Executive summary:

By concentrating on hybrid social situations (not strictly within the norm), the research project PROFACITY experimented with novel forms of citizenship that modified the borders of legal citizenship. These forms of citizenship involved practical activities that coped with existing systems or milieus, whose challenge was the continuing invention of the democratic principle itself i.e. the 'right to have rights'. Such practices asserted and translated into reality the 'right to the city' (droit de cite) that was not recognized straightaway, which we called profane citizenship. Our intent was to use profane citizenship as an analyzer of democratic ownership.

The research project PROFACITY examined in what way practices of actors who were in situations in which they had to make do with their faults, handicaps, lack of resources, were taken (or not) into account as alternatives to legal citizenship. Qualitative surveys were conducted within the scope of three overlapping research domains (languages and codes; attestations of identity; and tests of urbanity). The results of these surveys were submitted to the professional and institutional representatives concerned (Sensing).

The first result led to significant progress in the research project: the documented assessment of the existence of hybrid social situations where citizenship was at work. In those contrasting situations, true participation in/contribution to society did not necessarily require the status of legal citizen. And vice-versa, individuals or groups with the status of legal citizen could be faced with difficulties in or impossibilities to have access to the basics of true citizenship. Therefore, this result confirmed one of the intuitions in this research project: those hybrid social situations could be considered as 'laboratories' where the contours and the meaning of 'being a citizen' could be examined.

The second result was a final result as such: the conjunction of profane know-how with expert skills. By focusing on profane know-how, the research project aimed to give access to and make visible acts and operations that went unnoticed by experts in citizenship. By working out initiatives that contributed to the common space (the community) and by being visible in the public space, the creation of new forms helped shape citizenship beyond the strictly juridical or legal framework. In this regard, when we displaced the frontier between recognized expertise in citizenship and profane citizen's know-how, we also questioned the ontological limits of what it means 'being a citizen'. Further than sticking to opposing experts in citizenship against profane citizens, the research project could bring to the fore situations that gave rise to hybrid expertise based on varied forms of know-how and expertise.

The third result contributed to the development of the concept of translation milieus. Because many meanings and representations qualified as translation milieus, the research project assessed the in-between zones where expert and enforced forms of citizenship interacted with practical implementation of profane forms of participation in the community. Such interactions often went unnoticed. By concentrating on contexts, places, occupations, and events that qualified as translation milieus, the research project documented the concept of translation not so much as a one-way translation of infra-citizenship into legal citizenship, but rather as a two-way translation to and fro between 'what is done' and 'what is said that is done'. The concept of rendre public was developed here.

The fourth result addressed the issue of democratic ownership. This term tested the democratic quality of the operations that were to attest to democracy in European countries as against democratic principles. Democratic ownership was one of the research orientations in Fieldwork. The research showed in what way there was democracy in participating in ordinary social operations in the community (such as building houses, sweeping the streets). We examined renewed and not necessarily public forms of contribution to true citizenship. And we defined new forms of participation in the public space as many moments of appropriation of one's share of democratic ownership.

Public project website: http://www.profacity.eu/

Project Context and Objectives:

Project context

Even though the Lisbon Strategy (2000) defined the zones to which European citizenship would apply in the years to come (work for all, social integration, participation in the society of knowledge), one cannot avoid noticing the difficulty in turning these powerful principles into facts. On the one hand, research into the detailed daily activities of the European Community's inhabitants (working, studying, going into entrepreneurship, living, speaking, communicating, attesting one's identity, discussing, taking sides…) shows that having access to spaces where action and recognition are possible depends on social, national and ethnic criteria quite restrictively. On the other hand, legal citizenship has not produced the effect democracies had counted on: participation in national and European consultations has been weak, and though the trend might be reversed, when people do participate, it is often to oppose what is being proposed or even to reject it outright. Finally, it is apparent that the formal framework of legal citizenship is being outflanked insofar as people take refuge in their communities, or take part in social rebellions, or escape by breaking down psychologically or falling into using emergency expedients (alcohol, drugs, antidepressants), or even explode through individual or collective actions that cast doubt on the very meaning of 'civic' and 'civil' (vandalism, hooliganism, the return of racist acts).

All the same, between the two poles that represent, on the one hand, legal citizenship (referring to both rights attached to a juridical status and the knowledge and awareness of having such a status) granted at birth to inhabitants belonging to the normal social fabric, and, on the other hand, 'privatized' forms of civic desertion that express the loss of sense of belonging to a supportive society, there was room for research into the forms that we called profane citizenship. Often defended by individuals or groups in have-not situations, who were defective in some way or handicapped, declarations that one had a 'right to the city' (droit de cite) typically avoided the dichotomy between formal and informal, private and public, institutional and 'wild', or even between ordinary and political. On the contrary, they connected to intermediate places, thanks to supportive networks or cooperation between people with different experiences - such spaces remaining all the more mysterious as these initiatives did not necessarily demand public recognition.

Profane citizenship. Our main hypothesis was that such secular/profane operations, that aimed to redefine European citizenship, were not to be considered only from the point of view of validating or extending legal rights to new 'cases' or new social categories. More precisely, citizenship, from our point of view, emanated from what certain investigations into democratic ownership had termed the ontological politics of citizenship (Mol, 2003). Inscribing the awareness of the 'right to have rights' (Lefort, 2001) in the generic principle of

democratic culture, these initiatives developed an idea of citizenship that went beyond the classical definition of a political and legal link connecting the individual to the State. Profane citizenship experimented with forms of citizenship, evidenced by those who were participants and non-participants acting as one, and aiming to redesign the borders of legal citizenship. Put it more broadly, such forms of citizenship led to practical actions coping with systems or milieus, whose challenge was the continuing invention of the democratic principle itself. Our intent was to use the collective effort to assert and translate into reality people's 'right to the city' (Balibar, 2001 ; Battegay, 1997) as an analyzer of democratic ownership in present-day conditions (Gusfield, 1981).

Translation milieus. We intended to show that between legal citizenship, defined as a body of rights upheld by the law, and the infinite and multifaceted diversity of private actions (neither political nor micro-political), there was room for a study of the processes and operations that 'enhanced' private initiatives as acts of profane citizenship. In the experimental fields that we called translation milieus, citizenship experts teached categories of participants (professionals, intellectuals, managers) to act in solidarity by accompanying the secular/profane commitments so as to give them a format compatible with legal citizenship. These experts did not dictate a norm (of knowledge, of the law), but experimented with the problematic contours of given situations with the people or groups concerned. Comparable to Jacotot's ignorant master (revisited by Ranciere, 1987), they did not intend to introduce situations of marginality into a formal framework, but did try, all together, to enlarge the possible meanings of citizen as a norm, and to ask the question of how it developed. In this sense, they constituted laboratories where the ontological contours of democratic ownership were being put to the test, as much as places where expertise in the accompaniment of citizen’s causes could develop (CRESAL symposium, 1985).

Contagion. By analogy, our proposal could be linked to an ensemble of research in the Sociology of Science and Techniques (STS) that places profane knowledge on a level with expert knowledge. In this school of research (Charvolin et alii, 2007), it has been established that profane or secular knowledge, borne by non-specialists, are alternative, complementary, original modes on a par with the expert knowledge obtained in a laboratory. B. Wynne even uses the expression 'lay expertise' (Wynne, 1996). For this author, even though profane knowledge is not ontologically oriented towards scientific progress but rather to solving the practical problems experienced by its adepts, it contributes to the elaboration and socialization of knowledge, including scientific knowledge. Such STS research shows that profane knowledge is not 'local', and that it can develop on various scales, in non-contiguous spaces of recognition. Analogically speaking, then, profane citizenship as we understood it and wished to elaborate, was also not limited to local recognition, for example within a circle of friends. It was conquered at different levels, in configurations that had to be invented and validated in on-going practical situations . Through various modes of empowerment and building up people's ability to act -

acquired in the doing but aiming to trigger external solidarity on all sides - profane citizenship was contagious: one individual performed a private act that could enter into the process of contagion involving author and act, his or her reflexivity (what he or she said about it and what was actually done), the surrounding persons who noticed it, the interpretations that irradiated from it and filtered into other neighborhoods.

Project objectives

At the theoretical level, we enriched the concept of democratic ownership by referring it to a policy that included human rights and by associating it with practically invisible forms of civil initiatives in situations involving "have-not" people. From this point of view, the concept of translation milieus became the object of an original and productive theoretical construction. The concept of profane citizenship was usefully compared with other entries for citizenship (ordinary, social, participative...) that confronted present-day legal citizenship. This theoretical advance should enable contemporary thought to consider the changing and dynamic transformations of the content of citizenship in the European contemporary context.

Empirically speaking, on the basis of the data collected from the surveys within the scope of the PROFACITY three research domains, we documented the conditions under which translation milieus were not only scenes of acts of profane citizenship but also many forms of emerging relationship between these acts and the reasons for legal citizenship. Particular attention was paid to cross-references between the research domains: how, in a situation concerning the language problem, questions connected to attestations of identity or tests of urbanity arose.

At the experimental level (Sensing), it was not a matter of defining a new model of "omnibus" citizenship that would be applicable or transferable as such to various fields and according to various national contexts. We rather enhanced the practical definitions and the practical resources already at work in translation milieus. Instead of habilitating expert positions placed above the masses to make translations, the concept of profane citizenship invited us to consider expertise as an action consisting in accompanying initiatives towards the "right to have rights".

Concerning extended dissemination, we compared the initiatives surveyed in the different national and democratic frameworks in Europe in order to stress both the uniqueness of those initiatives and the political ontology involved therein. In each survey, the objective was to give public visibility to the concrete empowerment of categories of population in situations of lack or frailty, and to the concrete increase of unstable or not legally recognized forms of democratic ownership.

Fieldwork

PROFACITY concluded with an inventory in each of its research domains (languages and codes; attestations of identity; and tests of urbanity), confirming the hypothesis that underlay the research project, namely: experiments with novel forms of citizenship, that we called profane citizenship, took place in very specific contexts as both historical backgrounds (covering different periods of history) and national particularities related to the domains played a significant role.

The investigation conducted by the Slovene partner into the "erased" was attached to a particular event that occurred in Slovenia's history: part of the population living in Slovenia was deprived of its legal status by a law, placing these people in a juridical no man's land. No doubt that the investigation related closely to the history of the Slovene State, its creation and the aftermath in that post-socialist society. In such a context, the investigation was about designing and implementing a scheme by which we could match the notion of translation milieus with practical responses that developed in present-day Slovene society as against emerging and enforced ideological and political policies that divided the Slovene society into authorized or legal citizens on the one hand, and the non-authorized or illegal citizens on the other hand.

The investigation conducted by the Dutch partner into the "drop-out" started from a quantitative survey that had been previously carried out when PROFACITY was launched. The first results of the investigation led to Sensing meetings in the schools concerned and with the attendance of the teachers and students concerned. The investigation pointed out sharp differences between the interviewees (young girls versus young people) in terms of representations and behaviours regarding school and employment. Representations of practical (everyday) integration into citizenship in the Dutch society - i.e. the level of acceptance or reject - beyond formal citizenship, did have an impact on shaping behaviours and mobilizations; for instance, young girls with Muslim religious backgrounds asserted their identity in their workplaces.

