A Radical Journal of Geography
ANTIPODE

Politics Disrupted? Collective Intentionality, Inaugural Performativity, and Institutional Receptivity in Undocumented Migrant Struggles

Thomas Swerts

Department of Public Administration and Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands;
swerts@essb.eur.nl

Abstract: Critical scholarship on "the promise-of-the-political" thesis customarily understands undocumented migrant struggles (UMS) as being politically disruptive. However, the question of what gets disrupted, how, by whom, and to what effect tends to be ignored. Building on insights from the empirical literature on UMS and ethnographic research of the "Solidarity March With and Without Papers", this paper argues that three conditions need to be in place for UMS to be disruptive. First, undocumented activists need to craft collective intentions to challenge the institutional order in and through joint action. Second, protest acts need to effectively interrupt everyday routines symbolising the status quo and instigate replication. Third, UMS need to unsettle and force a response from the order in ways that defy existing institutional logics. These findings are translated into a research agenda that proposes to investigate the relative importance of collective intentionality, inaugural performativity and institutional receptivity for UMS.

Keywords: disruptive politics, undocumented migrant struggles, collective intentionality, performativity, activist ethnography

Introduction

On a cold Saturday afternoon in April 2013, a diverse group of protesters marched side by side as they passed by "The Little Castle",[1] the refugee reception centre in the city centre of Brussels. The protesters carried banners depicting migrants with taped mouths, symbolising the lack of voice that characterised the situation of the sans-papiers in Belgium. Spectators who tried to figure out what was going on found clues in slogans like "*Paroles sans-papiers*" (words without papers), "*Ce n'est pas mon destin d'etre clandestine*" (it is not my destiny to be clandestine) and "*We are not dangerous, we are in danger*". That day marked the beginning of the "Solidarity march with AND without papers" (henceforth: the March), a protest action whereby undocumented activists and citizen allies set out to walk through nine Belgian cities over the course of two weeks. As an immigrant protest event, the March was unprecedented in the history of the Belgian

Antipode Vol. 0 No. 0 2020 ISSN 0066-4812, pp. 1–24 doi: 10.1111/anti.12662

sans-papiers movement. 15 years earlier, the sans-papiers had burst onto the scene in response to the tragic death of refused asylum seeker Semira Adamu during a forced deportation effort. In the following years, activists typically relied on church occupations and hunger strikes to make their claims heard (see Laureys 2013; Swerts 2017a:389). The pressure exerted by the sans-papiers movement on the Belgian government resulted in "once-only" collective regularisation campaigns in 1999 and 2009. Established civil society organisations (CSOs) who negotiated these "deals" celebrated them as victories. However, many sans-papiers who risked their livelihoods in the heat of the struggle felt left behind when they failed to fulfil the criteria (see Swerts 2017a:387). Once protests re-emerged in 2012, State Secretary for Asylum and Migration De Block gained popularity by refusing to negotiate with activists who went on a record-breaking 102-day hunger strike, stating that "starting a hunger strike is a means of exercising pressure to which we do not give in".[2] Given this deadlock, the March's goals were as radical as they were ambitious: to disrupt politics as usual, regain visibility for the cause and put regularisation back on the political agenda.

This paper investigates whether undocumented migrant struggles (UMS) like the March can be considered politically disruptive. Among readers of critical scholarship on the "political", the sans-papiers' act of emerging from the shadows and stating "we are here" undoubtedly strikes a chord. Since the early 2000s, post-foundational theorists like Rancière (1999, 2001, 2010), Mouffe (2005) and Žižek (2008) argue that agonistic politics have become effectively foreclosed and erased from the public sphere under neoliberalism. In translating this argument to the domains of urban and citizenship studies, scholars like Swyngedouw (2009, 2011, 2014, 2018), Dikeç (2004, 2013, 2015, 2017) and Isin (2002, 2008) have systematically relied on UMS to accentuate the promise they hold to disrupt the status quo and revive "the political". Most followers of the "promise-of-the-political" thesis (henceforth POP thesis) tend to adhere to a political ontology which posits that the subjects capable of enacting "the political" can—in theory—not be identified *before* they disrupt the status quo by publicly staging and performing equality. As Beveridge and Koch (2017:35) have argued elsewhere, these rigid ontological underpinnings make it "impossible empirically as well as normatively to judge or evaluate the radical or emancipatory quality of actually existing politics". Yet, paradoxically, UMS are foregrounded repeatedly to argue that radical political change and insurgent citizenship can only be expected to arise from marginalised communities and peripheral spaces (see e.g. Swyngedouw 2009). The significant contribution of critical scholarship on "the political" has been its ability to orient academic attention towards the emergence of new political claims and processes of political subjectivation that challenge—and potentially transform—democracy and citizenship. However, key questions of what gets disrupted, how, by whom, and to what effect tend to be ignored.

This paper aims to engage with the analytical challenge formulated by the POP thesis by theoretically and empirically *situating* the disruptive character of migrant protest events. Theoretically, I bring insights from empirically grounded geographical and sociological literature on migrant mobilisations into dialogue with the aforementioned literature on the political. Empirically, I rely on an activist

ethnography of the March, which I consider to be a "critical case" (Flyvbjerg 2006:229–232), to explore and examine the propositions of the POP thesis. I subsequently argue and empirically demonstrate that specific spatial (see Nicholls et al. 2013; Darling 2017; Karaliotas 2017; Swerts 2017a) and relational (Enriquez 2014; Nicholls 2013a; Swerts 2018; Lambert and Swerts 2019; Swerts and Oosterlynck 2020) conditions affect the disruptive character of UMS. First, undocumented activists need to craft shared, collective intentions to challenge the institutional order through joint action. Second, protest acts need to effectively interrupt everyday routines symbolising the status quo and instigate replication. Third, UMS need to unsettle and force a response from the order in ways that defy existing institutional logics. These findings are translated into a research agenda that proposes to investigate the relative importance of *collective intentionality, inaugural performativity* and *institutional receptivity* for undocumented migrants' and other marginalised groups' struggles.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. First, I critically discuss the POP thesis and contrast its interpretation of UMS with that of more empirically informed studies on migrant mobilisation. Second, I explain the case study logic, outline the activist ethnographic approach deployed in this study and reflect on my own positionality as a participant observer. Third, I present empirical examples of the case study that help to illuminate the three conditions of disruptive politics. Finally, I formulate a research agenda for future studies on UMS.

The Promise-of-the-Political Thesis

As a symbol of our times, the figure of the undocumented migrant has inspired scholars in critical geography and citizenship studies to re-assess the meaning of the political. Undocumented migrants represent the ultimate incarnation of Agamben's (1998:171) *homo sacer*: the illegalised non-citizen who is "stripped of every political status and wholly reduced to bare life". Critical migration scholars have readily embraced Agamben's notion of "bare life", referring to the state of utter rightlessness that subjects who are trapped into camp-like spaces find themselves in, to "delineate the plight of … unauthorized migrants floating in the global economy who live in an indefinite and suspended state of noncitizenship" (Lee 2010:57). Systematically subject to what Menjívar and Abrego (2012) have called the "legal violence" of state-sanctioned bordering practices like detention and deportation, undocumented migrants inhabit the injustices of exclusionary migration policies. For scholars who are invested in exposing the state of "post-political crisis" (Swyngedouw 2009, 2018) we are in, the suffering of the sans-papiers therefore has a universalistic quality to it. According to Swyngedouw, post-politicisation has come to designate "the contested and uneven process by which consensual governance of contentious public affairs through the mobilization of techno-managerial dispositives sutures or colonizes the space of the political" (Swyngedouw 2018:xv). Translated to the sphere of migration, the global consensus that has emerged around the need to "tackle illegal migration" through border control "management" and surveillance technologies is a case in point (see Van Reekum and Schinkel 2017). When undocumented migrants organise

themselves collectively to expose a "wrong" (Rancière 1999), they are said to cause "a disruption of the field of vision and of the distribution of functions and spaces on the basis of the principle of equality" (Swyngedouw 2018:54).

