Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

Acts of European citizenship: a political sociology of mobility

Journal Item

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

oro.open.ac.uk

Acts of European Citizenship: A political sociology of mobility[1]

Claudia Aradau, Jef Huysmans and Vicki Squire

Abstract

European citizenship is marked by a tension: between a citizenship that is derivative of the nation-state, and a citizenship that is defined by free movement. Approaching this tension as symptomatic of a deep-rooted contradiction between integration and mobility that is constitutive of modern social formations, this article develops a political sociology of mobility that challenges territorial and culturalist accounts of European citizenship. It does so by exploring the political enactment of European citizenship by marginalised subjects, whose engagement in relations of exchange serve as the ground for acts of European citizenship that 'mobilize mobility'. This is illustrated by an analysis of the 2005 Declaration for the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe.

Introduction

European citizenship is marked by a tension: between a citizenship that is derivative of the nation-state, and a citizenship that is defined by free movement. On the one hand, citizenship rights are primarily granted to citizens of member states and are only partially or differentially extended to third country nationals (Maas, 2008). On the other hand, citizenship rights in the Union are primarily activated through practices of free movement, rendering the mobility of citizens central to the effective institution of European citizenship (Guild, 2004). European citizenship, it would seem, is marked by a deep-rooted tension between nationality and free movement.

This article approaches the tension between nationality and free movement as symptomatic of a more deep-rooted contradiction between integration and mobility, which is conceived of here as constitutive of modern citizenship at large and European citizenship in particular. By examining mobility in its ambiguous relation with integration, the article develops an account of European citizenship that focuses on the acts through which it is created, rather than on a status that is institutionally granted. It shows how European integration entails a territorial or culturalist account of citizenship, which favours the scaling up of territorial boundaries and national belonging to the EU level and which often renders invisible the political bearings of those whose rights are limited. As an alternative, the article develops an approach that is based on a reconceptualization of mobility. From this perspective mobility is not primarily defined as a matter of cross-border movement or of the outside coming inside. Instead, mobility is interpreted as a *mode of sociality* that is constituted

through exchange relations, most notably those expressed in money transactions. By approaching mobility as a mode of sociality rather than as constituted through border-crossings, the question of European citizenship shifts from an emphasis on discriminating between insiders and outsiders, or between citizens and strangers. Instead, the emphasis is on relations of exchange which bring into play the tension between integration and mobility, and on how such relations are the condition of possibility for political acts that disrupt institutionalised territorial or cultural practices and norms of European citizenship.

In making the case for an approach to European citizenship informed by a political sociology of mobility, the article proceeds in four stages. First, it problematises existing debates by showing how mobility is brought to the fore in the integration literature only to be reduced to a socio-economic practice to be contained within a territorially and culturally circumscribed legal European space. As the basis of an alternative approach, the second section re-conceptualizes mobility by drawing on Georg Simmel's theorisation of exchange relations, money and the stranger. This allows for a conceptualisation of mobility *qua* exchange relations between strangers, which fundamentally challenges territorially and culturally contained forms of social and political organisation. In order to open up the ambiguities of the European integration project, the third part of the paper shows how mobility as exchange relations can be mobilised through 'acts of citizenship' whereby institutionalised citizenship practices are disrupted politically (Isin and Nielsen, 2008). The critical analytical import of such an approach is demonstrated in the fourth section, which interprets the mobilisation of mobility by sex workers in the 2005 Declaration for the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe as an act of European citizenship.

European integration and mobility

The tension between integration and mobility has been mediated in distinctly territorial and cultural terms in the European integration literature. If we bracket the geopolitical rationale of overcoming violent inter-state rivalry through functional integration, the development of European cross-border free movement is first of all driven by economic reasoning. Thus, early accounts of the constitution of a European polity conceive this as dependent on the development of a sufficient level of social and economic integration by means of increasing free movement of goods, services, capital and people. One of the expected effects of increased cross-border transactions, travelling, and labour mobility is the production of 'we-feelings' between people across different countries (Deutsch, 1953, 1957). Functional mobilities are therefore seen as potentially constituting a European collective consciousness and a European identity expressed in shared culture and values. Mobility is here a vehicle for transcending national identities in the formation of a supra-national *demos*. The neo-functionalist (Haas, 1961, 1968, Lindberg and Scheingold, 1970) and transactional integration literature (Deutsch, 1953, Deutsch, 1957) explicitly turn this mode of sociality into a political opportunity. For them functional integration and cross border movement of people create opportunities for developing a European political identity and a European political terrain through which citizens can legitimize and bring to account European policy-makers. Mobility is here no longer simply an economic opportunity and a vehicle of economic integration between states. Rather, it creates the conditions for demanding a European polity that is defined by European citizens with a common status and identity.

As far back as the Tindemans report (European Communities 1976), European citizenship has been a key vehicle through which this interest in changing a community of states into a community of people with a common status and identity (i.e. the shift from economic integration into political integration) has been expressed and contested. This particular framing of European citizenship has had a number of important consequences. Although free movement has been crucial in creating the economic and social background conditions against which the questions of political identity and status could arise, the political spillover sought through the conception of European citizenship is not one of politicising mobility but one of moving from mobility to a different set of issues: the constitution of a European demos, rights and cultural values, and the development of a European public sphere. On this account, mobility largely remains a socio-economic practice that creates the conditions for the demand of European citizenship, but is in itself not political. While free movement stays firmly in the picture as the central development that challenged the exclusivity of national citizenship in the European Communities and later on the European Union, political integration is largely conceived of as requiring the institution of rights, political identity and public spheres to be lifted from the national level to the European supranational level. In this regard, the political integration literature assumes a 'scalar' model of citizenship (Isin 2007), in which the ambiguities of mobility and integration are eclipsed by the problem of how to reproduce at a higher-level citizenship and other political institutions and practices that were previously developed within the confines of nation-states.

