

# Open Research Online

---

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

## Taking not waiting: space, temporality and politics in the City of Sanctuary movement

### Book Section

How to cite:

Squire, Vicki and Bagelman, Jennifer (2012). Taking not waiting: space, temporality and politics in the City of Sanctuary movement. In: Nyers, Peter and Rygiel, Kim eds. Migration and Citizenship: Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement. Routledge Research on The Global Politics of Migration. Routledge.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2012 The Authors

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415605779/>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

# Taking not waiting: Space, temporality and politics in the *City of Sanctuary* movement<sup>1</sup>

*Jennifer Bagelman and Vicki Squire*

In 2007 Sheffield became a *City of Sanctuary* with the support of the City Council and over seventy local organisations. While Sheffield was the first city in the UK to achieve official status as a *City of Sanctuary*, it is by no means the only city or town to do so. The formation of a city or town as a *City of Sanctuary* is based on the commitment of member organisations and groups, as well as on support from local politicians and the active participation of refugees and refugee groups. In June 2010 a national network of local groups in seventeen towns and cities throughout the UK formed part of this ‘...movement to build a culture of hospitality for people seeking sanctuary in the UK’, the primary aim of which is to ‘...influence policy-makers and public attitudes throughout the country’ (City of Sanctuary 2009). While the network does disseminate information about campaigns that support its overarching aims and objectives, *City of Sanctuary* explicitly avoids political lobbying or campaigning in favour of a more subtle process of transforming culture. This effectively consists of a grassroots approach to political change, which is based on creating a culture of sanctuary or hospitality at a local level through coalition building and through the development of opportunities for building personal relationships between local people and those seeking sanctuary (Barnett and Bhogal 2009: 83).

As the first official UK *City of Sanctuary*, Sheffield serves as a key site for the emergence of a proliferating network that challenges many of our assumptions about the meaning and practice of sanctuary. If we interpret the network as a movement that forms part of a broader political response to state policies and practices that limit the ability of noncitizens to move to and settle within the UK, *City of Sanctuary* can be understood as challenging policing and border controls that criminalise many migrants and asylum seekers. Thus it might be described as contesting a *statist* logic, which is characterised by the struggle to divide people into the categories of ‘citizen’ and ‘noncitizen’ and to render the state as a unified space through the containment and expulsion of its ‘excessive’ elements. However, a second logic also comes into play in sanctuary practices; namely a *pastoral* logic which is characterised by the struggle to draw hierarchical distinctions between ‘protector’ and ‘protected’ as well as between those who are ‘worthy’ of protection and those who are not. What is critical about *City of Sanctuary* from our perspective is that the movement troubles both *statist* and *pastoral* assumptions about sanctuary, which come together in defining noncitizen migrants as apolitical whether through a process of criminalization or through a process of victimization. Such assumptions are evident in many historical accounts of sanctuary, and we argue that they risk being implicitly reaffirmed in recent Foucauldian renderings of sanctuary. Our chapter troubles *statist* and *pastoral* readings of sanctuary by considering the implications of sanctuary practices that are not contained within a territorially-bound space and that constitute subjects which do not conform to the hierarchical distinction of s/he who is to be protected and s/he who protects. Rather than comprehensively unpacking the potentialities and limitations of *City of Sanctuary*’s politics, the chapter thus limits its

focus to an exploration of the ways in which the activities of the movement prompt a re-conceptualisation of sanctuary beyond a statist and pastoral frame.

So how does *City of Sanctuary* trouble the assumptions of statism and pastoralism? The analysis developed in this chapter suggests that this occurs in two ways. First, the activities of *City of Sanctuary* potentially challenge the statist assumption that sanctuary is contained within sites that fall out of the standardised spatial order of the state, because sanctuary is enacted in much more diffuse terms across the urban environment. Second, such activities potentially challenge the assumption that sanctuary implies an unequal relationship of pastoralism, because they create the conditions by which those taking sanctuary enact themselves as political subjects in their own right.<sup>2</sup> Important in this regard is that *City of Sanctuary*'s activities cannot adequately be understood in spatial terms as practices that occur within a contained site, nor can they be understood in political terms as activities in which distinctions between protector and protected are standardised in line with those of citizen and noncitizen. The activities of *City of Sanctuary* are thus critical not simply because they mobilise sanctuary in terms that do not fit with the logic of containment which a statist politics implies, but also because they challenge a pastoral politics of care or protection that is associated both with the hierarchical relationship between protector and protected and with the distinction between those who are worthy of protection and those who are not. That such a challenge is posed to both statism *and* pastoralism is important, we want to suggest, because the pastoral logic ultimately reinforces a statist logic by constituting the noncitizen migrant as apolitical through a politics of care or protection. This depoliticisation can be interpreted as the inverse of the process by which noncitizen migrants are constituted as apolitical through a politics of security and criminalisation (Squire 2009a). While we acknowledge that *City of Sanctuary* certainly can be said to practice protection or care in these terms, what we also want to point to here is the potential for moving beyond such a politics of care in the movement's emphasis on opening up of access and routes for participation for those taking sanctuary in the city. A key intervention of this chapter is thus to point to the ways in which the politics of *City of Sanctuary* cannot in any simple way be reduced to a series of relations in which the sanctuary 'provider' occupies a privileged position over those taking sanctuary.

When sanctuary is practiced not through the closing off of a (mythical) site devoid both of violence and politics, but through the opening up of access to various sites and participation within various activities, opportunities are provided for movements and interactions that challenge the dichotomy of the incapacitated or irresponsible (noncitizen) 'victim' versus the capacitated or responsible (citizen) 'provider'. Such practices are not understood here in terms that privilege mobility analytically, but are theorized in relation to movements and interactions that emerge in and through seemingly fixed sites. We introduce the notion of 'mobile enclaves of sanctuary' in this chapter as a means for understanding these dynamic social and political sites. Specifically, we consider how movements through, and interactions within, such sites can be understood as creating the conditions for 'unexpected' relations that challenge the hierarchical standardisations associated with statist and pastoral renderings of sanctuary. While we indicate that *City of Sanctuary* creates the conditions for an increasingly mobile form of policing that is grounded in relations of statism, pastoralism, hospitality, and care, we thus also show how the activities of the movement create opportunities for a more radical challenge to such renderings of

sanctuary. The political significance of *City of Sanctuary* in this regard is that the movement creates the conditions for sanctuary practices that cut through depoliticizing depictions of refugees as victims seeking protection as well as through depoliticising depictions of asylum seekers as criminals ‘abusing’ the ‘hospitality’ of the ‘host’.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF *CITY OF SANCTUARY*