The interest that critical scholarship on the "political" displays towards UMS primarily revolves arounds their capacity to announce the incipient "return of the political" (see Rancière 1999, 2001; Swyngedouw 2018). As Balibar (2013) has put it, we "owe" the sans-papiers for showing us in practice what the political *could* look like:

> [T]he sans-papiers, the "excluded" amongst the "excluded" … have stopped appearing simply as victims and have become actors in democratic politics. They have helped us immensely, with their resistance and their imagination, to *breathe life back into democracy*. We owe them this recognition, we must say it, and must engage ourselves, evermore numerous, by their side, until their rights and justice are rendered.

Balibar made the above statement in solidarity with a group of 300 undocumented migrants that occupied the Saint-Bernard Church in Paris in June 1996 to claim "papers for all". The case of the "Sans-papiers of Saint-Bernard" (henceforth SP-SB) marked a new beginning for the French sans-papiers movement and similar movements in Europe (see McNevin 2011; Siméant 1998). Although this speech is hardly a systematic analysis of the situation, it was nevertheless heavily cited (see e.g. McNevin 2011).

This example is emblematic for the way in which critical scholarship has labelled UMS as "disruptive". Scholarship that adheres to the POP thesis argues that the "part-of-no-part" disrupts the order of things when they raise their voice to make egalitarian demands (see Rancière 1999, 2001). This thesis is grounded in a political ontology that recognises the potential disruptive qualities of the moments when societal outcasts like the undocumented reject their assigned position on the margins. Becoming a political subject depends on the "inaugural" act whereby the status quo is denounced and a different logic of ordering is announced "in the name of equality" (Dikeç 2017:52). Such acts are deemed to be "disruptive" and "constitutive" because they "rupture or break the given orders, practices and habitus" (Isin 2008:36). In sum, the disruptive qualities of acts (migrant protests) and acting subjects (undocumented activists) are presumed based on the theoretical premise that marginalised subjects who act in the name of equality embody "the political".

While scholars advancing this thesis assert that political subjects cannot "be identified *before* they disrupt the police order" (Dikeç 2015:96), UMS are nevertheless consistently used to provide empirical ground for the POP thesis. Dikeç (2013:78), for example, argues that the sans-papiers' regular protests at the Place du Châtelet in Paris "disrupt the established order of things by opening up political spaces through processes of political subjectification". Similarly, Galindo (2012:594) has relied on civil disobedience actions by undocumented youth activists in the US to argue that their appearance on the scene "reconfigured the field of experience of illegality". The readiness with which the sans-papiers are identified as embodying "the political" is more than incidental. Drawing historical parallels to the 19th century proletariat, Swyngedouw (2011:374) states that "[t]

oday's undocumented immigrants, claiming inclusion, are a contemporary example of the political paradox, i.e. the promise of equality that is disavowed in the policing, categorisation and naming of some as outside the symbolic order of the Law". While I agree with these authors that UMS hold valuable insights in the current state of democracy and citizenship, I argue that their disruptive effects should not be readily assumed.

Situating Undocumented Migrant Struggles

Critical scholarship on the POP thesis does an excellent job at orienting scholars to potential moments of political disruption. However, this literature is often too abstract to grapple fully with the ambiguity and complexity of undocumented activism on the ground. As Beveridge and Koch (2017:32) argue, the POP thesis' conception of "the political" as a rare, heroic occurrence is "too narrow a basis to capture the contingencies of actually existing urban politics". Furthermore, the rigid binary between politics and "the political" leaves researchers of "actually existing" UMS with little choice than to either label struggles as "disruptive" or to renounce them as reinforcing the status quo. However tempting the former option might be for researchers of UMS who are invested in—evoking Balibar—engaging ourselves by their side, I argue that there is fairly little to analytically gain in doing so. What is missing, then, from these discussions is a proper understanding of how undocumented activists craft collective intentions to challenge the order in and through joint action, how the protest acts they are engaged in unsettle routines and instigate future action and how the institutional order is effectively forced to respond to these acts.

Avoiding the trap of romanticising UMS therefore requires us to dive deeper into the "socio-spatiality" (see Leitner et al. 2008) of UMS. The rich empirical literature on immigrant mobilisation offers pointers to develop a more *situated* perspective on disruptive politics. On the one hand, scholarship on the spatiality of solidarity movements and local immigrant rights politics has shown that space and place-making play a crucial role in the formation of disruptive political subjects (see Darling 2017; Featherstone 2012; Karaliotas 2017; Nicholls et al. 2013; Swerts 2017a). On the other hand, the literature on immigrant rights mobilisation and coalition formation (Enriquez 2014; Lambert and Swerts 2019; Nicholls and Uitermark 2017; Swerts 2018; Swerts and Oosterlynck 2020) demonstrates that unequal power relations between (and among) activists and organisations affect mobilisation processes and outcomes. Moving forward, I integrate insights from both strands of literature to delineate a research agenda centred around three socio-spatial conditions of disruptive politics.[3]

Collective Intentionality

First, disruptive politics involve forms of *collective intentionality*. The latter can be defined as the extent to which individuals who are engaged in collective action come to a shared understanding of the political situation that implies an explicit intention to challenge the institutional order. For illegalised subjects like

undocumented migrants, stigma and fear for deportation constitute substantial barriers to political mobilisation (see Swerts 2015:350-352). Collective intentionality captures the willingness, courage and commitment that participants mobilise in joint action to overcome these barriers and become engaged in the struggle. Of course, social movement scholars have long noted that effective mobilisation depends on "frame alignment" (see Benford and Snow 2000; Snow et al. 1986), referring to the necessary linkage between individuals' interpretations with the collective action frames of social movement organisations. However, frame analysis' emphasis on pre-meditated, rationally calculated, ideologies and meanings fails to capture the more ambiguous moral and emotional motivations of activists as well as the conflicts involved in negotiating and constructing such motivations (see Jasper 1998; Polletta 1998; Swerts 2015). In this respect, critical geographers have rightfully pointed out that collective action does not solely revolve around bringing together different actors and movements around common interests, but is also *generative* of political subjectivities (see Featherstone 2003). This generative process essentially involves "debate, negotiation and contestation rather than a simple coming together of homogeneous action or pre-existing political wills" (Featherstone 2003:416). Hence, collective intentionality is less about "aligning" pre-existing "frames" of individuals and organisations than it is about intentions that come about at the collective level in the process of undertaking joint action. In this respect, Searle (1995) makes a sharp distinction between "We-intentions" and "I-intentions", whereby "We-intentions"—although held by individuals—are always oriented towards joint action and can never be reduced to "I-intentions".

