UNSETTLING GENDER AND SEXUALITY ACROSS NATIONS

Transnationalism within and between nations
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Introduction

Transnationalism holds within it the promise and contradiction of movement and stasis. While much popular rhetoric celebrates the crossings and connections enabled by the *trans* in transnationalism, the *national(ism)* weighs down the possibility of crossings and connections at the same time as it facilitates the movement of bodies, goods and capital. It is thus not surprising that geographers in general, and feminist geographers in particular, have paid attention to the spatialities of transnationalism. Feminist geography has brought to transnationalism questions of how and where gender and sexuality intersect with flows of migration, goods and capital and how to create knowledge communities and solidarities across national contexts and relations of inequality. There are now many excellent reviews and accounts of feminist geographical approaches to transnationalism (see Katz 2001; Nagar 2014; Silvey 2006; Swarr and Nagar 2010). In this chapter, we aim to follow feminist, anti-racist, decolonial and queer approaches to transnationalism that apprehend the transnational as a space and site of relations of power. In these relations of power (that lie at the core of the contradictory nature of transnationalism), conditions of possibility for particular subjectivities and subjects both emerge in new ways and consolidate old patterns and certainties.

To this end, we consider what is most useful about a transnational approach to gender relations and what might be productively rethought. First, we work through a range of examples, focusing mostly on the Filipino diaspora, to consider the ways that gender relations and sexualities become reworked through migration experiences and how norms in one place are taken up and reused in another to both destabilize or restabilize gender norms. Our focus on the Filipino diaspora emerges from our lived experience and research (May Farrales) and extended research collaborations (Geraldine Pratt) and the fact that so much research has focused on the Filipino labour diaspora, one of the largest globally. Second, we examine how gender norms are resistant to change, and how racial difference, racism and nationalisms are enacted through hetero- and homonormativities. Finally, we seek to set in motion or unsettle what is typically taken to be the relatively static part of transnationalism: the nation. We do this by considering Indigenous critiques of normative notions and dominant forms of nation in settler colonial contexts; that
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is, we consider the transnational already embedded within the settler colonial state. We pay particular attention to how the non-Indigenous and non-Black racialized diasporic subject figures in settler colonial relations. By bringing these critiques into conversation with transnational approaches, we leave the chapter with questions of what building a transnational approach into a settler nation brings to studies of transnationalism.

Gender, sexuality and race in transit

In the opening chapter of his book *Filipino Crosscurrents: Oceanographies of Seafaring, Masculinities, and Globalization* (2011), Kale Fajardo dwells on the photograph of a forlorn Filipina nurse adorning the cover of the *New York Times* containing a magazine article about Global South migration. Fajardo describes the woman's image: she is alone, barefoot on the sand, dressed in hospital scrubs and looking into the distance over an expanse of water. She stands as the quintessential image of the modern-day overseas Filipino migrant, Fajardo argues. Over the past few decades, the Filipina overseas worker, in multiple iterations as a domestic helper, entertainer, nurse or nanny, has come to figure large in the imaginary of transnational migration. Worldwide, almost half of temporary workers – who are by definition in transit between nations – are now women, often migrating alone to work in feminized, racialized and sexualized jobs (Global Commission on International Migration 2005). Of the new recruits from the Philippines in 2010, for example, 68 per cent were employed as domestic helpers or housekeepers (Philippine Overseas Employment Administration 2010). Both in sheer numbers and in the gendered, sexual and racialized nature of the care work that they perform across the globe, Filipinas have come to function, as Rachel Parreñas (2001) put it, as the ‘servants of globalization’, who are slotted into insecure, low-paid jobs through ‘capitalist scripts’ that operate through persistent gendered and racialized inequalities. Transnational labour migration, therefore, often works within, extends and hardens existing gendered and other power relations on a global scale.

