

root causes of displacement that were caused by the Global North. *Crossing* then describes how Global South states developed and signed regional refugee agreements—the Organization of African Unity Convention of 1969 and the 1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugees—to address their concerns with the global regime (pp. 99-107). While these regional agreements represent key fixtures of Global South resistance and solidarity, case studies of treatment of Syrians in the Middle East and Venezuelans in Latin America reveal how the migrant/refugee binary continues to structure political responses and public opinion toward mass displacement.

Hamlin also provides illustrative case studies of Europe and the United States to show how the labels affixed to people on the move structure political discourse in both the North and South. In both cases, the problem with maintaining the binary is that it obscures external causes of displacement and allows contemporary anti-migrant sentiment to fester. For example, recognizing that the United States' interventions in Central America sowed the seeds of contemporary mass movements breaks down the necessity of the migrant/refugee distinction, and it raises important questions about the rights of those affected by such coercive interventions.

Crossing's exploration of the origin and effect of the migrant/refugee binary puts it at the center of modern migration debates. However, this centrality, scope, and ambition also raise several further questions. First, what is the role of race in perpetuating the migrant/refugee binary? Hamlin selectively touches on issues of race, most notably in its discussions of colonialism (pp. 30, 34-36) and European responses to Mediterranean arrivals (p. 123). Yet, while these discussions reveal that racial discrimination and white supremacy likely shaped the emergence of restrictive migration policies and unequal sovereignty in the postwar era, there is little discussion of the role race played in the construction of the migrant/refugee binary itself. Hamlin discusses how the terms “migrant” and “refugee” are politically constructed to minimize the suffering and exploitation of the non-white Global South. But racial perceptions seem to lurk in that minimization, and they go undiscussed. For instance, we learn that the migrant/refugee binary allows Global North states to avoid acknowledging how colonialism caused mass migration and displacement. But how do racialized perceptions lead European publics to assume that migrants are undesirable economic actors?

A second question is how we should think about solutions to the migrant/refugee binary. This problem is thorny because the binary has become received wisdom in the scholarly, lay, and policy-making communities. This ideology is difficult to subvert because, as several chapters in *Crossing* reveal, politicians and citizens use it to warrant restrictive migration policies. But what should be done? Hamlin implores us to “move beyond binary” thinking,

which she associates with avoiding discussing the culpability of border crossers and referring to them as a singularity, as opposed to distinct types (p. 161). These calls are admirable, but they are expressed in the passive voice. I wondered who needs to change their behavior and the prospects for those changes to occur. For example, if this call refers to academics, then we must deal with the uncomfortable question of the role of academics in public life: how much does the scholarly voice matter? What is the best way to convince organizations like UNHCR to change their approach to refugee governance and activism, particularly given the role the binary plays in bolstering its organizational legitimacy?

If the call refers to policymakers or the public, then it raises a final question. Given, 1) the electoral incentives that politicians face, 2) the issues of race and racism discussed earlier, and 3) that the public typically responds to elite cues, is moving beyond the binary even a possibility? As Hamlin reminds us, politicians continue to trade on anti-border crosser rhetoric, and they likely do so because it works. This seemingly dire question, particularly in the Global North, provides an important path forward for future research, and the conclusion of *Undesirable Immigrants* points in the same direction. Hamlin's argument points out that breaking down the conditions that allow structural inequalities in international migration to fester requires deep engagement with how states make policy decisions, which in part depends on the migrant/refugee binary. Destabilizing that binary emphasizes that scholars must work at the intersection of political communication and migration studies to investigate both the power that leaders have over their constituents, as well as ways to educate the public to overcome the power of the bully pulpit.

To reiterate, *Crossing* is an important book that will generate significant debate. Unsurprisingly, the scope and importance of the book's argument raises more questions than it answers, but the looming threat of climate migration continues to reveal the importance of treating all border crossers with equal moral worth, irrespective of their presumed culpability or motive. Hamlin provides further confirmation of this task's difficulty as it intimates the very real extent that moral worth, deservingness, and race unfortunately will remain highly correlated.

Response to Andrew S. Rosenberg's Review of *Crossing: How We Label and React to People on the Move*

doi:10.1017/S1537592723001135

— Rebecca Hamlin 

I appreciate Rosenberg's careful explanation of my argument, its contributions, and his questions about how entrenched the dynamics I illuminate are. Ironically,

this was also my biggest question about *Undesirable Immigrants*, which I think reveals the close association between our two works, and the fundamental challenge of writing a book that tries to point out the impacts of longstanding structural forces without forsaking all hope for the future.

