

2015-06

# Britons abroad or European citizens? The negotiation of (trans)national space and citizenship by British migrants in France

Ferbrache, F

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/3967>

---

10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.03.021

Geoforum

Elsevier BV

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

## 1. Introduction

Migration and mobility are important components of citizenship (Cresswell 2006a 2006b, Yarwood 2014): a citizen's identity is related to the spaces that he or she can move through, rather than just an association with a fixed territory (Ho 2008, Staeheli *et al.* 2012). Citizenship grants people a right to be mobile and, in turn, the privileges and duties afforded to them as they move across and between spaces. Citizens of the European Union (EU), for example, are allowed to move between, reside and work in its constituent states. These rights not only define EU citizenship but serve to strengthen the political concept of the EU by recognising a single form of citizenry in addition to several located in different nation-states (Fligstein 2008, Rother and Nebe 2009). Supporters of closer union advocate that those who avail themselves of the right of free movement will strengthen European unification through their everyday lives, as enthusiasts and actors of a borderless Union:

Enjoyment of permanent residence by Union citizens who have chosen to settle long term in the host member state would strengthen the feeling of Union citizenship and is a key element in promoting social cohesion, which is one of the fundamental objectives of the Union. (Directive 2004/38/EC)

EU citizenship and the mobility it confers can be understood as part of a broader political project to legitimise the European integration project through socio-cultural strategies. Citizenship and mobility may thus contribute to new forms of political space (Cresswell 2006a).

Yet citizenship is not only defined by *de jure* terms. Staeheli *et al.* (2012) argue that the formal rules and regulations that define citizenship, as well as everyday practices that constitute belonging to a particular state or community, are negotiated in *de facto* terms. 'Ordinary citizenship' is conceived as the ways "in which law and ordering are normalized through daily life" (p.640) and then "'located' or 'mapped' at different sites" (p.641). An emphasis on laws and social norms entwined with routine practices implies a sense of order to citizens' daily lives but mobility is often conceived as disruptive to such norms (Aradau *et al.* 2010). While mobility may be used in an effort to create new political spaces, such as the EU, it is not a foregone conclusion that citizens will necessarily align themselves as members of these places.

In order to understand more fully how mobility contributes to citizenship, it is important to consider how migration links citizens to a web of multi-scalar engagements and interconnected places (Painter 2002, Closs Stephens and Squire 2012). In this paper, we use Staeheli *et al.*'s (2012) concept of 'ordinary citizenship' as a starting point to examine the relationship between mobility, citizenship and political space. Specifically, we use a case study of Britons living in France to examine how legal frameworks, normative structures and everyday activities help to shape their

identities and experiences as citizen subjects of the EU. In doing so, we address three questions. First, we attempt to distinguish the relative significance of political-legal frameworks and everyday activities to transnational citizenship. We examine how migrants negotiate formal structures and informal practices in relation to different territorial scales. Second, we question how migrants form their own subjectivities to identify themselves as citizens, the places they associate with their citizenship and how these impact on multiple senses of belonging. Finally, we question whether new forms of EU citizenship have emerged, at what scales, and the extent to which these might legitimise further call for citizenship as underpinning formation of a closer Union. In doing so, we argue for a reconsideration of local and community as spaces of citizenship that are linked to the principle of domicile (Bauder 2014), and for a broader conceptualisation of 'ordinary citizenship' that acknowledges the messiness of citizenry spatialities and modalities that stretch and morph on a daily basis.

In the next section we review the resurgence of interest in geography of citizenship studies, introducing the different ways in which it has been understood and conceptualised, and what this means in terms of the promise of citizenship for the European integration project. Our case study population is then introduced in the third section and, in section four, analysed through the lens of 'ordinary citizenship' and informed by other geographical literatures to examine the legal, normative and everyday practices that shape migrants' senses of who they are.

## **2. Everyday Citizenship and Mobility**

Citizenship is enjoying a resurgence of interest in geography (Bauder 2014, Staeheli *et al.* 2012, Yarwood 2014) and is recognised as something that has significance to people and places above, below and beyond the framework of the nation state (Desforges *et al.* 2005, Staeheli 2008). It has been speculated that mobile populations are contributing to new forms of transnational citizenship (Ong 1999, Castles and Davidson 2000, Desforges *et al.* 2005, Ho 2008, Castles and Miller 2009, Staeheli 2011), reflected in Bauder's (2014 p.93) comment that "citizenship...associated with bounded territory, seems ill equipped to accommodate populations that are mobile and transcend the geographical boundaries of these territories". Such views have challenged the notion that exclusive belonging to a nation-state, and its associated set of legal rights and responsibilities (Marshall 1950 [1992]) is the only or main reference point for citizens. Instead, ideas of post-national (Soysal 1994, Painter 2002) and flexible citizenship (Ong 1999) have drawn attention to a range of spatial scales in which individuals hold simultaneous membership of political communities at local, regional and supranational levels.

Yet the nation state continues to play an important role in the regulation, definition and conferral of citizenship (Isin and Turner 2007). As Rubenstein (2003 p.256) reminds us, "while there has been considerable interest in the sociological, political and cultural aspects of citizenship, its legal

foundations cannot be forgotten". The bestowal of *de jure* citizenship, together with the rights and duties associated with it, is usually conferred by birth within the territory of a state (*jus soli* or 'law of the soil') or through family or ethnic descent (*jus sanguinis* or 'law of the blood') (Samers 2010).