Investigating collective intentionality thus requires an analytical focus on how disruptive intentions come about in particular spaces where activists with unequal power relations debate and negotiate their commitment to and expectations of joint action. Previous research on the illegalisation of migrant populations demonstrates that categorical differences create inequalities in legal status and moral deservingness between groups (see Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas 2012). Categorical differences between more desirable "political refugees" and less desirable "economic migrants" can result in a highly contentious process of achieving collective intentionality (see Nicholls 2013b). Since participating in mobilisation is both a high-risk and high-stake activity for undocumented migrants, conflicts and debate about collective intentionality are even more likely to occur. Furthermore, maintaining cross-status alliances between undocumented activists and citizen allies involves delicate micro-political processes (Swerts 2018). Consequently, I argue that researchers need to put themselves in the midst of the action in order to analyse how collective intentionality is constructed and negotiated from below. As I have argued elsewhere, undocumented activists tend to rely specifically on the construction of "interstitial" "spaces in-between legality and illegality, visibility and invisibility and formality and informality" as places where they can reimagine their political subjectivities (Swerts 2017a:380). This necessarily implies that ethnographers have to negotiate access to the "safe spaces" (see Leitner et al. 2008; Swerts 2020) where undocumented activists share their stories, negotiate differences, and evaluate their collective action. In sum, collective intentionality is a

central aspect of disruptive politics because it produces subjects that explicitly and deliberately intend to disrupt and challenge the status quo through joint action.

Inaugural Performativity

Second, disruptive politics imply acts that institute *inaugural performativity*, defined as the interruption of everyday routines that uphold the status quo and the announcement of new routines symbolising equality through repeated public performance. Butler's (1988:526) work on performativity shows that repetition operates as a "mundane and ritualized form of … legitimation" since it is "at once a reenactment and reexperiencing of a set of meanings already socially established". According to this logic, social constructs like citizenship depend on their perpetual legitimisation through repeated public action. Hence, UMS need to effectively interrupt public actions that legitimise illegalising migration politics and expose their unjust logic. This immediately brings to mind anti-deportation campaigns or intentional border crossing that use the public performance of "presence" and "mobility" to contest exclusionary citizenship regimes (see Darling 2017; Swerts 2017b). Yet the inaugural performativity of an act goes beyond its contestatory message. As Houston and Pulido (2002:401) argue, the power of performativity depends on its ability to "work simultaneously as a space of social critique *and* as a space for creating social change".[4] In this regard, several authors (Karaliotas 2017; Mensink 2019) consider the mundane, day-to day practices and experiments whereby undocumented activists create autonomous spaces and try to lead a "normal" life to be expressing prefigurative political imaginaries.

But solely focusing on the symbolic qualities of acts risks ignoring the socio-spatial infrastructures that allow acts to "travel", inspire and set in motion future acts. In other words, inaugural performativity cannot be solely captured by what Isin (2008:25) calls the "transcendent qualities" of acts, but equally relies on their repeated public performance in different locales. Behind the seemingly spontaneous convergence of immigrant protests "lay the work of long-standing communities and organisations that developed strategies and tactics to activate pre-existing networks, prompting members, allies, acquaintances and strangers to come out in support" (Nicholls et al. 2013:1). Thus, the proliferation of "coming out" strategies among undocumented youth activists in the US can be explained by the geographies of activist networks and safe spaces where backstage trainings took place (see Nicholls 2013a; Swerts 2015). Similarly, church occupations became effective "repertoires of contention" for the sans-papiers movements in France and Belgium because they could easily be "read" and replicated by activists (see Siméant 1998; Swerts 2017a; Tilly 1984). This resonates with Featherstone's (2005:264) work on militant networks in 18th century London that demonstrates how the performativity of strikes stemmed from their ability to bring "together some of the repertoires of activity and assertive political identities that circulated through these networks". In sum, inaugural performativity is a central aspect of political disruption because it involves the backstage work and front-stage performance necessary to produce disruptive acts and ensure their spread and reverberation through activist networks.

Institutional Receptivity

Third, the reason why certain migrant protest events cause more disruptive "fuzz" than others is not only determined by conditions internal to the movement, but also by external conditions. *Institutional receptivity,* then, refers to the capacity of acting subjects to unsettle and force a response from the order in ways that defy existing institutional logics.[5] Social movement scholars tend to reduce external conditions that affect disruptive politics to "political opportunity structures" that either encourage or discourage actors to engage in collective action (Tarrow 1996:54). However, as empirical studies of migrant mobilisations have demonstrated, "political opportunities" for unwanted subjects like undocumented migrants are often grim or non-existent (see Nicholls 2013b). Advancing the research agenda on UMS thus requires a "shift in attention away from big, general, and rare political-discursive opportunities and towards the narrow, nuanced, and interstitial openings that make up the political worlds of marginalized groups" (Nicholls 2014:26). Navigating niche openings necessitates undocumented activists to re-appropriate well-known scripts, discourses and spaces symbolising (national) belonging and citizenship, and project them back to the order (see Karaliotas 2017; Swerts 2017a). Political disruption can therefore only take place when acts "appear on the radar" and provoke a response from challenged institutional actors.[6]

Because the POP thesis conceptualises the institutional order as a rather passive "order of bodies" or a "distribution of the sensible" (Rancière 1999), it tends to reduce institutional actors to mere abstract structures with little capacity to act back. However, I argue that institutional receptivity should become better integrated into the analysis of UMS. For example, considering the already mentioned collective regularisations of 1999 and 2009 in Belgium, institutional actors were forced to give in to the sans-papiers' demands in unprecedented ways. However, as Nicholls (2014:84) has argued, being heard and seen as a legitimate "voice" rather than illegitimate "noise" often requires the construction of representations of immigrants and their cause in ways that solidify, rather than contest, existing institutional logics. Furthermore, the effectiveness of institutional actors to "bounce back" from disruptive events and reinstate institutional logics should not be underestimated. In the case of the SP-SB, for example, the French state responded with a brutal police intervention of 500 officers and a case-by-case regularisation that created division within the movement (see Siméant 1998:18). This led Rosello (1998:150) to question whether the highly visible police intervention "was not the most effective moment of re-appropriation of the whole symbolic event". Paying more explicit attention to the workings of institutional receptivity can therefore help to nuance how UMS are interpreted.

In the empirical analysis below, I illustrate how each of these three conditions played out in the case of the March.

Investigating a Critical Case Up Close

I adopt an extended case study method (Burawoy 1998) to "extract" insights about conditions for disruptive politics from the empirical observations made

during the March. As argued above, the March can be considered a *critical case* (Flyvbjerg 2006:229–232) that can be used to examine empirically the propositions of the POP thesis. Indeed, the March is a protest event organised in public space by a marginalised community (the sans-papiers) that aims to challenge the status quo in name of equality. Hence, the expectation at the outset was that this case would "most likely" confirm the POP thesis that undocumented migrant protest events disrupt the status quo (ibid.). However, as I will show in the empirical analysis below, the findings complicate, (in part) contradict and nuance a straightforward interpretation of the March as "disruptive".[7] By focusing on how antagonisms and ambiguities around collective intentionality, inaugural performativity and institutional receptivity unfolded leading up to, during and after the March, I try to engage in what Burawoy has called "the imaginative and parsimonious reconstruction of theory to accommodate anomalies" (Burawoy 1998:5).

I adhere myself to the principles of *activist ethnography* whereby the specific development of the sans-papiers movement and its local understandings, routines, and performances are analysed from the standpoint of activists themselves (see Graeber 2009). This requires a "politically engaged and collaborative form of participant observation carried out from within rather than outside grassroots movements" (Juris 2007:165). To this end, I actively participated in the planning, execution, and evaluation of the March between November 2012 and May 2013. While I mainly rely on ethnographic data gathered in this period, my more extensive engagement with the Collectif Sans-Papiers Belgique (henceforth: SPB) allowed me to document the entire "life course" of the March. As I outline elsewhere (Swerts 2020), I used my privileged positionality and access to networks and resources that come with it strategically during my fieldwork. Gaining access to SPB required me to state explicitly my support for collective regularisation and "prove" myself in practice as an "ally" (ibid.). My previous engagement during the 2012 European Solidarity March had already solidified my position as an ally at this point (see Swerts 2017b).