This reductive account of mobility may explain why many political analyses of European citizenship either gloss over mobility (e.g. Bellamy, 2008), or consider it to be indicative of earlier versions of 'market' (Everson, 1995) or neoliberal (Hansen,

1998) citizenship. Such analyses suggest that, if European citizenship is to become a viable political project, provisions concerning freedom of movement need to be either *supplemented* through an expansion of political and social rights or *supplanted* by a more political rendering of citizenship. For example, many scholars attempt to surpass what they see as its unfinished and apolitical nature by finding different grounds for European citizenship (Bellamy, 2008; Neveu, 2000; Wiener, 1998), moving from a commercial and economic understanding of the community to a political understanding of the 'union'. There are at least two ways in which European citizenship literature conceives this political project as possible. Firstly, the identification and creation of a European demos is required if European citizenship is to be understood as political (e.g. Bellamy, 2008; Habermas, 1992, 1998; Holmes and Murray 1999, Kastoryano, 1998; Kostakopoulou, 2001; Preuss et al 2003; Schnapper, 1999; Smith and Wright 1999; Weiler, 1997). Key here are issues of commonality and inclusiveness (Bellamy, 2001; Wiener, 1998). Secondly, affective supplements to the socio-economic are required if European citizenship is to be conceived of as political. Belonging is here seen as filling an affective dimension that is lacking in an economically-driven account of citizenship (Kostakopoulou, 2007; Maas, 2007, pp.115-120).

Despite the dominance of an integrative approach in political analyses of European citizenship, some rights-oriented approaches in the integration literature do seek to retain a much closer and continuous relation between the development of social and economic free movement and the constitution of political citizenship. Here, economics is related to politics via the rights of free movement. For example, Willem Maas (2007) claims that free movement has changed over the course of the integration process from facilitating economic relations between states into a set of

rights that individuals can claim directly. This, he suggests, is indicative of a commitment on the part of European leaders to the political development of the Union, and serves as the bedrock for a re-interpretation of European citizenship as a specifically political project founded upon free movement. Maas suggests that the constitution of a community of individual rights holders serves as evidence of the development of a 'genuine' European political community, with the rights of free movement as the kernel of European citizenship status. Despite this, however, Maas cautions against a supranational citizenship that remains a 'bargain among member states rather than enjoying widespread popular support' (2007, p. 7). This leads him to make the case for the development of a shared European political identity to complement the institutions that support European citizenship. The cultural constitution of the demos returns in Maas' analysis, although this time it is fully embedded in a political process defined by the development of free movement rights.[2]

Despite its diversity, however, the literature on EU citizenship ultimately remains hostage to a territorial and culturalist model of citizenship in which integration is privileged over mobility. Citizenship is primarily conceived of as European in terms of the scaling up of national models of citizenship to the wider legal and territorial entity of the European Union. As a result, the constitution of cultural or legal boundaries delineating membership, along with the constitution of territorial boundaries marking the spatial reach of the public sphere are seen to define the political practice of European citizenship. In such accounts, mobility and the transactions it implicates are primarily locked within a socio-economic terrain that is seen as either non-political or only incipiently political. This reflects a problem in the

---

[2] Elspeth Guild's (2004) work is another example of an approach that emphasises the importance of free movement to European citizenship, this time from a legal perspective. She emphasises that moving is a condition for enjoying key European citizenship rights. For example to claim residency rights, transferability of social security rights or mutual recognition of diplomas one needs to move between the member-states, otherwise there is no need to claim European rights.

conceptualisation of mobility, whereby the ambiguities emerging as a result of the constitutive tensions between integration and mobility are ignored.

In order to evade this problem, the next part of the article develops an alternative account of mobility that brings the ambiguities of mobility/integration to the fore. This account draws inspiration from sociological theorists of modernity such as Georg Simmel, whose work is taken up here in order to show how mobility constitutes a particular mode of sociality based on exchange, rather than substantive integration (see Frisby and Featherstone 1997; Levine 1971, Simmel 1978; Urry 2007, pp. 20-26). [3] By drawing on Simmel we aim to insert mobility differently into European citizenship debates, which we will refer to as mobilising mobility through 'acts of citizenship'. This, we suggest, allows an extension of the purview of European citizenship to marginal actors who are rendered invisible in approaches that scale up territorial and cultural citizenship to a higher level.

Beyond integration: mobility as social practice

Mobility does not necessarily pose a challenge to territorial or culturalist models of citizenship if understood as movement across borders. One could even interpret mobility as reproducing territorial and cultural citizenship where is it conceived in such terms, because borders are predicated upon the existence of separate territorial and cultural communities between which movement takes place. While the focus of

---

[3] In drawing on the work of Simmel we do not seek to make any interjection into a historical sociological account of modernisation theory, nor do we intend to provide a progressivist reading of history. We take Simmel's work as a starting point to trace tensions in modern social relations. We then use these tensions to understand the complexity of the relation between integration, mobility and European citizenship today.

this article is on exchange relations that take place within a context marked by an intensification of the physical movements of people, a conception of mobility as a mode of sociality based on exchange shifts the focus away from movement across borders to movements of both a social and physical type that challenge the territorial and cultural lines of inclusion/exclusion which integrative approaches inscribe into political formations. Mobility is thus not conceptualised here in terms of movement across borders, but is rather re-conceptualised as a *mode of sociality* that is based on exchange relations in which people become detached from personalised community bonds. The main source for our understanding of mobility as such is Georg Simmel's sociology of money (1978) and the stranger (1950a).