The investigation conducted by the Portuguese partner was wholly in keeping with the integration of the Deaf into the school system and society in Portugal. We intended to develop a two-pronged investigation. Firstly, the investigation concentrated on

i) skills and expertise used in professional and institutional environments that promoted a medical solution to tackle handicaps with cochlear implants, and

ii) hybrid solutions of integration of the Deaf into mixed-ability schools with both hearing pupils and deaf pupils.

Secondly, the investigation concentrated on following isolated deaf people up, showing the role that local social relations played in integrating or isolating profane citizens.

For the Belgian partner (CICI) and the French partner (CNRS-CMW), delivering results was all the more difficult since the partners investigated into several research domains at a time. At CICI, we developed a three-pronged investigation. Firstly, the investigation concentrated on institutions and associations concerned with the enforcement of immigration policies in urban environments (like the Centre Social Protestant in Antwerp), the first results of which validated one of the a priori definitions of translation milieus: a milieu gathering associations and public bodies that act as interfaces between the juridical system, social affairs and humanitarian aid on the one hand, and people with no legal citizenship status on the other hand. Secondly, the investigation concentrated on mobilized artists acting in solidarity networks with illegal people, the first results of which showed that solidarity was shared, and forms of commitment were common when upholding any public cause. Thirdly and lastly, the investigation concentrated on the different strategies that arose in immigrant families, and particularly on mothers who used their children's education as a window of opportunities and abilities to act while being in fragile situations.

At CMW, we also developed a multi-pronged investigation. Firstly, the investigation concentrated on the Illiterates, by following families up in the long term and analysing situations with regard to contexts. The results showed how people managed to develop technical, practical, and even institutional skills that gave them access to rights to participation, work, and occupations, while being faced with everyday difficulties due to their lack of written language skills. Such situations occured discreetly, unknown to the public, and disconnected from the public policies expected to erase the handicap of illiteracy. Secondly, the investigation concentrated on what was at stake when mediating illegal immigrants' applications for legal documents.

The results showed new entities that could qualify as definitions of translation milieus:

i) law (especially lawyer's files),

ii) the media,

iii) associations, and

iv) public services.

Thirdly, the investigation concentrated on ethnic businesses (notably kebabs), by analysing different situations. The first results showed an ecological dimension included in the concept of translation milieus. Indeed, in situated urban contexts, the issue of the "right to the city"

and the "right to have rights" went on a par with issues of access, movement, exchange, and closeness in the public space. Everything from the theatre set to the play was to be negotiated when it came to practical and democratic ownership. Fourthly and lastly, the investigation concentrated on identity check situations, already giving food for thought about forms of profane citizenship. The techniques used in the control of legal documents - and more particularly those used in France and across Europe, and consisting in turning documents into biometric documents - allowed stricter control of the people authorized, tolerated or refused in the territory. The human body itself - and its related record in databases - was becoming part of a wide-spreading process that separated the Authorized from the Non Authorized. We found that situations in which such control was carried out in the public space, creating interactions between the people checked, the police and the witnessing public, were "laboratories" where one could see and realize the border between legal rights and the right to enter a territory.

Consortium methodology

We proposed cross-investigations into three research domains (languages and codes; attestations of identity; tests of urbanity). We did not divide the consortium into as many groups of specialists as there were research domains, which would have meant juxtaposing competences and results without taking advantage of our combined analytical strength in the framework of PROFACITY. On the contrary, thanks to a research scheme that mixed specializations at the very outset, from survey design to result presentation in front of Sensing groups, we set up working groups (seminars, mixed research groups, symposia) to guarantee that references, problems and languages could circulate among all the people concerned.

Such a research scheme enabled theoretical contributions to develop the concept of profane citizenship, and to rethink the limits of its relevance, on the basis of situated experiences. To what extent did the procedures, tools, rules, techniques of translation milieus facilitate institutional intervention regarding the problems of those who claimed to be legitimate political 'subjects' by declaring their right to have rights? To what extent and at what level those who asserted themselves (actors as well as causes) were recognized as being able to contribute to a share of democratic ownership including through forms of non consensus? In what way did the concept of profane citizenship enable to take account of both the uniqueness of those initiatives (commitments) and the political ontology involved therein, in situations of delicate or relative balance, in temporary and reversible twilight zones, and in various national democratic and political cultures?

Therefore, we introduced into the research project a system allowing us to take ethical issues into account when considering the concept of profane citizenship. While the research

project acknowledged the right of vulnerable individuals to have rights, it also imposed respect for other persons and associated groups. We met this requirement by setting up ethical guidelines to govern the research, and hiring an ethical expert within the consortium.

References

BALIBAR E., 2001. Nous, citoyens d'Europe? Paris: La Découverte.

BATTEGAY A., and BOUBEKER A., 1997. Parcours et mouvances associatives : entre affirmation d'un droit de cité et gestions politiques. Migrations Etudes, n° 69, p. 1-8

CHARVOLIN F., MICOUD A., and NYHART L.K., 2007. Des sciences citoyennes? La question de l'amateur dans les sciences naturalistes. La Tour d'Aigues: Editions de l'Aube.

CRESAL, 1985. Roundtable on Situations d'expertise et socialisation des savoirs. Saint-Etienne (Fr), 1985. N.p.: CRESAL.

GUSFIELD J.,1981. The Culture of Public Problems. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

LEFORT C., 2001. Essais sur le politique. XIX et XXemes siecles. Paris: Seuil.

MOL A., 2003. The multiple body: Ontology in medical practice. Durham: Duke University Press.

RANCIERE J., 1987. Le maître ignorant, cinq leçons sur l'émancipation intellectuelle. Paris: Fayard.

TAYLOR C, 1992. The politics of recognition. In: GUTMANN A. (Ed.). Multiculturalism. Princeton: Princeton University Press [second expanded edition: 1994]

WYNNE B., 1996. May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert-lay knowledge divide. In: LASH S., et al. Risk, environment and modernity. London: Sage.

Project Results:

A - PROFACITY scientific posture and main hypotheses

On the profane

If we mobilise the expression, 'profane citizenship', we shall have to explain this usage. The French word, 'profane' encompasses various meanings, covering two lexical fields: on the one hand, expertise, on the other hand, the sacred. And the conjunction between these two fields of reference is not coincidental.

In the first lexical field, profane (or lay) is seen against expertise. A person is called a layman (profane) if they have no knowledge of a science or an art, with the following synonyms: foreign to a discipline, ignorant (a word to be found in both French and English), incompetent, inexperienced, uninitiated, novice. Translating the French word 'profane' poses difficulties - profane may insist on the uninitiated, while lay-man emphasises the practical rooting of a man of the field. This dichotomy between two poles of knowledge - that of experts and that of laypersons - is eminently political and debatable. An author such as J. Rancière (2004), when referring to Jacotot, pleads for the 'equality of intelligences' precisely aiming at challenging the natural and obvious character and the hierarchy between those who know and those who do not know, which is itself indexed to a hierarchy of knowledge.

Anthropology of knowledge and sociology of sciences have also contributed to confusing matters, while calling for a new breakdown between expertise and lay knowledge. Anthropologists such as A. Strauss (1992) or U. Hannerz (1992), who have been interested in relationships between laypersons and professionals or laypersons and specialists, have long shown that there is not a layperson on the one hand and a specialist on the other, but depending on situations, the roles may change. They have also defended the idea that laypersons dispose of knowledge from experience which contribute to collective intelligence.

In the field of the sociology of sciences, for instance in conflicts on interpretation of environmental or medical risks, authors such as B. Wynne or M. Callon have taken on a lay-expert with expertise from the field to whom they attribute rationality (even if its of a different type) and for whom they plead for the right to participate in formulating the truth and policy. B. Wynne (1996) emphasises that knowledge that is turned towards

experimenting is flexible, not dogmatic and open, and that this knowledge is complex, reflexive, dynamic and innovative, and that material, empirical and theoretical aspects flow into them… Irrespective of qualities or flaws, they are epistemologically alive and substantial. M. Canne criticizes models which brutally or gently and pragmatically deny the layperson any competence for participating in the production of the only valid knowledge: that which may be described as scientific. To the contrary, he pleads for a model of coproduction of knowledge which tends to surmount limits by actively involving laypersons in elaborating knowledge that concerns them (1999).

The second lexical field of the concept of the French world 'profane' coincides with the English term, 'profane' and is related to the sacred. This is the opposition that E. Benveniste takes up etymologically in his son article, 'Profanus et profanare' (1960), insisting upon the proximity and the overlapping character of the sacred - which is withdrawn into the temple so as to participate in a sacred rite (sacere) - and the profane - which remains in front of the le temple (pro fanum), in the public sphere. Tradition, he writes, wanted the flesh of the consecrated animal to be returned to the public sphere after the ceremony, and a great banquet was organised in which everyone had the right to consume the flesh of the consecrated animal. 'The offering is consecrated, and then profaned through its consumption. ' Being profaned is not in opposition to the sacred, but to the contrary, it mean returning the sacred to a primal state, that of the community. 'The quality of profanum does not apply to everything that is not in fact sacred but what has ceased to be so. ' Profanation is the moment of returning to the public sphere from what had separated it, and there is a sort of re-appropriation or re-integration of the sacred within the profane. This form of 'reconciliation' is symbolically denoted by the banquet, the people's consuming of the consecrated meat, i.e. its profanation. Here, we take note that Benveniste specifies that the profane is not only designated by what is negative (what is not sacred) but also by what is positive (what is present in the public sphere - the polis). We also note that while he is committee etymological clarification of the meaning, he manages to establish a demarcation between such things and acts which are hidden from the public, who are deemed to be uninitiated, incapable of attending the ritual, and on the other hand the public sphere as a place which is open to all, rendered public.

From this etymological understanding of profanare as a return to the sacred in the common sphere, G. Agamben (2005) offers a more critical and political understanding of the idea. Profanation (…) involves neutralising what is being profaned. Once it is profaned, what was unavailable and remained separated loses its aura so as to be returned to use. It is a political operation « which disactivates systems of power and returns those spaces which it had confiscated to common usage. For Agamben, the political, active and radical dimensions are designated by the term, profanare. For this author, to profane is to detach oneself from the control of power, which had confiscated the common use of places, and to return those places to precisely what they are: commonplaces.

If these models, focussed on expertise and the sacred equip us to approach the operability of the 'profane' in politics, a complementary dimension, which also plays a role in issues of citizenship, also seems to be added: the public dimension. With the reflections of the anthropologist, James Scott (2008) as a support, we are encouraged to introduce the distinction between public transcripts and hidden transcripts, as much on the side of those who hold dominant norms as on that who hold non-dominant norms. For crucial stakes (which the surveys in this book take account of in various ways) are to be found in the fact that knowledge, information and data are or are not put in the public domain, made accessible to the public, to the layperson, to the uninitiated or to those who are not in the innermost circle.

