyday lives compelling many to leave not only for larger urban areas in Colombia for better economic opportunities and to escape the vulnerability of the violence wrought by drug cartels, leftist guerilla groups and right-wing, government-backed paramilitary groups.

Not only do these issues continue to catalyze migration and influence the reputation of Colombians in the US, but also Colombians in Philadelphia still grapple with and resist these associations. Experiences with violence, direct and indirect, across Colombia has shaped who has been able to migrate as it has contributed to their decisions to migrate. The experiences with drugs and violence, as well as concerns about economic opportunity, have also shaped when people have migrated. Most importantly Colombianos in Philadelphia have had endure these characterization as stigmas seek to

---

<sup>50</sup> While the difference may be subtle it is essential in order to avoid circumscribing and over determining violence as the definitive feature of Colombia as a so-called failed state. Violentólogo or Violentology has emerged as a specialized scholarly field of study, especially in Colombia but elsewhere in Latin America, that seeks to understand and address the root causes of political and social violence but in ways that often naturalize the issue of violence as a taken for granted feature of contemporary nationhood. See Roldán (2002) for a critique of the emergence and focus on violence by social scientists in the 1960s who sought to explain *La Violencia* as related to the uneasy shift from a “pre-modern to a modern society” and in doing so “exaggerated aggression fueled by status deprivation, or to rivalries between patron-client systems in which peasants blindly followed the dictates of an elite leadership or party boss” (2002: 22).

address these negative images by trying crafting a Colombianidad that presents themselves as ideal citizens—good and deserving people who seek upward mobility and security.

### Community Formation: Understanding Fractures

For Colombians in Philadelphia fragmentation can exist along multiple axes of difference as regionalism, class differences, and differences in educational attainment reinforce those tightly bound social networks. Differences in length of residency can create divisions between those of the first and second waves and between individuals of the same wave, though many social networks include family and friends from both waves. Moreover the tight-knit social networks of friends and relatives often share not only similar regional backgrounds but also similar class backgrounds. The history and political economy of Colombia, specifically political tensions and instability, rural to urban migration and the rise of the drug trade and guerilla activity, illuminate why people left but these factors are also implicated in the making of social relations between Colombians in Philadelphia and between Colombians and other Latinos.

### *Regionalism*

The salience of regional identities in Colombia is about more than geography (interior versus coast), but also about the history economic development and industry, which create ideas about specific cultural traits being tied to region (Bushnell 1993; Wade 1993; 2000; Appelbaum 2003; Roldán 2002). Regionalism amongst Colombians is reproduced but also reworked in United States, often serving to fragment social relationships among Colombians (Nasser 2013; Guarnizo et al. 1998). In Philadelphia, while the majority of Colombian immigrants came from the three largest cities, many

more hail from Cali than from Bogotá or Medellín. The predominance of Caleños in Philadelphia and their incorporation into middle-class positions in nonprofits and as small business owners, re-animate regional divisions between those from Cali and other Colombians.

Speaking about the prevalence of Caleños, Victor, a man from Bogotá who has worked various service jobs in downtown hotels, that note they are *cerrado*, or “closed,” because of the perceived preference for Caleños to associate with other (middle-class) Colombians from Cali. While people from Cali and Valle del Cauca have the reputation of being outgoing, social “party people,” Victor turned that reputation inside out and reworked his experiences with Caleños in Philadelphia to critique about the relative openness, or lack thereof of the group as a whole. This perception of Caleños as “closed” served as Victor’s justification for not living in North Philadelphia among other Colombians and for explanation of his reluctance to attend most Colombian cultural events or organizations.

### *Class*

As many Colombians who came to Philadelphia in the first wave were middle class with high levels of educational attainment in search of economic opportunities, some were able to re-establish their class status once in the US. Some who came in the first wave who had not completed college, who had gone to vocational school, or did not finish high school, became differentially incorporated into the labor market, working in factories or the service industry. As Heide, a woman from Bucaramanga who migrated in 1982 to Philadelphia said,

When I got here I met other Colombians, often in church or on the street and at that time I was trying to find work, maybe in a factory. It was hard

to find thing in common with other Colombians who had already started their businesses or who were professionals. It seems like they were already friends with each other and that was that.

Heide's perception of class differences as the obstacle to forming new ties with other Colombians continues to hold true.

For those who came in the second wave, class and regional fragmentation continued to produce small social networks. Those who had friends or family already in Colombia often became part of existing social network so while the networks expanded they remained relatively closed to outsiders. Perpetuating the closed nature of many of these social networks was social rituals or events that stayed private. Many people would socialize by visiting friends or having a party in their house. While new friendships formed, already existing social relationships remained the most important. As Diego, a man in late 30s explained to me,

When I came here in 2003 I would go to my cousin's house whenever he had a party. I would meet his friends and they would become friends of my wife and I too. In that way I got to know other Colombians who had been in Philadelphia about as long as my cousin David [who came in 1979]. Of course I met other Colombians and they are my friends but it is David and my friends I know through him who I will have over, who I will ask for advice, who will help me and I will help them. The others are more acquaintances.

Outside these social networks, *desconfianza*, or mistrust can continue to impede the forming of new social relations (Guarnizo et al. 1998). As Guarnizo and Diaz note the drug trade exacerbated the already exclusionary nature of Colombian society, which has come to bear on Colombianos in the diaspora (1999; Guarnizo et al. 1998).

Understanding these fractures reveals both the obstacles and the limits of the ways people come to construct a sense of Colombianidad. Differences not only became an obstacle to strong ties and alliances between Colombian migrants themselves and between

Colombian migrants and other Latinos, especially Puerto Ricans in the city. The spatial incorporation of Colombians into the Puerto Rican neighborhoods of North Philadelphia in moments of change shaped their experiences with racialization. Moreover in the 1980s the dynamics of incorporation into North Philadelphia also produced some frictions and distance between Colombians and Puerto Ricans.

#### Social and Spatial Relations with Other Latinos in a Changing City

The first wave of Colombian migrants formed “pockets” within the broader landscape of Puerto Rican community. Yet it was not only the various waves of Colombian migrants who became absorbed in to Puerto Rican spaces in Philadelphia. Other waves of Latin American migrants began to settle in North Philadelphia neighborhoods that were predominantly Puerto Rican in the late 1970s and 1980s the years during which many Puerto Ricans had been displaced from the Spring Garden corridor by urban renewal projects.

While Colombians have become anchored in and across neighborhoods in Philadelphia they remain spread out and diffuse; there is no specific Colombian neighborhood or enclave. Colombians remained interspersed throughout North Philadelphia neighborhoods with the largest concentrations in Juniata Park/ Feltonville, Hunting Park, Oxford Circle, and Lawncrest/Summerdale. Upwardly mobile Colombians often relocate to middle-class North Philadelphia neighborhoods like Olney or nearby suburbs like Cheltenham (Patusky and Ceffialo 2004; Goode and Schneider 1994).

Since the 1950s, Philadelphia has maintained the third largest Puerto Rican population of any mainland US city and remains important destination city for the migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland [see chapter 2]. While the Puerto Rican

population has historically been the largest Latino group in Philadelphia, smaller populations have grown including Cubans and Dominicans in the 1970s who arrived from New York City. In the 1980s Colombians has outpaced Dominicans and Cubans to form the second largest Latino groups but waves of other migrants, including Mexicans and Dominicans, in the 1990s would surpass Colombians.

*Incorporation into Puerto Rican-dominated Latino Organizations and Colombian Concerns*

Colombians and Puerto Ricans shared social and physical spaces in the very early stages of Colombian arrival in Philadelphia. Colombians who came in the 1970s and 1980s joined the existing Puerto Rican community who had already been displaced to North Philadelphia neighborhoods and joined them in the available positions within the service industry and the last remaining vestiges of the manufacturing industry in the city. In addition to lacking spatial contiguity of their own, the spatial concentration of Colombians in established Puerto Rican neighborhoods offered space for shared languages and experiences. Yet at the same time, perceived and material differences hardened socially constructed boundaries as divergent experiences of racialization, different access to US citizenship and resolve for political involvement proved to be obstacles. Though many Colombians focused on the fractures between themselves and other Latinos, especially Puerto Ricans, Alicia, a woman who had lived in Hunting Park since the mid-1970s, held a different perspective. She maintained deep social ties to the neighborhood and many of her Puerto Rican neighbors over the years, and insisted, “Puerto Ricans paved the way for all of us Latinos here.”

As newcomers, Colombians from the first wave relied on many established Puerto Rican community organizations and social spaces like churches to help them acclimate to their new life in the city. Those organizations helped Colombians find housing and jobs, and the church offered a space for worship and socializing. In this respect efforts towards building a cohesive Latino community seemed to be working but at the same time frictions, both structural and discursive, emerged in ways that limited coalition building between Colombians and Puerto Ricans.

Life histories of Colombians who migrated in the late 1970s and early 1980s illuminated four overlapping but substantial obstacles towards establishing deep and widespread alliance. First, the divergent racialization of Puerto Ricans and Colombians established different concerns and associations between the different groups. Second, and related to the first, Colombians migrants learned to distance themselves from Puerto Ricans (and African Americans) leading many to racialize Puerto Ricans as inferior. Third, differential access to US citizenship proved to be a substantial obstacle as many Colombians, both documented and undocumented, possessed fundamentally different political rights from Puerto Ricans and some viewed the citizenship as an undue advantage. Fourth, and related to the third, a different willingness and commitment toward local politics and political engagement, owed in part to political corruption and instability in Colombia, limited political organizing between Puerto Ricans and Colombians.

#### The Production of Difference: Stigmas and Racialization

The violence and drug trafficking that compelled many Colombians to leave became the associations that they continued to try to escape once in the United States.

Marked by the national reputations of drugs and endemic violence in the US imaginary, Colombians' racialization in the United States combined those particular stereotypes with more general presumptions about Latinos "illegals" that bring crime and unduly drain economic resources. Images of the drug trade as the defining feature of Colombia permeate US news reports, media and filmic representations, rendering Colombians as both victims and perpetrators of this violence. Both the specifics of Colombians' racialized association with drugs and violence and the general degradation of Latinos served to reinforce the stigmatization of Colombianos from both the first and second waves in Philadelphia.

These dynamics are exemplified in the story of Oscar, a man from Medellín who left for Philadelphia, sought to escape the conditions of Colombia's second largest city in 1996. While he migrated at the age of 30, his formative teenage and early adult years were spent in Medellín, the stronghold of the largest drug cartel and the city with the highest homicide rate throughout the 1980s. As a young man he was always fearful of the fact that men under thirty were the largest demographic of murder victims and having seen firsthand the risks endured by some of his friend who had turned into petty enforcers for low-level cartel members. Though he had not gone to college, instead completing his education at a vocational high school, he moved to Philadelphia because he "hoped his son could have a better education and not have to worry about the violence." Oscar's mother had left to live with her sister in Philadelphia so she petitioned a visa on his behalf with the hopes he could bring his wife and son shortly thereafter.

Yet Oscar's experiences once in Philadelphia reveal how the very issues he was trying to escape followed him as other people he encountered drew on the stereotypes and

associations of Colombians and the drug trade to judge him. Oscar recounted that after he was hired for a job in a warehouse, his supervisor told him, “I don’t know what you guys do down there in Colombia but we have a strict no drug policy in the work place.”

Oscar’s response was to assure the supervisor that he had nothing to worry about because he was never involved in drugs. On another level Oscar felt his supervisor’s assumptions also reinforced Oscar’s lower position in the workplace, to “put him in his place,” and served a warning that he might be watched more than others because of his nationality.

Not only did Oscar resent these associations he felt that it reduced him to oversimplified stereotypes and noted, “They hear you are Colombia and so the first thing out of their mouth is either drugs and cocaine, or coffee and Juan Valdez.” The dominant public perception of Colombia was and continues to be defined by drug trafficking. By association political instability, violence, guerilla activity, and the cartels that thrived in the global exportation of cocaine are implicated with perceptions of Colombia as a weak state and thus become not only projected upon the people in the nation but also Colombians who chose to emigrate in large part because of those conditions (Marrow 2005; Guarnizo and Diaz 1999; Guarnizo et al. 1998; Cepeda 2010; Collier and Gamara 2001).

Social and cultural projects undertaken by Colombians seek to reject this stigmatization of violence and narcotrafficking by asserting and highlighting the overlooked aspects of Colombian culture, identity and history. The reputation and associations with violence and drugs in the 1980s became the most widely disseminated images of Colombians in the very moments that their immigration to Philadelphia and elsewhere in the US increased. This racialization has not only shaped the incorporation of

Colombians in their chosen US destinations but also affected the interpersonal relationships of Colombians with others and Colombians relations with one another by weakening social ties (Guarnizo et al. 1998).

Yet despite the resentment of their racialization, Colombians apprehended the racial hierarchy of Philadelphia, where Puerto Ricans and African Americans were positioned at the bottom, and in many ways learned to distance themselves from those subordinated groups. In the 1960s national and local government categorized Puerto Rican as “White” and “citizens,” while Whites who shared Philadelphia neighborhoods perceived Puerto Ricans as “foreign,” “brown” “noncitizens” (Whalen 2001). City officials and social service agencies attributed racial tensions, including fights and riots, in the Spring Garden neighborhood in the 1950s and 1960s to cultural difference. They defined the problem not as racism but rather as Puerto Ricans and their culture. Social service workers and policy makers in Philadelphia interpreted Puerto Ricans through the emerging “culture of poverty” paradigm, which posited that roots of Puerto Ricans’ problems racial tension, struggles in the job market—were rooted in their culture which at its core sustained a lack of work ethic, laziness, dependency and lack of a sense of community.<sup>51</sup>

Mirroring national discourses, the Philadelphia public held fast to the notion that Puerto Ricans were responsible for their own poverty and struggles rather than the structural inequality of racial discrimination in housing and employment exacerbated by the economic restructuring and capital flight of a past-industrial city. Puerto Rican failure

---

<sup>51</sup> Whalen also discussed the gender implications of culture of poverty for Puerto Rican in Philadelphia. See also DeGenova and Ramos Zayas 2003 for a discussion of Puerto Rican racialization as dependency. Several works in anthropology concurrently sought to dispel these culture of poverty myths as they were become part of the common discourse about Puerto Ricans and Blacks in cities including Eames and Goode 1977; Leacock 1971; Valentine 1968.

was eminently racialized and “attributed to the immutable immorality or the underclass” (Goode 1998: 2). Colombian migrants arriving in the 1970s and 1980s often contributed to these narratives marking Puerto Ricans “as having it easy when it comes to jobs,” or “lazy” in contrast to themselves as hard-working immigrants. The differences of Colombian racialization from the racialization of Puerto Ricans, and the ways in which many Colombians continued to racialize Puerto Ricans as “dependent” much in the same way as Whites in the Philadelphia did.

Moreover the mutual deployment of racial stereotypes exacerbated the social distance. For example, Anita, who migrated in 1982, said she resented when her husband’s Puerto Rican friend who was over for dinner in the first year in Philadelphia made a joke about “Colombian neckties,” a violent killing often employed by drug cartels. In her opinion,

I thought he should know better. As a Puerto Rican he must have had things said to him or know what people think about them in general. How could someone who also is discriminated against also go ahead and that stereotype about us?

The difference experiences and discourses of racialization that Colombians and Puerto Ricans had to contend for Anita should have put them on common ground, but she felt even more betrayed by the association with the violence of narco-trafficking.

In other words, though there existed the many common experiences between Puerto Ricans and Colombians in the 1980s, many recalled instances where the differences were more significant than the commonalities. Indeed fragmentation and the closely bounded nature of Colombian social networks only created more obstacles. Despite numerous commonalities not limited to racialization, language, culture and geographic proximity in Philly neighborhoods yet Puerto Rican dominance of social and

cultural organizations as well as Puerto Rican involvement in local government, coupled with difference access to citizenship and legal status, created a social distance between Colombians and Puerto Ricans.

*Divergent Concerns about Citizenship and Political Engagement*

The lack of concern about citizenship and legal status among Puerto Rican organizers and institutions also proved to be a gap, as legal status remained a major Colombians concern, especially for Colombians without documents. Puerto Rican organizations formed to address issues of housing, bilingual education, limited city resources and services, and often attempted to incorporate the diversifying Latino population in the 1980s. In fact, Puerto Rican run and dominated organizations were often named “Latin” organizations in order to attract participants from the broader immigrant community, yet even deliberate attempts to incorporate all Latinos did not overcome differences.

For Colombians who arrived in the first wave, community-based organization, proved to be an important avenue for incorporation into the city and its institutions, and served as a way to get to form relationships with other Latinos. Yet there were obstacles to their sustained involvement in these organizations. For instance, Beto, who is now employed by the Philadelphia school district, migrated from Cali with a degree in education at the age of 26 in 1980. He sought to get involved in a Puerto Rican lead organization during his first few years in Philadelphia but recounted his frustration to properly convince the predominantly Puerto Rican organization to devote more time and effort to working with school administrators to help parents without papers feel comfortable enrolling their kids in school or getting involved in school activities. Beto

lamented that the focus was solely on introducing more bilingual programs as he saw the two causes as inextricably linked. He said

They simply did not understand what it is like for people who are not them. We have to worry about legal things, they never do. Initially that is fine but in my involvement with them in different organizations...like “Latinos for Schools” and “Latinos On the Move”<sup>52</sup>, many of them just did not take seriously what I said were important issues for Colombians. The issues they say for themselves became the only important issues for all of us and that’s not how it was. My ideas about what Colombians, or others, needed or what matters to us was just dismissed because they didn’t matter. I got so frustrated I left. They acted like, ‘Well there are more Puerto Ricans so its not that we are favoring Puerto Ricans we are just helping out the majority. Those other issues we will work on later.’ But they were connected for so many of us but not [for] the people in charge.

Beto expressed what he thought was marginalization and dismissal in his experience in these institutions. He recalled that while he was trying to appeal to all Latinos, he was trying to draw attention to what Puerto Rican leaders he worked with did not see as vital. Lack of legal status or comfort navigating institutions for Beto went hand in hand with the needs of Colombians and other Latinos, underscoring how the issue of citizenship between Latino groups, did in some instances impede working together. Beto also attributed the disinterest in addressing the needs of non-citizen or undocumented migrants as part of a larger pattern of marginalizing the concerns of “other Latinos” for what was better for the whole, namely the larger, more established Puerto Rican community. While it does not stand that all organizations maintained such a divide, Beto’s experiences speak to his specific perceptions of the divide between some Puerto Rican and Colombian activists at the time. On a general level engagement with city politics created wide gulf between the level of political involvement Colombians wanted and the level of involvement some politicized Puerto Ricans envisioned for Latinos.

---

<sup>52</sup> Pseudonyms

Guarnizo and Diaz argue the reluctance of US Colombians to become involved in politics stems from political corruption and the political process in Colombia. They posit “in general, the national political culture has been dominated by intolerance, exclusion, and often even violent suppression of the opposition (see Delgado et al. 1996).” (1999: 410). While not true for all Colombians many had a deep ambivalence or an outright mistrust of political involvement, in part, because of lack of trust of Colombia’s government. Moreover while many lacked citizenship for various reasons depending on their legal status, some Colombians were reluctant to naturalize of fear of losing an important symbolic tie to the nation of origin (see Jones-Correa 1998).<sup>53</sup> Similarly, as deportation was gaining attention as a solution to the problem of “illegal immigrants” in the 1980s and 1990s, undocumented Colombians feared political visibility might lead to their immigration status becoming exposed. Political involvement, especially in local politics shored up not only a reluctance of Colombians to enter into political coalitions with Puerto Ricans but also highlighted that many Colombians were ineligible for citizenship and sometimes disinterested in participating.

#### *Shifting Neighborhood Dynamics in the 1980s and 1990s*

While Colombians became the second largest Latino group behind Puerto Ricans in the 1980s the influx of a large number of Dominican migrants in the 1990s, both directly from the island and those relocating from New York City, shifted the demographic balance in North Philadelphia. Many Dominicans settled largely in North Philadelphia amongst the Puerto Rican community, especially in Hunting Park, which

---

<sup>53</sup> The Constitutional Reforms of 1991 permitted dual citizenship for Colombians living outside the national borders. The new constitution granted them the right to vote in political and the right to political representation in Colombia. These reforms, as part of broader constitutional reforms, signal the growing political and economic importance of Colombian migrants.

also had the highest concentration of Colombians in the city. By the time of the second wave of Colombian migration in the late 1990s and early 2000s the numbers of other Latino migrants groups remained large and Colombians would remain only the fourth largest Latino group in the city.

As increased Latino migration continued, the composition of the neighborhoods changed in correspondence. During fieldwork I focused on Hunting Park in particular because of the concentration of Colombians and other Latinos and its geographic location, it lies due west of other Latino neighborhoods Juniata Park and Feltonville, and as such is lies next to the predominantly Black neighborhoods of North Philadelphia. While Hunting Park's boundaries are no means concrete they are generally accepted to be Hunting Park Avenue on the south, Roosevelt Boulevard on the north, 9th Street on the west and 5th Street on the east. Feltonville begins at 5th street (though some would point to Front St. as its western boundary) ends at G St on the eastern boundary. Its bounded on the North by Roosevelt Boulevard and along the south by Erie Ave. Juniata shares the northern and southern boundaries, on the west Juniata begins at G St. and on the east it is bounded by the small Frankford Creek. Eastward of Juniata the neighborhoods become increasingly White. According to 2010 census data between 2000 and 2010 Juniata Park/Feltonville area saw the city's largest increase in Latinos as more than 6,600 new Latino moved into the neighborhood. (Shaw 2011). Neighboring Hunting Park after the 2010 census was 58% Latino and 39% Black/African American, where 14% of residents identified as Puerto Rican and almost half of household spoke Spanish (ibid). Because of the shared Latino population there is much overlap and movement between the neighborhoods.

While contiguous neighborhoods across North Philadelphia like Feltonville, Juniata Park and Hunting Park have significant Latino population and presences the neighborhoods are far from homogenous and have layered histories of demographic change coupled with racial tension. Even prior to the current increase of migration that has contributed to the city's 2010 population growth, migration and demographic change has exacerbated racial tension within and across adjacent neighborhoods. Despite the present racial composition of these neighborhoods, they have undergone significant change since the 1980s but each on their own trajectory.

Feltonville in the late 1980s and early 1990s was seen as a safer neighborhood than Hunting Park to the west and Fairhill to the south, which was associated with the "Badlands" an open air market of drug activity and related violent crime. The tumult of drug activity, racial change and the shifting urban economy was not exclusive to Feltonville but felt across many North Philadelphia neighborhoods. For years the residents of Hunting Park, which lies directly east of Juniata/Feltonville, were devastated by the loss of manufacturing plants and jobs from the neighborhood. In the wake of this exodus, the drug epidemic of the mid 1980s took hold in the neighborhood, whose reputation, economic vitality, housing stock and residents suffered the consequences for decades afterward.

As the loss of the manufacturing industry exacerbated White flight, the departure of longtime White residents made more room for Latinos to settle there. In the very moment of demographic change, Colombians settled into North Philadelphia neighborhoods that were experiencing a proliferation of drug use and drug dealing, which only served to reinforce the stigmas of violence and narcotrafficking. At the time that

Feltonville was becoming increasingly Latino, many White residents understood the demographic change as Blacks and Puerto Ricans infiltrating “their space” and as a harbinger of the invasion of drugs crime. Nearly all-White as recently as 1980, by 1989 Feltonville was home to an growing Latino population who at the close of the decade made up about 25 percent of the neighborhood’s residents.

*The Life History of Carmen*

Rapid demographic change sustained existing racial divisions and created new sources of tension in several neighborhoods. In Olney, a nearby neighborhood of middle class and aspiring middle class residents who are attracted by the larger housing available, the mix of ethnic whites and upwardly mobile Latinos experienced illegal realtor actions outlawed by the Human Relations Commissions of Philadelphia well into the 1980s (Goode and Schneider 1994). Tactics like block-busting maintained these neighborhoods as white in earlier decades, and still existed in Philadelphia in the late 1980s despite its illegality.

Racial tension over neighborhood change combined with these illegal tactics in ways that shaped Carmen’s experiences of marginalization in her first years in Philadelphia. Carmen, a hairdresser who migrated directly from Cali, recalled feeling unwelcome when she originally moved there in 1989. Though she lived with her sister Yasmina and her brother-in-law Jaime. Carmen struggled to get her bearings as she endured both covert and overt racism.

She was startled one day in April of 1989 to discover a handbill that had been slipped under the front door that listed the Latino surnames of recent homebuyers and urged current residents to move. Peddling white fear of racial change, the handbill

attempted to revile the newly settle Latinos, including Carmen and her family. Heightened emotions persisted as Carmen tried to come to terms with the event and turned to friends and family for support but she found mixed reactions. Despite her feelings of alienation and limited social network, Carmen was friendly with one White neighbor who had also received the same flyer with whom she discussed the situation. This neighbor confirmed that she had also found it under her door and felt sorry that Carmen and her family had received it. Though it remained unclear who was responsible for the handbill, the experience had a profound impact on Carmen's first years in Philadelphia. Yet the handbill itself was not the only surprising event, Carmen was also surprised by the difference between her reaction compared to that of her sister and brother-in-law, who insisted that instead of being angry Carmen ought to change her attitude. Between a neighbor's sympathy and her family's insistence that it was Carmen's emotional response that needed changing she felt alone, isolated and confused.

Carmen explained to me, "apparently they [whoever distributed the handbill] didn't know, *no se da cuenta*, they did not realize, that we were renting because the owners were *viejisimo*, very old, a very sweet old couple that bought a house in Bensalem [a middle class suburb in Bucks County]." The owners knew Carmen's brother-in-law as their son's friend from work and they decided to rent to the trio after they moved to the suburbs. Since the home remained in the hands of the original owners it was the young Colombians who received the handbill, which was supposed to incite racial fear of the very situation they existed in—increased Latino residents in a neighborhood that had primarily been white.

After the incident Carmen was reading the Philadelphia Daily News, a deliberate strategy to improve her English, when she came across an article that detailed the racial tension in Feltonville and described the real estate handbill issue. Carmen carefully cut out the article at the time and even though the delicate clipping had become yellowed and wrinkled she kept in a binder filled with other keepsake documents like her niece's junior high school graduation program. She confessed she kept the clipping because it made her feel like it really happened; it served as a tangible reminder of the experience.

In time her sister and brother-in-law relocated to suburbs of lower Montgomery County, a common destination for upward mobile Latinos who often lived in North Philadelphia (Goode and Schneider 1994). Carmen chose to move to El Centro de Oro, right off of North 5<sup>th</sup> St. in the heart of the business corridor of the Puerto Rican/Latino community saying she wanted to “stay somewhere she felt comfortable, surrounded by people like” rather than move to the suburbs and experience the same sort of racism all over again. As Carmen and others chose to stay in a predominantly Latino neighborhood, she witnessed the growth and diversification of the Latino community. Successive waves of migrants from other nations not only made these space more Latino, but Colombians without a spatial concentration and lower overall numbers remained without distinctly Colombian institutions, save for the handful of small businesses like bakeries and restaurants that dotted the 5<sup>th</sup> street corridor.

*“What it’s like to have something for ourselves”: Carving out Colombianidad in Latino Philadelphia*

Across the Philadelphia region and it is precisely the “marginal” position of Colombians that render the experiences of Colombians so very meaningful. Though they are largest South American group in the region, the numbers pale in comparison to the

long-established Puerto Rican community and the more recent but rapidly growing Mexican community and Dominican community.<sup>54</sup> This focus on Colombian migrants not only allows for a rethinking of experiences of their distinct racialization as Latinos (stigmas of violence and narcotrafficking), but also because their smaller numbers means that their interactions with other Latinos across Philadelphia neighborhoods hold added significance as they have neither the numbers, social organizations nor the political capital as Puerto Ricans, do not have the rapid increase of Mexicans whose fast-growing and spatial segregation in South Philadelphia offer a visibly distinct enclave.

Despite their decades long presence in the city, Colombians remained “invisible immigrants” in part because of their lack of a political presence and lack of identification as a socially distinct group. The first Colombian cultural organization, *Colombianos Adelante* formed in 2004. Over the course of several weeks in a computer class offered by a now defunct Latino immigrant community organization, a handful of Colombians in the class met and began discussing how the needs of the community in Philadelphia could not be met without its own organization. Within four years there were twelve Colombians

---

<sup>54</sup> A snapshot of the five county metropolitan area from the American Community Survey 2010 shows the number of Colombians by county:

Philadelphia County 4,675; Montgomery County 1,041; Bucks County 748; Delaware County 513; and 662 in Chester County.

Colombians’ demographic position amongst other Latino group in each of the five counties:

Philadelphia County had 121,643 Puerto Ricans; 15,531 Mexicans; 15,963 Dominicans and 4,675 Colombians making Colombians the 4<sup>th</sup> largest Latino population in the city.

For Montgomery County there were 13,386 Mexicans; 9,356 Puerto Ricans; 1,338 Cubans making Colombians the 4<sup>th</sup> largest Latino population.

In Bucks County there were 10,397 Puerto Ricans; 6,867 Mexicans; 1,101 Guatemalans; 946 Cubans; 806 Ecuadorians and 784 Colombians.

In Delaware County there were: 6,327 Puerto Ricans; 2,879 Mexicans; 1,089 Ecuadorians; 834 Cubans and 513 Colombians—the 5<sup>th</sup> largest Latino group.

Chester County had 18,860 Mexicans 7,725 Puerto Ricans, 720 Cubans, 714 Guatemalans and 662 Colombians—the 5<sup>th</sup> largest Latino group.

who attended the regular meetings and served as an informal board by taking turns meeting at each other's homes.

Paulina, a Caleña now in her fifties who arrived in Philadelphia in 1980, who was part of the original group of Colombians in the computer class assumed the logistics as the group expanded. Using a small office tucked away behind the package-sending business that she own with her husband Paulina splits her time and the single computer to manage both the business and the activities of *Colombianos Adelante* (CA). Paulina sees her unpaid work to keep CA alive and growing as part of a longer trajectory and commitment to community work.

Her bachelor's degree in social work from a university in Colombia helped her learn to navigate the social institutions there but upon her arrival to Philadelphia her English language skills made finding work as a social worker difficult. During her first few years she was able to find work using her degree and experience in Colombia working in Puerto Rican-run, Latino community organizations. For Paulina that introduction into both the non-profit sphere and existing Latino organizations would become in her words "her life's work" even though she decided to leave the field at the end of the 1980s. Like many college-educated Colombians from the first wave, Paulina was able to leverage her class and education background in Colombia to become middle class in the United States through becoming a small business owner.

She and her husband saw the diversifying Latino population of Philadelphia in need of particular services that couldn't be filled by existing Puerto Rican businesses—specifically the niche of sending remittances and packages to countries of origin in Latin America. Over the years their business has incorporated money transfer services, money

exchange services, and courier services first beginning with establishing those services from Colombian migrants and then expanding their business to serve Latinos from other nations. In the years before cell phones and Skype, the business offered international calls directly from the office and pre-paid calling cards. For Paulina her work to create CA was a natural extension of her previous jobs because the goal remains “to find a way to help the community and to help each other.” As she relayed her main concern was to figure out the strengths and weaknesses of the Colombian community in Philadelphia, who for her “were notoriously private” and with “no tendency for community participation,” she wanted to “promote and strengthen leadership within the Colombian and Latin American community.” For Paulina, the lack of a Colombian-oriented and dominated organization became an essential absence to remedy because, “we don’t know what its like to have something for ourselves.”

Noting that many other cities with Colombians has similar organizations or long standing institutions, Paulina and the others from the class, wanted to compliment cultural activities with immigration assistance. Like Paulina, the other members of the founding group of CA were college educated and had come from both the two main waves. Several had been in the city for decades while others had come as recently as the 2000s. CA’s particular programs emerged from discussions about the particular needs for Colombians. Programs include consular visits, citizenship workshops, and cultural events like an annual Christmas party celebrating the diversity of the Latino community in Philadelphia and summer programs for youth. Consular visits and citizenship workshops are their most used services and while the former serves only to Colombians nationals many Latinos use the latter as it is conducted in Spanish.

The consular visits became biannual program when Andrés, who arrived to Philadelphia in 2003, lamented how he and so many other Colombians had to travel to New York City or Newark New Jersey to visit the Colombian consulate to renew their *cédula*, national ID cards, which was costly both in terms of travel expenses and because many people would have to take the day off from work. Instead CA has worked an arrangement with the consular office of New York to have a weekend event held in Philadelphia where Colombians can come from all over the region to renew their Colombian passports and national ID. Small but growing, CA fills a hole that Paulina and the others saw for the Colombian community in Philadelphia.

Experiences of Colombians in Philadelphia reveal how the larger history of Colombia compelled them to leave and shaped the particular challenges faced by the first wave when they arrived in Philadelphia. As harbingers of demographic change Colombians who settled in the 1970s and 1980s faced discrimination. Their particular racialization drew from the association of drugs and violence that had become synonymous with Colombia and only reinforced the fragmentation of social alliances. That fragmentation not only limited the formation of an “imagined community” of Colombians in Philadelphia but also created some social distance between Colombians and Puerto Ricans who shared neighborhoods in Philadelphia. Differences in racialization and differences of citizenship occasionally created different strategies to combat Latino marginalization.

Yet some, like Paulina, have sought to create a sense of Colombianidad through community organizations that strengthen ties amongst Colombians and between Colombians and other Latinos. For Colombianos who came in the second wave, they

encountered similar challenges in a changing Philadelphia with its diversifying Latino population. As their experiences Colombia shaped their racialization in Philadelphia the reputation of Colombia continued and continues to impact the racialization of Colombians and their constructions of Colombianidad long after they leave.

### The Reinvention of Colombia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Since the neoliberal economic reforms of the 1990s, Colombia's economy has grown through its opening to international markets. While this has not translated into improved living conditions or alleviation of poverty for millions of Colombians who remain, the Colombian government has sought to trumpet its successes with the hopes of attracting more foreign investment and capital in order to improve its position in global markets. In recent years Colombia has tried to change its reputation by focusing on economic development and peace agreements with guerillas in the 2000s. Reports of economic growth and potential peace talks with guerilla groups dominate international media coverage in recent years to paint a picture of "progress." As such Colombia has sought to usher in a new moment of recognition on the global stage not simply through economic growth but also through the launch of a national brand with its own marketing campaign. The brand and its campaign seeks to overcome political and economic realities by positioning them in the past as well as positioning them as matters of perception, so that they are no longer pertinent to the newly articulated brand of Colombia.

Moreover it is not simply the creation of a national brand but also the growth of the Colombian economy in its alliances with the US that has transformed its desire and ability to attract global investment. The efforts of Colombia to resuscitate its image into one of positive recognition mirrors the efforts of Philadelphia's attempts to fashion itself

as a more “global” city. These attempts of both Colombia and Philadelphia simultaneously seek to expand their economic reach and change a beleaguered reputation, and notably began roughly at the same time. Colombian migrants who retain ties to both places in many ways become the subjects of these transformations in ways that shapes how they craft a sense of Colombianidad. The transformations in Colombia have also come to shape ways in which Colombianos assert their belonging in Philadelphia, in addition to leveraging their belonging as immigrants who help to contribute to the improvement of the city, Colombianos also use the improving reputation of Colombia to assert themselves as good representatives of those positive changes.

*The Supranational Scene: Colombia in Latin American Relations*

Colombia’s economic and political alliance with the US since the implementation of Plan Colombia has transformed Colombia’s geopolitical relationship to many of its Latin American neighbors. Colombia’s economic growth in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, coupled with the relative decline in guerilla activity, has allowed for new alliances with international organizations much to the chagrin of other Latin American national governments. As Colombia has remained the largest recipient of US aid since Plan Colombia the sustained economic and political ties between the two nations not only stands in stark contrast to the strained relations between the US and leftist or populist governments in Latin America, it has also strained relations between Colombia and other Latin American nations.

Taken together the signing of a security treaty with NATO, the signing of a Free Trade Agreement with the US, and the creation of a national brand mark a profound attempt of the Colombian government to more readily assert itself as player on the global

political and economic stage. Further solidifying Colombia's attempts at changing its geopolitical position within Latin America are its increased oil production since 2008 that has allowed it to become Latin America's third largest producer as production has declined or stalled in Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela and Ecuador. The government has partially privatized the oil industry in order to attract investment and allows them to operate without having to form a partnership with its state-owned company, Ecopetrol. In 2011 the Inter-American Development Bank sponsored an investment forum with Colombia and Brazil in order to develop business opportunities between two of the strongest economies in Latin America.

While some of these efforts have strengthened relations with other Latin American nations, such as the economic development efforts with Brazil, Colombia's pursuit of political alliance have angered other Latin American nations with leftist governments. In June of 2013 the Colombian minister of defense signed a treaty with NATO creating an agreement to share security and intelligence information. While the agreement does not mean Colombia can become member of NATO it is a first step toward future collaborations and marks the first time NATO signed a security-based treaty with any nation in Latin America. The signing yielded criticism from the governments of like Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Venezuela arguing that should Colombia become a member of NATO it would pose a threat to the region as a "beachhead" and undermine the power of Unión de Naciones Suramericanas, UNASUR, of which Colombia is a member ("NATO Signs Cooperation Agreement with Colombia" 2013).

Frictions between Colombia's more conservative government, exemplified by its political alliance with the United States, stands at odds with the other leftist regimes in Latin America. Colombia has sought to establish itself as pro-business seeking market-based remedies and maintained support of "law and order" politics in its alignment with the US. This creates a substantial divide between Colombia's attempts to reposition itself globally and its leftist neighbors who fear these policies and agreements could open Latin America to unwanted presence by NATO troops or US sponsored regime changes. Since the implementation of Plan Colombia other Latin American nations have become wary of Colombia's international agreements and relations with the United States.

Passed in 2011 and implemented in 2012, the US-Colombia Free Trade Agreement is lauded by supporters in both nations as a means to economic growth and job creation. Yet critics note that the elimination of tariffs for US industrial and consumer exports will further expand the US dominance of the Colombian consumer market and destabilize the agricultural sector which will have to compete against heavily subsidized US products. Without sufficient protection the dismantling of the agricultural industry could increase make those employed in agriculture vulnerable to job loss prompting both the increase of drug cultivation as a means to survive (Norby and Fitzpatrick 2013). The lessons of the North American Free Trade Agreement show that the dismantling of agriculture can spur intense migration (Bacon 2012), and what remains to be seen is just how much migration both to Colombian cities and to the US will come in the wake of free trade.

*Re-Branding the Nation and Colombianidad*

Yet security treaties and free trade agreements are not the only means through which Colombia has sought to strengthen its economic agenda. The creation of a national brand in 2005 by the ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism attempts to rework not only Colombia's economic prowess but also the national image. *Colombia es Pasión*, Colombia is Passion, markets the Colombian nation as a brand on a global stage with hopes of changing the world's negative perceptions of the nation in order to attract foreign investment and increase tourism. Intensive market research sponsored by the ministry through national surveys and focus groups decided that "passion" was the greatest raw material of the national citizenry and hence the brand and accompanying campaign implore Colombians "be passionate for Colombia and identify with your country's brand."

The aim of *Colombia es Pasión* and several related government projects and policies since the late 1990s is to improve the nation's image and reputation as a means to attract investment capital, facilitate trade, improve private sector competitiveness in different industries, secure geopolitical influence and entice tourism (see Chapter 8). The narrative of progress becomes essential for brand success. María Claudia LaCouture, at the time the general manager of Proexport Colombia and one of the main architects of *Colombia es Pasión*, stated at a presentation in 2009,

In recent years Colombia has made progress in different aspects such as security, economy, and quality of life indicators, among others. This new reality allowed Colombia to consider the need to generate a label that would become the right tool to reflect these changes to the world. The reality of the country is different from the global perception of Colombia and those erroneous, negative perceptions deny the opportunity for tourism, foreign investment and exports... The world needs to know that

Colombia as changed and it has grown and it will continue to grow.<sup>55</sup>

The message and images of *Colombia es Pasión* seek to global perception and negative associations of violence, drug trafficking and political volatility, and replace them with a positive, and passionate image. Premised on the notion that branding can develop and successfully disseminate images and meanings of a product, and even a place Colombia's brand seek it generate a unique identity and market the nation in a global economy by differentiating itself from other nations to attract business and tourists. In part these branding effort are attempts to make visible the "progress" in addressing the issue of violence (Echeverri, Rosker and Restreppo 2010).

Yet Colombia's efforts to improve its global economic position does not only affect its geopolitical position in Latin America, it also comes to bear on the ways Colombian migrants abroad relate to the nation and in turn craft their own Colombianidad. To understand Colombianos in Philadelphia requires not only understanding how the history of Colombia created the conditions for migration but also how changes in the nation since they left have important implications for how they fashion a sense of Colombianidad. These changes in turn continued to impact the formation of Colombianidad in Philadelphia as Colombians seek to draw attention to the social and economic improvements in Colombia as a means to assert their own belonging.

Jessica, a twenty-five year old Colombiana born and raised in Philadelphia, noted after her first trip to Colombia a few years earlier

---

<sup>55</sup> Quote taken as field notes in attendance at the "Latin America: Crossroads for Change" Conference held by the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School of Business, Global Wharton Alumni conference series, in Bogotá on May 21, 2009.

It's a shame because I always thought it was a bad thing, being Colombian, so I didn't really think about the culture or history too much. But I got older and could finally afford to visit and it was beautiful. I don't know if it is because things have gotten better or they were never as bad as they seemed but it made a huge difference to how I think about the country and even myself.

For Jessica, the trip changed her perception of Colombia and changed how she thought about her own identity. Unsure of whether she was able to witness a nation different than the one her mother left decades earlier or whether her perception of the nation was worse than it merited, she was still compelled to reconsider her sense of self.

While Jessica's experience in Colombia changed how she thought of herself, Olga a woman in her fifties, was concerned with how others perceived Colombia and by extension her as a Colombian. Olga said that many things have gotten better in Colombia since she left in 2002, specifically the reduction in violence and guerilla activity, but that these changes have gone unnoticed by the "whole world." She lamented,

nobody seems to care that things have gotten better except for us [Colombianos in the US]. We are here and Colombians are making our lives better, but it's another obstacle we have to overcome, we have to deal with the bad images, the bad ideas people have about Colombia.

For Olga, Colombians who have migrated to the US, whose efforts to improve their lives goes unrecognized because of the negative perception of the Colombian nation. In this sense she argues that she and other migrants are in a position to confront the image problems of Colombia from outside its borders. These improvements prompted Colombians to redress their racialization and the lingering stigmas of drugs and violence and as a means to assert and draw attention to their upward mobility in Philadelphia. These new dynamics in Colombia converge with the longer historical factors that come to shape Colombians' incorporation in the city.

Conceptions and expressions of Colombianidad become petitions not only for belonging, but also for the positive recognition of Colombians. Though many Colombians may not be aware of the details of Colombians transformations in terms of geopolitical relations with Latin America or well versed in its alliances with the United States, they are concerned with conditions Colombia as getting better or improving. On another level Colombianos in Philadelphia are invested in the idea that that the improvements in Colombia will also lead to a better reputation and less stigmatization for them. As they learned that the negative association of Colombia came to define their racialization, improvement in Colombia and in Colombia's reputation are seen as openings that can finally shed their association with violence and drugs (see Chapters 7 and 8).

The next section and the chapters that follow explore how changes in federal and local immigration policy come to shape the experiences of Colombians in Philadelphia and the US more generally.

## CHAPTER 4

## FROM THE FEDERAL TO THE LOCAL: NEW STRANDS OF US IMMIGRATION POLICY

In the United States, immigration policy has dictated who could legally become members of the nation-state and thus who was “let in” in distinct historical moments reveals not only how different immigrant groups were constructed as desirable or undesirable, but also how transformations in immigration policy shape the social and political rights of immigrants across time. Understanding the long trajectory of immigration policy and reform also elucidates the constructions of migrant legality and illegality, and the contingent consequences of that illegality/legality for arriving and established immigrants. Despite the often-invoked conception of the US as “a nation of immigrants,” policy reform throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century increasingly treated immigration and immigrants as a “problem” or a “crisis.” This chapter traces this trajectory of immigration policy in the United States both to illuminate the commonalities and disjunctures, alongside the public debates about the place of immigrants within society and the role of policy itself. Taking seriously both the discourses around immigration and the material effects of policy, the chapter outlines how transformations in immigration policy have shifted from the domain of the federal government to the hands of local governments.

Beginning with the broad changes between the 1880s and the 1960s the chapter pays close attention to the ways that post-1965 federal immigration reform has gradually become restrictive and punitive which has increasingly criminalized “illegal” immigration. These policies have become restrictive in the sense that they have sought to

restrict, numerically or otherwise, who had permission to legally enter the nation and have narrow the rights available to all migrants, both legal and illegal. The policies have become more and more punitive in that there have been harsher penalties for violations of law and policies, and for simply being an “illegal” immigrant in the US. Taken together restrictive and punitive policies produce the criminalization of migrants where criminalization refers to the processes through which behaviors and individuals become understood as crime and criminals. Moreover as Latinos have become conceived of the quintessential “illegal” immigrants they have been constructed as inherently different from other immigrant groups, past and present, and illegitimate members of society, to become the primary targets of the restrictive and punitive policies.

As federal immigration reform has used punitive measures to deter people from migrating it has made immigration enforcement the primary mechanism of immigration control. In particular since the 1980s and especially since the 1990s the federal government has authorized and expected states and cities to support the efforts to control immigration. Emphasizing both the trajectory of immigration policy and what is new and distinctive in different political moment, this chapter lays out how immigrants have been positioned as an economic drain, undeserving of social benefits, a threat to national security and immigrants have become linked to conceptions of immigrants as an economic drain, and a threat to national security across time and space.

In contrast to restrictive national trends, Philadelphia has sought to create measures and policies to attract immigrants to the city. While these effort exist in stark contrast to harsh federal policies, they reveal an overlooked and novel feature of policy that emerged in policy reform of the mid 1990s, the ways states and cities have been

granted new leeway and authority to craft localized immigration policy. Highlighting this localization of policy illuminates how in the absence of comprehensive federal reform states and cities have sought to fill the gap by taking immigration into their own hands. As such this chapter emphasizes how local policy became a possibility, how local policy is produced, and its particular sociopolitical effects. Foregrounding the stalled efforts of Philadelphia in 2000 and local government's renewed commitment to producing its own immigration policies in 2011, shows that localization is poised to remain a feature of US immigration policy.

### Major Federal Statutes

#### *An End to "Open Immigration": 1880-1924*

While throughout the late 1880s until the 1920s mass migration of unskilled labor fueled the expansion of industry, specifically the manufacturing shift to industrial capital, the relatively open immigration system<sup>56</sup> and growing presence of immigrants produced nativist, anti-immigrant sentiments. Nativism grew as a reaction to social problems—poverty, disease, class tensions, overcrowded housing, urban slums—supposedly caused by the influx of migrants. During the 1880s numerous policies sought to restrict immigration on the basis of both labor needs and race, barring both the illegal importation of foreign laborers and Chinese workers, and doing so instantiated a profound contradiction between the need for immigrant labor and the social rejection of their presence.

Following continued migration despite attempts to curtail and following the heightened context of nationalism and anti-foreign sentiment in the wake of World War I,

---

<sup>56</sup> The system was relatively open as it allowed most able-bodied immigrant to enter but there were restrictions on the entry of criminals, prostitutes, the "insane" and persons with communicable diseases.

federal immigration policy passed in 1924, The National Origins Act, a preference for Western and Northern European immigrants through the imposition of quotas based on an immigrant's nation of birth. A measure to explicitly discourage immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe, the Act firmly put into practice a system of racial preference based on national origin and all but eliminated migration from Africa and Asia as most non-European nations were limited to 100 visas annually.<sup>57</sup>

Ngai notes that numerical restrictions in Immigration Act of 1924 created "illegal aliens" as new, massive category of people whose inclusion was both "a social reality and illegal possibility" (2004:57). The restrictive policies produced the "illegality" of those who came without expressed permission as the Act of 1924 established deportation as a central aspect of immigration policy and created the Border Patrol, emphasizing both the necessary removal of undesirable "illegal" migrants and unprecedented control over the nation's land borders.<sup>58</sup> Despite the emphasis on deportation and border control, Mexican migration went relatively unchecked throughout the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Without a numerical quota and the active recruitment of Mexican labor in the Southwest for agriculture, construction and mining, migration from Mexico was ignored by immigration inspectors and flowed relatively freely across the border. Nevertheless these changes reshaped both the meaning and grounds for immigrant inclusion and exclusion in the US.

---

<sup>57</sup> Visas were granted based on the strict numerical quotas, which were calculated at 2% of each nation's presence in the United States as recorded in the census of 1890. It was a deliberate effort to retain racial purity of U.S. based on the demographics that existed 30 years earlier and the ceiling was 150,000 visas total per year.

<sup>58</sup> The end of WWI marked the crystallization of the global nation-state system which was marked by solidified borders, state-based citizenship and passports in a new modality of Westphalian sovereignty (Zolberg 2006; Ngai 2004).

*1965 Reform: The Redistribution of Quotas and the Centrality of Mexican Migrant Labor*

In 1965 comprehensive immigration reform dismantled the national-origins quota system and the new policy favored family reunification and employment preferences, for high skilled workers, as the criteria for determining the allocation of immigrant visas. Post-1965 immigration dramatically changed the demographics of the United States to include migrants from Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America in substantial numbers. Though Latin American immigration increased dramatically after the 1965 reform it did so in spite of the policy imposing quotas on all nations in the Western Hemisphere where previously there had been none.<sup>59</sup> Restricting migration from Western Hemisphere nations continued a core contradiction of US immigration policy the need and desire for immigrant labor for economic development juxtaposed against the political and social resentment of those immigrants. After 1965 this contradiction was maintained by the decision allow for sufficient visas for the legal entry of migrants, especially those from Mexico.

Despite the imposition of quotas for the first time, Mexican immigration increased post-1965 in large part because of the long history of labor migration. The Bracero Program, an agreement between the US and Mexican governments to recruit Mexican workers for employment in the US, began in 1942 amid labor shortages during WWII and was sustained by post-WWII economic growth. With the tacit understanding that Mexican migration filled labor needs, documentation went relatively ignored until Operation Wetback in 1954 deported numerous workers back to Mexico, including US citizens of Mexican descent. While the program lasted until 1964, the need for labor ran

---

<sup>59</sup> This was the first imposition of quotas on immigrants from nations in the Western hemisphere to 120,000 per year, which represented a 40% reduction from pre 1965 allocations (Ngai 2004).

directly against the strict visa limits. The insufficient visas to meet employer demands or immigrant desires meant that many entered “illegally.” Specifically the 1965 reform and visa limits made legal entry markedly more difficult than in the past and in many ways produced an inevitable rise in undocumented migration (Massey et al. 2002).

The *longue durée* of Mexican labor migration to the US creates what Nicholas De Genova has called the “revolving door” of policy that creates a disposable, deportable and cheap labor force (2002; 2005). Prior to the 1965 reform there were far more than 20,000 braceros and migrants approved for legal permanent residency, but the imposition of quotas alongside the demand for Mexican labor regardless of legality transformed large swaths of migrants into the quintessential “illegals.” Previously a primarily legal and unregulated flow of migration, new attention to “illegal entry” produced Mexican immigrants as criminal (Ngai 2004; De Genova 2005; Calavita 1992). De Genova and Ramos Zayas argue “the tenuous distinction between ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’ immigration has been deployed to stigmatize and regulate Mexican/migrant workers for much of the twentieth century” (2003: 6), often by racializing Mexican migrants as criminal “illegals.”

*Immigration Policy and Racialization: Mexican Migration and the “Illegality” of Latinos*

Scholars of the history of U.S. immigration policy have highlighted how shifting visions of nationhood shaped policies by foregrounding the centrality of race (deSipio and de la Garza 1998; Hing 2004; Zolberg 2006). In the United States citizenship as long been a proxy for race; historically laws, policies and court cases have defined who could be eligible for citizenship and naturalization based on race.<sup>60</sup> Just as the 1924 Act

---

<sup>60</sup> From the Naturalization Act of 1790 whereby naturalization was a right exclusive to “free white men of good moral character” and the Naturalization Act of 1870 extended naturalization to

forbade barred migration for anyone deemed racially ineligible for naturalization and the 1965 reform produced Mexican “illegality,” citizenship was fused to race throughout the most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century through US immigration policy. Racialized notions of citizenship enacted through immigration policies continue to be the primary means of migrant exclusion in the US in determining who belongs and how while revealing national anxieties around immigration (Ngai 2004; Lowe 1996).

As Mexican migration increased after 1965, so too did migration from Central and South American and Caribbean nations. Due in part to both US policy reform and internal political shifts within nations of origin often tied to US involvement Cuban, Dominican, Colombian and other Latin American nationals migrated to the United States. In the context of increased migration the stigmatization of Mexicans as “illegals” has become a central aspect of the racialization of Mexicans, Chicanos (Mexican Americans), and all other Latinos (De Genova 2002), regardless of immigration status or US citizenship as all groups become categorized and ultimately homogenized as Latinos or Hispanics regardless of national origin (Oboler 1995; Zentella 1995). Moreover the particular construction of the pan-Latino ethnic label emerged during the 1960s and 1970s as a way to subdue the historical marginalization of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans and subvert their political organizing at the height of the civil rights movement (Oboler 1995). The creation of Hispanic or Latino as an intelligible category of racialized social difference serves as a means to deny full social and political rights and belonging.