Simmel's sociology of money is based on the view that exchange is a means by which society becomes an 'inner bond between men [sic]' rather than a 'simple collection of individuals' (Simmel, 1978, p.265). He argues that exchange establishes bonds between people less on the ground of their similarities than on the ground of their mutual sacrifice of one object to gain another object. For Simmel, the value of the exchange thus emerges from this particular relationality established by reciprocal sacrifice and gain, rather than from the individual desires and needs of the subject or the scarcity and quality of the objects as such (Simmel 1978, pp. 79-90).

The historical transformation that Simmel analyses is complex, but finds its social expression in money and merchants (p. 176), both of which directly implicate movement or circulation. The mature money economy emerges through the intensified circulation of goods and services, because it allows for increased exchanges over bartering systems. Historically, the intensification of exchange relations is made possible by the detachment of property relations from land ownership and from membership of nobility, which fixes people to a particular place

and limits the acquiring of property through ascribing nobility status (Simmel 1978, p. 320). Moreover, when one object can be exchanged not just against another, but against several others, money emerges as an exemplary mode of exchangeability that has no value in and of itself. In this way, according to Simmel, money comes to express the value generated in the exchange without adding anything in terms of substantive value of its own; it becomes a symbol completely detached from any residual requirement of having to contain in itself substantive value (e.g. by being made of a particular amount of precious metal). What is thus important about money for our purposes is that it entails abstract characteristics. Money renders everything quantifiable according to one scale of value and permits previously unthinkable comparisons among objects, persons, and activities. Money 'commensurates incommensurabilities' (Maurer, 2006, p.16) thus entailing a particular form of egalitarianism.

The abstract nature of money means is that it potentially has a levelling effect. Buying and selling suggests that the parties involved in the exchange are on some level equal. The exchange is not based on a fixed bond between servant and master. It is a transaction quantified in an objectified system of pricing in which one party pays for something the other party has, and in which the other party accepts the payment as a proper equivalent of the value of the object (Simmel 1978 p. 408). Money, Simmel argues, 'has provided us with the sole possibility for uniting people while excluding everything personal and specific' (1978, p. 345). In this regard money is related to a mode of sociality that is based on equivalence, reciprocity and the rejection of traditional family, guild and communitarian values. Money can establish new relationships between elements that would otherwise have no connection. In other words, the circulations associated with money facilitate individuals' independence

from group interests. For example, if one's land or the obligation to work the land could be sold for money, the individual can be liberated and move around, acquire property or services from elsewhere, etc. Similarly, if the medieval corporation embraced the whole individual, the money economy could be said to sustain depersonalizing human relations by turning them into functional relations. Organisations do not have to buy the individual as a whole but can buy a particular function and replace the individual with another who performs the same function. (Simmel 1978, p. 286; 299). For Simmel, money thus ties individuals to one another and to society (Simmel 1971, p. 24; Deflem, 2003) in quantifiable relations that express value as form of motion – i.e. value generated by circulating services, goods and people through exchange. Intensified circulations become an inherent element of exchange relations within Simmel's reading of the mature money economy.

Money in this regard has a logical affinity with a mode of sociality that is related to what Simmel calls 'the stranger' (Simmel 1950a). The stranger is less a particular kind of person as a particular mode of sociality, which is defined by a paradoxical relation to the community. As indicated above, money and the transformation towards depersonalised exchange relations facilitate transactions that do not require organic or territorially bound social relations. Something similar occurs where people engage in exchanges through movement. In such cases, people can potentially form relations where they are both fixed to particular communities (strangers live in a community), while simultaneously being freed from any specific ties to fixed communities (strangers do not belong to a community in an organic way).[4] In Simmel's more

---

[4] Simmel was also aware of how the stranger could be linked with 'dangerous possibilities'. 'In uprisings of all sorts', he noted, 'the party attacked has claimed, from the beginning of things, that provocation has come from the outside, through emissaries and instigators' (Simmel 1950b). The fears and anxieties associated with the stranger can be understood as part of the destabilising and decentring process that mobility brings about and the tensions that are played out between substantive belonging and depersonalised exchange.

abstract terminology, the stranger unites the opposites of being fixed to a point in space and being free from any given point in space. In this regard mobility is not simply a form of disconnectedness, fluidity or nomadism,[5] but a particular mode of sociality and interaction that is constituted through depersonalised exchange relations. This suggests the simultaneous need for fixity (related to a place where one trades), as well as a need for movement (related to the need to circulate goods and services between individuals and places).

While Simmel describes modernity's paradigmatic stranger as the merchant or trader, intensified circulations of money and of people in the contemporary context would seem to render relations of strangerhood more generalised. In this regard, mobility as a social practice has become more widespread over time (Simmel 1978, p. 227). If tensions between integration and mobility are taken to be constitutive of contemporary social formations, mobility can be interpreted as increasingly challenging an integrative mode of sociality associated with the territorial and culturalist models outlined in the previous section. On this account the assumption that mobility can function as an integrative force that knits people together into a territorially bound and culturally defined collective conscious ignores the destabilising and decentring role that mobility can have.

A Simmelian approach to mobility would not conceive migrants as mobile because they cross borders. Rather it conceives migrants as mobile insofar as they act as exemplary agents in the circulation of services and goods and in the production of social relations of exchange. Migrants are more likely to become bonded to other people on the basis of exchanges and the exchange value they create because their physical and social movements across space often work against a more 'organic' or

---

[5] For an important critique of this conception of mobility, see Cresswell (2006).

territorial mode of sociality. Exchange relations may take on a more or less mobile form, of course, just as money can form the basis for different kinds of social relations. Yet what we want to emphasise here is the logical affinity of money and exchange relations with a mode of sociality in which the migrant emerges as the exemplary stranger. The observation that migrants are central figures in the constitution of European citizenship as well as in the constitution of relations between strangers is clearly not original to this article. However, what this article adds is the insight that political struggles over European citizenship are grounded not in a tension between belonging and movement or between inside and outside, but in a tension that emerges between mobility placed within organic, territorial, cultural conceptions of community – i.e. mobility as internal integration and external border crossing – and mobility as a form of bonding through circulation in depersonalised exchange relations. For our purpose, the exchanges of migrants involved in sex work are particularly important in this regard, because they allow us to highlight political struggles that contemporary analyses of European citizenship generally overlook.