What is at stake in asserting a presence, demonstrating or concealing oneself are also at work in situations in which asserting rights to be there and to have rights depends on activities and competencies related to this work on the visible and invisible, on what has been experienced and on what is known, on the accessible and the inaccessible. One dimension of the profane appears in the tension between a policy of public declaration and the reserving of what is kept secret. Reciprocity here is active: those who remain in the public place do not know what is transpiring in the temple, but those who have the right to go into the temple do not necessarily know what is being said and is happening outside in the public arena. In this double game between what is shown and what is hidden, the issue of the breakdown of ignorance arises, when one believes what one sees or what one says, while a hidden dimension is active unbeknownst to the general public.

Profane citizenship

What openings does the use of the expression 'profane citizenship' make possible? To what extent does this formulation, given the variety of its potential meanings, make it possible to open up new approaches to issues of citizenship, and even answer the question 'what is citizenship? ' How can we imagine and how can we validate answers which are not aimed at reproducing a mechanical dualism, which on the one hand views the institutional and formal vision of law - people are deemed to be citizens if they fulfil the conditions for gaining access to the status of citizenship - and on the other who defend a more 'activist' version of citizenship - people are deemed to be citizens if they, through their own action, manage to open up access to citizenship.

We must immediately avoid a source of confusion: profane citizenship is not intended to designate the citizenship of the profane or of laypersons. If it is true that part of the surveys in this book look at individuals or groups who were not recognised for their competence as experts, our work specifically contributes to blurring this line. On the basis of a position which detaches itself from labelling positions that create a demarcation between experts on

the one hand and laypersons on the other, we have emphasised dissymmetry and the reciprocity of perspectives which lead experts in a field to recognise that they are laypersons in another field, and on the other hand, persons who are deemed to be laypersons in one field to be recognised as expert in that field but with another vantage. On the other hand, the contribution of the layperson allows us to formalise and validate statements and practices differently, referring, from the lay point of view, to experiences of citizenship which also generate the effect of framing rendering objective. Thus, the notion of 'profane citizenship' announces a strong programme aiming at renewing the epistemological or even ontological foundations of citizenship. Allow us to explain.

The 'profane' or layperson, in the coordinated meaning of public and uninitiated (someone deemed to be ignorant who has no access to the hidden spaces of the powers over the polis), specifically designates a position which de-naturalises what is presented as obvious and beyond debate in the application of the law. Here, the profane consists of a point of resistance to the effect of authority of knowledge and the expert formatting of citizenship (including citizenship as underpinned by science) and particularly those of the law, political sciences and political philosophy. As researchers in the social sciences, we are authorised to take up and to document those decisive deviations between what is said to be citizenship and what is perpetrated in its name, between a citizenship based upon formal institutional principles and a citizenship which is implemented, politicized, rendered controversial in various fields of expertise and the experience of situations.

Thus, profane citizenship is not an alternative framework to legal citizenship, and is neither a new citizenship, nor a citizenship of those excluded from expert models of citizenship. In the context of the surveys presented in this book, 'profane citizenship' designates various approaches. On the one hand, it may be a concept that implies a new paradigm, the pertinence of which can be extended beyond the particularity of situations and groups under study. It may also be a notion the heuristic value of which is above all to explore and which offers ways to describe and name the diversity of forms in which rights are asserted and individuals and groups participate in the life of the polis. Finally, the notion may be interpreted as a revealing tool for transformation in citizenship and for the effects of such transformation with a view to the various situations under study and the national contexts in which they are situated.

Rather than consider citizenship first from the perspective of how States configure the body of citizens which belong to them and which they represent, we should think of citizenship on the basis of actions which have been initiated and interpreted as having a citizen dimension, by those who are asserting that they have a right to being there and a right to have rights, to take part in public life and the life of the polis. In this sense, we might say that the citizenship the authors are interested in is profane in a dual sense: it is of a profane or lay

quality with regard to the legal expertise which lays down the criteria of citizenship, and it is profane with a view to the sacralisation of citizenship which makes it a civil religion.

A pluralistic work of diverse surveys

The surveys that we are accounting for in this work looked at the issue of profane citizenship from contrasting vantages. For one of the specific stakes of this group work is to have recognised the semantic variety behind this common notion, a movement of positive diffraction which can be illustrated by the question: What does being a citizen and not being a citizen at the same time mean? The answer to this question is not and need not be unambiguous. It is the openness of this term to being used in diverse operative contexts for varying phenomena that proves its heuristic value.

The surveys were conducted from October 2009 to November 2010 in 5 countries: with young immigrants aged between 12 and 22 in the Netherlands (ethnographic survey and questionnaire submitted to 608 native youths and immigrant youths); with (10) deaf students and (16) isolated deaf people in Portugal; with (24) people erased from the citizenship register in Slovenia; with (10) illiterate people in France; with (45) undocumented families, women, youths and single people in France and Belgium; with (20) managers of ethnic businesses/kebabs in Lyon and Amsterdam. The surveys consisted of interviews and studies of the interviewees' environment: interviewees' relatives, associations, collective action groups, lawyers, press and TV journalists, teachers, social workers and sign language interpreters, politicians and public policy-makers. We also observed 46 identity checks at the Part-Dieu railway station in Lyon.

These surveys were conducted on the basis of a conjunction of several methods:

- desk study: review of literature from the press, TV news bulletins, websites, administrative and official documents, statistics, legal texts and laws, court decisions, administrative orders, and lawyers' files;

- quantitative questionnaire;

- ethnographic research: interviews and personal life accounts, participative observations, follow-ups, discussions by means of focus groups, participation in the activity of collective action groups, associations, social services centres or schools;

- synchronic and diachronic approaches; and

- reflective feedback on the surveys: varied forms of discussion sessions about the results of the research into all the fields covered (sensing).

The right to be there. Parts of the surveys addressed the issue of the right to be there. The contribution of the Slovene authors consists of documenting conditions that make it possible for citizens who had citizenship rights under the Yugoslav Federation to find themselves in a situation of illegal residing aliens or undocumented persons from one day to the next, inasmuch as they had been 'erased' from the registers of residents, with rights which were inferior even to those of foreigners since they had not even been given the legal right to enter the territory. It is also around these issues that the surveys on the undocumented in France and Belgium were carried out. Even if these surveys did not restrict themselves to revealing careers or strategies of presence on the territory with a view to obtaining papers to regularise their situation, they took into account the activities, the milieus and the mediation that made the paths those undocumented people take possible. On the margins of the status of formal citizenship, we can find individual, professional and artistic mobilisation which will have an impact upon the conditions of the possible regularisation of status. It is also the point to the survey carried out on identity checks in the public sphere to show how technical and regulatory police and administrative measures (of prefectures and customs) de facto lead to a public policy of controlling foreigners within a territory.

As regards a strictly legal definition of citizenship, the contrasting illumination of those places in which law is executed show that there is not always a clear-cut division between what is 'authorised' by and what is prohibited by law (Jean Carbonnier, 2001). These borders are anything but hermetically sealed, and work carried out by the combined effort of all involved forces, (which in this respect are hybrid because they involve both those persons who are involved in a situation which is not legal as well as their professional or personal supports, and the State officials who are in charge of examining their case and enforcing the law) continues to thicken the ties between the two spheres of law and non-law. These surveys help to complicate all of the sequences implied by these situations, the outcome of which is more or less open, uncertain and experimental, imposing a survey on the meaning of decisions to be taken in a situation of uncertainty upon the actors.

But what is also suggested by the detour by non-law put forward by J. Carbonnier is that law does not sum up every regulatory aspect of access to 'real' citizenship. Thus, we see surveys interested in people whose situation is not legal or persons who are concerned by the various national forms of asylum rights or the right of refugees which depend upon specific law applied to foreigners waiting for their legal situation to be resolved. They show how such places as schools, businesses, health, lodging or accommodation become strategic areas for setting up and experimenting with administrative rules, which are in tension with the implementation of forms of recognition of citizenship.

The right to have rights. If we broaden the question of 'having rights' to 'being able to exercise rights', the answer to the question 'What is profane citizenship' should be asked beyond mere situations involving formal and legal citizenship which has been recognised by the State. What is at issue is in such a case not (only) the possibility of presenting an official legal title recognising status as a member of the 'nation', it is (also) the translation of presence into a right to have access to rights. The legitimacy and practicability of rights to rights (for instance to education, health and work) for people or categories who run up against the difficulty or even impossibility of gaining access to rights interferes with formal rights as recognised by the law. Here, too, a dual intrigue may be illuminated by our surveys: either the law or regulations can be challenged because they obliterate access to rights for certain persons or groups, including citizens; or the tangible conditions of the functioning or practical organisation of such and such a field invalidate the competencies (which are not recognised) of concerned members.

The fields covered by the surveys presented in this work are related to this problematic of rights to rights which concern persons or groups who do not at base have problems of recognition of their formal citizenship, but who experience the limitation prohibiting their access to rights for which they believe they have legitimate expectations. This is for instance the case of the deaf, who while being formally recognised as citizens run up against many obstacles or barriers to exercising their rights as citizens in the way they are taken account of. Our study shows how this issue of the right to rights is not asked independently of the models of how the instituted society takes care of them and the outcome of controversies in the spheres of both experts and laymen (such as hearing devices, recognition of sign language, bilingualism). The comparative surveys conducted with isolated deaf people and schools that do or not recognize sign language, showed that where it is recognized, sign language plays a significant role in the process of socialization of deaf children and contributes to integrating deaf children both into the hearing realm and groups of deaf people. Conversely, the survey focused on isolated deaf people that do not sign, showed that they are deprived of a reference linguistic community, a socializing group of people that can sign, and in spite of all their efforts, they are subject to discrimination.

Similar questions, which however do not necessarily appear in the public arena (or differently, if at all), are raised in the surveys on illiteracy. Here, again, the concerned subjects are not necessarily not in possession of formal legal citizenship, however they run up against obstacles to the full exercise of the rights of person because of their particular relationship to a command of the written language. In contrast to what is possible in the world of the deaf, there are no groups of illiterates, but instead strategies to make their illiteracy invisible (even among family members) which make it possible for them to live and survive, sometimes even to live well and to protect their ways of muddling through which allow them to conceal this aspect of their lives.

By way of contrast, these two situations show what is at stake even in the way these issues are addressed publically. If on the one hand, this may show a sort of public recognition of persons or groups and the assertion of the desire to take account of their respective specificities by identifying them as a 'target group', it can also ipso facto present forms of discrimination of these persons or groups by setting them apart from their formally recognised citizenship. Our surveys, by going quite far in the scale of observing individual and inter-individual situations, point to the sequential networks which interlink situations and contexts, and the effectiveness of non-law in the implementation of rules allowing for (or prohibiting) access to rights. These situations then appear to be hybrid to the extent that they create an interaction between aspects that depend upon the major formats of public action or the institutions on the one hand, and aspects that depend upon initiatives taken by the concerned persons or groups, or their representatives and their supports.