Transnational migration also can ossify and exacerbate gender binaries at home. Migrant mothers (but not migrant fathers) are often stigmatized in their home countries. Mexican migrant mothers, Joanna Dreby argues, ‘bear the moral burdens of transnational parenting’ (2010, 4; see also Parreñas 2005a), exposing how gender norms can be resistant to change. Migration calls upon traditional gendered scripts, in most cases by passing care work to other female kin. In her study of children of migrant mothers living in Manila, Parreñas found that these same scripts led children to feel abandoned. ‘Again and again children describe the nurturing provided by migrant mothers as “not enough”’ (Parreñas 2005b, 33). Parreñas argues that children’s inability to recognize the care that they receive from their mothers and their extended female kin, and their feelings of abandonment and longing for greater intimacy with their mothers who are working abroad are instilled in the Filipinos by the norms of patriarchal gender relations in the heteronormative family, promulgated in the media and literally taught in the state-regulated Values Formation curriculum at school (Parreñas 2010). She calls for an expansion of the ideology of mothering in the Philippines to include economic provisioning as a respected maternal role, as well as a recalibration of the gender division of the labour of social reproduction, such that fathers assume a greater caregiving role. But she sees no evidence that migration or transnationalism, in and of themselves, have altered gender relations in a country – the Philippines – where it is estimated that one in ten citizens is at any time working abroad (but see Aguilar 2013 and McKay 2007 for accounts that view family separation as much less damaging).

Fajardo complicates this picture of the feminization of transnational labour migration, by going to what he calls the ‘backwater geographies and oceanographies of globalization’: to the men who live and work on the container ships, moving goods through global transportation
networks. The Philippine state champions these Filipino seamen’s masculinity as counter to neocolonial and orientalist narratives that feminize the nation (Tadiar 2004). Filipino men are cast as heroic hyper-masculine figures, manning the ships of globalization. Through their remittances, they are heralded as heroes in a ‘national struggle (not against colonialism) but against [foreign] debt’ (85). Fajardo enriches this understanding of the seafarers’ masculinity by seeing it as produced at the cross-current of multiple trajectories of power: class; race; sexuality; and citizenship. Their experience of masculinity is shaped through their experiences on the ship, including their sense of being entrapped in space and suspended in time in a ‘queer’ space–time. Fajardo suggests that there is a loosening of gender scripts and expectations in the spaces of transit and transportation; for example, seafarers’ masculinities shift in relation to the figure of the tomboy. Counter to Western narratives that posit bodies from the Global South as wholly repressed or excessively sexualized, the Filipino tomboy occupies a particular identity in the Philippine imagination as a form of female masculinity or ‘an embodiment of female manhood’ with specific working-class roots. Instead of falling in line with the dominant state narrative of the Filipino seaman working on foreign-owned container ships to support family and nation, the men tend to embody queer masculinities in finding common ground with the tomboy figure’s masculinity and working-class mythology. For Fajardo, these queer encounters provide opportunities to hold together feminine masculinities and masculine femininities along a continuum of sexualities instead of cleaving the masculine and feminine apart.

In this thread of work, of which Fajardo’s work is illustrative, the transnational is understood as a space and site of power relations in which subjectivities emerge in negotiation with normative narratives and structures. Subjects and subjectivities, reworked through migration experiences, are afforded a degree of mutability and distance from dominant gender relations and sexualities (see, for example, Cruz-Malave and Manalansan 2002; Manlansan 2003; Pratt and Yeoh 2003; Yeoh and Ramdas 2014; Thangaraj 2015). Gayatri Gopinath (2005), for example, theorizes the concept of a queer South Asian diaspora as a translation. Gopinath captures the multiple registers through which transpire ‘the formation of sexual subjectivity within transnational flows of culture, capital, bodies, desire, and labor’ (13). In this formulation, Gopinath disrupts a linear causal link between the concepts of ‘queer’ and ‘heterosexuality’, and ‘diaspora’ and ‘nation’, where heterosexuality and nation act as the original, and queer and diaspora are its mere twin copy. She proposes instead that ‘queer’ and ‘diaspora’ are translations of ‘heterosexuality’ and ‘nation’, and vice versa: ‘Translation here cannot be seen as a mimetic reflection of a prior text but rather as a productive activity that instantiates new regimes of sexual subjectivity even as it effaces earlier erotic arrangements’ (14). In other words, for Gopinath, the transnational or diaspora is a process of translation, not a monolithic site attached to nation (both home and host) as ‘mimetic reflection’. Instead, it is a productive and generative space in which different subjectivities emerge. Gopinath argues that with migration, then, diasporic subjects cannot be easily captured by homonormative gender and sexual paradigms in the host countries of the Global North.

