

## Durham Research Online

---

### Deposited in DRO:

28 July 2017

### Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

### Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

### Citation for published item:

Maestri, G. and Hughes, S. M. (2017) 'Contested spaces of citizenship : camps, borders and urban encounters.', *Citizenship studies.*, 21 (6). pp. 625-639.

### Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2017.1341657>

### Publisher's copyright statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor Francis in *Citizenship Studies* on 07/07/2017, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13621025.2017.1341657>.

### Additional information:

Guest editor's introduction.

## Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

**Contested Spaces of Citizenship:  
Camps, Borders and Urban Encounters**

Gaja Maestri (Durham University)

Sarah M. Hughes (Durham University)

it's not something you ever thought about doing  
and so when you did –  
you carried the anthem under your breath,  
waiting until the airport toilet  
to tear up the passport and swallow,  
each mouthful of paper making it clear that  
you would not be going back.

*Excerpt from 'Home' by Warsan Shire*

**Introduction: Conversations between Space and Citizenship**

In the last decades, the question of who has the 'right to have rights' has become ever more important. Across much of the world, citizenship regulations have tightened with increasingly punitive measures taken against those written as 'non-citizens'. At the same time, a large number of protest and activist movements against the violence of border and migration control have emerged and spread worldwide. Warsan Shire's poem was written in response to the reality of reaching and living as an undocumented migrant in Europe. Her words have been a powerful rallying call for some advocates and supporters of so-called 'illegal' migrants (Bausells and Shearlaw 2015) and are testament to the current social, political and cultural transformations around citizenship and the violence of borders. Yet what forms of exclusion are experienced by 'non-citizens'? How do they claim rights in the urban space? By which means does citizenship emerge in camps? In what spaces does solidarity between citizens and non-citizens emerge? These are just some of the questions addressed by this special issue, which emphasises the importance of an attention to space in understanding the rapid changes characterising contemporary citizenship struggles.

Citizenship is indeed inextricably and irreducibly *spatial*, and strongly linked to the material and discursive dimensions of different geographical places and scales.

The authors of this special issue therefore draw upon Geographical literature to develop understandings of how space is embedded in these processes of political subjectivation. Focusing on critical sites through which exclusionary logics materialise, we investigate how marginal(ised) political subjects claim their rights in and through space in multiple different and ambiguous ways. As the contributions to this special issue show, citizenship may be negotiated through the circulation of material from Immigration Removal Centres (Hughes and Forman, this issue), the shaping of solidarities in migrant protest camps (Depraetere and Oosterlynck, this issue) and in precarious spaces (Nordling, Sager and Söderman, this issue), but also through the production of different meanings around the space of the Roma camps (Maestri, this issue) and interactions with urban spaces (Canepari and Rosa, this issue). Through an attention to camps, borders and urban encounters – sites that characterise much of the contemporary moment – these contributions explore and illustrate the struggles, solidarities and ambiguities shaping political subjectivities from the margins. As Darling remarked in the Afterword, these articles “expand the practices, sites, and subjects associated with contesting citizenship” and show what an attention to acts, ambiguities and labour can bring to understandings of citizenship within the contemporary moment. Indeed, Darling observes that the contributions shed light on the ‘Janus-faced’ dimension of citizenship, its complex relation to the state, and the learning processes that sustain the acts and practices of citizenship making.

The discussion arose out of the ideas developed at the conference “Contested Spaces of Citizenship” hosted by Durham University (UK) in April 2015, which aimed to take stock of and critically engage with the literature on spatialities of citizenship, which has been considerably growing in the last two decades. Such a commentary on the relationship between space and citizenship is, therefore, not a new area of debate. The role of space in the production of marginal subjects has been largely discussed in the literature on segregation and ghettos, and also by the literature on camps, carceral spaces and border technologies. The debate on racial segregation has, since its very inception, tackled the issue of the spatial concentration of stigmatised minorities, looking at the socio-economic causes of its persistence (Wilson 1987) and at the role of racial discrimination (Massey and Denton

1993; Wacquant 2008). Similarly, the literature on camps has focused on the spaces emerging through the suspension of ordinary law (Agamben 1998; Edkins 2000; Minca 2015), as well as on spatial apparatuses of discipline, governmentality and security (Hyndman 2000; Lippert 1999; Peteet 2005). Furthermore, scholarship on border political technologies and migrant detention has looked at the spatiality of dispositifs managing unwanted mobilities: from the externalisation and virtualisation of the border beyond physical frontiers (see Amoore 2006, Bigo 2007, Lyon 2005), to the emergence of spaces of detention for undocumented migrants (see Bloch and Schuster 2005; Mountz et al 2013). Critical geographers are, however, continuing to develop nuanced methods to investigate questions of space in the struggles of marginalised subjects, showing a growing attention towards the spatial in the field of citizenship studies. For example, Staeheli (2010, 398) has argued for the '[i]mportance of looking to a variety of locations – public, private, place-based, socially constructed, north, and south – to see how citizenship is made and remade'. This attention to space is particularly relevant in the context of the hospitality or refugee 'crisis' that is taking shape in multiple ways across Europe, together with the rise of far-right nationalism, has seen an increase in the stigmatisation of migrants and an associated tightening of formal citizenship requirements across many states (Zedner 2016; Paret and Gleeson 2016).

