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This book, *Transbordering Latin Americas: Liminal Places, Cultures, and Powers (T)Here*, explores transbordering/transnational Latin American sociocultural and spatial conditions across the globe and across scales—from the gendered and racialized body to the national and transnational arena. What do we mean by “transbordering Latin Americas”? When we use the plural *Latin Americas*, we purposefully implode the notion of a unified, cohesive, and static Latin America and a corresponding singular identity—a way of being or being perceived as Latin American. The phrase “transbordering Latin Americas” thus comprises instances of that which can be defined as “Latin American” (which is, in turn, open to debate and transformation), which occurs through plurilocal societal relations—existing within, between, and above the traditional container spaces of national and continental societies without clear or stable “motherlands” (Pries 2004; Irazábal, 2012). *Latin Americas* in plural aims to push further the problematization of “methodological nationalism,” or the tendency to liken society to the nation-state. Indeed, despite its continuous undeniable importance in framing social dynamics, the nation-state has been debunked as the “natural” unit of the modern world and particularly as a useful one for the study of migration and diasporic phenomena (Duany 2011; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002). This book suggests the need to go beyond not only “methodological nationalism” but also “methodological continentalism” to effectively deconstruct and reconstruct the notion of multiple and fluxing Latin Americas.

When we refer to “liminal places, cultures, and powers” we wrestle with the transitional and unstable phases and conditions of sensory and mental thresholds, bare perceptibility, and the in-betweenness of the varied places, cultures, and powers that we investigate. We also denote the imbricated and fluxing nature of places, cultures, and powers and set out to explore their processes of mutual constituency. The ambiguous term *(T)Here* reflects the new chronotopes or arrangements of time-space that are neither fully here nor there but also are both here and there. The term also alludes to the increasing difficulty of distinguishing between time and space—what some theorists have named the time-space compression...
nature of the condition of postmodernity (Harvey 1990) and geographies of temporality or “TimeSpace” (May and Thrift 2001). While acknowledging this condition and incorporating it to our analyses, the notion of (T)Here simultaneously aims to highlight the spatial dimension of the places that transbordering subjects move through and inhabit, suggesting both that such places are new assemblages of “heres” and “theres” spanning plurilocally, and places that have fragments of “theres” embedded in their actual “heres.”

SO WHAT DOES TRANSBORDERING MEAN?

The term transbordering, which I propose, both captures the nuances of the concept transnationalism and supersedes its limitations, as I explain in this section. A multidisciplinary notion, the term transnational has captured those scholars’ imaginaries that have found concepts such as international, globalization, or cosmopolitanism too rigid to capture the fluxing and complex nuances of today’s world. Trans is a prefix that means above, beyond, across, or exceeding. In our interrelated world, the lives and practices of many individuals and communities often transcend the boundaries of particular cultures and localities within nation-states, destabilizing previous geographic and power arrangements.

Transnationalism has come to signify the cross-border networks developed by localized communities routinely traveling or connecting to people abroad and the ways in which the resulting networks link geographically distinct places into single social fields (Trotz 2006). The notions of inter-, supra-, re-, and postnationalization as well as globalization, glocalization, diaspora building, and transnationalization have contributed to a more complex understanding of the emergence and dynamics of these dense and vibrant societal spaces (Pries 2005), but they have also felt short in some respects. Transnational social practices have been found unique in that they include multiple spaces of localization and articulation (Smith 2001), spaces of places and spaces of flows (Castells 2004) transcending a single nation-state. At the same time, transnationalism is not exclusively about movement—movement, at least of people, is not a prerequisite for engaging in transnational practices (Levitt 2001).

The term transnationalism is used to refer to “the cultural specificities of global processes” (Ong 1999, 4) and the multisided dimensions of the practices of place making that transcend nation-states. The concept was first used in economics literature referring to the movement of capital, commodity chains, and the impact of transnational corporations. It was then extended to international migration flows and their role in increasingly cross-border linkages through return visits and remittances (for the term’s genealogy, see Duany 2011). Not only does transnationalism reshape local realities but local factors also mediate transnational practices, although
the latter have been the focus of far less research (Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt 1999; Torres and Momsen 2005), a condition that this book aims to redress.

Michael Peter Smith’s (2001, 5) seminal work on the subject of transnational urbanism defines it as “a cultural rather than strictly geographic metaphor.” Smith also articulates a conceptual distinction existing between globalization and transnationalism. Discourses on globalization and transnationalism differ in the assumptions they make about the role of the state in the production and negotiation of power, knowledge, subjectivity, and space, which in turn shape meanings, identities, and social relations (Irazábal, 2009). Transnationalism, as different from globalization, captures the horizontal and relational nature of contemporary economic, social, and cultural processes that stream across spaces (Smith 2001, 5). It also expresses these processes’ embeddedness in differently configured and reconfigured scales and regimes of power (Irazábal, 2005, Ong, 1999).