The idea that the queer racialized diasporic subject confounds normative sexual scripts, because their gender, sexual and racial subjectivities are reworked through transnational migration, is echoed in Martin Manalasan’s (1995, 2003) ethnography of Filipino gay men in New York:

Filipino gay men are not typical immigrants who ‘move’ from tradition to modernity; rather, they rewrite the static notions of tradition as modern or as strategies with which to negotiate American culture. Immigration, therefore, does not always end in an assimilative process but rather in contestation and reformation of identities.

2003, 14
Stories of migrating from Global South to Global North, he notes, are often constructed within a teleological movement from tradition to modernity, in the case of gay Filipino men from *bakla* to global gay (see Benedicto 2014 for the ways in which elite gay men in Manila deploy this teleological narrative). In contrast, in diasporic spaces such as New York, *bakla* is not a ‘premodern antecedent to gay’ but rather is ‘recuperated and becomes an alternative form of modernity’ (2003, 21). Practices of cross-dressing in the Filipino diaspora are poorly understood, he argues, within the White conventions of drag, underlining the point that queer and feminist theories in the Global North likely miss the complexity of transnational lives if they work within existing, largely Eurocentric concepts and categories.

While Manalansan appreciates that the rewriting and reworking of subjectivities are part of a process of negotiation with dominant structures, at the same time he signals the stubbornness of the forces involved in creating the diasporic queer’s conditions of possibility. The tenacity of certain gender, sexual and racial norms makes these resistant to change. Feminist scholarship that pays attention to the stubbornness of gender norms both highlights the work that gender and power do in transnational processes and investigates how normative and dominant gender, sexual and racial regimes are often recuperated and redeployed in the transnational. The promise of gender equity, or a reworking of gender relations, sits as a promise in much of the literature on transnational lives (e.g. Mahler and Pessar 2006); but, as we explore further in what follows, it is a promise that needs close interrogation.

The ‘national’ in ‘transnationalism’

An August 2017 media report of a planned anti-immigrant rally that was thwarted by almost a thousand anti-racist protestors in Vancouver incorporates a photograph of an older White man in the midst of the rally-goers. The man is wearing a baseball cap emblazoned with the Canadian flag. He is pointing a finger, as if scolding someone in the crowd, and is holding a sign that reads ‘Population Reduction. Zero Immigration’. While it might be an extreme position in a country that prides itself on its liberal multicultural messaging of tolerance, the sign nonetheless captures a sentiment that points to the stasis inherent in transnationalism. In particular, the refrain ‘Population Reduction. Zero Immigration’ evokes the nation and its racialized and gendered borders. To explore that which weighs down the potential of crossings and connections, in this section we focus on the *national(ism)* in *transnationalism*. Following the work of critical race and feminist scholars, we propose that the ‘nation’, itself a rendering of colonial, imperial and capitalist designs, aligns transnational migrations to its own normative formations. This alignment, we suggest, points to enduring or stubborn hegemonic gender, sexual and racial norms and relations that set the conditions of possibility when transnational migration is anchored in dominant ideas and workings of nation.

Harsha Walia (2013), for example, theorizes the concept of ‘border imperialism’ to situate contemporary transnational migrations in the broader geopolitical historical and present-day context of colonialism, imperialism and capitalism. She explains:

Border imperialism is characterized by the entrenchment and retrenchment of controls against migrants, who are displaced as a result of the violences of capitalism and empire, and subsequently forced into precarious labor as a result of state illegalization and systemic social hierarchies.
Walia forwards an analytical framework for transnational migrations from the Global South to North America that simultaneously critiques the imperial and colonial workings of nation states that dispossess, displace and force migration at the same time as they centre the ways that states limit the inclusion of migrant bodies through established hierarchies of race, class and gender. Or, as she puts it, ‘Western states thus are the major arbiters in determining if and under what conditions people migrate’ (39). The concept of border imperialism invites closer scrutiny of the work that nations and states do in transnationalism. It makes clear that material conditions limit the possibilities for transnational migrants.