Freedom(s) of the city and the right to be. In the secularised States of contemporary Europe, the issue of regulating cultural differences is framed both by legal and regulatory conditions depending upon national contexts, and by rules which J. Carbonnier refers to as 'non law'. School, the municipality, health, culture and commerce are all fields which are subject to this dual jurisdiction. One of which emanates from public authorities and is translated (or not) into public policies which either homogenise or particularise the diverse origins of citizens. The other emanates from individual or group initiatives. In both cases, these practices of law and non law render public a presence which is anchored in diverse histories and traditions with which they entertain various relationships. The question 'What does it mean to be a citizen and a non-citizen at the same time' also crops up in these situations, when citizenship is seen in its cultural, historic and memorial diversity, challenging all principles of reference to nationality and its uniqueness. The issue of law is not challenged directly, since the concerned persons or groups may be in a situation of regularity within the legal frameworks of formal citizenship. What is at issue in these situations are the practical and legal conditions for framing these various forms of taking part in the public sphere and the extent to which actors who are making use of their competencies and asserting a right to have rights, a right to initiatives, a right to contribute, a right to be there and to show enterprise are actually able to act.

The two fields of investigation mentioned above are contrasted. In the case of ethnic businesses, our investigation started from the urban presence of these businesses and their role in the way the city functions and their visibility, and aimed at documenting how these initiatives taken by people or communities which often stem from immigrant populations and have formal citizenship are integrated into diversified urban forms of consumption, movement and life. Not only did the investigation document this phenomenon but it also showed the resources, the competencies and the activities necessary for people taking the initiative of setting up and giving a lasting form to these economic and commercial forms, which attract a variety of customers and also offer a place for a public and customers whose religion or culture is Muslim. While the public discourse of town planners tends to refer

these questions to the domain of private 'entrepreneurial' activities, our survey has shown how to the contrary obstacles and successes in showcasing a 'halal' convention allow them to make these urban forms prevail in contemporary cities, despite the controversies in the 'public debate' which such practices give rise to. From this point of view, the capacity to respond to diverse styles of consumption and procuring supplies on the part of diversified urban populations is related to the public assertion of a right to have rights. However, the resonance of this conjunction, in terms of 'cultural citizenship' resounds differently depending upon the public cultures which are taking effect, which are both urban and national cultures.

In the survey of the life patterns of young foreigners in the Netherlands who drop out of the school system prematurely, the question is put from another vantage. Given the observation that neither Dutch school nor Dutch society has the capacity to make these young people comply with the 'national' norm on a sustainable basis and that society itself is producing an otherness which may represent a danger for public order, the Netherlands' (social welfare) State has set up a series of initiatives to try to deal with these situations. Either it acts upstream, in schools, or downstream, so as to improve conditions for gaining access to the employment market. The questions that arise are then the following: To what extent are such top-down initiatives effective? To what extent will they have an effect upon the youth? Are they convincing? Do they produce results? The also looks at bottom-up initiatives, coming from the groups themselves who assert a right to be present in Dutch society which respects their cultural identity (for instance access to jobs for young women of Muslim origin). Here, the survey is broken down into various objectives. On the one hand, it aimed at understanding factors of 'social dissidence' for young people who undergo exclusion and the citizenship of which is viewed by Dutch society as being problematic (even when they are formally citizens). It also aimed at reproducing the points of view of these young people, which are distinct from those of their teachers, regarding their own situation and future in Dutch society. Finally, it aimed at documenting public initiatives of veiled young women who are trying to conquer a right to difference and recognition in the Dutch public sphere.

The questionnaires and ethnographic surveys showed that, regarding the future of these young people at school, in society and in the labour market, teachers are pessimistic whereas these young people are quite optimistic. They draw such optimism from the patterns of their parents at school and in society, and from the support they get from their families that consider their educational and social achievements of paramount importance. However, even though they remain confident, such optimism is restrained by the lack of concrete support from their parents in their work at school and in the guidance on courses to be followed, by the negative experiences they go through and by the discrimination which they say they are subject to. Contrary to the judgments that prevail in Dutch society, they assert their attachment to their town quarters, and claim their behaviours and the right to organize themselves as they want. At odds with conceiving citizenship based on the pre-requisite of assimilation into Dutch society, they consider that they can be Dutch citizens

without having to give up their group's orientations which they do not consider as an obstacle to their participation in Dutch society even if they criticize some aspects of it. The points of view of these young people on themselves and their participation in society differ from those of their teachers. These experts - although they wish they would help these young people see through - are influenced by the public discourse on immigration, and have a tendency to attribute educational problems to the individual rather than to the school system. This results in hindering the development of full citizenship while the points of view from these young people are not fully taken into account and challenge the meaning of 'being a Dutch citizen'.

Because of their very contrast, these two fields of investigation make it possible to document a public dimension of citizenship which is manifested beyond the formal right to be legally recognised as citizens. At a collective and public level, these two case studies point to standards of business, the city and culture when cultural differences are asserted or even displayed, thus making inherent tensions within the cultural complexities of societies that claim to be pluralistic and democratic even more acute. What is at stake through the negotiations of a right to difference and to participate is experimenting with forms of citizenship and the public life, putting differentiated practical value systems to the test and transforming them at the same time.

Translation milieus

So as to establish what processes are at work between legal citizenship as defined by the law and the infinite diversity of acts and initiatives in society and ordinary life, the investigation has equipped itself with the notion of translation milieus, which it has devoted care to documenting and examining as a problematic. The notion of translation milieus aims at going beyond taking account only of experts in citizenship, whether professionals or activists in non-profit organisations acting by way of solidarity. It suggests remaining close to the course of action and experience of initiatives or groups rather than focusing on scenes of participative democracy, hybrid forums or scenes of consensus, aiming at integrating the point of view and action of ordinary citizens (Callon et al., 2001). Finally, this notion is not limited to emphasising the unexpected participants of individual actors and groups, supposed to be autonomous so as to assert the right of points of view and interests that otherwise would not be taken into account (Rancière, 1995).

The notion of translation milieus was more an incentive for producing descriptions or operations of translation, which are neither identified or related to patented translators nor considered in the sole format of a chain of intermediaries retranslating the words and positions of persons into a position of visibility or official status, whether bottom up or top down. The idea of translation milieus, put forward for further elaboration, is not to be

confused with that of the sociology of translation and the theory of the actor-network of Michel Callon (1989), in which a multiplicity of associations of human and non-human actors, adopting strategies and alliances, forming complex maps of networks of actors, help us to recognise resistant forms of reality and truth. If the idea of a translation milieu does not restrict translation to actors alone, the operation of translation within the sole mode of cooperation is not limited to looking for a consensus on behalf of populations who are marginalised or excluded from citizenship. The idea of translation milieus is to the contrary an incentive to produce open descriptions of translation operations, and not descriptions oriented around the normative horizon of broadening the possible meaning of the norm, 'citizen', or through the ambition of introducing situations of marginality into a formal framework. It should also make it possible to carry out investigations and understand how and through which operations translations which deny citizenship were made possible, or who diverging interpretations of acts or representations of citizenship are produced.

The notion of translation milieus also refers to an ecological conception which makes us speak of language as a milieu, law as a milieu, the city as a milieu, or scenes of shared interpretations as a milieu. It conjointly induces us to pay attention to actors who translate while making milieus or make milieus while translating, as well as the cognitive or event-oriented operations of translation. Its conception, which is both flexible and oriented, has given it the status of a sort of guide for paying attention to spaces, moments, operators and operations. It showed its validity both as a tool for exploration and analysis of various field of investigation and objects of research, while taking account of their singularity and their national contexts. At the same time, it went through the investigations like a concept to be elaborated, the contours of which remained to be specified and which had to be given consistency.

At the beginning of our research, differences in perspectives emerged which we need to recall here so as to take account of where we came from, which questions were asked and which paths were taken. From the beginning, translators were listened to, including operators which were as diverse as professions, competencies, scenes, objects, procedures and expertise. Nevertheless, the gamut of translators, the places they occupy and the roles they play, as well as the operations of translation they participate in, required specification and examination in their situations.

The investigation in Belgium on the undocumented led us to take account of organisations and networks with humanitarian and religious conceptions as translation milieus; one example is the Protestant Social Centre, which plays an active role among undocumented foreigners. Socio-artistic networks which develop artistic creativity for and with these foreigners, who are themselves producers of artistic creations and recognised as such, produce a translation milieu and give other versions of experience. But this role in translation milieus is reinterpreted, questioned during the scenes in which researchers or

members of civil society share their experiences, their interpretations, discuss their conclusions and actions, of which they 'look for the meaning', and that they may help to change the functioning of and their way of seeing social realities.

The survey conducted in the Netherlands on young non-European foreigners who had dropped out of school led us to go beyond a conception of translation focusing upon teachers and professionals in education and social action who follow up and accompany these young immigrants. The translation milieu becomes the space for updating things which have not been specified by thought or influences of public or political discourses on modes of thought and analysis of educational milieus. Following investigation and upon the basis of its findings it can also become the space for expressing paradoxes and contradictions between perceptions and interpretations of the place and future of young immigrants in society by themselves or by professionals.

The investigation conducted in France on illiterates, who do not present themselves as a group and refuse to be marked, registered or rendered visible as illiterates, raised the question of milieus in which practices would or would not be translated into citizenship. Translation milieus as they were approached in this case are not formed around measures on behalf of the illiterate but upon the basis of the initiatives of the latter. They aim at becoming indistinct parts of society in which they take part, by maintaining networks and extending them on the basis of commercial and non-commercial exchanges. There is thus no pre-existing translation milieu which is delimited and fixed. Discovering translation milieus may mean exploring the locus of family bonds and social networks, social experiences and exchanges such as a 'protecting milieu' as much as a 'translating milieu'.

Translators who make it possible to translate initiatives and mobilisations into citizenship cannot be the only ones to be taken into account. Well intended modes of translation should be investigated. Acts, strategies through they manifest their ownership in the social space, whether indirectly or not, cannot be considered independently of the institutional systems with which they are in tension. Finally, concurrent translations which may take the form of cooperation, but also of conflict, controversy, or incomprehension, or other translations that do not aim at broadening citizenship, but to the contrary restricting it or even depriving people of it, should also be examined.

The investigation of the erased in Slovenia led researchers to wonder how the apparently administrative act of the pure and simple erasure of non-Slovenian Yugoslav citizens had been made possible. The description of the erasure and its effects in terms of translation milieus led to the analysis of the discourses which contributed to this or which subsequently were opposed to it while acting as vehicles for divergent ideologies. The approach in terms of translation milieus made it possible to show how these discourses refer to one another

upon the basis of a higher hierarchical discourse. The hypothesis was that arguing this dominant discourse had become invisible and that its suppositions which defined what was or what was not a citizen following the break-up of Yugoslavia and the independence of Slovenia, were accepted by common sense without being questioned. Part of the investigation consisted in seeking out an unstated argumentative sequence, which is subsequently imposed not as a supposition but as an explicit fact. But the initial approach also became more complex with the compilation of substantial documentation throughout the investigation. This showed how, from an initial situation in which 'they were all citizens of Yugoslavia', a large variety of produced argumentative sequences were affected by other discourses, which led to inflections of the notion of translation milieus, related to the authors of the statement and towards understanding the intertextuality of the discourses.

Doing translations. These questions and approaches in each investigation made it possible to reconsider and reformulate what could act as a translation in such a situation or for such and such a population, from what, by whom, how and in which terms. They also made it possible to grasp the translation milieus which are not part of the usual repertory of scenes of democracy, public debate or recognised and instituted resources of public and social life. Finally, the formation of translation milieus was envisaged at the interface of worlds with different perspectives, the interpretations of which are in tension and interaction, at the conjunction of discourses, objects, and scenes in which they are made visible and invisible. This is the case of certain milieus which are both places and objects of perspectives and interpretations in interaction, of interconnections, negotiations and co-productions. Law, the city and language are thus considered to be translation milieus.