I attended and took up a role as note-keeper during the weekly preparatory meetings for the March and served as the liaison with activists in the city of Leuven. I also participated in the Communication and Coordination subcommittees, where my main task was to translate press releases, the March's charter and "know your rights" leaflets from French to Dutch. Since the sans-papiers lack a driving license, I occasionally drove around the van. During the March, I collected and translated chants from French to Dutch and led a workshop whereby the marchers learned how to pronounce their chants phonetically. While I was deeply immersed in the collective action, I tried to make sure not to influence the actual *content* of the claims being made or influence the strategies activists adopted. The March itself took place from 6 to 21 April 2013, halting in eight cities and drawing anywhere between 60 to 100 marchers. I recorded meetings with labour unions and migrant organisations, took notes of interactions and did informal interviews with marchers throughout. The interviews were conducted in French, Dutch or English. I also analysed media reports, internal meeting notes, daily entries in the "Journal of the March", the March's website,[8] and ten radio

broadcasts (Radio Panik) made by activists. I translated all quotes used here into English.

Exploring Disruptive Politics through the Lens of the March

Crafting Collective Intentionality

Undocumented migrants do not turn into "disruptive" subjects overnight. The "moral economy of illegality" installs categorical differences between refugees, (rejected) asylum seekers and "economic" migrants (Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas 2012). Furthermore, more established CSOs often overpower the "voice" of undocumented migrants (see Nicholls 2013b). Whereas categorical differences fracture marginalised populations like the undocumented into groups, more privileged "representatives" appropriate the means to give voice from the powerless. Both group fragmentation due to categorical differences and the appropriation of means due to unequal power relations within movements therefore constitute significant obstacles to crafting collective intentionality.

SPB was founded in 2011 at a moment when "the sans-papiers movement" was virtually inexistent. As SPB leader Abas explained, "those who led the movement in 2009 were regularised and the reality is that, once regularised, the sans-papiers quit the movement and picked up their daily lives".[9] Strict regularisation criteria and the incapacity of the administration to process the applications left many applicants in limbo for years. It is in this context that SPB was established:[10]

> The start was that we were waiting for more than a year for response [from the state] … But little by little, we realised that … if we really want to speak for the sans-papiers, we had to involve undocumented migrants who are in all sorts of different procedures. *This was a problem we faced in the beginning, namely that … the division between asylum seekers, clandestines or families created a division within the movement. In order to really be a collective force, we need to gather our strengths. But assembling everyone is not something that is easily done.*

The categories that were created by the Belgian state to sort and rank migrant populations impaired the movement's collective intentionality. Overcoming internal divisions and aligning undocumented migrants' minds around joint action (see Enriquez 2014; Searle 1995) were therefore central priorities for SPB around the time that the idea of the March started to germinate. Although SPB had expressed its solidarity with the "rogue" actions undertaken by hunger strikers before, its leadership identified lack of unity to be a real threat. The media and the general public seemed to have lost interest in the cause. Furthermore, negative experiences of political cooptation of the sans-papiers' struggle by established CSOs had made activists wary of recruiting support. In order to rebuild a disruptive political subject, organisers decided to organise a nationwide March. During the first planning meeting, public visibility was underlined as its central objective:[11]

> *There is a complete absence of any public debate on this issue* [of the sans-papiers], the absence of a neutral media vision on the subject makes any mobilisation and awareness very limited. Several movements are trying to denounce this situation as much as

> possible, but the current socio-economic situation has made this issue a marginal point for politicians, social movements, and public opinion.

A small group of SPB activists and citizen allies laid down the preparatory groundwork for the March. Five subcommittees were formed around the themes of communication, logistics, mobilisation, legal aid, and coordination. Demonstrating the importance activists attributed to safeguarding their autonomy (see Mensink 2019), adding logo's or speaking in name of organisations was not allowed.

The most heated topic of discussion revolved around the question of which "revendications" (demands) the march should make. Without a doubt, regularisation still formed the ultimate end-goal of their struggle. Opinions were split, however, about the best way to realise this goal. As undocumented Latina organiser Maria explained, a first necessary step was for people to focus on collective intentions:[12]

> *We can really hurt the government if we assemble ourselves*. The march means that we are not waging an individual struggle, case by case [regularisation], because, we are all sans-papiers but each person is in a specific situation depending on the procedure wherein they find themselves, 9bis, annex 26, and so on …. *In the beginning, we had this big discussion about the demands we were going to make through this march, "we are going to get papers at the end of the march", but no, that is a long-term goal*.

The March's leadership intended to build agreement and expand organisational strength before making claims for regularisation to the government. Since its foundation, SPB had functioned as a safe space for sans-papiers whose application for regularisation through a work permit during the 2009 campaign was pending or rejected. Because of this focus, SPB mainly attracted North African migrants who had lived and worked in Brussels for several years. Meanwhile, small, ethnically organised "collectives" emerged over the years that operated in relative independence of SPB. These collectives mainly consisted of refugees from countries like Afghanistan and Guinea, which respectively constituted the first and second most prevalent nationalities to apply for asylum in Belgium in 2013 (CGVS 2013). About half of all Afghan applicants and up to 85% of Guinean applicants received a negative decision that year (CGVS 2013:27). Many refused asylum seekers who became undocumented sought refuge among and took action with compatriots.[13] As SPB tended to perceive these actions as uncoordinated and opportunistic, the organising committee considered it to be "more urgent to begin with a convergence at the very heart of the movement".[14] This emphasis on overcoming differences rather than making concrete demands is illustrated by the marching call:[15]

> We, migrants or settlers, with or without papers, militants, solidarity and rebellious men and women have decided to march through Belgium for a month in April 2013. A march for dignity … The "migration policy" today comes down to a true manhunt at the expense of dignity and freedom. This manhunt is justified by an anti-migration discourse, based on xenophobia, and manifests itself in repressive safety practices. Just like other people in a precarious situation, unemployed, homeless, benefit recipients, workers, employees, etc., migrants and undocumented migrants are designated as

> scapegoats … *We cannot just let this happen and we want to make visible the violence that affects women, men and children in the name of security and the economy.*

Two elements of this statement are worth dissecting. First, the acting subject of the March regroups a diversity of targeted groups in society under the banner "We". The call thereby reinforces the familiar trope of the sans-papiers as the "excluded among the excluded" who are acting "in name of all" (see Balibar 2013). Second, the call clearly names the "wrong" (see Rancière 1999) that the order is inflicting and expresses "We-intentions" (Searle 1995) to disrupt the status quo. In reality, however, the crafting of collective intentionality ran into two major obstacles.

A first obstacle presented itself when, despite its wide circulation, the organising committee received little positive response to its call. Subsequently, SPB participated in a meeting where established CSOs convened to "relaunch the sans-papiers movement in Belgium" under the banner of the "Migrant Front".[16] When SPB members stressed that this was exactly the goal of the March, they were silenced. In a message sent to the Front's organisers, SPB denounced their unwillingness to support the March:[17]

> Forming a national movement (the Front) in order to support a march, which has as its goal to assemble and wage a common struggle at the national level!! … Again, I take note that certain people fail to understand or do not want to understand the march … *If the sans-papiers do not have a voice it is because certain people smother our voice.*

Even when undocumented activists tried to act autonomously, uneven power relations between established CSOs and the sans-papiers persisted (see Nicholls 2013b; Swerts and Oosterlynck 2020).