Nation states (and national citizens) not only repurpose hierarchies of gender, race, class and uneven development; in some cases, hard-won struggles for gender and sexual equality are being used to similar effect, to harden the borders of the Global North and mobilize narratives of life in the Global South as traditional, ’backward’ and a threat to liberties in the Global North. In many countries in the Global North, gender equality and tolerance of sexual diversity are now taken as a measure of liberal moral progress and secular modernity (and of the implicit backwardness and threat of Islamic societies where such tolerance is not exhibited). Jasbir Puar (2007) has identified the melding of sexual liberation with nationalism as ‘homonationalism’. Sexual politics has become, in Puar’s words, an ‘optic and operative technology’ in the production and disciplining of Muslims (2007, xiii; see also Butler 2008; Mepschen, Duyvendak and Tonkens 2010). Gender equality can serve the same end, and accepting a diversity of gender norms (e.g. female circumcision; the hijab) has proved challenging for many Western feminists. It is perhaps not entirely surprising that those who carry out the everyday hate crimes towards Muslim women in Malmo in Sweden, such as pushing, spitting on, verbally abusing or attempting to pull off their veils, are often found to be older non-Muslim Swedish women (Listerborn 2015). Sara Ahmed (2000) argues that such acts of exclusion both differentiate and include ‘the stranger’ (i.e. racialized migrants) to secure the dominant citizen-subject in Western liberal nations:

The recognition of others [is] … central to the constitution of the subject. The very act through which the subject differentiates between others is the moment that the subject comes to inhabit or dwell in the world. The subject is not, then, simply differentiated from the (its) others, but comes into being by learning how to differentiate between others.

2000, 24

These racialized, sexual and gendered forms of inclusion/exclusion are important to understand if transnationalism is to be apprehended as a process that is mired in a contradiction of movement and stasis. The tension between movement and stasis operates in a number of registers. Devaluing the feminized work of social reproduction (whether uncommodified or commodified) has been essential to profitability in capitalist societies (Federici 2004; Fraser 2016; Katz 2001), as has the devaluation of racialized labour (Gilmore 2007; Pulido 2018; Robinson 1983). One need not resolve debates on whether gender and racial hierarchies are internal or external to the workings of capitalism to notice the utility of such hierarchies for profitability in such societies. Global movements of labour from the Global South are drawn into and are part of such processes. Such hierarchies, as we have suggested, are not simply imposed by the nation state: they enter into our formation as subjects; and seemingly unrelated cultural politics (such as legalized gay marriage) can become technologies for racial differentiation and border control.

This is not to say that transnational mobility is simply, or always, or easily absorbed into the sameness of the repetition of racial and gender hierarchies. It is important as well to disrupt the
assumption that North America and Western Europe are the inevitable and preferred destinations for transnational migration. In the last 15 years, more and more Filipino balikbayans (members of the overseas Filipino immigrant diaspora, in contrast to migrant overseas Filipino workers) have been returning to retire in the Philippines, where they are creating new processes and forms of inequality and difference (Pido 2017). The Philippine state is enthusiastic about the return of those who had previously migrated to North America, viewing their return and assets as an economic development opportunity. This enthusiasm is captured by President Benigno Aquino III’s Proclamation 181, which designated the years 2011 to 2016 as the ‘Pinoy Homecoming Years’ (Pido 2017, 148).

Alternatively and additionally, in some cases migrants actively resist their instrumentalization by the nation state. Filipino migrant worker activists in Vancouver in Canada, for instance, note how experiencing gender and racial hierarchy transnationally can itself be radicalizing. In trying to understand the relative difficulty of mobilizing Filipino male migrant domestic workers, they note that men and women come to Canada as domestic workers through different migration trajectories: male domestic workers tend to come directly from the Philippines, whereas many women come to Canada after working as foreign domestic workers elsewhere. This pattern reflects differential (gendered) access to resources. Women are more likely to be what Paul (2011, 2015, 2017) refers to as ‘capital constrained’, thus must work their way to their desired migration destination through ‘step-wise migration’. Filipinas coming to Canada as migrant domestic workers often work first as domestic servants in Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan or the Middle East, working in at least one other destination country for several years before securing the necessary economic, human, social and cultural resources to come to Canada. Activists assess that this step-wise migration experience, in and of itself, has a politicizing effect: ‘And for them, given their experience before, there’s really no worry because, you know, either you die fighting or you just accept it.’ Step-wise migration is an education in itself in the commodification of Filipina labour around the globe, an education that has had radicalizing effects (Pratt and Migrante 2018).