Recent work by geographers has made important contributions to reconciling these tensions. Staeheli *et al.* (2012) discuss how citizenship is negotiated according to legal frameworks of the state as well as normative ideas linked to justice and care that are played out by citizen-subjects in particular spaces. They draw these ideas together through the concept of 'ordinary citizenship', which "fuses legal structures, normative orders, and the practices and experiences of individuals, social groups and communities" (p.631). These interactions are played out through the "behaviours, relationships and interactions of daily life" in a range of spatial settings including schools, homes, shops, nurseries and community groups that help to establish migrants as visible and valuable citizens in wider society. Everyday activities and performances allow 'ordinary citizens' to recognise and negotiate their citizenship in relation to wider judicial-political structures that seek to define it. The daily practices of citizenship are understood as performances that are experiential and negotiated forms of belonging pertaining to socio-cultural dimensions of citizenship as much as political formations (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2006, Dickinson *et al.* 2008). According to Dickinson *et al.* (2008 p.104), geographies of everyday citizenship are "characterized by routinized 'complex systems [which] generate both systematic orders and open, creative events.'" Such approaches have been successful in unpacking the agency of citizenship, for example through daily practices of living within a community and engaging with others (Staeheli 2008), and the idea that belonging is also about one's feelings and emotional attachments (Ho 2008 2009). Socio-cultural approaches to citizenship (Miller 2002, Jackson 2010) that draw on a wide variety of modes of belonging have emerged as prominent aspects of geographical approaches to citizenship (Yarwood 2014).

Staeheli *et al.* (2012) discuss their ideas in the context of migration and, in particular, where the legal status of a citizen is disputed. Their ideas are supported by a plethora of studies that have examined how immigrants must negotiate their status as citizens through legal-judicial structures and daily practices (Al Sharmani 2010, McIlwaine and Bermúdez 2011, Elmhirst 2011). These reveal citizenship to be messy; negotiated on a daily basis (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2006); affective (Ho 2008 2009) and often out of sync and rhythm with nationalised norms (Favell 2008b 2010). For example, Bosco *et al.* (2011) traced how Latina immigrant women in Southern California work in a Neighbourhood Action Group to provide support for those attempting to gain US citizenship, advocate community needs and provide community services. As the authors point out, their position as citizens is contradictory: they are pushed out of public space as a result of their uncertain status as immigrants, yet they choose to participate in community affairs. We might refer to these as 'acts of citizenship' (Isin 2008), which draw attention to the way that individuals constitute their identities and belonging through creative activities that rupture the normalities of daily life and challenge social and political orders.

Yet not all migrants seek to challenge the established order. Some use citizenship in a strategic way to avail themselves of different economic and lifestyle opportunities (Ong 1999; Favell 2008b). For others, citizenship remains in the background; unrecognised until it becomes challenged. For example, in her analysis of lifestyle migrants to rural France, neither Benson (2011a) nor her respondents refer explicitly to citizenship and, instead, note the importance of achieving an 'authentic' French lifestyle. Citizenship occurs in the background, is rarely broached and yet allows migrants to seek out new places and lifestyles. Compare their experiences to those trapped in makeshift camps at Sangatte (Rigby et al 2012) Whether migrants are conscious of it or not, legal frameworks of citizenship contextualise how migrants live out their daily lives.

In this paper we extend the empirical scope of Staeheli *et al.*'s (2012) ordinary citizenship by applying it to elite groups of migrants, specifically British migrants to France. In doing so we extend work on these groups of people (e.g. Buller and Hoggart 1994, Scott 2004 2006 2007, Beaverstock 2005 2011, Drake and Collard 2008, Benson 2009 2010 2011a 2011b) by considering the (in)significance of citizenship to their movements and daily lives. Examining citizenship through the framework of 'ordinary citizenship', we attempt to illustrate the role of normative ordering in the lives and experiences of intra-EU migrants. In doing so we also draw further attention to more cultural conceptions of citizenship that may be less ordered in terms of informal and active membership within less territorially defined communities. Politically this is important for, as Bauder (2014) suggests, participation at sub-national level should lead to the recognition of citizens through the principle of domicile rather than the *jus sanguinis* or *jus soli* principles frequently applied by states. Everyday forms of citizenship and transnational mobility can challenge existing political spaces and are integral to the formation of new ones (Ehrkamp 2006, Fligstein 2008, Ho 2008). These forms of citizenship have been particularly important to, and a central assumption of, the EU's political project to create "an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe" as stated in the 1957 Treaty of Rome. The following section explores this context.

### *2.1 The Case of the European Union*

The Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) 1957, defined the European integration project as a political goal towards achieving an "ever closer union among the peoples of Europe". Over time, the European project has taken shape through various policies that have strengthened economic and then societal and cultural interactions (Wise and Gibb 1993, Shore 2000, Fligstein 2008). In 1992, the Treaty on European Union (TEU) gave support for transnational EU citizenship:

Citizenship of the Union is hereby established. Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union (Article 8 (1)).

EU citizenship is foremost conceptualised as a scaling up of national citizenship models to supranational status (Aradau *et al.* 2010) - a *de jure* understanding fostering a legal link between individuals and the EU 'state', and bestowing a set of rights for those eligible within distinct boundaries. This is a new form of multi-scalar citizenship that exists alongside, and not in place of, nation-state citizenship. It provides a set of political rights that includes the right to free movement, settlement and employment across the EU, the right to vote in European elections, and the right to consular projection from other member state embassies when abroad (Hoe-Yeong 2013).

Mobility is deeply entwined within these rights. The principle of free movement was introduced in a regional context in 1951 by the European Coal and Steel Community seeking to facilitate recruitment of qualified coal and steel workers between its six member states. In 1957, the Treaty establishing the EEC affirmed a more generalised right for workers to accept offers of employment in another member state and to reside and remain there following employment. Since then, the development of free movement rights has been accompanied by a shift in emphasis from the free movement of workers to the free movement of all member state citizens. Favell and Recchi (2009) charted the steps taken to advance this process, including the introduction of EU citizenship, which Recchi (2008 p.205) described as 'the single most important constitutive policy addressing cross-state mobility included in the EU Treaties'. Significantly, transnational mobility is now a central pillar of EU citizenship whereby:

*Citizenship of the Union confers on every citizen of the Union a primary and individual right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States (Directive 2004/38/EC).*

Thus, EU Citizenship is largely defined by mobility (Cresswell 2006a 2006b, Aradau *et al.* 2010) and an ability to move between places and claim universal rights within them (Marshall 1950 [1992], Cresswell 2009). According to Recchi (2008 p.205), EU citizenship "glorifies free movement as a first-rank, generalized individual right".