---

persons of African descent and “aliens” born in Africa. The Chinese Exclusion Acts of 1882 prohibited the migration of Chinese laborers while simultaneously rendering Chinese immigrants already in the U.S. permanent aliens who were racially ineligible for citizenship. This mandate and prohibition of migration were later extended to all individuals from the Asia-Pacific Triangle. In 1922 and 1923 the Supreme Court ruled that neither Japanese nor Indians were considered white.

Shifting demographics became the grounds by which the production of “illegality” encompassed Mexican migrants and all Latino as racialized others. Increased Latino presence became discursively structured as an “alien invasion” of “immigrants” that posed a drain on state and federal resources, a characterization that persists with renewed vigor in the present day (Santa Ana 2002; Chavez 2008). Through increasingly punitive immigration policies Latinos have become made and remade as the archetypal “illegal aliens” that stand in stark contrast to other immigrant groups both past and present. The mark of illegality and criminality has come to render Latinos as illegitimate members of society and thus undeserving of social benefits or rights (Chavez 2008).

Moreover as Mexican/Latino migration has become synonymous with undocumented migration, the sense that migration is “out of control” or a “crisis” is concomitant with the notion that there has been a “loss of control” at the have lead to an undue emphasis on immigration enforcement at the border and in the interior in subsequent immigration reforms. It is in the context of this hysteria that dramatic shifts in the public discussion and legislative action vis-à-vis immigration policy have ushered in a new era of immigration control.

*Contradictions and Criminality in 1986: Border Control and Amnesty*

While the presence of undocumented migrants had long been made “illegal,” the consequences for “illegality” had not been as harshly punitive until the mid-1980s. Centered on addressing “crisis” of undocumented migration, the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), passed in 1986, established federal sanctions against employers who “knowingly” hire undocumented migrants,<sup>61</sup> increased funding for enforcement,

---

<sup>61</sup> IRCA made it illegal for employers to knowingly hire undocumented migrants. Though illegal labor recruitment was similarly penalized in the 1880s, IRCA was novel in that it made hiring a

while it offered amnesty to millions of undocumented migrants already in the US. The policy was both restrictive in that it overtly sought to restrict entry of migrants by emphasizing enforcement specifically through ramping up border control. IRCA was also expansive in the sense that it expanded the Border Patrol and similarly expanded deportation as the main ways to handle “illegal” immigration. A primary aim of IRCA was deterrence, which was to be accomplished through the prevention of entry and the prevention of employment and thus a primary consequence was harsher punishments for undocumented migrants, despite amnesty the policy ultimately reinforced the association undocumented migrants with criminality.<sup>62</sup>

An essential feature of IRCA was prevention of entry through intensified border control, as immigration control became evermore linked to prevention, security and enforcement. Through IRCA, Border Patrol grew from a minimally funded government agency to the largest civilian police force with budget of over a billion dollars. Efforts to make the border seem impenetrable, such as channeled funds and increased human

---

crime by penalizing employers who hired undocumented workers and held employers responsible for determining and knowing the status of its employees. With the hopes that the policy could discourage migrants from coming to the US, the legislation made it illegal to hire, even through a subcontractor, recruit or refer for a fee for employment any “alien” knowing that they are unauthorized to work or any person without verifying their work status. The onus of employee verification continued to be a key feature in post 9/11 localized legislation that attempts to identify whether a worker is “illegal” and therefore ineligible for hire as a means to manage, control and penalize undocumented migrants despite a need and desire for cheap labor in the US.

<sup>62</sup> As employers had to fill out I-9 forms that identified prospective workers and catalogued the documents they presented. IRCA applied sanctions against employers who “knowing hired” undocumented migrants and the I-9 forms were a way to operationalize “knowingly.” Employers could satisfy their requirements by inspecting “reasonable looking” documents and completing the I-9. As the demand for low-wage migrant labor did not diminish and workers were in need of “reasonable looking” documents, the buying and selling of false documents flourished (Massey et al. 2002). As such IRCA contributed to yet another phase of a revolving door of deportable migrant labor despite sanctions.

resources to police the border, sought to alleviate public fears over border control and in doing so created a “spectacle” that emphasized immigrant illegality as border-crossing (Chavez 2008; Perea 1997).

Yet IRCA perpetuated what Durand and Massey (2003) term an “escalating politics of contradiction” whereby the US sought to selectively insist on separation from Mexico in terms of border control and labor markets, while facilitating the integration of exchanges of business, goods, capital, and information. Consequently IRCA became the template and set in motion ever-increasing militarization of the border that led to riskier passage into the United States, forcing border crossing into more remote, and thus less safe, locations and thus become even more precarious for migrants themselves.

Enforcement and militarization came to dominate approach to immigration “management” through IRCA and into the 1990s.<sup>63</sup>

Perhaps it’s most well-known provision, authorized amnesty for undocumented migrants who could prove five years continuous residence in the United States, sought to “wipe the slate clean and begin afresh” (Massey et al. 2002: 90), by creating, a pathway for many undocumented migrants towards legalization and eventual access to citizenship.<sup>64</sup> This was especially significant for Colombian migrants in Philadelphia who

---

<sup>63</sup> Before IRCA, Durand and Massey (2003) note that 85% of Mexican migrants entered via three corridors that were incredibly small compared to the 2,000 mile long border. With the increasing militarization of the border, reflected in the increased budget of and growth of the Border Patrol, especially in the known corridors near San Diego and El Paso, migrants began to avoid these reinforced points and enter through less patrolled areas. In response authorities extended their presence to the new areas. In 1994, Operation Gatekeeper deployed more enforcement resources to deter entry in California, which pushed migrants to new entry point in Arizona, New Mexico and more dangerous parts of the Rio Grande River. Overall the militarization of the border lead migrants away from heavily patrolled urban towards remote, isolated areas, which made crossing riskier and deadlier (2003:237-238).

<sup>64</sup> Corollary to that was a legalization program for migrant farm workers, which continued to entrench the revolving door policy of labor migration.

had come without papers. As the first wave began to arrive the late 1970s and continued through the 1980s, many were able to take advantage of the amnesty offered by IRCA and become legal permanent residents and naturalized citizens.

*Amnesty for the Valencias*

The experiences of the Valencia family illustrate the impact of the passage of new immigration policies as each family member navigated the unfamiliar landscape of being and undocumented migrant in the years before and after IRCA. The family, including a husband, his wife and his sister, migrated from Colombia to Philadelphia between the late 1970s and early 1980s, and though in their journeys they were beset by deportations, they were all able to become naturalized citizens.

Abel Valencia, who was originally from the Cali in the interior of the Valle del Cauca *departamento*, had been working in the coastal city of Buenaventura during the 1970s when the city's location on the Pacific made it a key outpost for the nascent global narcotics trade, prompting his desire to leave. Spurred by Canadian missionaries who visited the technical school where Abel taught, he applied for and received a Canadian student visa. He arrived in Québec with enough money for a single semester and while he was able to stretch that money into two semesters working under the table as a janitor and busboy, it was insufficient for any further study and Abel wanted a more sizable and stable income. On the advice of a friend in Philadelphia who offered him lodging, Abel traveled from Québec City and soon found a job at a photo processing plant in North Philadelphia in 1978.

Both his sister, Leticia, and fiancée, Vera, in Cali were determined to join Abel but their experiences getting there were far from smooth. As Abel did not have enough

money to send them to apply for visas and he was without papers himself they decided *entrar por el hueco*, literally come in through the gap, referring to the physical and metaphorical gap in US immigration policy at the time. At that time it was common for Colombians without visas to enter by way of the Bahamas, specifically Bimini, because Colombians did not need visas to travel to the Bahamas and it was a short plane ride or boat ride from Bimini to Miami that would go unnoticed by US authorities (Castro Caycedo 1989).<sup>65</sup>

Leticia and Vera arrived in Florida clandestinely in the fall of 1981. Originally the women decided to travel together for safety but each woman made their way up the East Coast a year apart. Early in the trip Vera was caught by INS and deported back to Colombia—an experience she refuses to speak about or allow others to speak about even in the present. Nevertheless, Vera decided to once again *entrar por el hueco*, and made the journey successfully up to Philadelphia to reunite with her husband and sister-in-law.

Even though Vera, Abel and Leticia lived in Philadelphia during the early 1980s without documentation, certain circumstances made their lives slightly easier. Abel was able to purchase a fake social security card and a Puerto Rican birth certificate in his name making it possible to work his way through several jobs and companies with ease.

---

<sup>65</sup> As Colombian writer and journalist Germán Castro Caycedo noted in his book *El Hueco: La entrada ilegal de colombianos a Estados Unidos por México, Bahamas y Haití* during the late 1970s and early 1980s there were many undocumented Colombians who migrated to Florida travelling clandestinely via the Bahamas by boat or plane. The trip from was often planned by tourist agencies that connected people, especially those from Western Colombia with a tour guide in the Bahamas as Colombian did not need visas to enter the Bahamas. The tour guide often had a resident visa and could move with ease between the multiple countries in play. As Castro Caycedo describes there were “herds of Colombians who wanted to escape from their land” (1989:27). There were thousands already in the Bahamas in addition to those in Colombia who were willing and had the means to pay the thousands of dollar for the trip. A less common route was by land to cross the border from Mexico.

Despite enduring the deportation, Vera was able to return because she entered the US again before deportation became the main tenet of immigration policy and its enforcement. The traumatic set backs Vera and her family endured were in part offset by their eventual ability to change their legal status which offered opportunities for economic mobility.

The timing of the Valencia's migration from Colombia granted them the possibility of citizenship through naturalization, while policy changes foreclosed that possibility for future migrants. Leticia was able to become a legal permanent resident through her marriage to her white, American husband while Abel and Vera became citizens in 1986 with the passage of the IRCA. Vera, alluding to the events of her past, said, "things before had been so tough but this [naturalization] gave me the opportunity to move forward and I try not think about the time I had lost while Abel and I were apart." Yet while IRCA gave amnesty to millions, like Vera, it expanded deportation to manage immigration as a crime with increasingly harsher punishments. As major immigration reforms in 1986 and again in 1996 coincided with the main waves of Colombian migration to Philadelphia, the passage of particular policies shaped differential experiences with legal status adjustment, deportation and the ability to support families.

Immigration Policy in the 1990s: The Crisis of Immigrant "Illegality," Fiscal  
Responsibility and Personal Responsibility

*Unfettered Free Trade/Restricting Immigration*

Undocumented migration grew rather than declined after the passage of IRCA despite expectations that enforcement and more punitive measures would deter

migration.<sup>66</sup> Still in the 1990s the emphasis on border control and enforcement remained at the fore of immigration policy. At the same time new reforms embraced neoliberal ideology and shaped responses to immigration through both policies and public discourses that 1) emphasized unfettered economic exchange while ignoring the expectation of that migrant labor would fill demands; 2) constructed immigrants as serious economic drains on public resources; 3) decimated the social welfare safety net under the pretext of personal responsibility, which targeted and disproportionately affected immigrants and the poor.<sup>67</sup>

Continuing the selected integration of the United States and Mexico, the North American Free Trade agreement passed in 1994 facilitated the movement of goods and capital in the name of economic growth, while deploying increasingly harsh punishments on migration. As a condition of the agreement the US insisted on its exclusive right to control the US-Mexico border. Like IRCA, NAFTA was both a restrictive and expansive

---

<sup>66</sup> Massey et al. (2002) argue that another unintended consequence of border enforcement has been a “move toward permanence” as these policies have led to longer duration in the United States and lower probabilities of return migration. As such the effects of these policies, contrary to their intentions, have contributed to the increase of undocumented migrants who stay in the US in the long term and on a permanent basis.

<sup>67</sup> Rather than neoliberalism I emphasize neoliberalization by paying particular care to emphasize the processual, contingent, uneven and contradictory nature of policies and their consequences. Taken together the consequences of these policies shifts in the 1990s illuminate important features of neoliberal processes including the emphasis on personal responsibility, which intertwine three major issues at stake. First is the primary responsibility of the state to promote the market. Second is the idea that the state should reduce social provisions and public expenditure (often termed the “withdrawal” of the state this is more a reconfiguration and redeployment of state power and resources to support the market, private enterprise and private property rather than provide public resources or support the people). Third emphasizes personal responsibility promoting the idea that state cannot and should not offer too many resources to the public because it fosters dependency on the state. Hence the state withdraws support for public provisions for the “good” of people themselves allowing them to become self-sufficient, self-reliant and empowered, which is made possible through a new relationship between individuals, the state and the market. See also Kingfisher and Maskovsky 2008; Harvey 2005; Hyatt 2001; Peck and Tickell 2002; Goode and Maskovsky 2001.

policy. Its passage was heralded with celebrations of economic integration and expansions while reaffirming the continued efforts to restrict immigration, specifically Mexican immigration, and tighten border “security.” As such NAFTA, in combination with IRCA, extended the revolving door policy of a deportable labor force whose presence is criminalized but whose labor is needed. The unintended consequences of NAFTA fueled migrations as the introduction of new capital opened up markets to massive and massively cheap imports from the United States decimating industries in Mexico, agriculture in particular.<sup>68</sup> The dismantling of industry compelled even more migration, both documented and undocumented, after NAFTA’s passage.

The effects of free trade combined with intensification of border enforcement only further instantiate how Mexican, especially migrants workers, become racialized and criminalized as “illegal aliens.” At the same time as migration from other Central American, South America and Caribbean nations increased during the 1980s, as the associations of presumed illegality and criminality extended to Latinos of all national origins. Anti-immigrant sentiments soared and discourses about the “crisis” of immigration, which conflated Latinos and illegality, reanimated public debates about the economic burden of “illegal aliens” for individual states.

---

<sup>68</sup> First it brought about serious economic transformation in Mexico, which compounded with previous neoliberal reforms—specifically the selling of common lands, *ejidos*, as private property and elimination of national markets for some crops like coffee and tobacco; migration became a necessity to escape economic uncertainty. IRCA had previously expanded pre-existing H2-A visa program, which allows U.S. agricultural employers to bring in workers, and workers are granted temporary visas tied to employment contracts. See Bacon 2012 for a discussion of the transnationalization of the pork industry under NAFTA, its dismantling in Mexico and its relation to immigration to new destinations, particularly North Carolina.

*The Economic Burdens of Immigration*

Increasingly restrictive immigration policies in the 1990s put into legal effect anti-immigrant sentiments that had been growing during the 1970s and 1980s (De Genova 2005; Chavez 2001). California's passage of Proposition 187 in 1994 propelled economic concerns to the center of debates about immigration and represented the incipient stages of a state's attempt to craft a localized immigration policy. The law denied public benefits to "illegal immigrants" and required social service providers to report any service user they suspect of being undocumented to law enforcement authorities.<sup>69,70</sup> Opponents argued the law was racially discriminatory and would unduly impact residents and migrants of Latino and Asian origin regardless of immigration status. The courts invalidated the law before its implementation on the premise that a state did not have the power to regulate immigration law.<sup>71</sup> Still its passage represented

---

<sup>69</sup> The policy banned all forms of non-emergency health care, and even barred undocumented children from attending public schools.

<sup>70</sup> Proposition 187 is not a unique attempt of an individual state to attempt to deny rights and benefits available to noncitizens and undocumented migrants. Denial of public school education has a longer history. In 1982, the Supreme Court decision of *Plyler v. Doe* ruled that public school education (primary and secondary school) could not be denied to undocumented students. The ruling protected the rights of undocumented children and in doing so struck down a Texas law that attempted to deny free public school enrollment on the grounds that undocumented children were not "legally present" in the U.S. even if they were effectively Texas residents. The Texas law that was struck down initially authorized local school to initially deny undocumented students in 1975 and two years later the school district imposed a \$1,000 tuition fee for undocumented students. Texas rested on the argument that undocumented children were present without legal authorization and as such they were not "persons within the jurisdiction of Texas" and, as a result, not protected by the Equal Protection Clause in the Fourteenth Amendment (quoted in Varsanyi 2008a). The Court denied Texas' legal argument by arguing that equal protection under the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment is applicable to anyone subject to the laws of a state, citizens and noncitizens alike, and that specifically a person's entry or legal status does not "negate the simple fact of his presence within the State's territorial perimeter" thus mandating that undocumented children have access to public education.

<sup>71</sup> Proposition 187's proposed denial of public education, health care and social services to "illegal" immigrants was deemed unlawful as was its statute that obligated local actors like school

two important developments in the trajectory of immigration policy: 1) increasing harshness towards “illegal” immigrants through its denial of public assistance and 2) the essential example of state intrusion into federal plenary powers over immigration.

Discourses that supported the “Save Our State” initiative, as Prop 187 was also known, were grounded primarily in economic justifications as proponents argued that these cost-saving measures were necessary for the fiscal solvency of California. Calavita (1996) notes that the law in and of itself was novel in its construction of immigrants as a tax burden.<sup>72</sup> Prop 187’s passage represented to its proponents a solution to a “crisis” in the management of human migration and positioned California as a state in need of saving and in need of relief (Suárez-Orozco 1996). Under the guise of crisis, the lines of “legality” and “illegality” were once again redrawn when a state sought to deny constitutionally guaranteed benefits to undocumented migrants, and redundantly bar undocumented migrants from forms of public assistance for which they were already ineligible.

At the time, President Clinton encouraged California voters to reject the policy on the grounds that it impinged upon the plenary power of the federal government but sympathized with the desire of the state government and voters as taxpayers to curtail illegal immigration.<sup>73</sup> The commitment to enforcement, deportation and border control

---

administrators, social workers, health care workers and local law enforcement be responsible for turning in individuals they suspected to be “illegal.”

<sup>72</sup> Calavita (1996) also notes that the particular economic context of 1994 with the deficit defined as “out of control,” economic uncertainty and the shrinking of public safety net, contributed to the formulation of immigrants as a drain on scarce resources.

<sup>73</sup> Clinton asked voters to allow the federal government to “keep working on what we’re doing stiffening the border patrol, stiffening the sanctions on employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants, stiffening our ability to get illegal immigrants out of the workforce, increasing

would join the denial of public services to undocumented migrants to form the keystone of Clinton's the federal policy reform in 1996. As an anti-immigration policy at the state level Proposition 187 became the template for further restrictions on the benefits available to both "legal" and "illegal" immigrants.

*Personal Responsibility Laws*

In 1996 the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) intensified the punishment of migrants, both undocumented and legal residents, limited the political rights of migrants and reduced their access to social resources in a moment where the tenets of neoliberal individual responsibility demonized poor people of color and migrants. These major policy reforms wed fiscal responsibility to a reduction of services for migrants under the guise of personal responsibility and the crisis "illegal immigration."

PRWORA, known colloquially as "welfare reform," granted states unprecedented powers in the generation, disbursement, and distribution of funds as well as limited the eligibility of individuals for various means-tested social welfare programs.<sup>74</sup> Additionally it reduced or eliminated eligibility for social welfare programs for legal immigrants during their first five years of residence in the United States. Drawing from Proposition 187 the restrictions in federal policy emphasized immigrants' consumption of public

---

our ability to deport people who have committed crimes who are illegal immigrants" (as quoted in Martin 1996: 258).

<sup>74</sup> Programs included Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF), food stamps, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and nonemergency Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). TANF replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the welfare program that provided assistance to children for poor families and was created in 1935 as part of the New Deal's broader Social Security Act. TANF placed a five-year lifetime limit on federally assisted cash benefits for most families and contained requirements to channel recipients into jobs or work readiness programs for the sake of "empowerment" and eliminating "dependency."

benefits as a burden on state funds and thus the reform barred states from using federal fund to provide those benefits to legal immigrants—benefits which undocumented migrants were never eligible.<sup>75</sup>

Morgen and Maskovsky note that the wording of the legislation itself and the public discussion surrounding its inception and passage relied on a rhetoric of eliminating “dependency” and facilitating “self-sufficiency” for those in need, which ultimately reconfiguring the poor from passive recipients of state services to self-governing and self-made consumer citizens (2003). These policy changes, and their profound effects increased the vulnerability of immigrants and native-born poor. Goode and Maskovsky argue these often overlapping groups experience new forms of subjectification within a “regime of disappearance” which they define as “a mode of governance, economy, and politics in which the poor are not so much vilified as they are marginalized or erased by the institutional and ideological aspects of work, social welfare, and politics that are dominant under neoliberalism” (2001:10). Contempt for both “welfare” and “immigrants” became welded together in the public imaginary through both the discourses of support for and through the material effects of policy, as immigrants came to represent the most pressing drain on scarce public resources.

IIRIRA, which again increased funding for immigration enforcement and Border Patrol, maintained the decades long emphasis on deterrence and deportation. The law

---

<sup>75</sup> These policies bestowed to states a new ability to discriminate against noncitizens in deciding eligibility for their programs. Before 1996 this would have been considered an unconstitutional encroachment into federal powers over membership policy and a violation of equal protection guaranteed by the constitution (Varsanyi 2008a). Moreover significant changes in the law disproportionately affect noncitizen residents. PRWORA creates legal grounds to divide migrants between pre-enactment (those who arrived prior to 1996) and post-enactment groups (those who arrive after August 1996). In doing so it creates new categories of “qualified” vis-à-vis “unqualified” migrants as all legal permanent residents, refugees and asylum seekers comprise the former while all other migrants the latter.

dramatically expanded the grounds for deportation, eliminated the eligibility of noncitizens for various public benefits, ended judicial review of a wide variety of agency decisions in the immigration context, and heightened penalties for immigration law violations.<sup>76</sup> Moreover IIRIRA made legal permanent residents deportable, not just the undocumented, and with the expanded the range of crimes considered deportable the law made more noncitizens ineligible for legal permanent residence. Ultimately as IIRIRA changed the boundaries of deportable offenses and deportation, it represented a simultaneous widening and deepening of the net of enforcement which further fused the categories of “illegal” and “criminal” and the concepts of “illegality” and “criminality” to “immigrant” and “immigration.”

Similarly the overarching framework of both PRWORA and IIRIRA marked a clear moment in emphasizing personal responsibility to justify the withdrawal of the state, as the broader political moment of the 1990s remained forcefully anti-immigrant. Discussing the effects of PRWORA and IIRIRA, De Genova and Ramos Zayas argue,

---

<sup>76</sup> Hagan, Castro and Rodriguez (2010) specify that the legislation expanded the definition of aggravated felonies to include all crimes requiring a prison sentence of a year or more, and the law required retroactive punishment for previously crimes committed. Thus, crimes committed before the passage of IIRIRA that were not defined as aggravated felonies at the time of conviction became grounds for deportation even if a sentence had been served. The law also eliminated the waivers convicted noncitizens could potentially file to remain in US, which made it more difficult for undocumented migrants to become permanent legal residents. Furthermore before 1996 noncitizens had to be sentenced to at least 5 years in order for the conviction to count as an aggravated felony under immigration law. The reduction to the one year sentence requirement meant that a broader range of crimes, including misdemeanors, could be considered aggravated felonies and be grounds for deportation. As such shoplifting, tax evasion, bribery, counterfeiting, drug possession, drug addiction, forgery, car theft, simple battery and unauthorized reentry after deportation became aggravated felonies (Coleman 2007; Inda and Dowling 2011).

In addition to IIRIRA, the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) passed in 1996 formally authorized nonfederal law enforcement officers to arrest and detain “unlawfully present noncitizens” who had previously been convicted of a felony. AEDPA extended IIRIRA’s emphasis on deportation as criminal.

“these pronouncedly punitive legislations together represented a major material and practical culmination of the protracted onslaught against the poor that had been defining of the broader ideological climate of hostility against both ‘welfare’ and ‘immigrants’ especially the undocumented” (2003: 211). For Colombian migrants who came in the second wave in the mid-1990s, the enactment of PRWORA significantly limited their access to resources simply because they were newly arrived migrants and the enactment of IIRIRA rendered them more vulnerable to deportation than ever before.

### *Magdalena*

More than anyone else I came to know Magdalena’s life had been ripped apart by the policy changes in the mid-1990s. As a wife and mother her life would be forever transformed by the changes IIRIRA and PRWORA introduced.

As we sat in her tidy, saffron-colored kitchen, Magdalena wiped her tears away from the corners of her eyes and tried to keep her hands occupied by alternating between wringing them together or stirring the spoon in her coffee. Staring at the mug in front of her she quietly noted that she had been in profound mourning ever since her marriage dissolved after her husband Francisco was deported back to Colombia in 1999. For Magdalena that sense of loss had lingered for sixteen years. Her feelings were complicated by the fact that while she had loved her husband she felt guilty at herself for not working harder to maintain the relationship and angry at him that after the deportation he slowly disappeared from her life and the life of their son Mateo. This double experience of loss, the geographic separation of her husband and the eventual loss of their relationship, diminished her sense of hope about the sacrifices they made as a family when they decided to migrate to Philadelphia in 1995 would ever pay off.

Though she had applied for an immigrant visa in 1991, and was petitioned by her mother who had already become a naturalized US citizen, Magdalena migrated before she was granted the visa. Francisco decided to join Madga rather than be separated without applying for a visa as their hometown, situated between the city of Cali and the more rural coffee-growing region, became increasingly subject to paramilitary violence during the early 1990s. Since Magdalena migrated while her immigrant visa was pending she decided to remain in the US after Francisco's deportation because she feared not being able to re-enter and because she remained committed to raising her son here even if it meant doing so without her husband.

Outlining the losses she experienced and the rationale of love she used to justify the sacrifices, Magda shared with me not only the deep emotionality that the experience of deportation provoked but also how changes in immigration policy had rendered her as a mother unable to provide for her child. In addition to describing her fear of deportation while she waited to adjust her legal status, Magda described the profound anger she felt at Francisco for abandoning her and Mateo after he was deported. She said at first phone calls, cards and letters would come a few times a week, then weekly, then biweekly and finally Francisco stopped returning her calls all together. That anger was only compounded when as a newly single mother the passage of PRWORA coupled her with legal status in limbo made it such that Magdalena was unable to access social welfare programs to help her son.

Once in the United States her husband's deportation became a personal crisis that symbolized the shifting political and social landscape, as her legal and economic situation was foreclosed before her very eyes. Just as Magdalena's and Mateo's

wellbeing became dictated by the changes ushered in by PRWORA it was the passage of IIRIRA, which dramatically expanded the grounds for deportation and ended judicial review for a wide variety of offenses in order to deport migrants as swiftly as possible, that swept her husband into the broadened and deepened net of deportation and tore their family apart.

Magdalena's experiences not only immediately implicate how deportation and policy changes in the mid-1990s created a very different terrain for Magdalena and her family than for Colombians who migrated earlier. Both Magdalena and Abel, who had migrated earlier, encountered new circumstances that structured the way they endured different legal subjectivities but Abel experienced delayed family reunification and deportation of a loved one under similar circumstances but with a substantially different outcome. Both products of shifting circumstances, and both compelled to migrate for different reasons; the differences between Magdalena and Abel experiences underscore how dramatic shifts of immigration policy create new parameters for legality and illegality but also new consequences for different legal subjects.

For many Colombians who came through the first wave without authorization in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the ability to adjust their legal status with the passage of IRCA stands in stark contrast to those the opportunities for both authorized and unauthorized Colombian migrants who came in the second wave as PRWORA made citizenship a prerequisite for the receipt of many basic public benefits. As newly arriving legal permanent residents are ineligible for basic support programs for the first five years of their settlement, Colombians who came in the second wave experienced starkly different relationships to the changes in federal policy.

*Devolution and the Expansion of State Powers in 1996*

Deportation became the primary mechanism to control migration with the mid 1990s policy reform, constituting what De Genova and Puetz (2010) term a “deportation regime,” an expansion of the categories of noncitizens subject to deportation, through the restriction of migrants’ possibilities for appeal, an increase the number and type the offenses for which noncitizens could be deported. IIRIRA further instantiated the deportation regime into immigration policy because it 1) broadened and deepened the net of deportation; 2) affected the resources legal migrants had available to them and 3) deputized state and local officers to identify “illegals,” all for the sake of enhancing immigration enforcement. This third aspect allowed local law enforcement authorities to partner with federal immigration enforcement, and represents an essential feature of the devolution of the responsibility of immigration management and control.

A primary feature of both PRWORA and IIRIRA was the devolution, meaning the transfer or delegation of power to a lower level of government, from the federal to the state government in both policies. This devolution expanded the power of individual states over welfare and immigration control, and ultimately created the pathway for the emergence of both restrictive and inclusive localized immigration policies in the mid-2000s. Since the mid-1990s stricter immigration policy has become not only further intertwined with the dismantling of social welfare policies but also enabled by it. PRWORA ended the federal entitlement for welfare by creating temporary, time-limited policies that restricted access for even legal migrants. Yet another essential feature of PRWORA is the devolution from the federal to the state level the authority and responsibility to implement and allocate public assistance. Previously the domain of the

federal government the major welfare program shifted to hands of the states, much like immigration enforcement.<sup>77</sup>

Varsanyi argues that these policy changes profoundly reoriented the relationship between the state and immigrants because, “the partial devolution of welfare policy and immigration policing powers challenges rather strict jurisdictional lines in place for over a century, and gives state and local governments newfound and increasing powers to discriminate on the basis of alienage or noncitizen status.” (2008a: 878). Taken together IIRIRA and PRWORA represent a profound shift in how migration “management” figures into the devolution of power, as it represents not so much a pure withdrawal of the federal government but rather a shifting and reorganization of partial powers to local governments. At the time of IIRIRA and PRWORA’s passage the granting of this unprecedented authority to states was seen as a way to fix the “broken” systems of immigration and welfare. The significance of devolution and the consequences of devolution—specifically granting localities unprecedented power over the control and regulation of membership –would not fully be realized or felt until the rise of localized immigration policies in the mid-2000s.

#### Reworking the Politics of Immigration: Local Economic Development and Matters of National Security

##### *“The Right Kind of Immigrants”: Migrant Desirability in pre-9/11 Philadelphia*

In Philadelphia localized efforts to attract immigrants began in 2000 as immigration became tethered to its potential for economic development. Though the initial efforts to craft policy solutions became derailed by 9/11 they represent an

---

<sup>77</sup> Specifically states receive funds through block grants for the new program TANF and have much lateral in the design and implementation of workfare programs and fund disbursement.

important moment to examine in order to understand the trajectory of localization in the United States. The arguments that supported attracting immigrants to Philadelphia turned the discourses about the “crisis” of immigration as an economic drain on its head, as migrants were positioned as a solution to the city’s fiscal crisis.

Councilman-At-Large James Kenney spearheaded an initiative to welcome immigrants as a solution to the city’s sixty-year decline and proposed the creation of an Office of New Philadelphians. Decades of population loss and eroded tax base brought together both elected officials like Kenney with policymakers and private research institutes to lobby for measures to attract immigrants even as anti-immigrant sentiments persisted at the national level. The initiatives drew from the indelible fact that Philadelphia had been rapidly losing residents and positions attracting migrants as the most tenable, and economically productive, solution.

On October 17<sup>th</sup> the City Council’s Legislative Oversight Committee held a daylong hearing on ways to make the city more attractive to migrants. Representatives from government groups, different city departments, advocacy groups, and immigrant organizations attended to offer their input, which consisted both criticism and suggestions to the community (Harris 2000). That day Kenney cited San Jose, Chicago and Houston as cities that bolstered dwindling population numbers with immigrants and noted that in the 1980s cities like New York and Boston staved off large population losses precisely because they attracted new immigrants (Gupta 2000). Kenney, in his initial address, noted,

We as a city government must do everything we can to address our population loss, and increasing immigration is a critical step in the right direction. The City must ensure that we are not an impediment to new immigrants' success, that we respond to their needs for assistance, and that

they can successfully become contributing members of our society.

For many others testifying at the hearing the loss of residents was similarly framed as a devastating population exodus and finding new immigrant residents was positioned as the obvious cure for the shrinking tax base. Ultimately other council members, city agency officials and private business groups framed immigration as economically desirable, however the framing of immigrants differed amongst different actors, even those who supported the attraction of immigrants.

Though there was no dearth of supporters of immigration at the hearings, there were several concerns raised including the adequate provision of services to immigrants, specifically culturally sensitive police officers and sufficient numbers of translators. Even without specific detractors present, several individuals testifying addressed the imagined concerns of potential detractors and in doing so set up a dichotomy between “desirable” and “undesirable” migrants. The notion of immigrants as “takers” was consistently deployed during the 2000 City Council hearings, even though the invocation of the stereotype was always brought up as a means to argue against it the constant referral to notion of immigrants as “takers” or a “drain on society” only served to reinforce the connotation.

Though in Philadelphia public discourses during the mid-1990s and early 2000s tended to avoid relying on representations of immigrants as illegals or criminals, which are usually entrenched immigration policy debates, characterization of immigrants as potential economic drains persisted even by those who sought to argue against those facile characterizations.<sup>78</sup> Kenney stated in his opening remarks, "I know that one of the

---

<sup>78</sup> Goode notes that the absence of anti-immigrant sentiments or nativist responses to the official call for immigration is owed to the relative invisibility and small number of immigrants before

political pitfalls for advocating for immigration is the misperception and fear among some citizens that new immigrants will drain resources and take jobs.” The lingering stereotype of immigrants as in need of or inclined to use public benefits remained solid in the public social imaginary, and matched the federal policies PRWORA and IIRIRA passed just a few years earlier.<sup>79</sup>

The Pennsylvania Economic League (PEL), the main booster of Kenney’s initiatives, published its own special reports outlining the necessity of immigrants if the city were to remain economically viable moving into the new millennium. The report written by Anuj Gupta, a PEL research associate at the time, highlighted the tensions between Kenney’s vision and the more selective desires of the PEL. As an economist primarily interested in the mutually beneficial relationship between high-skilled workers and growth of the professional sector of the economy, Gupta stated in the written report,

It will take a strategic plan that involves job creation, selective recruitment of immigrants, and the fostering of an atmosphere in which newcomers will not only settle, but thrive. Unless the city found a way to reverse that trend, it would miss a chance to revitalize the economy and rebuild failing neighborhoods (4, 2000).

Bolstered by a burgeoning literature on immigrant entrepreneurs in sociology, the PEL explicitly framed high-skilled, professional migrants as the key to Philadelphia’s

---

the 1990s, and “the subtle valorization by whites and middle class Blacks of immigrant work ethics and family structures over those of native-born poor people of color” (Goode 2011, see also Goode 1990, 1998).

<sup>79</sup> Similarly, the executive director of the Pennsylvania Economy League (PEL), David Thornburgh, testified that “At a very basic level, immigrants help replenish the population exodus that many of the nation’s older industrial cities are suffering from,” but later added that “legal immigrants have no greater propensity toward welfare usage than natives.” (City Council Meeting Transcript, October 17, 2000). As the main boosters of Kenney’s initiatives, PEL’s support shape the continued effort to craft policy and create institutions to facilitate immigrant integration in the city for years to come. While Thornburgh’s and Kenney’s perspectives did not oppose each other, there exists some tension between the two assertions—one that favors only “desirable” migrants and one that valorizes all migrants respectively.

turn around. This perspective relied on familiar tropes of America as a meritocracy where immigrants or any resident can improve their social standing by “pulling themselves up by the bootstraps.” In essence the report constructs migrants as having an innate desire for upward mobility in search of the “American Dream.”

Only immigrants who are perceived as the most productive and beneficial are the intended “targets” of the proposed policies within the vision of the PEL.<sup>80</sup> Gupta wrote,

As their time in the United States increases, immigrants augment their status as productive and value-added members of society. The point to be drawn is that immigrants are upwardly mobile people. Although they may not arrive with a great deal of economic resources or immediately offer many benefits, with time they adapt and contribute to society at the same level as natives... The majority of immigrants come to the U.S. with the notion of seeking a better life. As a result, they are job seekers and locate in areas where they can readily find employment.

Desirable migrants explicitly became the “value-added members of society” who seek a better life for themselves, while “undesirable” or “less” desirable migrants implicitly are those who leave their countries out of necessity whether to escape violence, persecution, political or economic instability. In other words “desirable” migrants were those who would contribute, undesirable migrants were left out of the report and implicitly constructed as migrants who might be in need of resources like bilingual education, language accessible municipal services, properly funded public school system or jobs that paid a living wage. Even though the pro-immigrant discourses and proposed strategies valorized immigration and immigrants, they imagined and constructed an idealized immigrant that would revitalize the city.

---

<sup>80</sup> Similarly Gupta’s full report offered solutions to specifically attract highly educated and professional migrants for high-tech industries and corporations through encouraging area colleges and university to focus on recruiting more international students and expanding international flights and international airlines at the airport in order to attract and accommodate immigrants.

Yet at the time, the city's labor market depended upon low-wage workers because of the growth of the service industry and not just high-skilled workers and specialists. By contrast Kenney maintained support for all migrants to be welcoming in Philadelphia, stating to the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, "a growing service industry would help provide job openings for unskilled newcomers" (as quoted in Rohr 2001). While Kenney offered a more inclusive vision of migrants that could bolster economic development, desirability remained inherent in the grounds for inclusion.

Migration reform in Philadelphia became stalled, however it did not diminish entirely. Though the "Office for New Philadelphians" never came to fruition, the discourses of the 2000 Legislative Oversight Committee Hearing and the PEL report characterized "desirable" immigrants as productive, entrepreneurial, job-seekers who embrace hard-work and come to embody neoliberal ideologies and values. Even though efforts stalled they are essential to trace first, because they shape local incorporation processes for migrants and second, because they discourses about immigrants as assets to economic development persisted in future efforts.

Derailed by conflicts with then Mayor John Street and the immediate aftermath of 9/11 that characterized foreigners—immigrants and terrorists alike—as a threat the national security, the Office of New Philadelphians failed to become a reality. The efforts of Philadelphia to create policies that seeks to attract migrants emerged before 9/11 and the exacerbation of anti-foreign sentiment which directly lead to punitive and restrictive local policies that cropped up during the 2000s in the absence of federal immigration reform and during the national "War on Terror." The effort to craft policy to attract immigrants to Philadelphia never fully went away. Instead it receded quietly into the

background only to become reinvigorated after local-federal enforcement agreements and punitive localized policies blossomed across the United States.

*Post 9/11: The War on Terror and the New “Threat” of Immigration*

As anti-immigrant sentiments became reinvigorated in the post-9/11 moment, the “war on terror” galvanized national politics to produce new policies, forms of policing and surveillance. Immigration control became a crucial aspect of national security, and the post-9/11 enforcement apparatus, which intended to protect the polity and people against terrorism, increasingly targeted undocumented migrants (Golash Boza 2011). In both public debates and in the restructuring of government agencies that handled immigration, the criminality of “illegal” migrants became associated with the criminality of terrorism.<sup>81</sup> In the post-9/11 political landscape the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, significantly increased the capacity for the enforcement of existing immigration laws that emphasized deportation and conceptualized it as an imperative of the newly formed agency (Golash Boza 2011).<sup>82</sup> Moreover Inda and

---

<sup>81</sup> In its most extreme, but all too common, forms the “war on terror” racialized those of Middle Eastern decent and followers of Islam as potential terrorists as it exacerbated anti-immigrant xenophobia and racialized all foreigners as inherently suspicious. The political imperative to protect the “homeland” has indeed shaped the governing of migration. Specifically Inda argues, “protecting the nation thus not only involves preventing terrorist attacks, but also mitigating the dangers posed by ‘illegal’ and ‘criminal’ immigrants. Indeed, the undocumented have come to be seen as criminal threats to national security. The homeland must on this logic be protected from these irresponsible ‘criminals’” (2013: 296-297).

<sup>82</sup> Under the auspices of the recently created Department of Homeland Security many of the functions of the now defunct Immigration and Naturalization Service which was housed in the Department of Justice, were relegated to new agencies within DHS: (1) U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, deals with forms and materials related to immigration and naturalization including visa petitions, naturalization petitions, application of asylum and refugee status, and adjudication of asylum claims; (2) U.S. Customs and Border Protection, regulates international trade, the trafficking of illicit substances and contraband, but also apprehension of people who attempt to enter without authorization; (3) Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) the primary branch of enforcement which has two main divisions: (a) Enforcement and Removal Operations which deals with among many identification, arrest and removal of “illegal aliens”

Dowling (2011) argue that the aggressive pursuit of “illegals” in the name of national security constitute “governing immigration through crime.”

Yet many states and municipalities did not begin to engage in the federal and local partnership for immigration enforcement, made possible by IIRIRA in 1996, until after the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks. While the border remains the essential “frontier” of immigration control, enforcement moved inward from the border to the interior of the United States, as concerns about “illegals” became the responsibility of both local and federal authorities (Inda and Dowling 2011; Kanstroom 2012; Inda 2011; Coleman 2007b).<sup>83</sup> Inda argues that the localization of enforcement “interiorization of the border” (2006) whereby policing, surveillance and control of immigration has shifted from the national to the local scale—from the US-Mexico border to Main Street of any state, county or city. Facilitated devolution, politics and policing of immigration have moved inward since 2001, giving rise for the proliferation of state and local ordinances that do not simply partner with federal law enforcement but rather implement their own, more restrictive and punitive localized policies to address the so-called problem of “illegal” immigrants.

### The Localization of Immigration Policy

#### *Devolution and Preemption of Plenary Power*

---

and includes the handling of detention and deportation and (b) Homeland Security Investigations which investigates human trafficking, drug trafficking, financial crimes, international criminal activity and other areas.

<sup>83</sup> For many scholars this localization has taken the form of enforcement and policing in the aftermath of September 11<sup>th</sup> and been carried out through an increased reliance on deportation, policing throughout the country and workplace raids in the interior (De Genova and Puetz 2010; Coleman 2007; Inda 2011, 2013).

While state and local immigration regulation has always been a feature of the United States since the early republic (Rodríguez 2008), the rise of local regulation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century has outpaced any other historical moments and appears to remain a permanent feature of local governance in the absence of federal reform. The federal government has exclusive power over immigration, specifically the authority to exclude, admit or remove noncitizens, in the United States as a matter of the Naturalization Clause in the Constitution, which has been upheld by several Supreme Court cases in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Varsanyi 2008b).<sup>84</sup> The exclusivity, referred to as “plenary power,” has been challenged by the stalemate on federal immigration policy—specifically the failure to deal with closed borders, deportation and pathway to citizenship—and by local-federal immigration enforcement partnerships. Emboldened by events of September 11<sup>th</sup> and the failure of federal immigration policy reform in 2005, states and cities have increasingly crafted their own policies to deal with immigration and immigrants to give rise to the localization of policy in the US.

The localization of immigration policy occurs in two main ways: devolution and the preemption of plenary powers. The devolution of power and authority through IIRIRA and PRWORA granted states and cities unprecedented reach in dealing with the treatment of and the rights of immigrants present in their localities. Devolution also made localities more responsible than ever before for managing immigration through partnership agreements between federal agencies under Homeland Security with both state and city agencies regarding criminal law enforcement and social services. While devolution conceded localities unprecedented scope to handle immigration, it has also

---

<sup>84</sup> Notably proponents and opponents of localized immigration policy often defer to the exclusivity of the federal government over immigration matters (Varsanyi 2008a; Rodríguez 2008).

given rise to the other side of the coin specifically the preemption of plenary powers. Local policies attempt to preempt the plenary powers of the federal government by granting localities new authority to dictate the terms of immigration regulation, specifically through attempts to exclude noncitizens.

In the past decade the vast majority of localized immigration policies that have been proposed and passed at the state and local level have been restrictive and punitive. Changes in federal law have facilitated local-federal partnerships have become the seeds through which localities have sought to displace federal law in order to “succeed” in controlling immigration in the ways the federal government has “failed.” Attempts by city governments, state legislators and initiative developers to advance policies that allow local government and law enforcement to be the primary enforcer of immigration law have exploited the now ambiguous line between the plenary power of the federal government over immigration and the newly ceded authority to state and local governments.

By contrast some localities, usually cities, have sought to welcome immigrants by passing legislation that would facilitate immigrant integration through immigrant-oriented institutions and services. Since the mid-1990s more cities began to pass “sanctuary” policies which bar government officials (government employees and law enforcement) from inquiring about immigration status.<sup>85</sup> While the passage of anti-

---

<sup>85</sup> Though municipalities cannot fully ban sharing immigration status with federal officials based on a 1996 congressional law, they have adopted tacit policies that abide by a “don’t ask, don’t tell” protocol where inquiries about immigration status are only employed to ascertain eligibility for certain services. The contemporary use of the terms “sanctuary policies” or “sanctuary city” is owed to the sanctuary movement in the 1980s that worked to protect undocumented Central Americans from deportation. The sanctuary movement of the 1980s was grounded in religious and humanitarian politics that asserted the US government was obligated to honor the rights of undocumented Central Americans to stay and not be subject to deportation because they fled

immigrant localized policies has outpaced pro-immigrant policies, local attempts at policies that are more welcoming to immigrants and less restrictive of their social and political rights have also grown. Philadelphia's attempts to attract immigrants emerge from this broader opportunity to craft local immigration policies that suit a specific localities needs.

Still the rise of localized immigration policies, both restrictive and welcoming, has shifted the relationships between federal, state and local authorities in dealing with immigration and created new questions over which governing bodies get to decide membership, who is able to live and reside and what their social and legal rights are. Localization has further challenged whether immigration regulation and control remains the exclusive domain of the federal government. Focusing on the rise of localized policies and the growth of local-federal partnerships illuminates both how restrictive and punitive policies as well as welcoming policies grapple with, resist or defer to plenary power of the federal government to justify their existence. This section traces the localization of policy to illuminate how Philadelphia has navigated the line between crafting measures to attract immigrants while maintaining its authority to do have localized policies that meet its needs and protect the rights of immigrants in the city.

*Regimes of Local-Federal Partnerships: Enforcement and 287(g)*

A provision within IIRIRA amended the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), to include 287(g) a statute that authorized state and local officers to support federal

---

persecution and torture in their nation of origins that were the direct result of US foreign policy that supported these repressive governments (Coutin 2007). While the use of the terms "sanctuary city" or "sanctuary policies" refer to a loosely collected, non-rigidly defined set of protections for undocumented migrants of all origins to not have to disclose their immigration status in order to avoid being identified as "illegal" and subject to deportation.

officers in the location and “removal” (read deportation) of “noncitizens who pose a threat to national security and public safety.” 287(g) trained and deputized local police agents as federal migration authorities making it possible for local enforcement to now identify, process and detain “noncitizens who pose a threat to national security and public safety.”<sup>86</sup> Although 287(g) agreements had been legal and available for use since 1996, only after September 11<sup>th</sup> were the provisions put into use.

While the program makes it possible for state and local law enforcement to enter into agreements with federal enforcement to enforce immigration law, 287(g) does not specifically grant power over immigration enforcement to state and local authorities. As widespread use of 287(g) agreements grew after 9/11, it was the failure of proposed federal immigration reform in 2005 that fueled cities and states to take matters into their own hands and craft ordinances that asserted the authority of local government to enforce immigration matters. It is this subtle difference between partnerships for the sake of enforcement and actual authority over immigration that engender the tensions inherent in localized policies of cities and states in the mid 2000s.

#### *Failure of Federal Reform*

Continuing to the longer trajectory of emphasizing enforcement, deterrence and criminalization of immigrants, the US House of Representatives passed The Border Protection, Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act (HR 4437), in December

---

<sup>86</sup> Section 287(g) allows local law enforcement, as agents of federal immigration enforcement, to conduct immigration functions: identification, process and detention of migrants. State, county and city law enforcement are permitted to arrest and detain noncitizens for federal immigration authorities, to investigate immigration violation, make immigration arrests, collect evidence and form cases for prosecution or removal in the court system and increased civil penalties for unauthorized entry (Vázquez 2011). Under 287 (g) state, county and city law enforcement were permitted to arrest and detain noncitizens for federal immigration authorities, to investigate immigration violation, make immigration arrests, collect evidence and form cases for prosecution or removal in the court system and increased civil penalties for unauthorized entry.

2005. The bill contained a provision that would have transformed undocumented immigration a felony rather than a civil violation. The passage of HR 4437 proved to be a watershed moment as it animated massive, nationwide protests in May 2006 as immigrants and supporters attempted to combat the felony provision and draw attention to the importance and centrality of immigrants in everyday American life (Chavez 2008). In the larger context of protest and activism the Senate failed to pass the bill and no federal immigration bills passed for the next two years. The inability of Congress to reform immigration policies spurred local governments that were eager to address immigration to create their own ordinances.<sup>87</sup>

While many cities opted to welcome immigrants by creating initiatives and institutions that facilitated immigrant incorporation and endorsing “sanctuary policies,” others passed laws that attempted to expand the authority of states and municipalities to participate in and define their own parameters for immigration enforcement. Hence since the mid-2000s more municipalities have led the charge in harsher, more punitive immigration enforcement, sometimes in ways that disregard the plenary power of the federal government. Ultimately 287(g) created the expectation of partnerships between state and local officials to enforce the immigration laws as both devolution and failed punitive federal reform converged to give rise to more localized restrictive ordinances.

#### *Hazleton and Arizona: Local “Crimmigration” Policies*

Between 2005 and 2011, over 370 local governments, including cities, states and counties, proposed or implemented policies to address issues of undocumented

---

<sup>87</sup> Local anti-immigrant policies proliferated in the spring 2006, coinciding with the Day Without an Immigrant marches. In fact empirical studies showed that while less than 20 municipalities proposed local anti-immigrant policies between 2000 and 2005, over 50 were drafted just in the summer of 2006 (Hopkins 2008, 2010 cited in Dick 2011).

immigration (Walker and Leitner 2011). While many localized policies defer power to the federal government, several “Illegal Immigrant Relief Acts” (IIRA) passed since 2005 attempt to carve out unprecedented power for localities to restrict the rights of undocumented migrants and allocate harsher punishments for being undocumented. These IIRAs are often justified by the supposed “insufficiency” of the federal government to “properly” do its job in deterring immigration, and attempt to extend the authority of localities to control immigration.

In 2006, Mayor Lou Barletta passed Hazelton, Pennsylvania’s ordinance, one of the first in the US. The ordinance made it illegal for landlords to rent to undocumented migrants, and included an English-only ordinance amongst other prohibitions, which replicated restrictions from failed federal reform to discriminate against migrants in new ways.<sup>88</sup> Hazelton’s laws drew upon features in the failed HR 4437. HR 4437 attempted to expand the category of “harborer,” as in the act of “harboring a criminal,” to be applied to persons or organizations that aided undocumented immigrants to legally categorize them as akin human traffickers (Chavez 2008; Dick 2011). The novel criminalization of renters and landlords in Hazelton’s laws targeted the everyday life of migrants. As such, the ordinance, and others like it, sought to restrict the kinds of private agreements individuals can enter to on the basis of legal status and in doing so attempted to expand the authority of the local to restrict the very presence of immigrants (Varsanyi 2008a).

Though district courts struck down Hazelton’s ordinances shortly after its passage on the basis that it violated the plenary power of the federal government, other small

---

<sup>88</sup> The Hazelton ordinance also prohibited business owners from employing undocumented migrants. In order to obtain a business permit from the city the ordinance required all businesses to file an affidavit with the city stating they do not knowingly employ undocumented migrants (Walker and Leitner 2011; Rodríguez 2008).

towns followed its lead and passed similar measures within months.<sup>89,90</sup> The Hazelton IIRA, also became part of the template for Arizona's Senate Bill 1070.<sup>91,92</sup> Signed into law by Governor Jan Brewer, SB 1070 expanded both the criminality of undocumented migrants and attempted to expand the authority of the state in immigration matters.

The Arizona law, the first of its kind passed at the state level, expanded Hazelton's efforts and sanctioned penalties for anyone who sheltered (i.e. rented), hired or transported (having someone as a passenger) unregistered "aliens." Moreover the law gave local and state police unprecedented discretion to arrest and investigate the immigration status of anyone who seemed to be an "illegal alien" on the basis of "reasonable suspicion." Arizona's law faced numerous injunctions because of its

---

<sup>89</sup> District courts struck down the laws primarily on the basis that it attempted to legislate the employment of undocumented migrants. The district court ruling on the Hazelton ordinance argued that it was federal policy, IRCA, which does not allow for state regulation of its employment provision.

<sup>90</sup> At nearly the same time Valley Park, Missouri passed an ordinance that copied nearly word for word large parts of the Hazelton ordinance. See Dick 2011 for an excellent exploration of the interdiscursivity between anti-immigration ordinances penned in Hazelton, PA, other local policies and federal policy, especially the role of media in linking local mayors' interests in passing these ordinances. Additionally, Dick shows that even if local policies fail they can come to shape future federal reforms noting that California's prop 187 contributed key elements of IIRIRA's intent and underscores how these specific local anti-immigration ordinances racialize and criminalize undocumented migrants, especially Latinos.