In architectural and urban discourse, transborderism/transnationalism provides a framework with which to address a societal and professional shift in the construction of place, whereby traditional geographic understandings are problematized and reworked so as to play new roles in the development of socially constructed space. Smith (2001, 4) expounds:

Nation-state and transnational practices need not be mutually exclusive—In the process nation and state would need to be vigilantly delinked, making room for notions of de-territorialized nationalisms, loosed from their moorings in the bounded unit of the territorial state, and coalescing at both local and translocal levels.

Theorists of transnationalism treat the nation-state and transnational practices as interlocked, enmeshed, mutually constitutive social formations where identity formations are produced and reproduced. Appadurai (1996, 192) recognizes the special “translocalities” that these processes produce, “in which ties of marriage, work, business, and leisure weave together various circulating populations with kinds of locales.”

Jackson, Crang, and Dwyer’s (2004, 1) understanding of spaces of transnationality includes

not just the material geographies of labour migration or the trading in transnational goods and services but also the symbolic and imaginary geographies through which we attempt to make sense of our increasingly transnational world. Transnational space is, we argue, complex, multidimensional and multiply inhabited (cf. Crang et al. 2003). People from various backgrounds enter its spaces with a whole range of investments and from various positionalities. They may occupy its spaces momentarily (during the consumption of a meal, for example) or for a lifetime (as members of ethnically defined transnational communities).
They may have residual affinities to the transnational identities of earlier migrant generations or emergent identities as a result of their own current transnational experiences. Focusing on the spaces of transnationality, rather than just identifiable transnational communities distinguished from other (and often still normative) national communities, opens up ways of exploring this multiplicity of transnational experiences and relations. (Jackson, Crang, and Dwyer, 2004, 1; cited in Torres and Momsen 2005, 319)

Despite the expansive ways in which they have been theorized, the terms transnational—with its reference to a political entity, the nation-state—and translocal—with its anchoring on a place-based society—nonetheless do not fully capture the many borders migrants and other people cross. As Stephen (2007, 6) put it referring to Mexican migrants, “The borders they cross are ethnic, class, cultural, colonial, and state borders within Mexico as well as at the US-Mexico border and in different regions of the United States. . . . While crossing national borders is one kind of crossing . . . there are many others as well.” Thus, although impactful in many ways on the lives of societies across national boundaries, transnational experiences are best conceived “as a subset of a more holistic approach to transborder experiences” (Bada 2010, 243). In its verb tense expression, transbordering, instead of transnationalism, better alludes to the ongoing transversal, transactional, translational, and at times transgressive aspects of contemporary behaviors and imaginaries that are incited, enabled, and regulated by the changing logics of states, societies, and capitalism/anticapitalism tensions at different scales at, below, and above the nation-state (Irazábal 2005). If borders are predicated upon politics of inclusion and exclusion not only policed at physical frontiers but also in public spaces, the workplace, the home, and the body (Bauder 2013), transbordering practices alude to the agency of both individuals and groups that negotiate and disrupt hegemonic power relations to improve their life chances. Many of these disruptions may not have political transcendence but some can become reformist or even revolutionary (Irazábal, 2008).

Thus, although the term transnational has its epistemological root in the nation-state and the term translocal in locale, both supersede those origins; the notion of transbordering both acknowledges and departs from the practices of bordering. Furthermore, as bordering formations are always mobilized in social fields, aiming to identify transbordering dynamics in particular places helps us recognize the restructuring of boundaries, restrictions, margins, edges, verges, controls, and regulations and their subsequent destabilizing and restabilizing of subjectivities and life opportunities.

Ever more, the global and local are blending in glocal contexts of sustained and evolving social practices (Jones 1992; Rodriguez 1995) that compose new chronotopes or logics of time/space. The resulting networks, or “social fields,” bridge localities, nation-states, and even continents and create hybrid and fluxing social and cultural spaces (Featherstone 1990;
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Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Landolt, Autler, and Baires 1999). Within them, migrants reconstruct their regional, national, continental, racial, ethnic, sociocultural, and political identities as an adaptation to their fluid multibordered and multinational existence. Transbordering migrants and peoples assume multiple identities as they negotiate their positions between and within cultures, nation-states, and other bordered/bordering contexts (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992; Glick Schiller and Fouron 1999; Kearney 1991; Torres and Momsen 2005, 319).

Transbordering politics depict social relations as anchored in, but also transcending, particular cultures, nation-states, and other bordered/bordering contexts, such as those of race, ethnicity, gender, age, physical abilities (ableism), sexual orientation, political ideology, language, religion, etc. They emphasize the continuing yet reworked significance of borders/bordering, state policies (local, regional, national, international), and individual, societal, and regional/national/continental identities, recognizing that media networks and social practices often transgress them.