This special issue therefore builds upon, and contributes to, a rich lineage of scholarly work in this area but also proposes new ways of thinking through this relationship. In so doing, the contributors to this issue open up new avenues of conversation on the relationship between "citizenship" and "space", by emphasising the places and scales of emerging practices of solidarity and strategies for claiming and enacting rights. There are four special issues that have shaped the geographical debate on citizenship in the last three decades, and that we consider particularly relevant to our work and approach. Painter and Philo's (1995, 118) special issue was the first to focus upon an exploration of the complexities of geographies of citizenship. This issue is of note because it examined citizenship as membership to a political unit and explored the relationship between territory and citizenship, caught within the tension between not only "us here" and "them there", but also "them here". The two authors underscore citizenship as potentially exclusionary of an internal other and maintain that 'the bounded space of citizenship [...] cannot be [regarded

as] straightforwardly inclusionary because some of the people resident within the territorial limits are properly regarded as being “like us” (Painter and Philo 1995, 112). This conversation was continued directly in 2005 by Kurtz and Hankins (2005, 1), who explored the geographies of citizenship in relation to how ‘different political subjectivities are fostered across spaces and scales of citizenship’, developing an understanding of citizenship as a continual process of (re)negotiation and contestation. This conceptualisation of both citizenship and space as emergent has continued to undergird many discussions on their relationship. For example, in 2016, Turner explored citizenship from marginal spaces, emphasising the relationship between ‘marginality and the political’ (p 14). The papers in the issue edited by Turner look at struggles over space, to explore the multiple, contested subjectivities within, and spatialities of, the marginal (e.g. through migrant youth, black minorities and the workless). This contribution was followed by Ataç, Rygiel and Stierl’s (2016, 527) issue on the ‘contentious politics of refugee and migrant protest’ looking at ‘remaking citizenship from the margins’. Their issue brings together literature on social movements with that of migration studies and contentious politics with the contributors noting that much literature on social movements has failed to pay attention to the ‘nuances of space’ (Ataç et al. 2016, 53). The contributors to this last issue seek to redress this, drawing upon different ways in which space is produced through relations and structures.

These special issues are an important indication of the legacy of the conversation between these two contested terms and crucially shape our approach to the analysis of citizenship, which we conceive as spatially embedded, as a marginalising process constantly open to re-negotiation, and as linked to form of collective action. The papers in *Contested Spaces of Citizenship* position themselves at the intersection of citizenship studies and critical Geography to examine the nuances of how space is conceived and perceived, mobilised, used and, in turn, shaped by political struggles and different types of claim making, through contestation and solidarity that allow for new political subjects to emerge (Isin and Nielsen 2008; Isin and Ruppert 2015). The contributors will do so by investigating the themes of spatial segregation, borders, marginalisation, resistance and solidarity.

### **The spatial dimension of citizenship from the margins**

Throughout this issue, space is understood to be multiple, relational and comprised of a ‘matrix of relations’ (Butler 1993, 7; see Massey 2005, Law 2008, Connolly 2007). Space, for

Nigel Thrift (2009, 95) is the 'fundamental stuff of human geography' as, for geographers, the production of knowledge within the discipline has always involved a concern with space (Gregory 2009). The discipline's imperialist roots saw an interest in fixing particular locations to the earth's surface, involving mapping and calculations to render the earth knowable and conquerable (Braun 2000). In the 1950s-1960s, Geography followed this epistemology, with the 'quantitative revolution' bringing in a focus on statistical methodologies and computing. Within this ontological positioning, space was conceptualised within a positivist, Cartesian framework: an absolutist perspective which considered space to be fixed, between defined co-ordinates (Gregory 2009; Hubbard et al. 2002; Heffernan 2009). However, there have been a rapid set of paradigm shifts within Geography, with the quantitative revolution (Barnes 2001) countered and critiqued by the radical and humanistic Geographies that emerged in the 1970s-1980s (Heffernan 2009) and which was accompanied by a profound critique of Geography's imperialist histories.

In the 1970s, two 'very different strands of geographical inquiry' (Hubbard et al. 2002, 41) emerged from this critique of positivism. The first saw 'humanistic accounts that emphasize that different settings have a different sense of place' (Campbell 2016) and the second arose from a Marxist understanding of space as a product in and of society. These frameworks took a relational approach to space, understanding space to be a product of the multiple relations that fold in and through it (see Lefebvre 1974, Harvey 1999, Gregory and Urry 1985 and Soja 1989). This perspective of space as relationally constituted developed through the poststructuralist turn within the discipline in the 1990s, with Geography focussing upon spatiality as multiple, plural and beyond 'true' representation. Massey's (2007) argument that a true recognition of spatiality necessitates acknowledging a co-existing multiplicity is key here. If space is a product of interrelations between components, then multiple narratives can co-exist within a single space (Murdoch 1998; Massey 1994, 2007). The authors in this special issue are united by a conception of space as not existing as a passive backdrop for human action, but as being actively embedded and strategically involved in the performance of (de)politicised subjects. Moreover, the articles will highlight the ambiguity of exclusionary and marginal spaces, which are also shaped by unsettling and empowering practices.

Scholars writing on the politics of citizenship have also expressed interest in the specificities of space, in particular with regards to the ways in which new spaces of citizenship may become opened up to 'potentially enable both new ways of being political and new visions for the type of politics we wish to imagine in the world' (Nyers and Rygiel 2012, 9). The contributions to this special issue align with an understanding of citizenship as more than membership, as a constant process of subject formation, dynamic and open to continual re-definitions. This understanding developed around the 1990s, mainly due to Isin's (2002a) work that proposed an understanding of citizenship as a way of being political, shaped by struggles and by acts of claim-making, and always spatially (and temporally) situated. The debate around citizenship was until that moment very much influenced, on the one hand, by scholarship looking at the formal and legal nature of citizenship and, on the other hand, by research more focused on the way citizenship is practiced. The literature on formal citizenship can be considered to have started with the seminal work of Thomas Marshall, who defined citizenship as a 'status bestowed on those who are full members of a community' (2009 [1949], 149). From here, scholars began interrogating processes of citizenship extension to categories formerly excluded from the formal realm of citizenship, focusing on the different legal articulations that the phenomenon of citizenship assumes in different historical moments and geographical locations (see Brubaker 1989).