If mobility is conceived of as a mode of sociality whereby intensified circulations work against cultural and territorial bordering practices, then the mobility of sex workers cannot be defined in terms of the crossing of boundaries or exiting of confined urban zones. Rather, the mobility of sex workers needs to be defined by virtue of their engagement in exchange relations, which transforms personalised community relations and has the potential to politically transform the terrain of European citizenship. It is important to stress that this reading of exchange does not refute that money's levelling effects and abstract relations can become alienating. Nor does it go so far as to say that abstract relations of exchange have a comprehensive levelling effect. Indeed, factors such as the criminalisation and related exploitation of

many sex workers (particularly migrant sex workers) effectively reduces their ability to engage equally in exchange relations. Nevertheless, (migrant) sex workers do participate in transactions in various ways, and it is in light of the exchange relations formed through such transactions that we read the 2005 Declaration of the Rights of Sex Workers as a political act that intervenes in the terrain of European citizenship. Interpreting the Declaration's contestation of European citizenship in light of 'monetised' exchange relations, we suggest that the Declaration reflects deeper-rooted antagonisms between divergent modes of sociality. In order to flesh out this argument in further detail, we need to first introduce the concept of 'acts of citizenship'.

Mobility as political: acts of European citizenship

An integrative model of citizenship struggles to delimit territorial space (hence the importance of external borders), to bind individuals into a polity through shared values (hence the importance of cultural integration), and to discriminate between 'integrated' and 'non-integrated' individuals (hence the importance of organising surveillance, identification documents, and a sharp distinction between citizens and non-citizens at a European-wide scale).[6] As a form of governance, this model is thus marked in the EU by a strong tendency to split mobility between its internal and external dimensions. Consequently, internal mobilities are seen to operate as instruments of integration, while external mobilities function as the limit of integration; as the excesses of mobility that need to be controlled or kept at a distance. Our analysis, however, suggests that this attempt to separate external and internal

---

[6] See, for example, Diez and Squire (2008) for a discussion of the on-going centrality of exclusionary citizenship practices within Europe.

mobilities (like the attempt to divide mobility between people, goods and capital) ignores the constitutive role of mobility in modern social formations.

If mobility is taken seriously in a socio-political sense, its paradoxical effects need to be recognised rather than neutralised in the constitution of European citizenship. A political sociology of mobility foregrounds the significance of exchange relations that work beyond, against, or across the institutionalised territorial-cum-cultural limitations of European citizenship. By claiming common cultural values and by privileging proximity, an integrative model of European citizenship seeks to incorporate individuals as 'whole persons' (i.e. as citizens or subjects belonging to a territorial community), rather than engaging them as agents that play a constitutive role in various European social formations. To exclude the latter from our understanding of the formation of European citizenship would render practices that are constitutive of European social formations invisible at the political level. How, then, can we account analytically for the ambiguities of mobility in the political terrain of European citizenship?

The tensions that mobility generates for an integrative model of European citizenship are interpreted here as conditioning the emergence of political struggles through which those with limited or no political voice bring rights claims to bear upon the European Union. Simmel's analysis of exchange, money and the stranger allows us to conceptualise mobility in terms of socio-economic practices that create the potential for political mobilisations around exchange relations. We have already noted the levelling effects of money. Money, Simmel notes, 'becomes the centre of interest and the proper domain of individuals and classes who, because of their social position, are excluded from many kinds of personal and specific goals'. (Simmel 1978, p. 221) Thus, money-mediated exchanges make it possible for those in marginal

positions to pursue goals 'that are open to fully entitled persons or to the indigenous people by specific concrete channels and by personal relationships (Simmel, 1978, p. 224)'.

Although money becomes 'the ultima ratio of the socially disadvantaged and suppressed elements' (Simmel, 1978, p. 222), the circulation of money does not immediately or directly lead to rights for the marginalised. Rather, the sites created by socio-economic practices of mobility need to be claimed or enacted politically through processes of mobilisation. For example, Cresswell's (2006) analysis of the lengthy struggles through which mobility has been claimed as a right before the US Supreme Court demonstrates how mobility as a social or socio-economic practice does not immediately entail political rights. Mobility creates the possibility of rights, yet rights are always claimed in struggle, or through mobilisation. Indeed, as the European integration literature suggests, sociality does not in and of itself create political community, whatever its form. While mobility understood as a mode of sociality between strangers can foster equivalences that challenge scalar conceptions of European citizenship, these equivalences need to be enacted in ways such as by claiming them as grounds for the right to hold rights if they are to be engaged politically.