The diverse mobilities of actors, capital, information, cultural traits, goods, and their intersections have played a key role in constructing both Latin American countries and the Latin American continent as ever-shifting and dynamic transbordering spaces. In the words of Arturo Escobar (2006, 13), “it is crucial to recognize that Latin America is today a global reality—Latin America is literally the world over.” As a result, a continuous process of (re)construction of multiple places and identities around the world manifests different degrees of liminality, hybridization, and syncretism that include but also surpass what are generally recognized as distinct Latin American traits. Similarly, the identities of Latin American individuals, collectives, and places, while maintaining to different degrees a generally recognizable Latin American core, often become more flexible, performative, permeable, and transbordering.

This book explores the production and transformation of new and conventional Latin American types of spaces, sociocultural and political identities, and engagements through a transbordering frame in a transnational arena. We aim to understand the different subfields of transbordering living and acting that subjects engage in and to assess their individual, collective, institutional, and sociospatial effectiveness and implications. We pay close attention to the way in which subjected populations resist, adapt, or coproduce transbordering transnational dynamics and projects deployed upon themselves and/or their communities and, in the process, transbordering subjects—occupying different positionalities here and there and composing other (t)heres—are reshaped. We want to probe the effects on conditions of knowledge, power, subjectivity, and/or space that these dynamics have (Irazábal 2009) and reflect on their actual and/or potential contributions to furthering oppression or emancipation.

Latin Americanists from across the globe are examining these rich phenomena in a myriad of different contexts and scales, but their insights
and findings had yet to be collectively considered. This book brings into creative dialogue scholarship from the “spatial sciences”—architecture, preservation, urban design, urban planning, and geography—and other complementary fields—anthropology, history, economics, and sociology. Through case studies, contributors explore different agents engaged in city-making practices. The book explores Latin Americanness the world over and integrates into Latin American studies theoretical and methodological perspectives drawn from the interaction between spatial sciences and other fields. This book thus contributes to the cutting-edge area of transbordering studies. However, the intent is not only to offer revealing case studies and advance theory and transdisciplinary inquiry but also to assist creative and progressive thinking in the areas of policy, research, and pedagogy.

Jackson, Crang, and Dwyer (2004, 1) note that often transnational studies have “under-played the transformation of space.” We want to reverse this condition. The contributors to this book put forth an expansive notion of transbordering space—where transforming social practices evoke new spatialities and vice versa—to further our understanding of Latin Americanness. Bearing this notion of transbordering spaces in mind, our examination of the social constructions of Latin America under these dynamics is both a theoretical and political project that seeks to contribute to a deeper elucidation of its impacts on policymaking, placemaking, research, and teaching.

THE BOOK’S CONTENT

The book is composed of four parts. Part I, “Gender and Image Making,” discusses the tensions between hegemonic and antihegemonic constructions of gender—as well as its intersectional national, class, ethnoracial, and age identity traits—in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), Postville (United States), and Caracas (Venezuela). Some of these practices subvert socioeconomic and institutional orders, including those of the mainstream media, the drug trade’s economy of violence, and immigration policy regimes to open up unforeseen opportunities for self-representation and emancipation of subject individuals and populations. The authors reveal how capitalist and neoliberal discourses and practices are embedded in these dynamics and often (enthusiastically) adopted (and maybe subverted) by the subaltern. The result is a complex and fluxing mixture of further alienation and disenfranchisement with varied outcomes of resistance and liberation.

In Chapter 1, Stephan Lanz discusses the transformation of the global image of Rio de Janeiro through some of its global subcultures, from the era of the “marvelous city” of the 1960s and 1970s to that of the favela as a symbol of a divided metropolis ridden by violence. He analyzes the favelas’ subcultural practices of baile funk party culture and social movement to uncover how, although appearing at first sight to be confined to operating locally, they are actually rooted in the reception and integration of global
cultural trends. Baile funk, for instance, is a product of the incorporation of African American musical styles that reached the favelas through the reception of the Black Power Movement and US media channels into Brazilian musical traditions. In recent years, the favelas have been sending their funk music to North America and Europe, where it has become hip in the clubs of western metropolises and can be heard on the soundtracks of internationally successful movies. With baile funk, favela youth have created not only a defiant representation of their everyday life but also an independent economic niche that offers possibilities of generating income and thus represents an alternative to the drug trade’s economy of violence. Their recent international success has also begun to garner for some of these youths, for the first time, respect for their cultural production. Other subcultural actors from the favelas, like the hip-hop network Cufa or the Grupo Cultural Afro Reggae (CGAR), are active in social education as well. Lanz illustrates the extent to which these actors operate from a global base by their use of neoliberal discourses circulating worldwide that call on their subjects to adapt to the demands of capitalist markets by regarding themselves as “entrepreneurs of the self.” A new transnational quality becomes apparent in recent projects in which CGAR has carried its social education program into marginalized immigrant neighborhoods in East London with the goal of socially integrating local youth involved in crime. This exporting of a sociopedagogic approach from the favelas of Rio into London’s poor neighborhoods illustrates that transbordering south-north movements are beginning to expand beyond cultural practices, people, or goods to include government and NGO approaches to dealing with poverty, exclusion, and violence. Lanz’s chapter analyzes the various ways in which the local and the global are interlocked in the favela subcultures and how these subcultures are fertile terrains for transbordering; it also explores these subcultures’ respective sociopolitical implications.