Transnational mobility reaches not only across space but through families and over time. In an early collaboration (Pratt, in collaboration with the Filipino-Canadian Youth Alliance 2003/04), we explored the need on the part of many second-generation Filipino–Canadian youths in Vancouver in Canada to claim their transnational identity. Parents’ experiences of dislocation and relocation touched the lives of their children in what Katherine Sugg (writing about the children of exiles from Cuba, 2003) has termed a ‘generational legacy’. Youths came to identify both with their parents’ wounds of dislocation – including their experiences of systematic racism in Canada – and the Philippines. Learning about, visiting and becoming involved in political activism in the Philippines then shaped and radicalized Filipino–Canadian youths’ analyses and activism in Canada. Critical race, feminist and queer scholarship thus provides a sustained critique of dominant forms of nation and its racial, gendered and sexual workings vis-à-vis the transnational subject and suggests some powerful oppositional impulses that can emerge from within it.

Transnationalism in a settler colonial nation

Writing from the Canadian context, as a second-generation Filipinx and a fourth-generation White settler, respectively, we raise a further contradiction within the nation to question how approaches to transnationalism can be and have been reinforcing the enduring colonial violence of settler colonialism. Often, scholarship on transnationalism, while attuned to how colonial forms of gender, racial and sexual regimes operate in transnationalism, falls short of critiquing the role of settler colonialism in the transnational flows of bodies, capital, goods and politics, and the position of racialized arrivants within it.
Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd’s (2011) work on Indigeneity as a transit for US empire-building provides a way to think about diaspora differently in ways that connect, for example, the Philippines and Canada as two different colonial and capitalist enterprises. Byrd, along with other Indigenous scholars in Turtle Island (the place now known as North America), reminds us that Indigenous nations, systems of governance and relations to their lands and each other continue to exist despite the onset of settler colonialism. Even the Canadian nation state now recognizes nation-to-nation relationships with Indigenous peoples in Canada.2

For Byrd, centring this perspective asks that:

"[The] settler, native, and arrivant each acknowledge their own positions within empire and then reconceptualize space and history to make visible what imperialism and its resultant settler colonialisms and diasporas have sought to obscure. Within the continental United States, it means imagining an entirely different map and understanding of territory and space: a map constituted by over 565 sovereign Indigenous nations, with their own borders and boundaries, that transgress what has been naturalized as contiguous territory divided into 48 states."

Byrd offers important points that are imperative for conceptualizing how transnationalism works in and with settler colonialism. First, she regards diasporas and settler colonialisms as the twinned results of imperialism but refuses to conflate processes of racialization with the logics of colonial dispossession. As many Indigenous and allied scholars have noted, dispossession of land and resources (in the case of Indigenous peoples) are not the same as racialized labour exploitation, and equating the racialization of Indigenous and migrant peoples renders Indigenous peoples, Byrd argues, as ‘unactionable in the present as their colonization is deferred along the transits that seek new lands, resources, and peoples to feed capitalistic consumption’ (221). Second, she argues that ideas of Indian and Indianness have functioned as the ‘transit’ of US empire, the ‘ontological ground through which US settler colonialism enacts itself as settler imperialism’ (2011, xix). In the case of the US, transnational exchanges of bodies, ideas and legal precedents have taken place between settler colonialism and imperialist ventures elsewhere. For example, the modes of warfare and the actual high-ranking US army officers from the wars fought with the Plains Nations in North America were literally reemployed in the Philippine–American War of 1899 to 1902 (see also Miller 1982). Neferti Tadiar (2015, 143) documents how the incorporation of the Philippines into US domestic space as a colonial acquisition ‘bore the legal memory’ of earlier landmark legal cases, framing citizenship for African and Native Americans in the US. In not extending the Fourteenth Amendment of the US Constitution to the Philippines as an unincorporated territory in 1901, ‘we could say Filipino is racialized as not black, and like Indian’ at one defining moment in its national formation (143). Third, recognizing relationships made possible by ‘imperialism and its resultant settler colonialisms and diasporas’ allow for an alternative understanding of territory and space that potentially denaturalizes the authority of settler nations and states.