While migration took place within Europe before the establishment of a politically integrated space, European institutional and legal structures have made movement, residency and settlement easier between member states. The right to free movement entails "the right not to encounter the administrative authorities of member states" (Guild 2006 p.15), while more specifically, "mobile citizens are exonerated from the duty to ask for residence permits" (Recchi 2008 p.206). Accordingly, EU provisions for free mobility can be conceived in terms of creating a supranational framework of citizenship for daily life (Favell and Recchi 2009). Subsequently, "new forms of migration" (King 2002, Strüver 2005) have been established and the category of intra-EU migrant

generated through a spatial vision of mobility where "giant steps have been taken in the direction of turning cross state movements in the EU from international to internal migration" (Recchi 2008 p.27, see also Rumford 2008).

Prioritising mobility as an essential part of EU citizenship, Aradau *et al.* (2010) called for accounts of citizenship that focus on acts that create it anew, where "regardless of status or substance, subjects constitute themselves as citizens" (p.955). The focus on acts has scaled down the methodological focus on EU citizenship from politically institutionalised settings to the everyday lives of mobile citizens through, for example, business networks (Fligstein 2008), political participation (Collard 2008; Favell 2010), and European-wide markets for study and employment (King and Ruiz-Gelices, 2003, Favell 2008b, Wilson 2011, Kuhn 2012). However, these examples focus on temporary moves, and it is understood that migrants moving to take up primary residence in another EU member state provide more nuanced insight to contemporary forms of citizenship (Favell and Recchi 2009), which remain, to a large extent, based on a sense of stability through long-term residency (Bauder 2014).

Supporting this perspective, Favell (2010) argued that intra-EU migrants play out their citizenry status "as consumers, neighbours, public service users and cultural entrepreneurs". Similarly, Osler and Starkey (2005) argued that citizenship is defined through practices of engagement and dwelling within a community. Such work has demonstrated that forms of everyday and cultural citizenships are just as important as the judicial-political frameworks that enable them within the EU, and empirical research into the daily routines, processes and practices of EU citizens has become an integral component of studies seeking to understand, what Milward (1997) terms, the 'social bases' of European integration - the social foundations underlying political and legal construction of the EU (Fligstein 2008).

Cultural forms of citizenship, identity and belonging are important in this context (Miller 2002, Jackson 2010), as are interactions between citizens and their communities (Staheli 2008). Among such studies that focus on intra-EU migration, Strüver (2005) found that regular cross-border movements of Dutch citizens living in the German border town of Kranenburg affected their sense of belonging and spatial identities that became transnational rather than singularly national, as residents continuously negotiated between the two. Elsewhere, Benson (2011b) demonstrated that migrants' mobile practices and their expectations of mobility contributed towards the perceived success of their new lives. These:

included but were not limited to, physical, imaginative and communicative travel. As they travelled from their homes to those of their friends living locally and more distantly, as they walked around the local market, and as they sent an email or picked up the telephone to call

their families, it became clear that mobilities were an important part of how they experienced their new lives abroad. (Benson 2011b p.228)

Examining these migrants through the lens of lifestyle migration (O'Reilly and Benson 2009), Benson prioritised migrant subjectivities over the broader contexts in which they moved, for example in terms of the formal and institutional settings through which legalised relationships of citizenship are grounded (Oliver 2011). Other work has examined more closely migrant and state interactions (Recchi 2008) through, for example, welfare and health care rights, particularly for retired migrants (Dwyer 2001, Ackers and Dwyer 2002, Dwyer and Papadimitriou 2006, Favell 2008b), and voting (Collard 2010, Favell 2010). Together, the scope of these reveal the way that daily lives are negotiated within and around state legislation, as well as the significance of everyday cultural lives and spaces in the formation of new EU citizenship.

In this paper, we complement such literature by applying the idea of 'ordinary citizenship' to combine legal state structures with normative everyday practices and personalised cultural experiences of migrants. We also seek to move beyond the sense of order to examine how one might conceive of the more irregular and messy aspects of citizenship negotiation. In doing so, we examine how daily lives and cultural interactions are more significant to people's identities as citizens and, perhaps, EU citizens. Here, we also consider the extent to which these experiences legitimise the EU argument for citizenship as the basis of a deeper political Union. While Favell (2008a p.499) identified the need for "a great deal more data, from much more varied sources, about what *being* and *doing* Europe is", Yarwood (2014 p.57) acknowledged "the need for empirical work on the daily lives of migrants to understand better the nature and impact of transnational citizenship and mobilities on citizen identities". In response, we continue by focusing on British migrants living in France.

### **3. Britons in France<sup>1</sup>**

It is not particularly new to find Britons living in France (Thorold 2008). What is more recent is the permanency of their stay and the rise in number of those making France their primary residence (Ferbrache 2011a). This stability may point to the significance of EU legislation and the right of British people to live and settle in another EU state. At the same time, evidence from other studies demonstrates that many British people are able to fulfil lifestyle choices by living in France (Buller & Hoggart 1994, Drake and Collard 2008, Geoffrey 2008, Benson 2009 2011a, Teindas 2009). Taken together, this would suggest that some British migrants in France are successfully living out the

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Britons' in this paper are defined as legal citizens in relation to the nation-state. This reflects the importance of relationships developed in place, the methodological nationalism that had underpinned predominant societal and academic understandings of citizenship, and respondents' positionality. In doing so, we risk implying 'Britons', 'British' and 'France' as homogenous categories so use these labels primarily as simplified organising devices.

forms of 'ordinary citizenship' offered by the EU. The implications of citizenship for political and social progress of the European integration project legitimise closer examination of the quotidian lives and in-depth experiences of Britons as intra-EU migrants (Painter 2002, Favell and Guiraudon 2011).