In Chapter 2, Gerardo Sandoval and Luz Hernández trace the evolution of a group called Las Mujeres con Grilletes Electrónicos (Women with Electronic Shackles), the icon of one of the largest immigration raids in US history, to discuss gender, transnationalism, and empowerment in Postville, Iowa. Sandoval and Hernández uncover a compelling paradox—how Las Mujeres’ captivity in the United States empowered them by increasing their political, social, and economic agency through their role as mothers to take on the state and pursue legal remedies available to them. These women challenged their migratory status, even as they were forced to endure arrest monitored by a global positioning system. Following Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo’s concept of “transnational motherhood,” Sandoval and Hernández look at how the role of motherhood changed for Las Mujeres con Grilletes in a transbordering regulatory setting. In a multisited research project, they examined gender roles in the women’s home countries and how those roles changed in Postville, Iowa, before and after the raid. Sandoval and Hernández argue that although the state still shapes transnational gender roles
to some extent, Las Mujeres con Grilletes demonstrate how active agents, in this case in the role of transnational mothers, found the agency to use the state’s structure (including its rules and procedures) to challenge and change their immigration status as they responded to their dehumanizing treatment and criminalization. Sandoval and Hernández’s work, however, also exposes the gruesome price these women had to pay to be able to access these openings for the acquisition of greater agency in their lives. The authors’ account reveals the complicity of familial and nation-state institutions and practices (including these women’s own internalized identities) in both their native countries and the United States that have kept these women in submissive and disempowering conditions. Thus grave questions remain: How can some of the empowerment acquired by these women through the process of responding to Iowa’s immigration raids be available to them without requiring the catalysts of such dramatic events and their ensuing losses? How could the allied agents and institutions that mobilized in the women’s and their families’ favor after the raids act in proactive rather than reactive manner? What policymaking and planning reforms can be offered to support nontraumatic immigration integration in this and other contexts?

Last, Yves Pedrazzini offers us the masculine human body as the site for the struggle between individual and global identity formations. In Chapter 3, Pedrazzini explains how the barrio, as an urban and Latin American trope, entered the worldwide media sphere, generally perceived as an asphalt jungle full of barbarians. The particular Latinity of the barrio is replicated at the global level often for the worst: in common representations, dark streets abandoned to drug dealers and armed teenagers replace inventive and diverse popular neighborhoods. None of these images are hegemonic, but today’s nightmarish vision often overrides yesterday’s picturesque one. The globalization of an aesthetics of violence founded on the rhetoric of the “ugly poor” and the “dangerous barrio,” lock people up in a worldwide imaginary of Latin Americans restricted to two extreme figures, the criminal and the party animal—an essentialization with dramatic consequences. The society of the spectacle reproduces these images in a continuous “storytelling” of the Latin American city, presenting it as a disorderly place that frightens but seduces and excites. Pedrazzini examines how the fabrication of the “myth of the violent barrio” and the demonization of the gangster (the malandro in Venezuelan slang) attribute the responsibility of negative urban phenomena to the young, poor Latin male and his popular culture. This allocation of responsibility allows the dismissal of societal responsibilities in the structural conditions that create and reproduce the pauperization of the working classes. In consequence, a negative liminality is created around each “Latin space” (neighborhood, street, bar), which hinders the possibilities of affirmative Latin Americanisms to foster social links within and beyond the Latin diaspora. Pedrazzini criticizes the paradoxes and hypocrisies of this construction of the Latin male in the so-called Global North.
In Part II, “Tourism and Transnational Planning,” the chapters help to characterize places impacted by tourism and transnationalism through the relationship between human subjectivity formations and embodied practices in space. The chapters engage places at different scales—a city (Cusco, Peru), a shopping mall (Plaza Mexico, United States), and a small rural town (Monteverde, Costa Rica). These acts as models of touristed and multicultural landscapes (Cartier and Lew 2005; Irazábal 2006) that allow for a retheorization of the relationship between tourists and the toured, “travelers” and “locals,” and the sociocultural, spatial, and policy contexts and implications of these processes and formations in an era of transbordering.