Rosenberg's first question is about the role of race in perpetuating the migrant/refugee binary. In short, I view the migrant/refugee binary as highly racialized, especially as it relates to the responses of Global North receiving states, but I think the persistence of the binary is about much more than race. Recent public enthusiasm about welcoming Ukrainians as refugees illustrates the point that a lot of the resistance to border crossers from Africa or the Muslim world into Europe and from Central America into the United States is related to the race of the people seeking entry. I talk in the book about how these figures are highly racialized in the imaginations of American and European publics, and how racialization can enhance public disregard for their suffering and deservingness. When and if the binary can be used to define racialized others as migrants, it serves to enable states to keep out people deemed undesirable without seeming overtly racist. This phenomenon can be true even as Global North states do choose to resettle some non-white people as refugees, since a strict adherence to the binary promises to keep those numbers manageably low.

However, in the Global South, the story is more complex. Ambivalent public reactions may include some element of racialization (see Lamis Abdelaaty, *Discrimination and Delegation: Explaining State Responses to Refugees*, 2021, who found more openness to people from the same ethnic background as the dominant group in the receiving state), but it takes a very different form than the white supremacist racial politics of the Global North. For instance, when Syrians enter Lebanon or Venezuelans enter Colombia or Rohingya enter Bangladesh, receiving state reluctance and the decision to frame arrivals as migrants is about many things besides race, including sending a message to IOs or wealthy donor states about burden sharing.

Rosenberg's remaining questions are about who I think should change, and how likely I think change is. To be clear: I do not think Global North politicians or even UNHCR will move beyond binary thinking willingly, because it benefits them directly. However, I do have some optimism that the scholarly and advocacy communities can take a more critical look at the language we use and who it is serving. Unsurprisingly, since *Crossing* was published, I have found scholars of and advocates for people who get classified as migrants to be far more receptive to this point than people who self-identify as refugee advocates. However, I have also seen a critical turn against positivism even within the refugee studies community, especially as more work has engaged with the

colonial legacies of the Refugee Convention (Lucy Mayblin and Joe Turner, *Migration Studies and Colonialism*, 2021; Ulrike Krause, "Colonial Roots of the 1951 Refugee Convention and Its Effects on the Global Refugee Regime," *Journal of International Relations and Development* 24:599–626 [2021]).

Both *Undesirable Immigrants* and *Crossing* point to seemingly intractable forces of resistance to any acknowledgement of the deep injustice of colonial history and neo-colonial practices of protecting privilege. All we can do as scholars is to keep pointing out who benefits and who suffers under the status quo.

Undesirable Immigrants: Why Racism Persists in International Migration.

By Andrew S. Rosenberg. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2022. 384p. \$120.00 cloth, \$35.00 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592723001111

— Rebecca Hamlin , *University of Massachusetts, Amherst*
rhamlin@umass.edu

Andrew Rosenberg's *Undesirable Immigrants* is a cutting-edge work of International Relations (IR) scholarship, and it is deeply critical of the IR field. It is also a brave book written with much integrity and care for the topic, method, and intended audience. I am grateful to have been asked to review it, since I found it not just convincing, but stimulating and refreshing. I hope it is widely read and considered by IR scholars and anyone interested in international migration.

Rosenberg begins with the basic puzzle of international migration, that widespread political resistance to immigration exists as an exception to liberal capitalism's commitment to global free movement of goods and ideas. He then very carefully demonstrates another dimension to this puzzle, the reality that even as immigration laws have become facially race-neutral around the world, their effects are still systematically uneven. In other words, people who originate in the Global South or in post-colonial states have far less freedom of mobility than people who tend to be perceived in immigrant receiving states as white.

Rosenberg then explains this disparity, which he calls an "underflow" of legal migration from the non-white world, using three related theories, which he grounds methodically using an impressive blend of historical analysis, post-colonial theory, and sophisticated quantitative models. First, he argues that the right to control borders has not always been a core aspect of state sovereignty, but rather was constructed alongside the modern nation-state. As the source of authority shifted to "the people" rather than a monarch, modern nation-states became concerned about the composition of their peoples. Thus, the idea of keeping out undesirable immigrants became a matter of nationalist concern. Second, Rosenberg explains how colonialism