<sup>91</sup> The commonalities between these local measures are owed to Kris Kobach, a lawyer who was chief legal counsel for the Federation for American Immigration Reform (a hate group according to the Southern Poverty Law Center and a group whose founding has white supremacy origins), was the primary architecture of these ordinances in concert with lawmakers in each locality. Kobach served as lead attorney on the *Lozano v. City of Hazelton* district court case. Kobach was elected as the Secretary of State of Kansas in 2011. Kobach also worked with the American Legislative exchange Council (ALEC), a forum for state lawmakers and private sector individuals to collaborate and draft legislation that may be modeled and adapted for specific localities and jurisdictions, to draft Arizona SB 1070. ALEC is largely conservative and often operates around principals of free-market enterprise, and encourages local and state representative from around the US to use policy language they draft to become proposals these representatives submit to their legislatures.

<sup>92</sup> The passage of SB 1070 in Arizona spawned over a dozen similar laws at the state level around the United States; five passed: Georgia, Utah, South Carolina, Alabama and Indiana.

questionable constitutionality and a majority of its key measures were struck down in 2012 with the Supreme Court Ruling of *Arizona v. United States* on the grounds that it usurped the federal government's authority over immigration regulation and enforcement.<sup>93</sup>

As local anti-immigrant policies grow they seek to control the movement of immigrants by legally hollowing out their ability to simply be present in the jurisdiction. By implementing policies and practices that tie renting, working or traveling in car to criminality they make mundane human activity illegal. In essence these forms of localized policies become attempts to exert control of the movement of migrants and to manage their political and social presence (Dick 2011; Jones 2012; Coleman 2007a, 2007b; Varsanyi 2008a, 2008b; Rodríguez 2008; Wells 2004). In doing so they often impinge upon the power of the federal government.

The localized policies of Hazelton and Arizona demonstrate the frictions of localization and plenary powers of the federal government. In theory local policing through local-federal partnerships does not conflict with the plenary power of the federal government since federal law has both authorized and required it. Yet localized immigration policies with increasing regularity are passing ordinances that are in tension with the scope of the federal government's power to determine membership and regulate

---

<sup>93</sup> SB 1070 also mandated that that police determine and verify the immigration status of anyone arrested or detained for any offense if police had any "reasonable suspicion" that the individual was "illegal." The Supreme Court struck down three major provisions. First it dismissed the requirement that legal migrants must carry registration documents (to differentiate themselves from "illegal immigrants"/undocumented migrants) at all times. Second it forbade state police to arrest any individual they suspected to be an "illegal immigrant." Finally it abolished the provision that criminalized undocumented migrants for searching or holding a job in the state. However the decision upheld the portion of SB 1070 that allowed Arizona state police to investigate the immigration status of individuals who were stopped, detained or arrested if there was "reasonable suspicion" they were in the country without authorization.

the treatment and rights of noncitizens. Federal pushback to the threats over plenary power reaffirm the federal authority over immigration policy yet as these localized policies test out the latitude for state and local governments to enforce and enact immigration law independent of federal law they open up new spaces to shape future federal reform.<sup>94</sup> The creation of the Secure Communities program in 2008 represents one federal response to the growth of local policies.

### *Secure Communities*

While local-federal partnership remain essential to current modes of immigration enforcement, the federal government has sought to rein in states' and localities' leeway to craft their own efforts that may undermine its exclusive power over immigration matters. Shortly after the failure of the Congress to reform federal immigration policy and in the context of the rise of local IIRAs, President Bush initiated the Secure Communities program through ICE in 2008. The program, expanded under President Obama, mandated compliance of all municipalities to partner with federal departments and law enforcement, and therefore attempted to reassert the sole authority of the federal government to dictate the terms of partnerships.

The Secure Communities Program, an information-sharing program between the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigations and local law enforcement about the migration status of arrestees, expedited the location and deportation of "illegal" immigrants through multi-level collaboration. By DHS's own mission statement, Secure Communities was created "to identify, detain and remove from

---

<sup>94</sup> Dick (2011) makes the indispensable argument that failed local policies are essential to track because they may become part of future comprehensive federal reform as was the case with Prop 187 and IIRIRA and PRWORA in 1996.

the United States aliens who have been convicted of a serious criminal offense and are subject to removal” (quoted in Vázquez 2011: 659). Removal, deportation in the parlance of Secure Communities, is supposed to target only those who are deemed a public safety threat or have repeatedly violated immigration law, yet even in local-federal partnerships, local police enjoy tremendous discretion over arrests. Thus under the program local police have the freedom and the power to use minor offenses like speeding, traffic violations and disorderly conduct and any arrest, as the grounds for identification of immigration status which could trigger detention and deportation.

Secure Communities, along with 287(g), represent a significant restructuring of federal-state relationship whereby the devolution of powers now not only allows but also expects localities to exert authority in enforcement and identification of undocumented migrants.<sup>95</sup> Because state and local authorities now have the authority to identify, arrest and detain undocumented individuals on criminal and civil grounds in the name of “national security,” Coleman argues that this represents a changing geography of immigration enforcement as it represents erasure of a “bright line” that strictly divided criminal law enforcement at the local and state levels and federal civil immigration enforcement (2007b: 56).<sup>96</sup>

Though restrictive and punitive local measures have received attention from the national media and scholars alike, little, if any, has been paid to inclusive policy efforts.

---

<sup>95</sup> And whereas the 287(g) program was voluntary, meaning municipalities themselves decided if they wanted to enter the program, Secure Communities program was a nationwide mandatory program for all municipalities that was rolled out in various phases.

<sup>96</sup> In certain aspects this localization is not complete as DHS had the authority to compel compliance with Secure Communities. This was the case in 2011 when Illinois governor Pat Quinn attempted to stop participation in Secure Communities but DHS overrode his attempt to withdraw and mandated the state continue to share fingerprints.

Yet many local legislatures passed laws and resolutions during 2010-2011 that were inclusive and sought to welcome immigrants and protect their rights (Dick 2011). As local measures proliferate, including inclusive measures, scholars must examine the overlapping features that these localized measure have, because even if their strategies target different ends, the scope of localized migration policies and the potential tension with federal exclusivity remains an important commonality. Facilitated by devolution, both anti-immigrant and pro-immigrant policies also illuminate how cities and states assert themselves into debates about immigration reform. Closer examination of Philadelphia's efforts to craft policies to attract immigrants specifically reveals how states and cities can come into conflict with one another as they grapple for discretion to create their own policies.

When the Local Meets the State: Tensions of Localization and The Pennsylvania  
Compact  
*The State of Politics in the Commonwealth*

Philadelphia stands in stark contrast with the recent attempts of places like Hazelton and Arizona to create its own localized policies. Earlier city initiatives from 2000, while stalled, never went away entirely. Rather, organized efforts to craft local policies in the city came back in full force during 2011 as a means to push back against proposed state legislation and as a way for the city to stake its own claim in creating localized policy that responded to the proliferation of punitive, restrictive local policies passed across the US.

The year 2011 offered an unprecedented number of bills at the state level that sought to regulate immigration, and control the rights and resources of migrants in

Pennsylvania.<sup>97</sup> There were 71 bills proposed in the State Senate and House of Representatives, more than in the years immediately before and after, and even substantially more than the first session after 9/11. Notably the state legislative session that spanned 2011-2012 was Pennsylvania's first full session after the successful passage of Arizona's SB 1070. Emboldened by the immediate success of Arizona's passage at the state level, the Pennsylvania legislature drafted more bills that sought to provide the commonwealth "relief" from immigrants and target Philadelphia's efforts to adopt sanctuary policies to protect the rights of all migrants regardless of legal status. The proposed bills also speak to both the broader dynamics between the city and the state.

In Pennsylvania, Philadelphia holds an ambiguous position. While it has a robust and diverse economy compared to many other counties, Pennsylvania state politics, politicians and ordinary Pennsylvanians often regard the city with disdain. Philadelphia is seen as always in need of more money and getting more than its fair share. The characterizations and critiques of the city as "scourge" or a "drain on state resources" are rife with racial implications as the state itself is overwhelmingly White, while Philadelphia's population as a "majority-minority" city has more Blacks and Latinos than it does Whites.

It is in this context that the largely rural and white representatives of the Pennsylvania State Senate and House of Representatives were poised to expand the boundaries of criminality for undocumented migrants and restrict political and social rights for noncitizens in 2011. The package of 14 bills in the House of Representatives,

---

<sup>97</sup> The commonwealth of Pennsylvania has become a key battle ground for the localization of migration policies as it has had a high concentration of local ordinances; over 40 municipalities have introduced or proposed policies, particularly in rural areas of the state (Walker and Leitner 2011).

named together “National Security Begins at Home,” endeavored to make e-verify a mandatory state program, demand proof of citizenship for basic services, eliminate birthright citizenship for children born to undocumented parents and penalize any municipality in the Commonwealth that passed “sanctuary legislation” by depriving them of state funds.

A champion of several of these bills, Representative Metcalfe stated in an official press release

there are no innocent illegal aliens because their very first step across the border is a criminal violation of federal immigration law. After that they must break law after law in order to survive, including, but certainly not limited to, committing welfare fraud and stealing jobs from taxpaying Pennsylvania citizens.<sup>98</sup>

The bills themselves and Representative Metcalfe’s statement underlines the ways in which “illegality” as a state of being, or “illegal” as a particular form of subjecthood is not a given, but rather actively produced and re-produced over time through the enactment of policies (Ngai 2004; De Genova 2005). Metcalfe’s justifications for the bill reinforce the supposed inherent criminality of undocumented migrants and continue to rely on racialized notions of Latinos, both legal and “illegal,” as linked to theft and fraud. The suite of bills offered the one-two punch of punishing undocumented migrants and punishing Philadelphia should it pass sanctuary policies by being able to withhold state funds that would support all people, especially racial minorities, in the city.

---

<sup>98</sup> Representative Daryl Metcalfe of Butler County sponsored all these bills with support from other legislators. Metcalfe has attempted to make a name for himself in the state Republican Party by pushing very conservative measures (Denvir 2011). Driving legislation through his affiliation with conservative organizations like ALEC and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), the Southern Poverty Law Center labeled a hate group, Metcalfe proposed these bills with the hopes they would reach then Governor Corbett, a fellow conservative Republican. These “National Security Begins at Home” bills borrowed language and elements from Arizona’s SB 1070, which is no surprise given Representative Metcalfe’s links to ALEC and FAIR.

These policies, both their proposals and their ultimate failures, illuminate the debates around migrants and the tensions between state and local politics over the role of migrants. The state level bills, though they did not become law, represent new attempts to restrict access to public benefits for noncitizens and attempts to control the direction of localized policy in the state. More specifically these bills deliberately sought to restrict the ability for Philadelphia to enact measures to secure the rights and resources of migrants within its jurisdiction and undermine the more inclusive nature of Philadelphia's local immigration policies. In 2011 as the state legislature attempted to shape the politics of localized policies in Pennsylvania, Philadelphia City Council challenged the proposed state level restrictive measure by passing its own ordinances that maintained the city's authority to attract and welcome migrants.

#### *The Pennsylvania Compact*

The Pennsylvania Compact, Philadelphia City Council Resolution 110313, developed with the hopes of guiding state-level immigration discussions and policy-making to ensure the city and the state remain a “welcome society to immigrants” and to prevent the passage of restrictive state level bills. The principles outlined in the text of the Pennsylvania Compact itself reveal how local government sought to both manage the city's needs with state ideological battles over the role of migrants and their place within Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania Compact itself outlined five principles (“federal solutions,” “law enforcement,” “families,” “economy” and “free and welcoming society”) that informed not only City Council's decisions and strategies with respect to how to deal with immigration but also provided a template and plea for state-level policymakers to

adhere to the same principles. The first principle reasserted the plenary power of the federal government, stating, “immigration is a federal policy issue between the US government and other countries—not Pennsylvania and other countries.” While underscoring the federal government’s authority to decide on immigration matters the Pennsylvania Compact navigates an interesting line with respect to localization. It constructs restrictive policies, like those proposed at the state level, as outside the jurisdiction of states and localities while preserving the rights of localities to have localized welcoming measures, as they do not threaten the plenary power of the federal government.

Relatedly, the second principle argues that local law enforcement should channel efforts to address criminal activities not “civil violations of federal code.” The second principle highlights that undocumented immigration status is a civil violation and not a felony and in doing so pushes back against the imposition of criminality upon on undocumented migrants by the language of the state level policies and the practices of federal enforcement.

The third principle states that “strong families are the foundation of successful communities” and goes onto to explain that the Compact and those who signed it oppose policies that separate families unnecessarily. The invocation of family unity is a direct appeal to the fundamental principle of 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, that outlined family unification and preservation as a major criteria for immigration visas. Again this localized policy reframed its principle as in line with federal policy but maintained a pointed critique of deportation as needlessly ripping mixed-status families apart.

The fourth principle reiterates the economic justification for migrants and acknowledges the contributions that immigrants make as taxpayers and workers. It also reasserts the importance of immigrants as tied to economic development for the city and state, “Pennsylvania’s immigration policies must be fair and friendly both to businesses and workers who choose to establish themselves here, in order to strengthen our economic role nationally and globally.” Finally the fifth principle makes the case for maintaining a free and welcoming society in the spirit of the inclusion rooted in the founding of the United States but also specifically in the Quaker founding of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia.

The resolution navigates with caution around the line of demarcation that establishes the federal government’s powers to position the city’s policies firmly within its rights and in doing so sought to differentiate itself from the constitutionally questionable bills at the state level. Moreover it reworked the economic premise of the state level policies to argue that immigrants contribute rather than take away from the vitality of the Pennsylvania. The resolution and the Council insert themselves into state and federal debates about immigration reform. The passage of the Pennsylvania Compact a new layer of tension between competing political entities, the state and the city, each which seek to establish and determine the place of migrants within society as well as the rights and access to rights that migrants have within the localities.

### *Testimonies*

On a humid morning in June, where even the marble columns in Philadelphia’s City Hall seem simultaneously slick and sticky with perspiration, and the halls were busy with people. Room 402, the main chamber of the City Council, was filled with

politicians, their aides, advocates who would testify in favor of pro-immigrant policies, their colleagues and a handful of interested onlookers. At 11 am on the 26<sup>th</sup>, Philadelphia's City Council's Legislative Oversight Committee began to hold public hearings on immigration reform and the place of immigration within Philadelphia as part of a larger proposal of Resolution 110313.

Councilman James Kenney, who proposed the Resolution, began the hearing by outlining why he believed passing the resolution was necessary. Kenney set the tone by applauding the city's 2010 population growth, emphasizing that this was the first population increase in over half a century. Backed by census data that confirmed this overall population growth was primarily due to immigration, in particular from Latino and Asian migrants, this accomplishment was repeated by nearly everyone who testified as if to say the numbers foretold a future of prosperity.

As Councilman Kenney moved on to outline the financial ways the city benefits from immigrants through revenue, personal income, sales tax and property tax paid by immigrants. Beyond their tax contributions he insisted that migrants start small businesses at extraordinarily high rates and that migrants accounted for nearly three-quarters of labor-force growth in Philadelphia between 2000 and 2006. Kenney deliberately emphasized how even "those without papers" likewise contribute to the local economy as workers, taxpayers and business owners. The clear emphasis on the importance of undocumented migrants to the city marks a significant departure from the testimonies in 2000 that implicitly relied upon the need for and contributions of high-skilled migrants, professional, and of course, documented migrants. Though the valorization of migrants in 2011 remained tethered to economic development, the

discourses shifted to encompass the rights, deservingness and value of all migrants and to argue that there exists a mutually beneficial relationship between immigrants and the city.

Following Councilman Kenney's introductory, Rich Negrin, the Director and Deputy Mayor for Administration and Coordination for the City of Philadelphia, argued immigration was essential to establishing Philadelphia as an international city, likewise he simultaneously implies that Arizona's SB 1070 has done a disservice to Phoenix while allowing Philadelphia to capitalize on its population increase.<sup>99</sup> Mirroring the language of the Pennsylvania Compact, Negrin—the son of Cuban refugees—stated “the spirit of this city and country was born of immigrants, built on a foundation of hard work, fueled by optimism and bolstered by an unwavering belief that our lives can be better here in America and specifically here in Philadelphia.” Negrin also invests a particular vision of the future in which the treatment of immigrants become a characteristics of a “truly great international city” and whereby the fair treatment and inclusion of immigrants can and should, in his vision, become the grounds for the successful attraction of global capital.

---

<sup>99</sup> Negrin's full quote: “I believe this is the next great international city, a destination city for world travelers, tourists and those looking to make a new life in a great American city. All this points to one single fact, that the immigrants have only enhanced this great city and state, and they were the reason why Philadelphia bumped Phoenix, Arizona back to No. 6 in terms of population. I don't believe it's a coincidence that we surpassed Phoenix as a result of an increasing immigration population. Philadelphia can no longer be viewed with a traditional Black and white construct. The spirit of this city and country was born of immigrants, built on a foundation of hard work, fueled by optimism and bolstered by an unwavering belief that our lives can be better here in America and specifically here in Philadelphia. In closing, one thing is clear. If we are to continue our ascent as one of America's great destination cities, we must welcome those coming from a broad cross-section of the world to help comprise our very diverse Philadelphia mosaic. If we want to showcase our great city by hosting a World Cup, an Olympics or other significant national and international event, it is imperative that we present ourselves to the world as a truly great international city.” See also the beginning of Chapter 1.

Throughout the morning, many of the individuals who testified on behalf of passing the Pennsylvania Compact discursively linked immigration and economic benefit. The representative from the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce extolled the contributions that immigrants make to the city's economy stating that "immigrants found companies that grow and that growth says we [Philadelphia] are open for business," likening the city to a business that proclaims its readiness to grow.

Continuing the call to embrace immigration as solution to the city's woes, Nina Ahmad, the Chair of Mayor Nutter's Commission on Asian American Affairs, identified herself as a small business owner and stated, "I am here to testify about potential, the potential of our immigrant community to help transform our City of Brotherly Love and Sisterly Affection into a truly world-class city." Within the same vein, Aldo, a pastor of a multi-ethnic church in South Philadelphia implored, "And there's so many immigrants that choose Philadelphia because they know because we know not only the City is a City of Brotherly Love, but also we like to contribute and to share the love."

As various social actors, lawmakers, representatives of community based organizations and business associations and individual citizens advocate for inclusive policies with respect to they discursively positions migrants as the key resource for Philadelphia's continued transformation. Drawing from Ngai, I argue that taken together these discourses and the passage of the Pennsylvania Compact itself seek to redefine the "normative basis" of social desirability and inclusion for migrants in the city (2004: 58). As Rodríguez notes "states and localities, through their efforts to manage migration, are thus contributing to the process of defining the political and cultural identity of the United States by sorting people and their preferences" (2008: 641). Philadelphia has

embraced significantly different means to manage migration and in doing so redefined the grounds for membership and inclusion.

### Conclusion

Looking at the localization of policy entails understanding the mechanics and consequences of anti-immigrant ordinances, as they wrestle with both the plenary power of the federal government and their own authority facilitated by devolution. Yet understanding the localization of immigration policy has gained little scholarly attention and the existing scholarship on localized policies primarily focuses on how enforcement have rendered migrants more vulnerable to deportation, the exclusion of rights and further solidified the association of criminality with undocumented legal status. Yet I argue that we must conceptualize the inclusive policies that seek to attract migrants as both similar to and distinct from the restrictive policies. First, it is essential to understand how local inclusive policies offer an expansion of rights but second, we must understand the limitations of inclusive local policies as well.

Cities like Philadelphia, through localized migration policies, are producing new and more expansive conceptions of membership and belonging, further substantiating the notion that cities are the preeminent sites for understanding renegotiations of citizenship, democracy, belonging and the redistribution of rights.<sup>100</sup> Though still a rarity, these policy efforts mark attempts to ensure that noncitizens including undocumented migrants, experience full substantive citizenship and keep access to the civil, social, economic and some political rights equivalent to those for citizens.

---

<sup>100</sup> As it stands only cities and not a single state have passed inclusive and welcoming policies. See Rodríguez (2008: 588) for a discussion of the failed proposals by Iowa Governor Tom Vilsack in 1998 to generate state level policy to attract migrants.

For Holston and Appadurai substantive citizenship refers to the “array of civil, political, socio-economic, and cultural rights people possess and exercise” (1996:190) while formal citizenship refers to membership in the nation-state and thus legal status. In disentangling substantive from formal citizenship Holston and Appadurai argue that in practice substantive forms of citizenship can be independent of formal citizenship, which opens the possibility that people can experience substantive citizenship without possessing formal citizenship.<sup>101</sup> The inclusive, localized policy in Philadelphia offers individuals with varying legal statuses the protection of rights that may be denied at the state or even the federal level. These localized policies in Philadelphia, however limited by their discursive construction of desirable migrants, still expand the conditions of substantive citizenship for all migrants.

Yet there are two main caveats to consider before lauding the expansion of substantive citizenship enabled by local policies. First, localized policies, both the inclusive and restrictive ones, create profoundly uneven experience across the US as migrants can encounter a vastly different scope of rights, protections or persecutions from place to place which limits the opportunity to fully experience that substantive citizenship. Second, it is necessary to recognize the ways that even inclusive localized policies are both beholden to and voluntarily sustain the federal emphasis on enforcement and deportation.

First, the issue of unevenness creates geographically-contingent and wildly disparate protections and vulnerabilities as one vein of localization continues to carve out

---

<sup>101</sup> Holston and Appadurai argue that in theory though the full scope of the rights of citizenship is contingent upon full membership, in practice the substantive forms of citizenship can be independent of formal status. On the one hand this means that formal membership is not “sufficient condition” or a guarantee for the full-scope of rights of citizenship and there are indeed too many individuals who are denied access to the full scope of rights.

spaces for the safeguard of migrants' rights and resources, while the other side of localization seeks to further criminalize their presence through punitive measures.

Traveling across the counties of Pennsylvania, a migrant could experience drastically different vulnerabilities between Philadelphia and somewhere like Hazelton; their ability to drive a car or rent a home, even their very presence could be a liability. In this frame the efforts of Philadelphia and other cities to attract immigrants and protect the treatment and rights of noncitizens stand to combat the rollback of rights of noncitizens. In preserving the equal protection of immigrants as persons, the efforts to craft localized policy and create institutions that seek to incorporate migrants in the city, while not a corrective, stand to carve out legal and social space for immigrants.

Discussing the localization of migration policy in the United States, Rodríguez argues that, “strong local institutions and local power have become necessary—both to integrate immigrants into the body politic and to manage the human and social consequences of a federal immigration policy full of contradictions” (2008: 641). As localities increasingly attempt to manage migration on their own, these attempts not only seek to define and redefine the political landscape of the United States but also create a new geography of belonging and exclusion.

The second issue, whereby localities are bound to and voluntarily practice federal immigration imperatives of deportation and enforcement, similarly concerns Philadelphia. While Philadelphia's policies and institutions aim for inclusivity and attraction of migrants, they retain some of the elements of anti-immigrant local measures. Though Philadelphia never entered the 287(g) program, it became “activated” as a Secure Communities cite in July 2009, which undermined nearly a decade of local government

efforts to attract migrants to the city.<sup>102</sup> In fact, between 2009 and 2014 Philadelphia collaborated with ICE in the Secure Communities which were initiated and sustained by mayoral agreements between the Philadelphia Police Department and Mayor Michael Nutter. The local-federal enforcement partnerships belie the inclusionary efforts of Kenney and other policymakers as even the inclusive policies both proposed and passed in the Philadelphia remained subordinated to more exclusionary, punitive measures.

The contradictions are acutely felt by Colombians in Philadelphia and the next chapter examines the limitations of Philadelphia' immigrant inclusive local policies to show how the threat of deportation even in a "welcoming city" shapes mobility, notions of safety and trust.

---

<sup>102</sup> Different in scope and aim, 287(g) and Secure Communities have some important difference. A major difference between the two is that Secure Communities does not authorize local police to inquire about immigration status or make an arrest on that basis. But once a person is arrested, regardless of the crime, that person's fingerprints are run against a federal immigration database. While the 287(g) program authorized local police to question individuals about their legal status and make arrests, the Secure Communities requires/allows local police to check the fingerprints of arrestees only into a federal database. Moreover Secure Communities could only flag those aliens whose prints or identifying information was already in immigration databases.

## CHAPTER 5

## WHAT LIES BENEATH: THE SPECTER OF DEPORTATION AND THE HIDDEN REALITIES IN THE “IMMIGRANT FIRENDLY” CITY

This chapter illustrates the tensions produced when the attempts of City Council to create immigrant-friendly discourses and policies in order to attract new populations are being developed within the context of increasingly anti-immigrant rhetoric and draconian federal and state policies, especially the contradictions between official welcoming policies and the experience of everyday life of Colombian immigrants in Philadelphia. I highlight the incongruities between valuing migrants as a solution to the city’s woes and the Philadelphia’s continued agreements to collaborate with ICE. Though the mayor’s office ended the agreement to honor ICE detainees in April 2014 because of community pressure and the urging of these collaborations remained in tact during the duration of my fieldwork. I then explore how Colombian immigrants come to understand the risks of deportation facilitated by local law enforcement agreements with ICE.

Not only did the agreements permit the sharing of arrestees’ information and hold immigrants on ICE-detainers their very existence belie the supposed transformation of Philadelphia into an “immigrant-friendly” city. While on the one hand the rhetoric of local government celebrates immigrants revitalizing the city and increasing the population, on the other hand these “victories” are undercut by the existence of local and federal law enforcement agreements that transform the everyday routines and social relationships of Colombians in the city.

This chapter illustrates different responses to cope ranging from political mobilization to quiet acceptance to highlight how the specter of *la migra*, or immigration police, becomes powerful force that shapes the ways people understand safety, mobility

and interpersonal trust. Their concerns come to impact the ways in which Colombians not only see individuals outside their family or immediate social network but also the ways in which they are willing to form relationships with these others. Ultimately I argue that while Philadelphia's local policies intend to attract immigrants, they simultaneously maintain channels for increased police surveillance and fracture social alliances— inadvertently carving out mechanisms that *weaken* immigrant incorporation.

As the previous chapter argued, understanding the localization of migration policy is urgent because comprehensive federal immigration reform has become unlikely in the current political climate. While the inclusive measures of Philadelphia remain a rarity as draconian anti-immigrant legislation proliferates at state and local levels, analyzing the limitations and the contradictions of immigrant-friendly measures shows the ways that Colombian migrants remain vulnerable in the city. Even as local policy makers champion immigration as a panacea for Philadelphia's widespread problems, this conceptualization chafes against national characterizations of migration as threatening. Anti-immigrant sentiment remained manifest in the agreements between the Philadelphia Police Department (PPD) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and turned the spaces of everyday life--homes, workplaces, avenues and boulevards that serve as ICE checkpoints, neighborhoods--into sites of surveillance and policing.

### The Realities of Deportation in an “Immigrant-Friendly” City

#### *Deportation by the Numbers*

Though only a few Colombians I met experienced deportation of a family member or someone they knew, nonetheless many were immanently concerned about its possibility. It remained an ever-present specter for undocumented migrants who lived

throughout the city, as well a fear that hung over the heads of legal residents and full citizens. Though is hardly surprising when considering that Latinos represent 93% of individuals identified for deportation through the program (Kohli, Markowitz and Chavez 2011). Moreover Golash Boza (2011) notes that overall nearly all deportees are Latino or Black and overwhelmingly male. In 2014 alone ICE reported 315,943 deportations, down from 2013's 368,644. The top 11 nations for deported national comprised over 96% of all removal that year and all are Latin American and Caribbean nations and Colombians were the 7<sup>th</sup> highest nationality by deportation with 1,181 individuals deported.<sup>103</sup>

The Secure Communities program faced harsh criticism at the national and local level for its overly broad net that resulted in the deportation of individuals with no criminal background or no threat to public safety, often breaking apart families. Though Secure Communities program was discontinued as part of President Obama's executive actions in November 2014 and replaced by the Priority Enforcement Program, whose ambiguities may mean nothing more than a change in name rather than scope or intention,<sup>104</sup> it remains a frightening presence in the lives of many Colombian migrants regardless of legal status or length of residence, and even those born in the US.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Nearly 80% of all deportees nationwide for the 2014 fiscal year come from just 3 nations: Mexico, Guatemala and Honduras. Mexicans comprised 65 percent of all deportees, and the next largest percentages of deportees were Guatemalans (12 percent) and Hondurans (10 percent). (“Removal Statistics”)

<sup>104</sup> Under intense criticism of the Secure Communities program Department of Homeland Security Secretary Johnson announced in November 2014 new rules for interactions between ICE and state/local law enforcement agencies. The new rules primarily affected individuals in state or local custody. While ICE would continue to encourage state and local enforcement agencies to share fingerprint information for anyone booked in their custody regardless of whether the individual had been formally charged, set to be tried or had ever been convicted, ICE would not seek the transfer of such individuals to federal law enforcement unless they fit in the newly established “priority” categories. Moving forward ICE would only seek the transfer of an undocumented individual in the custody of state or local law enforcement (through the new

While an executive order signed by Mayor Nutter in November 2009 prohibited all city employees from inquiries about immigration status unless it was to determine eligibility for certain programs or unless law specifically required them to check, Secure Communities remained intact for several years. Ultimately Mayor Nutter's decision to consistently renew the Secure Communities agreement through 2014 undermined these protections. Specifically the renewal of the Secure Communities program in Philadelphia in August 2011 became symbolic of the contradictions inherent within the localization of immigration policies aimed to attract and integrate immigrants. As such I want to underscore how the efforts to create an immigrant-friendly city were always impartial, incomplete and not always successful—especially in light of the threat of deportation as facilitated by Secure Communities.

Contradictions and Consequences: How Moments of Change Construct New Divisions

*City Council Pressure in 2011*

The conflicting goals and policies endorsed by different branches of local government highlight the fractures within imagining and creating an immigrant-friendly

---

program that replaced S-Comm, called Priority Enforcement Program or PEP) when the individual has been convicted of an offense that they listed as a priority or when a ICE Field Office Director judged the person to be a threat of national security.

<sup>105</sup> Responses from informants about this phenomenon varied as some insisted that, “If you do nothing wrong you will have nothing to worry about” or “I worry because they don’t care who they take. They see a Spanish last name and they see your face that’s enough for them to think you are illegal. Plus you might have the same name as someone else and they don’t care if you were born here and they confuse you for someone else.” Or “I would be okay but I worry about my relative” as in the case with Sonia and Pilar.

This resonates with the findings of Kohli et al., who comment that, “Notably 39% of the people identified for deportation by ICE in our study reported having a US citizen family member. Thirty-seven percent reported a U.S. citizen child and 5% reported a US citizen spouse. This may reflect an undercount as immigrants may fear disclosing personal information to immigration authorities, particularly if they live in mixed-status families and fear negative consequences for family members” (2011: 5).

city, particularly one that hopes to transform itself through migration. Between 2008 and 2014 the stances of progressive City Council members on local law enforcement cooperation with ICE was at direct odds with Mayor Nutter's plans, though it was a mayoral decision that ultimately dictated local-federal cooperation with ICE. During the summer of 2011, the very same summer as the passage of the Pennsylvania Compact, the city agreement with ICE was set to expire on August 31 unless it was renewed. Philadelphia City Council voted unanimously on June 23 to end the city's participation in the Secure Communities program. That resolution, No. 110536, stated, "All residents of Philadelphia have the right to remain in their neighborhoods with their communities and their families, regardless of their economic status, their immigration status or their criminal history."

The resolution cited most recent ICE data available at the time and noted that 348 of the 583 Philadelphia suspects transferred from Philadelphia Police to ICE custody between October 27, 2008 and April 30, 2011 were never convicted of any crime. Moreover 480 of those 583 individuals (over 82%) had no criminal history or only low-level, non-violent misdemeanor convictions. The statistics were taken as evidence by City Council that in practice Secure Communities violates its own purported goals. Of significant concern was that ICE data revealed Philadelphia had one of the highest rates in the US for transferring individuals with no criminal history or low-level non-violent convictions, a statistic that certainly undermined to efforts to be and become seen as an immigrant-friendly city.

City Council's firm condemnation and demand to end the city's agreement to allow ICE access to arrest information and its participation in the Secure Communities

Program did not persuade Mayor Nutter to end cooperation. Amid federal pressure for all major cities to remain vigilant about immigration enforcement, Mayor Nutter renewed the agreement several times. The Mayor remained publically ambivalent about providing immigrants resources or passing legislation to protect immigrants in the city throughout his first term despite pressure from political and private actors. Only in the middle of his second term, without concerns about winning a future election, did he move to take action on immigration.

In April 2013 with sustained pressure from public-private agencies and did Mayor Nutter make his first move to come closer in alignment with the pro-immigrant efforts. Through an executive order Nutter created the Mayor's Office of Multicultural and Immigrant Affairs (MOIMA) with the overarching goal to improve access to city services including translation services, economic resources, education and commitment o community-based organizations. The creation of MOIMA signaled an important turn about the Mayor's role in crafting an "immigrant-friendly" Philadelphia. It also signaled a response to the success of City Council members to create their own agenda and particular ideas about what the priorities are in improving the lives of migrants.

#### *Local Political Actors*

Sustained political pressure from Councilpersons Jim Kenney, María Quiñones-Sánchez and Jannie Blackwell, who championed the Pennsylvania Compact to ensure its passage, also contributed to the creation of MOIMA and the eventual demise of the Secure Communities program in Philadelphia. Each City Council member brought their own political aims to the table; both to serve their constituents and to build upon years of efforts shape city level efforts to support immigrants and people of color.

Kenney, spent many years trying to draw migrants to the city in order to help revitalize the population and grow the city's economy. His election in 1992 to an at-large seat in City Council did not have him beholden to a particular district and afforded more latitude to developing a citywide agenda. Notably progressive through his tenure, his commitment to immigrant issues has continued since the failure to establish the Office of New Philadelphians in 2000. Kenney's explanation for his support of these issues often is couched in terms of recognizing his own family history as Irish immigrants who settled in Philadelphia and faced discrimination. In interviews with the press and even in his testimonies in front of City Council Kenney places himself within a larger trajectory of immigrants who have come to the United States and struggled and in doing so he positions himself and his background on common ground with recently arrived immigrants.<sup>106</sup>

Quiñones-Sánchez, elected in 2008, represents the 7<sup>th</sup> district of Philadelphia, which is home to the majority of the city's Latinos. Born in Philadelphia to parents who migrated from Puerto Rico to the city in the 1960s, Quiñones-Sánchez is not only the first Latina to represent that district she is also the first Latina elected to city. Though she has not been on City Council as long as Kenney or Blackwell, she has remained an advocate for neighborhood redevelopment projects in her district and for immigrants' rights within the city. Her road to City Council was hard fought and put her in opposition with the Philadelphia Democratic party machine and more recently in tension with the elected Latino representative of the Pennsylvania Democratic party machine.<sup>107</sup> Though she won

---

<sup>106</sup> Fieldwork observations of City Council meetings in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

<sup>107</sup> In 2000 Quiñones-Sánchez challenged the white incumbent City Council person who represented the gerrymandered 7<sup>th</sup> district, which contained many pockets of predominantly white

reelection and maintains her seat, constant challenges from other Democrats, may limit render some political commitments, like the creation of Philadelphia municipal ID cards for all residents regardless of legal status, hard to ensure.

Like Kenney, Jannie Blackwell has served in City Council since 1992 and like Quiñones-Sánchez she serves a district. The longtime representative of the 3<sup>rd</sup> district that covers parts of Southwest and West Philadelphia, predominantly Black neighborhoods, Blackwell has secured new housing developments and economic redevelopment of the 52<sup>nd</sup> St business corridor in West Philadelphia. A longtime advocate of the poor who sought to bring resources to her district neighborhoods, Blackwell has also earned the reputation of an “unpredictable” and “independent operator” who remained unconcerned with forming alliances in City Council unlike Kenney and Quiñones-Sánchez (Kerksta 2014). Additionally the growing African immigrant population in Blackwell’s district provides a natural political alliance to support measures that provide resources to migrants and protect their rights across the city. Together these local government officials have become the staunchest advocates of ending the city agreement with ICE, bringing their disparate but overlapping interest into a powerful coalition with immigrant organizations. These alliances, between the politicians themselves and between local government and private citizens and organization, proved to be a formidable influence in changing the course of the city’s agreement with federal immigration enforcement.

---

space. While she lost that initial it put her at odds with the larger party because she challenged the Democratic machine backed White male candidate. When she finally won in 2008, displacing a different white male Councilman, she received no endorsements from Democratic or Latino ward leaders (Otterbein 2016; Thompson 2011). In 2015, city Democrats challenged Quiñones-Sánchez’s reelection bid for her district.

*The End of an Era: Philadelphia Says No to ICE*

The spring of 2014 proved to be a watershed moment, as Mayor Nutter decided to end Philadelphia's agreement with ICE in April. The decision was due in no small part to the years of concerted effort by local activists and organizations, who mounted concerted efforts in the first few months of the year to change the complicity of city government and local police in ICE's undue targeting of immigrants. In February several community organizations/immigrant advocate organizations joined together to form the umbrella coalition of "Philadelphia for Families."<sup>108</sup> The groups held a joint press conference with City Council members James Kenney, María Quiñones-Sánchez and Jannie Blackwell to call on the mayoral administration to end ICE holds and to create new local immigration policy in collaboration with immigrant advocate organizations, drawing new public attention to their cause. On March 3, 2014 the City Council held a public hearing on PPD-ICE collaborations to further elaborate the argument that the collaborations diminish trust between immigrants and local law enforcement. By April the mayor signed an executive order that no longer permitted PPD to detain immigrants without a federal warrant, which prevented PPD from passing immigrants without criminal conviction to ICE and together these measures effectively ended ICE detainer holds.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> Pseudonym

<sup>109</sup> ICE holds, also called ICE detainers, one-page detainers or immigration holds, are federal requests from ICE to local or state law enforcement asking local enforcement to hold an immigrant in local custody (for up to 48 hours) who would otherwise be released. ICE holds are not subject to judicial review before they are issued because the holds are issued on the basis of immigration status and holds are not criminal warrants. ICE request holds as way to allow them more time to determine if they want to proceed with immigration hearings and take the individual into federal custody.

In doing so, Philadelphia's local law enforcement policy became one of the most progressive nationwide. Though as of April 2014 similar restrictions were already in place in Washington DC, New York City, Baltimore, New Orleans and across California and Connecticut, those policies still allowed immigrants with previous first and second degree felony convictions to be held. By contrast the Philadelphia policy had the additional requirement of judicial warrants before ICE could continue their detainers.<sup>110</sup> Moreover the city would not disclose a to ICE a prisoner's pending release unless the person is a convicted felon and the ICE request has the judicial warrant (Matza 2014).

Whereas the restrictions in the aforementioned cities and states applied only to the police, Philadelphia's executive order applied to both police and prison departments, which allowed for a broader scope because of the additional requirements and restrictions. Taken together these changes brought Philadelphia's policies closer to the discourses that support immigration to the city and valorize the place of immigrants within the city. Still the risk of deportation came to shape conceptions of safety, trust and mobility as it also made many Colombian migrants, and certainly other migrants, reluctant to cooperate or contact the police for a range of matters.

Deportation becomes a reality in its possibility, a tangible fear even if it not commonly experienced. Its possibility is so scary and weighs so heavily for many that in spite of local government efforts and policies, the uncertainties it produces reveal not only the ways it affects the everyday lives of the people I met and interviewed but also reveals the contradictions and complexities of the sociopolitical context in which they live. By the time the agreement formally ended in 2014, the fear of deportation as

---

<sup>110</sup> Though detainer requests in Philadelphia had declined from 2011-2014 already the new policy has effectively ended detailers because ICE rarely sought out judicial warrants in conjunction with detainer requests.

socially constructed amongst Colombian remained firmly in place, as many spent years living in fear that deportation would become a reality produced profound sense of insecurity. Though many Colombians I spent time with and interviewed could not specifically the name “Secure Communities” Program or sometimes confuse what was possible under Secure Communities versus 278(g),<sup>111</sup> the risk of deportation and encounters with the police troubled many. Fear of routine traffic stops speaks to the ways the policies and how they were enforced create a pervasive sense of never feeling quite safe.<sup>112</sup> And as Gilberto Rosas argues the “securitization of immigration” as produced by policing, detention and deportation results in the *insecuritization* of immigrant communities (2015).

#### *Quantifying Secure Communities*

Recently released data from Immigrations and Customs Enforcement reveal the number of people deported in each county during the active period of Secure Communities, October 2008 until February 2014. Though the numbers disclosed do not include the total number of deportations, only those made through Secure Communities, Philadelphia County had 706 deportations between its activation as an SCP site in 2009 and the program’s end in 2015. In the five-county Philadelphia metropolitan area, Bucks

---

<sup>111</sup> In 2012 ICE announced the elimination of some agreements under the 287 (g) program, which was being phased out and replaced by Secure Communities. The changes no longer deputized local police to exist as task forces responsible for the enforcement of immigration law though the program was to remain in local jails. In contrast to the 287(g) program, Secure Communities did not require a Memorandum of Agreement between ICE and local law enforcement (the jail, sheriff or police department) and that also further removed local police officers from the direct enforcement of federal law.

<sup>112</sup> The Secure Communities program allowed for the exchange of information between local enforcement agencies and immigration agents. Under Secure Communities, jails in participating localities submitted the fingerprints of arrestees to both a criminal database and immigration databases. This information sharing allowed ICE unprecedented access to information about individuals held in local jails.

County had 361 deportations, Montgomery County had 712, Chester County had 158 and Delaware County just 42 between 2008-2014. Philadelphia County is notable compared to other cities across the US deported more immigrants relative to its overall population and even deported more migrants than the more populous Cook County which includes Chicago.<sup>113</sup>

Despite its emphasis on deportation, ICE sought to justify its tactics as logical and necessary by supposedly prioritizing the removal of migrants whose presence posed the highest risk to public safety. Utilizing what they termed a risk-based approach under Secure Communities, ICE created 3 criminal levels to focus their removal efforts on previously convicted individuals they determined to pose the greatest public risk. Those convicted of major drug offenses and violent offenses are categorized as Level 1, while Level 2 includes individuals convicted of minor drug offenses and most property offenses (burglary, larceny, fraud) and Level 3, the lowest level, includes those who have been convicted of other offenses.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> By comparison between October 2008 and February 2014 Baltimore County “removed” or deported 246 individuals, New York City (all five boroughs) deported 2,428, Suffolk County, MA which includes Boston deported 858, Washington DC deported 199, Wayne County, MI which includes Detroit deported 754; Cook County, IL which includes Chicago deported 614, New Orleans deported 292; St Louis County deported 369, San Francisco deported 922 and Los Angeles deported 35,750 people through Secure Communities (“Map: Secure Communities Removals by County, 2008-2015”).

<sup>114</sup> ICE lists murder, rape, manslaughter, robbery, and kidnapping to the main offenses as they are considered an imminent threat to public safety under PEP. Level 1 – Individuals who have been convicted of major drug offenses and violent offenses, such as murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, and kidnapping; Level 2 – Individuals who have been convicted of minor drug offenses and mainly property offenses, such as burglary, larceny, fraud, and money laundering; and Level 3 – Individuals who have been convicted of other offenses (“DHS’s ‘Secure Communities’: No Rules of the Road”).

The focus on deporting violent criminals with the highest threat level made no difference to ordinary Colombian migrants. Many Colombians remained concerned with the risk of deportation that they, their loved ones or even neighbors faced, as many knew and recounted stories about individuals who had been deported for minor infractions. Indeed Spanish language media, in particular newspapers and to a lesser extent television and radio, followed the stories of immigrants tapped for deportation, detailing their fights to stay and the tolls exacted on the families. Reports of these experiences created a sense of immediacy about the very real possibility of deportation as a risk, even for individuals with no criminal records.

#### The Chilling Effects of ICE: Conceptions of Safety, Mobility and Trust

While the policies in Philadelphia intend to attract and incorporate migrants by providing services and resources differ substantially from more punitive approaches of localized policy in other localities, there are unintended consequences that weaken migrant incorporation. During the duration of my fieldwork many individuals and groups organized against and criticized the continued agreement between local law enforcement and ICE. In spite of years-long grassroots efforts to end the mayoral agreement and City Council persons' backing of the ending of the agreement, the collaborations with ICE represent a particularly jarring divide between an immigrant-friendly image and the ways in which immigrants are treated. Concerns about mundane encounters with law enforcement took on extra significance. Anxiety about routine traffic stops, reluctance to even filing noise complaints or enduring a small complaint filed against oneself became grounds for fears about the reach of the state power to deport or check the legal status of immigrants. The need to drive to work or for family care, or to fulfill basic needs like

food shopping became risky endeavors for many. While undocumented migrants were most at risk the very real threat of deportation created uneasiness amongst undocumented migrants, legal permanent residents and citizens alike. Though there little direct experience with deportation among most Colombians I spoke to, their belief that deportation was an imminent threat came up during interviews about neighborhoods, safety or places they would not go in Philadelphia.

*Legality and the Risky Business of Going to Work and Traversing Neighborhoods*

The power of fear is evident in the reluctance to engage in certain activities as migrants weigh the serious risks against the potential outcomes. Esteban, a man his mid-fifties who came to Philadelphia in 2003 without documents, worried about a particular set of his everyday movements and wellbeing under the Secure Communities program. Esteban has worked on and off as kitchen staff in various hotels in the downtown area, though for the past two years he had worked in maintenance in one large hotel. Because Esteban lives close to public transportation that he can easily take to and from work between his South Philadelphia residence and Center City workplace, this movement posed little risk in his opinion.

Work was considered a safe space because it was in Center City. Though work place raids are common in other localities, Esteban assured me that he did not worry because his workplace and line of work, was dominated by undocumented men from all over Latin America, and no one had ever mentioned experiencing a raid in Philadelphia. Like border policing, the workplace raid is a practice of “governing migration through crime” (Dowling and Inda 2011) that aims for the exclusion and deportation of undocumented migrants deemed threatening to the social body. Though workplace raids

became frequent tactics of immigration enforcement after 2001, President Obama phased out the practice after his election. In fact while it was not a common topic of workplace discussion Esteban said he had a few conversations with other undocumented co-workers who had been in Philadelphia longer than he had who assured him that they had never heard of a workplace raid in the city.

Though his daily routine did not worry him too much it was the times he ventured to Colombian spaces in North Philadelphia that caused alarm. Esteban was a resident of a South Philadelphia neighborhood which he described as “peaceful, quiet and somewhere I can be alone,” who purposefully avoided living in North Philadelphia, which he described as “too loud, too noisy, too many other immigrants who want to know all your business.” Yet his trips to North Philadelphia, though not frequent, were central to his routines. As the institutional heart of the Latino community, North Philadelphia neighborhoods offered Esteban and others Colombian access to the goods and services in the broader Latino spaces. While Esteban went to church in South Philadelphia and relegated most of his travels between home and work his trips to North Philadelphia took him to the Colombian spaces that spread north of Roosevelt Boulevard.

Like many Colombians, Esteban noted he was “not a political person, I am someone who tries not to get involved,” owing to the longer history of political tension, corruption and violence in Colombia.<sup>115</sup> He explained that in 2012 he decided to do

---

<sup>115</sup> As noted earlier there remains a reluctance of Colombians to become politically engaged in the US or in transnational activities (Guarnizo and Diaz 1999; Guarnizo 2006). During *La Violencia* political engagement limited as political apathy and mistrust of partisan politics increased. Even prior to *La Violencia* the political system was dominated by elites who through patron-client relationships maintained local, region and national power. Indeed many people I spoke to, much like Esteban, to often referred to themselves as purposefully non-political, and uninterested both in local or national politics in the US or in Colombia despite many being quite interested in being politically informed. In particular I found that for many Colombian migrants born during or in the

something he would not normally have done—he called his local representative about police stops along Roosevelt Boulevard and urged the representative to put pressure on the Mayor to end Philadelphia’s agreement with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. He got the idea after he accompanied his friend to a meeting of an immigrant-rights community organization who offered a free clinic on in a Catholic Church in the Feltonville neighborhood of North Philadelphia. The organization was starting a grassroots campaign to end the local law enforcement agreement with ICE participating in the Secure Communities program. Esteban noted that,

I didn’t pay too much attention to it. It’s not that I didn’t think about those things but I associate that with North Philadelphia, as more of a problem over there. The people at the clinic offered us to use their phones, they had a room set up with multiple telephones and gave us a piece of paper with different politician names and their phone numbers. I did not call but I tucked the paper in my wallet because it just seemed useful.

Esteban did not think about the piece of paper until about a month later when a different friend of his, Octavio, told him how he was stopped for speeding and the police threatened to investigate whether he was in the country legally. Though Octavio, another Colombian from Cali, was a legal permanent resident had warned Esteban for years about the very real vulnerability he faced as an undocumented migrant. Esteban, spurred by the meeting and his friend’s advice, decided to call his City Council person and State Senator about the police stops and the Secure Communities program more generally. He told those representatives

---

years after *La Violencia* (for many born in the late 1940s through the 1960s) seemed particularly ready to identify themselves as not interested in politics or political, in part, perhaps because of the political culture during their youth spent in Colombia.

While I do not vote, as I am not a US citizen, you are still my representative. You represent the people of this neighborhood and it is necessary that something be done about this situation. As the representative you must do these certain things to protect the people you represent.

However his status as an undocumented migrant impacted the nature of the call and the information Esteban chose to disclose. As an extra measure of safety he chose to call from a payphone rather than his cell phone because he wanted to remain anonymous and not have the call linked to his name. Moreover Esteban during his phone call decided to leave his legal status ambiguous. Esteban said

ES: it was not necessary to divulge that I am undocumented. They don't need to know that. Let them think I have a green card. It doesn't matter to me. What matters is that this changes and they, politicians, might ignore someone they think does matter under the law or someone they think is a law breaker. But I still have rights.

DG: Were you worried about calling?

ES: I do not want to be a hypocrite but I presented myself not as someone without papers but I still want them to stop setting up police cars on across the city or around Roosevelt Boulevard, that's where I go to get my *pan de yucca* my *buñuelos*, go to send money home. I like to live in South Philly but too many Colombians are up there and when I go there I think they are trying to catch people for speeding.

You have to worry about a minor thing, speeding, tinted windows, wearing a seatbelt, a broken light, expired inspection stickers, your baby in a car seat. Probably other things I haven't even thought of. Who could keep track? Even doing normal things could get you stopped... All that worrying gets to you. It is stressful. Maybe they listen to me. Maybe they do not but I still feel a little relief at least saying something.

While his legal status makes him more vulnerable to policing he nevertheless demanded redress from the state as subjects of its governance. He acknowledges the stress that comes with being in constant fear of surveillance or deportation, even going through one's everyday routines like going to work, riding in a car or travelling to another part of the city to run errands. When he leaves his common geographic circuit to visit North Philadelphia to run errands that are both necessary and routine for

transnational migrants such as himself, he fears for what might happen to him when he enters these spaces but also what happens continually to other Colombians who always live in these spaces. The common knowledge that these were marked spaces in North Philadelphia rendered him vulnerable whenever he went there.

Fear is used both to justify his appeal to the state representative but also to justify his attempt to maintain anonymity. And though Esteban's phone call, despite his self-description of a person "not interested in politics" this is an effort to be seen as worthy citizen-subject who deserves state services but also protection from the various agencies of the state. Esteban's actions not only represent a claim for rights and an exercise of rights but also a form of citizenship that emerges from his identity as a subject of governance (see Greenhouse 2002:196).

The fear for oneself also intertwined with a concern for others both unknown and known, and it becomes both the fear and the possibility of real, material consequences that continued to shape the livelihoods of Colombian migrants. For many it was the vulnerability to encounters with the police that could lead to deportation, which shaped their mobility within the city but also between the city and the suburbs. In contrast to Esteban whose travels to and from work caused him little concern, it was precisely getting to and from work that was the major cause of Magdalena's anxieties—though not because she was primarily worried about herself. Magdalena's concern stemmed from how the presence of her undocumented friend in her car could render both of them vulnerable.

*Driving and Immobility*

Magdalena shook her long Black hair out from the bun she kept tightly bound at the nape of her neck and began to twist her back to alleviate some of the tension. Now in her mid-fifties, Magdalena had been working cleaning houses since she migrated to Philadelphia in 1995. Though finally received a green card in 2005, she was still worried about driving to and from work. On a unseasonably warm evening in February of 2011, she continued to brush out her hair and rub her wrists as she mentioned that she was unsure if it was the drastic weather change or just more stress about driving in her car that cause “even her hair to ache.”

As a homeowner in the Oxford Circle neighborhood in North Philadelphia, right near the county line with Montgomery County, Magdalena traveled nearly six days a week between her house and the houses she cleaned in nearby suburban areas. Often times Magdalena would drive ten minutes to drop her son off at the closest subway stop to shave half hour from his commute. Though she had kept this routine for several years starting in 2009 she added another route. After dropping her son off she would loop back to her neighborhood and pick up another woman, Belina from Nicaragua, who also cleaned homes in the suburbs. Though they lived only a few blocks apart in the city Magdalena met Belina on a quiet block in Cheltenham after Belina had accidentally locked her phone and keys inside her employer’s house when she left. She met Magdalena as Magdalena was leaving a house two doors down and was able to borrow her phone to talk to her employer. The women chatted and came to realize they often worked in the same areas and lived just a few blocks from each other in Philadelphia.