In Chapter 4, Miriam Chion presents Cusco as one of the most transbordering small cities in Latin America. It receives one of the highest numbers of tourists per resident on the continent. It also has diverse foreign investments and international organizations as well as an increasingly diverse population. From Inca times as the political center of a broad territory of indigenous communities to current times as a major tourist center in Latin America, Cusco illustrates both the strength and malleability of local culture in its interaction with a wide range of transnational economic and cultural influences. In the city, traditional music and crafts in some cases are detached from contemporary and commercial activities and in other cases, intertwined with them. These cultural practices illustrate the production of transbordering spaces and subjects, even in the most traditional domains of rural artisans, as well as the dissolution of fixed local/international, displaced/displacer, and traditional/modern divides. Given its rich history and contemporary tourism pressures, Cusco provides an intense developmental context in which these complexities are amplified. Sandeck’s concept of “city of memory” and Nieto’s *discurso andino moderno* ("modern Andean discourse") frame Chion’s analysis of the production of these spaces through strong traditional knowledge and sense of identity, an engaging production process, and expanding learning flows. Aqui

In Chapter 5, Clara Irazábal and Macarena Gómez-Barris discuss new tourism dynamics and their implications for identity and community development in metropolitan Los Angeles’ Plaza Mexico, a shopping mall. Conceived and owned by Korean investors, Plaza Mexico embodies a unique case of invention and commodification of traditions for locally bound immigrants and US citizens of Mexican/Latino descent. The plaza is an architectural collage of Mexican regional and national icons that make its patrons feel “as if you were in Mexico.” In displacement from and migration to/within the United States, these patrons (and/or their ancestors) have undergone different processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization of their identities, their living practices, and their imagined conceptions of homeland. Plaza Mexico taps into these imaginaries to produce a space of diasporic, bounded tourism, whereby venture capitalists opportunistically reinvent tradition within a structural context of constrained immigrant
mobility. Many visitors do not have the legal or economic resources to travel to Mexico—even if they wished to—and thus experience the plaza as its available surrogate. While most contemporary theories of tourism, travel, and place emphasize the erosion of national boundaries and the fluidity of territories, the case of Plaza Mexico brings us to appreciate these phenomena and their opposite as well—the strengthening of national borders and their impact on the (im)mobility of millions of individuals. This chapter identifies ways in which Plaza Mexico affects and intensifies these processes and also opens up new opportunities for community development in a transbordering arena.

In Chapter 6, Marisa Zapata analyzes the multicultural planning dynamics between Costa Rican peasants and American Quakers living in Monteverde, where quiet, decentralized, rural development has given way to a patchwork of haphazardly placed physical structures and stretched natural resources. The chapter examines how these two cultural groups, responsible for leading the development of a master plan in Monteverde, have conceptualized public participation. In Costa Rica, the planning profession has relied on the incorporation of the technical, physical tradition of planning in the United States and western Europe. Facing similar challenges to planning practice in the United States to ensure that plans meet democratic ideals, Costa Rican planning also promotes the incorporation of public input and participation. Comparing perceptions about participation between Costa Rican and US community members in Monteverde, Zapata provides important insight into how participation is contextualized. Together, the conceptions of public participation by these community leaders pointed to serious deficiencies in the planning process to address the normative and pragmatic goals of participatory planning. Zapata critically examines the importance of historically situated differences to demonstrate the relevance of social planning tools for a community with access only to physical planning guidelines. It highlights the limitations of zoning and land-use tools in addressing the needs of this transbordering community, where dissonance between social groups demands other planning tools. The chapter concludes with suggested tools and techniques, including scenario planning, that the community could integrate into its planning process to better utilize the benefits of regulatory planning while realizing their ambition of participation and justice within the process and final plan.

Part III, “Place-Making and Ideology,” explores the distinct condition of indigenous communities in Latin America, forming disputed nations within nations, and how these formations are often constructed, supported, and contested in transnational arenas. This part also focuses on Mexico, where both the cases of industrialized housing production in exurban areas and business megaprojects in central urban areas presented in the following two chapters illustrate the contestations between top-down governmental and corporate-driven development and the bottom-up adaptation and subversion of targeted communities, with ensuing spatial transformations. The
ideologies of modernity, progress, nationalism, and globalization underpin the particular versions of neoliberal urbanism that are both pushed and resisted in these interventions.

In Chapter 7, Marcela Tovar-Restrepo explains how, over the last three decades in Latin America, indigenous movements have played key roles in revising democratic processes from local to global arenas. These movements have sought to redefine their identity, constitutional rights and duties, and relations to nation-states. Bolivia, Nicaragua, Colombia, and Ecuador are some of the few examples where these sprouting transnational citizenship projects have emerged, contesting not only the foundational nation-state tropes but also conventional isomorphisms established between place, space, and culture. The term transnational in the context of this study refers both to relations among postcolonial nation-states and to indigenous communities within particular countries as constituting nations within nation-states. These ethnic rights initiatives have problematized nation-state boundaries, making evident the existence of ethnically different nations within the countries’ geopolitical and imaginary limits. As nations within nations, indigenous men and women have claimed special citizenship rights, deploying diverse strategies to maintain and produce new forms of cultural difference. Such strategies have required the flexible and transbordering networking of these communities between historically and hierarchically interconnected local, regional, and global spaces. Local communities, states, NGOs, and regional and international movements have been crucial sites where indigenous communities have negotiated issues of identity, established different alliances, and asserted new political, cultural, and gendered geographies. Tovar-Restrepo asserts that gender issues have become particularly complex within these processes, since in most cases indigenous women have not been fully recognized as claimants of rights. Indigenous women have faced further contradictions and identity tensions given that members of their communities often perceive their negotiations of gender vindications as threats to collective ethnic claims. Tovar-Restrepo explores strategies followed by indigenous communities to produce new forms of cultural difference within local/global shared and connected spaces. She analyzes national constitutions and international agreements as key loci that illustrate how transbordering imaginaries related to identity and citizenship have traveled from local to global spheres and back, making possible the interscalar recognition of indigenous rights. Tovar-Restrepo also discusses contributions made by articulation theory to understand processes of creation of ethnic sameness and difference that are at the core of these emergent transbordering citizenship projects pursued by indigenous movements.