Key in understanding the political significance of *City of Sanctuary* is that it is a movement – or perhaps more accurately a network – that emerges in a context whereby refugees and asylum seekers have become widely stigmatised within the UK. Asylum has formed the focus of intense political and social scrutiny over the past two decades, where fears about rising numbers have often been at the forefront of debate (Squire 2009a). Public opinion toward asylum has often been negative in this regard, while the popular press has been hostile both to asylum seekers and to migrants whose status is irregular (Innes 2010). Asylum and immigration policies have, in this context, been torn between heavy restrictions and limited liberalisations. On the one hand, border controls have been intensified with the aim of inhibiting unauthorised entrance, while measures such as the withdrawal of asylum seekers’ rights to work have reduced the capacity for many to participate within ‘host’ communities. On the other hand, the opening of labour markets to groups such as EU nationals and limited numbers of the highly skilled migrants has moved policy in a more liberal direction (see Spencer 2003). Based on a separation of migration into its ‘productive’ or ‘harmless’ and its ‘unproductive’ or ‘problematic’ elements, this policy response has contributed over recent years to the development of a harsh environment for refugees and asylum seekers who have been subject to various processes of criminalisation (Schuster 2003).

Despite the role of policy in constituting a harsh environment for many refugees and asylum seekers, the development of integration and cohesion policies might be interpreted as part of an attempt to create a more welcoming environment for migrants at large. While local authorities and agencies are increasingly responsible for the task of implementing integration and cohesion policies, asylum seekers are often disqualified as subjects of integration and cohesion due to the wider framing of such policies (see Squire 2011b).<sup>3</sup> In this context, voluntary sector groups often tend to fill in the gaps of integration and cohesion policies by providing services and opportunities for those who fall outside the remit of public support (see Zetter, Griffiths and Sigona 2003). *City of Sanctuary* in this regard might be interpreted as extending the remit of integration and cohesion policies in terms that are both disruptive and conservative at the same time. On the one hand, the activities with which the movement is involved would seem to exceed the limitations of existing policies by creating opportunities for the formation of relations that are otherwise rendered illegitimate by institutionalised policies and practices. On the other hand, the movement would inadvertently seem to play host to the practice of governing migrants even where that is not the explicit aim. Indeed, there is a particular risk of bringing to bear categories of worthy/unworthy or legitimate/illegitimate, as well as a danger of importing a series of statist categories that depoliticises migrants in engaging in practices of integration and cohesion (see Squire 2011b). This would

suggest that a series of critical questions need to be asked about the politics of *City of Sanctuary*, as well as attention being paid to the potentialities of such a movement in opening up sanctuary practices beyond their statist and pastoral limitations.

The struggle to transform the conditions for refugees and asylum seekers across cities and towns of the UK is thus a complex and difficult process. *City of Sanctuary* is a movement that was initiated by religious groups, and that was set up with the aim of extending a positive vision of sanctuary through promoting relationships between local people and people seeking sanctuary (see Darling 2010). The formation of a city or town as a *City of Sanctuary* is based on the commitment of member organisations and groups, as well as on support from local politicians and the active participation of refugees and refugee groups. In order to qualify ‘officially’ as a *City of Sanctuary*, a city or town has to achieve the four following goals: (1) ‘Resolutions of support from a significant and representative proportion of local groups and organisations’; (2) ‘The support and involvement of local refugee communities, and refugee representation on the local *City of Sanctuary* working group’; (3) ‘A resolution of support from the City Council (or other Local Authority)’; (4) ‘A strategy, agreed by the main supporting organisations, for how the city is to continue working towards greater inclusion of refugees and people seeking sanctuary’ (Barnett and Bhogal 2009: 79). Nevertheless, much work goes on in creating a city or town as a place of sanctuary even before formal status is gained, such as through an emphasis on creating employment opportunities for those denied the right to work or are unable to enter the job market based on their migration history as well as through the organisation of cultural events that bring together various local residents. *City of Sanctuary* in this regard might be read as challenging the exclusionary politics of asylum by creating opportunities for the formation of solidaristic relations between those who are authorised subjects of cohesion and integration and those who are not, albeit in a partial and at times a potentially problematic sense. In order to address the political significance of the movement in relation to the theorisation and practice of sanctuary, however, we first need to consider further how statist and pastoral assumptions are manifest in contemporary and historical accounts of sanctuary.

## SEEING SANCTUARY LIKE A STATE

The main argument that we develop in this chapter is that the relations constituted in and through the ‘mobile enclaves’ within which *City of Sanctuary* operates trouble statist and pastoral accounts of sanctuary. But what precisely do we mean when we speak of a statist account of sanctuary, and how does pastoralism relate to this? Statism entails an ontological assumption regarding political order as organized according to a unified and transcendental principle of sovereignty. This conception of statism draws on James Scott’s (1998) work on ‘seeing like a state’, which has been developed by Warren Magnusson (forthcoming) to illuminate ways in which the fixation on a singular form of sovereignty fails to acknowledge multiple authorities and power-relations. These multiple authorities and power relations are, Magnusson suggests, complex overlapping and contradictory, thus creating heterogeneous political orders that are contextually specific. In contrast to this, a statist politics entails a struggle to construct political space and time through the imposition of discrete ‘containers’ that are controlled and organized according to a hierarchical logic of simplification or standardisation. The logic of pastoralism might be

interpreted as relating to this where the statist categories of noncitizen and citizen are mapped onto categories of protected and protector. Nevertheless, while various containments are central to statist renderings of political order, it is important to note that statism also functions as a more flexible set of mobile practices. Indeed, as authors such as Bartleson (2006) and Deleuze (1988) have suggested, statism does not operate simply through processes of bordering *qua* containment. So also does it work through bordering practices that modulate flow and movement itself (Bigo 2002). Yet what interests us here is not merely the way in which statism (re)territorializes certain types of movement through new modes of ordering, such as through the localisation of control. We are also interested in exploring how these complex (re)orderings are contested through the practices and activities of *City of Sanctuary*. In so doing, we challenge the naturalisation of statism that is evident in many historical accounts of sanctuary, while raising questions about the limitations of Randy Lippert's Foucauldian account of sanctuary in terms of its ability to address sanctuary as a political site of contestation in its own right.