For undocumented foreigners in France, uses of law and rights in society are not limited to experts. Such uses unveil translation milieus that produce their own interpretations of the law and stress the uncertainty therein. These situations, these experiences and these measures of testing access to legal citizenship designate a multiplicity of practical procedures residing by legal, political, economic social or media supports which implement logics of interaction and coordination, alliances and conflicts, visibility and invisibility and complementarity. These use of law and of rights, which does not exclusively come from support groups, legal exports or mere representatives of the administration manifest tensions between various interpretations of citizenship. They also illuminate practices with their share of what is implicit, what cannot be said or is hidden and contradictory interests. Finally, they point to the need for and demand for new norms, as well as new forms of normative elaboration.

In the case of the kebab businesses, it is the city and its resources of urbanity that appear as the translation milieus to be explored. Thus, one must grasp how commercial offers are appreciated or not by those who go there, what type of contribution is recognised or attributed to them, to what extent their civility is referred to a common good of urbanity

and not only private or community strategies for settlement. What is at stake through these approaches also is aimed measuring to what extent this quality is recognised or not, if it interferes and if it concerns institutions of the governance of agglomerations, both in their functions of maintaining public order and maintaining and promoting the quality of life of the urban dwellers.

In the case of identity checks in the public sphere and all the more in a train station, a place of passage and movement, it was suggested that the situation of checking identities by the police be observed as a translation milieu. Here, we can see the effects of a policing of citizenship with its instruments, with civil servants, their techniques of control and selecting people for controls, their files and interconnections, their forms of presence and management of situations in visible and tangible terms. However, this milieu is not only that of the police. The situation publicly shows what should happen discretely behind the scenes and outside the vision of the public. This milieu is not just that of the police doing its job. People being checked are a part of it, just as the public, passers-by who are more or less concerned with or indifferent to the scene. Beyond this, the train station itself is the translation milieu of citizenship.

For the deaf, language as a translation milieu has many effects upon and implications for different ways of grasping deafness, the place of the deaf in society, and their situation, which investigations by Portuguese researchers have rendered visible and intelligible. Reflections and practices around language as a translation milieu and measures that had to be invented to take account broaden the circle of those concerned, and allow new figures of translators to emerge, rendering acts of communication and their interpretations more complex, and shifting the role and status of sign language for the deaf.

One of the characteristics of translation milieus to be found throughout the various empirical investigations is undoubtedly not to put an end to controversies and divergences but to make them more pertinent. These explorations of conceptions of translation milieus, as they are deployed in various fields of investigation, make it possible to take account of their variety, their various manifestations, as well as of the need for contextualised approaches. This diversity does not allow for a homogenous and homogenising definition of translation milieus, however it provides keys for each case and each situation so as to grasp transformations, reconfigurations, and renewed compositions in processes of citizenship.

Hybrid situations

The investigations presented in this work finally highlight a common notion designated by the term, hybrid situations. These situations are hybrid in many respects: in respect of legal citizenship, conception and enforcement of rights, configurations of actors, and scales set in given societies. They concern both individuals or groups that, in spite of being legal citizens, are not or feel not recognized as full citizens, and, conversely, individuals or groups that have not or have been deprived of legal citizenship and participate in the community all the same, feel or claim the right to be recognized as citizens not in the strictly formal framework of citizenship. Therefore, hybrid situations are about de facto or de jure citizenship that recognizes the right to be there and the droit de cite. Such citizenship and the rights attached to it are no longer just granted, claimed and gained, but are now also asserted, exercised, used and negotiated by a configuration of actors that do no longer stand in a face-to-face situation with the State or between experts and laymen. Individuals, groups, collective action groups, institutions and their representatives interact with each other in hybrid situations. Their schemes for action hinge on multiple interests, rules, norms and laws whose interpretations differ from one actor to another, and involve a varied range of scales and territories.

Hybridity stems from all these elements and their layouts in situations, and this is the content of such hybridity that our investigations aimed at showing and documenting. In each context and each situation, attention must be paid to forms of hybridity in order to be able to single out the actors and their cohabiting, cooperating, opposing or negotiating schemes for action, the competencies and the rules that result from joint production both in the realm of law and non law.

Situations in investigations then show that this droit de cité does not only depend upon a right acquired upon birth or through naturalisation, but is also obtained through work which is carried out in situations and contexts by mobilising actors, places, mediation and representations, according to social logics which have to be discovered and documented.

Inside and outside institutions. These situations may involve agents, operators and contexts which are on the one hand related to public or private institutions, which are supposed to take charge of the matters at hand in one way or the other. But on the other hand, they might also enlist persons, groups or their representatives (for instance in non-profit organisations or professional associations) who are immediately concerned with these issues and who take 'initiatives' on them, on their own behalf or on behalf of groups within the broader family or groups of peers. In the former case, there is a trend to apply instructions, established roles, and administrative or market logics; in the latter, there may be logics either of compliance or resistance to what is expected of an ordinary citizen, his or her conduct and his or her participation.

Institutions are no more disembodied than non-profit organisations. These organisations are implemented by workers or agents of the institution or the organisation, who depending upon the case at hand dispose of certain margins of manoeuvre for carrying out their function. By the same token, people involved who take initiatives are not totally outside all institutions. They have to come to terms with the 'harder' or softer aspects of rules and law, and must find forms of accommodation throughout the constraints with which they are confronted, for if not they incur risks of exclusion.

Thus, networks of ramification are woven, which are also hybrids and bring together heterogeneous human and non-human elements, files, agendas, techniques, meetings, regulations, legal provisions, economic and urban constraints, etc. Moreover, these hybrid situations are contextualised and are to be found in places, over durations, and in frameworks which leave their mark on both the material and symbolic formatting of the situations at hand. In this respect, elements from the strict reference to law (such as the case of the erased in Slovenia) or other more ideological or political elements (such as the existence of a nationalist current of opinion) may contribute to the concrete formatting of hybrid situations.

Hybrid expertise. The hybrid character of situations also concerns the knowledge and competencies at hand. There too, knowledge which is elaborated in an original way, depending upon a great level of technicality (for instance in law or medicine) can cohabit with practical knowledge or the hands-on approach described in French by the expression, 'savoir-y-faire' (to take on a distinction made by G. Delbos, 1983), which does not necessarily requires academic training, even if 'profane' or lay knowledge is as much a repository of abstraction and rationality as expert knowledge (Wynne, op. cit.). What also characterises this knowledge in hybrid situations is that they are not necessarily unequivocally attached to 'bearers' of knowledge. We may, in this respect, refer to a logic of distributed knowledge, depending upon the context, and vis-à-vis which laypersons may adopt the position of experts and experts the position of laypersons (Cahiers Profacity n°6, 2011 ; Battegay A., Coelho O., Vaz H., 2012).

How are varying types of expert and lay knowledge combined and linked in these fields which have been investigated? Are they practiced separately or are they distributed over various members of a family, of a group marked by interiority, networks of mutual assistance, or professional or political support groups? Are they mobilised homogenously and continuously, or are they differentiated according to embedded time sequences? In the field of the deaf, the investigation shows how the different models of taking charge (medically or socio-anthropologically) do not mobilise the same forms of expertise, both from the vantage of the medical corps and that of the families or the deaf persons themselves. Not only do we see that we are not dealing with the same forms of expertise, but we are not dealing with the same combinations of expertise. In the field of rights to

urban recognition, forms of initiatives tend to mobilise the entrepreneurial competencies which are confronted with legal, economic, financial and business issues, but also require the capacities to occupy visual positions in the public arena on sensitive issues and make attractive commercial propositions.

Between positions and discourse. Hybridity, in the situations examined in this work, may finally apply to the duality of positions and discourse. Persons and/ or operators engaged in these situations are so engaged in various positions and in various capacities, including the researchers who are conducting the investigation. The discourse and points of view which have been collected during this investigation are marked by differences in positioning. It is thus fair to talk of a distribution of points of view. But mapping points of view is complex. There may be relations of power between places, and this may be translated in proceedings established upon the basis of situations - effects of authority or influence, the imposition of silence on certain aspects, shameful or unspeakable areas, spaces of revelation, etc. There may also be distortions between an expected and an expressed viewpoint, discrepancies between places occupied and positions taken, and between explicit and implicit forms of partiality.

In this work, we have tried to maintain a balance in face of the pluralism of the positions that are represented here. The hybrid nature of this work is also an operator which allows us to describe the collective methodology which has been implemented here. Within these working spaces, discrepancies with regard to expectations in the order of the distribution of places for making utterances are not (only) due to a contestation of places or undue taking part, but themselves result from experimental formats of hybrid situations themselves. These formats can be seen and documented not (only) in public events or collective mobilisations, but also in unexpected and improbable arrangements of actors, agents and operators, configuring themselves as clusters in hybrid situations which have been recognised as such. Obviously, the presence of the researcher, his or her work and interpretation play a role in these hybrid configurations and our capacity for self-reflection (as in sensing sessions or scenes) may allow us to take stock of this role.

References

AGAMBEN G., 2005. Profanations. Paris: Payot and Rivages.

ARENDT H., 1972. Les origines du totalitarisme : le système totalitaire. Paris: Seuil (Collection Points/politique)

BATTEGAY A., COELHO O., and VAZ H. (Eds.)., (in press). Prendre soin, prendre part, vivre avec : enjeux et défis de la citoyenneté profane dans les rapports santé-société. Quelles médiations ?

BATTEGAY A., and DOURLENS C. (Eds.). Les reconfigurations des rapports profanes/experts dans le domaine des handicaps et des maladies chroniques : vers quelles citoyennetés profanes? [on-line].In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation milieus'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 21 January 2010. Lyon: CMW. Available at <see http://www.profacity.eu online>

BENVENISTE É., 1960. Hommage à Georges Dumézil. Revue d'Études Latines.

CALLON M., 1999. Des différentes formes de démocratie technique. Les Cahiers de la sécurité intérieure, n° 38

CALLON M., 1989. La science et ses réseaux. Paris: La découverte.

CARBONNIER J., 2001. Flexible droit : pour une sociologie du droit sans rigueur. Paris: LGDJ.

DELBOS G., 1983. Savoirs du sel, sel du savoir. Terrains, n°1.

DEWEY J. Démocratie et éducation. Translated by DELEDALLE G. Paris: Armand Colin, 1975; Paris: Nouveaux Horizons, 1990.

DEWEY J. L'art comme expérience. Translated by COMETTI J.P., et al. Pau: Éditions Farrago/Université de Pau, 2005; Paris: Gallimard, 2010.

FOUCAULT M., 1993. Surveiller et punir. Paris: Gallimard.

FOUCAULT M., 1997. Il faut défendre la société : Cours au Collège de France (1975-1976). BERTANI M., FONTANA A. (Eds.). Paris: Gallimard; Seuil, 283 p.

HANNERZ U., 1992. Cultural complexity. Studies in the social organization of meaning. New-York: Columbia University Press.