This paper specifically focuses on the Midi-Pyrénées region of South West France (Figure 1), which experienced growth in the arrival of Britons and other northern Europeans from 1980 onwards. Between 2001 and 2006, over 36 per cent of in-migrants came from the UK, raising estimates of the British population in the region to over 12,000 (INSEE 2005, Dugot, Laborderie and Taulelle 2008)<sup>2</sup>. The paper draws on interviews with fifty-three British migrants in this region who were recruited through a variety of different activities and spaces, including websites, expatriate media, church groups, clubs, societies, events and friend-of-friend recommendations (Ferbrache 2011b). As Table 1 illustrates, interviewees ranged from 18-88 in age, constituted a range of professional backgrounds and had varying family structures. Broadly, they represented two groups of migrants identified from previous studies. First, the majority reflected lifestyle migrants who were: "relatively affluent individuals of all ages, moving either part-time or full-time to places that are meaningful because, for various reasons, they offer the potential of a better quality of life" (O'Reilly and Benson 2009; Benson 2009 2011a). Second, others had moved mainly for work-related reasons and included what Scott (2004, 2006) has referred to as professional families and bohemians. Migrants who moved predominantly for lifestyle tended to live in more rural environments (see Benson 2011a), whilst economic migrants lived mainly in Toulouse (Puzzo 2007). All arrived sometime between 1978 and 2009 to live full-time in France (all but two respondents moved to France from the UK, even if some had previously lived abroad) and forty-five after EU citizenship was introduced in 1993. However, the distinctions suggested above were sometimes blurred, as in-depth interviews revealed.

---

<sup>2</sup> Interestingly, there is little precise information available regarding the numbers of Britons residing in France; not only are they considered a transitory population (Desplanques 2008), but as intra-EU migrants able to move freely across borders, they are "too volatile for the statistical eye" (Recchi 2005 p.17). This raises questions about how mobile citizens are seen (or not) by nation-states.



Figure 1: Midi-Pyrénées region, South West France (produced by Jamie Quinn and Brian Rogers Cartographic Production Unit, University of Plymouth)

[INSERT HERE]

TABLE 1: Respondents' life conditions

Interviews were designed to focus on respondents' particular experiences of moving to and negotiating daily life in France, and to explore the spatial scales through which their lives unfolded. While the majority of respondents were interviewed individually, others participated as couples or with children present. Most interviews took place in migrants' homes and lasted between sixty and ninety minutes. Each was recorded and transcribed with pseudonyms to assure anonymity. A broad interview schedule was used to explore how Britons came to be in France; their negotiation of administrative elements such as taxation, social security, pensions and health care; their experiences of living and settling into the area; and their citizen identities. Interviews were transcribed, and the transcripts coded systematically to identify key themes. The following section sketches out the political-judicial frameworks that provided a context for movements between Britain and France, and how Britons responded to them.

#### 4. The European Union, Citizenship and Mobility

British citizens moving to live in France enacted their supranational political rights as EU citizens, yet only two respondents in our study acknowledged their moves in this way. First, Rachel recounted moving to North America with her two sons through her husband's work visa. Her mother accompanied them, and applied for her own visa, which required annual renewal. Rachel revealed how the family deliberately used EU status to negotiate their living arrangements through migration and explained how EU citizenship free movement rights shaped the family's decision to return to Europe:

*Had we remained in the USA [my mother] would have had to keep applying for a visa... So this was always hanging over our heads and [the authorities] could have turned around and said no at anytime.*

In contrast:

*When she came here, there's no problem. It's the European Union and there was no problem with her being here from a legal aspect or having to provide any kind of authentication what she was doing.*

Second, EU citizenship and its benefits were carefully considered by Kay and Jamie who, after living on a boat for several years while travelling the world, decided to buy a house and settle in Europe where they would not need to apply for visas and residence permits.

For these two families, choosing to live in Europe was a deliberate decision that acknowledged the benefits of EU citizenship. For all other participants (who moved direct to France from the UK) any significance given to EU legal frameworks underpinning their move to France tended to be assumed, at best. EU supranational frameworks were barely acknowledged and, when they emerged in discussion, tended to be portrayed in a way that revealed how unremarkable they seemed, as Helen expressed:

*I'm just a Brit that lives in France.... I know technically I am, but I think of myself as a Brit who has chosen to live in France and we're all allowed to as a European.*

Seemingly an afterthought, this explicit mention is more than Drake and Collard (2008 p.277) found among Britons in Northern France where none of their respondents "could relate their own venture to the broader framework of Europe or the concept of a European citizenship". However, Benson (2011a) only encountered migrants with a "a vague sense that they, as individuals, belonged to Europe" (p.72). In terms of acknowledging the legal EU framework underpinning migration, Britons

in the South West fitted somewhere between these two, and revealed a taken-for-granted sense and passive acknowledgement of legal frameworks of citizenship to the process of individual free movement.