### Historical accounts of sanctuary

The notion of sanctuary as a territorially contained space is but one strand of sanctuary – a strand that is nonetheless often presented as the central story of sanctuary. This understanding emphasizes the sanctuary as a *temenos*, meaning a 'place that is cut off' (Pedley 2005: 29). Life inside sanctuary from this perspective is conceived of as sacred, untouchable and pure; not only from violence but also from movement and indeed political life. This spatial understanding of sanctuary as a place 'cut off' serves to cement an image of those seeking sanctuary as similarly cut off; those 'inside' sanctuary are positioned 'outside' the public or political realm. Indeed, a statist account often perceives sanctuary-seekers to be passive victims (if not risky threats) who await salvation from those who are not contained within the space of sanctuary: namely, citizens. Moreover, it is the 'agency of sanctuary providers' - those deemed to be providing rather than depending on the 'physical protection' of sanctuary - which tends to be the central focus of much research into sanctuary (Lippert 2005: 15-16). In contemporary accounts of sanctuary this territorialized demarcation separating those inside from those outside often reifies a split between those deemed to be irregular and those deemed to be regular. From a statist perspective, the former are immobilised and rendered apolitical, while the latter are granted free movement in the granting of hospitality to subjects whose existence depends on the generosity of others.

The association of sanctuary with specific locales has a long history. Reflecting on the pre-modern era, Philip Marfleet claims that sanctuary was practiced through '...sites of cosmological significance – locations sanctified by deities or by those empowered by them – which were inviolable' (2007: 138). These sites were often relatively broadly defined locations of geo-religious significance, such as islands, mountains, valleys and caves. Despite this more amorphous notion of spaces of sanctuary, however, the association of sanctuary with more narrowly-defined religious buildings is evident in the linguistic association of sanctuary with *sanctuarium* (the Roman notion of an inviolable area of the temple) and *sanctum* (the early medieval European notion of a place of the sacraments in the Christian church), to which Marfleet draws attention. These entail both some sense of an *enclosed* space of sanctuary as well as a

distinction between s/he who receives sanctuary and s/he whom provides sanctuary. The concept of sanctuary as developed out of *sanctuarium* and *sanctum* thus brings to bear an unequal relation in which the recipient is under the protection of the provider. In the Roman and Judaeo-Christian tradition this was conceived of in terms of the 'helpless' slave or prosecuted criminal receiving protection from the all-consuming power of God offered through the church within 'sacred' sites. In this history an unequal relation is thus constitutive of sanctuary practices, which are necessarily conceived of as emerging within an enclosed space out of which the recipient is perceived to be at risk of violence.

Indeed, sanctuary is often said to have officially emerged in 392 CE with the early Roman law of Theodosius, who stipulated that 'victims' (initially slaves complaining of maltreatment) who 'sought sanctuary in churches could not be removed by force' (Price 2009: 32; see also Cox 2005; Lippert 2005). This has become a recognized origin-story within the sanctuary literature, and as such it is often taken for granted that sanctuary 'is the name given to church-based asylum', a practice which provides physical 'shelter' to the helpless (Price 2009: 32). This historical definition and conception of sanctuary is evoked and reproduced in a number of contemporary readings of sanctuary, including Charles Cox's *Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers of Medieval England*. Cox acknowledges earlier informal expressions of sanctuary, yet places emphasis on Theodosius' legal articulation when it was formally recognized by the state as a practice designed to protect those 'in danger of life or limb' within church walls (Cox 2005: 2). While the sanctuary literature has more recently gestured at the ways in which sanctuary has moved beyond religious sites, an emphasis on the 'wall,' or enclosure, often remains pervasive.<sup>4</sup> Sanctuary both as a concept and as a practice would in this sense seem to have been articulated in terms that run parallel with dominant understandings and practices of citizenship as a regime; specifically with an approach which is characterised by a struggle to order subjects legally and spatially and a related struggle to 'split' mobility through fixing the boundaries between those who have the right to move freely within and across space, and others who are denied such a right. Sanctuary in these terms is, to put it simply, a statist project.

Statist rationalities?

While many historical accounts tend to reduce a complex set of practices to pastoralism through rendering sanctuary in statist terms, a Foucauldian approach facilitates a more complex account by fleshing out the heterogeneous power relations that are constitutive of sanctuary practices. Randy Lippert's (2005) influential analysis of *Sanctuary, Sovereignty and Sacrifice* is illuminating in this regard, because it shows how pastoral, sovereign and governmental power relations become intertwined in contemporary church sanctuary incidents. Arguing that the former two rationalities have recently been overshadowed by a scholastic obsession with governmentality in the Foucauldian literature, he explores how the three rationalities of power overlap and work together in the case of sanctuary.

The first rationality of power that Lippert addresses is governmental power, which constitutes freedom as an instrument of power and control. Governmental power does not operate from above by directing subjects, but instead operates through processes of normalization and responsabilisation whereby subjects are presented with the free

choice to act responsibly (Lippert, 2005: 63). Power from a governmentality perspective is thus largely devolved individually, with citizens increasingly governing themselves through technologies and forms of knowledge which monitor, evaluate and reform (Cruikshank 1999). Sanctuary might be read from this perspective, Lippert implies, as a space carved out by 'responsible' individuals who seek to help 'helpless' migrants abandoned by the state to become responsible in their own right (see also Rose 1992). While sanctuary incidents are often assumed to be a direct resistance to the sovereignty of the state, Lippert suggests that such incidents may be better understood as a modality of government through which the governing of refugees is practiced through the 'responsibilization' of 'self-regulating liberal citizens' (Lippert 2005: 138). In this respect Lippert indicates that sanctuary incidents do not so much challenge a statist politics as they do reinforce this type of politics, implicitly reaffirming the territorialized logic of inside/outside and the hierarchical relations of legal/illegal or citizen/noncitizen that such a politics involves. Indeed, Lippert contends that governmentality has not displaced state sovereignty but rather suggests that the two are intertwined through contemporary sanctuary incidents.