Following Engin Isin and Greg Nielsen (2008), we call these struggles *acts* of European citizenship to distinguish them from citizenship as a status granted by EU member states or citizenship as a practice of enacting existing rights.[7] Isin and Nielsen introduce the notion of acts of citizenship to draw attention to 'those acts when,

---

[7] Although we draw particularly on Isin's work, there is a larger literature that has pointed out the need to inquire into the 'proliferating sites of making and enacting citizenship' (Soysal, 2002: 139). Our approach to citizenship as a way to engage with rights claims is slightly different from that endorsed by Barry Hindess (2004). Although we agree that citizenship is an exclusive regime which views other forms of life in negative terms, we argue that the elements that Hindess locates are part of the tensions of citizenship. Therefore, it is the circumstances in which these tensions are played out – in our terms the struggles and mobilisations – that need to be explored.

regardless of status or substance, subjects constitute themselves as citizens' (Isin and Nielsen, 2008: 2). This move shifts the focus in citizenship debates from subjects and their status to the acts through which political subjectivities are created. More specifically, the notion of 'acts of citizenship' seeks to emphasise the constitutive role of rupture, disorder, and deviation in the political terrain of European citizenship. Rights claims made by undocumented migrants and refugees are examples of such acts of citizenship (McNevin, 2006; Nyers 2006, 2008; Squire 2009). Mobilizing the tensions that mobility brings to community forms of social organization can in this regard be interpreted as an act of European citizenship in which new political subjects constitute themselves through enacting the sociality of exchange as a basis for the 'right to hold rights'. As we will show below, sex workers have been able to mobilise around the sociality of exchange by claiming rights for all, thus challenging the internal/external distinctions drawn between sex workers by the EU's territorial-cum-cultural governance of mobility. The mobilisation of sex workers is thus interpreted here as an act that challenges territorial and cultural limitations of European citizenship through mobilising alternative ways of being connected based on social relations of exchange.

It is perhaps helpful to clarify here why it is that the acts of citizenship framework is of critical analytical import for a political sociology of mobility that focuses on transformative acts through which socio-economic relations of exchange are politically mobilised. An approach that emphasises the self-constitution of political subjects as well as the rupturing effects of citizenship acts differs from approaches that treat European citizenship as a status defined by institutionally endorsed rights. Rather than orientating citizenship towards order and status quo, the former privileges rupture over routine, disorder over order, and deviation over habit

(Isin, 2008: 20). An emphasis on acts of citizenship also differs from approaches that focus on how European citizenship forms a complex site for the practice of rights. Practice-based approaches emphasise the constitution of citizens though institutional practices of 'making citizens' or individual practices of expanding or deepening an existing bundle of rights. Citizenship in such approaches is conceived as 'a set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural), which define a person as a competent member of society' (Turner, 1993, p. 2).[8] In contrast, acts of citizenship allow for an exploration of the ways in which citizenship is created anew – not necessarily in an institutionalised legal form but in a political form that contests the existing institutional order.

While 'active citizens' follow already given scripts through performing institutionalised statuses and through practicing existing sets of rights (Isin, 2008: 38), 'acts of citizenship' are marked by the articulation of new scripts and by the constitution of new actors (see also Isin, 2009). Acts of citizenship can thus be interpreted in terms of the *politics* that are played out when different socialities encounter each other and 'instantiate [divergent] ways of being that are political' (Isin and Nielsen 2008: 2). Mobility is one mode of sociality that is constitutive of European social formations, and that is enacted politically through mobilisations formed on the grounds of exchange relations. Mobility as sociality between strangers is set in tension with ideas of citizenship as static or territorially bound and as composed of pre-existant subjects. Migrants, sex workers, the poor – all those deemed

---

[8] In this context, the shift from citizenship as the possession of civil and political rights to citizenship as practice has been an important theoretical and political move to help unravel the historical constitution and contestation of citizenship. In a similar vein, much of the literature on European citizenship that has challenged a 'static' and nationally-bound conception of citizenship has emphasised practice through the creation of norms, civic engagement in the public sphere, the creation of 'active citizens' and the fostering of European identities. There is a large literature that has tackled 'citizenship as practice' in European studies (e.g. Wiener (1998); Wiener and Della Salla 1997; Bellamy (2001)).

in some sense as 'abnormal' - are often denied freedom of movement where citizenship is inscribed in terms of territorial or cultural statuses and practices. What the citizenship acts framework allows us to emphasise are the contestations of such exclusions which are grounded in the exchanges that emerge from movements of a physical and social form.

Mobility is at the heart of European citizenship, but not simply as a set of rights (Maas, 2007) or practices triggering citizenship rights (Guild, 2004). Rather, mobility is at the heart of European citizenship because it is central to the enactment of a different political project from those attempting to render more coherent, systematic and comprehensive the current provisions regarding the mobility of people in the EU. European citizenship should not simply be conceived of in terms of a demos that is constituted through identity and value-based association, but is better approached in terms of its constitution through a mobile mode of sociality that emerges through exchange relations and encounters between strangers. It is in bringing to the fore the tensions that lie between processes of integration and practices of mobility that we can understand the political importance of mobilisations through which claims to the right to have rights such as those of free movement are enacted. This emphasis allows a political sociology of mobility to bring to centre stage marginalised 'strangers' such as sex workers as protagonists of European citizensip, as demonstrated in our analysis of the 2005 Declaration of Sex Workers as an act of European citizenship below.

Sex workers, mobility and acts of European citizenship

Sex work is not only absent from the debates around European citizenship, but also forms a complex terrain of debate itself. Migrants selling sex is a doubly complex and controversial issue. This paper cannot do justice to these debates, and instead focuses on the particular case of the Declaration for the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe,

which was presented to the European Parliament in 2005. This case allows us to show how the mobility as a mode of sociality is mobilised by (migrant) sex workers in terms that contest an integrative form of citizenship governance within the EU.

The mobility of sex workers has become the focus of significant debate in the European context, where it is primarily addressed in relation to the issue of human trafficking. However, human trafficking is not directly linked to discussions surrounding European citizenship, but rather skirts around the edges of such debates through the representation of those who are trafficked to work in the sex industry as 'illegal migrants' or, more recently, as 'victims of trafficking' (Anti-Slavery International, 2002; Experts Group on Trafficking in Human Beings, 2004). In the EU, human trafficking has thus been problematised as essentially a question of illegal migration and integrated within the governance of cross-border movement (Aradau, 2008). This entails a separation of the mobility of sex workers in terms of internal/external mobilities, which reflects the practices of governing the EU as a territorially bound and culturally defined space.