As a legal status that seemed to become evident when migrants stepped beyond the limit of its territorial boundaries, it became increasingly clear as research unfolded that Britons assumed, rather than failed to recognise, their EU status. This emerged as Britons revealed their (largely unfulfilled) expectations of what the supranational framework meant for them as they moved from Briton to France. For example, some believed that their EU status defined how they would be treated. As Kay claimed: "we're the EU and provided for as a European citizen". This reveals the blurring between two types of constitutional and legal practices defining citizenship and which Staeheli *et al.* (2012) argued, overlap in everyday life: rules specifying who is a member, and rules defining how those members are treated. In this example, the two distinctions merge through assumptions about the ease with which Britons will be able to live in France on the basis that they are EU citizens. For example, Henry described how he assumed that "everything works on an English basis around Europe. It doesn't... it's a different country", or like Rita:

*we assumed with all this free movement in Europe that...[there] would have been like a reciprocal arrangement with the UK, but it turned out that once [we] started to make enquiries that no, that wasn't the case.*

When it became clear to migrants that moving to France did not relate to a broader Europeanisation of administration, negotiations had to be conducted at national level to deal with a different political system. As one respondent expressed:

*The EC has these strange little international frontiers so there are all sorts of little hurdles you have to jump over. It's just part of the mechanics of trying to live in two places at once, the rules are there and you just have to go with that.*

Benson (2011a p.76) referred to this situation as a tension for Britons as "intra-European migrants free to move while their rights and entitlements remained bounded to place". By conflating EU membership with confusion about the way things worked in Europe, what was often taken for granted in terms of EU citizenship was quickly replaced through alignment with national political systems. In this way, it is perhaps unsurprising that few Britons acknowledged their EU status, as the EU failed to meet expectations for the few migrants who anticipated more, and seemingly brought them minimal benefit as they settled into life in France. 'Ordinary citizenship' helps us to make sense of this complexity and confusion, suggesting that alternative norms and values are often used alongside legal frameworks. For these Britons, while EU free movement rights were

normalised into migration moves, the legislative apparatus of the national political system took primary position for migrants adapting to life in France, as the next section examines.

#### **4.1 National Citizens?**

While the majority of migrants found their identities as EU citizens difficult to acknowledge, and in other ways unfitting as a legislative framework for daily life, norms were rationalised and the national state emerged as the principal scale for organising official affairs. For the majority of migrants, this meant aligning with a French legislative framework. As Diane explained, "We're not British resident anymore, we chose to be resident and domiciled in France. We've changed everything: tax, social security, insurance, car registration, banks, health care". Sue, similarly "As soon as you enter the country you're meant to be registered for tax...you have to be registered with the right people". For these Britons, moving to France was something that needed to be reflected in the orientation of their administrative lives and often, as Diane noted, with accompanying detachment from the UK. This was sometimes expressed as a reciprocal and moral responsibility: "if you come here then you do as the Romans do and you pay in the system" (Steve).

While participants did not refer explicitly to citizenship, they spoke about rights relating to *de jure* citizenship, but also to a broader set of ideas that analysts have previously connected to formal belonging of a national state territory. These included, but were not limited to, taxation, health care, pension, other social security benefits, (self-)employment qualifications and registration, political involvement (through voting or standing for election), car registration, driving licenses and education for children. For more than half of Britons interviewed, formal belonging was enacted through form filling, translating documents into French, and visiting or attending meetings at local administrative buildings such as the *Mairie* and *Préfecture*, as Benson (2011a) has argued. This process of organising one's affairs in line with the state (compliance with an established national order (Staehele *et al.* 2012)) was predominantly oriented towards France, even though none of these Britons were French citizens.

For a few people (particularly those who spent some time in the UK for work or otherwise), belonging continued to be negotiated with the UK:

*Because we've got our main business interests in England we stay, as far as that stuff, resident in England and not in France* (Annette and Steve).

*My residence for all purposes is the UK... My tax is in England. My dentist is in England and all sorts* (Laurence).

These attitudes are largely reflective of the way that state sovereignty continues to play an important role in the organisation of taxation, social security and welfare within the EU (Ackers and Dwyer 2004, Favell 2008a 2010). The territoriality of the nation-state is very much a material reality and also a normalised assumption for intra-EU migrants, providing insight to the norms and values that distinguish the nation-state as a principle mode of legal-political belonging for these citizens (Dijkink and Mamadouh 2006). Staeheli *et al.* (2012) argued that such norms are important in shaping citizenship affiliations, but are rarely examined. So far, this example emphasises the way in which the citizenship norm is rooted in the nation-state.

However, this British/French dichotomy of migrants' formal organisations, risks masking the way in which norms of mobility, in relation to EU free movement, were sometimes revealed through the discussion of legal frameworks. Norms associated with mobility, and conversely stability, underpinned a toing and froing between different states in terms of travel, residency and organisation of one's official affairs. This supports Ho's (2008 p.1287) assertion "that sending and receiving societies should be understood as constituting a single field of analysis, given the multiple attachments and multi-stranded social relations experienced by migrants towards their societies of origin and settlement". While Staeheli *et al.* (2012) emphasise ordered practices of citizenship leveraged through legal and everyday settings, our work highlights the significance of mobility in this process and the opportunities and confusions that can arise from being transnational.

On the one hand, misunderstandings or lack of specific knowledge about the political systems meant that migrants did not immerse themselves fully in the French system. This was often unordered as migrants did the best they could to make things work. On the other hand, some migrants used their mobility as a strategic act to negotiate and exploit differences between the UK and French systems. An example of this was illustrated by Sarah who used her physical mobility between London, her French house and other (business related) locations to mask where she carried out her work: "We've been here three and a half years and we still pay our tax in the UK, but it's not quite right". Sarah's husband confirmed: "There is sort of a way to fudge it and a way of not being totally legal". Here, norms associated with 'free' mobility, enable migrants to permeate borders and take advantage of the different conditions between different states (see Favell 2008b). Despite saving on tax by paying lower rates in the UK than they would in France, Sarah and Stuart faced repercussions and Sarah described what was at stake:

*I would like to be in the French health care system, which we're not at the moment. Stuart broke his leg and he went back to London and had a big operation but it would have been better if he'd had it [in France] and not traipsed back with a broken leg... I know [he] would rather have had it in London... It's silly to fly all that way. But if one of us got cancer and we needed regular*

*chemotherapy, then what are we going to do? That's why we need to start paying tax in France so we can get into the system.*