Similarly, Lippert demonstrates that pastoral power remains central to sanctuary incidents, despite the widespread assumption that such a rationality has faded in the wake of advanced liberalism. Lippert identifies three key characteristics that are constitutive of pastoral power, which in many respects do not undermine governmental power. First, pastoral governance constitutes 'authority in the figure of a shepherd' (Lippert 2005: 90). As Foucault notes: 'The shepherd must be informed of the material needs of each member of the flock and provide for them when necessary' (Lippert 2005: 95). Second, pastoral power is inexorably linked with the notion of sacrifice. Lippert alludes to Foucault's statement that 'pastoral power is not merely a form of power which commands; it must also be prepared to sacrifice itself for the life and salvation of the flock' (Lippert 2004: 359). Third, pastoral power cannot function without shepherds 'becoming informed' of the needs of members of the flock; that is, by 'making them reveal their innermost secrets' (Lippert 2005: 96). Lippert emphasizes Foucault's suggestion that the shepherd 'must know what is going on, what each of them does – his public sins. Indeed, he must know what is going on in the soul of each one, that is: his secret sins, his progress on the road to sainthood' (Lippert 2005: 96.). Lippert refers to this final quality as 'individualizing and intimate knowledge' (Ibid.), indicative of the way in which pastoral power and governmental power are intertwined in complementary ways in contemporary sanctuary incidents.

Lippert suggests that sanctuary entails the coupling of these pastoral rationalities with a liberal rationality – that is, a marriage of governing through freedom and governing through need. Important from our perspective, however, is that this intertwining of governmental and pastoral creates a population which is *nevertheless divided*. The rationalities of governmental and pastoral power do not constitute each subject equally. Indeed, the sanctuary incidents that Lippert addresses distinguish between 'provider' and 'recipient' in ways that create a distinction between responsibilised and irresponsibilised subjects, which might also be understood in terms of the divide between 'legal' citizens and the 'illegal' migrants (see Inda 2011). The 'illegal' migrant in this regard might be interpreted as a subject who has a different experience of power, for s/he '...cannot be considered affiliated to civilized communities because they are [conceived of as] incapable of managing themselves as subjects...or they are considered a threat...to political order' (Rose 1996: 341). As Nicholas Rose argues,

those deemed to be 'less receptive to responsabilization strategies' face different and 'more intensive strategies' of control (Ibid.). An account that points to the intertwined strategies of pastoral and governmental power in this regard thus allows us to see how the subjects of sanctuary are hierarchically divided and ordered in complex ways.

For Lippert, this intertwining of governmental and pastoral power cannot be understood in separation from sovereign power. Sovereign power, Lippert argues, functions largely through the 'control of territory' (Lippert 2005: 68). If governmentality and pastoralism are rationalities that function through the gaining of (official and personal) information, then sovereignty *qua* territorialization can in some respects be conceived of as a condition of possibility for these practices. Indeed, Lippert contends that the borders enacted to surround a given space of sanctuary enable providers to keep track of recipients (Lippert 2005: 75). This effectively enables citizens to organize, gain data and assist migrants in need as it is through the bordering of space that the migrant may be tracked, known and therefore supposedly protected and cared for more efficiently (see also Cruikshank, 1999). Lippert's Foucauldian approach is thus important in drawing out the complexity of the power relations which are enacted through sanctuary incidents and in showing how heterogeneous rationalities are contingently intertwined in ways that (re)order the subjects of sanctuary in statist terms. In particular, Lippert's analysis is crucial in pointing to the various ways in which sanctuary practices become involved in the governing of migrants in terms that reinforce a notion of the non-citizen migrant as apolitical.

Despite the critical insights of Lippert's Foucauldian account of sanctuary incidents, however, we want to suggest that this type of analysis risks overlooking some of the more dynamic interactions and unexpected relations that emerge in 'mobile enclaves' whereby sanctuary is both taken and enacted. It could perhaps be argued that Lippert's reading of sanctuary further embeds an unequal or hierarchical relationship between provider and recipient by dividing those 'inside' sanctuary from those 'without' in the public or political realm (Lippert 2005: 16). While Lippert's discussion of sanctuary incidents needs to be read in relation to a particular form of anti-deportation activism, it is nevertheless important to consider how this type of analysis of sanctuary can reify a relationship of pastoralism and care in which those who are to be protected are effectively denied political capacity or voice. This is perhaps accentuated in research that gives voice to providers only, and which tends to support a pastoral-governmental politics of care by presenting 'recipients' as victims requiring protection. The temporal emerges here as a spatialized question in terms of 'when might they become political?' with those within the contained space of sanctuary implicitly posed as *waiting* for political life to begin. In this regard, the statist-pastoral spatial ordering of subjects is transformed into a statist-pastoral temporal order in which those authorised to move are distinguished from those who are not yet ready to do so. Such an analysis of sanctuary in this sense would seem to risk reaffirming statist and pastoral distinctions while overlooking some of the more dynamic interactions and unexpected relations that an analysis of 'mobile enclaves' might provide.

## SANCTUARY ON THE MOVE?

While this chapter draws upon and acknowledges the critical insights of Lippert's Foucauldian analysis of sanctuary in terms of its emphasis on the intertwining of heterogeneous rationalities of power, it also takes as a starting point the observation that a more dynamic rendering of sanctuary might be gleaned from an analysis of the practices of *City of Sanctuary*. *City of Sanctuary* is an interesting case, because its practices are not confined to an enclosed or contained space, such as the church as a sacred space of protection. Rather, the movement's struggle to constitute the city as a space of sanctuary brings to bear a dynamism that a statist frame of reference is unable to grasp (see Darling 2010; Squire 2011b). Indeed, more dynamic enactments can be found littering historical practices of sanctuary, suggestive of the partiality of a conception of sanctuary that assumes spatial containment or enclosure.<sup>5</sup> The practices of *City of Sanctuary* might be conceived of in relation to these alternative histories of sanctuary. Rather than functioning in or through the logic of containment, the activities of *City of Sanctuary* operate through what we call 'mobile enclaves of sanctuary', which open up possibilities for unexpected relations that challenge statist and pastoral renderings of sanctuary. The notion of mobile enclaves of sanctuary thus brings to the fore the inherent dynamism of social sites that are often assumed to be static and unchanging (e.g. Jensen 1999). These sites, we suggest, create the conditions for the emergence of relations that cut through depoliticizing pastoral depictions of those taking sanctuary as victims who are worthy of protection, along with the statist distinction between citizen and noncitizen on which such depictions largely rely.