Belina had her own car, though was without a license, and the two used to occasionally car pool when their schedules allowed. However in July 2009 the city became activated as a participant in the Secure Communities Program. Magda's son Mateo, a community organizer at a Latino organization who had been active in the fight against the local law enforcement's participation, urged Magdalena to be the main driver from now on and implored her to be extra careful about stopping at stop signs, buckling seat belts and driving under the speed limit while Belina was in the car. Upon her son's recommendation Magdalena became the sole driver when the women carpooled as Magdalena had previously obtained her license nearly a decade earlier using her Individual Taxpayer Identification Number. Belina still drove herself to work on several days as their schedules were not always compatible and it offered her the opportunity to get to other jobs without waiting for Magdalena. Despite her own protection the stress grew on Magdalena. When asked how, if at all, this has changed the way she drives to work or how she feels about it Magdalena explained,

MF: I would do anything to help Belina. She is a good woman who is just doing her job. But I notice on certain days, days when we go together in the car, I feel more nervous stressed. I hold the steering wheel a little tighter. In my mind I pray the cashier at the Dunkin Donuts gives me the coffee and change faster while Belina waits in the car. I think "Hurry up, hurry up. I just want to be on my way." But I don't tell her. I consider her a friend and I don't want to make her feel guilty. I think she has the right to feel safe and go about her business. It's not fair for her. Still it is hard for me and I worry about both of us.

DG: What worries you?

MF: I worry someone is going to stop us and ask for papers. For instance maybe I won't realize the [tail] light is out on my car and the police maybe they pull me over. I have my license and my green card but what if they ask Belina. I know Mateo told me that in some places you can get in trouble for even having someone in your car. I know Pennsylvania is not one of them but still it worries me. I have already dealt with so much.

Magdalena was well aware of the risks to her and her friend Belina and took on the added stress even as it took a physical toll. The localization of policy that promoted local politicians to attract migrants to the city also gave rise to the same policing measures that surveils their presence in the city and limits mobility in and out of the city.

Just as border policing and raids seek to govern migration through crime, routine traffic stops, while seemingly more mundane, were a common tactic in Philadelphia. Ostensibly traffic stops do not outright target undocumented migrants, however where Philadelphia Police Department chose to set up their checkpoints to detect speeding and other traffic violations implicated migrants in other ways and can have substantially different consequences for noncitizen drivers. Checkpoints frequently set up in Latino immigrant neighborhoods in North Philadelphia, especially along Roosevelt Boulevard a prominent thruway that runs through North Philadelphia neighborhoods like Hunting Park, Feltonville, Juniata and the Near Northeast, in neighborhoods like Rhawnhurst, can implicitly target migrants because of the chosen location.

As Steusse and Coleman note, “these programs convert the mundane act of driving into the activity of highest risk for undocumented individuals.” (2014: 54). From Magda’s change in routine we can see the real social effects that local agreements with ICE, like Secure Communities, produce. These routine traffic stops and checkpoints, to monitor like speeding, not wearing a seatbelt, having a broken tail light or turn signal, or driving under the influence, do impact and potentially limit mobility by altering daily routines and the ability to travel to work by car. It also provides a broader glimpse of how, despite the efforts to create an inclusive, welcoming environment, there remain very

real contradictions between the lived experience of Colombians and that image of Philadelphia.

While Magda's specific fears confused the Secure Communities and 287(g) programs, this only serves to underscore the pervasive power of local authorities to enact federal immigration enforcement. The major difference between the two programs is that Secure Communities does not authorize local police to inquire about immigration status or make an arrest on that basis, however once a person is arrested, regardless of the crime, that person's fingerprints are run against a federal immigration database. ICE activated the city of Philadelphia as a Secure Communities site in July of 2009. The city did not have, nor had it ever had a 287 (g) agreement. While the 287(g) program authorized local police to question individuals about their legal status and make arrests, the Secure Communities allows local police to check the fingerprints of arrestees only into a federal database. Moreover Secure Communities could only flag those aliens whose prints or identifying information was already in immigration databases. Yet the threat of getting entangled with local enforcement programs is shrouded in confusion, only further serving the social construction of fear and the specter of deportation.

After the deportation of her husband Magda was keenly aware of the irreversible consequences,

You know not everyone and not even me sometimes but in general it is us immigrants who live in fear because any thing with the police might mean going to immigration and deportation. I know because I watched it happen and when it happens your family is ripped to pieces.

Magda did not want to make Belina feel even more uncomfortable or worried about her undocumented status, and was therefore reluctant to bring it up with her. Though she eventually did bring up the topic she introduced it to Belina as a display of maternal

pride, telling her about all the wonderful things Mateo was doing with the organization.

In response Belina asked if Mateo had some more information she could have so that she could know her rights.

Magda said the conversation was difficult because even though Belina knew about her husband's deportation, Madga was still anxious about bring up her concerns about sharing rides. This reluctance to speak also emerged from the unwillingness or fear of some undocumented Colombians to divulge their legal status, both to friends and acquaintances who did not know and to me. Some informants who chose to share their legal status were quite open during initial interviews, while other waited until later in the interview to divulge. Some even kept it a secret during multiple rounds of interviews only to "confess" to me later while running errands or having coffee.

#### *Navigating Trust and Intimate Relationships*

Despite the relative infrequency of deportation and detention of Colombians I came to know, many, especially those with undocumented relatives or friends, expressed fear or anxiety about the possibility of being discovered or deportation. Sonia, who moved to Philadelphia in 1988 after spending seven years in Queens, was a legal permanent resident with married adult children and a spare bedroom. Though Sonia and her immediate family had been in the United States for years the majority of her family remained in Colombia. In 2005, her adult niece Pilar came to live in the United States by overstaying her visa. Pilar found work quickly as a bartender, receiving payments under the table, as she lived with Sonia. Though their relationship was good there were some tensions that emerged because of Pilar's legal status. At the crux of there relationship was Sonia's concern about Pilar's relationships. Intimacy become a minor risk that Pilar

chose to accept even as she heeded Sonia's concerns and decided to abide with Sonia's wishes that she not tell anyone that she was undocumented.

While Sonia not only appreciated the company and help of her niece around the house she also worried for her safety in the city because

She is a young, pretty girl. It is not always safe around here late at night. And with her job she works uncommon hours and sometimes has to hang around drunkards [*borrachos*]. Men who get handsy. Sometimes I worry because she has no papers and I imagine *la migra* [immigration police] coming into the restaurant one day for a raid and then she is gone.

Pilar who was home at the time and making tea in the kitchen sighed audibly, annoyance thick in her voice as she said, "Ay, Tía its not like that." Pilar turned to me and asked rhetorically,

Did you know that she made me promise not to tell anyone I meet that I don't have papers. They know at work, my co-workers, because most of them don't have them either. But she made me promise not to tell any customer. Isn't that crazy?

Part of the larger tension between aunt and niece, though by no means a contentious relationship, was how Sonia, who was in her late forties, still acted liked a mother figure to Pilar, who at in mid-twenties often thought of herself as an independent adult. In this context what Pilar saw as Sonia's excessive mothering was framed around a concern for Pilar's safety as a young woman in the city who was vulnerable to deportation which she linked to the untrustworthiness of unknown men who could seek retribution (*venganza*) after rejection (*rechazo*).

Sonia quickly pointed out that "Yes I know that Pilar can take care of herself and is careful, especially dealing with men who she meets at work," and after detailing a number of issues that concerned her Sonia concluded, "most serious is now I know they are being more critical of immigrants. The city is not that bad but there are things you

can't control no matter how careful you are." While Sonia remained steadfast that Pilar was always at risk as an undocumented migrant in the city it was the acknowledgement that her vulnerability is not something that she can completely eliminate, no matter how careful she was. Her concern is not only with mobility, and how traveling to and from work or simply anywhere in the city can be fraught for Pilar, but also concern for the kinds of social relationships that Pilar forms.

Work and people that Pilar might meet through her work place, in other words new social relations, became especially meaningful for Sonia. She explained,

You don't know who you can trust and you don't know who might tell someone else and they can report you. For Pilar I think maybe there are men that go sit at the bar and flirt with her, they offer to take her out and I worry if she dates them but then decides not to stay with them or if she rejects them they will be angry and take it out on her. They might tell someone she is here without papers. You cannot trust people you don't really know.

Here trust becomes a main concern, especially for Pilar's potential romantic suitors. Sonia's cautiousness about social relationships, trust and potential betrayals put Pilar in a precarious position. As she wanted to go out, meet friends and explore the city she admitted that she wanted to respect her tía's wishes. Pilar said

Sometimes I think she can be too extreme. I don't think she wants to control me but I think she worries too much. Sometimes I just want to ignore her and do whatever I want. Other times I know she is right. So I have become very careful not to say anything that would reveal my [legal] status to anyone. I know she doesn't tell her friends or anyone, maybe they know maybe they assume, but for me I am more careful with who I get close to. And still I do not tell them. I finally am listening to her. I met a nice guy. He's not Colombian, he is from Philadelphia, and his family is Italian. They have been here for many years but I will not tell him anything, until I know what I mean to him.

As Pilar notes she has become more careful with whom she gets close to and with whom she is willing to share that part of her life.

The threat of deportation, while not immediately looming over her everyday life, impacts the ways in which Pilar forms attachments and how she chooses to get close with people. Indeed the unknown—the fear of deportation or betrayal of trust by a friend, coworker, patron or romantic interest by informing the authorities that she is *sin papeles*, without papers, becomes a major concern for both aunt and niece. In this respect the looming specter of deportation can inhibit or constrain social relations, causing Sonia and Pilar, as well as others, to become cautious of who can be trusted in general and with the sensitive information about Sonia's legal status. Trust in and of itself then becomes a measure of not only existing social relations but also future and potential social relations. Pilar, under Sonia's insistence, became very cautious of entering into new friendships and especially careful of romantic relationships often preferring to be in the company of friends or relatives of people she already trusted.

#### *Worrying for Others*

Concerns about arrests or deportation exist beyond one's social network and extended to minor acquaintances, including neighbors. Neighbors also posed a predicament as some people attempted to carefully toe the line between their expectations for their quality of life and maintaining respect for and a sense of protection for undocumented individuals they did not know. Within a city where almost anyone could be vulnerable, in spite of efforts to attract and incorporate migrants, many migrants maintained a significant level of concern for others they did not know.

Still another unanticipated consequence of the contradiction between efforts to attract immigrants to Philadelphia and the remaining ICE agreements were the ways in which social interactions were mediated by the fear of reporting crimes or even involving

the police in minor issues. This became clear through my first interview with Raquel, a woman in her late 30s who migrated to Philadelphia in 2001 from Cali. As I walked down the block to Raquel's home for the first I heard the bass-heavy blare of salsa music. Catching my shoelace on a piece of uneven pavement I rolled my ankle just in front of the house where the sounds were emanating. I paused long enough to make sure I was all right and looked around to check that no one had witnessed my clumsiness. While in the moment I was concerned with looking clumsy I glimpsed a woman on the phone near the screen door at the front and overheard her say "Yes. Okay. Fine. Okay. Just a minute." She caught my eye and threw her hands up from her ears to above her head before turning around and closing the main front door. I continued my walk to Raquel's, two houses away, the music faded.

When I first entered Raquel's house for the interview, she had already arranged a plate of *bocadillo con queso*, guava paste with cheese, studded with multicolored toothpicks on the table and insisted I take the leftovers home with me before I was allowed to sit down. Once we settled at her kitchen table she shook her head and asked me if I heard all the noise coming from the street while I was walking from the bus stop. I confessed I had heard some neighbors listening to music loudly. Raquel opined that "when music is that loud it stops being music and becomes noise" as her voice got edgy with frustration. She was worried we wouldn't be able to do the interview because she imagined we might not be able to hear each other over the salsa. Here the banter before the interview started became as instructive and as meaningful as the series of interrelated questions I had planned to ask. In the moments before I begin to ask Raquel about her migration experience, she shared her opinion of her neighbors, their music listening

habits, expectations of politeness and also how her concern for the police intervention in the situation shaped her response and her relationship to her neighbors.

Raquel said she did not know those neighbors well and that they were always pleasant, but the loud music was “a new behavior for them.” As I wondered to myself if the woman I saw on the phone was fielding a phone call from a similarly dissatisfied neighbor, Raquel proceeded to describe the neighbors she knew to live in the house saying,

They were always nice when I see them on the street. The wife sweeps their porch and keeps things tidy. For the longest time I couldn't imagine why they would start listening to music so loud. I think maybe they are renting out some rooms to tenants or maybe they have some family staying with them that plays the music. I don't see them that often but it does not seem like them. So I cannot say I know who it is.

Because she did not know the original residents well though she still saw them on occasion Raquel was hesitant to directly confront them. Moreover since she imagined that the loud music players were new tenants, either relatives or strangers, she did feel more comfortable speaking to them directly to tell them to stop playing the music so loudly during odd hours—late and night and sometimes all day. Though Raquel had gone over to the house to ring the doorbell on several occasions to ask for the music to be lowered since she could hear it and feel the bass two houses over she was not pleased with the response she received.

The first time she had gone over to introduce herself and asked the man who answered the door his name and she recalled that he

Turned his eyes away from me and looked down at the floor at his feet. Eventually he said Jesus but so quietly and I immediately felt bad because I know that can make you scared some person coming to your door and demanding your name. So I just said to him ‘No matter, I live right there

and I wanted to ask if you would be willing to turn down the music. The houses are old and attached and sound travels easily through the shared walls.' He nodded and seemed polite. He apologized and turned around and before I was down the stairs the music was lower. I was thankful it was so easy.

However just a few weeks later Raquel had a more difficult encounter with the same household and her reaction to the encounter was different. She recounted to me that just about a week before I came over to interview her for the first time, that the music had returned to the same volume as it had the day she went over. This situation presented some dilemmas for Raquel and she spent time deciding how to address the issue. This time the music was very loud on a Saturday night. Raquel thought it must have been a house party because the music had been going on for hours.

First Raquel was home alone that night with her children and while she had gone to knock on the door the last time she was hesitant to leave her children in the house at night while she went down the block. Eventually because it interfered with her children's sleep, Raquel decided to run down the street to ask her neighbor to turn down the music that night. She explained,

I mean I really ran down the street. I went over there and ask the neighbors to turn down the music. It was two in the morning and I have my kids trying to sleep. My youngest, she is four, she woke up and couldn't fall asleep again the whole night. I knocked on the door because I did not just want to go in, but no one came to answer. I knocked a few more times. I assumed they couldn't hear me over the music and I was just about to open the door when a man, different from the first one I spoke to, opened the door. First I asked him if he lived there and he didn't want to answer. He stood in silence and I just wanted to get home quickly. I asked again and I said, 'I live in house just to the left, the music is too loud for my kids to go to sleep' and I asked them to turn down the music. He looked at me for a long time and finally said 'Okay, fine. It's late. I understand.' I went home but the music never got softer, it stayed the same. I thought about calling the police but what if someone there was illegal? I can't do that. I thought about the man I spoke to during the day and the look in his eyes when I asked him his name and I thought about the one I spoke to when I

went that night and how he didn't want to say if he lived there or not. At first I thought he was rude but then when I thought about the first man I began to think maybe they are illegal. I didn't want to risk calling the police to complain about the noise. I would worry. I know how it can be or what could happen. You have to be careful in the city. How could I do that I did not want them to be involved in something like that over music that was too loud. It would not be worth the trouble so I went home and simply waited...I guess I also did not want them to turn against me if the police showed up. They would know it was me who called.

Raquel's primary concern is the potential disruption that a noise complaint might cause to her neighbors. Though she does not know them well, nor was she happy about the loud music she had to deal with consistently, she prioritizes their wellbeing.

Weighing the risk of potential outcomes she decides not to involve the police because of her interactions with the new tenants down the street because she was concerned about their legal status and the fear of what that an encounter with the police might mean. Here the trepidation comes from knowing "how it can be" or "what could happen to them" which Raquel later specified that if the cops had showed up at their door could result in a citation, a record or even an arrest or deportation, and she worried that even a citation might make them vulnerable to deportation if they had a future encounter with the police. Her decision not to contact the police was primarily informed by the potential repercussions to people she barely knew. In the city the immediate and abstract threat of encounters with local police became synonymous with immigration trouble and the possibility of deportation.

Though she struggled with her decision, especially how to deal with her sleepless daughter and whether to leave her home in the middle of the night, Raquel nonetheless decided to endure the noise because she did not want to jeopardize anyone's livelihoods. Drawing from her interactions she comes to the

conclusion that her neighbors might very well be without papers. While she also expressed concern that her neighbors would blame her if the police did show up her ultimate decision firmly rested upon concerns about legality, policing and potential deportation. The possibility that she might jeopardize someone's livelihood weighs heavy on her conscience. At the same time Raquel also feared being identified as the one who theoretically called the police. Though she did not contact the authorities, Raquel's decision and justification foregrounds how Secure Communities comes to change the ways in which Colombians, and migrants more generally, come to create and navigate new social relationships in a city full of contradictions. Anxieties about deportation and the jeopardy someone could face from something innocuous as a noise complaint permeated decisions about how to relate to other people. While the police would most likely have no cause to investigate the legal status of someone responding to a noise complaint it was an entanglement Raquel did not wish upon others.

### Conclusion

Fear for safety about oneself or others emerged from what was imagined as possible and what was known to be true about the vulnerability of Colombians and all Latinos. Sonia specifically mentioned a story she heard about in 2009 where a Peruvian or Ecuadoran man (she could not remember where he was from) was pulled over by Philadelphia police for a driving without a seatbelt was instead charged with a DUI. Sonia told me she remembered hearing something about it on the news but added that her friend Monse<sup>116</sup> said that she had known the man's wife from church. Though Sonia

---

<sup>116</sup> Though Monse was also from Colombia I was never able to interview her and so my knowledge of the story is limited to Sonia's retelling.

made it clear that Monse did not know the wife very well, the wife informed Monse that her husband had received bad legal advice to plead guilty. Monse said that other women she knew at church told her that he did what he was told by the lawyer but they never told him saying he was guilty could lead to his deportation. According to Sonia, the family found out later that he could just simply completed a program to avoid the charges and not have had to face deportation. Because Sonia was loosely connected to the man through her extended social network and she knew his wife was a church-goer and he a business owner with a young son, this served as an example of how a “good and innocent man” could be subject to deportation. This story, and the stories of countless others, who may have been directly connected or completely unknown to Colombian migrants in the city became evidence that even everyday routines can result in catastrophic events and that deportation can happen to anyone.

The specter of deportation takes on several forms that reconfigure not only perceptions of mobility and safety but also how what kind of social relations are “safe” and it creates serious questions about who people feel they can trust. Hence doing a favor for a well known friend becomes a stressful activity for Magda, flirting with patrons to get higher tips or even making new friends because a fraught activity for Pilar, who Pilar socializes with becomes Sonia’s concern and Raquel worries about how to handle a common issue with new neighbors take on added significance. The discovery of someone’s legal status by an unwanted party—whether a stranger, a government representative or a police officer—becomes a driving force that shapes where people go, who they speak to and what they tell them. No matter how remote the possibility of deportation the uncertainties about

safety persist and create a fraught scenario whereby people like Raquel, Pilar, Sonia, Magda and Esteban are forced to create a social calculus whereby they weigh the variables of trust and mobility against the factors of exposure and vulnerability.

Their experiences and perceptions provide a necessary counterpoint of lived reality against the rhetoric and images of Philadelphia as an immigrant-friendly city. Though the direction of Philadelphia's localization of policy creates opportunities and provides resources and access to resources, it did not and cannot eliminate threats to safety. While the new forms of urban governance focus on immigrant attraction and incorporation, national demands for security and enforcement come at their expense. Taken together the promise of an immigrant-friendly city and the reality of deportation not only contradict that promise but also contribute to a weakening of immigrant incorporation through diminishing trust and social relations.

Though my fieldwork had concluded by the time the executive order was passed it represented a new direction for localized policy and police enforcement. However one it remains to be seen how and to what degree the end of ICE agreements in Philadelphia, and the replacement of S-Comm with the Priority Enforcement Program, will change the ways undocumented and documented migrants are willing or able to report crimes or interact with police. Will it shift ideas about trust safety and mobility or will hesitations remain because of the larger threat of federal policy? It seems certain that for many whose livelihoods take them outside Philadelphia for work (like Magda's friend Belina), travel or any reason will remain vulnerable. Therein lies the difficulty in celebrating

localized policy that seeks to attract and incorporate migrants. On one level there inevitably exist deep fractures and disjunctures within the policies as I have explored. On another level these protections, no matter how limited, exist only in certain places and the vast majorities of cities, municipalities and even entire states have no such measures, or worse they have punitive and restrictive policies in place.

Ending ICE detainers within Philadelphia is a significant achievement and yet there are many other steps that can be taken to improve the lives and rights of migrants within the city. Other states and localities have attempted to promote immigrant integration through the construction and protection of day-labor centers or to provide in-state college tuition for unauthorized students, or to permit driver's licenses for residents regardless of legal status (see Rodriguez 2008; Varsanyi 2008a for other examples).<sup>117</sup> Though there are several organizations in Philadelphia working towards those goals, local government remains uncommitted to realizing those goals. In addition to in-state tuition, driver's licenses and day-laborer center many cities and counties have created municipal ID cards that are available for all residents.<sup>118</sup> Municipal ID cards enable people to easily establish their identity and residence with several institutions and services. Advocates argue that municipal IDs allow cardholders to more readily access resources by making people feel safer to report crimes, interact with emergency medical responders, open bank accounts, apply for loans, rent apartments, fill medical prescriptions and even pick up their children from school (Matza 2014). Philadelphia City Council has had bills pending

---

<sup>117</sup> Pennsylvania once did authorize and issue driver's licenses but then ended the program in 2002 but stopped the practice after the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks.

<sup>118</sup> There are several cities that offer municipal ID cards for all residents including New Haven, Connecticut, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, and Richmond (all in California), Washington D.C., and Asbury Park and Mercer County (both in New Jersey). New York City also has plans to launch their own municipal ID program in early 2015.

to create municipal ID cards that have yet to be passed. In 2013 Councilwoman María Quiñones Sánchez, who introduced the legislation said, “Lack of government-issued identification is a problem disproportionately faced by immigrant communities, seniors, people with disabilities [and] low incomes.” Just as access to resources and services is not confined to migrants, Philadelphia’s successful efforts remain firmly within translation and language services and now the adoption of sanctuary-like laws that end local-federal immigration enforcement. Yet the past is unchangeable. What remains certain is that there is not, nor will there ever likely be, a mechanism for those already deported to return.

In spite of its good intentions the localized efforts to pass policy and create access to services, resources and institutions that facilitate immigrant incorporation can only ever be partial solutions. First and foremost it remains the purview of the nation-state to determine membership through legal status. Though I emphasize the critical nature of understanding the localization of policy, federal programs in many ways can undermine local efforts (or require cooperation). Philadelphia may have passed efforts to make the city immigrant-friendly, as with the dissolution of ICE agreements, however deportation remains a powerful force whose specter remains present and creates both vulnerabilities and uncertainties in everyday life. Furthermore these contradictions reinforce and reproduce the insecuritization of migrants (Rosas 2015).

The tension between localized policies, those that sought to attract and incorporate juxtaposed the local-federal agreements with ICE, for the duration of my fieldwork created an unsettling and disorienting experience for many Colombianos. Many people were concerned by the potential threats of deportation, even if they

themselves had not directly experienced the heavy toll that detention or deportation could have on one's family. Persistent confusion about what was and was not possible for undocumented migrants under Secure Communities reveals the profound vulnerability that migrants faced even within a city in many ways sought to protect their rights, provide access to resources and services, and make them feel safe. The threat of deportation always seemed to loom near as Colombian migrants had to make decisions about safety and mobility, and just for themselves but for family, friends, neighbors and even individuals who were only minor acquaintances. These conceptions of safety and mobility in many ways changed social relationship as it made trust, how much to trust and whom one could trust, paramount.

Here I want to underscore two main arguments. First, local policy is always partial as federal policy and federal demands can trump and have trumped local efforts, even though the effectiveness of federal policy relies on that very localization to carry out its aims. Second, in Philadelphia specifically these local-federal police agreements maintain channels that can actually weaken immigrant incorporation through concerns over issues of safety, mobility, trust, fear of interacting with police, which can fracture social alliances. As conceptions of safety, mobility and trust become transformed in the paradox of being a migrant who is valued and sought while they remain thoroughly vulnerable, Colombianos come to understand both the possibilities and the limitations for claiming rights and establishing a sense of belonging.

As the previous chapter explored the trajectory of immigration policy in the United States and the ways Philadelphia local government has both gone against the grain to welcome immigrants and fallen in line with local-federal enforcement policies, and

this chapter has analyzed the contradictions between the immigrant-friendly discourses and policies in Philadelphia and the everyday experiences of Colombian migrants, the next chapter examines how Colombians articulate, experience, and assert citizenship. Paying close attention to the everyday experiences vis-à-vis formal citizenship illuminates not only how performances and practices of citizenship extend beyond juridical and legal rights, but also how they are both enable and constrained under regimes of localized policy in Philadelphia. The emphasis on citizenship, not as a status that one does or does not have, but rather something that is established processually through life experiences illuminates how Colombians establish a sense of belonging, both because of and sometimes in spite of the contradictions of immigrant-friendly policies and discourses.

## CHAPTER 6

## CITIZENSHIP BEYOND LEGALITY: PERFORMANCES AND PRACTICES OF BELONGING

*Citizenship concerns more than rights to participate in politics. It also includes other kinds of rights in the public sphere, namely, civil, socio-economic, and cultural. Moreover, in addition to the legal, it concerns the moral and performative dimensions of membership, which define the meanings and practices of belonging in society.* James Holtson and Arjun Appadurai, *Cities and Citizenship*, (1996: 200).

This chapter will follow Holston and Appadurai to elucidate citizenship as the claims and assertions of belonging amongst Colombian migrants across the legal spectrum, from naturalized citizens to undocumented migrants. Moving away from citizenship as juridical status, a thing one has or does not have, I attend to the ways that Colombians in Philadelphia claim citizenship through a sense of belonging. As such citizenship becomes “the meanings and practices of belonging” and can be recognized as processual, constantly produced and reproduced. This chapter shows how notions of citizenship, ones that encompass the performative dimensions of membership, are oriented towards and grounded in the experiences of social and political belonging in Philadelphia. Stated another way, rather than being oriented at the national level, which retains the right to grant citizenship as legal status, Colombians’ performances and practices of citizenship are tied to the local. The chapter shows that these are performances and practices of belonging because they are negotiations and claims that are asserted but also sometimes denied.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> The notion of performance or performativity is indebted to Judith Butler’s scholarship on gender as an ongoing performance that it is not a singular act, but a repetition and a ritual. This repetition is not where a subject comes into being but rather this repetition is at once a re-enactment and re-experiencing of a set of meanings already socially established; repetition is the mundane and ritualized form of their legitimation. Corollary to that Butler insists that there is no presocial subject instead asserting, “There need not be a ‘doer behind the deed’ but that the ‘doer’

Performances and practices of citizenship become claims for belonging through the exercise of rights and the assertion of contributions, however the limitations of these claims are just as important to understand. The previous chapter examined the limits of migrant legality through and examination of the specter of deportation. In this chapter I explore how Colombians' racialization as "illegal" and as "foreigners" limits their sense of belonging because it demonstrates how they are not treated as full citizens, both in personal, institutional and service encounters. As such, many attempt to carve out a sense of belonging through performances and practices of citizenship that are grounded in their worth—worthy citizens who contribute to the city by working hard, worthy citizens who fight for their rights and recognition, worthy citizens who attempt to maintain respect in service encounters that seek to limit their access to resources. Finally I address the ways people seek to assert their contributions as conditions for their sense of belonging and recognition as citizens. Here the contributions are grounded within being good parents who raise their children in the city as good citizens. Ultimately these assertions seek to expand citizenship beyond legality in order to establish a sense of belonging and worthiness.

Specifically avoiding an emphasis on juridical or political definitions of citizenship can be understood as a set of practices, which constitute individuals as recognized members of a community (Turner 1990). Here citizenship is not conceptualized not as merely as something some has or does not have—the way a focus

---

is variably constructed in and through the deed," (1990:181). The main difference between Butler's theorization of gender and the ways her notion of performativity gets taken up in citizenship studies is that in her original formulation this repetition is not always explicit or intentional, and it operates below the level of consciousness. In citizenship studies the performances and practices of citizenship aimed at establishing a sense of belonging or claiming rights is both intentional and strategic and thus eminently formed as conscious acts and behaviors.

solely on legal status would maintain—but rather offers a framework to understand citizenship as processual and enacted, offering a complex repertoire of acts and claims to those who do and do not possess formal citizenship.<sup>120</sup> I draw from Suzanne Oboler’s concept of citizenship as a “lived experience,” which attends to the formulation of citizenship, assertions of belonging, practices of citizenship, the exercise of rights and experiences of inequality to recognize citizenship as “not only a legal status but also a measure of the relative equality of the social actors as well as of the quality and practical implications of the common good” (Oboler 2006:5).

Citizenship as lived experience is then about much more than participation in the public sphere, but also about the everyday ways that Colombians in Philadelphia not only claim rights but also make claims as deserving subjects and the ways in which they imagine they contribute to the social fabric of the city. Thus the nexus between citizenship as legal status and citizenship as lived experience become the focus of this chapter as I illustrate the ways in which Colombians understand themselves and their experiences in Philadelphia. As legal scholar Linda Bosniak notes theorizations of citizenship exist within three mutually imbricated categories that concerns the what, where and who of citizenship. The substance of citizenship concerns what citizenship is, what its meanings and experiences are, and how it incorporates civil, social, political and

---

<sup>120</sup> The literature on citizenship has primarily focused on formal citizenship, or citizenship as legal status, by exploring the ways nation-states have come to define citizenship and assign corresponding rights and responsibilities to the citizenry. British sociologist T.H. Marshall’s *Citizenship and Social Class* has become the seminal text that many subsequent analyses of citizenship draw from and also argue against. For Marshall (1964) citizenship is a status that involves access to various rights and powers.

Yet beyond strict juridical considerations of citizenship is a body of literature that recognize that citizenship is more than just a condition that a state bestows upon subjects but rather it is processual and concerns not only the practices and performances of citizenship but struggles for rights and belonging (Turner 1990; Rosaldo 1994; Flores and Benmayor 1997; Oboler 2006).

economic dimensions. In this sense the nexus of legal status and lived experience contribute the substance of citizenship for Colombians in Philadelphia. The where of citizenship concerns the domain or location of action, what Bosniak describes as “where citizenship takes place.” In this respect I show how dimensions of citizenship are anchored in a sense of local, as citizenship and its meanings take place in Philadelphia, rather than at the level of the nation-state, as Colombian migrants present themselves as worthy citizen-subjects and emphasize their contributions to the city (Bosniak 2006: 17).

I explore how citizenship is constituted by the lived experiences of Colombians. Specifically how their practices and performance of belonging illuminate the uneasy ways in which individuals attempt to assert their rights, how they experience the limitations of rights, and how they navigate the excessive demands as citizens and noncitizens to prove their worth and contribution. This chapter draws upon the concepts of “cultural citizenship” which focuses on how Latinos understand their senses of belonging and claim “membership in this society as they struggle to build communities, claim social rights, and become recognized as active agents in society” (Flores & Benmayor 1997: 2). Rosaldo argues that “cultural citizenship” conveys a sense of human worth, dignity and respect and as such cultural citizenship illuminates the subjective evaluations people have of their treatment and livelihoods in society, which includes a sense of belonging and a sense of recognition (Rosaldo 1994; 1997).

Social practices and claims that seek to redress disenfranchisement become the core of “cultural citizenship,” however cultural citizenship cannot fully account for the ways in which Colombians along the spectrum of legality are confronted with the limitations of their rights, the non-recognition of their claims for rights or their

racialization as presumptive “illegals” which attempts to erase not only their social and political rights but their very presence in US society. As Chavez notes “feelings of belonging and desire for inclusion in the social body exist in a dialectical relationship with the larger society and the state, which may or may not find such claims for cultural citizenship convincing” (2008:13).

Therefore it is necessary to complement the framework of cultural citizenship with that of subjectification, or being-made as it relates to self-making. Aiwha Ong, drawing on the work of Foucault, argues that it is critical to understand how someone is constituted as a subject who exercises or submits to power relations when conceptualizing citizenship. Here citizenship is a “dual process of self-making and being-made within webs of power linked to the nation-state and civil society” and “an attitude of self-making in shifting fields of power that include the nation-state and the wider world” (1996:738). This draws attention to the ways that people can assert citizenship, however not under conditions or circumstances entirely of their own choosing. Hence it reveals not only the various ways that Colombians of different legal statuses assert their citizenship and how they construct a sense of belonging, but also the ways that as Latinos they attempt to always prove their worth in order to access the full scope of social and political rights.

As Colombians, even those who are US citizens, face discrimination, presumptions of illegality and restricted access to resources like health care, good education or local social services, their petitions to claim membership in the community are often denied. As Ramos-Zayas notes there is a tacit and explicit insistence that Puerto Ricans and all Latinos must “prove their deservingness of US citizenship in order to be

legitimately entitled to civil rights and social benefits that other-particularly white male-populations can assume as inalienable.” (2004: 35). Broad anti-immigrant discourses at the national level in conjunction with restrictive immigration policies that make legal entry and naturalization increasingly difficult and thus constitute the “webs of power” in Ong’s formulation. The self-making of Colombians, which attempts to make them full subjects entitled to rights, comes to rest on the notion that they must present themselves as good citizen-subjects who assert their contributions as a condition of their worthiness.

Likewise while claiming rights is essential, it does not guarantee that rights are granted or persons are recognized as legitimate subjects deserving of those rights. Colombianos in Philadelphia are constantly reminded of their non-belonging because of legal status, race and phenotype, accented English or foreignness. Thus while I examine how citizenship is enacted and defined beyond legal status, legal status still has important implications for establishing a sense of belonging. By extension how individuals come to form a sense of belonging the ways in which their belonging is challenged also point to the ways in which citizenship and race remain intimately connected and come to impact everyday experiences as they navigate the city and its institutions.

### Citizenship and Belonging

While the concept of belonging remains central in analyses of citizenship, what remains underexplored how people create a sense of belonging. Understanding how people construct a sense of belonging or what the grounds or criteria for feeling like one belongs is not only critical in the experiences of migrants but also allows for a theorization of citizenship beyond legal status. A sense of belonging is available to Colombians in Philadelphia in ways that formal citizenship status is denied.

Belonging also captures emotion and affect embedded in citizenship. Beyond rights and obligations citizenship is also about understanding the emotions, feelings and affect that inclusion and exclusion can elicit or provoke. Belonging is at once imagined as an interior state or feeling or sense, however a sense of belonging is also subject to contestation from others. Stated another way, one can feel like they belong and assert their belonging in order to ask for rights or recognitions, but institutions and even other people can dismiss those assertions.

Citizenship, understood as legal status and beyond legal status, connects to feelings of belonging. Those without formal authorization to be in the country can feel a sense of belonging in spite of their legal, economic, political and social marginalization. On the other hand even naturalized or native-born citizens can experience both a sense of belonging and experience the limits of belonging through exclusion.

Bosniak explores the meanings of citizenship delineating between citizenship as a (legal) status, a set of rights and entitlements secured through political participation, but also gives due attention to conceptualizing citizenship as identity. Thinking through “people’s collective experience of themselves” Bosniak asserts that the element of citizenship as identity is “the quality of belonging-the felt aspects of community membership.” (2000: 479). The “feeling of citizenship” emerges from both the ways citizenship is conceived and practiced in legal and political realms and the “citizenly sentiment” as shaped by culture and society.

Yuval-Davis (2006) defines a sense of belonging as an interior state of emotional attachment, about feeling “at home” and “safe”, and given the experiences of Colombian migrants in Philadelphia I would add “accepted” (see also Flores and Benmayor 1997:

15). This conceptualization emphasizes the duality of belonging both as an act of self-identification and identification by others. Yuval-Davis also defined the politics of belonging as comprised of political projects aimed at constructing belonging in specific ways towards particular collectivities. Here both a sense of belonging as an individual feeling and a politics of belonging towards a larger collectivity exists for Colombians who seek to claim rights as worthy Latinos and challenge the denial of the full scope of their rights as good and deserving immigrants who contribute to the city. As such, this chapter focuses on the ways Colombians construct and assert a sense of belonging and the grounds upon which they challenge the denial of their belonging.

Belonging, both as a feeling and as an assertion, is multiple, multilayered and constantly shifting. Diaz-Barriga suggested we expand cultural citizenship by recognizing the ways in which “belonging is ‘felt’ in everyday life and the ways that its meaning is articulated and contested” (2008:137). A sense of belonging for Colombian migrants in particular can be related to a right to exist and be in a place, which in turn can also be linked to a demand for recognition, respect and dignity—in short full personhood. A sense of belonging, one that considers not only an individual’s interior state of feeling but also their connection to other members, is premised on that recognition of mutual personhood or their relative equality. Therefore it is not only how Colombians perceive and assert belonging that illuminates the performances and practices of citizenship, but also instances that provoke feelings of exclusion or non-belonging. Questions about who belongs and who does not are enmeshed within larger projects of immigration policy, constructions of legal citizenship and race, owing to a longer trajectory of exclusion and

inclusion not only in the United States, but also specific to particular localities, like Philadelphia.

While belonging tends to be naturalized in everyday practices, and undertheorized in some of the scholarship, it is always a dynamic process and not a self-evident state of being. Then a place-specific sense of belonging matters as it constructed over time and emerges through participation in the local. Colombians' performances and practices of citizenship emerged from a particular sense of belonging to the city Philadelphia that derived from their encounters with other Philadelphia and from their understandings about the social positions of migrants within the city.

#### Grounded in the Local: Understanding Citizenship in and to Philadelphia

In a large but windowless room in the basement of a Catholic Church located in the Juniata Park neighborhood of North Philadelphia, the fifteen participants of the spring 2011 *taller de ciudadanía*, citizenship workshop, met on Thursday evenings through the late winter and into the spring to study for the naturalization exam. Though the course was hosted by *Colombianos Adelante* (CA) they advertised in local Spanish language papers and online to attract a variety of Spanish speaking immigrants. The *talleres*, or workshops, were held in both English and Spanish to facilitate discussions and to provide opportunities for participants to practice for the interview portion of the naturalization exam. Though CA offers several programs the citizenship workshops began in 2010 and promoting the naturalization of Latino migrants in Philadelphia has quickly become one of the groups' main efforts.

While the workshops clearly emphasize the need for citizenship as a legal status the discussions within the workshops offer conceptualizations of citizenship that extend

far beyond its legal dimension. *Taller* debates spanned from questions about naturalization procedures, to discussions about how many participants already considered themselves full members of society, or discussions about how naturalization would or would not change their lives by being able to vote in political elections or being able to sponsor visas for family members. These definitions and experiences that emerge in the *taller* discussions reveal that a sense of citizenship is oriented towards experience of social and political belonging in Philadelphia, in other words it is eminently local. Amongst *taller* participants, the practices and performances of belonging are oriented towards an understanding of citizenship specific to one's livelihood in Philadelphia as a place where people live, work, and raise families.

In these classes the primary instructor, Ronald, a Afro-Dominican migrant in his early sixties who naturalized in 1985, was dedicated to having these workshops not only serve as preparation for the exam but as critical explorations of what it means to be a citizen in the contemporary United States by engaging what naturalization meant to each participant. Ronald, who always wore a starched collared shirt and blazer, began each class with the reminder that, "We come to our road of citizenship from different places, countries, backgrounds. Our choice to take this next leap and to become a citizen of the United States can also come from different motivations. But we are here together." The classes became an opportunity for the concomitant production of knowledge between individuals who wove their experiences together and built upon their own ideas to offer their own conceptions of citizenship, albeit from the perspective of those who were in a position to be able to become naturalized citizens.

The spring 2011 cohort of *taller* participants came from several nations including the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Brazil (a man who spoke Portuguese, Spanish and English), Nicaragua and several, of course, were from Colombia. A mix of men and women, participants also ranged from the age of 24 to 67 in this particular group and also had varying lengths of residency in the United States and Philadelphia. Two women, Alba and Lorena, one in her 50s and the other 67, had been in the US for over 20 years and therefore qualified to take the naturalization exam in their native Spanish.<sup>121</sup>

Both Alba and Lorena were adamant about taking the exam in English but for different reasons that underscored the different ways each woman defined citizenship for themselves. When discussing the options available to take portions of the naturalization exam in Spanish, Lorena remarked, “it will be my badge of honor. I put in a lot of hard work to be able to express myself in English and here is the chance to demonstrate it.” Alba was initially hesitant to make a decision on the first day of class noting, “maybe I will take it in Spanish. It might make the whole thing go quicker. Anyway it seems like more work to get an interpreter that I don’t even need. We’ll see.” Lorena reaffirmed the notion that naturalization was an honor and sought to prove her English language skills, in part as a proxy for her Americanness, through taking the exam. Alba was deeply ambivalent about becoming a citizen. On the one hand she looked forward to being able to vote but noted that naturalization might not really change her life in any other

---

<sup>121</sup> If a person is 50 year old or older at the time of filing for naturalization and has lived as a permanent resident (green card holder) in the United States for 20 years they can take the civics exam portion of the naturalization exam in their native language. These are known as 50/20 exceptions. Individuals who are 55 or older at the time of filing need only have been a permanent resident for 15 years, the 55/15 exception. However for those who decide to take the exam in their native language, they must bring an interpreter with them to the interview. Those who qualify for the 50/20 or 55/15 are still required to take the civics test, and can take the civics test in their native language only if they have a “sufficient” knowledge of English.

meaningful way. These differences shed light on formal status, in this case naturalization and the change in legal status, as both symbolic and a mere formality and point to the ways in which individuals differently imagined their citizenship and their place not just within the United States but within the city of Philadelphia.

As the co-teacher of *talleres* in the spring of 2011, inside and outside of class I was always aware of my own privileges as native-born US citizen and more so as an *Americana* who could often more easily pass for White than my co-educator or the participants, who never had my citizenship questioned and who was able to more easily navigate resources and services as a native English speaker. During the courses I often helped lead group discussions, and that included tutorials for the pronunciation of English because of my unaccented English.

Through participant observation and my role as a teacher in the *talleres* I was able to get to know many of the *taller* participants and cultivated relationships during the course and after class ended. Beyond classroom observations and individual interviews, these sustained relationships allowed me to accompany some people in their daily routines which offered a glimpse of their experiences beyond the classroom setting. On the one hand, during in interviews, the *talleres*, and in everyday life, participants offered definitions of citizenship something that were partially national as becoming a US citizen or an American for many had a deep symbolic resonance. On the other hand performances and practices of citizenship were often framed as something that was definitively local, as a sense of belonging was tied to Philadelphia as the place where their contributions were asserted and mattered.

Hector, a sixty-year-old man who migrated from Cali, Colombia in 1980, interjected during a group discussion about Philadelphia's importance in the history of the United States. Remarking that the city had "so much history of democracy and freedom" he knew about but had "not yet experienced." Hector also hoped that he "would soon get to experience that feeling of democracy by becoming a citizen" because he attributed his poor treatment earlier that day in the municipal gas service office to his status as a noncitizen. These sorts of critical assessments of the meanings of citizens as they contrasted with personal experiences were common during the *talleres*. As such these *talleres* became a fruitful site from which to understand the motivations and decisions to become a naturalized citizen, for individuals who were in a legal position to do so, but to also analyze the limitations of citizenship as ensuring equality.

As Hector recounted a frustrating day spent navigating the bureaucracy of Philadelphia's municipal gas service, during this naturalization workshop he critiqued the discussion of the city's efforts to attract migrants. Hector did not hesitate to share his frustration and disappointment by sighing, "They might not like us, but they want us and need us, or that's what they say." Though different possibilities exist for migrants in a city desperate to ease its demographic and economic woes, Hector's experiences as a Latino painfully contradict the newly crafted image of Philadelphia as an immigrant-friendly city. His frustration speaks to a larger part of belonging, the ability to express clear frustrations and disappointments. While part of belonging is feeling "at home," feeling "at home" does "not necessarily only generate positive and warm feelings. It also allows the safety as well as the emotional engagement to be, at times, angry, resentful, ashamed and indignant" (Hessel quoted in Yuval Davis 2006).

Hector's critiques of "they might not want us but they need us" drew from ideas that while migrants were valorized that did not and could not assure that they were treated with respect and dignity. Moreover ending his remarks with "that's what they say" Hector questioned whether or not local politicians, policymakers and obliged city workers actually wanted to fulfill the promises they had made to migrants by offering language assistance and translation at municipal services. The timing of Hector's remarks came just a few months after the 2010 census officially declared that the population growth in Philadelphia was attributable to immigrants and indeed that fact was referred to several times over the course of the workshops.

Hector's story and the subsequent discussion that evening marked a turning point for that particular *taller*. Participants began to engage with discrimination and the limits of citizenship frankly and explicitly, more so than any the other *talleres* I co-taught. These critiques of the partiality of formal citizenship became a recurrent theme through which participants in the spring of 2011 came to understand their past experiences and the lens through which they would imagine their post-naturalization futures. Discussions amongst participants still held naturalization as something desirable and aspirational but critiqued experiences of racial and legal discrimination. Oftentimes *taller* participants found support from each other when individuals had dealt with similar experiences or offered advice to fellow participants for how to deal with a problem.

Hector's issue that day centered on his difficulty making payment on his gas and water account to avoid shut off. He had spent most of the day, a day he had to take off from work, trying to amass a sufficient combination of cash and money order to pay a little bit more than minimum required to keep the services going and to buy him some

time until he could make the next payment. His first frustration came with asking to pay in the combination of bills and money order as he was told he would have to stand and wait on two different lines to process the payment. Hector was confused because he had gone to the building downtown before to pay a late bill and had used a combination of payments without being forced to wait in different lines.

He told the class that he had asked to speak to someone else and the woman he had been working with “got a bad attitude like I was trying to go over her head. It was because I knew she was wrong.” That demand generated into a longer back and forth where the representative started speaking louder and slower, taking on a hostile tone with Hector. Eventually they came to the agreement that he would talk to a Spanish language assistant that would help him navigate the process. Hector admitted that he hoped a fellow Spanish speaker would be more amenable to help him and less likely to discriminate against him for being enrolled in the low-income payment program. Eventually Hector figured out that the woman he had first been speaking to had misunderstood him and believed he was trying to make payments for two different accounts but he was still angered and attributed it to her lack of care and understanding. He stated

I showed her one bill with just a single account number and I asked to use two different payment methods. I have done this in the past and she was not interested in helping me. She just wanted to get rid of me and put me on her colleague who spoke Spanish. She did not want to deal with me and assumed I was incompetent and could not understand her. I understood her perfectly. It was she who did not understand me, the situation, or my questions. The problem was with her. She just saw me as an immigrant and tried to move the line along without trying to help me.

He concluded by repeating, “They might not like us, but they want us and need us, or that’s what they say.” For Hector, treatment at the municipal gas service comes

from the denial of his recognition as a citizen-subject who should be afforded not only the full scope of his rights, but proper treatment and support. Hector as a legal permanent resident applying for naturalization challenged the notion that Philadelphia's policies that valorize migrants and migration. His frustration challenged the notion citizenship is a neutral framework for the equality of individuals in the US by highlighting how citizenship has never entirely been about inclusion in the polity and instead has operated as a modality of exclusion and difference (Hall and Held 1989; Soysal 1994; Rocco 2004; Ramos Zayas and De Genova 2005; Bosniak 2006).

Hector explained how he experienced this lesser "form of social and legal existence" (Ramos-Zayas 2004: 39) in his encounter. He shared a deep ambivalence about the respect he thought was absent from the transactions he had at the office, saying "I am used to this kind of thing. I was hoping that things would be better because of immigrants and the population but perhaps that is naïve." Hector attributed the denial of his service to his recognition as a non-citizen. As a legal permanent resident that enrolled in a naturalization course, Hector indeed had aspirations for recognition as a full citizen but throughout his time in Philadelphia, not just this day at the municipal gas service, he was confronted with limited structural conditions that created major obstacles to his sense of belonging.

The ensuing discussion amongst *taller* participants interrogated how as immigrants they could be at once valued and at in the same token dismissed. Later Arturo, who was normally reluctant to participate in debates, added "it is not great here but it's better than most places. My cousin lives in Allentown and Philadelphia is not perfect but at least in the city we know that as immigrants we have a place here." Here it

is the socio-geographic sense of place to which belonging is attached and from which rights and recognitions emerge. While some *taller* participants voiced opinions that the city does not need to do anything special for them as migrants as they were self-sufficient, others argued that as a matter of rights if they were valued by lawmakers to help the city rebound, then their daily experiences with limited public transportation, failing public schools, blighted neighborhoods and state-sanctioned surveillance would be addressed.

By doing so their assertion for rights and their sense of belonging to Philadelphia as a socio-geographical place was firmly rooted within their past experiences and their imagined futures in the city. Understandings of citizenship, likewise the resultant rights and entitlements conferred upon and actively claimed, were primarily understood in terms of the local. The city itself became the primary locus for their performances and practices of citizenship that emerged from but also produced particular notions about citizenship, specifically how to be good citizens in a way that exceeded simply becoming naturalized.

Participants, as individuals and as a group, constructed a recurrent theme of citizenship, grounded in and to the locality, rather than something existing at the national level. Assertions of citizenship deeply anchored to the scale of the local, and their performances and practices are oriented to the here-ness of Philadelphia through people's quotidian routines, their engagements with local services and institutions like the public school system and through their social reproduction living here and raising children. In this sense citizenship become eminently local, but it does not replace legal citizenship as a national phenomenon, but rather an understanding of citizenship being grounded in the

local reflects Colombians' experiences, performances and practices of rights and belonging in a city where the social, economic and political positioning of migrants is simultaneously valued and undermined by Philadelphia's local policies. Likewise underscoring the local aspects of the processes of citizenship draws attention to both the sociopolitical effects of localized immigration policy and the way migrants seek to redress their marginalization in the city.

Moreover classroom discussions about American history and personal motivations to seek naturalization revealed how migrants insisted that belonging ought to be assessed through social and economic contributions to the city, not legal status. Many *taller* participants like Hector already understood themselves as “good” or “proper” citizens. Interviews that touched upon decisions to naturalize as well as the benefits and drawbacks of attaining legal citizenship revealed a tension within individuals who saw naturalization as aspirational, meaning they believed in the ideals of American freedom and democracy and meritocracy, and simultaneously viewed citizenship as instrumental, providing them with much needed legal legitimacy that would facilitate bureaucratic encounters with the state—such as filing taxes and applying for jobs—but not changing their everyday marginalization. Some, like Hector, saw these not as competing discourses but as inextricably linked material conditions.

#### Claiming Rights in Everyday Life

Anthropological approaches to citizenship have argued against the existence of a pure, abstract, universal definition of citizenship and given due attention to how claims of citizenship have historically been denied to certain subjects. As Judith Shklar, a political theorist, notes regarding citizenship in the United States specifically:

There is no notion more central in politics than citizenship and none more variable in history or contested in theory... citizenship in America has never been just a matter of agency and empowerment; it has always been a matter of social standing as well... The struggle for citizenship in America has, therefore, been overwhelmingly a demand for inclusion in the polity, an effort to break down excluding barriers to recognition, rather than an aspiration to civic participation as a deeply involving activity. (1991:1-2).

For many Colombians the struggle for citizenship and belonging includes these efforts to break down exclusionary barriers in order to gain recognition and to claim rights in the city. Hector's experience at the municipal gas service is also about the limitation and frustrations of securing one's right to service and his desire to maintain and regain dignity in that experience—to secure his social standing. Yet those are not the only encounters with the state under which migrants of varying legal statuses must navigate their social and political presence in institutions. Often time the denial of service or the never-ending expectation to produce documents, as proof of one's valid request for resources or service can be some of the most illuminating aspects of the intertwined nature of formal and substantive aspects of citizenship.

#### *Public School and Education*

Just as Hector attempted to claim his social and political rights during his experience, Carolina, similarly expressed frustration at her attempts to claim rights to register her son at a Philadelphia public elementary school. Carolina, a single mother, encountered a frustrating and byzantine path to provide proof of residence and documentation in order enroll her son, a US citizen, in public school. A legal permanent resident who migrated from Cali in 1997 at the age of 22, Carolina was angry and surprised at the way she was treated, specifically because her and her son's legal status were questioned on numerous occasions. First, Carolina was surprised because the public

school had many first generation students and migrant parents. Second, Carolina was angry because she provided all the appropriate documentation for her and her son and did not see the need for further questioning. Work and childcare arrangements became too demanding for Carolina to complete the *taller* but we maintained contact as she planned to take the course in the future.

Through a larger conversation about Carolina's general frustration with the underfunded public school system in Philadelphia I learned that Carolina was also frustrated with her whole experience with public schooling in the city. She was frustrated because her education in Colombia had taught her a different method to approach long division and she could not help her son with his homework when he needed it. She was frustrated with her inability to understand the way her son was being taught and was afraid that it was symbolic of a larger cultural divide between a mother raised in Colombia and a son raised in the US might become something unbridgeable as he got older. She was even more frustrated, and still slightly bitter, about the many ways she had to fight to even get her son enrolled in their neighborhood public school.