A second obstacle had to do with the lack of direct involvement in and commitment of undocumented migrants to the March. Out of the 19 people who signed up for the five subcommittees, only five were undocumented. When citizen allies presented the final plans for the March, they stressed how it was conceived as a two-week national consultation round with local exchanges in eight cities. Several sans-papiers objected to this plan, arguing that "[w]e need to occupy a church and demand regularisation, not talk all day". A group of deviant activists considered the March to be a toothless tiger and the collective of undocumented Guineans tried to recruit participants for a hunger strike instead. As a Guinean undocumented marcher explains, the situation of Guineans in closed detention centres motivated him to participate in the first place:[18]

> This is the first time that I am participating in a march like this … *I put my hope in this march in order to shut down the closed detention centres that are there and, at the same time, liberate the people who are in these centres.*

For many others, the March lacked the dramatic effect needed to "shake things up". But the activists who raised this issue were quickly silenced by the March's leadership. "The organisers are exploiting us, we cannot even talk about hunger strikes while they are getting subsidised over our heads" SPB member Anouar complained to me at the kick-off.

To conclude, while the undocumented organisers attempted to overcome categorical differences and uneven power relations by crafting collective intentionality, the persistence and proliferation of competing strategies and imaginaries undermined their efforts.

The Inaugural Performativity of Marching

The name "Solidarity march of people with AND without papers" indicates what the diverse group of marchers wanted to achieve with this act of protest. Solidarity should be conceived of here as "a relation forged through political struggle which seeks to challenge forms of oppression" (Featherstone 2012:5). The March as an act was aimed to link up activist networks into a movement, reinforce relations between documented and undocumented participants, and build momentum in order to challenge the status quo. Maria explained "why we say it is the march of solidarity with and without papers" as follows:[19]

> [T]he primary objective here is to stimulate encounter between undocumented and documented people … *But gaining visibility through marching and showing oneself is not enough, we also need to show an image that is more worthy, more valorising, more "real" in the end of who the sans-papiers are day in day out and that our struggle is significant. We are here, we do not leave our heads down and we continue.*

Marching is a performative way to show to the Belgian community that the sans-papiers are not afraid to show their faces and raise their voices in public space (see Swerts 2017b). Walking through the streets hand in hand signals that they are supported by a wide range of sympathisers. The passing by of the marchers represents a festive display of collective strength and an appropriation of public space that temporarily "disrupts" everyday life (see Karaliotas 2017).

Instituting inaugural performativity depends on the establishment of the March as a reference point; a "first" in a series of events. At the March's kick-off, a citizen ally and veteran labour unionist reminded everyone why this was a special moment:[20]

> Today, 25 years ago, I started my first hunger strike. I participated in eight hunger strikes in total. The last one ended in a deadlock. Undocumented workers are being exploited. My grandfather was a child labourer at age 10 … Mobilisation has brought change since then. However, in 2013, slavery still exists. *That's why we are here today … Democracy no longer exists when people are being exploited and no longer have a voice.*

Faced with a political context in which the sans-papiers literally had nothing to "hold on to", the March offered a tangible project. Stressing the inaugural potential of the March, Amin argued that "mobilisation always takes place after concrete and punctual actions".[21] The organisers of the March implicitly assumed that the march would refuel the movement. Or, as one of the sans-papiers leaders yelled via the megaphone during the kickoff, the "march does not stop here, it only begins here".[22]

How exactly "new" this beginning was, is up for debate. Critical scholarship on the political tends to portray immigrant protests as standalone, disruptive "events". However, social movement scholars have long noted that protest acts tend to be rooted in circulating repertoires of contention (see Tilly 1984). In the case of the March, the participation of key figures of SPB in the European Solidarity March the year before constituted a crucial precedent (see Swerts 2017b). SPB member Samir, who completed the entire trajectory, shared his experience with the marchers:[23]

> One moment that will be grafted in my memory was in Switzerland where supporters came with a tractor to help us to cross the border as the police stood by. We proved to them that there is no border and we can live in this world without borders … *With the European March, we showed that with courage we can break everything, that we are well integrated in society and that we have a right to stay*.

However, activists soon discovered that national identities still held their sway as they experienced difficulties bridging national differences and returned home empty-handed. As Abas explained, this convinced them of the need to "start looking beyond Brussels and organise encounters with other sans-papiers collectives, *there where they are in Belgium*".[24]

The marchers assumed that encountering other groups "where they are" in Ghent, Brugge, Sint Niklaas, Antwerp, Leuven, Liège, Charleroi and La Louvière would stimulate the resurrection of a national sans-papiers movement. The process of connecting local grassroots struggles to a national social movement infrastructure is indeed an important prerequisite for scaling up immigrant rights (see Featherstone 2003; Nicholls and Uitermark 2017). However, the marchers soon found out that encounters were insufficient to produce solidarity. None of the cities besides Brussels housed autonomous collectives and most organisations were led by professional social workers. Diverging organisational logics and dependency on state subsidies made it hard to find common ground. For example, representatives of the Christian-Democrat labour union in Antwerp explained that "at present the position of the unions is not really clear" since their members "are very scared of undocumented migrants, both in terms of competition on the labour market and of competences".[25] Likewise, in Ghent, local activists explained that CSOs focused on improving the humanitarian situation of Roma people.[26]

Despite these difficulties, a marching community formed with its own rules and a division of labour where "everyone has their place".[27] At the beginning of each marching day, roles like time keeping, translation, note-taking, mediation, writing in the march diary, newcomer reception, cooking and so on were distributed. The kinesthetic act of marching helped to reinforce feelings of solidarity among participants. For example, on 9 April, the marchers embarked on a 15.4 kilometre long walk between Willebroek and Mechelen. Testament to the sense of "community" that emerged is the following "song" they made:[28]

> *Travail au noir,* (Working "in black",)
>
> *mariage blanc*. (sham marriage.)

Où va ma vie, (Where is my life going,)

en endant? (in the meantime?)

Travail au noir, (Working in black,)

mariage blanc, (sham marriage,)

en endant, (in the meantime,)

c'est pas marrant… (it's not fun…)

Although hardly uplifting, the song demonstrates how the March allowed for critical collective reflection by the sans-papiers on daily routines. The recurrence of the phrase "en attendant" communicates the liminality of undocumented life. In the diary entry for that day, the reporter describes that "*While walking, the memories come up,* because many of us have traversed several countries by foot in order to arrive in Belgium".[29] Indeed, fellow marchers shared their migration experience walking side by side. Younes, for example, told me how it took him three attempts to reach Europe.[30] During the first attempt, he was locked up in prison in Greece for six months. The second time, he was detained in Switzerland before being deported. He only reached Belgium after a long drive hidden in the back of a truck via Turkey and Greece. For people like Younes, the march symbolised his migration journey and represented a first step in a politicising process.

Specific lived experiences during the March also inspired activists to rethink their strategy down the line. During the march, Anouar already highlighted how he felt that cooking and distributing food could be an alternative way to generate solidarity for the cause:[31]

> There are actions that are symbolic … that can have a big impact. When the sans-papiers prepare food for others, irrespective of their situation, documented or undocumented, Belgians or people from a different origin, this surprises people … *it is symbolic and it provides much visibility to the movement. If we do not achieve our big goals, there are always smaller things that can be done on the side that can provide an impetus for creativity*.

Five former marchers eventually put this idea into practice by starting CollectActif, an anti-food waste collective aimed at combatting "food precarity" while trying to increase solidarity with the cause of the sans-papiers, in 2014 (see Swerts and Oosterlynck 2020). This example shows how the March produced "beginners" after all, albeit in unforeseen ways.