#### Mobile enclaves of sanctuary

A focus on *City of Sanctuary* would seem to demand a more diffuse and relational account of the sites of sanctuary than that provided by the historical and contemporary analyses introduced above. For *City of Sanctuary* activists, it is the city or town that forms the key site to be constructed as a place of sanctuary, and this is thus seen as requiring a much broader range set of interventions across the urban environment than that associated with conventional church-based sanctuary practices (see Darling 2010). Instead of protecting sanctuary seekers in fixed spatial sites, *City of Sanctuary* promotes a culture of hospitality toward those taking sanctuary across diverse sites, such as the local business or workplaces, community cafés and religious congregations. This entails a range of practices, such as the placing of signs on the window sills of various community buildings, shops, student unions and offices around Sheffield which bear the words: 'We welcome asylum-seekers and refugees' (Interview with Craig 2009: 32). Practices such as these can be interpreted as constituting a wider range of relational sites through which sanctuary is practiced, and would seem to blur the boundaries between hospitality and sanctuary by enacting protection in the form of welcome at sites across the urban environment. Yet what we want to emphasise alongside this practising of sanctuary across dispersed sites is the way in which the hierarchies of citizen/noncitizen and protector/protected that inform statist and pastoral accounts of sanctuary are troubled through the enactment of sanctuary in 'mobile enclaves'.

What we refer to as a mobile enclave of sanctuary is perhaps apparent if we consider the Terminus Initiative in Sheffield, which is a community initiative set up by a local church group associated with *City of Sanctuary*. The Terminus Initiative includes a Conversation Club and community café. The former is a site whereby those seeking

sanctuary can meet with each other and with more 'established' residents to practice speaking English, and the latter is a site which is largely run by migrants and asylum seekers for local residents at large. As such, these are less adequately conceived of as fixed sites that contain those 'seeking' sanctuary, than they are as hubs which allow local residents to meet and interact, regardless of their social position or legal status (Barnett 2009: 35). As one of the founders of the *City of Sanctuary* movement points out, the sanctuary café is important as an initiative because, like other *City of Sanctuary* activities it effectively creates opportunities for 'greater interaction' between local residents (Interview with Inderjit 2009: 17). This is important in challenging policies and practices that limit the rights of migrants in moving to and settling in the city, because the practice of sanctuary is premised upon the creation of relational sites that operate according to a logic of open access rather than closed borders. Specifically, we want to stress the significance of this type of activity as creating opportunities for interactions and relations that trouble statist distinctions between those authorised to move and interact and those who are not, as well as pastoral distinctions between those worthy of protection and those in a position of providing protection.

Mobile enclaves of sanctuary can be interpreted as sites that are constituted through the movements and interactions of those taking sanctuary, and are politically significant because they entail the enactment of sanctuary in terms that are not prescribed by the practices of 'providers'. For example, Sheffield in itself as a 'city of sanctuary' can be interpreted as a mobile enclave that refuses the logic of closed borders by opening up its urban environment to the movements and interactions of those taking sanctuary. Whether or not the *City of Sanctuary* movement directly challenges statism and pastoralism in this regard is less important from the perspective developed here than the 'minor' practices that open up the potential for those taking sanctuary to challenge the closures and hierarchical distinctions associated of an exclusionary politics of asylum (Squire 2011b; Darling and Squire forthcoming). In this sense it is worth considering how our analysis of the Terminus Initiative indicates that those taking sanctuary in Sheffield are neither rendered immobile through their containment within fixed sites nor left dependent upon the movement and political advocacy of those 'providing' sanctuary. Those taking sanctuary in Sheffield engage with others in dynamic ways through their interactions within, and movements across or between, mobile enclaves of sanctuary such as the Conversation Club or sanctuary café. It is thus through this particular spatiotemporal arrangement that a series of more complicated and unexpected relations emerge than those that a statist or pastoral account of sanctuary would suggest. For instance, an asylum seeker describes her experiences working at the Terminus Café and the interactions and relations that that are constituted through such a site:

We are cooking a load of food for other[s] ...together and then one day they invited immigration and the police to interview. And me, I talk, they eat also my food, cooking - they enjoy (Interview with Adolphine 2009: 6).

What is significant about this example from our perspective is that it allows us to see how mobile enclaves of sanctuary such as that of the Terminus Initiative Café entail movements and interactions that would appear unexpected from a statist and pastoral perspective. Adolphine here describes how the relations of 'host' and 'guest' are reversed in the café, with Adolphine able to speak in her own voice as 'host' to those

who would from a statist perspective be deemed as her interrogators. Such an account is thus indicative of the constitution of sites of open access and equal participation by which those taking sanctuary relate to others in terms that are unimaginable where sanctuary is conceived of in terms of contained spaces and pastoral mechanisms.

One way in which we might understand the political significance of these relatively open, equal and relational sites of sanctuary is in relation to the notion of 'proximate diversity'. This notion is used by various urban studies scholars to describe how diverse actors and activities are brought together in shared spaces of the city, thereby generating a complex set of relations which often challenge discrete categorizations (Allen 2000; Jacobs 1961; Magnusson forthcoming). In terms of our focus on the way that an analysis of mobile enclaves of sanctuary challenges statist and pastoral accounts of sanctuary, what is most interesting about these complex relations of proximate diversity is that they trouble any singular account of sovereignty imposed from above or below. This means that legal distinctions between citizens and non-citizens become ineffective, while political distinctions between the protector and the protected and between the worthy and the unworthy begin to unravel (see also Nyers 2010). This is evident in the claim of one interviewee, for example, who describes her experience of a Conversation Club associated with *City of Sanctuary* as follows: 'You cannot come to a Conversation Club and not be changed' (Myra 2010: 5). The notion of proximate diversity in this regard is one that is inherently relational,

The critical importance of this notion of proximate diversity is further evident if we consider the case of an asylum seeker who was interviewed as a participant of *City of Sanctuary* (see Squire 2011b: \*\*). What is striking about this particular example is that the asylum seeker in question works as a radio broadcaster in Sheffield and in this capacity described a situation in which he interviewed the local Mayor on the issue of asylum on a local radio show (Interview with Ouattara 2009). Already, we can see how the movement of this individual into the city invokes a relatively complex set of diversities, with the individual in question simultaneously occupying both a position of legal, social and economic marginalisation (as asylum seeker) as well as a position of social status (as broadcaster). The individual in question effectively challenges the assumption that his status as asylum seeker relegates him to a position of one who is denied the right to work and political voice, and points to the ways in which this brings him closer to others in the following way: 'one of my friends, who was working here voluntarily [at the Radio Station] ...he never knew I was an asylum seeker and he was always against them. But the day I tell him about ourselves, he was in tears' (Interview with Ouattara: 15). The story that this interviewee tells us is indicative of the creation of unexpected relations in a context whereby the movements and interactions of those taking sanctuary refuse to conform to (or exceed) existing political categorisations. This is politically significant because it allows us to see how an analysis of the proximate diversities that are constituted through mobile enclaves of sanctuary can challenge the unequal relations by which non-citizen migrants are defined as apolitical, whether through a process of victimisation or of criminalisation.