However, a number of scholars have pointed out the limitations of such a perspective (see Isin 2002a, Staeheli 1999). Not only did it produce a narrow and linear understanding of the historical development of citizenship, but it was also based on the assumption that class is the only source of inequality, ignoring the various other aspects that can determine unequal power relations, such as gender and race (Isin and Wood, 1999). This critique ushered in new research on how citizenship is fragmented and on how nominal membership to a political community does not necessarily translate into a full practice of rights and duties. Citizenship is, therefore, a complex phenomenon that stretches beyond legal definitions, into the domains of those who are formally citizens but do not practice their citizenship, and those who enact their rights to have rights even though not officially entitled to do so.

Citizenship is more than membership of a political community. It is a way of 'being political' (Isin 2002a) whereby subjects constantly re-constitute themselves with and against each other through acts of citizenship that disrupt established practices of citizenship, opening up

possibilities for new political subjectivities (Isin and Nielsen 2008). Whilst the understanding of citizenship as *practice* gives more importance to habitus and order, the notion of act refers to a process of claiming rights which constitute certain subjects as claimants, writing new scripts of being political. However, some acts also risk reinstating exclusionary citizenship configurations (Squire 2015), while others do not produce new political subjectivities but mainly aim to disclose inequalities (Walters 2008). Furthermore, not all acts of citizenship necessarily become enduring. As argued by Isin and Nielsen (2008, 272), 'to make an enduring and convincing argument work in an act of citizenship the speaker and the listener first have to take each other's discourse seriously and give each other access to an ultimate word about themselves'.

Central to this special issue, then, is that citizenship is fundamentally spatial: space 'is a fundamental strategic property by which groups [...] are constituted in the real world' (Isin 2002a, 49); it is crucial to the creation, embodiment and lived experiences of political subjects (see also Gonzales and Sigona 2017). It is in spaces of encounter and struggle that new and old political subjectivities are contested and resisted. Space is not, therefore, the neutral background of political struggles, it is actively and strategically used, both as tool to disempower abject subjects (Isin and Rygiel 2007) and as a resource for enacting new scripts of activist citizens, not only through contestation but also through solidarity (Isin and Nielsen 2008). At the same time, space is constituted by political struggles and forms of citizenship, affecting the ways in which new political subjects come to emerge, for instance traversing and interstitial spaces can generate opportunities to rethink political subjectivities (Isin 2012). For these reasons, this special issue argues that geographical dimensions are fundamental to understand citizenship, which is, for example, performed at a variety of scales and in different sites (see Desforges et al. 2005, Staeheli 1999), such as in the everyday life of the urban informal economy (Canepari and Rosa, this issue), in municipal Roma camps (Maestri, this issue) or Immigration Removal Centres (Hughes and Forman, this issue). Mobility is also increasingly important in the production of political subjectivities and the articulation of inclusion/exclusion (Aradau et al. 2013; Nyers and Rygiel 2012) through, for instance, in between spaces and mobile commons (Nordling, Sager and Söderman, this issue).



The papers in this special issue also reveal the limitations of the binary division between citizens and non-citizens, which cannot grasp the different shades of inclusion in the citizenship realm: from “strangers”, i.e. those who are officially included yet prevented from fully practicing their citizenship, to “outsiders”, seen as enemies in competition with the citizens in claiming rights, and finally “aliens”, i.e. the abject, whose subjectivity is constituted by exclusion and expulsion (Isin 2002a). This understanding of different ways of being political enriches the traditional understanding of politics as the binary opposition between friend and foe, and underscores the nuances of citizenship, which includes multiple solidarity and othering strategies, always open to re-negotiation. Following this starting point, the contributions presented here offer an analysis of citizenship processes from the margins. As Darling notes, the value of this perspective is in “illustrating not just how citizenship is being practiced at the margins, but in reflecting on how the nature of citizenship is being continually revised and remade in relation to those on the margins” (this issue). Roma people, undocumented migrants and asylum seekers are all subject characterised by abjection and exclusion: despite formally being citizens, the Roma are often relegated into camps, the detention of undocumented migrants is on the rise, and asylum seekers are also increasingly stigmatised. However, being at the margins of citizenship does not deny political agency and the possibility to enact citizenship by constituting themselves as subjects entitled to certain rights. Looking at strangers, outsiders and aliens allows us to go to the very political core of citizenship, which is called into question and re-defined in space through struggle and contention. But claiming rights does not necessarily imply antagonism, it also entails solidarity between different political subjects. Indeed, this is another important aspect that the papers in this special issue touch upon, considering a variety of non-governmental actors, such as, community-based associations, non-profit organisations and social movements.

### **Practices of contention of marginal citizens: space, struggles and ambiguity**

Acts of citizenship can be defined as:

‘[E]vents that contain several overlapping and interdependent components: they claim rights and impose obligations in emotionally charged tones; pose their claims in

enduring and convincing arguments; and look to shift established practices, status and order' (Isin and Nielsen 2008, 10).