What is notable from our perspective is that these processes of categorizing sex workers in relation to trafficking and migration divide sex workers into those who are citizens and those who are not, with the latter largely experiencing reduced rights. Moreover, when migrant sex workers are problematised through the lens of human trafficking, mobility is removed from the sphere of debate and the recognition of political agency is uneven. As Alison Murray (1998) suggests, the 'voluntary' prostitute is generally endowed with agency and associated with the Western sex worker, while the sex worker from a developing country is considered incapable of making this choice, being either easily deceived or deterministically influenced by poverty.

This division of sex workers needs to be viewed in terms of the wider marginalisation of sex workers within the European citizenship regime. Sex workers with citizenship status only have a right to free movement as long as the country to which they move regards prostitution as a form of 'work'. De facto and de jure mobility thus does not map clearly onto the differentiation between EU citizens and non-citizens. Legal and administrative measures reduce the freedom of movement of sex workers both within and between states.[9] Victims of trafficking do not fare better in this regard. Even if the status of trafficked women as victims is recognised, those who are not EU citizens are often subject to voluntary return after having testified against their traffickers and after having undergone more or less extended periods of rehabilitation.[10] Deportation practices ultimately reproduce territorial citizenship within the EU and the cultural, racial, and ethnic distinctions that separate citizens from non-citizens (see Berman, 2003, p. 540).

From the perspective of the political sociology of mobility developed here, these distinctions can be challenged, first, by showing how mobility as a mode of sociality entails engagements that do not depend upon substantive belonging and, second, by showing how exchange relations constitute sociality in ways that open up possibilities for its politicisation through acts of citizenship. These two dimensions are evident in the Declaration of the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe (ICRSE, 2005), which was endorsed by sex workers from 28 countries at a Conference in October 2005 before

---

[9] In the UK, for example, Anti-Social Behaviour Orders are used to restrict the sex workers' freedom of movement (ICRSE, 2005, p.3). Even in the context of national citizenship, mobility is not a given, but requires continuous forms of mobilisation to challenge its limitations.

[10] Although the deportation of illegal migrants is replaced by voluntary return and the detention centres for asylum seekers are substituted by rehabilitation centres, the practices of governing irregular migration and human trafficking remain virtually identical. Numerous documents by international organisations, the EU, as well as NGOs discuss the measures that states take for victim protection. On the conditions for residence permits in the EU, see European Commission (2001). The rationale for rehabilitation and reintegration is discussed by the European Commission (2005). For a critical analysis, see Aradau (2008).

being presented to the European Parliament. The Declaration emerged out of one-year long consultation among sex workers started by an Organisation Committee in the Netherlands. The Committee was made up of sex workers and former sex workers, including migrants. The Declaration does not mention European citizenship, which is no surprise given the marginal or excluded status of many of those who initiated or signed the Declaration. Nonetheless, we contend, the Declaration is an act of European citizenship inasmuch as it intervenes within the terrain of European citizenship to claim the right to have rights for marginal subjects. It is thus through the Declaration that marginalised sex workers constitute themselves as European citizens.

The Declaration disrupts a territorially and culturally bound understanding of citizenship as it includes – on an equal basis – migrant sex workers. It also disrupts a rights-based approach to European citizenship inasmuch as the rights claimed in the Declaration are not granted to sex workers and migrant sex workers. Even if some rights exist de jure, the Declaration claims those as equally de facto rights. It claims the right to have rights for those most often excluded from the purview of citizenship, migrant sex workers. Through this act of citizenship, subjects whose agency is often overlooked make visible their claims and in so doing enact themselves as political subjects. As such, the Declaration directly challenges institutional practices which limit rights to particular categories of citizens.

Mobility as a mode of sociality can be interpreted as underpinning the claims of the Declaration. Understood as money-mediated exchange, mobility is essential for the livelihoods of sex workers. Indeed, this requires mobility as freedom of movement, without which exchanges would be suspended. Thus, the Declaration states that: 'No restrictions should be placed on the free movement of individuals between states on the grounds of their engagement in sex work' (ICRSE, 2005). The

other rights claimed in the Declaration are also ultimately claims for the recognition of sex workers within social formations based on exchange. This sociality also challenges distinctions between sex workers by claiming the same rights for migrant sex workers. From the economic perspective that many writers on sex work and migration take, this position can only be one of competition between service providers, which precludes the possibility of collective mobilisation. Yet, from the perspective of exchange relations as theorised by Simmel, this mode of sociality is one that is constituted in relations between strangers.

The reading of sex work in terms of exchange relations is not new. Simmel himself saw sex work – or in his terminology, prostitution – as an example of the mode of sociality that we have developed in this article. For Simmel, prostitution consisted in an exchange that mirrors that of money: '[t]he indifference as to its use, the lack of attachment to any individual because it is unrelated to any of them, the objectivity inherent in money as a mere means which excludes any emotional relationship.' (Simmel 1978 p. 377)[11] The anthropologist Paola Tabet (2005) also defines prostitution as a 'sexual-economic exchange' that takes different forms in various societies but which acquires particular characteristics given gender relationships of property ownership and exchange. While Simmel does not discuss the role of women in exchange relations, women have often been marginalised from achieving their goals in the terms of substantive, value-based communities. In that sense, access to money-mediated exchange can be a form of liberation (Tabet 2005).[12]

---

[11] Simmel, however, reinscribed an essentialist gendered and premodern approach upon his analysis of prostitution in arguing that women contributed their 'whole self' whole man contributed only part of his personality. This mirrors the opposition of premodern, totally connected individuals versus the modern functional and partial positions of detached individuals.