Carolina struggled to take care of her son, Sebastian, and work full time after her husband left when their son was 4 years old in 2002.<sup>122</sup> Her younger brother, still in Colombia, routinely applied for an immigrant visa as he intended to join Carolina to help

---

<sup>122</sup> The stresses of migration and disagreements over whether to stay in the United States can put an undue strain on partnerships and marriage and divorce or separation is not uncommon and thus women often become the head of households (see Grasmuck and Pessar 1991: 156; Gilbertson and Gurak 1994; Jones-Correa 1998). Carolina herself did not intend to return to Colombia even though she missed her parents, friends and hometown. She remained resolute in her decision to stay in the US because of the high rates of unemployment in Colombia and economic stagnation. Her husband wanted to stay in the United States temporarily and return to Colombia once the economy improved. When Carolina found out she was pregnant she decided she wanted to raise her son in the US and while she these divergences did not cause the split they she noted they contributed to the outcome.

out with Sebastian but was denied every time. Carolina stated “You know there is never any guarantee for the visa but you have to start thinking there is something suspicious when someone is denied 5 times in a row and you never get to know or understand why.” The opacity of the visa process was a common complaint for several Colombians who I spoke to and it underscored their underlying distrust of political systems and the state more generally.

Carolina could not and did not understand why her brother was consistently denied a permanent visa despite filling the requirements and the filing the paperwork perfectly. Carolina was disappointed that her brother could not qualify for a Family Preference Immigrant Visa. Though this category of visa is limited, they are reserved for more distant familial relations with both lawful permanent residents and US citizens. Unfortunately siblings were considered the fourth category of preference and only eligible for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens over the age of 21. To circumvent these limitations her brother would often arrive on a non-immigrant visa, a B-2 visa designated for tourism, to stay and help her with Sebastian. For many legal permanent residents, the inability to petition for family members’ visas was often a driving force that compelled them to apply for naturalization.

Even though she fully acknowledged the staunch numerical limits on permanent immigrant visas, Carolina struggled to reconcile why she had been granted one and her brother could not obtain one—especially when she needed and wanted his help. With her brother’s petitions denied (as a legal permanent resident Carolina was unable to petition as a family member for her brother’s immigrant visa) Carolina decided to send her son back to Colombia to be raised by her parents and her brother until he was seven years old.

After three years and a handful of shorter visits to Colombia, Carolina and her family decided it was a good time to have Sebastian come back to live in Philadelphia as the move was never intended to be permanent.

In the interim Carolina had acquired a comfortable job with benefits working as a paralegal for a lawyer who focused on immigration cases and become more comfortable navigating life in Philadelphia. She also felt that “working for the lawyer made me understand my rights more. I felt a confidence that I did not have before because I understood the law better and what could and could not happen to me. I felt protected by that.” She wanted her son

To take advantage of that [US citizenship] and go to school here. Also my parents are older and they had already done so much for me I knew it was my responsibility to raise my son. Besides, I eventually intended to become a citizen and then sponsor them to come.

Sebastian returned with Carolina on a trip she made in June of 2007 so that she could enroll him in public school before the start of the school year. Carolina decided to enroll Sebastian in his neighborhood school, where priority is given to students who live within a particular geographic boundary. Carolina lived where Juniata Park bled into Hunting Park, in the racially-marked spaces of Latino neighborhoods in Philadelphia, and sought to enroll Sebastian in a large elementary school in walking distance from her home. Though the school was large with over 500 students, Carolina knew other mothers in the neighborhood that had sent their kids to the school and who were satisfied with the experience. In particular her friends had noted that some of the staff spoke Spanish and were also Latino, and that some of the teachers were Latinos as well. With over half of school’s students Latino and about 20% enrolled in English language learning programs, Carolina felt comfortable sending Sebastian there.

Carolina knew she needed proof of residency within the boundaries of the public school for enrollment so she amassed and organized all the necessary documentation to bring in order to register Sebastian, plus extra forms. She said she had his birth certificate, her proof of address in the form of her apartment lease and multiple bills in her name (though only one form was needed), and Sebastian's current immunization records from a doctor in Colombia. Carolina did not realize what she was missing until she went to the school to enroll her son—his report card from school in Colombia. Carolina asked to enroll him in the school promised to give a copy of the report card as soon as she received it.<sup>123</sup>

The administrator Carolina spoke to the first time she went to the school was adamant that she could not enroll Sebastian without the report card because school officials could not know what grade to place him in. The administrator instead offered to have Carolina fill out an application for Sebastian to apply to that school as if he was an applicant from outside the geographic boundary, which Carolina refused.

CC: I do not know why she offered me that. I know applications are only for students who do not live in the neighborhood area. Because I didn't have the report card so she treated me suspiciously.

DG: How did she do that?

CC: Her eyes shifted and she changed her tone of voice. It was like she didn't believe me that Sebastian had gone to school. I tried to show her his social security card and birth certificate to show her he was a US citizen but she refused. She made a copy of the birth certificate but all she wanted was the report card and without it, it was like Sebastian had no rights. I felt like I could not prove anything to her. I brought everything. I felt like I

---

<sup>123</sup> To register a student for Philadelphia public school the following are required: proof of age (birth certificate, baptism certificate/other religious document, or a signed affidavit from the parent is accepted); proof of current address (parent's driver's license, non-driver ID, apartment lease, voter registration card or recent utility bill. Must contain parent's name and address). For students enrolling for the first time the following addition proof is needed: current immunization (health passport or immunization summary sheet from a healthcare provider); child's most recent report card or alternative document that will be used to assess placement in the appropriate grade.

had no rights. She acted like she didn't believe me. She made me feel like she did not trust me and that I shouldn't be in the school. That was unacceptable. I knew immediately that it was something ridiculous to have Sebastian apply as if he lived outside the zone. That wasn't right. How does that change the fact that while I did not have the report card yet I had all the documents they needed? He deserved to enroll.

In this instance proof of citizenship and proof of residency were momentarily less important than Sebastian's report card, which confused Carolina. Though schools cannot require social security cards or proof of citizenship for enrollment Carolina decided to bring it with her the next time she went to the school to enroll Sebastian as irrefutable proof that he deserved to enroll.

Carolina said she left the school that afternoon and talked to her boss about it the next day, and he explained that the administrator probably did not want to make it seem that she was forcing Carolina to prove legal status and therefore did not want to see the social security card. In the moment however this refusal represented a dismissal and an indication of disbelief in Carolina's eyes. Carolina pointedly linked the demand of the report card and refusal to acknowledge Sebastian's citizenship via his social security card to a discourse of rights.

Not only did she feel like she had "no rights," but she felt the way she was treated also limited the rights of her son. Carolina was made to feel suspect and disagreed with the channel the administrator tried to persuade her to take. Carolina linked rights, the exercise of her entitlement to have a say in the ways that her son entered school, to what was "right" or correct. She knew that it was not right for her to try to enroll Sebastian via application and tried to circumvent the missing document by promising to submit it as soon as it was available.

Following that first encounter at the school Carolina went home and called her parents immediately to get the telephone number for Sebastian's school. Her parents went in person to request the report card and Carolina called the school every two days until she got the administration to send a report card to her parents and one directly to her address in Philadelphia. Once Carolina received the report card she went back to the school armed with all her documents again to try and get Sebastian enrolled. Again she was directed to the same administrator but she did not want to deal with her again. Carolina worried that "she wanted to enroll Sebastian in a way that did not guarantee him a spot and I wanted to make sure they did not try to force him into a lower grade." Carolina thought the administrator might be a Latina, whom she hoped might be more sympathetic or understanding of her needs, but she felt even more alienated by her treatment and frustrated by her attempts to find common ground with the administrator.

On her second attempt Carolina successfully enrolled her son but it was not without struggle. At first Carolina felt that the administrator spent an unreasonable amount of time scrutinizing the documents she had submitted. Carolina described the second interaction as one rife with miscommunication and a lack of trust, as she struggled to determine the ethnoracial background or bilingualism of the administrator. Carolina said,

She spent too long. Looking, inspecting the report card. Everything was in Spanish because it was from Colombia and I think she spoke Spanish or was familiar because I kept offering to translate but she said it wasn't necessary. I couldn't tell from her name or her look if she was Spanish and at one point I asked in Spanish, "is this what you need?" and she did not even look at me. She was looking at it too long. I ask her many times "is everything ok?" and "is that what you need?" in English after she ignored me in Spanish. She truly looked at the report card for an eternity. She took in her hands away from the desk we were standing at and went into another room to the left. I could not see her, or the room or if she was talking to someone else. My heart was racing because I took this as a

sign that she did not want to accept it and wanted to inspect the report card without me watching her. She was gone with the report card for about ten minutes. When she returned she was carrying a clipboard, but it was behind her back. She came back to the desk and look at the report card a bit more and finally said to me “Ok we will accept this and can enroll him in the second grade.” I felt happy and angry. She made me wait so long, made it seem like something was wrong with everything I gave her. Finally she took the clipboard from behind her back, sneaky, and let me begin to sign things to make it official.

The time it took for the administrator to scrutinize the papers Carolina provided only seemed to underscore her distrust of the administrator and heighten her worries. She attempted to not only find a common linguistic denominator and asked a question in Spanish only to be ignored. The lack of communication and the administrators’ disappearance into a room beyond her sight made Carolina feel powerless. She was metaphorically left in the dark and the opacity of the criteria for judgment or what the administrator was even trying to determine from the report card was out of Carolina’s hands. As she recalled how the waiting made her feel, the end result was what she wanted and thus elicited a combination of happiness at the relief of having the report card accepted and anger at the way she was treated.

Even with the report card in hand Carolina disagreed with the same administrator on whether to place Sebastian in English as a Second Language Instruction. Sebastian had grown accustomed to speaking primarily in Spanish because of his time spent in Colombia but maintained fluency in English. He did however, at first, struggle to read in English. Carolina did not want him to fall behind in and fought to have him only partially enrolled in the English language learner (ELL) program at the school. Her knowledge of the parents and the student body, one that had many ELL students, was both reassuring to Carolina but also made her feel empowered to put her foot down against the administrator’s wishes. The administrator wanted to decide that day what level of

bilingual instruction to place Sebastian. Carolina did not want the decision to be made that day especially because while at the school Sebastian had most communicated with her only in Spanish and she did not want that to become the grounds for his placement.

She noted

He was acting shy every time we were in the school. It was a big, new building and things here were still a little unfamiliar to him. And I know that he saw I was upset and stressed and maybe he even didn't want the woman who was causing my stress to understand what he was saying to me. Sebastian spoke Spanish the whole time we were in the school but at home and everywhere else he spoke both [English and Spanish] easily. I did not want that single day to set his whole school year.

Instead of accepting the placement of 2-3 hours of ESL instruction (English as a second language, reserved for students who spoke no English) that the administrator recommended, Carolina said she demanded to talk to the ESL specialist of the school. By talking to the specialist Carolina was able to make sure that Sebastian could take the home language survey, that they schedule the test for another day and was provided a description of the teaching methods used in the program. Carolina wanted reassurance that the school recognized Sebastian's English language skills and reassurance that she could claim her rights as a parent. She asserted her power to make her own decisions and made sure she had the right to remove her son from the ESL program if she wanted. Carolina informed me that Sebastian was placed into the intermediate ESL level and quickly moved on to the advanced level within the school year. She also made it very clear that the administrator, whose name or role she could not remember after so many years, left the school a year after Sebastian enrolled.

Visa denials and frustrations with school enrollment while representing vastly different encounters with the state routinize the ways in the rights and distributions of

citizenship, or the limitation of non-citizenship, come to bare on people's everyday social and political experiences with belonging, inclusion and claiming rights through things as mundane as public school enrollment or as something as "grand" as permission to enter the nation. Often times Carolina expressed feeling confused by the criteria and the processes of these encounters and frustrated by the lack of agency she, as a legal permanent resident and a migrant, was able to exert. The bureaucracy in those encounters, in her opinion, exposed the limits of her rights and the limits of her son's rights even though they both had legal status. Carolina's struggle to enroll her son in school and the resultant feelings from her encounters with the bureaucracy of the public school system limited her sense of belonging through limiting her power to make demands as a parent and as a legal subject.

As a noncitizen but a legal permanent resident the repertoire of available action that Carolina has within the public school system is identical to that of a juridical citizen and yet her experiences and the scrutiny she faced made her feel, in her own words, "not trusted and that I shouldn't be in the school." Sebastian's legal status as a US citizen and Carolina's legal status as a permanent resident was not enough to guarantee or protect them from feeling vulnerable or being made to feel as if their right to rights were denied. She felt that she and her son were being judged as non-legitimate subjects whose right to access resources, enrollment in public school, and exert agency to determine the level of ESL instruction were not recognized. As Carolina felt her social standing was questioned, she began to demand her inclusion though attempts to claim her and her son's rights—in short these became her practices and performances of belonging.

*Normalized Recognition of Legal Permanent Resident Status*

Carolina's struggles to provide proof of her son's eligibility for enrollment in public school shows how identification, as both a physical piece of material and as a process, is one way that subjects become knowable, or legible to the state (Scott 1998). Yet identification can often times as fraught reminder of the divide between citizens and noncitizens in a strictly legal sense. Forms of state issued ID serve as a protection of privileges guaranteed from Social Security cards, birth certificates, passports, green cards, driver licenses all bestow upon the carrier a form of protection and mobility but also legibility to the state and others about who you are and what rights you have in certain instances.

For instance, Josefina explored how she felt showing her ID in different encounters as a legal permanent resident. Josefina, a woman in her mid-forties who migrated from Cali in 2000, had spent all her years in the US living in Philadelphia. As a non-driver, something Josefina and I shared in common, she never decided to get a non-driver's state identification and instead chose to use her green card as her primary form of identification. Her reliance on her green card sometimes provoked curious looks in different situations. Josefina linked the ways in which her green card was scrutinized in everyday situations to the ways in which she as an immigrant is subject to more surveillance and scrutiny than others.

Well aware that her choice to use her green card was a bold, yet uncommon choice, Josefina still lamented the fact that some people and places took much longer to look at her green card. Specifically Josefina noted a difference between shopping at her local grocery store, owned by Dominicans with many Spanish-speaking workers, who

greeted her when she arrived. As a smaller neighborhood-oriented store Josefina liked to go there in between trips to a larger store a bus ride away, and liked to go there because she felt welcomed and acknowledged.

On the other hand Josefina simply could not find everything she wanted at the smaller neighborhood store, especially a wide array of produce considered staples in Colombian cooking like yucca and plantains, as well as fruits like lulo, a sour citrus, to make fresh juice. In those cases she ventured to a large, well-known grocery store in the heart of a North Philadelphia Latino neighborhood. That larger store, owned by a Middle Eastern man with a Latina wife, catered to and attracted a broad immigrant clientele, especially Latino migrants from all over the city. Like her neighborhood store many of the workers spoke Spanish, including the cashiers. Yet despite its location on the main Latino business corridor, the Latino workers, and the diverse shoppers, Josefina was irritated by the way she thought the cashiers often take much longer to verify her green card than the forms of ID that other shoppers presented. She noted

But then sometimes when I use my credit card and they ask for ID to check the name I give my green card. Why not? They look back and forth at the names and then at the picture and then at me again. Then they repeat the whole process all over. I feel like they always look just a little bit. No. More than a little bit longer at the green card and at my credit card than the person before me.

As Goode and Schneider note “service interactions are public performances. They communicate messages about economic and power relationships engendering resentment and hostility that affect both the actors directly involved and the observers in the store” (1994: 156-157). Josefina took issue with the extra scrutiny of her green card as indicative of an unfair treatment, treatment that was reserved for her choice of ID based on her legal status. While she sought to normalize her choice in these sorts of service

encounters, and thereby assert her rights to use whatever form of ID she wanted, she felt marginalized and undermined. Josefina likewise noticed that shoppers before her who had their IDs checked after using credit cards received a cursory glance, but her ID demanded extra attention and that the other shoppers behind her would surely notice how much longer it took the cashier, any cashier, to verify her ID. Josefina was adamant that the use of her green card did not deserve such a long inspection.

And yet the green card marks her immediately as a noncitizen in a way that a driver's license or a state-issued non-driver's ID would not. Yet Josefina remained steadfast in her commitment to use her green card with the intent to normalize her action to others. She notes the problem did not lie within her choice, because the card "is valid. It is me," but with others who refuse to easily recognize her choice. In her formulation it is the issue of those who are unfamiliar with green cards or unwilling to routinize her use of her green card that are at fault in Josefina's view.

As someone without the legal status of citizen Josefina uses her identification that marks her as a green card holder and thus a permanent resident and thus authorized to live and work in the US. Her moves offer a strategy toward inclusion and normalization of the noncitizen, albeit a documented one, in the mundane routines of everyday life. This deliberate routinization is one that Josefina feel comfortable enacting and one that sometimes provokes extra scrutiny, however in a way she is asserting her membership and inclusion through forcing others, like grocery store workers, to also become comfortable with the form of ID she chooses. In this sense it represents a practice and performance of belonging as a way to claim her inclusion through the use of

identification that marks her as an “alien.”<sup>124</sup> Josefina’s assertion of citizenship comes through her claim valid and legitimate subject who has the right to be treated equally regardless of what form of ID she uses or what that ID reveals about her legal status.

For both Carolina and Josefina their attempts to claim rights and having those attempts denied felt even more egregious occurring in Latino-marked spaces within the city. In her neighborhood school with many Latino students, Carolina thought that a possible Latina, but ultimately racially ambiguous, administrator would have dealt with situations like hers before and would have had more sympathy for the position Carolina was in. Instead Carolina felt even more excluded and judged. Josefina thought that given the supermarket’s large Latino clientele, its location and its workers, her green card would be easily accepted. Yet its long and thorough examination, like Carolina’s documents, communicated an unwillingness and rejection not only of the ID or the document but also of the women themselves and their sociolegal standing. Their expected solidarity was met with dismissal and both women felt that in these encounters their ability to claim or even exercise their rights was being denied.

The experiences of Carolina and Josefina illuminate how they assert themselves as knowable subjects with rights for inclusion. For both Carolina and Josefina it is the limitation of these rights, or the scrutiny to which they and their documents/identification are subjected to that comes to bear on their encounters in everyday places like the school and the grocery store. The focus on practices illuminates how Colombians negotiate their access to resources and how that comes to shape their understanding of selves as subjects

---

<sup>124</sup> The Immigration and Nationality Act, defines an “alien” as any person not a citizen or national of the United States. “Aliens” are subdivided into two major categories: (a) immigrants, and (b) nonimmigrants. Immigrants are recognized as those who have been authorized as legal permanent residents like Josefina. People are considered nonimmigrants if they are authorized for temporary entry through visas.

with “the right to have rights” in different contexts. Yet rights alone, both the claiming and the denial of rights, cannot fully account for understanding a sense of belonging as it both an act of self-identification and identification by others. For Carolina and Josefina, interactions with others illuminated the limits of their own sense of belonging.

### Racialized Citizenship and the Denial of Belonging

As US citizenship is always-already a racializing institution<sup>125</sup>, race and presumed non-citizenship are intertwined and projected upon the bodies of Colombians in Philadelphia who grapple with their presumed foreignness.<sup>126</sup> The presumption of foreignness positions Latinos as inherently other and non-American, regardless of legal status, language ability, birth place or time spent in the United States. Though many Colombians actively tried to perform and present themselves as deserving subjects, regardless of political status they also constantly confronted racism that constructed them as illegal, foreign, unwanted and illegitimate. In particular, the ways Colombian migrants encounter racial discrimination in which their legitimacy as residents is called into question shows how their presumed foreignness comes to impinge upon the ways in which others perceive their legality, their citizenship and ultimately whether they belong.

Through the semi-formal interviews and extended life histories it became clear that many Colombians faced explicit discrimination as multiple individuals were told outright to “go back to your own country.” This presumption of foreignness and

---

<sup>125</sup> Thank you to Ana Ramos-Zayas for encouraging me to bring this concept to the core of my arguments.

<sup>126</sup> Oboler (2006:10) notes that “to the extent that Latino/as continue to be the one population that, whether formally citizens or not, is consistently considered ‘alien’ in their own land, they will continue to be an essential component of discussions on the changing meanings of citizenship in the US context, while also remaining central to US immigration policy and hemispheric power dynamics.” Similarly, Lisa Lowe likewise recognizes that Asians are, “always seen as an immigrant, as the ‘foreigner-within,’ even when born in the United States” (Lowe 1996:5).

presumption of illegality shaped Colombians' understandings and experiences of belonging. Through discussions of how these encounters made them feel, Colombians delved into the ways both race and citizenship are implicated in their discrimination.

It was not uncommon, when asked directly, for participants to not recall or answer that they had never been treated unequally because they were Colombian, or Latino or because they were not originally from the United States or because someone assumed they were "illegal." Some only described these instances or encounters, as discrimination after he recounted the event and reflected upon its implications. However many, when describing their initial impressions or difficulties adjusting to life in the city, offered examples of discrimination.

Carlos, who migrated from Manizales, Colombia in 1980 at the age of 21, recounted an especially poignant encounter of being told to "go back to your own country." Carlos's story originally came from a longer discussion in his interview where he described the poor driving skills of white Philadelphians as a reflection of their "backwards mentality," which he noted was surprising since Philadelphia was a large city. It was through a discussion of poor drivers that he told the story from his perspective as an occasional pedestrian. He recalled crossing a small side street in the Latino-dominated neighborhood of Juniata just a few years prior, when an impatient driver barely hesitated at the stop sign and came uncomfortably close to the pedestrian Carlos. The driver beeped and at the end of an expletive-laden rant yelled out his window "Go back to your own country!" after which the man spit out of the window of his car.

Carlos reported not saying anything in the moment but said he "became angrier with every step" as he realized at that point he had lived in the US longer than he had

ever lived in Colombia. Before that confrontation Carlos had already realized that he had lived in Philadelphia longer than he had lived in his hometown of Manizales but he recalled that moment as crystallizing the significance of that difference between the years spent *allá y acá*, here and there. This confrontation symbolized not only the balance of years spent here versus there but something profound regarding how he is treated regardless of how long he has called Philadelphia home. He noted, “No one can see, can’t see that, they don’t recognize that. They see me and they think I just got here but really I grew up here. My daughters, I raised my daughters here.”

The notion that no one can see Carlos contains a layered meaning as it both refers to the fact that no one can visually look at Carlos and know that he has spent more years of his adult life in the United States, a point he made by noting that he “grew up here,” but also the sense that no one can see him as anything other than a Latino immigrant, a foreigner and in a sense “matter out of place.”<sup>127</sup> Bonnie Urciuoli reworks Mary Douglas’ concept of “matter out of place” to refer to “how racialized people are typified as human matter out of place: dirty, dangerous, unwilling or unable to do their bit for the nation-state” (1996: 15). Explicitly racist encounters in public, like the one endured by Carlos, racialize Latinos as matter out of place.

Ultimately he sees himself as “truly becoming an adult in the United States,” the place where he became a father and chose to raise his daughters, however because of dark hair and tan-colored skin illustrates how Colombianos, and Latinos more generally, are racialized as inherently foreign. Race has always been central to the project of citizenship

---

<sup>127</sup> Urciuoli, an anthropologist, draws upon Mary Douglas’ discussion of matter out of place as elucidating the importance of boundary markers and the ideas about contamination and pollution in social meaning systems. Douglas described the ways such metaphors framed beliefs and rituals in ways that shaped how political and economic resources were deployed or distributed.

and the shifting definitions of citizenship in the United States; the projection of foreignness onto migrant bodies comes to reveal the inextricable relationship between race, citizenship and belonging. For Colombian migrants, becoming a naturalized citizen, as Carlos did, does not or cannot eliminate vulnerability to racialized exclusion. Colombians' racialization is often grounded in presumed illegality and foreignness, which perpetuates exclusion. Encounters with other residents in Philadelphia that call into question Colombians' legality, or their rights to public space reflects the inherent limitations of the citizenship regime in the United States for incorporating Latinos as full societal members.

Orlando, a former architect from Cali, migrated to Philadelphia temporarily when he was unemployed in Colombia. His trips to Philadelphia, between 1999 and 2003 and again from 2007 until 2011, coincided with times of general underemployment and economic stagnation in Colombia. Each trip would last anywhere from 6 months to a year and during those times Orlando tried to keep his cost of living low, he stayed in an apartment with his mother and brother, and despite working in the low end of the service economy he was to be able to send remittances back to his wife and four children. He first found work in a large supermarket, a job he would sometimes return to when in Philadelphia while other times he found work as a short order cook. This downward social mobility coupled with undocumented legal status made for frustrating experiences for Orlando who, by his estimations, had spend approximately five years total in Philadelphia between 2000 and 2011. He said

Its tough to be here and be a nobody. Because nobody can see your citizenship. They don't know. They see me and they probably think I am illegal. I don't know, maybe they don't. I can't see anyone's citizenship by looking at them. The problems come if other people just assume that I am

not [a citizen]. Then they don't treat you with respect. I belong here just like anyone else. I am not hurting anyone. I just do my job.

Orlando resented the ways his body is read as a text and someone can simply think they "see" citizenship, or legal status, by looking at someone. He explicitly links the ways in which citizenship, and indeed legality itself, is unavailable as a bodily marker yet some people may see him and think he is "illegal." He injects himself into the exchange reaffirming the fact that he knows he cannot see anyone and presume to know their legal status. While Orlando was an undocumented migrant during each of his stays in Philadelphia he was careful to note that while he was not a citizen the problem arose when others presume his legal status and that those presumptions led to a lack of respect.

Orlando, whose mother and brother were both naturalized citizens, insists that he belongs just as "anyone else." His assertion that he belongs is grounded in his follow up statement where he he argues for his acknowledgement as an economic contributor, someone who does his job, which is preceded by the assertion that he does no harm by being in the US. Orlando draws attention to the ways in which he perceives how he is perceived as a noncitizen because of the way he looks and simultaneously notes that he is recognized only as a "generic Latino."

Orlando's experiences reveal the importance of one's social location in shaping their understanding and interpretation of racializing encounters. For Orlando and other these events become linked to issues of legal status and come to shape a sense of belonging, or really, limit a sense of belonging. He directly invokes the link between racialization and racial discrimination as a Latino to the questioning of his legal status and the consequence differential treatment.

Both Carlos and Orlando, referencing specific instances and a generalized sense

of judgment respectively, reveal the ways in which citizenship as legal status cannot protect Colombianos, or other Latinos, from presumed illegality and racialized discrimination. While citizenship as legal status is not a bodily marker, race as a constellation of physical markers, signals to others a specific social location and material positions and becomes a justification for differential and unequal treatment. In the same stroke both citizenship and race, and their inextricable link, remain best understood not as things or markers, but rather as processes and relations enacted not only in the day to day interactions between individuals but also through the systematic reproduction of racial difference and citizenship as social standing.

Citizenship as a process of belonging is often denied to Colombians as a condition of their racialized position within the US regardless of their legal status. That is to say Latinos are denied both rights and a sense of belonging because they are positioned as perpetual foreigners, permanently constructed as outside the national community on the basis of presumed illegality. Here performances and practices of belonging are how Colombians attempt to position themselves as good people who work hard, raise children, and contribute to their community regardless of legal status.

The denial of citizenship, and differential access to legal citizenship for immigrants, becomes a significant feature of their experiences of racialization. In these encounters an individual's legality does little to protect them from the ways in which they are treated as foreigners who do not belong, premised on the assumption of illegality. Bosniak states that "the idea of citizenship does a lot of work for us; it helps us to define our own identities as members of a political community, and it serves to structure our perceptions and treatment of foreigners as well" (1998: 28; see also Honig 2001). These

experiences of racial discrimination are not only tied to citizenship but also belonging, and reveal the ways that a sense of belonging is often times also accompanied by experiences of exclusion.

Citizenship as performances and practice of belonging for Colombians, are thus never fully independent from citizenship as legal status precisely because of their racialization. These experiences raises the questions of who belongs and who does not and by what criteria is their belonging questioned? Whether one has a strong sense of belonging but that sense can be partially undone or their claims for belonging can be called into question by others on the basis of race. As with Carlos, whose sense of belonging was rendered vulnerable in the face of an unpleasant racially motivated encounter with a white Philadelphia resident, belonging for Latinos is always subject to contestation as it is both an act of self-identification and identification by others.

#### Asserting Contributions: Worthiness and Belonging

Colombian migrants along the legal spectrum consistently acknowledged the benefits of legal citizenship while at the same time many underscored a deep ambivalence about naturalization and the protections or changes, if any, that naturalization afforded. For those who had attained or were seeking naturalization many had complex reasons that challenged the notion that they openly embraced the idealized notion of naturalization. While some individuals may express excitement about becoming a naturalized US citizen, others expressed disillusionment acknowledging that becoming naturalized would not really changing their everyday lives. Still the fact remains that these deep ambivalences are available only to legal permanent residents, who are only eligible for naturalization after five years of residency given that they meet all other

eligibility requirements including “good moral character” or have not traveled outside the United States for thirty months or more. Nevertheless even those pursuing naturalization often described a deep ambivalence about not only the lack of potential change in their everyday lives but also whether attaining naturalization was worth all the hoop jumping that it required (see Plascencia 2012, especially Chapter 6).

Alba would often drive me home after the *talleres* even though it was completely out of her way. She preferred to spend the extra half hour in the car chatting than “think of you waiting for the bus at night in that neighborhood.” The generosity of her car rides was also an opportunity to talk more about life, love and citizenship after class. Alba often reflected on her own life course and the decisions she made that led to her deciding to take the naturalization exam after more than thirty years in Philadelphia. A woman who migrated from Cali when she was in her early twenties joined her sister in Philadelphia in 1982. She met and quickly decided to marry her white, Philadelphia-born husband for multiple reasons. Alba said that

at the time I thought it was love, that I was in love. But really it was more practical. I wanted to stay in the country. I didn't want to go back to Colombia. I decided I wanted to stay here and with my visa expiring it seemed to both of us the logic step was to get married so that I could stay.

Alba was discouraged from naturalizing by her husband and her father-in-law “who would tell me ‘It is not necessary. Why do you want to do that? You don't need to do that.’” Early in the marriage Alba disclosed that while things were not always easy she did not feel especially compelled to seek out naturalization. But after her children were a little bit older during unhappy times in her marriage she was worried that as a noncitizen from Colombia she would either make her children suffer poverty if she ever got divorced from their US citizen father. Alba was concerned not only the downward social

mobility she might face as a single mother but also the shame of possibly needing to go on welfare and she worried about her access to welfare as an immigrant.

Everything I did for my kids. I didn't want them to have to grow up without money always worrying about money. Not that we had that much but could you imagine if I was on my own? No it seems to me that would have been impossible...I was concerned that if I left my husband I couldn't take care of my kids and give them the things they need and deserve. This was later in the 1990s, when they stopped giving welfare to immigrants. While my friend told me that that was only about ones who came later to this country but I was still worried I couldn't get it. Beyond that there was the shame of even considering that. That's not an option. It's not something I approve of but really I was just trying to plan for all my options if I decided to go. In the end I decided to stay for my kids and the kind of opportunities they could have with both parents.

While Alba expressed both her desire to leave her husband and her fear that she could not support her children on her own, she was highly critical of families who relied on cash benefits for economic subsistence. While she in other discussions asserted that, many people take advantage of the system making it harder for those who really need it in times of struggle, she considered it as only a semi-available option. Her fear that as an immigrant, even a legal permanent resident, she could be denied those benefits simply because she was not born in the US and her reluctance to consider welfare as an option if she had decided to divorce, point to the ways in which citizenship in the United States is linked to conceptions of the personal responsibility of hard-working individuals (Chock 1996; Inda 2006; DeGenova and Ramos-Zayas 2003).<sup>128</sup> Despite her reservations Alba remained married and maintained ambivalence about naturalizing.

---

<sup>128</sup> Phyllis Pease Chock, in her examination of US congressional debates on immigration reform, argues that "citizen" entails "a subject who is an income-producing worker, one who is rational and orderly, one who is head of a nuclear family that replicates the qualities of its head—that is, a unit that is productive, self-sufficient, and orderly. Conversely, non-citizen implies a subject who is dependent, irrational or disorderly, unproductive and unpaid." (1996:1). Furthermore the emphasis on individual responsibility underscores how, "neoliberal rule has tended to draw a marked distinction between the proper neoliberal citizen who secures his/her own well-being

While she may still question the utility of the exam as not changing much more than being obligated for jury duty or being able to vote in elections, her skepticism does challenge her husband's and father-in-law's assertions that it was unnecessary. She said

Looking back I think it was their way of keeping me in my place. Maybe they didn't want me to have too much independence or think I needed it. Now I think about getting it [citizenship] for me and because my children who are adults now are constantly reminding me that it's important and that it's something I should have done for myself a long time ago.

After a long time of never considering the exam, Alba decided to take the plunge and enroll in one of the *talleres*. However she remained critical of cost of the application and test, once free of charge, was now an exorbitant expense of nearly \$700. The \$595 filing fee for the N-400 Application for naturalization plus the \$85 biometric fee was a financial burden to Alba and she did not want her children to help her pay for it. The driving force for Alba at this point in her life was that her children were urging her to naturalize. Yet this decision was not without longstanding criticism. She stated

In another way I don't need a piece of paper, or another card, to tell me what I have. I am not a citizen in that I haven't passed the test, but I have the book but I don't need to study I know it all already. I have been here for many years, more than I even lived in Colombia. I lived here, worked here for many, many years.

Alba claimed her rightful place in the US by linking her own decades of contributions as a worker and a longtime US resident but also, and perhaps most crucially as a mother. Her sacrifices to stay in a difficult marriage, in part out of fear, but also out of commitment to her children whereby she decided,

It is better for them to have two of us than for me to do it by myself.  
That's how it was for me after my father left our family and I could not do

---

through active self-promotion and the deviant anti-citizen - the criminal, the homeless, the welfare recipient- who is deemed incapable of managing his/her own risks and thus lies outside the nexus of responsible activity" (Inda 2006: 76).

that to them. So I dedicate myself to my children. They are my life. I love them so much. And you know my husband he is still not great, but now that my children are adults he is much better. Much better with them and even better to me.

For Alba, her motherhood and the sacrifices she made for her children become a pathway to assert her own citizenship (Coll 2010). Here raising good citizens, both her children went to public magnet schools in the city, graduated college and got professional degrees, in effect offer Alba a sense of citizenship by proxy. She was especially proud of her children's educational accomplishments. Her son graduated from an elite East Coast college and was applying to law school while her older daughter had recently completed her MBA. These accomplishments become a critical aspect for her assertions for belonging and offer sense of ownership of her children's productivity.

I think to myself whenever someone says to me something racist or mean 'so what.' I am here, I do my part and my kids are educated, smart and successful. I am an immigrant but so what. Look what they have done, that's because of me. 'What have your kids done? What do they do?' I raised good citizens.

For Alba, like Carolina and Carlos mentioned earlier in the chapter, her claims to social rights and sense of belonging within the city come from understanding herself as a subject who contributes to the city through social reproduction as a parent; her performances of good citizenship rest in the accomplishments of children as measure of success. A moral discourse of probity informs these narratives of belonging and performances of good citizenship, where good citizenship is tied to goodness as expressed by a responsible, income producing, and caring individual. Drawing attention to intimate and familial relationships offers an alternative dimension for understanding citizenship through the practices and performances of belonging. When citizenship is strictly imagined in the juridical sense as legal status, these performances and practices of

good and caring parent are completely obscured, but parenting often became the grounds for inclusion and worthiness.

### Conclusion

I have explored the multiple ways in which citizenship takes on a widely divergent set of meanings for actor differently situated in relations of power—those with different legal statuses. Oboler notes that definitions of citizenship are “historically situated, politically verified and socially differentiated through relations within and across communities” (2006: 8). Then precisely how social actors question the very grounds of narrow conceptions of citizenship as legal formation, through their assertions of belonging, come to reveal how they understand themselves and others. Belonging can also then be understood as a repertoire of performances and practices whose meanings change over time as these performances and practices have aimed to define citizenship beyond legality in order for migrants to experience a wider, fuller scope of social and political rights. I have shown how the links between citizenship as a legal formation and citizenship as lived experience shape notions of belonging particular to their experiences in Philadelphia.

Citizenship as lived experience, particularly for Colombians in the US, offers a conception of citizenship where political rights are inextricable from social, civil and cultural rights and recognition. Oboler notes that as a result, regardless of their citizenship status and varied political participation, Latinos are “simultaneously contributing once again to reconfiguration of the meaning of belonging to a collectivity and hence of citizenship in its broadest sense, through their struggles against ongoing exclusion and for social justice and the affirmation of human dignity” (2006: 23). The key then becomes how to understand both how Colombian migrants in Philadelphia

construct and assert citizenship through the everyday performances and practices belonging, but also to recognize the limits of those assertions. Though many embraced notions of “good” citizenship as a potential shield against racial discrimination, regardless of political status Colombians also constantly confronted racism that constructed them as illegal, foreign, unwanted and illegitimate. The disjunctures between Colombians’ sense of belonging and their experiences of exclusion, reaffirm the need to more carefully understand the articulations of citizenship within structures of inequality.

Yet racial belonging for Colombians in Philadelphia implicated more than just a sense of citizenship beyond legality. Assertions of Colombianidad that relied upon the ways Colombians sought to distance and distinguish themselves from other Latinos in the city similarly shored up notions of worthiness, deservingness and goodness. Still the production of Colombianidad was premised on navigating the local racial hierarchy of Philadelphia in conjunction with the history and racial geography of Colombia, which informed how Colombians in the city sought to position themselves alongside and against other Latinos in the city.

## CHAPTER 7

CONSTRUYENDO DIFERENCIAS, CONSTRUCTING DIFFERENCES:  
RACIALIZATION AND LATINO CONTRADISTINCTION

As the previous chapter explored assertions of citizenship that emphasize the value and contributions that Colombians offer regardless of legal status in Philadelphia, this chapter focuses on the production of Colombianidad between the local dynamics of Philadelphia and the past and present of Latin America. Focusing on how Colombians attempt to distinguish themselves from other Latinos in the city reveals how Colombianidad is an active negotiation of fluid and contingent identities and elucidates how experiences in Philadelphia in terms of race and belonging are also in dialogue with circumstances, conditions and experiences in Colombia. I argue that ideas about race and difference formed in Colombia, and with reference to Colombia's history and geopolitical position within Latin America, shape the ways Colombian understand and racialize other Latinos in Philadelphia.

Here I offer an analysis of what I term *Latino contradistinction*, by which I refer to the processes and efforts of Latinos to meaningfully distinguish themselves from one another. This chapter focuses on the processes by which and the grounds upon which Colombians establish parameters that meaningfully distinguish themselves from other Latinos in Philadelphia. Yet as efforts of distinction are commonly enacted in everyday speech and in mundane ways, they have received little scholarly attention within the literature on the historic or contemporary racialization of Latinos.

To examine the production, meaning and consequences of Latino contradistinction this chapter focuses on three particular instantiations of difference. First the chapter explores how Colombians in Philadelphia comes to understand themselves

alongside their perceptions of Venezuela and Venezuelans. This points to the multiple ways that the historical relations between Colombia and Venezuela and their contemporary clashes and divergent national politics are in dialogue with the experiences of Colombians in Philadelphia. It becomes clear that countries of origin continue to supply the organizing schemes to interpret the racial calculus of Philadelphia among most Colombians as Latin American migrants in the exterior and US born Latinos.

Second I explore how local racial formations merge and are negotiated within Latino contradistinction. Specifically the section examines how Colombians produce and reproduce the negative racialization of Puerto Ricans in ways that draw from dominant US discourse of inferiority, dependency and lack of work ethic. The issue of citizenship, specifically legality and access to employment, positions Puerto Ricans as the urban underclass, as some Colombians come to assert their superiority as hard-working immigrants. During fieldwork I encountered rich commentary that subordinated Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia based on their “deficient” citizenship in contrast to the supposed the “worthiness” of Colombian migrants (see Ramos-Zayas 2004). Despite shared racial marginalization as Latinos, the convergence of local racial formations and Colombians’ contradistinctions creates both difference and distance as some assert their national identity to shield themselves from the racial discrimination Puerto Ricans face.

Third, the chapter explores how conceptions of race grounded in the geography of Colombia that dichotomize the Andean, mestizo interior from the Blackness of the Caribbean coast, come to be mapped onto Caribbean Latinos in Philadelphia. These assessments of contradistinction drew upon racialized differences both here and there, and became mapped onto judgments about gender, sexuality and bodily comportment.

Specifically the notion of good presence, or *buena presencia*, entails corporeal performances of classed and gendered notions of appropriate behavior, attitude and dress and was used to distance Colombians from other Caribbean Latinos and US-born Blacks. As De Genova and Ramos Zayas note (2003) racially subordinated groups are compelled to vie with one another for position within the racial hierarchy of the US. Hence not only do Colombians draw on dynamics within Latin America to understand and meaningfully differentiate themselves from other Latinos in Philadelphia, they draw upon the racial dynamics in the city to better position themselves within the racial hierarchy.

This chapter examines how Colombians navigate racial identification in their social relations and daily encounters in Philadelphia through an ongoing engagement with the past and present dynamics of Latin America. Colombians' assertions of social differentiation are key to understand how transformations in conceptions of race and local racial formations are produced in Philadelphia but enacted within and across transnational, national and local scales. Latino contradistinction renegotiates conceptions of race and racial boundaries as Colombian migrants continue to draw upon national and regional conceptions of racial difference in Colombia and Latin America.

Along these lines, the chapter explores the ways conceptual boundaries are constituted, produced and reproduced by social relations and power inequalities across time and space, in conversation with the past and present of Colombia and in conversation with the experiences of Colombians in Philadelphia. I examine how these boundaries enacted, enforced and embodied in order to reveal what these boundaries are contingent upon, what they are grounded in as well as the stakes of these boundaries and the consequences of these boundaries.

Within the framework of contradistinction, racialization is not only something attributed to Latinos from the outside by others but also something Colombians actively grappled with as they worked hard to meaningfully construct boundaries between themselves and other Latinos. Following De Genova and Ramos Zayas (2003) who explore how Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago produce parameters of racialized difference between one another in terms of competing frameworks of deservingness and worthiness, emotional disposition and bodily comportment, and civility and modernity, I argue that Colombians express Latino contradistinction as eminently racialized differences. These differences are racialized because they are understood as “inherent” characteristics, dispositions and perceptions as a racial formation grounded on different, and only sometimes overlapping, sociopolitical circumstances in Latin America, the US and Philadelphia.

These efforts become part and parcel of Colombians understanding of themselves and others, even other Colombianos as part of a wider set racializing discourses. Though some are explicitly about race, there are also covert racializing discourses whereby people, places, things, and practices become marked as inherently other, without having to ever be directly about race. Thus such issues as dress and comportment become identifying cultural features that point to historically grounded indexical regimes and “the ways such indexical regimes ‘lay claim on’ people” (Wirtz and Dick 2011: E4). These quotidian and everyday instances of self-positioning become the creation and legitimation of social difference within Philadelphia in ways that implicate relations within Latin America and relations between Latinos.

As those marked as Latino are members distinct groups with particular histories of subjugation and resistance, an emphasis on contradistinction also serves as a corrective against the homogenization of Latino/ Hispanic identity that not only erase differences but associates Latinos/Hispanics as dangerous, low-class, and poorly-educated (Oboler 1995). The focus on Colombianos and their efforts of distinction emphasizes Colombians as social actors who produce ideas about Colombian-ness vis-à-vis other Latino groups but also draws attention to the variegated processes of racialization for Latinos as “members” of the same racialized group.<sup>129</sup> I examine the construction of Colombianidad as inextricably linked to the construction of Latinidad, efforts of pan-Latino unity or understanding of solidarity, because of common political social and economic circumstances in the US that on occasion are coterminous or overlapping, but frequently position Colombianness as separate and discrete from the experiences of other Latino nationals. In constructions of the latter it is the mechanisms, processes and grounds by which those nationality defined differences are given salience and the ways in which they are distinctions that rely on and produce a particular form of racialization.

A critical aspect that remains unexplored is how relationships between countries of origin continue to shape the ways in which US Latinos understand themselves in relation to one another. Similarly, though much attention has been focused on the contingent nature of *Latinidad*, pan-Latino identity or *Latinismo* (Padilla 1985; Oboler

---

<sup>129</sup> De Genova and Ramos Zayas critique both the U.S. census race/ethnicity categories as well as the scholarship that posits that Latinos/Hispanics constitute an ethnic group. They state, “like much of the Latino Studies scholarship by sociologists, political scientists, and literary or cultural critics, anthropological research on ‘Latinos’ (or ‘Hispanics’) in the United States is often trapped by a tendency to subsume its subject under the conceptual frameworks of ‘culture’ or ‘ethnicity.’...relying upon biological or phenotypic notions of discrete racial categories, the U.S. Census has explicitly reserved the ‘Hispanic’ category as an officially non-‘racial’ one. By treating ‘Hispanic’ as an ‘ethnic’ designation, Latinos are thereby encouraged to identify ‘racially’ as white, Black, or Native American—in short, as anything but Latino.” (2003: 15)

1995; cf De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003), efforts towards distinction and social differentiation are not only salient, but also commonly produced, constructed and enacted in everyday discussions and through mundane activities. Contradistinction as a particular manifestation of racialization recaptures the processual and dynamic sense of how local, region, national and indeed transnational identities become constructed as supposed inherent characteristics. These modalities of difference are at one imagined, produced and enacted within the boundary work of Latino contradistinction to recuperate a processual understanding of the construction of Latin America from outside its borders.

#### Understanding Colombia in Latin America Through Colombianos *en el Exterior*

As E.H. Carr noted, history is “an unending dialogue between the past and the present.” This unending dialogue between the past and present points to the ways that Colombians in Philadelphia produced contradistinction in dialogue with the sociopolitical relationships of Latin American nations, often times in terms of historically complicated relationships but also with explicit reference to current events. Under the changing conditions and political regimes of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, Colombianos in Philadelphia craft notions of self whereby they seek to differentiate themselves from others in ways that are not only historically contingent upon conditions within Colombia and relations between Latin American nations but also emergent as these hemispheric dynamics shift towards new political alignments and economic relationships.

De Genova’s conception of *Mexican Chicago* stands as a corrective to perspectives that see Latin America as outside the United States, suggesting that “rather than an outpost or extension of Mexico, therefore, the ‘Mexican’-ness of Mexican Chicago signifies a permanent disruption of the space of the US nation-state and

embodies the possibility of something truly new, a radically different social formation” (2005:190). The lens of Latino contradistinction offers a similar epistemological way to think through the conceptual divide of inside/outside national and hemispheric borders and offers a more complete way to approach the racialization of Latinos as still shaped by dynamics in Latin America. In this respect the presence of Latin America in the US, is constituted *materially* in neighborhoods and social spaces, *embodied* through the dynamics of migration and demographic changes which leads to the increasing presence of Latinos, but also *ideologically* as Colombians draw upon hemispheric relations to understand themselves as social actors.

*Tensions Past and Present: Venezuela and Colombia/Venezuelanos and Colombianos*

Many first and second-generation migrants maintain the primacy of national-origins, defining themselves first as Colombianos or Dominicanos or Venezuelanos, and then only sometimes afterward as Latinos (or Hispanics).<sup>130</sup> The centrality of nationality is formulated among Latinos both through relationships within the city of Philadelphia but often times in response to the salience of national difference forged during the years spent in Latin America. For Colombians, one of the most important national differences came from the historical tensions between Colombia and Venezuela, despite the relative

---

<sup>130</sup> See Goode and Schneider 1994 for a discussion of the salience of national identity and national difference for newer Latino migrants. The particular ethnographic example discusses a unity festival held at a local North Philadelphia parish where the priests who planned the event use a large banner that simply read “Hispanic.” As a measure of resistance Latinos from Colombia, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Mexico and El Salvador tore down the banner and went home to procure flags and other symbols of national difference. Goode and Schneider also note that non-Puerto Rican migrants, like Colombians, highlight their national identities to avoid being identified as Puerto Rican. See too Oboler 1995 for a discussion of the primacy of national origins amongst those racialized as Hispanic or Latino in the US. See De Genova and Ramos-Zayas chapter 7 of *Latino Crossings* for a fuller discussion of Latino identity as a project of the middle class, a projection onto 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Latinos, but also the abjection of US-born children of immigrants.

paucity of Venezuelans in the city.

Over *arepas de choclo*, griddled, sweet yellow corn cakes, Ernesto shared his sentiments about the relationship between Venezuelans and Colombians after we spent the morning outside a church on North 5<sup>th</sup> st at a *concentración por la paz*, gathering for peace, dedicated to calling attention to the 2010 border conflicts between Colombia and Venezuela. He said,

Well now the Venezuelans have to come down a notch, you understand? They've always thought, well, they thought they are better than us. And now, well, with Chávez they can't act like they used because of that oil money. Now they can't just think they're superior, can't be all "high and mighty." They live down on earth with us now.

Ernesto felt strongly about the border tensions between the two nations that summer, and his comment jumped across time and space, joining that morning's event in Philadelphia to the long history of the neighboring nations. Ernesto's comment implicated how Latin America is ever-present in the lives of Colombians decades after they migrate.

The 2010 crisis was a diplomatic standoff between the two nations over allegations from then President of Colombia Alvaro Uribe that the Venezuelan government was actively permitting the FARC and ELN guerrillas safe haven in its territory. Officials long contended that guerrillas used the alleged assistance from Venezuela to cross back into Colombia and attack armed forces and civilians, and this particular iteration received much international attention and US coverage. Ernesto was acutely aware of the new perceptions about Venezuela that travelled globally under the rule of Chávez, and in a way, argued that it was necessary for Venezuelans in the US, who in his perception, thought they were better than other Latinos because of their historical association with the prestige and capital of oil. His comment draws upon a

longer history of Colombia-Venezuela relations but is primarily about how contemporary changes affect the ways Latinos think about themselves and others. Though he often critiqued the Chávez regime and its relationship to Colombia, Ernesto expressed relief that the reputation of Venezuelans no longer seemed unimpeachable.

Returning to Ernesto's remark, though it was tossed off casually after attending the gathering for peace in the summer of 2010, and before Chávez passed away, it was highly attuned to the relations between Colombians and Venezuela within Latin America and between Colombianos and Venezuelanos in Philadelphia. Further compounding the long, complex history between the two nations is the large wave of Colombians who migrated in the 1970s in search of work in Venezuela's growing economy, which was fueled by the increased price of petroleum.<sup>131</sup> The demand for labor soared as the Venezuelan government saw state revenues increase 250 percent between 1972 and 1974 as international oil prices rose, while in the same period the drug trade emerged in Colombia. As a result many Colombians entered Venezuela in the 1970s without authorization and became concentrated in low-end jobs. Yet the motivation to migrate to Venezuela lay in the prospect of higher-paying jobs, and not lack of employment in Colombia. Higher wages, even in low skilled jobs such as construction, manufacturing, commerce and agriculture, allowed Colombians working across Venezuela, but often

---

<sup>131</sup> In the 1950s there was also a significant flow of Colombian migrants to Venezuela as rural to urban migration in Venezuela diminished the pool of available workers and created a demand for labor to fill the growing agricultural sector. Yet because of Venezuela's closed borders and restrictive immigration policies much of the labor migrants recruited from Colombia entered illegally. Still, the numbers were far more limited in comparison to the migrations flows of the 1970s.

concentrated in border states, to save money and send remittances back home to supplement household incomes in Colombia (Mármora 1979).<sup>132</sup>

Though none of my informants had ever migrated to Venezuela for work, several mentioned Colombian migration to Venezuela as shaping the perceptions of Colombians in Latin America as “lower-class,” “unsophisticated” workers desperately seeking a way out of their country. The clandestine nature of migration into Venezuela in the 1970s created perceptions of Colombians as “illegals,” an unwanted presence seldom recognized for their necessity in producing economic growth. Ernesto’s comments harken back to the dynamics of decades past in ways that account for the contemporary relations between Latinos and the perceptions of their nations of origin within the US.