These include both everyday acts that disrupt ordinary practices, together with more collective forms of protest that voice new claims (see Gonzales and Sigona 2017). As explored in the previous section, space plays a fundamental role in acts of citizenship for it is not an empty container but the product of inter-relations that engender 'spatial agency', i.e. 'the ways that spatial constraints are turned to advantage [...] and the way that such struggles can restructure the meaning, uses, and strategic valence of space' (Sewell 2001, 55). Also Tilly (2000) argues that space matters in collective struggles because certain geographic areas can offer protection to contentious claim-making. Tilly (2000) also underscores the increasing importance of strategies of 'spatial claim-making', i.e. acts of claiming rights where locations and spatial configurations constitute an important part of contention. For instance, this occurs in contemporary social movements involved in border struggles, where 'the specific conceptions, perceptions and practices that are defined in borderzones shape their strategies of protest' (Monforte 2016, 422). As argued by Martin and Miller (2003, 144-145):

'[S]pace is not merely a variable or "container" of activism: it constitutes and structures relationships and networks [...]; situates social and cultural life including repertoires of contention; is integral to the attribution of threats and opportunities; is implicit in many types of category formation; and is central to scale-jumping strategies that aim to alter discrepancies in power among political contestants.'

A further conceptual thread connecting all the papers of this special issue therefore is the understanding of citizenship as *struggle*: from more vocal forms of protest and social movement, to more mundane and subtle strategies of negotiation. Whether explicitly oppositional or percolating the messiness of everyday life, citizenship is inextricably shaped by political struggle. Moreover, citizenship contention necessarily addresses the institutional articulation of citizenship and puts it into question. From the protesters in Maximiliaanpark in the heart to Brussels, to the 'discreet' practices of citizenship that Roma people develop in their everyday life in Turin, the acts of citizenship explored by the authors in this special issue call into question the institutional and official definitions of citizenship that exclude asylum seekers, economic migrants and many ethnic minorities. The multiple constituent

components of the state, including governmental institutions at various different spaces and scales, are therefore crucial interlocutors in the struggles for citizenship (Nicholls 2007). Moreover, political subjectivities are situated relationally and social movements mobilise different spatially positioned subjects (e.g. 'native'/'foreigners', locals/non locals) and negotiate differences among them, also through alliances (Leitner et al. 2008).

Space plays also an important role in migrant protests and tactics of resistance, as discussed by Ehrkamp and Leitner's (2006, 1591), who bring together work focussing on space and looking at 'how migrants transform material spaces and places in contemporary cities into sites and struggles for rights and citizenship'. This is also highlighted by Ikizoglu Erensu (2016) who, through the analysis of a protest organised by Afghan asylum-seekers and refugees in Turkey, shows how political subjectivities play out across sites and scales (see also work on relationship between citizenship and scale by Staeheli 1999 and Kurtz and Hankins 2005). In addition to this, Leitner et al. (2008) focus on place and networks as key spatialities for contentious politics, exploring the US Immigrant Worker's Freedom ride to show how social movements emerge in public spaces mobilising differently positioned subjects, through alliances and materiality. Also Nicholls (2011), by looking at migrants' mobilisation in France, observes that social movements are deeply shaped by spatial processes, such as the re-scaling and localisation of policies and grievances, the concentration of people, and the networking in and of places.

Finally, a focus on the spatial dimension of acts of citizenship can also underscore the inextricable ambiguity that comes with it. Indeed, as Darling comments, "marginal subjects appeal for rights whilst also critiquing and challenging the basis on which such rights are assumed" (this issue). For example, Squire (2015, 505-506) explores 'acts of desertion' as illuminating the ambiguities of abandonment and renouncement across the multiple spaces of the Sonoran borderzone, to reject the dichotomy between institutions of border security and migration practices. Acts of citizenship can therefore simultaneously undermine and reinscribe how space is conceptualised, as also discussed by McNevin's (2006) in her analysis of the struggle of the Sans-Papiers. Similarly, both Ní Mhurchú (2016) and Hughes (2016) draw upon music to highlight the importance of an attention to the ambiguity of spaces, when attending to conceptualising resistance and migrant groups. The cases

analysed in the contributions to this issue, and that we will present in the next section, are deeply ambiguous. For example, the solidarity between activists and undocumented migrants in the Maximiliaanpark in Brussels is also marked by power relations (Depraetere and Oosterlynck, this issue), as in the case of pro-Roma associations in Rome who end up reproducing ethnic inequalities (Maestri, this issue).

### **Camps, borders and urban encounters: the contributions of this special issue**

The articles that comprise this special issue contribute to these discussions, by developing an understanding of the political subject ‘not as a coherent and unified being but as a composite of multiple subjectivities that emerge from different situations and relations’ (Isin and Ruppert 2015, 4). The contributors also aim to offer an insight into space as a crucial component in debates around the place of citizenship within contemporary political scholarship. Within this work, the authors bring together a diversity of empirical work and variously bring the theoretical contributions of scholars such as Giorgio Agamben (1998; 2005), Jacques Rancière (2001; 2004; 2010) and De Certeau (1998) into conversation with the seminal work of Engin Isin (2002a; 2008; see also Isin and Ruppert 2015, Isin and Rygiel 2007) and his concept of “acts of citizenship”. These discussions take place in the context of countries in Western Europe: Italy, France, Belgium, Sweden and the UK. They are grounded within, and through, a diversity of spaces – Roma settlements, refugee camps and migrant detention centres – in different historical and geographical urban settings – Turin, early modern and contemporary Rome, Brussels, Oxford and Malmö.

The authors here explore the figure of the citizen as one that is simultaneously submissive, subversive and obedient: ‘the agency of the citizen appears in the gap between the capacity to submit to authority and yet the ability to act in dissent’ (Isin and Ruppert 2015, 23). Themes of rupture, subjectivity, resistance and encounters run through the sections of this work, as the authors share a commitment to critically interrogating space, as means to develop new understandings of citizenship. Whilst our editorial comments cannot hope to capture the rich detail of these contributions, we outline here three spaces of contested citizenship that emerge from the contributions and that are at the core of contemporary

struggles for emerging political subjects and their demands: the camp, the border, and the urban.