[12] This does not mean to ignore that forms of alienation and exploitation that can be associated with sex work. Rather, we are interested in how 'acts of citizenship' can challenge different forms of domination and exclusion. Exclusions from citizenship and enjoyment of rights – including rights against exploitation – is one such possibility.

The Declaration is a political act which challenges both the criminalisation of trafficking as well as the distinctions of citizenship by claiming the right to have rights and the agency of all sex workers. In this regard, migrant sex workers are not conceived of in highly gendered terms as 'passive victims', but are rather re-defined as political actors (Agustin 2007, Andrijasevic 2004, Aradau, 2008). In contesting the territorialised and culturalist renderings of European citizenship by mobilising around mobility, (migrant) sex workers recast themselves as protaganists of European citizenship by enacting their political subjectivity in innovative and challenging ways. Exchange relations thus serve as the grounds for a political sociological account of the mobility of sex workers that does not simply view mobility as a socio-economic practice of free movement that is governed by European regulations. Rather, our approach conceives mobility as a mode of sociality that is grounded in depersonalised exchange relations, which open up possiblities for political mobilisations that enact citizenship through the claiming of the right to have rights. The mobility of sex workers is thus not simply related to migration, but to a mode of sociality which creates possibilities for politicising exchange relations. The sex workers' Declaration in this regard signals a shift from socio-economic practices of mobility to political acts of citizenship, whereby ruptures in the existing terrain of European citizenship are mobilised not primarily by virtue of organic or cultural belonging but by virtue of the sociality of depersonalised exchange relations.

Conclusion

This article has shown that a political sociology of mobility challenges territorial and culturalist accounts of European citizenship by exploring how transactions associated

with the money economy constitute depersonalised relations of exchange between strangers. An emphasis on depersonalised exchange relations allows us to reconceptualise European citizenship as emerging out of transformations of the social fabric. These transformations are produced by a distinctive mode of sociality that is associated with mobility, and that can be mobilised by those whose rights are denied or reduced under an integrative citizenship regime.

Bringing to the fore these mobilizations of mobility allows for a renewed account of European citizenship. Rather than viewing mobility in terms of the movement of migrants from the outside-in, Simmel's work on money and the stranger allows for an analysis of mobility as integral to the constitution of European social formations without reducing it to a functional condition. The intense circulation across state boundaries in 'monetarised' exchange relations is indeed a basis for transnational European political integration, as the neo-functionalist and transactional integration inspired literature has argued for a long time now. However, these mobilities also create a mode of sociality through depersonalised exchange relations that challenge territorial and cultural integrative conceptions of socio-political relations. While forming the basis of integration, mobility also ruptures the institutionalisation of territorial and cultural conceptions of European citizenship which separate circulations that have political status and significance from those that have not. Mobilising this paradoxical relation constitutes new sites of citizenship in which subjects who institutionally are non-citizens (or who cannot exercise European citizenship rights) but who are nevertheless engaged in exchange relations do enact themselves as European citizens. This conception of acts of European citizenship that mobilise mobility to rupture existing practices and statuses of European citizenship renders visible the creation of new political subjects who, despite being outside of

existing European citizenship debates, are constitutive of the political terrain of European citizenship. It is only by engaging this political sociology of mobility that the 2005 Declaration of the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe can be viewed as a privileged moment in the constitution of European citizenship.

References

Agustin, L. (2007) *Sex at the margins. Migration, labour markets and the rescue industry* (New York: Zed Books).

Andrijasevic, R. (2004) *Trafficking in Women and the Politics of Mobility in Europe,* PhD Thesis. University of Utrecht.

Anti-Slavery International (2002) *Human Trafficking, Human Rights. Redefining Victim   Protection*. (London).

Aradau, C. (2008) *Rethinking Trafficking in Women* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Bellamy, R. (2001) 'The "Right to Have Rights": Citizenship Practice and the Political Constitution of the EU'. In Bellamy, R. and Warleigh A. (eds.) *Citizenship and Governance in the European Union* (London: Continuum).

Bellamy, R. (2008) 'Evaluating Union Citizenship: Belonging, Rights and Participation within the EU', *Citizenship Studies* Vol. 12, No. 6, pp. 597-611.

Berman, J. (2003) '(Un)Popular Strangers and Crisis (Un)Bounded: Discourses of Sex Trafficking, the European Political Community and the Panicked State of the Modern State', *European Journal of International Relations* Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 37-86.

Cresswell, T. (2006) *On the Move. Mobility in Modern Western World* (London: Routledge).

Deflem, M. (2003) 'The Sociology of the Sociology of Money: Simmel and the Contemporary Battle of the Classics', *Journal of Classical Sociology,* Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 67-96.

Deutsch, K. (1953) *Nationalism and Social Communication* (Cambridge: MIT Press).

Deutsch, K. Et al. (1957) *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Diez, T. and Squire, V. (2008) 'Traditions of Citizenship and the Securitisation of Migration in Germany and Britain', *Citizenship Studies* Vol. 12, No. 5. pp. 565-581.

European Communities (1976) *European Union Report by Mr Leo Tindemans to the European Council,* Bulletin of the European Communities Supplement 1/76.

European Commission (2001) *Short-term permit to stay granted to victims of trafficking who cooperate in the fight against traffickers or smugglers*, (Brussels: Directorate General Justice and Home Affairs) http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/news/forum_crimen/workshop/en/discussionpaper_1_1.pdf accessed 20 March 2006.

European Commission (2005) *EU action against trafficking in human beings and the sexual exploitation of children. -* http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/fsj/crime/trafficking/fsj_crime_human_trafficking_en.htm accessed 10 March 2006.

Everson, M. (1995) 'The Legacy of the Market Citizen'. In Shaw, J and More G. (eds.), *The New Dynamics of European Union* (Alderley: Clarendon Press).