This example reveals identities that draw from both sides of the border as a dynamic hybrid of French and British regimes. These transnational identities are more than the sum of individual British and French parts, and imply a transnational citizenship that other authors have recognised (Strüver 2005, Ho 2008). However, it also indicates deliberate attempts to rupture normative frameworks associated with exclusivity (Isin 2008). Favell (2008b p.205) claimed that for migrants like Sarah and Stuart, "The sense of unease expressed by these young free movers gets more troubling when the question of long-term planning is raised". Such negotiations are not just for young people through:

*EU retirees are faced with a dilemma when they move to another member country, namely whether or not to declare themselves as permanently resident. The advantages and disadvantages of so doing are particularly difficult to estimate when the individual has properties in, or income from, more than one country, and when they spend substantial time in two or more countries (King et al. 2000 p.178).*

While the citizenship frameworks determine the nation-state as the principal means of orientation, the overarching EU framework provides opportunity to pick and choose, and move between both states simultaneously. Migrants thus blend norms and legal frameworks with mobility to become flexible citizens in transnational spaces. It can be a risky option with the possibility of living out of rhythm with the nation state, as demonstrated elsewhere by Favell (2008b).

Despite the EU enabling flexibility and dynamic hybrid relations that provide a less ordered alternative to essentialised notions of territorial state citizenship, the majority of Britons articulated and attempted to live by the codes of one political system. Favell (2008b) has referred to such practices as 'renationalising', but this can imply a complete *de jure* belonging over and above *de facto* residency in France, whereas Britons were non-French citizens and denied certain official rights of French territorial membership. A more appropriate term might be 'denizen' that Shearing and Wood (2003 p.407) have used to describe "non-nationals that enjoy social and civil rights but not full political inclusion". To an extent, these practices also enact Bauder's (2014) principles of citizenry through residence: British citizens are able to live in France as 'almost citizens', while retaining connections with their own nation state and maintaining them through various forms of mobility. Although citizens retain their *de jure* status with Britain, some identified in *de facto* terms with the French state and comply with it as if they were French citizens.

As this section has revealed, there is a constant negotiation and renegotiation of citizenship in relation to different scales as values and opportunities are combined, tested, ordered and sometimes unordered. This is often performed tactically to achieve personal gain. Yet, although many valued the fluidity and mobility offered by their denizenship, others sought to emancipate themselves from their status as non-French citizens. Recognising the simultaneity and diversity of the processes that order citizenship is, according to Staeheli *at el.* (2012) grounded in an understanding of citizenship as ordinary. Yet, as the following sections explores, citizenship is also constituted through more cultural processes that illuminate alternative spatialities of citizen belonging.

#### **4.2 Citizen Subjects**

EU citizenship bestows the right to stand and vote in European and local elections, however the right for non-citizens to vote in elections varies widely across Europe. Some countries, for example the Netherlands and Sweden, allow all permanent non-citizens to vote in local elections following a defined period of residence (Samers 2010). In France, however, no such rights are extended to non-citizens, thus shaping the quality and inclusiveness of democracy within communities. The inability to vote in French national elections was the main, but not the only activity, that signalled to Britons their exclusion from full citizenship. As Phillip exclaimed: "I'm paying taxes. No taxation without representation. If they're taking my money then they should take my vote as well". George felt the same:

*We think it ludicrous that we are not allowed to vote nationally because we pay our taxes, we are living here. We are governed by rules here so why shouldn't we be allowed to have our say? Give us all the benefits, let us have a say in what's going to happen in the country.*

One concerned Briton also noted that British migrants living in France might be excluded from national elections in both France and the UK, for the right to vote in UK elections expires if British citizens have lived abroad for more than 15 years. For those Britons no longer with an address in the UK, it is then not possible to claim a democratic voice at national level. This was not so much a group struggle for migrants seeking to extend membership, but an individual negotiation for these Britons. Two interviewees were in the process of applying for French citizenship, which would bestow national voting rights on them, but others were ambivalent about this and instead exercised civic rights to participate in local affairs

Formal participation at local level was found to offer Britons the chance to engage closely with the running of affairs in their residential locality and, in doing so, to participate in the French democratic sphere and attain the rights and duties associated with being a citizen (Ghose 2005).

Participation in local planning or policy decisions is a visible way in which civic and political rights can be asserted to influence local decision making (Collard 2010). Local participation included voting and standing in the *élections municipales* and subsequent involvement as part of the elected committee. Participating in this way, Wendy voted locally for the first fifteen years that she lived in her village, and then decided to stand for election as "it would be quite nice to give something back". She was surprised by "how involved you can get" with local people and projects:

*I've already started a project on playgrounds and parks... I've been put in charge of the communication with the local people. Plus they're building a new school and I've been involved with teaching so they wanted somebody [with experience].*

Wendy valued the involvement she had in local events as a means of membership within her village. Not only did she affirm *de jure* status as an EU citizen (although she never expressed this as a motivation or even as a frame of reference), Wendy also strengthened her sense of belonging to the local community. Kearns (1995) has argued how such local involvement means more than formal *de jure* citizenship, by acknowledging how western governments promote local involvement as a citizenry duty. Similar circumstances led to Hannah being invited by the *Maire* to put her name forward for election to the local council:

*there were more and more Brits coming to our particular commune and he thought, quite rightly - proportional representation and all that - that we ought to have somebody who was a Brit. on the local council.*

These two examples reveal how civic duties were exercised on the back of EU citizenship rights, despite these two women not really acknowledging their capabilities in these terms. As acknowledged above, people are more likely to engage in local communities out of self-interest and for these women, a sense of identity and belonging as members within their local community was more important to them than a nationalised framework. This not only stresses how interactions can lead to "belonging, to obligation, or to simply getting on with each other... the everyday plays a powerful role in the way citizenship is structured, practised and enacted" (Staeheli *et al.* 2012, p.640), but also emphasises how personal practices of citizenship can establish meaning within established orders. In essence, it is necessary to move beyond definitions that confine citizenship to the rules related to an institutionalised derivative of the nation-state for these are not adequate enough to capture supranational practices of citizenship that are anticipated to legitimise the European integration project among its members (Painter 2002, Aradau *et al.* 2010). For Britons participating in local level politics, their emancipation from national membership is shaped through *de facto* residency and claims to membership at the local level. Here, the principle of domicile with its emphasis on citizenship as a right for any person who is *de facto* resident of a particular

(political) territory (*municipality, commune, etc*) (Bauder 2014) helps us to understand the emplacement of certain lived experiences.