LEFORT C., 1988. 'La pensée du politique ', A quoi pensent les philosophes ? Paris: Autrement.

RANCIERE J., 2004. Le maître ignorant. Paris: Fayard (Collection 10-18)

RANCIERE J., 2004. Aux bords du politique. Paris: Gallimard.

SCHMITT-PANTEL P., 1992. La Cité au banquet - Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques. Rome: École française de Rome.

SCOTT J., 2008. La domination et les arts de la résistance. Fragments du discours subalterne. Paris: Éditions Amsterdam.

STRAUSS A., 1992. La trame de la négociation. Sociologie qualitative et interactionnisme. Texts collected and presented by BASZANGER I. Paris: L'Harmattan.

WYNNE B., 1996. May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert-lay knowledge divide. In: LASH S., et al. Risk, environment and modernity. London: Sage.

B - Main scientific results

Surveys of the different case studies designed were carried out by appealing to a mix of different research disciplines, and by using the concepts of profane citizenship and translation milieus that could apply to those situations and experiences differently. The surveys resulted in contextualized definitions of profane citizenship in the light of experiences and operations. Firstly, we will describe the contours of these contextualized interpretations by showing how the concept of profane citizenship was interpreted, and what was the heuristic, methodological, documentary, and conceptual profit from the research strategy. Secondly, we will present several models of profane citizenship whose construction was fuelled by those surveys. These models should account for rather theoretical work proposals than set paradigms. Thirdly, in this concluding section, we will present configurations of translation milieus that emerged from our research approaches of contextualized profane citizenship. Finally, we will address the relation between science, making sense, and citizenship. In this respect, we will not intend to establish any normative scientific posture or normative theory of knowledge as far as profane citizenship is concerned. We will raise open-ended questions at work within and between the different investigations carried out in the framework of PROFACITY.

Interpretations of profane citizenship

The notion of profane citizenship was understood and reinterpreted in various ways in the investigations which were carried out. Nevertheless, in their approach and conceptualisation, all researchers regarded as pertinent the fact that profane citizenship made it possible to deviate from the purely legal conception so as to conceive of citizenship or forms of citizenship which were at work. They also retained the need to eliminate an ambiguity which links the idea of profane citizenship to the understanding of experiences of 'vulnerable groups'. Such an association might let us believe that the notion of profane citizenship is only limited to 'vulnerable' groups which for various reasons are on the margins of legal citizenship, and that it essentially designates the practices through which these 'groups' assert their participation in and contribution to the life of the polis in contrast to or apart from legal definitions of citizenship. At the crossroads of the investigations that were carried out, researchers seemed to share the idea that profane citizenship is not to be confused with the citizenship of the excluded, and an agreement is emerging on a formulation according to which profane citizenship is a necessary and useful notion for conceiving of transformations of citizenship. Rather than indexing the notion of citizenship to the experience of these 'groups' and thus situating it on the margins of citizenship, the

investigations that were carried out seem rather to reinforce the idea that as soon as citizenship is conceived not as a static notion but as a dynamic notion in movement, the analysis of its transformations has to be carried out on the scale of societies as a whole. The heuristic value of the notion of profane citizenship is not reduced to understanding what happens on the margin of citizenship, but how experiences on the margins of societies affect societies at their centre and as a whole. Nevertheless, these new formulations and points of convergence on what is generally envisaged by the notion of profane citizenship do not suffice to redefine its contours or to stabilise its interpretation. They rather allow a new relief to emerge which we propose to develop here.

The notion of profane citizenship, interpreted in the context of the profoundly deaf, makes sense both in a polemic and analytical vein. It brings these two tonalities together in various ways depending upon the types of dialogue and interlocutors. It is more polemical when it is opposed to medical perspectives which treat deafness as an infirmity that should be palliated and when it is mobilised to assert perspectives which view deafness as a relation and put the deaf themselves at the centre of an approach to care. It is more analytical when it is used in the socio-educational approach to try to elucidate the contours of the spaces of choice or initiatives which emerge between various forms of socialisation among the deaf, in interactional relationships between emerging sign languages, standard sign language and oral speech in the work of translators and interpreters in a working situation. But irrespective of their interlocutors, profane citizenship constantly reminds us of interaction, which places the position and experience of the deaf at the centre of scientific approaches and relational and institutional arrangements.

The notion of 'profane citizenship' acts here as an appeal to remain vigilant and as an intellectual and practical operator for refocusing scientific and institutional issues. The deaf are not 'target groups' for whom arrangements for care, education and access to professional life are to be found; they are actors in socialisation - their own and that of their environment. It is both analytical and normative dimensions that the notion of profane citizenship makes it possible to express - by using a formula which is sufficiently flexible and sharp to make sense in a variety of scenes and fields.

Interpreted in the context of the undocumented, different usages of the notion of profane citizenship can be found. First, it is a tool for reframing the situation, zooming in on the way the undocumented experience the legal irregularity of their situation and in which they try to resolve their situation, notably in a context in which requests for regularisation are dealt with on a case by case basis. The notion of profane citizenship is inextricably related to its dual polemical and analytical character. The analytical accent is marked when the notion of profane citizenship opens up on attempts to understand their route and the strategies with which men and women manage to take their place and weave relationships in societies which, far from welcoming them with open arms, relegate them to clandestine identities

and question the legitimacy of their presence on the soil. It remains analytical while becoming more polemical when working on understanding what is considered legal and what is viewed as legitimate by the undocumented, by lawyers, by support networks and by governmental agencies or even during short periods of interaction which suggest they are being received benevolently. Nonetheless, it is not reduced to polemic usage; it insists rather on the ambivalence which permeates all the operations and actors involved in decision making chains and in negotiating a right to be there for people in an irregular situation, without assertively entering into the debate on the right of host societies and their governments to decide on the conditions under which foreigners may enter their territory. The notion of profane citizenship makes it possible to consider the limits and effects of law which refuse to take account of facts and to negotiate the right to mobility and plurality of appurtenances.

Interpreted in the context of the experience of the foreign born in the Dutch school system, the notion of profane citizenship was used less as an analytical tool than as an issue to which attention should be paid, making it possible to illuminate different assessments of the social performance of those foreign born young people, as well as their potential. While teachers generally were pessimistic regarding the present-day situation and the scholastic and social development of these youngsters, the youths themselves seemed relatively optimistic as to their situation and their development.

On the one hand, they justified their optimism by mobilising comparative criteria (such as comparisons between their schooling and social development with that of their parents or of previous generations, or those of people they knew living in the country and their countries of origin; the positive assessment of their living conditions and their attachment to their town quarters as opposed to assessments by others, which describe them as ghettos which are tough to live in). On the other hand, and with respect to the place they are given in society or the relations they entertain with Dutch society, they pointed to positive aspects which are not part of the argumentative repertoire of teachers and social workers, who tended to point to negative aspects - their unfavourable position on the job market, their lack of skills and their poor living conditions. The youths' optimism appears also to be related to a conception of citizenship which combines the feeling of being Dutch and belonging to Dutch society and the orientation of their own group. The public and political feeling is that any orientation specific to a group is erroneous and denies the necessity of assimilating to Dutch society - which is born out by competitive conceptions of what being a Dutch citizen means. The notion of profane citizenship is used here both for reproducing the points of view of these young people when they describe themselves and describing the way they participate in society, and by distinguishing the opinions of their 'group' as much as those of their teachers, which are often viewed as expert opinions regarding these young people's citizenship.

Interpreted in the context of city dwellers and the diversification of offerings through the development of ethnic businesses (particularly kebabs), the notion of profane citizenship was related to forms of participation in public life differing from those which convoke citizens to public debates and instituted scenes. Attention shown to the proliferation of kebab businesses, with their halal displays, at a time in which debates on Islam mobilise European political scenes in various ways, has led us to emphasise the 'cultural dimension' of citizenship involved in ordinary practices. This cultural dimension of citizenship refers not to belonging to a particular group, but to the right to be different and to belong in a participative and democratic sense (Rosaldo, 1993). The notion of profane citizenship has itself been related to interpretations of citizenship, which may be called profane within the sense that they neither proceed from precise knowledge of the citizenship of those who are interacting, nor make precise references to the status of citizens, and are publicly manifest in a society which is being created, although this is not carried out in debates.

Interpreted within the context of identity checks in the public sphere of an international train station in which the conditions of the Schengen Agreement apply, the notion of profane citizenship made it possible to describe the public and political dimensions of interactions between the police, the identity controls, the public and the environment of the train station. Contrary to the framework of the exercise of the task of police officers, which aims at making the control invisible so that it not be conspicuous in the 'normal' conditions of a train station, the problematic of profane citizenship leads us to emphasise the reactivity, the concern and the commitment of all parties involved in the situation, which consisted of public and sensitive interaction. By setting off the control, they create an event within the station - they single out and individualise a person from among anonymous movements, and they ask the subject to justify his or her identity and reason for being there. Immersed in the physical reality of bodies which are also present, this scene points to one of the paradigmatic meanings of profane citizenship: who has the right to be there? Who has the capacity and legitimacy to control the regularity of presences? To what extent do presences in a train station present a form of assertion of a right to be there? And to what extent does police intervention in identity checks contribute to drawing an 'inner border' even within society, dividing the authorised from the irregular? Profane citizenship is manifest here in public situations of confronting with citizenship, when society itself tests itself in its relationship to citizenship.

Interpreted within the context of illiterate people carrying out a professional activity, the notion of profane citizenship was used less as an analytic tool or polemical notion than as a source of conceptual inspiration. It was understood here topologically within the space of non-market economics involving the play of social relations. It refers to a sort of alternative social sphere, of liberation, which the illiterate constitute and which empowers them to participate in what they are excluded from. Given the status of incompetence that all illiterates are given by society, those who carry out a professional activity are confronted with the challenge of doing more than anyone else, of providing a supplementary effort to

what is expected of them, whether they are surpassing the profile or in a position of usurper. This supplementary effort leads them more than others to deploy an equally supplementary space behind identity, which is hardly visible and protected through the division of the public and private spheres, as no institution can intervene there totally, although it produces effects beyond the private and the domestic. The notion of profane citizenship here is employed to suggest areas of liberation that anyone can create as an arrangement of and with society, but which - in the case of those who are more subject to the normative pressure of society than others (such as undocumented mothers, the profoundly deaf or foreign-born youth) -is charged with twice as much intensity, allowing them to participate in the life of the polis.