#### Unauthorised takings of sanctuary

So if the mobile enclaves of sanctuary and proximate diversities that these entail create the conditions for unexpected relations that trouble simplistic distinctions between citizens and non-citizens, between the protected and protector, and between

the worthy and unworthy, then how precisely does this play out in the practices and politics of *City of Sanctuary*? It is here that the subtle intertwinement of sovereign, governmental and pastoral rationalities of power needs to be carefully unpacked. To suggest that *City of Sanctuary* might most critically be understood in terms that refuse statism and pastoralism is not to say that its practices are entirely devoid of the sovereign, governmental or pastoral rationalities of power that Lippert outlines. For example, the very articulation of *City of Sanctuary* as ‘a movement to build a culture of hospitality for people seeking sanctuary in the UK’ (City of Sanctuary 2009) clearly invokes an unequal logic of pastoral care. It also draws lines between citizens and non-citizens in terms that affirm the assumptions on which a rationality of sovereign power rests. To suggest that *City of Sanctuary* is a post-statist movement or network would thus clearly be a step too far.

Indeed, *City of Sanctuary* might also be seen through a governmental lens as devolving authority to ‘responsible’ communities. This is evident in the first criteria of qualification as a city of sanctuary, whereby a city or town must gain ‘resolutions of support from a significant and representative proportion of local groups and organisations’ (Barnett and Bhoghal 2009: 79). It is not difficult to see how we might interpret the activities of *City of Sanctuary* as invoking a governmental rationality that is bound up with a ‘responsibilizing’ power-knowledge complex. For example, in order to ‘build a culture of hospitality for people seeking sanctuary in the UK’, a strong emphasis is placed on facilitating personal testimonies (City of Sanctuary 2009). Where these are invoked to facilitate protection and hospitality there is always a risk that such testimonies invoke governmental-pastoral rationalities in which those seeking sanctuary are divided into the simplified categories of responsible or ‘worthy’ victim and irresponsible or ‘unworthy’ threat.

Nevertheless, we want also to draw attention here to the ways in which the activities of *City of Sanctuary* facilitate movements and interactions that challenge such sovereign, governmental and pastoral rationalities, along with the social and political relations that they entail. In particular, we want to highlight the ways in which these ‘excessive’ relations challenge a hierarchical statist distinction between citizen and non-citizen, along with a series of simplifications that have become bound up with such distinctions. As one of the founding members of *City of Sanctuary* suggests, it is impossible to draw clear-cut lines between migrants and those seeking sanctuary; ‘Thus the distinction only loosely holds in practice despite the clear focus on sanctuary within the movement’ (Interview with Craig 2009: 8-9). Indeed, a series of simplified distinctions break down in the activities of *City of Sanctuary*: the distinction between citizens and non-citizens; the distinction between those who are responsible or worthy and thus authorised to move or interact and those who are not; and the distinction between those who are the recipients of sanctuary and those who are its providers. After all, mobile enclaves of sanctuary produce complex interactions through which unexpected social and political relations challenge hierarchical statist simplifications along with the exclusionary politics that they so often invest.

There are various ways in which this occurs. We have already seen how *City of Sanctuary*’s facilitation of voluntary work for those taking sanctuary in the city challenges the exclusions of contemporary asylum policy, where asylum seekers are denied the right to work. In so doing, the hierarchies of inclusion/exclusion that a statist politics implies are overturned and the potential for mutual exchange is opened

up in creative ways.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, voucher exchange programmes in which asylum seekers exchange supermarket vouchers for cash challenges exclusionary policy initiatives that deny those seeking sanctuary the opportunity to move across and engage within urban spaces in equal terms. Activities such as these should not in any simple way be interpreted in terms of a more inclusive politics, in our opinion. To reduce such interventions to a politics that seeks to bring that which is excluded to the 'inside' of community would be to remain within a statist frame of reference. Rather, what is important about these activities is that they entail a claiming of the right to move around and interact or undertake exchanges within the city regardless of ones' status. This claiming of a 'right to the city' through presence (see Lefebvre 1996) and regardless of status might be observed in the activities of sanctuary gardeners, for example, with the activity of 'community gardening' constituting a mobile enclave of sanctuary in which statist assumptions do not hold.

Clearly, the struggle to create a city of sanctuary in which status does not play a role has its limits. Ultimately the constitution of mobile enclaves of sanctuary does not effectively guard against the violences of state practices of forced (im)mobility, such as detention, deportation and dispersal (see Schuster 2006). Nor do activities such as voucher exchanges and sanctuary gardening effectively challenge exclusionary asylum policies (see Squire 2009a). However, such sites and activities do contribute to the creation of disruptive or 'unexpected' relations that open to question the assumptions upon which the political divisions and legal categories which inform such policies and practices (see also Squire 2009b). Importantly, they also shift attention from practices of *seeking* sanctuary to practices of *taking* sanctuary, thus troubling the distinction between 'recipient' and 'provider' along with the distinction between participants who are able move or act 'responsibly' and those who are not yet ready to do so.

Indeed, we would suggest that the temporality of *taking rather than waiting* is critical in understanding the political and temporal significance of the sanctuary practices that emerge through an analysis of *City of Sanctuary*. This emphasis allows us to expose how those taking sanctuary have a voice in the movement in the present, rather than having to wait to be spoken for:

We play an active role....And the problem is that we have to make people understand about asylum [seeker]s and refugees so by doing that they have to know the refugee themselves and send them to speak to the [people of] Sheffield, and this is what *City of Sanctuary* has done. (Interview with Ouatra 2009: 9).