The following two chapters explore the interactions between place making and ideology in two distinct Mexican contexts. First, in Chapter 8, Cristina Inclán-Valadez explores the expansion of large-scale affordable housing development over the past years. She specifically analyses the creation of
contemporary middle-class housing towns in Mexico by examining the
Casas Geo (GEO Houses, the largest private developer of affordable housing
in Latin America) phenomena in the city of Cuernavaca. Mexico builds over
500,000 houses annually in remote peripheries of established cities. These
houses, set in rows and organized in gated clusters of uniform street design,
are targeted to lower- and middle-class households as developments with a
specific iconography of middle-income groups. Inclán-Valadez demonstrates
that, rather than simply being a “finished” and “planned” product, these
housing schemes evolve through the participation of a wide range of actors,
including visitors, furniture designers, real estate agents, building construc-
tors, and current and potential residents. These schemes are purported to
represent a formula for “good city” growth, a legitimized model for housing
production and for creating “model” cities. They are touted as a means of
laying down the conditions for the social betterment of millions of Mexi-
can families. Inclán-Valadez explores how a global pattern of “created cities”
is being interpreted and experienced locally by the residents of a particular
complex—Geo-Bosques. The chapter identifies the generic characteristics
that can be found in the production of the Geo Houses scheme and discusses
how the model has been built, improved, organized, and invariably contested
as a result of continuous local strategies employed by different actors (mostly
residents). The aim of these actions is to achieve an “ideal” sociospatial
arrangement that seeks to emulate idealized global notions of a middle-class
lifestyle and increase the residents’ sense of security and social status. Inclán-
Valadez illustrates how the experiencing of new housing schemes takes shape
through the “vernacularization” of global referents and thus results in the
creation of new transbordering landscapes in Mexico.

Then, in Chapter 9, María Moreno Carranco directs us to Mexico City
to discuss the emergence of “urban megaprojects” as a dominant strategy in
the construction of Mexican cities during the current neoliberal economic
times and the opening of the Mexican economy. Mexico City is competing
with cities such as Miami and São Paulo to become an increasingly important
metropolitan node in the financial and productive networks of the global or
at least regional economy. Moreno Carranco focuses on the megaproject of
Santa Fe, the largest urban development in Latin America, widely decried as
an insertion of transnational urbanism imposed by undemocratic means for
the benefit of global capital and local elites. Santa Fe is not integrated to its
local surroundings owing to the ambition to create a “global place” embody-
ing the physical characteristics necessary to attract multinational companies
and improve Mexico City’s standing in the global arena. The study analyzes
the new geographies and cultural dissonances that emerge in the effort to
compete for better positioning within the global city arena. The disconnects
between the megaproject’s promises and the actual realities of Santa Fe
result in very particular urban conditions in which residents are subsidizing
the government’s deficient servicing of the area. This situation is further pro-
moting increased sociospatial segregation, spatial exclusion, gentrification,
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privatization of the city space, and alternative forms of governance. While transnational companies, AAA buildings, and high-end residences in Santa Fe face some urban conditions similar to those in squatter settlements in the city, the marketing discourses emphasize the very same elements lacking in the megaproject, selling an imaginary global place totally disconnected from its realities. Meanwhile, Moreno Carranco illustrates these paradoxes and also how local practices are a constitutive part of this imagined global place, transforming it with the continuous formation of new behaviors and appropriations of the city space.

Part IV, “Immigrant Ethnoscapes (T)here,” focuses on specific economic, cultural, and spatial processes by which diasporic groups of Latin Americans living abroad create for themselves spaces and sense of belonging in their homelands or host lands, in the process transforming the geographies and social fields of places here, there, and in-between (Irazábal 2011). As shown in these chapters, the economic, real estate, labor, musical, and spatial practices Colombian migrants in the United States and around the world, Latinos and West Africans in Bearstown (Illinois), Peruvian migrants in Japan, and Latin Americans in Madrid invest in transforming the institutions of public and semipublic space, housing, education, sports, and recreation in diverse rural, suburban, and urban areas of the world.