The following section expands this discussion of citizenship within local communities, and gives further consideration to the role of domicile. It does so by drawing on a broader range of socio-cultural interactions between Britons and their host societies that authors such as Favell (2008b 2010), Ho (2008), and Staeheli (2008) have recognised.

### **4.3 Daily life and citizenship**

Cultural and affective forms of citizenship were found to be influential and meaningful in migrants formation of belonging at the local level. Activities were diverse and included helping with charity organisations, participating in village event committees, playing sports, attending church, shopping and socialising in the markets, and swapping fresh fruit and vegetables with neighbours (Ferbrache 2011b). The importance of these banal activities was articulated as local level forms of emplacement and engagement with other people and can be understood as social and cultural forms of citizenship belonging.

Lily, for example, claimed a sense of belonging through assisting in a local charity shop, attending Anglican Chaplaincy services, and volunteering in a local school where she ran cookery sessions and taught English. The deliberate practices that Lily undertook to engage with the local population can be understood as legitimating an affective form of citizenship. While these were routinised in terms of occurring on a regular and sometimes frequent basis, the examples are more affective than contractual and imply a diversification to the 'ordinary' framework of citizenship towards more banal daily practices (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2006). This is demonstrated further in the following less formal example of Annie's self-identification as a local citizen.

Annie was an enthusiastic gardener and on arrival in France she transformed the field behind her house to create an extended garden with lawns, shrubs and flower beds. Eventually, her friends persuaded her to open the garden to visitors as part of a regional charity fund raising scheme. After residents from Annie's *commune* visited the garden, she was invited to participate in local decision making to select new trees for the village's main avenue. Annie described her gardening as having played an important role in fostering her sense of belonging to the local community, which was strengthened and then emplaced territorially through her civic act to help shape the local village fabric.

In these examples, 'local' is a site and scale through which Britons negotiated a particularly informal mode of citizenship based on effective residence in a place. Bauder (2014 p.92) refers to this as citizenship based on domicile whereby "a person is a citizen of the polity in which she or he

resides", rather than *jus sanguinis* or *jus soli* principles that are grounded in methodological nationalism. As such, the local represented an intuitive arena for Britons to negotiate a sense of belonging that did not rely upon their legal identification as British, French or EU citizens, but was shaped via their willingness to get involved. Benson (2011a) observed similar behaviour among Britons in the Lot, but also argued that one's own sense of nationality and that of others was an important factor in shaping who interacted with whom, and to what extent. In other words Britons wanted to be seen to interact with local people more than they were seen to mix with British, despite being often reliant upon their fellow nationals.

As these cultural constructions of citizenship are give significance in the everyday lives of British migrants, the local polity is a key site through which belonging is negotiated. While seemingly in tune with the principle of domicile, Staeheli (2008 p.7) has argued that local belonging is not a settled terrain for it is difficult to negotiate "different rationalities, moral values, and imaginations of what is possible". For Barbara and Gerald, a clash of values arose between themselves and the local hunting group (*chasse*) when the British couple sought to prevent the *chasse* accessing their land. Animal hunting was not a practice that Barbara and Gerald wished to endorse on their land however, in banning the *chasse*, the couple were concerned that they had disrupted local traditions, which had been taking place for decades. After some time, the couple removed the ban as they decided that good local relations were more important to them than standing by their anti-hunting sentiments. On the same topic, Charlotte felt that after seven years of having lived in her property, she was now accepted well enough by the locals to "put a foot down" and ban hunting on her land without the risk of being seen "as an interfering foreigner". Thus, one problem with domicile as a foregrounding principle for citizenship is that local belonging can be incredibly subjective, emotionally led and based on perceptions of how one should behave or be seen to behave in relation to the place of residence (see Benson 2011a). It points to a contradiction of citizenship that a normative coherence, for example that which is sought through 'ordinary citizenship', is unsettled by the messiness of empirically lived forms of belonging.

Domicile's emphasis on 'local' is suggestive of an immediate setting grounded in one's place of residence or habitation (Bauder 2014), however, at the root of respondents' claims to affective and cultural citizenship were a range of factors based on shared experiences, common values, and not always a common concern for place (see Staeheli 2008). A few Britons explained belonging as something that was less embedded in specific territorial spaces or locally contained communities, but shaped by dispersed people coming together to share an activity. One such example emerged in the organisation and game of cricket.