Despite the forms of exchange and community the March had been able to forge, the coordinators considered varying levels of motivation and involvement among marchers to threaten incipient solidarity. The following entry from the Marching Diary illustrates their discontent:[32]

> It seems that some marchers do not yet know the objectives of the March! Some remind us that we do not participate in the march for tourism but to: *raise awareness, be heard, exchange as to be more creative and come up with new forms of struggle, to have greater visibility, create a national collective, organize national actions and manifestations*.

Before the March had even started, I already noticed how much importance people seemed to attribute to "being on the list" of participants. Later on, I learned that this stemmed from earlier rounds of targeted regularisations based on lists of church occupiers (also see Siméant 1998:145). The discussion about "motivation" would linger on for the next three weeks. For example, when I talked to Mohammed, he told me he was "*really* motivated, in contrast to others". When I subsequently talked to Bashir, he confided in me that "to be honest, I am on holiday here, I am not interested in the March". Similarly, Bacri told me that he had only arrived in Belgium four months ago and the March "was a good opportunity to get to know Belgium".

Solidarity among marchers was further tested when news arrived that a collective deportation of Guineans was in the works. The March's coordination seized this as an opportunity to reaffirm their solidarity with the detainees and denounce deportation policies:[33]

> While 60 people march through Belgium, determined to fight against fascist and racist policies, others suffer the consequences of this repressive policy. 30 Guineans were brought together in six prisons for foreigners, spread across Belgium … *We oppose any management of migration flows because we believe that everyone should be free to install and move wherever they want! We express our solidarity with all detained and forcibly deported migrants and in particular with the Guinean people.*

On 15 April, a Guinean tried to commit suicide in the Vottem closed detention centre. The next day, 18 Guinean undocumented migrants started a hunger strike in centre 127 bis, stating that "This is our only way to fight" and "We need to receive help from outside to continue our struggle".[34] Help came in the form of a protest by the marchers on 21 April. However, the Guineans' hunger strike called into question the inaugural performativity of the March once more.

To conclude, the performative act of the March aimed to expose the injustice of the Belgian immigration system, nurture solidarity relations and resurrect the sans-papiers movement. Yet, the limited commitment and follow-up the March generated, points towards its difficulties to institute inaugural performativity.

Institutional Receptivity (Or The Lack Thereof)

The institutional order tends to be the focal point of public denunciations as well as the main interlocutor for political demands made by undocumented activists. Disrupting the status quo requires activists to stage events that run counter to institutional logics. As Nicholls and Uitermark (2017:35) argue, governing projects are inherently incomplete since populations and practices will always exist that "escape" or "exceed" governmental rationalities. Exposing the cracks in governing projects is therefore a central goal of disruptive politics. However, Gunneflo and Selberg (2010:191) argue that non-recognition by the order raises the question whether undocumented activists' "speech comes through to us as discourse or merely noise". Paradoxically, UMS only cause disruption if and when they "appear" on the institutional radar.

Secretary of State De Block became the "most popular politician" in Flanders in 2013 because of her "tough but correct" stance that "illegal residence is not a good choice and offers no future perspective".[35] Not surprisingly, the closest the marchers would get to the Secretary of State was when they protested in front of the—closed—door of her office. The refusal to meet with protesters demonstrates the fact that the chants and speeches given by the marchers are classified as nothing but "noise".

Public visibility was another major goal that the marchers set for themselves at the outset. The media and communication team, in which I participated, was established with the aim of maximising media attention. A website was created where the call, press releases, audio fragments, videos and daily journal entries were regularly updated. Great care had been invested in ensuring that all content was made available in French and Dutch. Despite these efforts, the media coverage was limited to say the least. The article below illustrates the lack of interest from traditional media outlets:[36]

> **Solidarity march with and without papers**
>
> A "solidarity march with and without papers" is going on throughout the country this week. Its participants want to denounce migration policies "which exclude and criminalize more and more migrants and solidary people". The organisers declare to initiate a national movement against migration policies. The closing march is scheduled to take place in La Louvière on Saturday 20 April.

Regardless of the incipient solidarity and politicisation that the marchers experienced themselves, the media tended to interpret the march as a non-event.

While the March finished on 21 April, people from Guinea and Senegal were gradually being transferred to closed detention centres 127bis and Caricole in Steenokkerzeel. Rumours had it that a collective deportation would be arranged from the military airbase at Melsbroek. Activists reported that hunger strikers were subjected to violence and put into isolation during the transfer. In the end, the majority of the hunger strikers were deported and those left behind stopped their action. The last words of the deportees, as they were uttered in the presence of activists, were "We are not animals", "One day Europe will pay the price", and "We are all humans".[37]

Towards the end of May, the coordination of the March was grappling with the question of what to do next. A series of meetings organised to answer this question ended in disarray. The following internal communication by the leadership illustrates the accusations that were flying around:[38]

> It has been a long time since … we try to lead, to create something from nothing, to motivate, to encourage to express oneself talking, looking for alliances, setting up projects, contacting lawyers, spending time with the small group of marchers that remains to think *how we can give meaning to our presence in this inert movement*.

Meanwhile, a "rogue" group of Afghan rejected asylum seekers took recourse to the well-known recipe of a church occupation accompanied by a hunger strike. SPB expressed its solidarity with the hunger strikers, but also warned against uncoordinated actions:[39]

> SPB expresses its solidarity with the young hunger strikers of … Afghan undocumented migrants. We value the strong commitment of these young activists … and we understand the reasons that led them to make this courageous gesture … However, we believe that the struggle for the recognition of the rights of undocumented migrants … is a long and sinuous struggle that requires determination, patience and perseverance and an effective political organization … SPB therefore calls on all political forces, collectives and indignant citizens *to act in a unitary way to make the voice of the undocumented heard*.

The institutional receptivity for the Afghan struggle was remarkably high. As Willner-Reid (2015) describes in detail, the Afghans succeeded in drawing constant public attention in the period between September 2013 and the spring of 2014 by organising weekly sit-ins at the Rue de la Loi intersection and two marches to the hometowns of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State. Ironically, the Afghan group's rise heralded SPB's demise. SPB's half-hearted support for the Afghans dwindled when it became clear that the organisers pragmatically demanded a moratorium to deportations to Afghanistan instead of a collective regularisation. Eventually, after four years of existence, SPB announced its disintegration with a press release entitled "Once upon a time there was a collective …":[40]

> Four years ago, four undocumented people decided to relaunch a mobilization of undocumented migrants around the issue of regularization … *Since then, the law has not changed, the borders are still closed and the closed centers still full. But this collective at least had the merit of moving and denouncing in a moment when almost no one dared to reopen this question of regularization … With the little support it received, this collective was able to maintain at least the flame of hope* through demonstrations, rallies, popular assemblies, occupations, a march in Belgium and Europe … *The struggle existed before this collective, and it will continue exist afterwards*.

To conclude, the case of the March demonstrates that for undocumented activism to have disruptive effects, a minimal degree of institutional receptivity is required. In this regard, the non-responsiveness of the order can be interpreted as an act of symbolic violence that disqualified the sans-papiers' voice as "noise" (see Dikeç 2004) and defused the threat the movement posed for the status quo.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that the POP thesis too readily interprets undocumented activism as being disruptive. Such scholarship makes an outstanding contribution by signalling the emblematic nature of UMS. Yet, its rigid ontological underpinnings stand in the way of systematically analysing the complexity and lived reality of mobilisation efforts. In this paper, I have argued that the research agenda on UMS can be advanced by paying more attention to the spatial and relational conditions in which these struggles are embedded. Based on an in-depth analysis of the case of the March, I identified *collective intentionality, inaugural performativity* and *institutional receptivity* as conditions of disruptive politics that merit further scrutiny. While these conditions hinge on UMS, these findings can

possibly be extended to the struggles of other stigmatised or illegalised groups like the homeless, the unemployed, disenfranchised immigrant youth or the sexually "different".