Interpreted in the context of the process and procedures of erasure of the resident records of Slovenian citizenship at the time of Slovenia's independence of those residing in Slovenia with the Yugoslav citizenship but without Slovenian citizenship, the notion of profane citizenship was used to understand this transformation of citizenship and to situate it within a historic development. The investigation was on the contexts of erasure, the route of certain 'erased persons', and the difficulties and dead-ends in procedures of reparation that were implemented. On the one hand, it demonstrated the illegal and anti-constitutional character of the administrative measure of erasure that was implemented by the Slovenian administration. On the other hand, it used the notion of profane citizenship as a conceptual and historic tool for conceiving of the passing from one norm of citizenship to another in the framework in which this erasure took place. The socialist revolution in Yugoslavia had changed the previous norm of citizenship - 'citizen versus bourgeois' - by establishing another norm of citizenship which juxtaposed the two concepts of 'workers' (in self-managed businesses) versus 'commoners' (actors in self-managed territorial units). At the time of the disappearance of Yugoslavia and Slovenia's independence, the 'erased' no longer benefited from the status of 'commoner' which they had benefited from in the system of Yugoslav citizenship. The erasure proceeded by denying the very institution of 'commoner', which was fundamental for ex-Yugoslavian citizenship, as well as de facto citizenship, which might be called instituted profane citizenship, according to which the possessor of citizenship of one republic was at the same time a citizen of the Federation and practiced his citizenship where he resided and worked. Subsequently, the cancellation of the act of erasure by the Constitutional Court, which was judged anti-constitutional because it 'discriminated against a group of foreigners defined by personal circumstance', confirmed the erasure of the norm of citizenship of self-managed Yugoslavia and achieved the restoration of the bourgeois legal norm of citizenship.

Profane citizenship in models

From these investigations, or as an echo of them, several proposals of models of profane citizenship were sketched out. Here, we shall try to present four, treating them less as

definitive models than as possible ways of giving form to the prolongation of the investigations and their contributions. This gamut of interpretations can be described as being limited on the one hand by the approaches of profane citizenship which attempt at least to fix the contents and delimit the contours, and on the other hand by conceptions that turn profane citizenship into a heuristic category of methodology as much as of analysis, opening up to the understanding of singular forms of participating in the life of the polis.

Dynamic model. The first model comes from the observation that with the concept of profane citizenship, the research group is trying to capture the process of the production of citizenship, how it evolves and how it is continuing to change (R. Maier). 'Profane citizenship' then designates the dynamic production of citizenship, and aims at analysing the basis of formal elaborations of citizenship. In this perspective, the suggestion was raised to describe it as a sort of proto-citizenship (R. Maier), and to relate the conditions of its emergence and activation to the contexts of contemporary European societies, conceived of as knowledge societies which share the conviction that in today's world, and certainly in Europe, all individuals are active in the way they perceive, communicate, learn, read and interact. These activities produces different forms of knowledge through interpretation, selection and the arrangement of what has been seen, heard and experienced in action. This is the knowledge, inasmuch as it produces the activities of individuals, which presupposes and develops a sort of basic right - the right to have rights.

The formula, the 'right to have rights' then appears as a right which irrigates proto-citizenship. This is very different from formally established citizenship which articulates rights and duties as characteristics of modern citizenship. The established rights of citizens, formulated and founded on a legal basis, have a history and every individual is supposed to know how to implement and realise these rights. This constituted form of profane citizenship is rather static, which does not mean that new rights cannot be formulated and instituted through social and political action. On the other hand, the dynamics of this proto-citizenship combine a factual hypothesis on knowledge while producing activities among individuals with a normative hypothesis, i.e. that these activities give rise to claims. In this perspective, a model of profane citizenship might be elaborated within the general framework of analysis in accordance with three dimensions.

The first, which might be designated as generative, specifies how knowledge as it develops the activities of individuals constitutes a force or a cause of the development of the right to have rights in given historic circumstances (with, for example, the differences between the Middle Ages and the modern era).

The second, the structural and process dimension, specifies how profane citizenship is a force or cause which creates new rights or develops (formalised) rights in new ways through

varied elaborations (making them explicit, applying them to new cases, and elaborating richer contents by combining selected aspects).

The third, the factual and normative dimension, specifies aspects and properties of profane citizenship both as a factual event and as a norm or claim that produces force (knowing something - the value of knowing it).

The discussion and elaboration of this model of understanding profane citizenship is still work in progress. The hypothesis that the knowledge society generates the feeling of a right to have rights deserves to be discussed in a historic perspective. It also commits us to thinking about the social organisation of knowledge and meaning in contemporary societies, as well as the use of 'science' as expertise in this context. The tendency of giving science a pre-eminent role instead of considering that it is just one element of 'making sense' - tends to establish its authority, and to become almost general vis-à-vis the ordinary citizen and lead to the silencing of the non-expert, who is considered incapable of having knowledge. These considerations show that the links between knowledge society and the right to have rights can hardly be regarded as definitively achieved without being tested by historic analysis and the analyses of activities in situation.

Historic model. The second model presents profane citizenship in a general historic perspective of citizenship (R. Močnik). It aims at making a contribution to classical theories of citizenship which have identified a succession of forms and norms of citizenship (the passing from legal to political citizenship and then on to social citizenship in Marshall (1992 [1950]), the passing from one norm of citizenship instituting a constitutive distinction - subject/citizen, citizen/foreigner - in the writings of Patricia Mindus (2010)). For irrespective of the differences between these two versions of the history of citizenship, the transition from one type of citizenship to another is implicitly conceived of as the effect of a major political rupture, but without the processes and dynamics which are at work in these transitions having been explicitly analysed. It is precisely here that the notion of profane citizenship appears necessary and pertinent in conceiving of transformations of citizenship. The political practices which have initiated these transformations contest the presently valid norm of citizenship, but they do not limit themselves to an opposition to the legal regulations of the moment; at the same time, they propose another norm of citizenship which points to the insufficiencies and limits of citizenship at the moment. These political practices denounce the limits of the norm of citizenship from the “outside”, but they themselves create that very outside. In this perspective, the notion of profane citizenship refers to the processes of the sui generis creation of outside spaces through political practices which transform citizenship. This does not, however, mean that these transformations are moving in the direction of a broadening or gradual increase of citizenship.

Performative model. One of the enigmas of profane citizenship is related to its capacity to be mobilised in various contexts of investigation, some of which are obviously concerned with the question of the polis, while others were related to more private, intimate or even 'invisible' situations or construct themselves as invisibles (J. Roux). The question is crucial because the “citizen” quality of such and such a subject not (only) depends on some pre-established political quality, but also on the way the participants and the researcher tend to grasp (or not grasp) him or her. Given the risk of everything being considered political, which ultimately abandons the analytical test of citizenship to the confusion between society and city, this model mobilises the notion of citizening. What is at stake is the defence of a performative approach to profane citizenship in which the demarcation line between what depends upon the polis and what does not depend on it is not pre-established in the defence of clear limits between fields or scholarly disciplines. Sociology and anthropology are both equipped here to allow for citizenship expressed in social acts to exist, as opposed to dogmatic law and political science. From this perspective, the citizenship quality of such and such a situation or scene is constructed in the field through confronting with, deployed above, underneath or alongside formal aspects of the same situations when they are reduced to or by expertise. Profane citizenship is manifest through its rugged, contrasted, extended and proliferating side in the framework of the distribution of operations throughout the stakeholders of the situations. The idea was put forward that if every situation in society might potentially come from a quality of citizenship, one needs a triggering event to contribute to the expression of what is just latent or even invisible in the fabric of social relations.

Profane citizenship in this performative approach appears as an irruption and the manifestation of the issue of the polis on the very inside of society as it is created. These circumstances are not bereft of history or context. They operate in milieus, understood as places or formulae of passage operating between the creation of society and the creation of the polis. Translation operations which are developed there are ramified, bi-unequivocal, proliferating and contagious. The triggering events of translations are not attributed to such or such an actor beforehand. They may result from an institutional intervention, the State, civil servants in charge of a public issue, the intervention of the media, or also a private initiative carried out within the context of the family, business or the law, or a group initiative, for instance setting up and mobilising a non-profit organisation, or a group which takes charge of a situation and puts it in the public place. In such situations of citizening, in the mutual passages between lay-society and lay-city, roles may be redistributed between positions of authority or power and non-dominant positions, between the positions of expert knowledge and so-called lay knowledge, between the public and hidden transcripts which model the many scenes of life in society (Scott, 2008).

Interpretative model. Another perspective is suggested which consists of approaching the transformations of citizenship while remaining attentive to new conceptions of citizenship

borne by individuals who re-elaborate them (A. Battegay). The formation of new subjectivities in a world which is evolving is detached neither from the legal constructions of citizenship nor contemporary tests to which social citizenship is put while participating in them. But emphasis is laid on the profane interpretations of citizenship which are asserted by acts which configure conceptions of citizenship, the right to be there and take part in the life of the polis, i. e. in public life. From this perspective, profane interpretations do not necessarily correspond to or prolong those which are being debated in scenes which are officially dedicated to defining legal citizenship or the scenes of participative democracy. This does not mean that profane citizenships are completely independent of official definitions and their re-definitions, but that they interpret them and update them according to logics which are not strictly legal.

The 'radical' character of this conception comes from the fact that it does not restrict itself to including among these interpretations such interpretations which are inscribed in the trend gradually to include those who had initially been excluded from citizenship within the circles and networks of citizenship. Profane interpretations of citizenship do not only come from those who are situated on the margins of citizenship and do not only work towards its broadening; they can also move towards a tightening or indeed rigidifying of citizenship. They can also come from groups and initiatives seeking to reduce access or governmental agencies which interpret legal citizenship they are called upon to administer in a restrictive, arbitrary and sometimes even illegal manner. This was the case when the new Slovenian administration erased residence records of part of the residents, which ran contrary to constitutional law but which responded to a political climate and economic stakes which made it possible to carry out a profane interpretation which restricted citizenship. This is also the case in France, where recent analyses of the regularisation of the undocumented show that the interpretation of their files often depend upon officials sitting at the desks at the prefectures who often depend upon the interpretations of their immediate supervisors, who select among the pile of changing valid regulations without really applying the law. In both cases, while the governmental agencies are meant to enforce the law, it appears that they interpret it, and these interpretations depend not only upon legal criteria, but point to margins for manoeuvre which can be played with.

In this sense, the subject of the ambivalences of citizenship becomes a central subject as a counterpoint to the progressive ideas which are often inclined to include only those interpretations which illustrate the trend of the gradual inclusion of new categories of populations who had initially been excluded into circles and networks of citizenship. The emphasis upon ambivalences of profane interpretations of citizenship should induce us to think of contemporary developments without inscribing them in a continuous movement of the broadening of citizenship which comes from the past and will shape the future. It does seem necessary to revisit this idea of a continuous and progressive movement, apart that it passes over those periods of European history marked by the reverse movement, at a moment in which European societies are being impacted by contradictory trends and

currents which mark the dynamics of their internal/ external borders, and their stiffening as much as their porosity. At a moment in which the number of those who are finding themselves in ambiguous situations is rising, both inside and outside, both within citizenship and at its doors, both outside citizenship and within its networks.

Profane citizenship and translation milieus

In hybrid situations in which forms of citizenship are experienced or tested, translations take place which initiate, accompany or participate in profane interpretations of citizenship. These processes of translation of citizenship, carried out upon the initiative of actors which go beyond the usual, official or institutional non-profit organisations, intermediaries or interlocutors for the concerned groups and individuals, are activated by a number of operators and operations, which have effects of requalification or disqualification in tension with official citizenships. At the end of this route in various fields of investigation, the configuration and scope of these translation milieus and the profane interpretations of citizenship they produce can be specified.