In Chapter 10, Milena Gómez Kopp analyzes the remittances sent home by Colombian immigrants across the globe—which have grown rapidly since the 1990s, reaching the record level of $4.5 billion in 2007—and their internationalization effect on the Colombian housing market. Remittances to Colombia are now the third largest remittance flow into Latin America and the Caribbean region, after Mexico and Brazil. They also represent the second largest source of income for Colombia, after foreign investment. In 2004, immigrants began purchasing real estate in Colombia, motivated by “dreams” of returning to their country. Policies of the Colombian government and activities of the banking and other industries have encouraged and supported these efforts. Immigrants’ purchases of real estate have increased, and these investments have impacted the Colombian construction business, generating jobs, development, and income. By analyzing the use of remittances for housing investments, Gómez Kopp examines whether and how remittances can be channeled into productive endeavors and identifies and makes recommendations for best practices to promote and harness the development potential of remittances to Colombia. She also exposes how remittances have forced the Colombian government to change its position vis-à-vis citizens abroad. While in previous periods the government neglected its expatriates almost completely, it is now pursuing new strategies to engage them. Immigrant outreach now stands at the top of Colombia’s national agenda. The study contributes to the ongoing discussion regarding the use and importance of remittance flows by documenting the interest of Colombian immigrants in investing in real estate in the homeland and by evaluating the evolution of the government’s policy agenda toward both the Colombian diaspora in the United States and the national
construction industry. As these are emerging phenomena, questions remain regarding the geographic and typological distribution of these new buildings and complexes in Colombia and their effects on land prices, real estate speculation, urban design integration, sense of community (specially if the rate of absentee landlords is high), and socio-spatial inequalities.

In Chapter 11, the multicultural, transbordering experiences of immigration in Bearstown, Illinois, is examined by Faranak Miraftab. Bearstown is an emerging multicultural community in the US heartland. A small midwestern town, it has had a rapid influx of both Latinos and West Africans owing to the labor recruitment practices of its meat-packing industry. While conventional immigration research tends to focus on a single immigrant group and its dynamics vis-à-vis the dominant native-born population, Miraftab’s study productively examines the intimate and unequal relationships that connect revitalization of this packing town to development processes in immigrant workers’ communities of origin in Togo and Mexico. To capture the agency of immigrants in negotiating their immigration experiences in a new and challenging setting, Miraftab highlights how immigrants’ families, friends, and home institutions subsidize reproduction of people and place in immigrants’ communities of destination—a “global restructuring of social reproduction.” This study not only sheds new light on our understanding of emergent multicultural geographies and immigration-based local development in Mexico, Togo, and the United States but also makes visible the global interconnections in processes of dispossession and development and assists us in charting new courses of policy and community-based action that can support healthy demographic integration in rapidly changing places.

Erika Rossi, in Chapter 12, takes us the furthest away from the Latin American continent. As a result of the new immigration law of 1990, about 400,000 immigrants from Latin American countries have gone to live on Japanese soil. As in many other countries receiving Latino immigrants, in Japan the Latino presence has changed the urban landscape in those scattered areas where migrant enclaves have been created. Given the scarcity of public spaces for gathering and the different ways in which these are used in Japan as compared with Latin American countries, the importance of semi-public spaces like bars, clubs, and restaurants as social spaces where cultural categories and power relations intersect becomes more prominent. Rossi analyzes Latino “music places”—clubs, bars, and restaurants where Latin music “takes place.” Two parallel music scenes are presented as a way to map locations of Latin American music and Latinos in Japan. First, the chapter focuses on the clubs in two industrial areas with a dense migrant population in the prefectures of Kanagawa and Gunma. Second, it focuses on Tokyo’s most famous leisure quarter—Roppongi—and its Latino music scene as a counterpoint for the analysis. Japanese nationals mostly populate the latter scene while Latin American immigrants mostly populate the former. These sites constitute what Bennett defines as “translocal music scenes,” although the actors participating in them are very different and their practices have distinct
outcomes in terms of the creation of social relations reflected in spatial terms. The study uses ethnographic fieldwork with *salsa* and *cumbia peruana* bands and participant observation in the places they usually perform. Through these case studies, Rossi reflects on the situation of Peruvian migrants in Japan, addressing both horizontal relations among migrant groups and also vertical power relations in Japanese society.