### ***Camps***

Camp spaces are proliferating across the world, from camps for refugees (see Agier 2014) and Roma (Picker et al. 2015) to migration detention centres (Moran et al., 2013) and EU hotspots (Squire 2016), from spaces of transit (Davies and Isakjee 2015) and of sanctuary (Bagelman 2016; Czajka 2012) to protest camps (Ataç 2016; Ramadan 2013). Camps can be defined as demarcated places which have an exceptional legal status and where specific populations are confined (see Bernardot 2005; Picker and Pasquetti 2015), more or less voluntarily (see, for instance, the case of gated communities in Diken and Laustsen 2005). As mentioned at the beginning of this editorial introduction, camps have been mostly studied under an Agambenian lens seeing them as a space of exception (Edkins 2000; Giaccaria and Minca 2011; Minca 2015) and a Foucauldian one focusing on technologies of discipline and security (Hyndman 2000; Lippert 1999; Peteet 2005). The papers in this special issue, however, approach the space of the camp differently.

Maestri's paper shows how the camp is not a sheer space of abjection, but a space where there are multiple potential political subjectivities in the making through different discursive articulation strategies developed by a plurality of non-governmental actors, including Roma solidarity movements. By interrogating the importance of how space is framed, Maestri argues that this imagining of space affects the multiple ways through which citizenship can be hindered, claimed and envisaged. Maestri's paper utilises fieldwork conducted in Rome, to argue that an analysis of the multiple spatial meanings and claims produced around the Roma camps can offer an important entry point into an understanding of the ways in which the Roma housing rights are claimed, including ambiguous forms of neoliberal and urban citizenship. The paper further illustrates that the discourses articulated by Italian Roma solidarity groups contribute to shaping new political subjectivities for the Roma.

Hughes and Forman's article illustrates how the circulation of material objects from Immigration Removal Centres opens up the potentiality for resistance. The two authors bring literature on new materialism into conversation with Isin's "acts of citizenship" to argue for an attention to the lively and agential materials that mediate citizenship claims.

They develop this argument through a detailed empirical study of the materials permitted to circulate from UK Immigration Removal Centres during a community exchange project organised by the charity Music in Detention. Through this they examine how the materiality of space is an inextricable part of “acts of citizenship”, which can be understood as undertaken by a heterogeneous collective assemblage of both humans and non-human actors, and therefore go beyond human intentionality.

Depraetere and Oosterlynck analyse how the political potential emerging in protest camps creates opportunities for solidarity in a space where migrants can disrupt the institutional order that relegates them at the margin. In 2015, following the failure of the Belgian state to provide for an increase in refugees arriving in the city, many individuals ended up sleeping in the streets and so some Belgian citizens built an informal refugee camp in Maximiliaanpark, outside the Foreign Office in Brussels, Belgium. The authors explore how the intricacies of this space can lead to improper placing and (dis)identification of non-citizens. The article focuses on the political dynamics of this camp, utilising Rancière’s (2010) work to understand the spatiality of this camp, which allows for the opening of the possibility of political claims of non-citizens.

These papers make contribution towards a geography of camp-like spaces and institutions, refuting simplistic understandings of camps as spaces of utter exclusion and bare life, or as discipline and governmentality. These articles rather show how the camp is a ‘political space’ (Redclift 2013), where a variety of actors operate in solidarity with camp-subjects and where multiple strategies of claim-making emerge, hence shaping a plurality of political subjectivities that exceeds that of bare life.

### ***Borders***

The border also emerged as an important space determining contemporary rights struggles. The papers by Hughes and Forman, Depraetere and Oosterlynck and Nordling, Sager and Söderman all consider the condition of subjects who have been stripped of their rights following the crossing of border of the European Union. The border has become an increasingly complex phenomenon, not only through the proliferation of walls (Brown, 2010), but also through their increasing delocalisation beyond the site of physical frontiers (Amoore 2006; Bigo 2007) and a growingly intricate assemblage of public and private actors

implicated in their management (Hiemstra and Conlon 2017; Prokkola 2013). The 'texture' of border has changed in the last thirty years (Walters 2006, 198) and border controls are now remote (Guiraudon and Lahav 2000) and externalised. They increasingly operate at the scale of the body, through identification strategies such as fingerprinting (Broeders and Engbersen 2007), becoming portable and virtual (Lyon 2005, Burrige et al. 2017). This diffusion of bordering practices and technologies increases the moments of filtering of mobility flows, producing a plethora of non-citizens. However, as pointed out by Mezzadra and Neilson (2012), the border is not only a site of exclusion and control but also of crossing and encounter, both dividing and connecting. It is this ambiguity of borderscapes (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2012) that the contributors to this issues have aimed to underline.