To a large extent, contemporary cricket in France reflects the sport's geographical origins in the British empire as it comprises a diverse range of players who, through various different migratory

flows, have formed a series of teams in South West France. At the centre of these teams are British migrants. One interviewee who was a committee member of France Cricket (the sport's national body in France) gave the following breakdown of roughly 1,000 official players:

*One hundred licence holders have traditional French names - persons with 'Français de souche', old century names; about fifty are French with Napoleonic colonial names coming from the DOM TOMs; four hundred sub-continentals - that's India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh; two hundred Anglo names; the rest are made up of other places - South Africa or New Zealand, for example.*

This diversity was evident on most of the cricket pitches of South West France and provided the backdrop for Albert's strongest sense of identity in France:

*I am captain, treasurer, secretary all rolled into one. I haven't played cricket seriously since 1990 but it was something to do and as soon as I joined I was given responsibilities. The cricket club keeps me busy and gives me enough of a social life.*

It was similar for Jamie who played a key administrative role in the regional cricket association as well as an individual club:

*It is, I suppose, a feeling of contributing something to a group of people who want to play, who wouldn't be able to play if I wasn't doing the admin. So it's a very focused piece of social benevolence, I suppose. And there is a buzz surrounding the games, without a doubt, and a buzz surrounding some elements of the admin., and the decision-making stuff that goes on.*

These cultural and affective modes of belonging were not located in fixed places as some of the examples above have indicated. Rather, they became rooted primarily in a sense of shared interests that stretched beyond the local, therefore making these affective modalities of citizenship more difficult to reconcile with domicile. In a way, it is enriching to move beyond a sense of belonging that it tied to territory, particularly within the EU where freedom of movement is an underlying principle. In this way, the normative coherence we seek from theories and frameworks does not easily fit with the messiness of migrants everyday negotiations of belonging.

The key point from the above examples is that citizen identities may develop from a range of cultural influences that are more or less territorially borderless in the way that *de jure* and even sometimes *de facto* forms of political citizenship are not. This is where citizenship appears to be less ordered territorially and via social norms. These spaces can be more or less political but reveal the hybrid identities of people negotiating a sense of belonging through free movement as Europeans,

and engagement with others through shared interests, experiences and spaces. While domicile begins to capture the way that migrants negotiate belonging at a micro- or community-scale, the territorial association is less ordinary to these migrants whose spaces and forms of belonging morph and stretch between people and across spaces. Alongside the normalised frameworks of citizenship, we begin to conceive of citizenship as dynamic, complex and sometimes less ordered by space and routines as some concepts suggest. The implications for understanding citizenship and migration, as well as citizenship spatialities within the EU remains central to our conclusions.

## 5. Conclusions

This paper complements a resurgence of interest in geographies of citizenship by drawing on the example of British migrants in France to examine the interplay of legal, normative and everyday frameworks in the making and remaking of EU citizenship. We have demonstrated in this paper, that Britons make and remake a complex and diverse range of citizenship modalities where empirical 'messiness' spills over attempts for normative coherence. Similarly, in consideration of the spatialities of EU citizenship, attempts to territorialise migrants' sense of belonging become ruptured by the interplays between mobility, settlement and meanings of space that stretch and morph beyond the normative geographies of national and local citizenship. This does not necessarily undermine attempts to theorise citizenship and migration, rather we argue for a greater synthesis of approaches to better understand the empirical complexities of contemporary forms of citizenry belonging.

Taking Staeheli *et al.*'s (2012) concept of 'ordinary citizenship' as a starting point, we have drawn out the ways in which legalised norms and orders associated with the nation-state were significant and pre-eminent spaces of citizenship for British migrants in France. While the overarching framework of EU citizenship enabled ease of mobility between two political systems (the supranational and national levels), migrants rarely valued their citizenry status in this way and instead reverted to the norms of French and/or British systems. In terms of citizenry geographies, we liken this cohort of intra-EU migrants to professional intra-EU migrants settling in cities, who were the focus of Favell's (2008b) examination. However, our unique insight to lifestyle migrants settling longer term in more rural locations extends the scope of his earlier work, as it does the literature on British lifestyle migrants in France (Drake and Collard 2008, Benson 2011a), which has largely overlooked broader structures within which migrant experiences have taken place (Oliver 2011). Furthermore, our empirical findings illuminate the contradiction of EU citizenship that other authors have acknowledged whereby it allows for freedom of movement but not the rights associated with citizenship (Aradau *et al.* 2010).

'Ordinary citizenship' has been particularly useful to draw out the way in which gaps in *de jure* belonging are complemented by *de facto* belonging i.e. through daily practices and negotiations. The exclusivity of aligning oneself either 'here' or 'there' was simultaneously linked by a fluidity whereby some migrants were able to cherry-pick their rights and strategically evade certain duties associated with one or other of their territorial affiliations. We term this a 'citizenship of convenience', reflecting the strategic use of citizenship to achieve lifestyle and economic advantage. It differs from Ong's (1999) flexible citizenship because migrants appear to react to citizenry frameworks on arrival in their destination, rather than as a conscious decision to move in the first instance.

This paper sought to extend the empirical scope of Staeheli *et al's* (2012) 'ordinary citizenship' by applying it to elite migrants. In doing so, we found that migrants' own sense of belonging demonstrated a 'messiness' that belies the normative coherence expected from the 'ordinary' framework. In addition, our empirical research has challenged the methodological nationalism at the heart of normative approaches to citizenship, instead emphasising structures of citizenship based on effective residency where local spaces and small-scale community connections were highly significant to the making and remaking of citizenship geographies. To an extent, the principle of domicile fits these ideas well, but falls short of capturing the connections between people outside of the territorial polity, as seen through the example of cricket teams in France. Yet again, the stretching and morphing of migrants' sense of belonging risks being overly simplified where we try to package it into normative frameworks.

Through the prism of citizenship, these British migrants demonstrate both politico-legal and socio-cultural forms of citizenship that span the borders of *de jure* and *de facto* negotiations through everyday practices. While Edensor (2002 p.2) has argued that:

National identity is facilitated by the state's legislative framework, which delimits and regulates the practices in which people can partake, the spaces in which they are permitted to move, and in many other ways provides a framework for quotidian experience

The messiness and sometimes convenience of everyday practices of citizenship demonstrates potential for the type of engagements that have been proposed to build a closer Union from below among the peoples of Europe (Millward 1997).

References?

I guess they are on the separate document but will need to be added and checked for formatting (N.b the ref below has not been formatted!)

Rigby, J and Schlembach, R (2012) Impossible protest: noborders in Calais Citizenship Studies 17, 157-172