Experts Group on Trafficking in Human Beings (2004) *Report of the Experts Group on Trafficking in Human Beings* (Brussels: European Commission/DG Justice, Freedom and Security).

Frisby, D and Featherstone M., (eds.) (1997) *Simmel on Culture* (London: Sage).

Guild, E. (2004) *The Legal Elements of European Identity. EU Citizenship and Migration Law*. (The Hague: Kluwer Law).

Haas, E. B. (1961) 'International Integration: The European and the Universal Process', *International Organization,* Vol.15, pp. 366-92.

Haas, E.B. (1968) *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces 1950-1957* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Habermas, J. (1992) Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe. *Praxis International* 12, pp.1-19.

Habermas, J. (1998) *Die Postnationale Konstellation. Politische Essays*, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp).

Hansen, R. (1998) 'A European Citizenship or a Europe of Citizens? Third Country Nationals in the EU' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 24, no. 4 pp. 751-768.

Hindess, B. (2004) 'Citizenship for All', *Citizenship Studies* Vol. 8, No. 3 pp. 305-315.

Holmes, L. and Murray, P. (1999) *Citizenship and Identity in Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

ICRSE (International Committee on the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe) (2005) 'The Declaration of the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe', http://www.sexworkeurope.org accessed on 1 October 2008.

Isin, E. (2007) 'City.State: Critique of Scalar Thought', *Citizenship Studies,* Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 211-28

Isin, E. F. and Nielsen, G. M. (2008) 'Introduction'. In Isin, E. F. and Nielsen, G. M, *Acts of Citizenship* (London: Zed Books).

Isin, E. F. (2008) 'Theorizing Acts of Citizenship'. In *Acts of Citizenship* Isin, E.F. and Nielsen, G.M. (London: Zed Books).

Isin, E. F. (2009) 'Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen' Vol. 29, pp. 367-388.

Kastoryano, R. (eds) (1998) *Quelle Identité Pour L'Europe? Le Multiculturalisme À L'épreuve*, (Paris: Presses de sciences po).

Kostakopoulou, T. (2001) *Citizenship, Identity and Immigration in the European Union* (Manchester University Press).

Kostakopoulou, D. (2007) 'European Union Citizenship: Writing the Future', *European Law Journal,* Vol. 13, No. 5, pp. 623-46.

Levine, D. N. (ed.) (1971) *Georg Simmel. On Individuality and Social Forms*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Lindberg, L.N. and S.A. Scheingold (1970) *Europe's Would-Be Polity* (Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Maas, W. (2007) *Creating European Citizens* (Plymouth: Rowanman and Littlefield).

Maas, W. (2008) 'Migrants, states, and EU citizenships unfulfilled promise'. *Citizenship Studies,* Vol. 12, No. 6, pp. 583-596.

Maurer, B. (2006) 'The Anthropology of Money'. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* Vol. 35, pp. 15-36.

McNevin, A. (2006) 'Political belonging in a neo-liberal era: The struggle of the *sans papiers*' *Citizenship Studies* Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 135-151.

Murray, A. (1998) 'Debt-Bondage and Trafficking: Don't Believe the Hype''. In Kempadoo, K and Doezema, J, *Global Sex Workers. Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition* (London: Routledge).

Neveu, C. (2000) 'European Citizenship, Citizens of Europe and European Citizens'. In Bellier , I. and Wilson, T. (eds.) [2000]: The Anthropology of the European Union . Berg, Oxford.

Nyers, Peter. (2006) 'Taking Rights, Mediating Wrongs: Disagreements over the Political Agency of Non-Status Refugees.' In Huysmans, Jef, Dobson, Andrew and Prokhovnik, Raia (eds) *The Politics of Protection. Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency*. (Abingdon: Routledge).

Nyers, Peter. (2008) No One Is Illegal between City and Nation. In Isin, Engin F. and Nielsen, Greg M. (eds) *Acts of Citizenship.* (London: Zed Books).

Preuss, U.K., Everson, M., Koenig-Archibugi, M., and Lefebvre, E. (2003) 'Traditions of citizenship in the European Union', *Citizenship Studies* Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 3-14.

Schnapper, D. (1999) 'The European Debate on Citizenship'. In Graubard, S.R (ed.) *A New Europe for the Old*, (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction).

Simmel, G. (1950a) 'The Stranger'. In Wolff, K.H. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, (New York:Free Press).

_____. (1950b) 'Metropolis and Mental Life'. In Wolff, K. H. (ed.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, (New York: The Free Press).

Simmel, G.(1971) 'The Problem of Sociology'. In Levine, D.N. (ed.) *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Simmel, G. (1978) *The Philosophy of Money*. Translated by Bottomore, T. and Frisby, D. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).

Smith, D. and Wright, S. (1999) *Whose Europe:? The Turn Towards Democracy* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Soysal, Y. N. (2002) 'Citizenship and Identity: Living in Diasporas in Post-War Europe?' In Hedetoft, U. and Hjort, M. (eds) *The Postnational Self: Identity and Belonging* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

Squire, V. (2009) *The Exclusionary Politics of Asylum* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Tabet, P. (2005) La grande arnaque : Sexualité des femmes et échange économico-sexuel, Paris: L'Harmattan.

Turner, B. S. (1993) 'Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship'. In Turner, B.S. (ed.) *Citizenship and Social Theory*, (London: Sage).

Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Weiler, J.H.H. (1997) 'Does Europen need a constitution? Reflections on demos, telos and ethos in the German Maastricht decision'. In Gowan, P. and Anderson, P. (eds.) *The Question of Europe* (London: Verso).

Wiener, A. and Della Salla, V. (1997) 'Constitution Making and Citizenship Practice – Bridging the democracy gap in the EU?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.35, No. 4, pp. 595-614.

Wiener, A. (1998) *European Citizenship Practice: Building Institutions of a Non-State* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).