As previously mentioned, Hughes and Forman investigate the political ambiguity of the activities carried out inside an Immigration Removal Centre. Depraetere and Oosterlynck highlight the ambivalence of the protest camps set up by undocumented migrants, which initiate a political process of subjectification, while at the same time being characterised by hierarchies among activists. Finally, Nordling, Sager and Söderman's paper focuses on the ambiguity of the struggles for the social rights of undocumented migrants in Malmö, Sweden, which potentially replicates the boundary between 'good' and 'bad' migrants, while also fostering solidarities emerging with fellow activists in a theatre play. In all these cases, the borderscapes are characterised by violent exclusion, but also by solidarity, ambiguity and creativity. For example, Nordling, Sager and Söderman explore the importance of space for community building, examining how an attention to spatiality can facilitate the emergence of political subjectivities, strategies of visibility and invisibility and shaping solidarities. They discuss this through an analysis of undocumented migrants' struggles over rights and representation, arguing that these practices constitute an enactment of citizenship. The authors utilise autonomous migration literature to explore acts of solidarity beyond the terminology of citizenship through the concept of 'mobile commons' (Papadopoulos and Tsianos 2013; Mezzadra 2015). To make this claim the authors focus on the experiences and activist practices of undocumented migrants as well as citizens in Malmö; the development of local guidelines extending limited social benefits rights to undocumented migrants; and a theatre performance involving undocumented actors to argue that encounters between citizens and non-citizens can create situated

spaces 'in between', by claiming citizen rights and by going beyond the language of citizenship through the emergence of mobile commons.

### ***Urban Encounters***

Finally, through these papers the urban is not simply conceived a space of the 'police' (in Rancièrian terms, i.e. of social order and control), but also as a space of 'politics', i.e. of disruption of the inequalities of the status-quo (Uitermark and Nicholls 2014). Canepari and Rosa's paper highlights how the urban has historically been a space of exclusionary processes and discrimination against mobile workers and certain ethnic minorities. However, it is also a space of everyday practices and claims to citizenship enacted by marginal subjects, for example by Roma migrants. By following an understanding of the urban as a space where social groups constitute themselves and claim rights, Canepari and Rosa do not define urban practices as a claim to citizenship, but as a as a *form* of citizenship. The authors frame this debate through a discussion of the relations between citizenship and marginal spaces in two chronological contexts: early modern Rome and contemporary Turin. The paper takes a comparative perspective, to explore the role of transient individuals in shaping the city space, together with how these individuals, throughout their spatial practices, 'quietly' claim their *citadinité*. This historical approach to space and "acts of citizenship", serves to reinstate transient inhabitants of these cities into the framework of urban belonging, and in doing so unsettle the perceived binary between formal and informal citizenship.

This view of the urban as space for citizenship struggles has also been suggested by Isin (2002b), who sees the city as a space of agonism. This is not simply a recent phenomenon, but such debates have been around since the very birth of citizenship. While at the national – and supranational – level the political and social rights of migrants are put into question, 'the majority of immigrants settle in cities and use urban resources to mobilize and articulate their demands for recognition' (Isin, 2002b, 313). The city, therefore, witnesses the emergence of an urban form of citizenship, 'understood not as membership in a polity – let alone the nation-state – but as a practice of articulation, claiming and renewing group rights in and through the appropriation and creation of spaces in the city' (Isin 2002b, 314). This is because cities are not bounded and uniform spaces, but are open spaces that must



'be deconstructed and their complex geographies understood' (Miller and Nicholls 2013, 465). As argued by Uitermark and Nicholls (2014, 988):

'Cities do not simply form the backdrop of social movements but offer crucial socio-spatial conditions for the formation of activist networks. The size, diversity, and density of cities enable strong and fluid relations between different activist clusters.'

For instance, Maestri's, Nordling, Sager and Söderman's and Depraetere and Oosterlynck's papers also show how the city becomes the arena for new encounters and solidarities. The case of the protest camp in Maximiliaanpark illustrates how urban spaces actively facilitate opportunities for new solidarity networks and the development of tactics for demanding rights. Similarly, in Rome, the Roma built new alliances with urban movements, while in Malmö, the encounter between citizens and undocumented migrants in a theatre performance led to the emergence of spaces for community building. 'The political not only "takes place" but emerges from space', argue Uitermark and Nicholls (2014), and what the authors of this special issue show is precisely that the urban space makes new political subjectivities emerge through everyday acts of dwelling and working, new encounters and solidarities. As Holston (2007, 23) reminds us "[i]n the process, cities become both the site and the substance not only of the uncertainties of modern citizenship but also of its emergent forms."

By looking at the camp, the border and the urban, the following contributions will unpick the struggles, the solidarities and the ambiguities which unfold in space, leading to the emergence of new contested political subjectivities from the margins.

### **Bibliography**

Agamben, G., 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press,.

Agamben, G. 2005. *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Agier, M. 2014. *Un monde de camps* [A World of Camps]. Paris: La Découverte.

Amoore, L. 2006. "Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror." *Political Geography* 25 (3): 336–351.

Aradau, C., J. Huysmans, P. G. Macioti, and V. Squire. 2013. "Mobility Interrogating Free Movement: Roma Acts of European Citizenship." In *Enacting European Citizenship*, edited by E. Isin and M. Saward, 132–154. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Ataç, I., 2016. "Refugee Protest Camp Vienna: Making Citizens through Locations of the Protest Movement." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (5): 629–646.

Ataç, I., K. Rygiel, and M. Stierl. 2016. "Introduction: The Contentious Politics of Refugee and Migrant Protest and Solidarity Movements: Remaking Citizenship from the Margins." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (5): 527–44.

Bagelman, J. 2016. *Sanctuary City. A Suspended State*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barnes, T. J. 2001. "Rethorizing Economic Geography: From the Quantitative Revolution to the 'Cultural Turn.'" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91 (3): 546–565.

Bausells, M., and M. Shearlaw. 2015. "Poets speak out for refugees: 'No one leaves home, unless home is the mouth of a shark'." *The Guardian*. Accessed online: <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/sep/16/poets-speak-out-for-refugees-> [30th March 2017].

Bernardot, M. 2015. *Déplacer et loger les indésirables, sociologie du logement contraint* [Displacing and housing the undesirables, sociology of forced housing]. Recueil Alexandries, Collections Esquisses, September.