Last, in Chapter 13, Rosa Cervera takes us through the “archiculture” of immigration in Tetuán, Madrid. The phenomenon of immigration, relatively new in Spain, is producing an urban and architectural physical and cultural transformation of cities that is not yet sufficiently studied. Madrid, as the Spanish capital city and the most active economic center of the country, has received more than 500,000 immigrants of Latin American origin in the last twenty-five years, the majority of them in the last fifteen years. The specific case of the district of Tetuán-La Ventilla, located in northern Madrid, is one of the most interesting examples of implantation of the Latin American population in the city. Because of the growth of the city, the quarter is close to some of its most valuable and representative areas, including a new business district. However, the history of Tetuán-La Ventilla—a neighborhood outside the historic city walls with an endemic lack of planning and a complex and very rugged topography—allowed this place to remain, despite its strategic location and its urban potential, as a largely irrelevant urban area and thus suitable for the settlement of migrants. Cervera examines the impact of immigration on the transformation of the neighborhood and its architecture—a transformation that is being carried out, most of the time, in a spontaneous yet silent way. This mode of action outside the norm is mainly due to the lack of foresight by public administration officials and also to the lack of control of the whole process, given the rapid pace of immigrant settlement. Many architectural and urban challenges are not addressed properly, owing to both the convenient blindness of administrative authorities and the secrecy and impenetrability of the immigrant society, which uses these traits as self-preservation strategies. Cervera’s work is a pedagogical reflection. In the process of identifying and studying the characteristics of the area, she presents the methodology undertaken in the Master in Advanced Project of Architecture and City at Alcalá University and discusses how, within that framework, it was possible to give sensitive design responses to the changing social, environmental, and urban conditions in the neighborhood. She also reflects on the challenges and responsibilities of designing for transbordering communities.

**LIMINAL PLACES, CULTURES, AND POWER**

(T)HERE—WHY SHOULD WE CARE?

This book examines the interconnections among urbanization, inequalities, and migration in both causing and reflecting the global restructuring of processes of production and social reproduction around Latin American
individuals and groups across the world. It builds on the conference “Transna-
tional Latin Americanisms: Liminal Places, Cultures, and Powers (T)Here.”
held at Columbia University on March 4–5, 2010. The contributors seek to
help us understand the unfolding phenomena before us and also to exca-
vate modes of interventions, policies, and actions that help us build capac-
ity for progressive change. The work collected here additionally echoes and
endorses the questions posed at another conference on the subject, “Cities
and Inequalities in a Transnational World” (Miraftab and Salo 2012), as the
critical issues around which to propose a renewed agenda of planning educa-
tion, research, placemaking, and policymaking:

- What are the new spatialities of cities in a world more than ever before
  transnational, transbordering, and unequal? What are these emerging
  spaces? How do they vary across urban areas and regions?
- What are the new or persistent forms of inequality that these processes
  produce, particularly with regard to gender, race, income, residential
  settings, security, violence, legal status etc.? How is transbordering
  implicated in the production of changing, and oftentimes ascendant
  inequalities?
- What are the ways in which inhabitants, vastly unequal in their condi-
tions of life, negotiate their livelihoods, security, and dignity in these
(urban, suburban, exurban, and rural) spaces? How do inhabitants
of these emerging, growing, or transforming settlements claim and
assert their right to their livelihood and dignity? How do these inhab-
itants practice their right to the cities and citizenship?
- What are the modes of intervention through formal policies or infor-
  mal practices by officials, activists, and inhabitants to address the
  emergent or persistent urban challenges?

Whether the focus of our work in teaching, research, placemaking or
policymaking is domestic or international, we all need to come to terms
with the expanding transbordering of our world and its political, eco-
nomic, sociocultural, and spatial dynamics. We need to be mindful of these
dynamics and account for them in our analyses and proposals. Torres and
Momsen (2005, 332) warn us that “the tendrils of transnational forces
are far-reaching and persistent, irresistibly stretching out to engulf even
the most isolated corners of the world.” The expansive and unintended
ramifications of this project—the ability to restructure seemingly remote,
unattached areas and communities—provide a cautionary tale for all devel-
opment initiatives. Inherent in our analyses in this book, then, is a critique
of the current processes of global capitalist-driven development. Under-
standing Latin America as a transbordering space provides insights into
“the power of global capitalism to expand geographically, to transform and
commodify spaces, and to tighten its grip on all aspects of life” (Torres and
Momsen 2005, 332). In doing so, globalization and capitalist development
in Latin America have often “exacerbated existing inequalities and created new uneven geometries of power at multiple scales. These inequities involve not only power and economics, but are also evident in the subordination of local cultures, social structures, and environments” (Torres and Momsen 2005, 332).

The instances of transbordering Latin Americanisms discussed in this book illustrate the complex web of actors and social relations occurring at multiple scales that construct spaces that reproduce inequalities between people, communities, regions, and nations. However, they also point to windows of opportunity, however frugal and challenging to come by or sustain, that promote individual and collective empowerment, sustainability, and justice. By critically examining the role of transbordering forces in reshaping local realities in and about Latin America and pushing for progressive change, it may be possible to heed the World Social Forum’s claim that “another world is possible,” characterized by more equitable and sustainable development and more spaces for solidarity, emancipatory knowledge, network power, and realized subjectivities (Irazábal 2009). If another world is possible, then other Latin Americas are also possible, including transbordering ones that incorporate us all.
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