The need to denaturalize settler states and their presumed right to Indigenous lands and territories remains a persistent call from Indigenous scholars and communities. Kwagiulth scholar Sarah Hunt (2014) theorizes ‘colonialscape’ as ‘a way of seeing that naturalizes the relations of domination and dehumanization inherent in colonial relations’ (7), including ongoing violence against Indigenous peoples and communities. One way of disrupting the assumed authority of settler states and nations, Hunt and other Indigenous scholars argue, is to re-centre concepts of land, intimate relations, territory and nation that flow from Indigenous forms of sovereignty and knowledges (see,
for example, Byrd 2011; Coulthard 2014; Daigle 2016; Hunt 2014; Million 2014; Simpson 2014; Tuck and Yang 2012). This central tenet of Indigenous communities and scholars in settler colonial situations puts pressure on transnational scholarship to consider the nation in different ways, reconsidering how diasporic peoples of colour come to be in settler colonial relations (within geography, see Farrales 2017; Johnston and Pratt 2017; Pulido 2018; beyond geography, see Day 2016; Lawrence and Dua 2005; Razack et al. 2010; Saranilllio 2013; Walia 2013).

Alongside the interwoven histories that create the ground for solidarities, immigration can and often does reinforce the colonial and multicultural nation state. As Patrick Wolfe (2006) has argued, there is nothing preventing even colonized natives from one region becoming settlers in another, if their actions support the dispossession of Indigenous peoples in the new locale. ‘Power does not simply target historically oppressed communities,’ Filipino scholar, Dean Saranillio, notes, ‘but also operates through their practices, ambitions, narratives and silences’ (2013, 286). Walia (2013) concedes that many mainstream immigrant groups on Coast Salish territories (Vancouver) perpetuate the dispossession of Indigenous lands and peoples by framing immigrant struggles as ‘integration issues’. However, she insists that while:

migrants of color are inevitably implicated in settler colonialism and have a responsibility to ally with Indigenous struggles, [I] do not believe that migration as a process in and of itself, especially in this late period of capitalist globalization and global neocolonialism, can inherently be understood as a form of settler colonialism.

2013, 129

The migration of Filipinos to Canada, for example, is entangled and implicated in the political economy and relations of settler colonialism by way of the Canadian state’s active recruitment of Filipino (im)migrant labour and by Filipinos’ presence in Canada. As part of this migration process, settler colonial logics make particular demands on racialized (im)migrants. In a study on the sexual, gendered and racialized performances of Filipino men at community-organized basketball games on Coast Salish territories, the game of basketball reperformed in Canada helps to realign and discipline Filipino racialized masculinities to the settler colonial project (Farrales 2018, 2017). Such racialized heteromasculinities fit into the demands and dynamics of the colonialscape that posits Filipinos as cheap labourers, striving to be proper citizens in ways that naturalize the authority of settler state.

There is clearly considerable room for research and debate, and Indigenous critiques of liberal settler nations invite scholars of transnationalism to ask different questions, for example, how narratives of immigrant integration and success might reinforce and further naturalize the legitimacy of the settler-colonial state. Equally, what are the varying and resonant ways that the racial state has systematically disrupted and devalued Indigenous and migrant families? How has the colonial state in a variety of colonial contexts disciplined sexual and gender multiplicity as a technology of colonial governance and control (Hunt and Holmes 2015)? How have, and how might, solidarities and alliances be effectively forged across different experiences of colonialism and transnational displacement (within and beyond the nation state), so as to imagine other ways of living and relating (Lowe 2015)? These are the types of questions that open up new avenues of thinking and research within and beyond feminist transnational studies.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attended to contradictions and tensions in the concept and processes of transnationalism, in the first instance by noticing the tension between mobility and fixedness
inherent in the term transnationalism. Focusing on the Filipino diaspora in particular, we have examined how transnational scholarship theorizes gender relations and sexualities in migration as a process of subject formation. We have outlined transnational approaches that show how processes of subject formation can both disrupt and reproduce dominant and normative paradigms and power relations in countries of origin and destination. We conclude by suggesting that transnational scholarship in geography should consider Indigenous critiques of liberal settler nations and states. In particular, in order to explore more fully the possibilities of movement and mobility, we highlight those Indigenous critiques that bring into question the presumed supremacy and normalcy of the settler state and nation. By bringing them into conversation with transnational approaches, transnational scholarship registers the ways in which immigration can function to both stabilize and destabilize settler colonialism. It extends and deepens the questions that we might ask about place, territory and nation to open possibilities for new relations of gender, sexuality and race.

Notes

2 For a critique of the Canadian state’s recognition of nation-to-nation relationships with Indigenous peoples, see Coulthard (2014) and Simpson (2014).
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