First, *collective intentionality* captures the spatial and relational conditions that are necessary to rally undocumented activists around a shared set of disruptive "We-intentions" (see Searle 1995). For marginalised subjects like the undocumented, the status quo stands for social and spatial isolation. While many undocumented migrants aspire change, substantial work needs to be done at the level of people's subjectivities to craft shared disruptive intentions. The crafting of collective intentionality tends to take place in the context of autonomous safe spaces where activists debate about competing visions and aspirations. This study revealed that crafting collective intentions relies on the presence of strong leadership and organisational infrastructure. Despite the drafting of a marching call and countless preparatory meetings, reaching consensus about their dissensus proved hard for the marchers. Disagreement also lingered about how to interpret the urgency of the situation and, conversely, how one should intervene. Collective intentionality thus forms a crucial step in the formation of subjects capable of acting.

Second, *inaugural performativity* refers to the ability of an act to establish itself as an innovative, yet replicable template or reference point in a series of protest events. The March proved inaugural as it produced—fragile—feelings of solidarity and community among marchers. Being collectively on the move set in motion processes of personal reflection and politicisation for certain marchers. This demonstrates that inaugural acts can help to "produce" disruptive intentions and subjects capable of acting these intentions out. As an event, however, the March turned out to be less of a source of inspiration for future actions than initially hoped. This reveals an inherent tension between interpretations that consider acts disruptive *in and of itself* and the ruptures and disruptive ripple effects caused by these acts. In addition, this finding should encourage us to take the temporality of disruption into consideration. While acts may momentarily "interrupt" the order, their disruptive effects may wane when the ruthlessness of everyday life asserts itself again. Moreover, the example of CollectActif (see Swerts and Oosterlynck 2020) illustrates that stopping the analysis when the natural course of action is completed can prevent us from seeing the unintended consequences acts produce.

Third, *institutional receptivity*, or the ways in which the institutional order responds to the acts posed by undocumented activists, should be an integral part of the analysis, rather than an afterthought. Even the complete absence of any response, as was the case with the March, provides valuable lessons about the ability of institutional actors to "ignore movements to death". The findings indicate that state and media institutions treated the March as yet another instance of "noise" coming from the margins. The brutal repression that accompanied the collective deportation of the Guinean hunger strikers serves to remind us that even more radical acts can be doomed to fail. This raises the question of whether it is fair to label acts or acting subjects disruptive if institutional logics do not get unsettled or transformed in the process. Paradoxically, this finding highlights the

importance of a minimal degree of recognition by interlocutors representing the order, for disruption to take place.

To conclude, the case of the March appears to confirm Rancière's (1999:139) statement that (disruptive) "politics, in its specificity, is rare". Unlike critical scholars inspired by his work, I argue that this rarity can in fact be explained and should be investigated. The situated perspective presented here offers pointers to how we can account for why certain immigrant protests have disruptive effects while others do not. It also allows us to understand why it is that, despite experimentation and repeated failure, undocumented activists are able to keep their disruptive dreams alive. Because history teaches us that when collective intentionality, inaugural performativity and institutional receptivity *do* align, not only disruption but also transformation enters the realm of the possible.

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank David Featherstone, the anonymous referees at *Antipode* and the participants in the session on "Undocumented Activism, Citizenship, and the Political" at the 2018 American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting for their excellent feedback. I would also like to thank Erik Swyngedouw, Walter Nicholls and Eva Swyngedouw for their indispensable support throughout.

Notes

[1] The Little Castle (or, in Dutch, Klein Kasteeltje), is the oldest and largest refugee centre in Belgium. It is located in the centre of the city of Brussels and therefore represents a visible marker of refugee presence in the urban landscape. Up until 2018—and, hence, also during the time of observation—the Little Castle functioned as a regular refugee reception centre. In the close vicinity of the centre, undocumented day labourers tend to gather on street corners to be picked up by potential employers.

[2] https://www.hln.be/nieuws/binnenland/de-block-heeft-geen-begrip-voor-hongerstakers~ab82dff2/

[3] Collective intentionality and inaugural performativity are conceived as conditions internal to movements that respectively correspond with the level of the acting subject and the act. Institutional receptivity in turns constitutes an external condition that potentially affects the disruptive effect of migrant protests events.

[4] Italics here and in all other quotes in this paper were added by the author.

[5] It speaks for itself that certain forms of institutional receptivity can also lead to institutional actors to co-opt or contain the disruptive potential of UMS. This is why we need to pay particular attention to forms of receptivity that destabilize, unsettle and provoke institutional logics.

[6] These institutional actors can comprise of both governmental (state agencies, ministries, bureaucracies, elected officials) and non-governmental (civil society, professional organisations, labour unions, companies, the media) actors.

[7] Although the March thus represents a relatively "failed" case of political disruption, it nevertheless allows us to theorise and learn lessons about the conditions that might produce political disruption.

[8] https://marchebelgique.wordpress.com/

[9] Interview Abas, SPB.

[10] Recorded meetings, March.

[11] Meeting notes, 24 November 2012.

[12] Recorded meetings, March.

[13] In this respect, it is worth adding that after SPB's demise, both the Afghan community and the Guinean community took a leading position in the sans-papiers movement. AS described in the paper, the Collectif of Afghans was able to capture the national spotlight between the summer of 2013 and December 2013. Likewise, members of undocumented communities originating from countries hit by the Ebola crisis like Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia joined forces in the "Collectif Ebola" in 2015 to demand regularization. This group, which would continue to occupy buildings in various Brusselian municipalities in the subsequent years, would later become known as "Collectif Voix des Sans-Papiers" (Collective Voice of the Sans-Papiers).
[14] Preparatory meeting notes.
[15] https://marchebelgique.wordpress.com/le-parcours-de-la-marche/appel-de-la-marche/
[16] Migrant Front meeting invitation.
[17] Internal SPB e-mail conversation.
[18] Radio Panik emission on the March.
[19] Recorded meetings, March.
[20] Ethnographic fieldnotes.
[21] Recorded meetings, March.
[22] Ethnographic fieldnotes.
[23] Recorded meetings, March.
[24] Interview Abas, SPB.
[25] Marching diary, 12 April 2013.
[26] Ethnographic fieldnotes.
[27] https://marchebelgique.wordpress.com/charte-de-la-marche-de-solidarite-avec-et-sans-papiers/
[28] Marching diary, 10 April 2013.
[29] Marching diary, 9 April 2013.
[30] Ethnographic fieldnotes.
[31] Recorded meetings, March.
[32] Marching diary, 7 April 2013.
[33] Press release, 12 April 2013.
[34] http://www.gettingthevoiceout.org/collectieve-uitzetting-naar-guinee-en-senegal2404/
[35] https://www.vrt.be/vrtnws/nl/2013/03/24/maggie_de_block_ispopulairstevlaamsepolitica-1-1583628/
[36] The Vif / L'Express, 12 April 2013.
[37] http://www.gettingthevoiceout.org/collectieve-uitzetting-naar-guinee-en-senegal2404/
[38] Internal e-mail conversation, March coordination.
[39] SPB press release, 31 May 2013.
[40] SPB press release, 21 March 2014.