Bigo, D. 2007. "Detention of Foreigners, States of Exception, and the Social Practices of Control and the Banopticon." In *Borderscapes. Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*, edited by P. K. Rajaram and C. Grundy-Warr, 3–34. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bloch, A., and L. Schuster. 2005. "At the Extremes of Exclusion: Deportation, Detention and Dispersal." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (3): 491–512.

Braun, B. 2000. "Producing Vertical Territory: Geology and Governmentality in Late Victorian Canada." *Cultural Geographies* 7 (1): 7–46.

Broeders, D., and G. Engbersen. 2007. "The Fight Against Illegal Migration. Identification Policies and Immigrants' Counterstrategies." *American Behavioral Scientist* 50 (12): 1592–1609.

Brown, W. 2010. *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. New York: Zone Books.

Brubaker, R. 1989. *Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Burridge, A., Gill, N., Kocher, A., and Martin, L. 2017 Polymorphic Borders. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5 (3): 239-251.

- Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies That Matter. On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. London: Routledge
- Campbell, C. J. 2016. "Space, Place and Scale: Human Geography and Spatial History in 'Past and Present.'" *Past & Present*, 17.
- de Certeau, M. 1988. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- Czajka, A. 2012. "The Potential of Sanctuary: Acts of Sanctuary Through the Lens of the Camp." In *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives*, edited by R. Lippert, and S. Rehaag, 43–56. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Desforges, L.C., R. Jones, and M. Wood. 2005. "New Geographies of Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 9 (5): 439–451.
- Diken, B., and C. B. Laustsen. 2005. *The culture of exception. Sociology facing the camp*. London: Routledge.
- Edkins, J. 2000. "Sovereign Power, Zones of Indistinction, and the Camp." *Alternatives* 25 (1):3–25.
- Ehrkamp, P., and H. Leitner. 2006. "Rethinking Immigration and Citizenship: New Spaces of Migrant Transnationalism and Belonging." *Environment and Planning A* 38 (9): 1591–1597.
- Giaccaria, P., and C. Minca. 2011. "Topographies/topologies of the camp: Auschwitz as a spatial threshold." *Political Geography* 30 (1): 3–12.
- Gonzales, R.G., and N. Sigona. 2017. "Mapping the soft borders of citizenship: an introduction." In *Within and beyond citizenship: Borders, membership and belonging*, edited by R. G. Gonzales and N. Sigona. London and New York: Routledge
- Gregory, D., and J. Urry, eds. 1985. *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. London: Macmillan.
- Gregory, D. 2009. "Space." In *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, edited by D. Gregory, R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. Watts and S. Whatamore, 707–710. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Guiraudon, V., and G. Lahav. 2000. "A reappraisal of the State Sovereignty Debate: The Case of Migration Control." *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (2): 163–195.
- Harvey, D. 1999. *Limits to Capital*. Second Edition. London: Verso.
- Heffernan, M. 2009. "Histories of Geography." In *Key Concepts in Geography*, edited by G. Clifford, N. Rice and S., Valentine, 1–20. London: SAGE Publications.

Hiemstra, N., and D. Conlon. 2017. "Beyond privatization: bureaucratization and the spatialities of immigration detention expansion." *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 1–17. doi:10.1080/21622671.2017.1284693

Holston, J. 2007. *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hubbard, P., R. Kitchin, B. Bartley, and D. Fuller. 2002. *Thinking Geographically*. London, New York: Continuum.

Hyndman, J. 2000. *Managing Displacement: Refugees and the Politics of Humanitarianism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hughes, S.M. 2016. "Beyond Intentionality: Exploring Creativity and Resistance within a UK Immigration Removal Centre." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (3-4): 427–443.

Ikizoglu Erensu, A. 2016. "Notes from a Refugee Protest: Ambivalences of Resisting and Desiring Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (5): 665–677.

Isin, E. 2002a. *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Isin, E. 2002b. "City, Democracy and Citizenship: Historical Images, Contemporary Practices." In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, edited by E. Isin and B. S. Turner, B. S., 305–316. London: SAGE publications.

Isin, E. 2012. *Citizens Without Frontiers*. London-New York: Continuum.

Isin, E., and G. M. Nielsen, eds. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. London-New York: Zed Books.

Isin, E., and K. Rygiel. 2007. "Abject Spaces: Frontiers, Zones, Camps." In *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror: Living, Dying, Surviving*, edited by E. Dauphinee and C. Masters, 181–203. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Isin, E., and P. Wood. 1999. *Citizenship and Identity*. London: SAGE publications.

Isin E., and E. Ruppert. 2015. *Being Digital Citizens*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Kurtz, H., and K. Hankins. 2005. "Guest Editorial: Geographies of Citizenship." *Space and Polity* 9 (1): 1–8.

Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social-an Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, J. 2008. "Actor-Network Theory and Material Semiotics." In *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, edited by B. S. Turner, 141–158. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lefebvre, H. 1974. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Leitner, H., E. Sheppard, and K. M. Sziarto. 2008. "The Spatialities of Contentious Politics." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33 (2): 157–172.

Lippert, R. 1999. "Governing refugees: the relevance of governmentality to understanding the international refugee regime." *Alternatives* 24 (3): 295–328.

Lyon, D. 2005. "The border is everywhere: ID cards, surveillance, and the other." In *Global Surveillance and Policing: Borders, Security, Identity*, edited by E. Zureik and M. Salter, 66–82. Devon, UK and Portland, Oregon: Willan Publishing.

Marshall, T. H. 2009. "Citizenship and Social Class." In *Inequality and Society*, edited by J. Manza and M. Saunder, 148-154. London: Norton and Co.