The centrality of the voices of those taking sanctuary within the movement is critical in understanding how its activities tend to function according to a principle of equality (Ranciere 1999), rather than simply conforming to the uneven logic of hospitality (Darling and Squire forthcoming). This is reflected in one participant's description of the movement, for example, where she describes how the *City of Sanctuary* allows her '...to be part of a group who look after me and [I] look after [them] too' (Interview with Adolphine 2009: 5). Moreover, the practice of sanctuary through a temporality of taking rather than waiting can also be read into the development of a town or city as one of sanctuary prior to its official recognition as such. The launching

of a town or city as a *City of Sanctuary* does not await the agreement of local authorities, as one participant describes:

We didn't er, wait for the Council to decide it and different organisations decided that the city should be called City of Sanctuary, they make it clear to the Lord Mayor, they sent a letter and petitions, and he saw them and these people – I mean the Sheffield wanted it to be called Sheffield, City of Sanctuary. And he just have to follow it (Interview with Ouattra 2009: 7)

*City of Sanctuary* in this regard might be read as enacting sanctuary in terms that facilitate the claiming a 'right to the city' regardless of status and official authorization, specifically through a temporality of taking not waiting.

So where does this leave us when it comes to providing an alternative lens through which to view sanctuary practices from the statist and pastoral approach which we examined in the first part of this chapter? Our analysis suggests that scholars such as Randy Lippert are right to point to the multiple rationalities of power that are at play in contemporary sanctuary practices. However, such an analysis would seem to miss a critical dimension of heterogeneity which exceeds the statist frame. We conceive this heterogeneity in the movements and interactions of those taking sanctuary which, through the proximate diversities of mobile enclaves of sanctuary, create a series of disruptive and unexpected relations that trouble the assumptions of statist and pastoral accounts of sanctuary. This element of heterogeneity might be situated within a broader 'politics of migration', which exceeds a 'politics of control' that struggles to capture or contain movements that are deemed to be unauthorised (see Squire 2011a). It might also be captured through a distinction between 'major' and 'minor' practices of sanctuary (Squire 2011b; see also Balibar forthcoming). Rather than accepting statist and pastoral distinctions as given, those taking and enacting sanctuary through *City of Sanctuary* challenge the assumptions about who is authorised to move and (inter)act politically. In other words, they prompt a re-thinking of sanctuary 'on the move' that undermines distinctions between protector and protected and between citizen and noncitizen, thus urging us all to 'see like a city' with all the ambiguities and complexities that this entails (Magnusson forthcoming). This is important when it comes to questions of migrant subjectivity, because it allows us to uncover the politics that an exclusionary politics strives to cover through categorisations of a statist and pastoral form (Squire 2009a).

## CONCLUSION

This chapter has made the case for a re-conceptualisation of sanctuary through an analysis of the activities of the *City of Sanctuary* movement in Sheffield, UK. Critiquing historical analyses which present the space of sanctuary as a contained space and which present hierarchical relations between those who protect and those who are to be protected as clear-cut and uncontested, we have shown how Randy Lippert's Foucauldian account of the intertwined rationalities of power serves as a welcome intervention in our understanding of contemporary sanctuary practices. However, we have also drawn attention to the shortcomings of such an approach in challenging a statist and pastoral frame of reference. Specifically, we have made the case for an approach that both takes into account these various rationalities of power

as they are played out in the activities or practices of *City of Sanctuary*, while also paying critical attention to the ways in which such practices create the conditions for movements and interactions that contest or exceed statist and pastoral framings of sanctuary. The analysis in this chapter conceptualises these contestations in terms of the taking and enactment of sanctuary across dynamic relational sites or ‘mobile enclaves’, through which ‘unexpected’ relations are created that trouble the hierarchical statist and pastoral categories of citizen/noncitizen and recipient/provider.

The contestatory politics that this chapter points to thus cannot be captured within a singular frame, just as the rationalities of power at play in contemporary sanctuary practices cannot be reduced to a logic of sovereignty whereby authority is granted to the state. This is not to say, however, that the politics of *City of Sanctuary* can in any simple way be understood as a pluralised alternative to statism, for this would be to leave unchallenged the distinctions of a singular frame. It is for this reason that we suggest that an analysis concerned with the political significance of *City of Sanctuary* requires an approach that is open to those elements that are heterogeneous to statism and pastoralism. This heterogeneity might be one that an approach based on ‘seeing like a city’ allows us to address through an emphasis on mobile enclaves and proximate diversities. Such analytical categories allow us to see how the enactment of sanctuary entails a disruptive politics of movement or mobility that exceeds the confines and standardisations of statist and pastoral rationalities. This is important, we argue, because it allows us to see how non-citizen migrants who take sanctuary in cities such as Sheffield challenge the processes of victimisation and criminalisation through which they are constructed and governed as ‘apolitical’ subjects. Contestations of a statist and pastoral politics of sanctuary in this regard are critical because they engage a temporality of taking not waiting, through which those taking sanctuary refuse to engage as criminals or victims and instead constitute themselves as political beings in their own right.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, J. (2000) 'On Georg Simmel: proximity, distance and movement' *Thinking Space*, 54–70, London: Routledge.

Aradau, C., Huysmans, H. and Squire, V. (2010) 'Acts of European Citizenship: A Political Sociology of Mobility', forthcoming in the *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48: 4 (September 2010).

Barnett, C and Bhogal, I. (2009) *Becoming a City of Sanctuary: a practical handbook with inspiring examples*, Plug and Tap.

Bartelson, J. (2006) 'The Concept of Sovereignty Revisited' *European Journal of International Law*, 17: 463-474.

Bigo, D. (2002) 'Security and Immigration: Towards a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease' *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27(1): 63-92  
City of Sanctuary. (2009) Available HTTP: <[www.cityofsanctuary.org](http://www.cityofsanctuary.org)> (accessed June 4 2009).

Commission on Integration and Cohesion. (2007) *Shared Futures*, Wetherby: Crown Copyright.

Cruikshank, B. (1999) *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*, Ithica: Cornell University Press.

Cox, C.J. (1911) *The Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers of Mediaeval England*, London: George Allen & Sons.

Darling, J. (2010) 'A City of Sanctuary: the Relational Re-imagining of Sheffield's Asylum Politics' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35: 125-140.

Darling, J. and Squire, V. (forthcoming) 'Assuming rightful Presence: The Politics of *City of Sanctuary*' (paper to be presented at ISA 2011, and in preparation for submission to *International Political Sociology*)

Deleuze, G and Guattari, F. (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, London: Athlone Press.