Ernesto, who migrated directly to Philadelphia from Cali in 1988 at the age of 34, as a late adolescent and young adult during the height of Colombian migration to Venezuela remained highly attuned to the reputations projected onto the Colombian migrants of the 1970s. He continued to incorporate the dynamics of the Latin American migrations into his understanding of himself as a Colombiano as well as his understanding of other Latinos in Philadelphia. His comments bring into sharp relief how

---

<sup>132</sup> The National Employment Service of Colombia, the Servicio Nacional de Empleo (SENALDE), a part of the Ministry of Labor and Social Security created a labor migration program in 1978 that surveyed Colombian deportees from Venezuela about their motivations to leave and their employment histories. Murillo Castana (1988) argued that migration to Venezuela should be understood as a short-term strategy for mobility with few how desired to relocate permanently. The survey analyzed the income-consumption relationship as a factor of expulsion and concluded that poverty was not the main impetus for migration as migrants' homes and incomes were generally sufficient to cover minimal needs in Colombia. For Murillo Castana migration was better explained by a “pull” factor the knowledge that higher incomes were in other areas, which would allow for savings and improvement in future economic conditions. Between 556,000 and 580,000 Colombians migrated to Venezuela between 1964 and 1973 where approximately 100,000 migrated legally and the remainder without authorization. According to Sassen-Koob (1979) Colombian migration to Venezuela increased 113% in the period from 1971-1976 jumping from 87,691 to 187,422. Currently there are approximately 4 million Colombians living in Venezuela.

the past remains in the present as his perception of the residual xenophobia Venezuelans held for Colombians, those who migrated and those who did not, informs how he imagines their so-called social superiority to be in jeopardy in the United States because of Chávez's government.<sup>133</sup>

Sustained migration between individuals from the neighboring nations and political tensions in the 21<sup>st</sup> century come with a new set of consequences for Colombians and Venezuelan in the exterior. This history undoubtedly contributed to Ernesto's perception of Venezuelans' perceptions of Colombians, perceptions that carry over into their lives in the US. He, like many Colombians, not only drew upon past relations to craft a particular kind of racial calculus whereby contemporary geopolitical relations in Latin America converged with local relations to influence the shifting position of Latino groups within the particular racial hierarchy of Philadelphia.

Impromptu events planned in response to unfolding political events, such as the gathering for peace in 2010 and a 2008 vigil in Philadelphia following the release of Ingrid Betancourt, a former presidential candidate kidnapped on the campaign trail by guerilla forces, were fruitful moments during fieldwork to analyze how political rifts between nations can affect Latino contradistinction even as they promote unity. They became opportunities to trace discussions about how current events in Latin America shape conceptions of Colombianidad vis-à-vis other Latinos.

Part of why Ernesto's comment struck me was not simply because it was at a rally for peace, but because his was not the only one that day and I would come to realize

---

<sup>133</sup> Pellegrino (1984) underscores the fact that in the 1970s Cali, as the capital of Valle de Cauca, experienced much in migration from rural areas in Colombia as it was simultaneously a locus of out migration to Venezuela.

throughout fieldwork that these expressions of difference and distinction were ubiquitous. Miriam, a social worker in her early 30s who migrated to Philadelphia in 2000, grabbed my arm and said in a hushed voice, “You know things have gotten really bad because Venezuelans pretend to be Colombian now.” Though I never encountered any Venezuelan who tried to cover-up their national-origin, these sorts of comments were ever-present, as people commented on the state of affairs in Latin America and Caribbean, relating it to their own connections and experiences with people from those nations in Philadelphia.

Months after the *concentración por la paz*, I had dinner at Miriam’s house. With dinner trays in front of each of us, Miriam, her husband Nicolas and I had pushed our empty plates aside, as we sat on their floral couch, engaged in a vivid *sobremesa*<sup>134</sup> while watching the news. Inevitably our discussion was shaped by the local and international news stories covered on channel 65, Univision, that was part of their nightly repertoire. Miriam and Nicolas, who migrated in 1999 at the age of 25 from a small town west of Cali, often paid extra attention to news stories that covered current events in Colombia.

That evening was no exception as Miriam hushed Nicolas’ discussion of local sports so that she could turn up the volume and listen to a story about the development of biofuels in Latin America that featured Colombia. The main part of the segment covered Colombia’s flourishing biofuel industry and how Colombia, in light of its success, was lending support to other countries, including El Salvador, Honduras and the Dominican Republic, that were interested in developing their own biofuel industries. Though there

---

<sup>134</sup> The literal meaning is “over the table” but signifies time spent talking, relaxing and enjoying company after a meal, though it can also refer to simply having dessert. Though it usually means conversations at the table I still use in this context in spite of our “unusual” arrangement of trays across the living room in front of the television.

were few details as the story was brief, Miriam vowed to investigate this new information on the Internet the following morning. She noted,

Now look at that. We are helping other countries! They should be happy and thank us. I have my friend Gloria from the Dominican Republic next door and María from El Salvador at work. I am going to have to tell them about it.

Miriam's eagerness to share Colombia's development efforts in the region, also implicates Colombia's rising geopolitical power in Latin America as discussed in Chapter 3. Indeed, Miriam wanted to share the news with those in her social networks considering it important to promote the positive changes in her home nation. After the segment was over, and after some careful moments spent thinking in silence, she remarked that "Oil is not the way any more. All the global warming is no good. Now the way is going to be biofuels and we are helping to move the world forward." Miriam went on to position Colombia's involvement in this industry as "moving the world forward" because it was not as environmentally hazardous as fossil fuels and Colombia's embrace of green energy would help to combat climate change.

More importantly Miriam contextualized these efforts through a veiled reference to oil, and in doing so, indexes Venezuela's oil industry and positions it as part of an "outdated" past. While Miriam and Nicolas drew upon their knowledge of current events in Latin America and the Caribbean to come to terms with their social world, Miriam again alludes to the tensions between Colombia and Venezuela as one of the most critical relationships for understanding Colombia's position in the hemisphere. Her eye on Venezuela and Venezuelans shaped her understandings of Colombia and herself as a Colombian as she celebrates Colombia's "forward thinking" in biofuels and emphasizes how this progress is being used to help other countries. Similarly her earlier claim that

some Venezuelans in Philadelphia pretend to be Colombian now likewise shows how the politics of Latin America come to shape the experiences of Latinos in Philadelphia, specifically through contradistinction.

The sentiments expressed by Ernesto and Miriam are noteworthy because comments on the difference between Colombians and Venezuelans are some of the most ubiquitous despite the fact that there are less than 800 Venezuelans in Philadelphia while Colombians are number 5,000 in the city alone and have a longer history of migration to the area.<sup>135</sup> Yet returning once again to the geopolitics of Latin America, the largest proportion of Colombians who reside outside their country live in the United States, but the second largest group of Colombians who reside outside the nation live in Venezuela.

The efforts of contradistinction are not limited to Colombia-Venezuela relations under the regime of Chávez.<sup>136</sup> Given the longstanding presence of Colombians in Philadelphia juxtaposed with their relatively marginal size, not as big as the biggest groups, but significantly bigger than other national-origin Latino groups, and given the heterogeneity of North Philadelphia neighborhoods where many Latinos reside, many Colombians understand themselves relative to other Latinos.

Diagnoses of the performances of others offer a new perspective on sameness and difference between individuals and communities whose presumed commonalities of

---

<sup>135</sup> Moreover there are nearly 8,000 Colombians in the five-county Philadelphia metropolitan area and only approximately 1,500 Venezuelans.

<sup>136</sup> There were also discussions beauty pageants that drew upon ideas about differences in conceptions of beauty and national rivalries between Colombia and Venezuela. A particular sore spot for some as Venezuela had won more international beauty pageant titles (Miss World and Miss Universe) than another nation. Often times when Venezuelan contestants won or did better than Colombian contestants in these platforms several interlocutors who watched the pageants decried the outcomes as unfair and biased toward Venezuelans who also imagine their superiority over Colombians in terms of having the “world’s most beautiful women.”

language, ethnoracial category or migration status often overshadow the detailed, fine-grained efforts toward distinction and the grounds upon which those distinctions were rendered meaningful.

#### Contradistinction through Intralantino Local Racial Formations

Frances Aparicio explains that thinking about relations amongst and between Latinos is best conceptualized as “intralantino” as opposed to “interlatino” because “intralantino” specifically refers to “within” and “inside,” thus “foregrounding the heterogeneity within the ethnic label of “Latino/a” and the diverse tensions, conflicts, and transformations that take place within this community” (2009: 639). These intralantino experiences constitute local racial formations in Philadelphia and shed light on the dynamics of contradistinction. These local racial formations draw upon transnational social relations as shaped by the contours of particular histories, geographies, politics and economics outside the boundaries of the United States and renegotiate the existing racialized division and class formations within Philadelphia.

Jones notes that for migrants “the process of becoming raced requires a revision of pre-existing ideas in relation to their experiences, especially in terms of access to mobility in the host community” (2012: 62). Latinos, as well as non-Latinos, are often compelled to vie with one another for position within the local racial hierarchy in ways that can create surprising alliances and cleavages. As efforts of distinction play out in locally specific ways there exists a tension between the aspirations for upward mobility, positive social recognition and the retrenchment of racialized marginalization and criminalization of other Latinos and people of color. These tensions in turn produce but also transform the local racial formations of the city as the demographics continue to

move away from a strict Black-White divide.

*Between Colombians and Puerto Ricans: Work, Morality and Citizenship*

Recall Abel, a man in his late 60s originally from Cali, who was introduced in chapter 4. Abel migrated to Philadelphia in 1978 without papers, and spent the remainder of that decade and most of the 1980s in manufacturing while those jobs still lingered in the city. During his first ten years in Philadelphia, Abel confronted anti-Latino bias at his work place with a boss who did not want to hire “Hispanics.” Abel attempted to navigate around this racism by passing for White during a job interview while relying on being able to pass as Puerto Rican in order to get false documents that allowed him to be eligible for work. Eventually Abel attempted to petition anti-Latino boss for his sister to be hired, but he carefully had to position her as a “good” Puerto Rican—an exception to all the other kinds of Puerto Ricans. Here the formal US citizenship that Puerto Ricans possess became both a resource that facilitates their entrée into the labor market but also the source of their supposed poor attitude about work, drawing from the culture of poverty discourses that permeated many Colombian’s perceptions of Puerto Ricans in the early years of community formation (see discussion in Chapter 3).

Despite this reliance on Puerto Ricanness that provided Abel and his sister with opportunities Abel still sought to distance himself from Puerto Ricans in terms of morality and hard-work. As he criticized Puerto Ricans for their entitlement, using their US citizenship as evidence of having it easier than Colombians, Abel sought to distinguish himself from Puerto Ricans in order not to be seen as inferior. Abel’s careful navigation of the local Philadelphia racial hierarchy embraced using Puerto Rican’s citizenship for his own advantage when it suited him while he readily embracing his own

national identity to contrast against stereotypes associated with Puerto Ricans.

Always impeccably dressed and with a thoughtful and deliberate speaking manner, Abel narrated to me how a confluence of particular circumstances in Colombia, lead to his ability to pass as French Canadian in order to be hired for his first job in Philadelphia. Recounting how his existing knowledge of French and his employment as a teacher at a technical high school in Colombia lead to his migration to Canada and eventually Philadelphia, Abel said,

So I did speak a little bit of French I was always thinking maybe one day I could maybe go to France. Well I could never but the first opportunity was for the second best, which was Québec, Canada. I was working in an educational institution in Colombia where they teach the trades. It was not a regular academic setting. We were teaching the kids who didn't want to do the regular high school or whatever. I was at a fishing school teaching. I was teaching math and Spanish. It just so happens that Canada had sent a cultural mission to help that Colombian institution with the development and improvement. So they promised a fishing ship. You know we were a fishing school without a ship! Do you believe that? In Buenaventura!<sup>137</sup> I was in Buenaventura in 1972. From 1972 to 1975. So when this mission arrived there was a gift from the Canadian government, a full fishing ship, and it so happens that the delegation was French-speaking people. They needed a translator and I was the only one who spoke a little bit of French at that school in Buenaventura. So they asked me to join them to be the translator. That how I started the links, with Canada and the French-speaking people over there. I got in very good terms with the direct of the mission. I was driving him up and down from Buenaventura to Cali. When I told him I wanted to leave Colombia he said "Why don't you apply to a Québec university and go there as a student? And then maybe from there you can get a permanent visa. Start working and what not.

As noted in Chapter 4, Abel left Cali to study at a university in Québec City and left when he was no longer to sustain himself working jobs under the table. A friend offered him lodging and Abel made the journey to join him in Philadelphia without papers.

---

<sup>137</sup> A city on the coast of the Pacific Ocean in the Valle de Cauca departamentos that in 1970s became a key port city in the burgeoning drug trade.

When he arrived in the United States his friend presented Abel with a social security card with the name “Juan Ramos” on it. The real Juan Ramos had been born in Puerto Rico and lived in Philadelphia for a while but never enjoyed living stateside and returned to the island after selling his SSN. Abel made no compunction about taking advantage of the birthright citizenship afforded to Puerto Ricans when he used the papers of Juan Ramos to get work in the US. Abel consistently relied upon the generosity of Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia in order to get documentation that would help him gain employment.

While working at the film development factory Abel was put in touch with Puerto Rican woman who he was told could get him a papers in his own name. He explained,

So I gave her the \$120 and the rest she did. About a month later she came with the legit social security card together with a certificate of birth from Puerto Rico for Abel. I probably still have those. I was born in Cyuga, or a similar name. Anyway she got me that. With that I was able to get a driver’s license and then I saw I needed to get out of that place [the film development shop]. They didn’t know that I was now Abel Valencia.

With documents now in his real name Abel no longer wanted to work at the film development factory. His roommate in North Philadelphia at the time was a young Filipina woman who suggested that he interview at her mother’s workplace because she knew that he was thinking about leaving the film place but she warned him that the owners of the company, a large fishing equipment manufacturer whose headquarters were in Philadelphia, did not like Hispanics.

Abel, committed to finding a new job, did not want to miss the opportunity so he said, as he put it, “told the big, big lie of my life. Or one of the biggest lies of my life.” During his interview he said he was a French Canadian who was down in the States looking for work, an assertion that was not only facilitated by his light-skin and hazel

eyes but also by his partial fluency in French. Abel also was hoping that because the owners were German he would be able to pass as French Canadian. The interviewer, one of the family members of the company asked if he had a social security card and when Abel confirmed he did, the employer did not ask any more question and he started work the next day.

As Abel entered without papers he circumvented the legal obstacles to his employment using the social security number of a Puerto Rican man for his first job at a film-processing factory and later by presenting himself as French Canadian for his interview at the fishing manufacturer for a boss who was “biased against Hispanic.” Abel’s eligibility was also only made possible through his social relations with Puerto Ricans who lent their identities and risked their own security to other Latinos in need.

#### *Navigating Puerto Ricanness as Colombians*

After a few years working at that company, Abel’s younger sister migrated to the United States. He wanted to help her find a job at the fishing equipment company but was again confronted with the employer’s anti-Hispanic bias that he was able to get around but he was not sure how to navigate the issue for his sister, Leticia, whose darker olive-toned skin, dark eyes and dark hair could not as easily be read as White or ambiguously White as Abel had. He said,

I was a ‘French Canadian’ and also I knew his bias against Hispanics. So what do I do? She’s a Hispanic, she’s my sister. What do I do? I went to his office and said, ‘Listen Robert. I know this lady. I just know this lady from Puerto Rico. I just came into her knowledge and I need you to help her. She’s a nice lady she doesn’t speak English.’ He said ‘Don’t worry there will be someone here who speaks English.’ He said, “Are you sure she’s a good person?” I said ‘Yes. She might be from Puerto Rico. She might be Hispanic but she’s nice. And she’s a good worker.’ So he took my word for it.

Abel had to vouch for his sister by concealing their relationship as siblings, and then had to present her as a Puerto Rican (and therefore legal and employable as a US citizen) but also as an exceptional Puerto Rican who was “nice” and a “hard-worker” counter to his employer’s perception. He was willing and able to take advantage of the legality of Puerto Ricans for his sister’s employment and his passing as a French Canadian meant that he could attest to her character.

Abel often worked several jobs at once, ranging from the film development factory to the fishing equipment company but he also worked as a technician for copiers and printers. In these spaces he often worked with other recently arrived immigrants (both from Latin America and elsewhere) as well as island-born and Philadelphia-born Puerto Ricans. The intimate environments of work and workplace dynamics provided interactions that shaped Abel’s assessment of his co-workers disposition towards “hard work,” which informed his understanding of how he should and could relate to Puerto Ricans. Though his sister Leticia was hired as the “good” kind of Puerto Rican, Abel shared some of the same anti-Puerto Rican sentiments as his boss.

Though his German employer was not American-born either he had internalized the pervasive negative stereotypes about Latinos. Speculating about why his boss developed such a bias, Abel discussed particular Puerto Rican co-workers, their attitude, habits and behavior to other co-workers and work itself as a possible rationale for the employer’s anti-Latino prejudice.

And I’m going to tell you why he got this bias probably justifiable, or not, I don’t know. [To his sister] Leticia, I don’t know if you remember this Puerto Rican guy. There was this Puerto Rican guy who worked in the shop where I worked. He was probably fine but you know more than often he would engage in fights, physical fights with whomever, especially with Americans. For this or for that, for any reason. He [Abel’s co-worker],

was lazy, he was bad all around. So maybe that's why he [their boss] was against Hispanics.

In contrast to this problematic Puerto Rican co-worker Abel positioned himself as an ideal worker, who “remained quiet and kept my nose down” to keep on working. Abel's assessment of the Puerto Rican co-worker relied on racialized assessments of his temperament—bad and prone to fighting, which combined with his attitude towards work, lazy, as part of larger Puerto Rican workforce who upon his arrival and integration into the local labor market appeared to Abel as “not as interested in work, finding it or keeping it [as others].” These assessments echo the racialization of Puerto Ricans in the United States more generally (Whalen 2001; Ramos Zayas 2003, 2004; De Genova and Ramos Zayas 2005; Urciuoli 1996).

Abel's social network in the mid-1970s was primarily Colombian but included other immigrants, co-workers and neighbors, and other Puerto Ricans he came to know through his Colombian social group. His assessment of this particular bad co-worker resonates with his interpretation of the lack of upward mobility for other Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia. He described Puerto Ricans as “immigrants who were not like the other immigrants” because,

while they didn't have it as easy as Americans, they have it easier than us foreigners. I did not have the paper work but I found the way to work and at one point had three different jobs. And yet I didn't need all three to pay the bills, it was nice to have more money to send home. But many [Puerto Ricans] that I knew complained about the jobs they did have. There were too many hours, not enough money. For them it was easier to get jobs but they didn't want them in the same way that others needed them and didn't mind. In a way, not in all ways, they had it too easy.

For Abel it becomes “too easy” for Puerto Ricans to find a job in the absence of illegality and the precarity that comes with it, and in his formulation this difference of citizenship

“allows” Puerto Ricans to become complainers who instead of being “grateful” for the work take issue with the conditions and pay. These expressions construct a moral sense of self in distinction to the supposed entitlement and laziness of Puerto Ricans.

In this juxtaposition Abel constructs himself, and non-Puerto Rican immigrants, as deserving workers who will allow no obstacles to block their path to employment. What is absent from Abel’s assessment is acknowledgement of the exploitation that he and many other immigrants faced or the acknowledgement of the ambivalent surrender to the exploitation because they did not always have the legal status to feel comfortable fighting it. His assessment also accepts the racial disparities in opportunities and hiring biases that Puerto Ricans and Latinos more generally faced, which was something Abel experienced first hand from his job at the fishing equipment manufacturer. As an unauthorized migrant before the passage of IRCA in 1986, Abel relied not only his ability to racial pass for both French Canadian, and ultimately White, and the ability to pass for Puerto Rican when it suited him but also on the benefits of US citizenship Puerto Ricans had access to that he did not prior to amnesty. At the same time Abel, other Colombianos and other Latinos, diminished Puerto Ricans’ disposition towards work as undermining the benefits that come with legality while recognizing racial discrimination without considering how it could impact complaints about work.

Like Abel’s assessment of his work conditions and the attitudes of his Puerto Rican co-worker, these forms of contradistinction are strategies developed to navigate the racial dynamics of Philadelphia. It reveals how Colombians negotiate their place in the local racial hierarchy through the ways they understand themselves in terms of others. In one way these efforts of contradistinction seek to combat insidious racialized stereotypes

of Latinos as lazy, illegal and dangerous. At the same time it represents pitting “hard-working immigrants” against native-born minorities who are constructed as unwilling to work. Colombianos, like Abel and others, must perform selves that not only affirm their moral deservingness but also perform selves that distinguish them from other Latinos in order to counter biases. Yet these particular deployments of contradistinction can reinscribe and perpetuate the very same racial hierarchy Colombian seek to renegotiate. In Abel’s accounts there are attempts to distance oneself and shield one’s self from negative stereotypes associated with Latinos. These claims also become strategies for positive social recognition but also reproduce structures of inequality. This distancing makes possible the crafting of particular notions of self and subject positions that respond to new relations to citizenship and civil society as well as new relationships to Latino under their changing circumstances in Philadelphia. As Colombians and other Latinos “devise a variety of new subject positions in reaction to their new political status and changing material conditions in the United States” (Gutiérrez 1999: 486), individuals, families and communities draw upon long-term historical understandings of differences between Latinos and the new and present circumstances within the city.

The policing of boundaries of what Colombianness meant vis-à-vis Puerto Ricanness reinforced aspirations of upward mobility rooted in deservingness and worthiness, supported by economic expectations of “hard-working” and “polite” citizenship, seeks to push out “deviant” performances and people outside of the boundaries of Latinidad. Doing so in lays claims of superiority in a context of marginalization, even alienating those who might otherwise understand these experiences and fight against racial discrimination. Expanding upon the boundary work between and

amongst Latinos in the next section I examine how Colombianos actively negotiate their place in local hierarchies through an engagement in the construction of racialized differences that draw upon assessments and evaluations of class, gender, aesthetics, sexuality and geography.

Good Presence, Good People/ *Buena Presencia, Buena Gente*: Gender, Sexuality, and Taste

Issues of bodily comportment, dress, and *buena presencia* often became the material that constructed the very boundaries of distinction drawing from and reinscribing particular notions about gender, sexuality and geography. I argue that the highlighting of these differences and the implications of *buena presencia*, bodily comportment and dress indicate the perceived inherent-ness of corporeal differences as inextricably tied to both affective and aesthetic differences in ways that sought to assess one's relative positioning in the racialized social hierarchy of Philadelphia. The concerns with *buena presencia* or the fixation on the absence of *buena presencia* became a way for Colombians, who sought to position themselves as respectable and deserving of positive recognition, to distance themselves from what they determined to be the inadequate attitudes and behaviors of other Latinos, primarily those from Caribbean nations. Yet these assessments also drew upon regional distinctions within Colombia, where coastal departamentos, especially the Caribbean coast, are associated with Blackness, sexuality and a set of aesthetics that differs from the whiter, more mestizo interior departamentos (Wade 1993, 2000). As such conceptions of race and region based on experiences in Colombia are used and reworked in order to assess and understand intralatin relationships in Philadelphia.

These moral evaluations of difference also corresponded to appropriate forms of bodily comportment. *Buena presencia* refers to not only good appearance and proper attire, which are linked to the physical body and choices about how to represent the physical body, but also to interior states of being like attitude, character and temperament. Drawing from Ramos Zayas' (2012) analysis of *buena presencia* amongst Latinos in Newark where *bunea presencia* denotes the embodiment and aesthetic of "good disposition" and emotional adequacy, here I similarly use it to refer to "good presentation or performance of self" both the interior self: attitude and emotional disposition, and the exterior self: appearance, looks and dress.

The notions of *buena presencia* often focused on the bodies of women, through both dress and comportment, whereby cultural repertoires and etiquette become associated with one's social location within Philadelphia and tied specifically to proper and professional dress. Notions of *buena presencia* also drew from perceptions of aesthetics and sexuality as tied to national origin and region. In particular dispositions to certain forms of dress ("revealing" versus "modest") and taste of dress ("flashy" versus "simple") index not only regional differences within Colombia but Latin America and the Caribbean more generally in ways that drew upon and reproduced racialized notions of difference. In these effort of contradistinction the assessment of aesthetics and beauty the Caribbean becomes to be constructed as excessive in ornamentation and sexuality that exists alongside an assessment of inadequate attention to proper self-presentation, while both assessments index Blackness. As an idea or a collection of often contradictory ideas, *buena presencia* and perceptions of appropriate dress and conduct come to position a region and people (the Caribbean as geographic place and by extension Caribeños (from

Colombia, the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico alike) based on valuations of cultural and racialized difference, often in distinction to the primarily mestizo Colombianos from the Andean interior. As Wade (2000) notes, the relationships between the cultural topography and race in Colombia produced notions of the Caribbean region as “hot” while the interior is understood as “cold” both in terms of climate and sexuality (see also discussion in Chapter 3 about the racialized geography of Colombia).

I first became attuned to the significance of *buena presencia* through casual conversation between friends. On this occasion Lourdes greeted her friend Melkys on a warm day in October by saying, “*Ay, mija.*<sup>138</sup> *Ya estas lista por la fiesta!*” or “Oh, girl. You’re already ready for the party!” Lourdes was clearly teasing her friend as she and I sipped café con leche in her kitchen that morning. Melkys, originally from the Dominican Republic, had dropped by Lourdes’s house hours before Lourdes’ jewelry party that evening to pick up a dress that Lourdes had borrowed because Melkys planned to wear it that night. While this kind of gentle ribbing often reads as insulting, it indexes familiarity and intimacy for many Latin Americans, however what struck me on this occasion was the seriousness about Lourdes’ accusation and the joke itself because of the deep investment in aesthetics that shapes her sense of self as a Colombiana.

Lourdes migrated to Philadelphia in 2003, but she was born and raised in Bucaramanga, located in the interior of Colombia, and attended university in Pamplona near the border with Venezuela. Her husband Bernardo, a darker skinned mestizo, grew up in Baranquilla on the Caribbean coast migrated in the mid-1980s to Philadelphia as a teen. They met while she was visiting a friend in Philadelphia and their relationship

---

<sup>138</sup> Mija is shortened form of “mi hija” meaning my daughter. It is a term of endearment, not only for one’s child, but also for a close friend. Here I have chosen to translate it as “girl.”

prompted Lourdes' move. Lourdes noted that as a young girl she developed an interest in and a talent for fashion and began designing and making her own clothes at a young age. This common interest and dedication to fashion as young girls was something Lourdes and I shared and helped to quickly establish rapport beyond our initial interview. She began to invite me to participate in her business events and parties she threw in her home.

While Lourdes studied education and worked as a teacher Colombia, she decided to change her career when she arrived in the States to be more in line with her "passion for fashion." This sense of self as a wife, mother, teacher, entrepreneur and dreamer alongside her dedication to aesthetics formed the backbone of kind of businesses she has created in the ten years since she migrated. The first business Lourdes started was a homemade jewelry line that she sold through social networks and community events where she would always rent a table to display her goods. Following some success at the community events Lourdes convinced business owners she knew on 5<sup>th</sup> street, from a Colombian bakery to a hair salon, to carry her wares.

She began with jewelry she made by hand from elements in her own collection of jewelry that she didn't wear anymore as a way to start making money when she first settled in Philadelphia. From the money she gained selling and refashioning things she already owned she saved that money for when she would go back to Colombia to buy cheap jewelry on the street or from wholesalers. She would sometimes rework the styles and sell them back in the US. In our informal conversation and in her official promotional material and social media presence, Lourdes always notes how her handcrafted jewelry is inspired by Colombia as her home county and "the art and beauty of our nature."

The second business that Lourdes started was as life coach, often choosing to work with other women, primarily Latina migrants, who are interested in starting their own businesses. Marketed as a bilingual company, Lourdes met many of her clients through friends, her community involvement and previous participants in her vision board parties. Now in the spare time that Lourdes has she has begun judging local Latina beauty pageants and her professional aspirations comport with her emphasis on beauty and evaluation. Her upward mobility as evidenced by her entrepreneurship and home ownership made class-based distinctions an underlying feature of the ways Lourdes assessed difference between Latinos and shaped her expressions of contradistinction.

*Evaluating Caribbeanness Via Colombia and Philadelphia*

Recall how Lourdes teased Melkys about her clothes. After she left, Lourdes noted that in her perception, women from the Dominican Republic often wandered around town in clothes and dress that she deemed unacceptable because it presented a “self” that should not be presented outside the home,

The women from the Dominican Republic sometimes, in public, when they are outside, they will leave the house with rollers in their hair. On the bus I see the rollers. They do not even hide them, they don't cover up with a scarf. They must do that in their country. Or that must be ok there? But it's so *descuidada*.<sup>139</sup> But they think its ok. It is all, it is all out in the open. Me? I would never leave my house like that. That is not what I was taught.

Here Lourdes distances herself from the particular choices Melkys made that day about her appearance. She likens her friend, who walked from her own front door into her car and then from her car directly to Lourdes' front door, to other women from the Dominican Republic who ride the bus or run errands in public across the city in a manner of dress that Lourdes finds in appropriate. Lourdes indicts this choice as a cultural norm

---

<sup>139</sup> Sloppy, unkempt, or careless.

that may be acceptable in the Dominican Republic, but should be national evaluated and judged as inappropriate in the United States. It violates the supposed norms of middle-class self-presentation in public space based on what she was taught growing up in Colombia. Lourdes at once teases Melkys for coming with her hair in rollers in her presence and then distances herself and her dress choices from other women who would deem this acceptable after Melkys left. As Bourdieu notes,

nothing is more distinctive, more distinguished, than the capacity to confer aesthetic status on objects that are banal or even ‘common’ (because the ‘common’ people make them their own, especially for aesthetic purposes), or the ability to apply the principles of a ‘pure’ aesthetic to the most everyday choices of everyday life, e.g., in cooking, clothing or decoration” (1984:6).

Here Lourdes’ evaluation of the look of the physical body positions rollers and sweats as a choice—the wrong choice for women—to be seen outside the home in a state of disarray or ungroomed.

She reads the bodies of Dominican women as a text that provides clues about their interior dispositions, as policing the boundaries of sexual and moral behavior of both men and women is used to maintain racial hierarchies and distinctions (Stoler 1995; Wade 2000).<sup>140</sup> Reading aesthetic choices in terms of morality, Lourdes continued

I don’t know, it seems to me that they are just too okay with messy things. It does not bother them. Messy hair for them it’s fine to go to work like that or run errands like that. I mean for Melkys, no, that’s why I was teasing her. But for the others that’s ok. I don’t know I don’t want to say it, I mean not all of them, but it shows they don’t care, about themselves or others. The men too. So many of them are *mujeriegos* [womanizers],

---

<sup>140</sup> Ann Stoler (1995) notes that the maintenance of racial hierarchies in European colonies involved the policing of the boundaries of the sexual and moral behavior of men and women. Wade (2000) uses Stoler’s analysis to explore how similar moral boundaries in Colombia developed in the colonial period and changed throughout time. Wade argues that the particular development of Colombia helped solidify the association of particular geographic regions to specific ideas about racialized sexuality of the people of those regions.

wearing the little white tank tops on the street, on their porches during the day, no job. It's just not right.

Lourdes' criticism of her friend, and of women from the Dominican Republic more generally, functions as a judgment of taste and connotes not only deeply gendered markers of class (how it is or is not appropriate to wear one's hair to work or in public), but also of nation and region. In opposition to *buena presencia* were notions of *descuidado*, carelessness or lack of concern about appearance and self-presentation. These, like Lourdes' comment, were often covertly racializing discourses that simultaneously became judgments of promiscuity and sexuality. These assessments of promiscuity and sexuality indexed moral worth and interior dispositions based on an evaluation of the external presentation and the physical body. These conceptions of manners and appropriate embodiment are essential elements for establishing the grounds of distinction as hierarchical and rely upon the perception of these manners and embodiment as "natural."

Wade argues that the Caribbean coast also has come to represent both Blackness and racial ambiguity in Colombia, while at the same time he underscores that both Costeños (people from the coast) and those from the interior propagate the idea that "compared to the interior highland, Costeño cultural practice is less inhibited, more open, more emotional, more sincere, more fun, more 'sexy' (in the modern connotations of the term) and also more superstitious, more magical, less Europeanized..." (2000:44). This notion of a racialized geography as intersects with sexuality produces particular ideas not just about the Caribbean regions of Colombia, but the entire Atlantic Caribbean. It is within this framework that Lourdes comes to understand Dominicans in Philadelphia, drawing Colombian notions about race, region and sexuality and reworking them to map

onto Caribbean Latinos in the city.

Still Lourdes separates her friend from her overall characterization of Dominicans as not caring. She specifies this lack of care concerns not only themselves but also what she sees as a lack of care about others, or more specifically about norms of dress and behavior that she sees as universal. And as Ana Ramos Zayas notes (2012: 382),

dispositions toward other people and communities, which in turn influence behavior and action, are always implicated in shifts in meaning and interpretation and how individuals come to view themselves in relation to others (similar to William's "knowable communities"). These are grounded in the body, including discussions of taste (Bourdieu), so that state regulation is now experienced largely as self-regulation and self-disciplining (cf. Foucault 1977).

Lourdes extends her criticism to Dominican men as well when in a single sentence she unites womanizers with men who wear tank tops. The mistreatment of women for Lourdes is symbolized by a choice of clothing, and also attached to lack of employment. In this instance, dress, labor and patriarchal mistreatment of women come to be symbolized by a men's shirt. These associations between seemingly disparate qualities or characteristics come to bare on the ways that Lourdes comes to understand Latinos from the Dominican Republic as neighbors and fellow residents of the city.

As the second largest Latino population after Puerto Ricans, Dominicans often share North Philadelphia neighborhoods with Colombians, Puerto Ricans and other Latinos. There are also nearly three times as many Dominicans residing in the city as Colombians (approximately 15,000 as compared to about 5,000 respectively). There are similar experiences of Dominicans and Colombians in terms of secondary migration from New York and to a lesser extent from New Jersey, whereby migrants have come to Philadelphia seeking a lower cost of living. Though Lourdes' perception marks

Dominican men as not having jobs, there approximately 1,000 Dominican owned bodegas across the city, particularly in neighborhoods without major grocery stores and Dominicans own nearly 600 of the city's 2,000 hair salons (Matza 2008). Hernández (2002) looking at Dominican migration to New York Has shown that Dominicans face high unemployment and underemployment rates in a shifting labor market resulting in economic hardship. In Philadelphia, the Dominican community is similar to the Colombian community in the sense that both populations have a substantial middle class and poor or working class families, but the Dominican Grocers' Association, and the high rate of Dominican ownership of bodegas, render Dominicans a more visible part of the Latino sociopolitical world.

While business-ownership rates do not give the full picture of the spectrum of employment of Dominicans, keeping in mind that nearly half of Philadelphians live in poverty, these assertions and judgments are made within a city where Latinos struggle for economic and social resources. As such, Lourdes' judgment of Dominican men as unfit contributors to society because they, in her perception, do not work (in contrast to her perception of the "messy" women she sees on their way to work), spend time outside in inappropriate clothing is embroiled within the local labor market and scarcity of resources. As a small business-owner herself, with clear aspirations for upward social mobility, Lourdes makes her judgments within a landscape of business competition and the racial hierarchy of the city.

Lourdes' assessment of both Dominican women, including her commentary on the upkeep of women's hair, draws upon and contributes to an ongoing project of

“respectability politics.”<sup>141</sup> Lourdes is also distinguishing between the good and deserving Dominicans, Melkys who dresses, well has a good attitude and works hard, in opposition to other Dominicans who are constructed as lazy and messy, and in the case of certain men, womanizers and lacking jobs. Within efforts of Latino contradistinction, taste becomes means of asserting differentiation and reproducing hierarchical notions about the links between cultural, race, and embodiment. Lack of *buena presencia* comes to represent racialized expressions of difference, tied to a geography of Blackness and diaspora of the Caribbean and contrasted to what many from the interior regions were “taught” about how to dress and act.

*American and Caribbean Embodiments of Blackness*

Hilda, a woman now in her mid-sixties who first moved in 1979 to the US from Cali, worked as a domestic in several families homes in Manhattan and then later as in housekeeping for hotels. Though she plans to retire soon, she continued working in hotels when she moved to Philadelphia in the early 1990s because “she could avoid the drama of families” or that she also had to navigate as a doméstica. A high school graduate, Hilda broached the topic of *buena presencia* by discussing what she saw as difference between youth and her generation, and related it to the education she received in Colombia.

Her evaluations of *buena presencia* were more explicitly about race as she directly linked dress and self-presentation and tied to what she saw as the culture of particular people from particular places. She recounted being cut in line at the grocery store by teenagers after school, who in spite of their school uniforms, looked sloppy. She

---

<sup>141</sup> The multitude of ways in which members of marginalized community attempt to demonstrate their worth, value and dignity by underscoring how their values and work align with mainstream values. See the work of Black feminist scholar Evelyn Higginbotham who originally articulated the concept.

stated “youth don’t care about looking nice and clean-cut” and that was due to the fact that their parents don’t teach them to value looking respectable. She continued

*Simplemente arréglate*<sup>142</sup>, *siempre*, Simply do yourself up, always. One must look good and present themselves well. In school they always taught me nice shoes, in good condition and nice hair, *peinado bien*, well styled. Present yourself well. Actually I didn’t have much growing up, but I knew how to take care of my things. In school they taught me, I always remembered, when you want to work or go out have a nice pair of shoes and a nice hairdo and people won’t always notice if your clothes are not that expensive. I shine my shoes, fix my hair and make sure I looked put-together. And well, that is what they don’t do, don’t take the time to fix or groom themselves. No pride in their appearance. You need to put your best foot forward. The young girls, the ones born here (Latinas), also the ones from the Caribbean, like the Blacks (African Americans)<sup>143</sup> it is as if they were not taught how to take pride in themselves or that they do not bother to make the effort. Either they look sloppy or too done up for nothing special. Some of them put on too much *chucería*, cheap looking jewelry.<sup>144</sup> They don’t know the right way.

Hilda contends that Latino youth today, especially ones born in the US, do not follow what she deems the appropriate protocol for self-presentation and as such concludes, “they take no pride in their appearance.” This lack of pride that Hilda perceives is symbolized in two slightly contradictory ways. First by a preference and over use of *chucería*, usually meaning trinkets or knickknacks, refers to “trendy” jewelry that connotes its cheapness and disposability, is a judgment of taste and aesthetic. Second she asserts that girls or women she is specifically talking about either look “sloppy” or “too

---

<sup>142</sup> *Arreglar* means to fix or repair but in the reflexive sense *arreglarse* means to get dressed up, to do yourself up.

<sup>143</sup> Wade notes that *moreno* brown is used to describe self and others across a broad range of racialized phenotypes. *Negro*, Black, can often be used in a derogatory fashion owing to larger stigma of Blackness in Colombia but for many Colombians it refers to American born Blacks/ African Americans (1993; 2000).

<sup>144</sup> *Chucería* can also mean knickknacks or trinkets but primarily it is an object or objects of little or no value approximating junk. *Chucería* can also mean junk food or snacks, connoting “garbage” or nutritionally empty.

done up for nothing special” which to Hilda, cues a misrecognition of social expectations and occasions. And as such they do not dress, accessorize, or present themselves in a manner in accordance with Hilda’s criteria.

Finally, and most overtly, Hilda ties these choices of dress to race and region by referring to those who lack pride in their appearance as young US born Latinas, women from the Caribbean (a follow up question refined that she meant women from Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica and some from Colombia) and *los negros*, referring to American born Blacks. Again Bourdieu insists that taste classifies and, “classifies the classifier. Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make, between the beautiful and the ugly, the distinguished and the vulgar, in which their position in the objective classifications is expressed or betrayed” (1984: 6). Hilda positions herself as a carefully cultivated self who is invested in a good appearance, and she contrasts herself with those whose choices she reads as vulgar.

Moreover, Hilda, in discussing her work history and experiences with various employers, noted that she always made sure to have *buena presencia* not only for the interviews (especially when she worked with families) but everyday that she showed up for work because, in her words, “I show them that I am *buena gente* too. They hire me to work for them but I show them that they are not better than me, we are the same.” Work and her positionality as a *doméstica* and hotel worker, became an aspect of her life where she sought to assert her identity through the dignity of her kind of labor and assert these differences through the lens of race and class.

*The Aesthetics of Colombianidad*

My own bodily comportment and aesthetics were often judged as a Colombiana who had grown up in the US, I was simultaneously cast as being a *cachaca* or *rola*, a woman from Bogotá (where my family is from), or as an American as I grew up in the States with skin so light I often am assumed to only be White. More than anyone with whom I developed a relationship through fieldwork, Penelope, originally from Medellín consistently reminded me of my Americanness, especially through her evaluation of my dress, attributing my penchant for jeans, sweaters and simple dresses as a function of my upbringing in the US reinforced by my shoe choice. She told me, “never a heel in sight because American women dress for comfort.” This coupled with our proximity in age meant that much of her interview and other time spent together centered around explaining Colombian culture to me as if it was entirely new, and thus provided a new lens and new layer of understanding that complicated the insider-outsider dilemma of being an anthropologist and participant observer.<sup>145</sup>

Penelope first moved to Phoenix in 2007 and to Philadelphia in 2010. Recounting her initial move to the US, Penelope recounted what one of the things she struggles with the most after she moved. After mentioning the language barrier and feeling somewhat isolated in the sprawl of Phoenix she told me,

I have to tell you, Colombians are party people. We love getting together with friends and family and having a good time. I love to entertain and when I do I go all out. One of the first things I notice when I come to this country, really in Arizona but also here, is that we would be invited to someone's house for dinner. This was a nice way to spend time with our couple friends. So I would get ready to look nice and be excited for a nice

---

<sup>145</sup> See Chapter 1 for a fuller discussion of “native” anthropologist (Narayan and Jones) or creates dilemmas for the disciplines sense of objectivity that imagines anthropologist as cultural outsiders and how these concepts of inside/outside divides comes to bare on how respondents/informants interact with the researcher.

meal. I would show up and be the only lady wearing a dress or heels or jewelry. That I didn't mind because I know I look nice—better than the host.

Penelope distanced herself from the white, American women whom she befriended in Phoenix, noting that their aesthetic was more casual, and she as a Colombiana would dress up because the occasion called for it.

Living up to her assertion of Colombians as “a party people,” about two months after our initial meeting I helped Penelope tidy up her house a bit prior to a party she was throwing. I came over early because Penelope insisted she help me with my makeup. As we were getting ready in front of the delicate white vanity in her bedroom she showed me the outfit she had settled on for that evening's event: a sleek Black jumpsuit with a deep v-cut halter top. She draped the outfit, still on the hanger, over her shoulders and said,

You can dress sexy, as a way to express yourself. It good, its fun to be feminine. But in order to maintain *buena presencia* you must watch your body language in order to avoid coming off vulgar or too sexy. Wear what you feel good in but always act like you are in a suit or an elegant gown that covers your body. This will ensure that you do not come off low class. I want to look sexy but classy.

A few moment later she noted that she had some friends who would being coming over later that night from the coastal cities of Baranquilla and Cartagena who had a great sense of style but

Let too much out and wear revealing clothing. Some from Cali too but less so. Maybe it's a Caribbean thing, its so hot or something they don't mind being immodest. I see that with the other women I know too some from the Dominican Republic and some from Puerto Rico. I don't really see that with the Nicaraguans or Ecuadorians I make friend with they are more modest, more quiet.

Like Hilda, Penelope's discussion of dress and self-presentation juxtaposed appropriateness against vulgarity and implied (hyper)sexuality, each with explicit

connotations of race and class. Moreover as Hilda drew on geography significant factor that shaped cultural choices, Penelope too links “let[ting] too much out” to Caribbean climate as creating acceptance for “immodesty.” Penelope elaborates on the way one can choose to wear certain revealing clothing styles but only under certain conditions: if they are not “too revealing” and if the wearer knows how to appropriately carry their body in order to maintain a semblance of “presentability.”

Taken all together these assertions from Lourdes, Hilda and Penelope construct a cultural geography of sexuality and racialization about the Caribbean, connecting parts of Colombia to the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rican, from their positions as Colombianas within the United States. Consequently this construction of Caribbeanness and its associations draws from their experiences with other Latinos and people of color in Philadelphia and understandings of culture and history of Latin America. It reveals how historical legacies offer naturalized frameworks of racial difference as mapped onto the bodies of people and places. Superiority and inferiority become racially coded as closer to Whiteness and Blackness respectively as discourses on taste, dress, and decoration encode racialized distinction. In these instances associating Caribbeanness, and by extension Blackness, with excessive ornamentation of overt sexuality and with choices that contradict the supposed normative class and gender identities as defined by lighter skinned Colombianas from the interior regions, enmesh Latin American and US racial dynamics in contradistinction.

Moreover their evaluation and judgment of themselves and others offer a gendered construction of *buena presencia* and appropriateness whereby women’s bodies and bodily comportment became the primary objects of scrutiny. Thus race, class, gender,

sexuality and above all, morality, become implicated in the production of contradistinction. Likewise these efforts of contradistinction extend beyond nationally defined differences in ways that become instantiated as inherent and natural, but also learned, cultivated and permissible in their imagination and interpretations of cultures they position as separate from their own.

### Conclusion

The creation and maintenance of meaningful social boundaries is an ongoing process that serves to both maintain and legitimize categories of sameness and difference, and through contradistinction, sameness and difference are eminently racial (De Genova 2005). For DeGenova, this also recuperates a processual sense of migration, not as *immigration* with fixed geographic and temporal ends, which forecloses the possibility that ongoing events Latin America as a region do not or could not affect US Latinos. The meanings and expressions of contradistinction are made and remade with reference to the past and the present and with reference to both here and there as Colombian migrants in Philadelphia attempt to maintain and render visible the differences and distinctions among themselves, and betwixt and between other Latino groups.

In this vein, Colombianidad become part of a broader project of contradistinction. Yet contradistinction is but only one strand of Colombianidad. The processes and contingencies of racialization, specifically how Colombians seeks to distance and distinguish themselves from other Latinos in Philadelphia construct and maintain those boundaries, are by no means solid or self-evident. Boundaries must be constantly produced and reproduces, and their meanings shift and contradistinction reveals the complexity of navigating and producing these racialized social boundaries between and

amongst Latinos. An emphasis on contradistinction is essential not only because it illuminates how shifting conditions within Latin America can produce the grounds upon which Colombians assert their differences but it is also essential because it so often is deployed in the everyday talk and interpretation of Philadelphia by Colombians. These distinctions are the socially meaningful backdrop for the marginalization, inequality and racial subordination they face in the city and illuminate the ways in which groups attempt to manage stigmas by either adopting distancing maneuvers or identifying in solidarity with one another (Dowling 2014).

Moreover as De Genova and Ramos Zayas note an emphasis on the production of distinctions “also makes possible a more effective formulation of Latino commonalities and coalitions across lines of difference rather than on the imagined and untenable basis of sameness” (2003: 21). Frances Aparicio likewise endorses the embrace of terms like “Latino/a” and “Latinidades” in order to illuminate “power differentials and the historical, social, and cultural dilemmas that these terms evoke as we identify the interactions between and among peoples of various Latin American national identities” (2009: 625). This chapter has offered a glimpse into the ways that power differentials are inextricable the historical and contemporary production of difference in Philadelphia, the US and within Latin America the production of these differences come to shape the subjectivities of Colombians in Philadelphia.

As the claims of Ernesto, Miriam and Nicolas seek to assert differences and distance between Colombians and other Latinos on the basis of changing dynamics in Latin America, the expressions of contradistinction from Penelope, Lourdes and Hilda reveal the ways that historical regional dynamics and racial associations within Colombia

and Latin America become intertwined in assessments of gender, class and bodily comportment. These efforts of contradistinction rely on Colombia's past and present, local racial formations of Puerto Rican "inferiority," internal divisions within Colombia, the racial geography of the Caribbean, and Colombia's changing position in Latin America with respect to other nations. countries of origin provide the organizing schemes that Colombian migrants use to interpret the racial hierarchy of the locality (Ramos-Zayas 2012), often understanding themselves in comparison to others along social axes of difference that included reputations, citizenship, employment and sartorial choices. Both long-standing and recently developed relationships emerge as the lenses through which Colombians sought to understand themselves with reference to other Latinos and national differences were at once racialized and linked to the particular racial hierarchy within Philadelphia. Analyzing contradistinction shows how Colombianos attempt to renegotiate their place within the hierarchy, but not critiquing the existence of hierarchy itself.

Scholars have argued that in an effort to make economic, political and social claims marginalized groups have attempted to demonize and victimize other marginal groups as a function of scarce resources, which can fracture of social relations between potential allies (De Genova and Ramos Zayas 2003). A focus on efforts of distinction point to the ways that fractures or alliances are enacted and produced in diversifying Latino spaces and neighborhoods of Philadelphia as a the result of commonalities, similarities, desires and even conflicts. It is the connections as well as the gaps of space between nationally-defined Latinos groups that shape how these dynamic play out in locally specific ways (Aparicio 2009). In this respect this chapter sketches how conceptual boundaries between Latinos are produced and reproduced by social relations

and power inequalities that implicate the boundaries and borders of Latin America and the racialized boundaries of difference particular to Philadelphia.

Latino contradistinction is both geographically and historically contingent as Colombians in Philadelphia reconcile Latin American history, reputations, and geopolitics to make sense of their own racialization both in Philadelphia and Colombia. Understanding Colombia through understanding Colombians in “el exterior,” those who have left but for whom the nation continues to be a remarkable presence in their understanding of self and others. These moments are part of an ongoing dialogue about the inextricable links that tie the US to Latin America and lay bare how contemporary connections within Latin America meaningfully shape Latino subjectivities. The past and the present provide the framework through which Colombians understand themselves specifically within Philadelphia. Yet the dialogue between past and present, especially changes in Colombia since many have left, come to inform Colombians’ relationship with their nation of origin. The next chapter explores how both the Colombian nation-state has sought to re-incorporate Colombians living outside its borders as it simultaneously engages in a deliberate effort to reinvent the global reputation of Colombia through a branding campaign. Specifically the chapter shows how Colombians construct their Colombianidad in dialogue with the Colombian nation, its meanings and imaginaries, from outside its borders.

## CHAPTER 8

## TRANSNATIONAL PASSIONS: REINVENTING THE NATION, AFFECT AND COLOMBIANIDAD

Though Colombians often sought to meaningfully distinguish themselves from other Latinos in Philadelphia, their racialization specifically as Colombians associated with the negative association of drugs and violence and social inequalities of Colombia, was in many ways inescapable. Even as some Colombianos may try to change the dominant narrative about themselves as good and deserving migrants and about Colombia as nation that has improved, they run up against the predominant characterizations of political instability, drug trafficking and violence that have permeated news reports, popular culture depictions and the general national imaginary of the United States. Yet just as changes in Colombia, specifically economic and social improvements, became the grounds upon which Colombians negotiated the racial hierarchy through contradistinctions, the changes in Colombia become central to the to crafting a sense of self.

This chapter explores how Colombians living in Philadelphia craft a sense of Colombianidad, or Colombianness, through affective expressions that tie them to their nation of origin, to one another and to their experiences in the city. Grounded within the larger body of scholarship on affect, I revisit the *Colombia es Pasión* campaign as a critical force that not only seeks to redress the dominant global perception of Colombia but also incorporates Colombian migrants in the exterior as stakeholders in the success of the campaign. *Colombia es Pasión* depends on affect as a way of mobilizing “labor” in its exterior, specifically through the increasing number of Colombians living in the

United States. How Colombianos come to understand not only their experiences with racialization and stigmatization in Philadelphia associated with the drug, narco-trafficking and reputation of violence of the Colombian nation becomes the affective medium through which they come to simultaneously embrace, resist and reconfigure the objects of the campaign towards their own ends.

Exploring the production and expression of affect illuminates how Colombianos engage with the reputation of the nation they left, and how they come understand themselves through their perception and others' perception of Colombia. Colombian migrants I spoke to, observed, and worked with were not only acutely aware but exceptionally keen on drawing attention to the ways they crafted themselves and their affective expressions to communicate ideas about Colombianidad, good citizenship, race and transnational belonging. Here affect becomes a medium in and through which not only are different types of subjects formed but affect becomes the medium through which different subjects form their relations between one another and the Colombian nation vis-à-vis its reputation and their experiences as immigrants.

#### Feeling Out the Affective Turn: Subjectivity and Affect

Examining subjects who are mutually constituted through affect within a particular conjuncture—a historical milieu of a specific place (or places) with a particular political economic trajectory—emphasizes how affect becomes the medium that not only ties people to one another but also becomes the medium through which people engage in projects of self-making that construct boundaries or emphasize difference. A renewed scholarly preoccupation with affect attempts to theorize in new ways how human subjectivity comes into being in dialogue with the material world (Massumi 2002; Thrift

2008; Sedgwick and Frank 2003; Stewart 2007). Anthropologist Kathleen Stewart defines affect as the capacity to affect and be affected, emphasizing affect as a process of sociality. Thus her focus remains on affect as a process of sociality, and specifically she examines its manifestation in movements, intensities, surges and bursts in the “prepersonal zone of affect” which connect people and creates common experiences that shape public feeling (2007).

The heart of what is at stake in exploring affect is exploring how affect can structure connectivity between subjectivity and self-making. Richard and Rudnyckj argue that

Affect, which can be both a noun and a transitive verb, simultaneously makes both its subject and its object. It is this dynamic and reflexive quality of affect and its ability to act upon (or affect) action that makes it analytically valuable. Parallel terms, such as emotion, lack these dimensions. It is the transitive and reflexive capacity of affect – actions that *affect* others and oneself – that makes it particularly useful for documenting how subjects are mutually constituted. Furthermore...we conceive of affect not so much as an object circulating among subjects, but rather as a medium in which subjects circulate” (Richard and Rudnyckj 2009:59).