References

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

Balibar É (2013 [1997]) What we owe to the Sans-papiers (trans J F McGimsey and E Doucette). *Transversal* http://eipcp.net/transversal/0313/balibar/en (last accessed 24 April 2019)

Benford R D and Snow D A (2000) Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611–639

Beveridge R and Koch P (2017) The post-political trap? Reflections on politics, agency, and the city. *Urban Studies* 54(1):31–43

Burawoy M (1998) The extended case method. *Sociological Theory* 16(1):4–33

Butler J (1988) Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal* 40(4):519–531

Chauvin S and Garcés-Mascareñas B (2012) Beyond informal citizenship: The new moral economy of migrant illegality. *International Political Sociology* 6(3):241–259

CGVS (2013) "Jaarverslag." Commissariaat-generaal voor de Vluchtelingen en de Staatlozen
Darling J (2017) Forced migration and the city: Irregularity, informality, and the politics of presence. *Progress in Human Geography* 41(2):178–198
Dikeç M (2004) Voices into noises: Ideological determination of unarticulated justice movements. *Space and Polity* 8(2):191–208
Dikeç M (2013) Beginners and equals: Political subjectivity in Arendt and Rancière. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38(1):78–90
Dikeç M (2015) *Space, Politics, and Aesthetics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
Dikeç M (2017) Disruptive politics. *Urban Studies* 54(1):49–54
Enriquez L E (2014) "Undocumented and citizen students unite": Building a cross-status coalition through shared ideology. *Social Problems* 61(2):155–174
Featherstone D (2003) Spatialities of transnational resistance to globalization: The maps of grievance of the Inter-Continental Caravan. *Transaction of the Institute of British Geographers* 28(4):404–421
Featherstone D (2005) Towards the relational construction of militant particularisms: Or why the geographies of past struggles matter for resistance to neoliberal globalisation. *Antipode* 37(2):250–271
Featherstone D (2012) *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism*. London: Zed
Flyvbjerg B (2006) Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2):219–245
Galindo R (2012) Undocumented and unafraid: The DREAM Act 5 and the public disclosure of undocumented status as a political act. *Urban Review* 44:589–611
Graeber D (2009) *Direct Action: An Ethnography*. Oakland: AK Press
Gunneflo M and Selberg N (2010) Discourse or merely noise? Regarding the disagreement on undocumented migrants. *European Journal of Migration and Law* 12(2):173–191
Houston D and Pulido L (2002) The work of performativity: Staging social justice at the University of Southern California. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20 (4):401–424
Isin E F (2002) *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
Isin E F (2008) Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E F Isin and G M Nielsen (eds) *Acts of Citizenship* (pp 15–43). London: Zed
Jasper J (1998) The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements. *Sociological Forum* 13(3), 397–424
Juris J S (2007) Practising militant ethnography with the Movement for Global Resistance (MRG) in Barcelona. In S Shukaitis and D Graeber (eds) *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations, Collective Theorization* (pp 164–178). Oakland: AK Press
Karaliotas L (2017) Staging equality in Greek squares: Hybrid spaces of political subjectification. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41(1):54–69
Lambert S and Swerts T (2019) From sanctuary to welcoming cities: Negotiating the social inclusion of undocumented migrants in Liège, Belgium. *Social Inclusion* 7(4):90–99
Laureys D (2013) *Solidarité avec les sans-papiers: Plus de vingt ans de mobilisation à Liège*. Seraing: IHOES
Lee C (2010) Bare life, interstices, and the third space of citizenship. *Women's Studies Quarterly* 38(1):57–81
Leitner H, Sheppard E and Sziarto K M (2008) The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33(2):157–172
Menjívar C and Abrego L (2012) Legal violence: Immigration law and the lives of Central American immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 117(5):1380–1421
Mensink S (2019) Prefiguration, strategic interaction, and political belonging in undocumented migrant and solidarity movements. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46 (7):1223–1239
McNevin A (2011) *Contesting Citizenship: Irregular Migrants and New Frontiers of the Political*. New York: Columbia University Press

Mouffe C (2005) *On the Political*. Abingdon: Routledge
Nicholls W J (2013a) *The DREAMers: How the Undocumented Youth Movement Transformed the Immigrant Rights Debate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
Nicholls W J (2013b) Making undocumented immigrants into a legitimate political subject: Theoretical observations from the United States and France. *Theory, Culture, and Society* 30(3):82–107
Nicholls W (2014) From political opportunities to niche-openings: The dilemmas of mobilizing for immigrant rights in inhospitable environments. *Theory and Society* 43(1), 23–49
Nicholls W, Miller B and Beaumont J (eds) (2013) *Spaces of Contention: Spatialities and Social Movements*. Aldershot: Ashgate
Nicholls W J and Uitermark J (2017) *Cities and Social Movements: Immigrant Right Activism in the United States, France, and the Netherlands, 1970–2015*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell
Polletta F (1998) "It was like a fever": Narrative and identity in social protest. *Social Problems* 45(2):137–159
Rancière J (1999) *Disagreement*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press
Rancière J (2001) Ten theses on politics. *Theory and Event* 5(3):1–11
Rancière J (2010) *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. London: Continuum
Rosello M (1998) Representing illegal immigrants in France: From clandestins to l'affaire des sans-papiers de Saint-Bernard. *Journal of European Studies* 28(1), 137–151
Searle J (1995) *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press
Siméant J (1998) *La Cause des Sans Papiers*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po
Snow D A, Rochford E B, Worden S K and Benford R D (1986) Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464–481
Swerts T (2015) Gaining a voice: Storytelling and undocumented youth activism in Chicago. *Mobilization* 20(3):345–360
Swerts T (2017a) Creating space for citizenship: The liminal politics of undocumented activism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41(3):379–395
Swerts T (2017b) Marching beyond borders: Non-citizen citizenship and transnational undocumented activism in Europe. In N Sigona and R Gonzales (eds) *Within and Beyond Citizenship: Borders, Membership, and Belonging* (pp 126–142). New York: Routledge
Swerts T (2018) "Check your privilege": Cross-status alliances in the DREAM movement. In V Lawson and S Elwood (eds) *Relational Poverty Politics: (Un)Thinkable Forms, Struggles, Possibilities* (pp 166–182). Athens: University of Georgia Press
Swerts T (2020) Power and empowerment. In H F Wilson and J Darling (eds) *Research Ethics for Human Geography: A Handbook for Students*. London: Sage
Swerts T and Oosterlynck S (2020) In search of recognition: The political ambiguities of undocumented migrants' active citizenship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1772044
Swyngedouw E (2009) The antinomies of the postpolitical city: In search of a democratic politics of environmental production. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33(3):601–620
Swyngedouw E (2011) Interrogating post-democracy: Reclaiming egalitarian political spaces. *Political Geography* 30(7):370–380
Swyngedouw E (2014) Where is the political? Insurgent mobilisations and the incipient "return of the political". *Space and Polity* 18(2):122–136
Swyngedouw E (2018) *Promises of the Political*. Cambridge: MIT Press
Tarrow S (1996) States and opportunities: The political structuring of social movements. In D McAdam, J D McCarthy and M N Zald (eds) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements* (pp 41–61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Tilly C (1984) Les origines du repertoire de l'action collective contemporaine en France et en Grande-Bretagne. *Vingtième Siecle* 4:89–108
Van Reekum R and Schinkel W (2017) Drawing lines, enacting migration: Visual prostheses of bordering Europe. *Public Culture* 29(1):27–51

Willner-Reid M (2015) Emergence and decline of a protest movement: The anti-deportation campaign for Afghan asylum seekers in Belgium. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 28(4):505–522

Žižek S (2008) *In Defense of Lost Causes*. London: Verso