Inda, J. (2011) 'Borderzones of Enforcement: Criminalization, Workplace Raids, and Migrant Counter-Conducts' in V. Squire (ed.) *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity* London: Routledge.

Innes, A. J. (2010) 'When the Threatened Become the Threat: The Construction of Asylum Seekers in British Media Narratives' *International Relations* 24:4 456-477.

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York: Random House.

- Jensen, O.B. (2009) 'Flows of Meaning, Cultures of Movements – Urban Mobility as Meaningful Everyday Life Practice' *Mobilities*. 4: 139-158.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996) *Writings on Cities* Edited and translated by E. Kofman and E. Lebas, London: Blackwell
- Lippert, R. (2005) *Sanctuary, Sovereignty and Sacrifice: Canadian Sanctuary Incidents, Power and Law*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Lippert, R (2004) 'Sanctuary Practices, Rationalities and Sovereignities,' *Alternatives* 29: 533-555.
- Magnusson, W. (forthcoming) *Seeing Like a City: Towards a Political Ontology of Urbanism as a Way of Life*. Forthcoming
- Marfleet, P. (2007) 'Refugees and history: why we must address the past', *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 26 (3), 136-148.
- Nyers, P. (2010) 'Duelling Designs: The Politics of Rescuing Dual Citizens' *Citizenship Studies* 14:1 47-60.
- Pedley, J. (2005) *Sanctuaries and the Sacred in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005
- Price, M. (2009) *Rethinking Asylum: History, Purpose and Limits*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rancière, J. (1999) *Dis-agreement* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rose, N. (1992) 'Governing the Enterprise Self,' *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: the Moral Debate*. Ed P. Heelas and P.Morris, 141-64, London: Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1996) 'The Death of the Social? Re-Figuring the Territory of Government,' *Economy and Society* 25:3 327-56
- Schuster, L. (2003) *The Use and Abuse of Political Asylum in Britain and Germany*, Frank Cass: London.
- Schuster, L. (2005b) 'A Sledgehammer to crack a nut: Deportation, detention and dispersal in Europe' *Social Policy and Administration* 39:6 606-621.
- Scott, J. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Spencer, S. (2003) 'Introduction', *Political Quarterly* 74(1) 1-24.
- Squire, V. (2009a) *The Exclusionary Politics of Asylum. Migration, Minorities, Citizenship*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Squire, V. (2009b) 'Mobile Solidarities: The City of Sanctuary movement and the Strangers into Citizens campaign', at <http://www.open.ac.uk/ccig/news/mobile-solidarities-the-city-of-sanctuary-movement-and-the-strangers-into-citizens-campaign>

Squire, V. (2011a) 'The contested politics of mobility', in V. Squire (ed.) *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity* (London: Routledge).

Squire, V. (2011b) "From Community Cohesion to Mobile Solidarities: The *City of Sanctuary* network and the *Strangers into Citizenship* campaign", forthcoming in *Political Studies*.

Zetter, R. Griffiths, D. and Sigona, N. (2003) 'Social capital or social exclusion? The impact of asylum seeker dispersal on refugee community organizations', *Community Development Journal* 40 (2), 169-181.

## INTERVIEWS CITED:

Andrew, Volunteer, asylum seeker and participant of *City of Sanctuary*, 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2010 (interview carried out by Gabi Kent, Director/Producer for Angel Eye Media).

Craig, National Co-ordinator and co-founder of *City of Sanctuary*, 30<sup>th</sup> March 2009.

Diane and Myra, Participants of Conversation Club, 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2010 (interview carried out by Gabi Kent, Director/Producer for Angel Eye Media).

Inderjit, Co-founder of *City of Sanctuary*, 4th April 2009.

Joy and Adolphine, Local minister, co-organiser of the Terminus Initiative and participant of *City of Sanctuary* with Adolphine, an asylum seeker who is a participant of the Terminus Initiative café, 4<sup>th</sup> June 2009.

Ouattrra, Broadcaster, asylum seeker and participant of *City of Sanctuary*, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2009.

Robert, Chair of Assist and participant of *City of Sanctuary*.

Rodrigo, Volunteer, refugee and participant of *City of Sanctuary*, 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2010 (interview carried out by Gabi Kent, Director/Producer for Angel Eye Media).

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors would like to thank all of the participants of the workshop *Putting Citizenship in Motion: Migrant Activism, Mobile Citizenship and the Politics of Movement*, which was held at the Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition, McMaster University, Canada, during October 2009. In particular, thanks are extended to our discussant, William Walters, and to the organisers of the workshop and editors of this collection, Peter Nyers and Kim Rygiel, whose insightful comments have been invaluable in our development of the arguments in this essay.

<sup>2</sup> The analysis in this chapter draws on a series of in-depth qualitative interviews with a total of ten organisers and participants from Sheffield *City of Sanctuary*, which were carried out in the Spring/Summer of 2009 and in June 2010. It also draws upon a documentary analysis of material written by organisers, as well as upon observations of meetings with participants from each of the mobilisations in question. Thanks are extended to Louise Richards, whose support with carrying out these interviews has been invaluable. Thanks also to Gabi Kent, Director/Producer for Angel Eye Media. Full details of these interviews are provided at the end of this article.

<sup>3</sup> Such a conception is evident, for example, in the fact that integration policy is officially orientated toward refugees and immigrants rather than toward migrants or asylum seekers (see National Strategy for Refugee Integration, 2004).

<sup>4</sup> Certainly it would appear that the walls of sanctuary have expanded (to include hospitals, schools etc) but it is largely assumed that enclosure itself is the condition of possibility for sanctuary. This is evident in Randy Lippert's work 'Sanctuary, Sovereignty, Sacrifice' whereby sanctuary is defined as a space in which migrants 'actually enter and remain in physical protection' (2005: 16).

<sup>5</sup> Before sanctuary was enshrined in Roman law the practice was 'already recognized and well established', and in fact was not delimited to the confines of a particular building, religious or otherwise. For instance, a form of sanctuary was afforded to those who fled to an unenclosed statue of a caesar, or to those who clung to an 'image of god while grasping a broken twig or wool, the signs of a supplicant' (Price, 31). These more disparate practices have, however, often been displaced or lost under the formal, state-recognized definition of 'sanctuary', which was originally provided by Theodosius and which places emphasis on the walled church.

<sup>6</sup> See Aradau, Huysmans and Squire (2010) for a discussion of the importance of exchange in relation to mobility.