Martin, D., and B. Miller. 2003. "Space and Contentious Politics." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 8 (2): 143–156.

Massey, D. S., and N. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Massey, D. S. 2005. *For Space*. London: SAGE publications.

Massey, D. S. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Massey, D. S. 2007. *World City*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mezzadra, S., and B. Neilson. 2012. "Borderscapes of Differential Inclusion. Subjectivity and Struggles on the Threshold of Justice's Excess." In *The Borders of Justice*, edited by E. Balibar, S. Mezzadra and R. Samaddar, 181-205. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mezzadra, S. 2015. "The proliferation of borders and the right to escape." In *The Irregularization of Migration in Contemporary Europe: Detention, Deportation, Drowning*, edited by Y. Jansen, R. Celikates and J. de Bloois, 121–35. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Miller, B., and W. Nicholls. 2013. "Social Movements in Urban Society: The City as A Space of Politicization." *Urban Geography*. 34 (4): 452–473.

Minca, C. 2015. "Geographies of the camp." *Political Geography* 49: 74–83.

Monforte, P. 2016. "The Border as a Space of Contention. The Spatial Strategies of Protest Against Border Controls in Europe." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (3-4): 411–426.

Moran, D., Gill, N., and D. Conlon, eds. 2013. *Carceral spaces: mobility and agency in imprisonment and migrant detention*. Avebury: Ashgate.

Murdoch, J. 1998. "The Spaces of Actor-Network Theory." *Geoforum*. 29(4): 357-374.

Ní Mhurchú, A. 2016. "Unfamiliar Acts of Citizenship: Enacting Citizenship in Vernacular Music and Language from the Space of Marginalised Intergenerational Migration." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (2): 156–172.

Nicholls, W. 2007. "The Geographies of Social Movements." *Geography Compass* 1 (3): 607–622.

Nicholls, W. 2011. "Cities and the unevenness of social movement space: The case of France's immigrant rights movement." *Environment and Planning A* 43: 1655–1673.

Nyers, P., and K. Rygiel, eds. 2012. *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*. Abingdon: Routledge

Painter, J., and C. Philo. 1995. "Spaces of Citizenship: An Introduction." *Political Geography* 14 (2) : 107–120.

Papadopoulos, D., and T. Vassilis. 2013. "After citizenship: autonomy of migration, organisational ontology and mobile commons." *Citizenship Studies*. 17 (2): 178– 196.

Paret, M., and S. Gleeson. 2016. "Precarity and Agency through a Migration Lens." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (3–4): 277–294.

Peteet, J. M., 2005. *Landscape of Hope and Despair: Palestinian Refugee Camps*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.

Picker, G., Greenfields M., and D. Smith. 2015. "Colonial refractions: the "Gypsy camp" as a spatio-racial political technology." *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action* 19 (5): 741–752.

Picker, G., and S. Pasquetti. 2015. "Durable camps: the state, the urban, the everyday." *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action* 19 (5): 681–688.

Prokkola, E.-K., 2013. "Neoliberalizing Border Management in Finland and Schengen." *Antipode* 45 (5): 1318–1336.

Ramadan, A., 2013. "From Tahrir to the world: The camp as a political public space." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 20 (1): 145–149.

Rancière, J. 2001. "Ten Theses on Politics." *Theory & Event* 5(3).

Rancière, J. 2004. "Who Is the Subject of the Rights of Man?" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 103 (2–3): 297–310.

- Rancière, J. 2010. *Dissensus on Politics and Aesthetics*. London: Continuum.
- Redclift, V. 2013. "Abjects or Agents? Camps, Contests and the Creation of 'Political Space'." *Citizenship Studies* 17 (3-4): 308–321.
- Sewell, W.H. 2001. "Space in Contentious Politics." In *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, edited by R.R. Aminzade, J. A Goldstone, D. McAdam, E. J. Perry, W.H. Sewell, S. Tarrow and C. Tilly, 51–88, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soja, E. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.
- Squire, V. 2015. "Acts of desertion : the ambiguities of abandonment and renouncement across the Sonoran borderzone." *Antipode* 47 (2): 500–516.
- Squire, V. 2016. "Hotspot stories from Europe's border." *OpenDemocracy*. Accessed online <https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/vicki-squire/hotspot-stories>. [30<sup>th</sup> March 2017]
- Staeheli, L. 1999. "Globalization and the Scales of Citizenship." *Geography Research Forum* 19: 60–77.
- Staeheli, L. 2011. "Political Geography: Where's Citizenship?" *Progress in Human Geography* 35 (3): 393–400.
- Thrift, N. 2009. "Space: The Fundamental Stuff of Human Geography." In *Key Concepts in Geography*, edited by N. J. Clifford, S. Holloway, S. R. Price, and G. Valentine. Los Angeles: SAGE publications.
- Tilly, C. 2000. "Spaces of contention." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 5 (2): 135–159.
- Turner, J. 2016. "(En)gendering the Political: Citizenship from Marginal Spaces." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (2):141–55.
- Uitermark, J., and W. Nicholls. 2014. "From politicization to policing: The rise and decline of new social movements in Amsterdam and Paris." *Antipode* 46 (4): 970–991.
- Wacquant, L. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Walters, W. 2006. "Border/Control." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9 (2): 187– 203
- Walters, W. 2008. "Acts of Demonstration: Mapping the Territory of (Non-)Citizenship." In *Acts of Citizenship*, edited by E. Isin and G. M. Nielsen, 182–207. London: Zed Books.

Wilson, W.J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zedner, L. 2016. "Citizenship Deprivation, Security and Human Rights." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 18 (2): 222–242