Toward this end Richard and Rudnyckj offer the analytic of the “economy of affect,” where affect serves as a “means of conducting conduct and thus forming subjects, to shed new light on those relationships.” Though their work ranges from disparate social and political economic contexts Richard and Rudnyckj reveal how certain affects are taken as indication that individuals have successfully undergone subjective transformations which correspond to and shape economic transformations.<sup>146</sup> In doing so

---

<sup>146</sup> Richard examined how grassroots networks in Mexico formed and leveraged affective ties to transnational NGOs and foreign donors into action and money. Rudnyckj focused on how workers in a Jakarta steel plant—that was undergoing privatization and elimination of state subsidies—were trained to become emotionally open and expressive whilst more disciplined in accordance with Muslim piety in order to improve economic productivity, accountability and

they draw attention to the importance of affect and the cultivation of particular affects in forging new modern subjects like volunteers, workers, patrons, consumers and in my own work transnational migrants. This highlights the inextricable link between cultural labor and economic shifts to underscore how affect creates particular kinds of global connections as it produces new forms of subjectivity (Hardt and Negri 1999, 2001; Ahmed 2004; Richard and Rudnyckj 2009; Massumi 1995).<sup>147</sup>

The link between affect and economic transformations that create new intersubjective ties becomes evident in the brand and campaign of *Colombia es Pasion*. In 2005 the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism launched the campaign to market the Colombia as a national brand with hopes of changing the world's negative perceptions of the nation, attracting investment and increasing tourism. I argue the implications for deeming passion the natural resource of the Colombian people also connects Colombian migrants living outside the national borders, both through their engagement with the campaign and by the ways affect comes to infuse their constructions of Colombianidad around a sense of emotional warmth, compassion and sensitivity. The particular configuration of affect (passion) into the rationality of investment and commodification of the nation comes to reinforce the ways in which Colombians consciously fashion a sense of Colombianidad that emphasize feelings like passion, compassion, and sensitivity to signal goodness and create distance between themselves as

---

competitiveness in the work place.

<sup>147</sup> Though I argue their needs to be intentionality and subject-centered agency present in analyses of affect, Massumi's contributions to theorizing affect remains critical, in particular his articulation of the connection between affect and economic development. Massumi concludes in "The autonomy of affect" that the "ability of affect to produce an economic effect more swiftly and surely than economics itself means that affect is itself a real condition, an intrinsic variable of the late-capitalist system, as infrastructural as the factory" (1995: 106).

people from Colombia and its negative associations. As the marketability of the nation becomes the primary concern of *Colombia es Pasión*, it joins a recent series of state projects through which the Colombian nation seeks to engage its diaspora.

Affect is the central component of the brand and its marketing helps to attract foreign direct investment and increase tourism. Yet it is affect that seeks to mobilize and incorporate its citizens living in the exterior to market themselves by being representative of the “new” nation, while the brand itself obscures the history and political economy that cause emigration in the first place. This affective incorporation not only binds Colombianos in Philadelphia to the nation, but also to one another. Through circulation and dissemination of the national branding campaign and through the collective enduring of the difficulties of migration and discrimination in the United States, passion becomes the medium through which Colombian migrants fashion a sense of Colombianidad that links them to each other and Colombians in the interior. As Richard and Rudnyckyj would say, this passion becomes a medium through which subjects act on others and are acted upon.

Obscuring History and Playing with Risk: How Affect Structures Economic Redemption  
in *Colombia es Pasión*

As brands have shifted from being strictly about consumer goods and have come to the primary force of the marketing industry at large, they often rely on the creation of feeling and attachment in order to sell a product. As Naomi Klein traces the history of branding and the consequences of branding in *No Logo*, she argues that the shift in marketing to emphasize brands and branding have changed the ways people think and feel not just about commodities but also about places, like cities, neighborhoods and nations. For Klein, brands are not no longer just products but “ideas, attitudes, values and

experiences” and growth of branding has reinvented previously uncommodified things in order to conjure new feelings, ideas and attitude. It is within this imperative of branding that Colombia has sought to brand itself as a nation with the hopes of replacing the previously unbranded nation, associated with drugs and violence, with a new brand premised on passion.

Through a dissemination of new images, information, facts and figures about the nation that are supposed to combat the outdated inaccurate reputations, the brand and campaign of *Colombia es Pasión* is attached to a narrative of change. The premise of the campaign is to change the impression and images of Colombia, to change outsider’s affective disposition towards the nation and foster a feeling of investment in the nation. The marketing of Colombia’s national brand relies on translating fact and figures about Colombia’s economic growth to position the nation as a worthwhile investment. Touting economic growth and stability within the campaign implies that all that remains if for the brand is to change how investors, both corporations and people, *feel* about Colombia. The brand is premised upon the notion that the reality of life in Colombia has changed but foreign economic investment and tourism will only pour in once feelings and perceptions about the nation change to match the new reality. The brand and the economic investment, tourism and recognition it seeks to attract ultimately rely on affect to effect change.

To market the branded nation, *Colombia es Pasión* relied upon a logic that turned the negative on its head. To that end, branding strategies included making presentations about the reinvention of Colombia. In 2009 during fieldwork in Bogotá I attended a presentation given María Claudia LaCouture, General Manager of Proexport Colombia

hence the brand manager, architect and spokesperson at the “Latin America: Crossroads for Change” sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School of Business.

María’s presentation sought to highlight what the campaign sees as transformations, stating,

in recent years Colombia has made progress in different aspects such as security, economy, quality of life indicators, among others. This new reality allowed Colombia to consider the need to generate a label that would become the right tool to reflect these changes to the world.

However, in order to make those improvements this branding campaign must first

successfully change the international perception of Colombia to reflect its current reality.

As such, the Colombia es Pasión campaign seeks to transform the perception of and improve the global recognition of Colombia by creating and marketing a national brand.

The campaign posits political and economic redemption through branding by only alluding to negative perceptions of Colombia as unsafe with the tagline “the only risk is wanting to stay”.

María continued with her presentation to underscore that national branding has become an increasingly common practice for countries that want to market themselves globally. Noting that other countries, such as Australia, Spain, South Africa, and India have understood the need to develop their own brand in order for each nation to market their distinctiveness, María posited that Colombia’s brand was part of a common practice that relied upon a careful dissemination of the specifics. In this campaign, promoting a national identity of passion became the means to improve Colombia’s global perception in order to attract financial investment and tourism. The presentation continued to highlight Colombia as a nation with tremendous potential and possibilities for development. María repeated throughout that morning’s presentation that *Colombia es*

*Pasión* went through extensive research in order to uncover its national essence only to find that the common denominator of the Colombians was their inexhaustible passion. As such the brand relied upon being able to turn the negatives of Colombia into positives.

As a campaign *Colombia es Pasión* positions itself as marketing “the national” and “natural” essence of Colombia, defining Colombians as a unique social and cultural group. The official website of *Colombia es Pasión* elaborates on this point by stating

we concluded that the passion is the force that drives us Colombians every day, it is the source from which our extraordinary tenacity and intensity of everything we do springs. Without a doubt, passion is the best raw material of our citizens. Within each of us begins the projection of the image we want for our country. So *Colombia es Pasión*, works for each of us to be faithful representatives of Colombian national identity, identifying with the noble heart, telling the world the good things we do with passion.

Passion is posited as the natural resource, which is supposed to drive Colombians to make the best of themselves for the good of the nation.

*Colombia es Pasión* markets “the national” and “natural” essence of Colombia, defining Colombians as a unique cultural group. At the same time this passion becomes a symbol, which seeks to maximize the international recognition of a positive Colombian identity, trying palpably to market Colombia in universally recognizable terms that highlight its distinctiveness.

Yet the emphasis on passion alludes to other associations of affect and sexuality. *Colombia es Pasión* creates a valuable kind of exoticism, rooting Colombian-ness in tropes of hot-blooded, Latin lovers and tempresses from below the equator. At the same time, the national brand of passion becomes tied to corporate interests of marketing, tourism and investment, as it draws upon the symbolic significance of eroticism. While the *Colombia es Pasión* campaign styles the nation itself at the nexus of the exotic and

erotic it does so through very subtle illusions to gender and sexuality, or sexualness, which rest at the heart of invocations of passion (see Nasser 2012). Still the allusions to passion are meant to provoke further investment—both in terms of affect and emotion as well as finances and capital.

In their discussion of national brands, anthropologists John and Jean Comaroff argue that the impetus of these emergent forms of corporate nationhood “is to make nationality an object of ownership as the property of the millions of people who share emotional identification through the nation” (124: 2009). Furthermore this identity is not merely wrought *by* and *for* its own citizens it is meant as well for commercial engagement with the “tourist” and the individual or corporate investor, as the consumer of this uniquely branded otherness. While the *Colombia es Pasión* campaign establishing claims of a stable political democracy and flourishing capitalist economy in order to commodify national difference and build a market niche around it.

The campaign posits political and economic redemption through branding by only alluding only to negative perceptions of Colombia as unsafe with the tagline “the only risk is wanting to stay.” The campaign seeks to overcome political and economic realities by framing them in the past as well as positioning them as matters of perception no longer pertinent to the newly articulated brand of Colombia. The rhetoric of the campaign highlights the “new reality” of Colombia by stressing achievements in terms of safety and economic stability, arguing that crucial changes have been made cracking down on the interrelated issues of narco-trafficking and guerilla groups, and lauding the success of neoliberal economic reform.

The point of the *Colombia es Pasión*'s initiative is to sell the country, its goods

and its goodness, to all sorts of consumers: citizens and foreigners alike. This marks a significant shift in the very conception of nationhood, one in which, according to Comaroff and Comaroff, “the country itself congeals in the brand its success and its shortcomings and failures, thereby creating the conditions of an ontological reduction of the nation state to a corporation where the right kind of difference adds value” (2009:124). Through an allusion to the shortcoming and failures, the *Colombia es Pasión* campaign glosses over decades of realities deemed unattractive for investments. Additionally, because the right kind of difference adds value, success of government is measured in terms of attracting enterprise and the capacity to accumulate wealth.

For Comaroff and Comaroff, deploying the national brand to maximum effect is accomplished through acting as an incorporated vendor by commodifying the essence of the imagined community, and positioning its subjects as stakeholders in the corporate nation (2009). In doing so the narrative of political and economic redemption of *Colombia es Pasión* comes at the expense of acknowledging the political realities of most Colombians whose lives have been affected by the decades of political instability, violence, narcotrafficking and now neoliberal reform. When the strategies of *Colombia es Pasión* seeks to gloss over these issues to change perceptions of Colombia on the global market, it comes at a great cost to both Colombians who live inside and outside the nation’s borders but these corporatized notions of nationhood are banking on it.

### *Plan Colombia*

Plan Colombia is a long-term multi-billion dollar program described by its critics as a continuation of the US policy of intervention in Latin America, directed toward militarily eliminating guerrilla forces in Colombia and repressing the rural peasant

communities which support the left-wing Marxist guerilla forces. Policy-makers who support the aid describe Plan Colombia as an effort to eradicate drug production and trade by attacking the sources of production that are located in areas of guerrilla influence or control to ultimately make the Americas safer. Nevertheless the decades long semi-covert war has cost thousands of lives and huge sums of money – much of it from the US, is not *explicitly* mentioned as an achievement but rather serves as the foundation for claims of safety. Nor is there any mention of the human rights violations in Plan Colombia's attempts to eradicate the drug war.<sup>148</sup> The goal of *Colombia es Pasión* is to present these issues as if they have already been resolved.

In 1998 and 1999 the administrations of Colombian president Pastrana and US president Clinton formulated Plan Colombia. The plan called for unprecedented amounts of aid to Colombia in order to boost the economy as a means to combat the drug trade and the civil conflict it sustained. In December 1999, President Clinton proposed \$1.6 billion in aid and Congress approved \$1.3 billion with the vast majority earmarked for military spending and training in July 2000. The initial aid package and its subsequent yearly increase made Colombia the third-largest recipient of US military in the world after Israel and Egypt, a position it still holds today. Though the US and Colombia have had a long and complicated history of political and economic entanglements in the 20<sup>th</sup> century Plan Colombia created a more intimate and interdependent relationship between

---

<sup>148</sup> A sharp increase in extrajudicial killings in 2000 became a major issue for human rights activists in and outside Colombia as the aid in Plan Colombia was contingent upon human rights improvements. Additionally there was an increase in aerial fumigation to eradicate coca crops, which also affected thousands living and working in vast swaths of land in multiple *departamentos*. Widespread human rights violations, collusion with illegal paramilitary groups and near total impunity. For a discussion of the debates and multiple scales of demands between human rights activists, NGO officials and politicians from both nation see Tate 2007.

the two as the economic interest of the United States and multinational corporations continue to shape the sustained military aid.

### *Neoliberal Economic Reform*

Although not directly related to Plan Colombia, the structural reform mandated by the terms of Colombia's loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) fits into Plan Colombia as part of the larger strategy to revive the Colombian economy, lending further credence to the notion that the aid in Plan Colombia was less about the eradication of the dangerous drug trade and more about promoting desired economic reforms in Colombia. For the first time in its history Colombia pursued a loan from the IMF in the 1990s. The state applied for the loan months before the US Congress approved the specific dollar amount but well after Clinton and Pastrana began negotiations on Plan Colombia. While the Colombian economy did not grow as fast as most of its counter parts in Latin America during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century it had up until 1999 avoided any substantial crisis. Economic stability, even in the face of frequent political instability, vanished when the introduction of economic reforms exacerbated the most serious economic crisis in the nation's history through its austerity measures (see Chapter 3).

The IMF granted Colombia a three year \$2.7 billion dollar credit contingent upon the IMF's routine mandates—an agenda of structural reform through fiscal austerity measures such as reform of public pensions, a downsizing of the public sector and a revenue sharing system. The IMF prescriptions shared much in common with the economic changes that created the crisis in the first place. These changes, caused by several destabilizing measures pursued in the name of neoliberal economic reform, began with President Gaviria's Nation Plan of Development, which sought to privatize national

industries and reduce import tariffs, Colombia's economy crashed and sputtered.<sup>149</sup> The reforms mandated by the IMF systematically eroded education, health care and other social services, which in turn laid off thousand of workers across various sectors of the economy.<sup>150</sup> Between 1994 and 1999, the number of Colombian emigrants doubled from two to four million (Safford and Palacios 2002: 214). In 2000, the unemployment rate

---

<sup>149</sup> Instead of opting for a gradual adjustment as he had proposed, Gaviria chose a rapid approach. The immediate tariff rate reduction caused imports to boom while exports barely grew. This market liberalization deregulated the flow of international capital, which in turn, increased foreign capital investment. Yet the substantial increase in foreign capital also made Colombia's economy vulnerable to issues in other markets. In 1997 when the East Asian market collapsed foreign investors fearing risk and withdrew substantial amounts of capital from Colombia. The en-masse withdrawal caused the Colombian exchange rate to fluctuate and amplified pressure to increase the exchange rate. In addition to international vulnerabilities, the inflow of foreign capital allowed bank credit to rapidly expand, which caused inflation. The Bank of the Republic in Colombia's response to inflation was to raise interest rates as a measure of control. While the increase in interest rates enticed more foreign capital it also put more pressure on the exchange rate and increased the banking system's liquidity. Without the support of foreign investment, the sudden rise in interest caused a "credit crunch" bursting the economic bubble and caused the Colombian economy to spiral into the crisis. The increase in liquidity made the banking system more fragile by fueling the credit "boom." The rise in interest rates harmed already suffering national industries (Spagnolo and Munevar 2008). See Spagnolo and Munevar (2008) for a detailed overview of the precipitating causes and the aftermath of reforms and IMF lending.

The reforms caused many private companies to go bankrupt, as they were unable to compete with the economic opening. Similarly when public enterprises became private they suffered and struggled to reposition themselves in the international marketplace. The fall of international coffee prices bankrupted thousands of producers and increased the unemployment rate of everyone involved in the industry; high unemployment rates in the coffee producing regions persisted despite their relative stability prior to the economic reforms. These issues reverberated throughout all economic sectors and caused historical rates of unemployment in the nation and in nearly every industry. The rapid and drastic structural changes profoundly reshaped the economic and social spheres where even educated professionals and those with university degrees became unemployed or underemployed as it increased wealth disparities and poverty in a nation with an already staunch rich-poor divide. All of these conditions promoted emigration, especially to the United States (Guarnizo 2006).

<sup>150</sup> Of course as the measures were unilaterally agreed upon by successive presidents who maintained accordance with IMF mandates, a strong grassroots opposition persisted and called attention to the ways these changes caused the suffering of many Colombian citizens. In March 2001 as a response to expected layoffs of 100,000 government employees, hundreds of thousands of Colombian state workers went on a 24-hour strike. The demonstration against the economic policies drew attention to the massive layoffs and the reduction of social benefits. In May of 2001 over 125,000 health care workers and 300,000 public school teachers went on a month-long nationwide strike to protest against the *ley de transferencias*, or transfers law, a bill that imposed a cap on the amount of federal money distributed to the *departamentos* for education, healthcare and other social services.

was the highest amongst Latin American nations, peaking at a staggering 20% (Simons 2004: 255). Pursuing economic development through the mandated reforms under the guise of market liberalization and free trade, poverty and inequality have actually deepened within Colombia as the state cut public spending in order to continue debt payments.

From the Colombian government's viewpoint the economic reforms were a necessary response to the economic stagnation of the late 1980s caused by the gradual closure of the economy to international trade and insufficient state intervention in certain economic sectors. Beginning with President Barcos (1986-1990), and continuing during the administrations of Gaviria (1990-1994), Samper (1994-1998) and Pastrana (1988-2002) and Uribe (2002-2010) and the current president Santos (2010-present), all have embraced the neoliberal economic reforms. Despite the severity of the crisis that prompted millions of Colombians to emigrate elsewhere in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the economy began a steady recovery from the crisis in 2002 through an average growth rate of 4.38 percent between 2002 and 2006 (Spagnolo and Munevar 2008). The relatively quick turn around and path towards stable growth provided the opportunity for the economic development so greatly touted by *Colombia es Pasión* but in many ways these measures of "progress" have come at a great cost to many people who struggle with reduced funds for social services and support. Moreover reinventing Colombia as a success story relies upon obscuring that the consequences of these neoliberal economic reforms created another wave of Colombian migration.

*Internally Displaced Persons*

The redemptive narrative of change at the center of *Colombia es Pasión* also relies on drawing attention away from the ongoing humanitarian crisis of internally displaced people within Colombia. Internal displacement is result of the ongoing civil war since the 1964, when leftist guerilla movements Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and National Liberation Army (ELN) began movements for control of land as part of their agrarian reform efforts. As discussed in Chapter 3, the government-backed right-wing paramilitary groups gained ground in the 1980s when drug cartels also lent their support to the anti-guerrilla efforts of the paramilitaries. The dispute over territory to gain power over growing coca and resource extraction between the groups caused the forcible displacement of millions, most within often indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities.<sup>151</sup> While many of the displaced sought refuge in the largest nearby city many remained in rural areas. It is hard to overstate the significance of displacement and dispossession as part of a larger human rights crisis. Though the Colombian government only began to count the numbers of internally displaced people in

---

<sup>151</sup> The precise numbers of IDP are nearly impossible to calculate, as many do not report their status to the Ministry of Public Affairs, often out of fear. There are two categorized forms of displacement—individual displacement and massive displacement. The root cause of internal displace in Colombia is in fact the conflict between guerilla, paramilitaries and the military which can directly and indirectly affect people’s everyday lives. People must choose between remaining where they live and enduring the risks of kidnapping, forced recruitment to a paramilitary group or even death. The other choice is to move to another part of Colombia or if possible to leave the county all together.

In Colombia the capital of Bogotá houses the largest portion of displaced population followed by Medellín, Cali and Barranquilla. While the largest cities receive the most IDP geographically it is rural regions of particular departments that experience the largest number of people who become displaced by the ongoing conflicts. Conflict continues in the coastal and interior border departments of Colombia. The Pacific costal region of has the highest proportion of large-group displacements with the highest concentration in Cauca followed by Valle del Cauca. (The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Country Profile 2015).

1997 the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimates that over 5.8 million people were displaced as of December 2014.<sup>152</sup>

As the humanitarian crisis persists despite economic growth touted by both *Colombia es Pasión* and the World Bank, what remains clear that the issue of internally displaced persons is inextricably linked to the failure of both Plan Colombia and the War on Drugs in the 1980s and thus connected to U.S. foreign policy. As President Regan began the War on Drug campaign stateside it was coupled with efforts to back the counter-insurgency efforts of the paramilitary groups.<sup>153</sup> Since the 1980s the paramilitary groups have been responsible for more civilian deaths than the leftist guerillas. Yet the US-backed aid of Plan Colombia did not successfully diminish the drug industry or de-escalate the guerilla movements. Instead the results were intensified militarization and violence that exacerbated human rights abuses and internal displacement.

It is this harrowing history that is notably absent from the narrative of change at the heart of the national brand. There is an unbridgeable gap between the lived reality of so many people who have had to endure displacement and everyday violence in Colombia and the laurels bestowed upon Colombia because of economic growth.

Acknowledgement of IDP as a large-scale issue would belie the World Bank's facts reports of progress that prompted it to change Colombia's designation from a "lower

---

<sup>152</sup> The consistently high rate of IDPs positions Colombia second only to the Sudan before 2011 and now second only to Syria since their civil war began in March 2011.

<sup>153</sup> The first paramilitary groups were organized by the Colombian military during the Cold War following recommendations made by US military policy advisers. The U.S. military recommended counterinsurgency as the main strategy to rein in and eliminate the growing power of political activists on the Left and armed guerillas. The geopolitical position of Colombia—its proximity to the Panama Canal, the direct to the Caribbean via its coast and its borders to other Northern Cone nations in South America—made it a key battleground for the US in their efforts to combat communism in the region (Tate 2015).

middle-income economy” according to the World Bank, to an “upper middle income economy.” According to the World Bank's 2010 “Doing Business” Colombia was “the top country to start or expand a business: because of the 400% growth of foreign direct investment between 2002 and 2008. These World Bank assessments of the Colombian economy remains at the heart of the *Colombia es Pasión* as its facts and figures are used as evidence for the necessity of the campaign. Even now as *Colombia es Pasión* has been replaced by the *Marca Colombia* brand,<sup>154</sup> the national brand relies upon changing the perception of the nation to reflect its new economic reality. A concern with image and perception over substance and actuality obscures the negative while boasting the positive, not just globally but domestically as well, proposing that these issues have all been resolved. When investment become the central aspect of the campaign what comes to the fore is the sophisticated financial systems, the incredible biodiversity and mineral resources, the growing exports, controlled inflation, a young population that is growing and substantial, sustained GDP growth compared to less financially stable Latin American neighbors. This comes at the expense of acknowledging the ongoing issues that face those who remain and the issues that cause many to emigrate.

#### *US Travel Warnings and Risk*

The very acknowledgement of negative perceptions of Colombia based on its association with drug trafficking, violence and risk is not absent within *Colombia es*

---

<sup>154</sup> In a promotional video of *Marca Colombia* (roughly translated as Colombia™) President Juan Manuel Santos says that because Colombia is experiencing a new moment where its better poised than ever before to offer solutions to the world's needs that a new campaign and brand were in order. Specifically he notes, "We have what the world needs," and thus the new tagline of the campaign is "*La respuesta es Colombia*" or translated to English "the answer is Colombia" ("La Nueva Marca Pais" 2012). In contrast to the previous *Colombia es Pasión* brand, *La Respuesta es Colombia* is supposed to emphasize the general economic attractiveness and resources of the nation for foreign investment rather than directly appeal to tourism as was the focus of "the only risk is wanting to stay."

*Pasión* but rather an integral component of its campaign. Deployed in a way that plays with the stereotypes—acknowledging them with a wink and nod in order to present a new narrative—the tagline of the tourism-specific campaign “the only risk is wanting to stay” elicits an affective relationship to the brand premised on excitement and danger. Rife within the brand and its campaign are not only descriptions and visualizations of passion (specifically the red heart logo), but also allusions to risk, danger and warning. The playing with notion of risk heightens the sensorial aspect of the campaign while allowing the brand to gloss over the particularities of its political history that have created the negative reputation in the first place.

The tagline “the only risk is wanting to stay” invokes risk to deliberately play with the negative stereotypes that exist about the nation. Not only does this reference to risk obscure the history that created those very conditions, but also it alludes to the continued designation of Colombia as a travel risk by the US State department. Travel warnings have been implemented and renewed by Presidents Clinton, Bush and Obama due to guerilla activity across the nation as guerilla activity is often categorized as terrorist activity. The first travel warning was issued in October 1995 through an Executive Order to address with what President Clinton believed was the threat that Colombian narcotraffickers and the violence and corruption of the state posed for U.S. national security, foreign policy and economy. The most recent renewal of the warning in June 2015 notes that though kidnapping is far less of a threat to US travellers than in 2000, the year kidnapping was at its peak, still positions risk as a preeminent concern. This risk as expressed through the official channels of the US government, regarding the

sustained issues of safety and travel, is markedly different from the use of risk in the campaign as the tagline turns a travel warning into an invitation.<sup>155</sup>

Playing with the notion of risk invites foreign travelers to participate as consumers in the remaking of Colombia's perceptions through their affective experiences. The underlying message is that tourist will not only come to feel safe once they see what Colombia is truly like but that they will not want to leave; they too will become passionate about Colombia. The desire to stay will trump the feelings of insecurity that might prevent someone from coming in the first place, a sentiment echoed in articles that highlight Colombia as an attract travel destination for U.S. citizens. In late 2007 the New York Times labeled Bogotá 21<sup>st</sup> in its list of "53 Places to Go in 2008" enticing intrepid travelers with the line "Bogotá might be remembered for its death squads and gang violence, but this Colombian megalopolis - the fourth-largest city in South America - is cleaning up its act and drawing tourists with its cultural diversity and colonial charms" (Lee 2007). Two years later, the paper listed the whole country as #26 on its "31 places to go in 2010," stating "Unfairly or not, Colombia is still known for its cocaine cartels and street violence, but cool-hunting travelers are calling it Latin

---

<sup>155</sup> The June 2015 warning reads "The incidence of kidnapping in Colombia has diminished significantly from its peak in 2000. However, kidnapping remains a threat. Terrorist groups and other criminal organizations continue to kidnap and hold civilians, including foreigners, for ransom. No one is immune from kidnapping on the basis of occupation, nationality, or other factors. The US government places the highest priority on the safe recovery of kidnapped U.S. citizens, but it is US policy not to make concessions to kidnappers" ("Colombia Travel Warning"). Despite US travel warnings between 2002 and 2009 the number of annual foreign visitors arriving in Colombia increased from 1.1 million to 2.5 million only solidifying its appeal as international tourist destination. See Nasser 2012 for a further discussion of the ways in which *Colombia es Pasión* plays with the notion of risk to entice tourists by appealing to their sensibilities as intrepid adventurers. Nasser's analysis also offers an in-depth discussion of the promotional videos of *Colombia es Pasión*, specifically the promotional video that flashes "FBI Warning" before instructing viewers that the video is not appropriate for "anyone with a weak heart."

America's next affordable hot spot" (Lee 2010). Here too US-based travelling writing invokes violence and narco-trafficking as if they are the worries of the past in order to position travelers as adventurers and consumers.

The passion as the affective substance at the center of *Colombia es Pasión* is not a mere side effect of the "successes" of neoliberal economic restructuring and Plan Colombian, but rather passion emerges as the central medium through which the transformations of the nation are to be *felt*. Passion becomes the way to apprehend that the old perceptions do not match the "new" reality of Colombia; one has to feel passionate about the nation and feel safe in order to fully experience the changes.

#### The Colombian Nation-State and Colombians Outside its Borders

It is non-Colombians who are affected by the reliance on affect in the brand and the campaign. Affect becomes central to how Colombians are constituted and constitute themselves as modern transnational citizens. In certain ways this glossing over of history in the national brand also contradicts the suite of transnational policies the nation has been pursuing to more readily integrate Colombians living in the exterior into the national social and political body.

For decades the Colombian government, political decision makers and analysts often understood out-migration as a response to under-employment in the nation and opportunities for higher incomes outside as a benign process that needed no intervention. Prior to the mid-1990s Colombian government had been doing little to integrate or even acknowledge its migrants and when it did it was to promote the return of high-skilled, high-educated professionals to combat brain drain (Cardona et al. 1980; Guarnizo 2006). Yet in the mid-1990s, the Colombian state sought to change its position toward

immigration as part of a larger interest in repositioning the nation in the global political economy. First as discussed earlier neoliberal economic reforms and restructuring were key to this repositioning, as were economic and political ties to the United States. Second, a newer approach, sought to capitalize on migrants outside of Colombia, especially those in the United States, as “potential advocates of ‘national’ interests before the US government” (Guarnizo and Diaz 1999: 398).

With the goal of strengthening transnational the nation-state devised and implemented programs and projects sought to incorporate Colombians outside the nation through public policies that addressed their political and social needs. The new constitution in 1991 introduced an array of social and political reforms<sup>156</sup> and for the first time addressed migrants by establishing dual citizenship and the right of residents in the exterior to elect a representative to the Lower Chamber of Representatives. In particular it was the high volume of remittances of Colombians abroad that sparked not only their increased visibility to the state but also their value as both local ambassadors and economic contributors.

The since 1993 the Colombian government has established several programs that seek to strengthen transnational links with migrants abroad in order to increase financial and affective contributions, as investment in dollars and pesos is matched with emotional

---

<sup>156</sup> Some of the major changes of the 1991 constitution include the elimination of the two-party agreement between the Liberal and Conservative parties to alternate the presidency. The 1991 constitution also recognized the past restriction of rights and recognition to both indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities. For each marginalized group the constitution recognized cultural assets, language rights and protections and rights to land (Safford and Palacios). Though dual nationality and pertinent rights were established in the 1991 constitution the related constitutional articles were not regulated until ten years later. Colombians in the exterior were only able to participate in legislative elections beginning in 2002 and Colombians who obtained US citizenship prior to July 4, 1991 cannot be eligible for dual citizenship, as they are no longer considered Colombian nationals.

ties. Anthropologist Ann Stoler (2005) has argued affect and sentiment have long been central to governing projects, and these efforts of the Colombian state seek to cultivate a sense of connection towards migrants in the exterior as well as cultivate migrants' feelings of connection to Colombia. In part because of a broader ideological commitment to free market demands and forces these projects, beginning in 1993 with *Colombia para todos* (Colombia for everyone) and *Colombia Nos Une* (Colombia Unites Us) in 2003 have focused facilitating economic remittances (Guarnizo 2006; "Colombia Nos Une" 2004). Through the Ministry of Foreign Relations' *Colombia Nos Une* offers training, credit and investment in different overseas locations to target not only high-skilled migrants but also lower and middle class migrants who comprised the bulk of the second wave.<sup>157</sup> Also established in 2003, *Conexión Colombia* (Colombia Connection) is program that draws government supports, support from the private sector and NGO support, to direct donations from Colombian groups or individuals abroad to NGOs in Colombia.

It is precisely migrants' location in the exterior that renders them so valuable to Colombia. These programs though devised to respond to Colombia's increasing expatriate population were also efforts to maintain close national ties among the Colombians abroad with political and material consequences as remittances have come to

---

<sup>157</sup> The five main goals of Colombia Nos Une in are, in its own words, to: 1) Generate initiatives, projects and strategies aimed at promoting networking and collaborative activities among Colombians within and outside the country and to promote the positive contributions of migrants to address the problems and real needs of the country; 2) Manage institutional initiatives for Colombians abroad and their families in Colombia. Specifically in terms of social security, housing acquisition, opening savings accounts in Colombian banks from outside the county, and proper utilization of remittances; 3) Develop actions to promote orderly and regulated migration; 4) Promote actions to foster positive conditions for Colombians who decide to return home; 5) Develop social networking processes that increase the capital of Colombian communities abroad. (Colombia Nos Une, 2004)

form a major source of income for the country and relatives who remain there. Between 1999 and 2004 remittances increased from almost \$1.3 million to nearly 3.2 million constituting 1.55% and 3.3% of the GDP respectively. In 2003 the remittances sent from Colombians living outside the nation surpassed the revenue generated by coffee exportation, coal and oil, and remittances that year made Colombia the eighth largest recipient of remittances globally. In 2004 remittances totaled \$3.857 million (in US dollars), which accounted for four percent of the national GDP according to the state-run central bank, the Bank of the Republic. In 2004 Colombia became the second largest recipient of remittances in Latin America.

Without doubt, the Colombian state now seeks to actively incorporate migrants into the national project as about a third of Colombians receive remittances. Understanding the relationships Colombian migrants in the exterior have towards the nation-state and the relationship the nation-state seeks to foster with its migrants illuminates how Richard and Rudnyk's concept of economies of affect "entail both a mode of producing new economic relations and a medium of subjectifying those who are enmeshed within these relations" (2009: 68). Policy transformations of sending countries towards migrants living abroad illuminate the redefinition of the nation-state itself and the reconfiguration of citizenship and membership to those who reside outside its territorial boundaries (Coutin 2007; Guarnizo 2006). To Colombia, Colombians migrants matter primarily as economic conduits of US dollars mirroring the importance of US-Colombia political and economic relations.

While Comaroff and Comaroff argue that national brand maximizes its effectiveness by repositioning its subjects as stakeholders in the "corporate nation"

(2009: 128), they do not consider is how migrants living outside the nation can come to be positioned as a particular kind of stakeholder in the national branding—a stakeholder whose value comes from their physical and social location outside the nation. Yet Colombianos in the US become the most powerful stakeholders and subjects of the Colombian nation precisely because of the long history of US-Colombia relations that form the crux of the material in the *Colombia es Pasión* brand and campaign. When the strategies of *Colombia es Pasión* gloss over these issues to change perceptions of Colombia on the global market, it comes at a great cost to Colombians who continue to experience the harsh realities of political violence in the present moment but it also comes at a great cost to those who have emigrated to the US to escape the conditions of political instability, narco-trafficking, economic crisis and the reduction of social services.

*Colombia es Pasión* crafts images of a Colombia as neoliberal paradise replete with the affective enticements of passion and risk in order to attract capital investment and emotional investment. In addition to attracting tourists and corporations, the national brand attempts to have Colombian migrants living in the exterior forge strong, deeply felt ties to the nation. Coupled with the newly formed state programs that target Colombians in the exterior, the national brand also seeks to create Colombian migrants as new subjects who believe in passion of Colombia and feel passionate about its changes and its potential as an undiscovered opportunity.

An analysis of the creation and dissemination *Colombia es Pasión* reveals how the erasure of an unwanted history ignored the persistence of political, economic and social issues in Colombia and the impetus for migration, but also reconfigures the relationships among individuals, the markets and the nation-state through a reliance on

affect as the medium through which modern subjects like diasporic Colombians are forged. Inherent within *Colombia es Pasión* is the idea of progress and new perceptions of Colombia and Colombians can be, has been and should be forged through passion. This in turn intersects with the way Colombian migrants in Philadelphia form their own subjectivity as Colombianos and craft notions of Colombianidad based on their affective dispositions.

#### Local Ambassadors of Affect: Representing the Nation and Crafting Colombianidad

One of the main ways they seek to contribute to this narrative of change, while critiquing its claims towards their own ends is through crafting a Colombianidad that highlights their best selves. To change negative perceptions they become representatives of the nation becoming exceptional citizens selling the Colombian nation through their embodiment of idealized representative. As Colombian migrants come to bear the particular stigmas of Colombia's association with violence and narco-trafficking, they insert these experiences as having made them compassionate and more understanding reinforcing how Colombianos come to understand themselves.

Affect becomes the main language and the main medium for Colombians to understand their everyday life experiences in Philadelphia and affective dimensions like passion, compassion and sensitivity came to undergird how they understood themselves as uniquely positioned to change negative perceptions of the Colombian nation. Thus strong feelings of passion and compassion and the sensitivity towards discrimination are not simply ancillary to the production of national brand premised on affect. Instead, affect is central to the creation of new perceptions of Colombians that are supposed to match its new reality and affect is central to the crafting of Colombianidad.

Affective belonging to both Colombia and the US are reconfigured in national branding within a longer history of complex geopolitical relation. More importantly these marketing strategies do not remain pristine as the Colombianos in Philadelphia draw on the messages and images of the campaign to make sense of their own experiences. Through their engagement they transform the meanings of *Colombia es Pasión* towards their own ends and I explore how Colombianos in Philadelphia are viewed and how they view themselves as it is tied to how Colombia itself is perceived.

As the Colombian government has crafted a national brand and global marketing campaign precisely to produce new perceptions of the nation, Colombianos in Philadelphia also grapple with images as they fashion a sense of Colombianidad that attempts to overcome the dominant global perception of Colombia. Affect has become the medium through which many Colombians come to understand not only their racialization and stigmatization in Philadelphia but it is also the medium through which they come to embrace, resist and reconfigure centrality of passion and affect of the campaign to speak to their experiences.

Though the primary aim of *Colombia es Pasión* is to change the perceived image of the nation in order to attract investment and tourism, the campaign called for individuals to “be passionate for Colombia and identify with your country’s brand.” These notions of identifying with “your country’s own brand” hits home for Colombian migrants living in Philadelphia as it engenders serious implications for understanding how they engage with affect in their construction of Colombianidad.

### *Engaging Pasión*

In September of 2009 *Colombia es Pasión* held a traveling exhibit in cities across the United States. Its largest exhibit took up nearly half of New York's Grand Central Station's Vanderbilt Hall with dozens of large, brightly colored heart installations. The hearts themselves were fashioned after the main visual symbol of the *Colombia es Pasión* campaign and several of them were interactive displays that highlighted a different aspect of Colombia's passion—culture, music, diversity, urban cities and artistic talents. Exhibit booths filled the cavernous hall with the vivid jewel-colored images of Colombia as posters, video and photographs celebrated the various growing industries of Colombia, such as tourism, fashion, sustainable energy, and biodiversity. The exhibition lauded the most famous natural resource of Colombia, coffee, while attempting to gain interest in its lesser-known industries of flower export and green energy. Intrigued by the exhibit I attended with a handful of members from *Colombianos Adelante* (CA). During the hours spent walking around the exhibit and in the car rides to and from New York each member responded in their own ways to the message and images of the campaign while reflecting on their own sense of Colombianidad.

As a group we alternated between walking together and walking in pairs or alone in allowing each of us to become engrossed in whatever distracted us in the moment. I stood off to the side of one of the interactive hearts while jotting down notes when Mercedes, a member of *Colombianos Adelante* who often hosted the group meeting in her home in Northeast Philadelphia, approached and gave me her initial assessment of the exhibit. Mercedes was the first to be critical of the images available on posters and in the videos that only featured up-close shots of light skin Colombians and the use of light-skinned Colombians as the narrators for the video that had them. She remarked that

indigenous and Afro-Colombians only appeared as smaller figures in the larger visual images of landscape, and because of these smaller bodies and faces one could barely distinguish individuals and not see any facial features, they were not seen as individuals.

An Afro-Colombian woman from Cali who migrated with her husband directly to Philadelphia in 1998, Mercedes noted that she was highly attuned to the ways Afro-Colombians were marginalized in Colombia and said the images available that day were likely done without thought or attention. “We are usually put in like trees in the background, unless they show a Black woman dancing like over there or carrying fruit like in that one, then she is seen with both her face and body,”<sup>158</sup> she stated while pointing to specific posters. She followed up her critique noting that sensitivity to these issues emerged from her Colombianidad. She said

I know I am maybe more sensitive, more focused, on these issues than others might be. But I think because I have seen it and felt it there [Colombia] I see how it still exists among Colombians here too, not our group, but others. But I think sensitivity helps me pay more attention to the ways all sorts of people are ignored. That’s important. We Colombians are all sensitive to our emotions but this kind of sensitivity gives me a greater view of things not everyone notices.

For Mercedes her sensitivity provides insight to a general human condition and emerged not just from her experiences with mistreatment and casual racism in Colombia but

---

<sup>158</sup> The link between women and nature has been produced and reproduced in Latin America often premised on notions of purity and beauty argue that association of Latin American women with nature is inherent in the power struggles between the geopolitical North and South for economic domination, land and discourse (1997: 15). Nasser explores the association of Colombian women, nature, beauty and regionalism in her study of beauty pageants in the US. She argues that in the historical development of Colombia “as a consequence of the simultaneous development of the tourist industry and CNB, an inventory of national riches associated with certain *departamentos* began to arise. Part and parcel with it came the description of products as *lo colombiano* (Colombian), *lo nuestro* (ours) and *producto nacional* (national product). Women, particularly the beauty pageant participants, were also described in this manner. They were considered among the country’s natural and national products. This association persists in the present day” (2013: 306; See also Nasser 2012).

through an affective trait she attributes to all Colombians. As an Afro-Colombian woman her focus on the role of race and marginalization and something she incorporated into her daily life as a social service worker in the largest Latino community organization in North Philadelphia—a job that this sensitivity and acute emotional acumen gave her greater skill in handling the individual cases of those who struggle in the city. Her critique opened up a larger dialogue about her sense of Colombianidad and understanding of racial marginalization in Colombia and the United States. Nevertheless she lauded the exhibit overall and made several remarks throughout the day about the importance of such an exhibit existing.

Mercedes was excited to attend the exhibit not only because she relished any opportunity to visit New York but also because she was excited about the celebration of Colombianness and the changes that the *Colombia es Pasión* campaign emphasized. She noted that there were many Colombians and other Latinos—she could tell by their differently accented Spanish—and even more noteworthy to her were the number of American, meaning White, families and tourists roaming through Grand Central were walking through to see the exhibit. Mercedes felt great pride in the sheer number of people that were there and continued that this pride came from seeing all the other Colombians who came to support their country and were invested in “how far their country has come.” Moreover she said it was even more essential for the Americans and tourists to see the “other side of Colombia, the good parts” but also important for them to see the numerous Colombians who came to the exhibit as well. Mirroring the core tenets of the national brand itself Mercedes wanted the non-Colombians at the exhibit to feel the extraordinary *orgullo*, pride, and passion that Colombians have. She noted they must

“sense” it while walking around the exhibit because the pride and passion that she as a Colombian brought there was palpable.

A little bit later in the afternoon over coffee two other members of *Colombianos Adelante* continued to discuss the relationship between Colombianos, affect and perceptions of the Colombian nation. Olga, who migrated from Cali, reflected on the day’s exhibit and said, “We, like Colombia, suffer from an image problem. We are very passionate in everything we do here and people need to know that. We are not dangerous bad people, we do good things and people need to recognize them.” For Olga this lack of visibility for Colombians in Philadelphia and the US, whose efforts to improve their lives goes unrecognized because of the negative perception of the Colombian nation, is also couched in terms of passion. She continued, “they [Americans] need to know we are not dangerous *narcotraficantes* because that’s what they think of as Colombia, but we are hard-working, passionate, caring people.”

Carlotta, responded to Olga’s statements by saying, “we work hard for our community because we need to, we work hard for Colombia because it needs us to” and in doing so she hints that transnational connections for migrants are constituted through service both in their “new” location in Philadelphia and oriented towards themselves and towards their nation of origin. Born in Medellín, Colombia in the early 1970s Carlotta migrated to Philadelphia in 1985 as a young teenager with her parents, in part to escape the escalating violence in the city at the height of the Medellín cartel’s stronghold. Though Carlotta has positive memories of growing up in Medellín she also was deeply affected by the reasons her family left. Responding to Olga’s comments as they touched directly upon her own life history Carlotta linked the need for hard work in the

Colombian community in Philadelphia to not only improving the reputation of Colombia but also to a broader process of *hacer patria*, or nation-making (Nasser 2013).

Her participation, her *hacer patria* became embedded within the ways she constructs a notion of Colombianidad. She followed up on her original comment by stating, “People only focus on the bad. We are warming and caring, and many of us have nothing to do with the bad that remains over there.” Specifically here her Colombianidad emerges from an imperative to serve as an ambassador that seeks to address the condition of Colombianos in Philadelphia through her work in CA and working hard to help repair the reputation of the Colombian nation. In doing so she seeks to reassert herself, and other Colombianos, as separate from the “bad” of Colombia and distinguishes them as good by virtue of their affect.

As these women critiqued and discussed the *Colombian es Pasión* campaign they took seriously how they as social actors are also implicated in redressing the national image of Colombia. They put the discourses of the campaign, specifically the notion of passion is an affective resource, to their own use to address the enduring stigmas that Colombians endure in the US. Although the proportion of Colombian migrants involved or even connected to drug trafficking is very low, the stigma of narcotrafficking has marked migrants and shaped their racialization in the US. The contours of this particular racialization, where all Colombians are assumed to be associated with the drug trade, persists in the present day but was especially salient in the 1980s as the first wave of Colombian migration to Philadelphia coincided with the cocaine and crack epidemics that plagued the US and decimated communities of color. Those who migrated in the first and second wave were not immune from those associations.

Santiago, one of the two men who ventured to New York to scope out the *Colombia es Pasión* exhibit, shared his insights on and experiences with racialization as shaped by narco-trafficking stigmas on the ride home in his car. Though I had driven up with Carlotta, Santiago offered to take me back to my apartment in the city. I was eager not to have to take the regional rail and subway from the suburbs after a long day and I was eager to have an opportunity to talk to Santiago, whose nature was somewhat reserved. Santiago is not shy but very deliberate with his words so while he participated in the conversations throughout the day I was only able to ask him what he thought about the day and our discussions in the car. Like the others, Santiago endorsed the general message of *Colombia es Pasión*, and thought it was necessary for the country not only to have made a big turn around in terms of violence and economic growth, but also to make that turn around more visible. He was relatively uninterested in talking about the campaign but seemed keen to discuss the previous conversations of his fellow members of *Colombianos Adelante* in order to expand upon his own experiences with racialized stigmas of drugs. He said that the day at the exhibit reminded him of the good and the bad of Colombia but more importantly it reminded him that those perceptions, which marked him as a dangerous other in his first few years in Philadelphia.

Santiago came to Philadelphia in 1988 to join his wife who had settled there about eighteen months earlier. Now the owner of a small electronics store, when he first migrated to the city he worked in electronics repair. He recalled an instance when one of his co-workers, a White man also in his late twenties, asked in a hushed voice if he had cocaine or if he knew anyone that could get him cocaine. Santiago gave a vivid description of his bodily reaction; he described his body and tongue as frozen as he felt his heart sink

into the pit of his stomach. He first thought to pretend not to understand what his coworker asked but changed his mind to spare the harm of being asked again. Instead he sought to keep his composure by relaxing his shoulders to look casual and unfazed. He tried to keep his voice from trembling so that he wouldn't betray how he felt inside, and answered solemnly that he "didn't know anything about that and did not know anyone who knew about that."

Santiago recalled the profound sadness and even sense betrayal that he felt at his co-workers inquiry. His reflection focused on his bodily response and the affective displays of his reaction. Mirroring much of the other's CA member's commentaries that day he noted that Colombians are very emotional people so that he had to work hard to hide his reaction. Initially he looked down in shame but made the decision to look directly in his co-worker's eyes when he spoke back. His coworker never asked him again but that the encounter stayed with Santiago. In the months after Santiago self-consciously tried to be as nice as possible to the offending co-worker. First he wanted to show his co-worker that he was wrong to assume that Santiago was involved in cocaine simply because he was Colombian. Second, Santiago felt bad for his co-worker and intended to show him what he had not shown Santiago, compassion.

At the height of the international drug trade centered in Colombia in the 1980s and 1990s and the associated violence, kidnappings, and bombings in both rural and urban areas became the impetus for many to migrate elsewhere. Here Santiago's story highlights the indirect link between the marked nature of Colombian migrants and the reputation of illicit narcotics traffic followed them to the United States. Looking back on the situation Santiago thought himself naïve to have been surprised by the question. He

sighed as he noted that it was less about his co-worker as a person and more about the ubiquity of the information and media coverage of Colombia at the time. He said “everything on the TV, radio, whatever thing only talked about Colombia and drugs and cartels. It was inevitable.”

Though it was never the main purpose of *Colombia es Pasión* to rely on Colombians abroad to rework the image of the nation, the members of *Colombianos Adelante*'s reactions reveal the ways in which the marketing intentions of the campaign are redirected to address the politics and the stakes of creating Colombianidad, especially a Colombianidad premised on affect. Furthermore these examples illuminate the ways the members of *Colombianos Adelante* grappled with the rhetoric of the national branding campaign and put it to use for themselves in order to position themselves as passionate migrants whose passion compels them to be hard working. Each comes to be invested in Colombia's narrative of transformation and to rework it to their own ends. For Mercedes, Olga, Carlotta and Santiago the negative perceptions of Colombia and the stigma they have come to bear can and should be corrected with an affective response. Yet affect as a medium not only ties Colombians as they craft their Colombianidad to connect them to Colombia but also serves as the substance through which they reflect on their life experiences and racialization in Philadelphia. The ability to feel compassion for others who wrong them or to produce feelings of passion and dedication, became, in the words of Richard and Rudnyckyj, a means of “conducting conduct and thus forming subjects” whereby expressions of Colombianidad form new subjects as Colombians in Philadelphia become representatives of the nation and its changes.

These members of *Colombianos Adelante* translated the national branding campaign to locate themselves as local ambassadors bearing the responsibility of disseminating a more positive perception of Colombia as they seek to claim a more positive image of themselves as Colombia migrants “doing good” in the US. As these individuals involved in *Colombianos Adelante* seek to align themselves with the culturally rich, passionate images of Colombia as a branded nation, they negotiate their own positionality through affect to make particular claims about themselves as deserving migrants.

There are many Colombians in the city not involved in *Colombianos Adelante* or who are only marginally interested in the programs they offer. The board members and other highly involved members of CA, including those who were able to visit the *Colombia es Pasión* exhibit in New York, are by and large middle-class, homeowners or business owners with professional jobs. Their investment in improving the image of Colombia is no doubt tied to their desire for success and social mobility. Yet their constructions of Colombianidad are by no means a monopoly on the multiple avenues and directions that it may take. Other constructions of Colombianidad also use affect as the medium through which subjectivity is fashioned but with a very different orientation towards the Colombian state and their experiences in the United States.

Recall Magdalena, mentioned in Chapter 4 and 6, whose husband was deported a few years later after she migrated in 1995. Magda had little interest in participating in AC events or programs with the exception of the mobile consulate visit where she could renew her Colombian *cédula* (national ID card). Though she too thought that in some way passion represents the Colombian “spirit and heart that most Colombians have,” she

had a more ambivalent relationship toward *Colombia es Pasión*, Colombia and its efforts to change its perceptions. Magda remained indifferent about changes in Colombia in the time since she left. When I met her in 2011, I off-handedly brought up the Colombian national brand and campaign and while she had not heard of it per se she had a very strong reaction. As I described the general concepts, the iconography and the tagline, Magdalena laughed and asked,

How have things changed and for who? Not for the poor rural *campesinos* [peasants/rural laborers] who have to deal with the paramilitaries and the guerillas. Not for those of us who chose to leave. The government here and there, they don't really care. They don't have that passion or warmth that the people are supposed to have. Not the Colombian government. It makes me laugh. Where is their passion? I have friends who left because first their social security got cut and then they got laid off. That's hardly compassionate.

A little later we discussed some of the other transnational programs the government had set up to incorporate migrants and again Magda derided the efforts saying

Oh now the government wants to bring us in? In what ways? But only if we have money to send back. Of course I send back, everyone who can does. But people are poor there and we are poor sometimes even when we come here. People struggle and many things are maybe worse here. Where is the program that addresses that?

Her disillusionment draws attention to the recent and one-directional interest that the Colombian governmental policies and programs use to try and re-incorporate migrants in the exterior. Though the discourses around the programs like *Colombia Nos Une* and even *Colombia es Pasión* tout unity and passion respectively as the means to connect migrants living outside the territorial nation, Magdalena deems these affective connections insincere and insufficient.

Her life circumstances, from her life spent in Colombia to her life spent in Philadelphia, have been shaped by hard decisions and difficulties. Her hometown of

Buga, is located in the Valle Del Cauca *departamento* is geographically situated between the city of Cali and the more rural coffee-growing region. Magda left with her husband and young son in 1995 to join her mother already in Philadelphia as the violence from the Cali cartel began to spread out of the city and into the more rural areas as clashes between military, paramilitary and guerillas grew more frequent in the 1990s.<sup>159</sup> Her husband's deportation became a personal crisis that symbolized neglect of migrants' circumstances by both the Colombian and US governments. Still Magdalena emphasized a sense of Colombianidad that emphasized a unique cultural character premised on affect, "our spirit, our warmth" in her words. Yet her feelings and disaffection for each government critiqued the notion that her problems or a nation's problem could be repaired through the creation of a brand, a campaign, or a new program.

A focus on the circulation of new images and discourses that celebrate the new, more positive ways to perceive Colombian nation in the national brand illuminates how Colombianos in Philadelphia craft an understanding of Colombianidad both in resistance to and in conjunction with these images, reputations and perceptions. This focus also illuminates the disjunctures between the brand's message and the persistent issues in Colombia as well as the disjunctures between the ways Colombians imagine themselves as both local ambassadors responsible for the distribution of Colombianness and the ways they have had to navigate how the negative associations of Colombia's reputation.

---

<sup>159</sup> In the mid-1990s Buga became the prime location where cartel-backed and military-supported paramilitary forces became more potent as they worked to block left-wing guerilla social and political agendas. They often recruited young men to gather intelligence about wealthy families in the area to either recruit for donation or establish targets (Human Rights Watch 2001). Buga also became the site of a paramilitary massacre in 2001 where an estimated 24 peasants were pulled from homes, buses and work places and shot because the paramilitaries accused of them of being guerilla supporters (Associated Press 2001).

Even as some circumstances improve in Colombia, the efforts of the national brand to close the gap between perception and reality can never address the ways Colombians living in the United States suffer at the hand of stigmatizing associations. In this light I draw attention to the inextricable link between affect as the medium through which subjects form their relations to the Colombian nation drawing from elements of their own experiences and the reputation of the nation. As some attempt to change the reputation of Colombia through their own performances of goodness and success, through passion, compassion and sensitivity which indicate they have successfully experienced subjective transformations that correspond to and shape economic transformations (Richard and Rudjnyckj 2009).

Colombian migrants in Philadelphia craft their version of Colombianidad, as grounded not only in their experiences in the local but as also shaped in dialogue with the transnational, specifically the changes within Colombia in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As affect becomes the medium through which Colombianidad is crafted, it is the substance that acts as the medium in which diasporic Colombians come to construct that Colombianidad vis-à-vis their experiences in Philadelphia, the national branding campaign, and the continued perception of the Colombian nation in the present. The social, political and economic situation of Colombia in the 21<sup>st</sup> century was incredibly salient to many, but not all, of my interlocutors who saw these “improvement” as their chance for their positive recognition in Philadelphia.

## CHAPTER 9

## CONCLUSION

Through an examination of how individuals craft, produce, express and assert Colombianidad I have shown how some Colombians have attempted to capitalize on both the policies that seek to attract and incorporate migrants in Philadelphia and the economic, political and social changes in Colombia in order to assert themselves as worthy migrants deserving of positive recognition and social inclusion in the city. This strategic formation and use of Colombianidad, reveals the flexible and contingent nature of Colombianidad and how it can operate as a petition for inclusion for Colombians to enter into broader local and nation debates about the nature of immigration and the contribution of immigrants.

Yet what are the consequences of these constructions of Colombianidad? On the one hand, they enable assertions of citizenship and belonging for migrants regardless of legal status. While Colombians demand they be seen and treated as citizens who do not deserve to be ignored, marginalized, policed, or imagined as threats and subject to unnecessary deportation, the contradictions within Philadelphia's policies and its racially divided space cannot meet those demands. Specifically chapters 5 and 6 emphasize citizenship as a means to illustrate how the contradictions with Philadelphia's local policies produce both a sense of belonging and profound sense of vulnerability for Colombians and other Latinos who fear deportation, mistreatment and racism. Moreover Chapter 6 reveals how belongingness and deservingness in Philadelphia can become premised on being the right kind of migrant, as Colombians offer versions of citizenship beyond legality that are grounded in their contributions to the city. While these practices

and performances rework the meanings of citizenship, they also position Colombians as self-sufficient, hard-working and personally responsible individuals firmly within the vein of neoliberal ideologies. As the dissertation addressed the linkages between citizenship and belonging I have pointed that the policies and discourses that valorize migrants in Philadelphia offer only a partial expansion of social and political rights as they retrench neoliberal ideas of personal responsibility.

In Philadelphia, the multiple meanings of Colombianidad can also be strategically deployed to resist and combat racial exclusion. At the same time, while Colombians reject their racialization these assertions can racialize others to in order to better position themselves as in the social hierarchy. Chapter 7, through its analysis of Latino contradistinction, elucidates how the self-promotion in Colombianidad draws upon the supposed improvements in Colombia to argue that Colombians have unfairly been stereotyped, where the goodness of their nation's new reality is mirrored in its new global reputation, as the rationale for the need to recognize Colombians in Philadelphia as good as well. Colombia was indeed a nation besieged the tumult of the drug trade, violence, and volatile politics, and these conditions became the reason why those who were able to leave chose to leave. Yet as Colombians continued to negotiate complex notions of Colombianidad, they defined their own identities through social relations with other Latinos in the city not merely as an attempt to carve out a distinct cultural identity but as an effort to avoid being positioned lower in the racial hierarchy of the city and its neighborhoods. As such the sense of Colombianidad implicated in Latino contradiction was a way for Colombians to avoid being seen as inferior and in doing so they reproduced the very inferior they sought to escape onto others.

The strategic deployment of Colombianidad also offers Colombians a way to redress their racialized marginalization and association with drugs and violence. With careful attention to how the Colombian nation-state seeks to more fully incorporate migrants in the diaspora into the social, political and economic conditions of their nation of origin, Chapter 8 illuminates how the national branding campaign *Colombia es Pasión* invokes affect as the rationale for migrants' investment in the nation. Similarly the chapter explores how as a brand premised on affect, the marketing of the nation seeks to transform its global reputation in order to attract capital investment, by invoking the supposed transformation of the political, social and economic conditions in contemporary Colombia in order to obscure the continued violence and displacement. Here notions of Colombianidad emerge through a dialogue between experiences in Philadelphia and those in Colombia, creating an ambiguous sense of belonging to both places.

Here a Colombianidad represents a means to participate in the formation of ideas about and representations of Colombia from outside its borders. Thus Chapters 7 and 8 illuminate how migrants remain engaged with their nation of origin and renegotiate identities in and between different geographic contexts with special attention to the political economy of migration both in terms of the global and local forces that compel migrants to leave, what attracts them to particular cities and how they are incorporated.

Through the dissertation I have sought to emphasize how Colombians are able to negotiate a sense of Colombianidad across time and place, underscoring Colombianidad as a process rather than an essence that is crafted under shifting structural conditions both within and between Colombia and Philadelphia. I want to conclude by considering the possibility or impossibility of comprehensive immigration reform in the US.

## Considering the Future of Localization and Comprehensive Immigration Reform

The questions that guided this dissertation, specifically how to understand the consequences of Philadelphia's local policies to attract immigrants for Colombians in the city, reveal both the possibilities enabled by and the limitations of creating an "immigrant-friendly" city. As the implementation of Philadelphia's policies are contradictory and incomplete because they are band-aid solutions to increasingly punitive and restrictive federal immigration policies; they finally offer partial protection from deportation. As such these local policies do little to change the vulnerability of immigrants beyond the boundaries of the city and even within the city they only scratch the surface. First contradictions emerge from the tensions between the Mayoral agreements to sustain ICE cooperation for multiple years and the efforts of City Council and political organizers to end them. Second the contradictions emerge from the disjuncture between efforts to attract and include migrants and whether those efforts make a difference in the material reality of the everyday lives of migrants.

For the few Colombians involved directly in political organizing in the city these are precisely the limitations of local politics that they seek to remedy. For Aron, employed as youth organizer at South Philadelphia-based immigrant rights organization, he argued that as a Colombian migrant whose parent brought him to Philadelphia at the age of six without documentation and a recently naturalized US citizen, he was uniquely positioned to understand the needs of both undocumented and documented Colombians and other Latinos in Philadelphia. While trying to come up with ways he thought Philadelphia was "friendly" to immigrants he argued that

So the city is supportive of Latino culture and cultural events but we are more than that. I mean if you want to be friendly to migrants you make

sure they have access to good education and jobs so that they can have real lives. But here the city fails immigrants and all city residents really because the public schools are crumbling and without a real education how is anyone supposed to get a decent job? But for undocumented migrants we need more. There need to be actual reforms. So City Council tried for three years to get mandatory paid sick leave in the city. Finally the Mayor [Nutter] signed it but we had worked with [Councilman] Greenlee for years and it failed twice. But with [paid] sick leave now as an undocumented worker you have more rights. So our new campaign is to spread the news to employers and employees so they know they can use it and the bosses know they have to honor it. Without that kind of stuff, its just kind of superficial, you know what I mean?

In this light while the policies seek to attract migrants they often stop short of changing the political and economic rights afforded to all migrants.

By tracing the successes and failures in Philadelphia to pass policies that attract and incorporate migrants, I have shown how they connect to devolution, stalled federal reform as well as the growth of harsher restrictive local policies. As a case study this dissertation also shows the contingencies of immigration reform in the US as the localization immigration policy may very well remain a new feature of the political landscape. More attention must be paid to inclusive measures even if they remain fewer in number for several reasons. Understanding the consequences, both intended and unintended, are critical to our understanding of the localization of migration policy as a whole.

While these inclusive measures do not guarantee freedom from surveillance, nor do they guarantee migrants access to resources that they may need and want, they are more viable than many features of the more restrictive policies. As the restrictive and punitive local policies are struck down because their tenets violate constitutionally guaranteed rights of all persons or because they violate the plenary power of the federal government to regulate immigration, local policies like those in Philadelphia are fully

legal and do not attempt to supersede federal power. Second, these inclusive, localized policies may ultimately influence the next round of federal policy to offer a pathway to citizenship as they have in the most recent attempt in 2013.

Though the hyper-partisanship in Congress has repeatedly stalled reform efforts, four Republican and four Democratic Senators labeled the “Gang of Eight” crafted a bill that incorporated a series of trade-offs and prerequisite conditions to be met before expanding the rights of undocumented migrants. In order to permit undocumented migrants in the US before December 31, 2011 to be eligible for “provisional” resident status, the bill proposed undocumented migrants would have had to pay fines and back taxes, and patiently navigate a thirteen-year pathway to citizenship. To offset the permission for undocumented migrants who were brought into the US as children by their parents to receive residency or citizenship, a number of border security measures would have to be completed prior.

Still, localization will remain a feature of immigration policy no matter if the next major federal reform skews inclusive or exclusive because of the varying needs of localities. Rodríguez argues, “The appearance of state and local measures is not simply (or even primarily) a symptom of the federal government’s failure to reform the immigration system. Instead, it reflects the *unsuitability* of a strictly federal response to immigration” (2008: 580). The growth of localized policies similarly attests to both the specific needs of localities (see also Heyman 1998) and divergent perceptions about immigration where exclusionary immigration laws reflect pre-existing sentiments about Latinos and other racial minorities already in the US.

In 2015, 49 states and Puerto Rico enacted 216 laws and resolutions that dealt

with immigration and immigrants. Up from the 171 laws passed in 2014, the measures addressed access to healthcare, education, employment rights, and driver's licenses (Gonzales 2016). While North Carolina passed a law that prohibited cities and counties from passing sanctuary ordinances—justified by the idea that sanctuary policies limit the enforcement of federal law—Oregon's legislation allows students without visas to be eligible for state-funded financial aid. Still, with the fate of President Obama's executive actions in the hands of the US Supreme Court, the future of federal reform remains unclear as localized measures remain subject to contestation.

### *The Fragility of Philadelphia's Inclusive Policies*

Localization is processual in and of itself and not a *fait accompli*—it is in limbo, subject to contestation, rejection and repeal. In Philadelphia there is significant political mobilization to expand the rights of noncitizens through grassroots organizing. Campaigns to end deportation, to close the family detention center in nearby Berks County join efforts to lobby the Pennsylvania government to re-allow undocumented migrants to be issued driver's licenses. Previously, residents in Pennsylvania were able to use their individual tax identification numbers (ITIN) issued by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to obtain a driver's license.<sup>160</sup> The law was revoked in 2009 and Pennsylvania revoked the licenses of everyone who had legally obtained them while the law was active. The organizing efforts have found an ally in Councilwoman Quiñones-Sánchez who is lobbying state representatives to fight for driver's licenses and introduced

---

<sup>160</sup> The IRS issues an ITIN regardless of immigration status precisely because while many noncitizens are not eligible for a Social Security Number, an ITIN allows them to file and pay federal and state income taxes.

legislation in 2013 to create a municipal ID card for all Philadelphia residents so that undocumented migrants have access to government-issued identification.<sup>161</sup>

In spite of gains made toward creating municipal IDs or to regain driver's licenses, migrants remain vulnerable to local policy changes. For instance in the final weeks of his second term in office Mayor Nutter repealed Philadelphia's end to the ICE collaboration in November 2015. Fearing for the safety and security of migrants in Philadelphia, activists and organizations immediately took to City Hall to protest the move as it coincided with the Department of Homeland Security's plan for ICE to execute nationwide raids to find and deport Central Americans who increasingly entered the US since 2013 to escape persecution in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras with the hopes of gaining asylum.

Though Mayor Nutter's reactivation of ICE cooperation remained in place for the remainder of his lame-duck days in office, the election of James Kenney to Mayor offered a modicum of relief. Kenney pledged to rectify that change and on his first day in office he signed an executive order that declared Philadelphia PD and city prisons would not honor ICE detainer requests for nonviolent criminals. A few weeks after Philadelphia reactivated its policy of noncooperation, the Department of Security announced that Nutter would become part of a federal advisory council for DHS. Mayor Nutter's reversal in November appeared to be a calculated move as many immigrant-rights activists suspected that DHS had been trying to convince a well-known city to reverse its "sanctuary policy" and adopt the Priority Enforcement Program in order to lend credence

---

<sup>161</sup> There exist municipal ID card programs in Los Angeles, San Francisco, New Haven, Connecticut, Washington D.C. and soon New York City. In an official press release in 2013 Councilwoman Quiñones-Sánchez stated, "Photo IDs are an essential part of modern life, and every Philadelphian deserves access to one."

to the new program. The change in Philadelphia, however brief, served as a reminder that years of gains could be undone with a single moment. As organizers and organizations condemned Nutter's reversal as selling out the city's immigrants for personal gain, it reflects a deeper contention over the existence, future and possibility of "sanctuary cities" in a national politics besieged by anti-immigrant nativism.

*National Debates and the Politics of Sanctuary Cities*

Despite the ubiquity of the term "sanctuary city" there is no legal definition and no agreed upon usage in public discussion about immigration. Different invocations of the term allow different actors from politicians to everyday citizens to stretch the meaning of "sanctuary city" towards their own ends. Common misconceptions about sanctuary policies fuel the ire directed at municipalities who pass them in a moment of renewed nativism, xenophobia and anti-immigrant sentiment. In this light, growing criticism of sanctuary policies also emerge in response to the publicity around crimes committed by undocumented migrants and have become a focal point of political discussion in the impending 2016 presidential election.

Questions about security, criminality and the "illegality" of undocumented migrants again came to the fore in July 2015. In San Francisco a young woman died after sustaining a gunshot wound at the hands of an undocumented migrant, who said the gun went off accidentally while at a public pier. The incident fueled strident debates over whether cities do or should have the authority to pass such policies. Pundits and politicians blamed a broken immigration system for the woman's death as the shooter had been deported multiple times and blamed the city's law enforcement for releasing him in March without notifying ICE. While ICE had issued a detainer, it had not issued a

warrant, and no other authorities had existing warrants that would have compelled the San Francisco Sheriff's Department to turn the man over to ICE. San Francisco law and local government maintained that they have the legal authority to disregard ICE detainers, as local jurisdictions cannot hold arrestees indefinitely without probable cause.

The event's concurrence with the incipient phases of 2016 presidential campaigns turned the tragedy into the example par excellence of why sanctuary city policies must be eliminated. In response the US House of Representatives passed a bill that sought to increase the penalties applied for those who reenter the US after being deported. A parallel bill was submitted in the Senate and though it did not pass it retains popular and partisan support. Yet another bill submitted for consideration in the Senate sought to withhold federal funds from cities and states that pass sanctuary policies because they supposedly violate federal law, which means lawmakers similar perpetuate these misconceptions through legislation. Heeding calls to take a harder line on immigration entrenches immigration as a perpetual "crisis" where enforcement and deportation are the only solutions.

#### *Misconceptions*

Being in the US without documentation authorizing one's presence is a civil violation of federal law, and as such local jurisdictions can never prosecute an individual, only the federal government can. As the dissertation has detailed, local law enforcement has only recently had the ability or authority to partner with the federal officers for immigration enforcement. The idea that cities and states are responsible to identify, arrest, detain and deport undocumented migrants emerges out of those changes and in the absence of comprehensive federal reform. A persistent criticism is that so-called sanctuary cities do not use their resources to "track down" undocumented migrants or

that local law enforcement do not arrest undocumented migrants when they learn their immigration status. Yet it is a misconception that local police departments should or can investigate and arrest people solely on the basis of immigration status. All persons, regardless of citizenship or legal status, are guaranteed the constitutional right to due process and against unreasonable search and seizure. An ICE request to detain someone without a charge, precisely the issue in San Francisco, can violate a person's rights.

The rhetoric that supports penalizing sanctuary cities by withholding funds is often justified by the notion that the punishment is warranted because the refusal to honor ICE detainers or to accept ICE enforcement programs violates federal law. Yet this is another misconception. For instance, Philadelphia's policy to bar ICE holds does not violate federal law rather it goes against Department of Homeland Security regulations. The ruling that localities are not required to uphold DHS regulations stems from a federal case from Allentown, Pennsylvania. When a New Jersey-born Puerto Rican man working at a construction job was picked up alongside his boss and two undocumented co-workers, the man was held for several days while police checked his immigration status even though he provide his social security number and driver's license and indicated his birthplace as the next state over. The 2014 ruling in federal circuit court declared that immigration detainers do not and can never compel local law enforcement to detain those suspected to be undocumented. Therefore cities like Philadelphia and San Francisco who do not comply with ICE detainers are not only within their legal rights to do so but provide an important check on the expansion of police power and an important check on the jurisdictional issues of immigration enforcement that have been made more ambiguous by the devolution of authority.

The ambiguous invocations of “sanctuary,” the lack of a uniform definition, and the misconceptions that abound make these policies particularly vulnerable. The meaning can be stretched to encompass measures that make cities more welcoming and could even become applied to programs like municipal IDs for the sake of hyper-partisan politics. Yet cities like Philadelphia will continue to dictate conversations about immigration reform. Even as immigration will always be a federal issue what the localization of policy highlights is the profound social, political and economic implications for localities. There is a serious need to understand the details of the localization of policy and its consequences because it contributes to a larger understanding of the changes in the ways that the rights of immigrants and noncitizens are being reconfigured in the present moment across the US, and in novel ways.

We are at a critical juncture in the history of immigration reform in the United States, while comprehensive reform occurs perhaps once a generation we are witnessing a more frequent attempt to change the ways in which federal and local governments conceptualize membership. On one hand there are annual submission of bills in US Congress to end birthright citizenship, while immigrants right groups fight for the DREAM Act, driver’s licenses and an end to deportation, especially on the grounds it tears families apart. On the other hand these changes may come far sooner than history might suggest and may take an unanticipated shape, as more localities and cities position immigration and immigrants as a solution for decline.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Adams, Carolyn, David Bartelt, David Elesh, Ira Goldstein, Nancy Kleniewski, and William Yancey. 1991. *Philadelphia: Neighborhoods, Divisions and Conflict in a Postindustrial City*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Adams, Carolyn, David Bartlet, David Elesh and Ira Goldstein. 2008 *Restructuring the Philadelphia Region: Metropolitan Divisions and Inequality*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ahmed, Sarah. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Aparicio, Ana. 2006. *Dominican-Americans and the Politics of Empowerment*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Aparicio, Frances. 2009. "Cultural Twins and National Others: Allegories of Intralatio Subjectivities in U.S. Latino/a Literature." *Identities* 16(5): 622-641.
- Aparicio, Frances and Susana Cháves-Silverman. 1997. *Tropicalizations: Transcultural Representations of Latinidad*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Appelbaum, Nancy. 2003. *Muddied Waters: Race, Region and Local History in Colombia, 1846- 1948*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Associated Press. 2001. "At Least 24 in Colombia Massacred." *Los Angeles Times*. October 12.
- Bacon, David. 2012. "How US Policies Fueled Mexico's Great Migration." *The Nation*. January 23.
- Bauman, John F. 1992. "W. Wilson Goode: The Black Mayor as Urban Entrepreneur." *The Journal of Negro History* 77 (3): 141-158.142.
- Bérubé, Myriam. 2005. "Colombia: In the Crossfire." in *Migration Information Source - Country Profiles*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bonner, Anne Marie. "10 Signs of Global Progress in Greater Philadelphia" August 28, 2015. Accessed September 13, 2015 [http://economyleague.org/providing-insight/regional-direction/2015/08/28/10-signs-of-global-progress-in-greaterphiladelphia?utm\\_source=Economy%20League%20Newsletter&utm\\_campaign=1e540591f6Citizens%27%20Business%3A%20August%202015&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_term=0\\_fdeb7c0f15-1e540591f6-52786045](http://economyleague.org/providing-insight/regional-direction/2015/08/28/10-signs-of-global-progress-in-greaterphiladelphia?utm_source=Economy%20League%20Newsletter&utm_campaign=1e540591f6Citizens%27%20Business%3A%20August%202015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_fdeb7c0f15-1e540591f6-52786045)

- Bose, Christine. 2001. *Women in 1900: Gateway to the Political Economy of the 20th Century*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bosniak, Linda. 1998. "The Citizenship of Aliens." *Social Text* 56: 29-35.
- Bosniak, Linda. 2000. "Citizenship Denationalized." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*. 7(2): 447-509.
- Bosniak, Linda. 2006. *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Richard Nice, trans. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brash, Julian. 2011. *Bloomberg's New York: Class and Governance in the Luxury City*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Brenner, Neil. 2004. *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford, England and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Brettell, Carolyn. 2003. "Bringing the City Back In: Cities as Contexts for Immigrant Incorporation." In *American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigration*. Edited by Nancy Foner pp 163-196. Santa Fe: School for American Research Press.
- Bushnell, David. 1993. *The Making of Modern Colombia: A Nation in Spite of Itself*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Calavita, Kitty 1992. *Inside the State: the Bracero Program, Immigration, and the I.N.S.* New York: Routledge.
- Calavita, Kitty. 1996. "The New Politics of Immigration: "Balanced-Budget Conservatism" and the Symbolism of Proposition 187." *Social Problems*. 43(3): 284-305.
- Cardona, Ramiro, Carmen Inés Cruz, Juanita Castaño, Elsa M. Chaney, Mary G. Powers y John J. Macisco Jr. 1980. *El Exodo de Colombianos: Un Estudio de la Corriente Migratoria a los Estados Unidos y un Intento Para Propiciar el Retorno*, Bogotá, Ediciones Tercer Mundo.
- Carrillo, Angela Consuelo. 2009. "Internal Displacement in Colombia: Humanitarian, Economic and Social Consequences in Urban Settings and Current Challenges" *International Review of the Red Cross* Volume 91 Number 875 September.

- Castells, Manuel. 1989. *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban-Regional Process*. Oxford, England and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castro Caycedo, Germán. 1989. *El Hueco: La entrada ilegal de colombianos a Estados Unidos por México, Bahamas y Haití*. Bogotá: Planeta.
- Cepeda, Maria Elena. 2010. *Musical ImagiNation: U.S.-Colombian Identity and the Latin Music Boom*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Chavez, Leo. 2001. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chavez, Leo. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens and the Nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Chesluck, Benjamin. 2008. *Money Jungle: Imagining the New Times Square*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press.
- Chock, Phyllis Pease. 1996. No New Women: Gender, “Alien,” and “Citizen” in the Congressional Debate on Immigration. *PoLAR Political and Legal Anthropology Review*. 19(1): 1-10.
- City of Philadelphia. 2008. "Five-Year Financial and Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2009-2013." Michael A. Nutter, Mayor, Philadelphia.
- Coleman, Matthew. 2007a. "A Geopolitics of Engagement: Neoliberalism, the War on Terrorism, and the Reconfiguration of U.S. Immigration Enforcement." *Geopolitics*, Vol. 12, 607–634.
- Coleman, Matthew., 2007b. "Immigration Geopolitics Beyond the Mexico-U.S. Border." *Antipode*, Vol. 39, 54–76.
- Coll, Kathleen. 2010. *Remaking Citizenship: Latina Immigrants and the New American Politics*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Collier, Michael W. and Eduardo A. Gamarra. 2003. “The Colombian Diaspora in South Florida. Working Paper. Colombian Studies Institute, Colombian Diaspora Project, Latin American and Caribbean Center. Florida International University. March 27-29. [http://lacc.fiu.edu/publications\\_resources/publications\\_frm.htm](http://lacc.fiu.edu/publications_resources/publications_frm.htm).
- “Colombia.” The World Bank. Accessed January 12, 2014. <http://data.worldbank.org/country/colombia>

- Colombia Nos Une. 2004. "Memorias del Seminario sobre Migración Internacional Colombiana y la Conformación de Comunidades Transnacionales, Junio 18 y 19 de 2003". Bogota: Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Colombia.
- Comaroff, John L. and Jean Comaroff. 2009. *Ethnicity Inc.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Council of the City of Philadelphia. 2011. Resolution No. 110536. Accessed February 8, 2012. <http://legislation.phila.gov/attachments/11804.pdf>.
- "Country Profile: Colombia." 2015. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e492ad6.html>
- Countryman, Matthew J. 2007. *Up South: Civil Rights and Black Power in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Countryman, Matthew. 2006. "From Protest to Politics, Community Control and Black Independent Politics in Philadelphia, 1965-1984." *Journal of Urban History*. 32 (6): 813-861
- Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2007. *Nation of Emigrants: Shifting Boundaries of Citizenship in El Salvador and the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Crew, Spencer R. 1987. *Field to Factory, Afro-American Migration 1915-1940*. Washington: Smithsonian Institute.
- DANE 1996a Censo 1993, XVI Censo Nacional de Población y V de Vivienda, Resumen Nacional. Santafé de Bogotá: DANE—1996c Censo 1993, XVI Censo Nacional de Población y V de Vivienda, Valle. Santafé de Bogotá: DANE—1997 Boletín Estadístico, Santafé de Bogotá: DANE
- DANE Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadísticas National Administrative Department of Statistics (Colombia), Documento Conciliación: Estimación de la Migración 1973-2005 and Colombia, Estimaciones de la migración 1985-2005 y Proyecciones 2005-2020 (Bogota: National Administrative Department of Statistics, 2005),
- "DHS's 'Secure Communities': No Rules of the Road." March 2011. National Immigration Law Center. Accessed October 19, 2014 <http://www.nilc.org/secure-communities-2009-03-23.html>
- Dávila, Arlene. 2004. *Barrio Dreams: Puerto Ricans, Latinos and the Neoliberal City*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Davis, Mike. 1992. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

- De Genova, Nicholas and Ana Y. Ramos Zayas. 2003. *Latino Crossings: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and the Politics of Race and Citizenship*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- De Genova, Nicholas and Nathalie Peutz. 2010. "Introduction" in *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, Nicholas De Genova and Nathalie Peutz, eds. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 1-29.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2002. Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 419-47.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2005. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- DeSipio, Louis and Rodolfo de la Garza. 1998. *Making Americans, Remaking America: Immigration and Immigrant Policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Diaz-Barriga, Miguel. 2008. Distracción: Notes on Cultural Citizenship, Visual Ethnography, and Mexican Migration to Pennsylvania. *Visual Anthropology Review* 24: 133-147.
- Diaz-Briquets, Sergio, and Melinda Frederick. 1984. "Colombian Emigration: A Research Note on Its Probable Quantitative Extent." *International Migration Review* 18(1): 99-110.
- Dick, Hilary Parsons, and Kristina Wirtz. 2011. "Racializing Discourses." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21, Special Volume 1: E2-E10.
- Dick, Hilary Parsons. 2011. Making Immigrants Illegal in Small-Town USA. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21: E35-E55.
- "Doing Business in Colombia" 2010 World Bank. Accessed March 13, 2015.  
<http://www.doingbusiness.org/~media/GIAWB/Doing%20Business/Documents/Subnational-Reports/DB10-Sub-Colombia.pdf>
- Dowling, Julie A. 2014. *Mexican Americans and the Question of Race*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1899. *The Philadelphia Negro*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Durand, Jorge and Douglass Massey. 2003. "The Costs of Contradiction: US Border Policy 1986-2000." *Latino Studies* 3(1): 233-252.
- Eames, Edwin and Judith Goode. 1977. *The Anthropology of the City*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

- Escobar, Arturo. 1994. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2010. Latin American at a Crossroads. *Cultural Studies*. 24(1): 1-65.
- Fairbanks, Robert P. 2009. *How It Works: Recovering Citizens in Post-Welfare Philadelphia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fassin, Didier. 2005. "Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies in France." *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 20 Issue 3 362-387.
- Feagin, Joe R. 1997. "Old Poison in New Bottles: The Deep Roots of Modern Nativism" Chapter 2 pages 13-43 in *Immigrants Out!: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York, NY and London, England: New York University Press.
- Figuroa, Daniel Lynette. 1990. Hearing Set on Hispanic Complaints. Philadelphia Daily News, April 30. Accessed March 5, 2014 [http://articles.philly.com/1990-04-30/news/25918506\\_1\\_hispanics-hearings-city-councilman-angel-ortiz](http://articles.philly.com/1990-04-30/news/25918506_1_hispanics-hearings-city-councilman-angel-ortiz)
- Flores, William V. and Rina Benmayor. 1997. "Constructing Cultural Citizenship" in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space and Rights*. Edited by W Flores and R Benmayor. pp 1-26. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Gibson, Campbell and Kay Jung. 2005. "Population Division Working Paper – Historical Census Statistics on Population Totals by Race, 1790 to 1990, and by Hispanic Origin, 1970 to 1990 – U.S. Census Bureau." U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. February. Accessed August 22nd , 2015 <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0076/PAtab.pdf>
- Gilbertson, Greta and Douglas Gurak 1994. *Household Transitions in the Migrations of Dominicans and Colombians to New York*. International Migration Review 28(1)22-45.
- Glick Schiller, Nina and Ayse Çağlar. 2009. Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(2): 177-202.
- "Global Economic Prospects." The World Bank. Accessed January 12, 2014. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects/data?region=LAC>
- Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2011. *Immigration Nation?: Raids, Detentions and Deportations in Post-9/11 America*. New York: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gonzales, Richard. 2016. "States Step Up As Washington Stalls On Immigration." *NPR*,

February 16, accessed March 3, 2016. <http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/02/16/466989955/states-step-up-as-washington-stalls-on-immigration>

- Goode, Judith and Jeff Maskovsky. 2001. *The New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics and Impoverished People in the United States*. New York: New York University Press.
- Goode, Judith and Robert T. O'Brien. 2006. "Whose Social Capital? How Economic Development Projects Disrupt Local Social Relations." In *Social Capital in Philadelphia*, edited by Richard Dilworth III. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Goode, Judith, and Jo Anne Schneider. 1994. *Reshaping Ethnic and Racial Relations in Philadelphia: Immigrants in a Divided City*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Goode, Judith. 1998. "The Contingent Construction of Local Identities: Koreans and Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia." *Identities* 5(1): 33-64.
- Goode, Judith. 2011. "The Campaign for New Immigrants in Philadelphia: Imagining Possibilities and Confronting Realities," In *Locating Migration: Global Immigration and Urban Scale* edited by NG Schiller and A Calgar, pp 143- 165. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Grace, Joseph. 1989. The Changing Face of Feltonville: Racism and Opportunity Shape a Mixed City Neighborhood. Philadelphia Daily News, August 14. [http://articles.philly.com/1989-08-14/news/26147041\\_1\\_hispanic-influx-neighborhood-change](http://articles.philly.com/1989-08-14/news/26147041_1_hispanic-influx-neighborhood-change)
- Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia Pessar. 1991. *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. University of California Press.
- Greenhouse, Carol J. 2002. "Citizenship, Agency, and the Dream of Time." In *Looking Back at Law's Century*. Edited by Austin Sarat, Bryant G. Garth, and Robert A. Kagan, pp. 184–209. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Griffin, Bryan and Jessica Vaughn. May 2015. "Map: Secure Communities Removals by County, 2008-2015." Center for Immigration Studies. Accessed June 1, 2015. <http://cis.org/Map-ICE-Secure-Communities-Removals-County-2008-2015%20>
- Guarnizo, Luis and Luz Marina Díaz. 1999. Transnational Migration: A View from Colombia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 22(2): 397-421.
- Guarnizo, Luis and Marilyn Espitia. 2007. "Colombia." In *The New Americans - A Guide to Immigration since 1965*, edited by Mary C. Waters and Reed Ueda, 371-385. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo, Arturo Ignacio Sánchez and Elizabeth M. Roach. 1999. "Mistrust, Fragmented Solidarity, and Transnational Migration: Colombians in New York." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 22(2):367-396.
- Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo. 2006. "El Estado y la Migración Global Colombiana." *Migración y Desarrollo*, 2006, No. 6:79-101, Primer Semestre.
- Gupta, Anuj. 2000. "Immigration in Philadelphia: A Call to Action." Philadelphia Economy League. October. Accessed January 21, 2014. <http://economyleague.org/providing-insight/reports/2000/01/01/immigration-in-philadelphia-a-call-to-action>
- Gutiérrez, David G. 1999. "Migration, Emergent Ethnicity, and the "Third Space": The Shifting Politics of Nationalism in Greater Mexico." *The Journal of American History* 86(2): 481-517.
- Hackworth, Jason. 2007. *The Neoliberal City Governance, Ideology and Development in American Urbanism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Hagan, Jacqueline and Nestor Rodriguez. 2002. "Resurrecting Exclusion: The Effects of 1996 U.S. Immigration Reform on Communities and Families in Texas, El Salvador, and Mexico," In *Latinos: Remaking America*, edited by Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco and Mariela M. Páez, pp. 190-201.
- Hagan, Jacqueline, Brianna Castro and Nestor Rodriguez. 2010. "The Effects of U.S. Deportation Policies on Immigrant Families and Communities: Cross-Border Perspectives." *North Carolina Law Review* 88: 1799-1824.
- Hall, Stuart and David Held. 1989. "Citizens and Citizenship." In *New Times. The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, edited by S. Hall & M. Jacques. pp. 172–188. New York: Verso.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, Linda K. 2000. "Phila. Seeks to Attract More Immigrants. What Better Way to Repopulate the City Than With People From Around the World? A Council Panel Took Suggestions." *Philadelphia Inquirer* October 18. [http://articles.philly.com/2000-10-18/news/25585468\\_1\\_immigrants-tax-base-population-exodus](http://articles.philly.com/2000-10-18/news/25585468_1_immigrants-tax-base-population-exodus)
- Harvey, David 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Harvey, David. 2009. *Social Justice and the City*. Athens, GA and London: University of Georgia Press.
- Hershberg, Theodore (editor). 1981. *Philadelphia: Work, Space, Family, and Group Experience in the Nineteenth Century: Essays toward an Interdisciplinary History of the City*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heyman, Josiah M.C. 1998. *Finding a Moral Heart for U.S. Immigration Policy: An Anthropological Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.
- Hing, Bill Ong. 2004. *Defining America Through Immigration Policy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Holland, Dorothy C., Donald M. Nonini, Catherine Lutz, Lesley Bartlett, Marla Frederick- McGlathery, Thaddeus C. Guldbrandsen and Enrique G. Murillo, Jr. 2007. *Local Democracy Under siege: Activism, Public Interests and Private Politics*. New York, NY and London: New York University Press.
- Holston, James and Arjun Appadurai. 1996. Cities and Citizenship. *Public Culture* 8(2): 187- 204.
- Holston, James. 1989. *The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Honig, Bonnie. 2001. *Democracy and the Foreigner*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hopkins, Daniel J. 2008. "Threatening Changes: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." Center for the Study of American Politics, Yale University, 2008
- Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 104(1):40–60.
- Hughes, Mark Alan. 1989. *Poverty in Cities*. Washington DC: National League of Cities.
- Hyatt, Susan Brin. 1997. "Poverty in a Post-Welfare Landscape: Tenant Management Policies, Self-Governance and the Democratization of Knowledge in Great Britain" in *Anthropology of Policy: Perspectives on Governance and Power*. Edited by C Shore and S Wright, pp 217-231. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hyatt, Susan Brin. 2001. "From Citizen to Volunteer: Neoliberal Governance and the Erasure of Poverty," In *New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in the United States*. Edited by J. Goode and J. Maskovsky, pp 201-235. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Ignatiev, Noel. 1995. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier and Julie A. Dowling. 2013. "Introduction: Governing Migrant Illegality." *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*. Edited by Julie Dowling and Jonathan Inda, pp. 1-36. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier. 2006. *Targeting Immigrants: Government, Technology and Ethics*. Walden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier. 2011. "Borderzones of Enforcement: Criminalization, Workplace Raids and Migrant Counterconducts." In *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity*. Edited by Vicki Squire. London and New York: Routledge.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier. 2013. "Subject to Deportation: IRCA, 'Criminal Aliens', and the Policing of Immigration." *Migration Studies* 1 (3): 292-310.
- James Wolfinger. 2007. *Philadelphia Divided: Race and Politics in the City of Brotherly Love*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jones Jacqueline. 1992. *The Dispossessed: American's Underclass from the Civil War to the Present*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jones, Delmos. 1970. "Towards a Native Anthropology." *Human Organization* 29(4): 251-259.
- Jones, Jennifer A. 2012. "'Blacks May Be Second Class, but They Can't Make Them Leave': Mexican Racial Formation and Immigrant Status." *Latino Studies* 10 (1-2): 60-80.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 1998. *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kanstroom, Daniel. 2012. *Aftermath: Deportation Law and the New American Diaspora*. Oxford University Press.
- Kerksta 2014. Charity or Campaign? Jannie Blackwell's Way. *AxisPhilly*. February 23. Accessed MARCH 24, 2014.
- Kingfisher, Catherine and Jeff Maskovsky. 2008. "Introduction: The Limits of Neoliberalism." *Critique of Anthropology* 28(2):115-126.
- Klein, Naomi. 2002. *No Logo*. New York: Picador.

- Kohli, Aarti, Peter L. Markowitz, and Lisa Chavez. 2011. "Secure Communities by the Numbers: An Analysis of Demographics and Due Process." *The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy*. Berkeley, California.
- "La Nueva Marca País, ¿Mejor que las Anteriores?" 2012. *Semana*. September 11. Accessed August 9, 2013. <http://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/la-nueva-marca-pais-mejor-anteriores/264530-3>
- Lamphere, Louise. 1992. "Introduction: the Shaping of Diversity. In *Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*. Edited by Louise Lamphere. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leacock, Eleanor. 1971. *The Culture of Poverty: A Critique*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Lee, Denny. 2007. "53 Places to Go in 2008." *New York Times*. December 9. Accessed March 13, 2015. [http://www.nytimes.com/ref/travel/20071209\\_WHERE\\_GRAPHIC.html](http://www.nytimes.com/ref/travel/20071209_WHERE_GRAPHIC.html)
- Lee, Denny. 2010. "The 31 Places To Go in 2010: Colombia." *The New York Times*. Accessed June 21, 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/10/travel/10places.html>
- Leitner, Kyle E. and Helga Walker 2011. "The Variegated Landscape of Local Immigration Policies in the United States." *Urban Geography* 32(2): 156-178.
- Lieberson Stuart. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie. Blacks and Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley, CA: University Calif. Press
- Lomnitz, Claudio. 1992. *Exits from the Labyrinth: Culture and Ideology in Mexican National Space*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Low, Setha. 1996. The Anthropology of Cities: Imagining and Theorizing the City. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25: 383-409.
- Low, Setha. 2000. *On the Plaza: The Politics of Public Space and Culture*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Lowe, Lisa. 1996. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lubrano, Alfred. 2013. "Of Big Cities, Philadelphia Worst for People in Deep Poverty." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, March 20.
- Mahler, Sarah. 1995. *American Dreaming: Immigrant Life on the Margins*. Princeton: Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Marcelo Suárez-Orozco and Mariela Páez. 2009. Introduction: A Research Agenda. In *Latinos: Remaking America*. Edited by Marcelo Suárez-Orozco and Mariela Páez. pp. 1-38. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marks, Carole. 1989. *Farewell—We're Good and Gone: The Great Black Migration*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press
- Mármora, Lelio 1979. *Labor Migration Policy in Colombia*. *International Migration Review* 13(3): 440-454.
- Marrow, Helen B. 2005. "Colombian Americans." In *Encyclopedia Latina: History, Culture, and Society in the United States*, edited by Ilan Stavans and Harold Augenbraum. Danbury, Connecticut: Grolier Academic Reference.
- Marshall, Thomas Humphrey. 1964. *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Philip. 1996. "Proposition 187 in California." *International Migration Review*, 29(1): 258-259.
- Massey, Douglas, Jorge Durand and Nolan J. Malone. 2003. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Massumi, Brian. 1995. "The Autonomy of Affect." *Cultural Critique* 31:83-109.
- Massumi, Brian. 2002. *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Matza, Michael. 2014. "Debate Over Municipal ID's for Immigrants." *Philadelphia Inquirer*. January 11. [http://articles.philly.com/2014-01-11/news/46069607\\_1\\_undocumented-immigrants-new-sanctuary-movement-drivers-licenses](http://articles.philly.com/2014-01-11/news/46069607_1_undocumented-immigrants-new-sanctuary-movement-drivers-licenses)
- McCaffery, Peter. 1993. *When Bosses Ruled Philadelphia: The Emergence of the Republican Machine, 1867-1933*. University Park, PA.
- McGovern, Stephen. 2006. "Philadelphia's Neighborhood Transformation Initiative: A Case Study of Mayoral Leadership, Bold Planning and Conflict," *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 17, no. 3 : 529-570.
- Metcalfe Press Release. 2012. "Pennsylvania Legislature Advances Historic Legislation to Shutoff Jobs and Public Benefits for Illegal Aliens" June 29 <http://www.repmetcalfe.com/NewsItem.aspx?NewsID=14768>

- Miller, Frederic M. 1988. "Immigration through the Port of Philadelphia." In *Forgotten Doors: The Other Ports of Entry to the United States.* edited by M. Mark Stolarik, pp. 37-54. Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press.
- Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Programa Colombia Nos Une. 2009. Migración y salud: colombianos en los Estados Unidos. Bogota: Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Taller de Edición Roca S.A.
- Morgen, Sandra and Jeff Maskovsky. 2003. "The Anthropology of Welfare "Reform": New Perspectives on U.S. Urban Poverty in the Post-Welfare." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 32: 315-338.
- Murillo Castana, Gabriel. 1988. "Effects of Emigration and Return on Sending Countries: The Case of Colombia." *International Migration Today*, UNESCO 191-203.
- Narayan, Kiran. 1993. "How Native Is a "Native" Anthropologist?" *American Anthropologist* 95 (3): 671-686.
- Nash, Gary. 1988. *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988
- Nasser, Michelle. 2012. "Feminized Topographies: Women, Nature, and Tourism in Colombia es Pasión." *Revista de Estudios Colombianos* (40):15-25.
- Nasser, Michelle. 2013. Bellas por Naturaleza: Mapping National Identity on US Colombian Beauty Queens. *Latino Studies* 11(3): 293-312.
- "NATO Signs Cooperation Agreement with Colombia." 2013. *America's Quarterly*. June 26. Accessed May 6, 2015. <http://www.americasquarterly.org/nato-signs-cooperation-agreement-with-colombia>
- Negri, Antonio and Michael Hardt. 1999. "Value and Affect." *Boundary 2* 26(2): 77-88.
- Ngai, Mae M. 1999. "The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924." *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 86, No. 1 pp. 67-92.
- Ngai, Mae. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Norby, Michael and Brian Fitzpatrick. 2013. "The Horrific Cost of the US-Colombia Free Trade Agreement." *The Nation*, May 31. Accessed June 4, 2014. <http://www.thenation.com/article/horrific-costs-us-colombia-trade-agreement/>

- Oboler, Suzanne. 1995. *Ethnic labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re) presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Oboler, Suzanne. 2006. "Redefining Citizenship as Lived Experience" In *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging*. Edited by Suzanne Oboler. pp. 3-30. New York: Macmillan.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1996. "Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States." *Current Anthropology*, 37(5): 737-762.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Otterbein, Holly. 2016. "The Sánchez Insurgency." *Philadelphia Magazine*, January 24. <http://www.phillymag.com/citifed/2016/01/24/maria-quinones-sanchez-profile/#zUUZowD26ZfExDdJ.99>
- Padilla, Felix. 1985. *Latino Ethnic Consciousness: The Case of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Palacios, Marco. 2006. *Between Legitimacy and Violence: A History of Colombia, 1875-2002*. Richard Stoller, trans. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Patusky, Christopher, and Johnny Ceffalio. 2004. "Recent Trends in Immigration to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Who Came and Where Do They Live?" Fels Institute of Government, University of Pennsylvania. [https://www.fels.upenn.edu/sites/www.fels.upenn.edu/files/Philadelphia\\_Immigration\\_Trends\\_0.pdf](https://www.fels.upenn.edu/sites/www.fels.upenn.edu/files/Philadelphia_Immigration_Trends_0.pdf)
- Peck, Jamie, and Adam Tickell. 2002. "Neoliberalizing Space." *Antipode* 34 (3): 380–404.
- Pellegrino, Adela. 1984. "Venezuela: Illegal immigration from Colombia." *International Migration Review* 18(3): 748-766.
- Perea, Juan F. 1997. *Immigrants Out!: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York, NY and London, England: New York University Press.
- Pérez, Gina. 2004. *The Near Northwest Side Story: Migration, Displacement and Puerto Rican Families*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Pessar, Patricia. 1995. *A Visa for a Dream: Dominicans in the United States*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pew Hispanic Center. June 2010. "The 10 Largest Hispanic Origin Groups." Washington DC.
- Plascencia, Luis FB. 2012. *Disenchanted Citizenship: Mexican Migrants and the Boundaries of Belonging*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. 2003. *National Performances: The Politics of Class, Race and Space In Puerto Rican Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. 2004. "Delinquent Citizenship, National Performances: Racialization, Surveillance, and the Politics of Worthiness in Puerto Rican Chicago." *Latino Studies* 2(1): 26-44.
- Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. 2012. *Street Therapists: Race, Affect and Neoliberal Personhood in Latino Newark*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- "Removal Statistics." Immigrations and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security. Accessed May 23, 2015. <https://www.ice.gov/removal-statistics>.
- Renato Rosaldo. 1997. "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality and Multiculturalism," In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space and Rights*. Edited by W Flores and R Benmayor, pp 27- 39. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Renato, Rosaldo. 1994. Cultural Citizenship in San Jose, California. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 17(2): 57-64.
- Richard, Analiese, and Daromir Rudnykyj. 2009. "Economies of Affect." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15(1): 57-77.
- Rocco, Raymond. 2004. "Transforming Citizenship: Membership, Strategies of Containment, and the Public Sphere in Latino Communities." *Latino Studies* 2(1): 4-25.
- Rodríguez, Cristina. 2008. "The Significance of the Local in Immigration Regulation." Yale Law School Faculty Scholarship Series. Paper 3907.
- Roediger, David. 1990. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso.
- Rohr, Monica. 2001. "Planning a Strategy to Lure Immigrants." *Philadelphia Inquirer*. May 20. Accessed on January 17, 2015. [http://articles.philly.com/2001-05-20/news/25300399\\_1\\_study-immigration-cities-population-loss](http://articles.philly.com/2001-05-20/news/25300399_1_study-immigration-cities-population-loss)

- Roldán, Mary. 2002. *Blood and Fire: La Violencia in Antioquia, Colombia, 1946-1953*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Rosas, Gilberto. 2015. "The Border Thickens: In-Securing Communities after IRCA." *International Migration*, 54(2): 119-130.
- Rúa, Mérida. 2012. *A Grounded Identity: Making New Lives in Chicago's Puerto Rican Neighborhoods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rutheiser, Charles. 1996. *Imagineering Atlanta*. London, England: Verso Press.
- Safford, Frank and Marco Palacios. 2002. *Colombia: Fragmented Land, Divided Society*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Santa Ana, Otto. 2002. *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2001. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen-Koob, Saskia. 1979. "Economic Growth and Immigration in Venezuela." *International Migration Review*, 13(3): 455-474.
- Schiller, Nina Glick. 2015. "Diasporic Cosmopolitanism: Migrants, Sociabilities, and City Making." In *Whose Cosmopolitanism? Critical Perspectives, Relationalities and Discontents*. Edited by Nina Glick Schiller and Andrew Irving, pp. 103-120. Brooklyn: Berghahn Books.
- Scott, James. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scranton, Phil. 1989. *Figured Tapestry: Production, Markets, and Power in Philadelphia, 1855-1941*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- "Secure Communities" Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Accessed March 23, 2015. <http://www.ice.gov/secure-communities>
- Sedgwick, Eve and Adam Frank. 2003. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Shaw, Julie. 2011. "Let's Put it this Way: Philadelphia Gained More Amigos." *Philadelphia Daily News*, March 12.
- Shklar, Judith. 1991. *American Citizenship: The Quest for Inclusion*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Shore, Cris and Susan Wright. 1997. "Policy: A New Field of Anthropology" in *Anthropology of Policy: Perspectives on Governance and Power*. Edited by C Shore and S Wright, pp 1-34. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Simon, Roger D. and Brian Alnutt. 2007. "Philadelphia, 1982-2007: Toward the Postindustrial City." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 131 (4), pp. 395-444.
- Singer, Audrey, Domenic Vitiello, Michael Katz, and David Park. 2008. "Recent Immigration to Philadelphia: Regional Change in a Re-Emerging Gateway." Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- "The 'Sixth Division' Military-Paramilitary Ties and U.S. Policy in Colombia" Human Rights Watch. 2001. Human Rights Watch. Accessed April 5, 2014. <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/colombia/2.3.htm>
- Smith, Neil 2002. New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. *Antipode* 34(3): 427-450.
- Smith, Neil. 1979. "Toward a Theory of Gentrification a Back to the City Movement by Capital, not People." *Journal of the American Planning Association* Volume 45, Issue 4, 538-548.
- Smith, Neil. 1996. *New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Soysal, Yasemin. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spagnolo, Laura and Daniel Munevar. 2008. "After Years of (Economic) Solitude: Neoliberal Reforms and Pay Inequality in Colombia." The University of Texas Inequality Project UTIP Working Paper No. 47 February 17, 2008.
- Steusse, Angela and Mathew Coleman. 2014. "Automobility, Immobility, Altermobility: Surviving and Resisting the Intensification of Immigrant Policing" *City and Society* 26(1): 51-72.
- Stewart, Kathleen. 2007. *Ordinary Affects*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2005. "Affective states". In *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*, ed. D. Nugent, J. Vincent, pp. 4-20. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M. 1996. "California Dreaming: Proposition 187 and the Cultural Psychology of Racial and Ethnic Exclusion Source." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, (27) 2, pp. 151-167.

- Sugrue, Thomas. 1996. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Tate, Winifred. 2007. *Counting the Dead: The Culture and Politics of Human Rights Activism in Colombia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tate, Winifred. 2015. *Drugs, Thugs and Diplomats: U.S. Policymaking in Colombia*. Stanford University Press.
- Thompson, Isaiah. 2011. "Quinones-Sanchez Trounces Savage; Hispanics More Likely to Hold Permanent Seat on Council. *City Paper*, May 15.
- Thrift, Nigel. 2008. *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. New York: Routledge.
- Tolnay, Stewart E. 2003. The African American "Great Migration" and Beyond. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 209-232.
- Turner, Bryan S. 1990. "Outline of a Theory of Citizenship." *Sociology* 24: 189–217.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie. 1996. *Exposing Prejudice*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Valentine, Charles A. 1968. *Critique and Counter-Proposals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Varsanyi, Monica W. 2008a Rescaling the "Alien," Rescaling Personhood: Neoliberalism, Immigration and the State. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*: 98(4): 877-896.
- Varsanyi, Monica W. 2008b. "Immigration Policing Through the Backdoor: City Ordinances, the 'Right to the City,' and the Exclusion of Undocumented Day Laborers. *Urban Geography* 29 (1): 29–52.
- Vazquez, Yolanda. 2011. "Perpetuating the Marginalization of Latinos: A Collateral Consequence of the Incorporation of Immigration Law into the Criminal Justice System." Faculty Scholarship. Paper 363. University of Pennsylvania. Accessed March 7, 2015 [http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty\\_scholarship/363](http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty_scholarship/363)
- Wade, Peter 1997. *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wade, Peter. 1993. *Blackness and Race Mixture: The Dynamics of Racial Identity in Colombia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wade, Peter. 2000. *Music, Race and Nation: Musica Tropical in Colombia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Waldinger, Roger. 2001. *Strangers at the Gates: New Immigrants in Urban America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Warner, Sam Bass. 1968. *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of its Growth*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Wells, M. 2004. "The Grassroots Reconfiguration of U.S. Immigration Policy." *International Migration Review* 38 (4):1308–47.
- Wells, M. J. 2004. "The Grassroots Reconfiguration of U.S. Immigration Policy." *International Migration Review*, Vol. 38, 1308–1347.
- Whalen, Carmen. 2001. *From Puerto Rico to Philadelphia: Puerto Rican Workers and Postwar Economies*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- William Robbins, 1983. "Study of Population Finds Older, Poorer Philadelphia," *New York Times*, August 7.
- Williams, Brett. 1988. *Upscaling Downtown: Stalled Gentrification in Washington, DC*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40(3): 196-213.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011. *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Zolberg, Aristide. 2006. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1991. *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1995. *The Culture of Cities*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.