Translation milieus have been configured around these problematic situations and the initiatives which have been observed as translation processes with their moments, actors and procedures. The configurations of these milieus, when they started based upon identified actors, whether collective, professional or individual, became more complex and it was shown that they cannot be reduced to these actors alone. Translation processes were developed or appeared which go beyond them, which 'transgress' or question them. The translations were not operated or did not appear as though they could not be operated in one direction, from the experts to the lay persons, the dominant towards the dominated, the hearing toward the deaf using interpreters, or between experts. Expertise or mediation itself was interrogated, and their actors and formats were revisited.

New figures of translation appeared, such as young immigrant entrepreneurs in Holland or groups of young women who wore veils, taking initiatives to point to the discrimination to which they are subject, while at the same time asserting their way of taking place in society. In conversations with the deaf, given that they often associate a standard language with an emerging language, the figure of the deaf mediator took place alongside the sign language interpreter, which made it necessary to cross translations and interpretations on the part of these participants to ensure the faithfulness of the content of the interviews so as to validate them. The diversity of situations and experiences which the deaf undergo and the variety of their points of view were asserted. Parents and the environment of the deaf became actors and indispensible interlocutors, both in setting up new arrangements such as bilingual schools and in controversies between medical, anthropological or relational approaches to deafness. The moments and procedures of translation, including when they

take place in milieus with actors who have been identified as translators, do not necessarily take the form of dialogue, agreement, understanding, consensus, homogeneity, or the exchange of individual expertise. They also take the form of the heterogeneous, the 'untranslatable', the immeasurable, dialect, interpretation, polyphony and compromise, participating in collective intelligence or what is more, social intelligence.

Translating milieus are more like processes in which meaning is sought out and created, in which complexity is produced, in which objects are rendered visible, or in which perturbation takes place, and spaces in which narratives are constructed and invented. These processes produced paradoxes and contradictions, or allowed those paradoxes and contradictions to emerge, notably in the fields of Dutch researchers interested in various perceptions of the future and the place of young immigrants in Dutch society and in the influence of surrounding discourses and policies conducted by education professionals. The latter, often considered natural translators or at least 'facilitators' for young immigrants, are revealed to be 'traitors'. In this case, research as an operation of translation points like a paradox and a contradiction to the optimism of young immigrants when asked about their future and the support they get from their families, while education professionals only see them as illusions and a lack of realism and cannot take the 'perspectives of these young people… seriously'. These paradoxes emerge in a public climate which continues to treat these young people as second class citizens, while 80 percent of them have Dutch citizenship, but are twice as likely to be unemployed. However, they also come from the fact that teachers adopt the point of view of a policy which makes the individual alone responsible for his success and failures without looking sufficiently at the responsibilities of a stratified school system.

These processes also come about at times and in scenes which have been organised by researchers in the Gand team, which organised interactions between citizenship and civil society and between civil society and scientists. These interactions are not so much aimed at an exchange between experts and even less at the dissemination of expertise as in constructing what G. Verstraete called 'social intelligence'. The aim is to question what appears to be obvious and to see how experiences gone through and research carried out can lead to upheavals or be introduced into professionalism or at least allow professionals to see their work differently. Thus, the welcoming and presence of foreigners without documents into the work of the Protestant Social Centre led them to think together about questions which are rarely posed: what distinguishes normal from abnormal citizenship? And is it up to social workers to be preoccupied by legal issues?

Other configurations of these translation milieus, which are less usual when the issue of citizenship arises, were taken into account. Thus, the city and language as translation milieus are not configured to the same extent as individuals who are considered translators or mediators or institutions dedicated to the exercise of citizenship, but more around

operations and arrangements inscribed in milieus in ordinary and daily life. A. Battegay believes that 'the fact that the city-milieu is the place and object of perspectives and interpretations which are interacting makes it a translation milieu', favourable for the 'complex negotiation of the quality of citizenship within an interconnected set of points of urbane points of view and practices. ' The nature and public and political scopes of translations carried out in situations has to be questioned. How do these experiences participate in the movement of societies? Do they or do they not remain on the margin and do they give rise to the production of a new sense of citizenship?

H. Vaz attributed a stake of citizenship to languages as a translation milieu on the basis of the question of schools of reference. He points out that the concept of a school of reference designates a form of school in which bilingualism is a distinctive feature, in the case of the deaf. The implementation of this concept makes it possible to determine deafness early on at an individual level. But it goes further, by recognising the primacy of Portuguese sign language for these pupils. The recognition of this language promotes its learning from the earliest age and beyond that gives it a pre-eminent position in the process of the socialising of deaf pupils, around the language. In the context of these schools, deaf pupils are integrated into a reference language community and a group of socialisation consisting of adults, children and youths who use sign language. This specific reception and socialisation through language in schools which also have hearing pupils lead to a dual inclusion among the hearing and among the deaf. This 'double inclusion guarantees a broader process of socialisation and linguistic identity by translating a cultural identity. ' This is done so that learning and using sign language in a language community make communication easier, allowing for dialogue between people, teachers and pupils alike, who do not share the same language; the differences between those people are not only an issue of whether words correspond. 'Language is an expression of one's self, inasmuch as the self is social and sociable. The spatiality of sign languages can only be translated into the time reference of the spoken word and vice versa if the communicable content of the context or milieu which produces it is impregnated, ' H. Vaz writes. But this double inclusion cannot be carried out without the parents realising its advantages and getting involved. The striking idea that the entourage of a deaf child is a determinant for the process of his educational, together with the use of sign languages as the primary language of the deaf allowed a new actor to emerge at the school: the Portuguese sign language trainer. This trainer, who is himself deaf, (although the law allows a hearing person to adopt this function), is a new figure in translation. Beyond teaching a language, he is the bearer of a visual and gesture-based perception and grasping of the world, and symbolises the social success of a deaf adult among the young. The statuses and relationships among trainers, who are often themselves deaf, interpreters, who can usually hear, and teachers are not without conflict. Their cooperation is not a matter of course. On the one hand, interpreters and deaf trainers have the status of technicians, although they play a role which is equivalent to that of a teacher. On the other hand, deaf trainers do not have pedagogical training which would allow them to develop this cooperative work.

The citizenship stakes with language as a translation milieu obviously concern the deaf but go far beyond them. They transform the life of young deaf people and their access to full citizenship, but also influence the entire school context by making us reflect on school, handicaps, differences, the visibility of language and the norm. Passing from the category of handicap to that of translation milieu will make it possible either to recognise its specificity or to allow a relationship of parity to emerge. Learning Portuguese sign language as a first language, its integration in early work with parents or the arrival of a deaf trainer are all postulates and practices which replace the relationship with deafness in the framework of the principle of the 'equality of intelligences' (Rancière, 1987).

In the case of the erased, attention is focused on operations of translation which deprived them of their citizenship and related rights following Slovenia's independence. The translation milieus were then defined 'as a semiotic and discursive field in which or through which utterances and texts were produced' during the investigation and on the basis of materials which had been gathered. While initially these discourses on the erased seemed to be deployed according to a juridical logic developed on the basis of a premise which had been made invisible through a dominant discourse which had henceforth been considered a matter of course, this approach appeared insufficient, given the diversity of discourses with sometimes contradictory conclusions. Instead of accepting that the erased paid the price of a change in conceptions of citizenship and that this change took place legally in compliance with legal frameworks, it appeared, to the contrary, that ideological discourses were introduced in a climate of xenophobia and nationalism, and that they had an impact on legal regulations, on instructions given to the civil service and on the enforcement of laws by the civil servants. The conclusion is that rather than recognise that 'former Yugoslav citizens exercising their citizenship in Slovenia should become Slovenian citizens, they were considered as foreigners or as citizens of the other republics of the former Yugoslavia, and they were reproached for not having acquired Slovenian citizenship, were erased from the lists without their knowledge, lost their citizenship and rights from one day to the next, saw their documents destroyed, and today their requests for reparations are not being followed through. Thus, ideologies affected the discourses and administrative acts, which did not depend upon strictly legal logics. And successive laws for amending erasure have proved inadequate for correcting the legal measures taken under these extra-juridical influences. "This is why we assert that erasure was committed and reproduced at the level of law enforcement, or in Foucault's term, at the level of governmentality' (R. Močnik). The Slovenian researchers used the notion of translation milieu to refer to the intertextuality and polyphony of the discourses, which made it possible to conduct a criticism of the underlying ideology (M. Kržan).

With the usage of law and of rights as the translation milieu in the case of the undocumented in France, emphasis is placed more on the lack of determination of the law and recourse to 'law and to non-law' (illegality) (Carbonnier, 2000) for the uncertain passages between non-citizenship and citizenship. This means passages from a theoretical

right to the effective conquest of 'practical power' (Sève, 1986), which makes law lose its appearance of being founded upon an a priori assumption. These uses of law nevertheless do not depend upon the sole initiative of foreigners and their champions, since the transfiguration of what is legal is not always ready to allow for an emancipation from the dominant social order. But these usages do not work on imposition, domination or deviance alone, are not limited to experts and legal professionals alone, and are extended to other actors in the translation. Thus, in legal files kept by the lawyers of the undocumented, we find documents in which worlds from various perspectives interconnect, whether they be part of government agencies, employers, non-profit organisations, undocumented individuals and those close to them, or also various national and extra-national jurisdictions. Rules, constraints and rights between which tension exists are updated and interpreted there. While government agencies require proof of exclusive allegiance, foreigners interpret citizenship not as an allegiance but as a resource which gives right to mobility and a plurality of appurtenances. Things which are not put in words, such as undeclared employment, the position of the undocumented in the economy and society, or like the discrete racism of regularisation on a case by case basis are made out and interpreted, exposed and made visible. Finally, arguments, traces of ordinary life and the assertion of rights are translated into documents. Nevertheless, usages of law as a translation milieu do not necessarily work in the sense of broadening rights and citizenship. A variety of contradictory translations do not always work in favour of the improvement of conditions of foreigners in an irregular situation. 'This nevertheless indicates that law, as a translation milieu, does not operate in a vacuum, and that it does not only consist in decreeing a rule prior to the fact. Law is not the only thing to establish norms. It leads to practices, arrangements and instrumentalisation, some of which aim at a negotiation of law. ' (Marie-Thérèse Têtu). Those who are subject to it can take it, interpret it and develop their own norms of justice. This would participate in a more general evolution towards the normative pluralism that is to be found in fields of social life other than that of foreigners whose legal situation is irregular. 'This confirms that sources of law are not limited to the law but also extend to practical usages which constitute real sources of normativity for the actors involved. ' (J.P. Bonafé Schmitt, 2010).

Making science and making meaning: one of the stakes of what is profane in citizenship

The contours of profane citizenship and translation milieus as they have been sketched here leave the paths of contagion or democratic appropriation uncertain. It is true that the idea emerges that these paths are not in a direct linear relationship: they do not follow paths which have been traced by intermediaries who would make products of experience pass from bottom to top or from top to bottom, and the translators who play a role in transformations of citizenship are confused neither with professionals, nor with non-profit organisations. Nevertheless, several positions are emerging through these investigations as to how science and meaning can be made in the problematics of profane citizenship. For the notion of profane citizenship involves at least four aspects, which appear to be remote from one another but which are present in this work, sometimes in the form of mutual tension.

Showing/hiding. At a time in which the programme of the European Union put the advance towards an economy and society of knowledge into its political agenda (Lisbon Treaty 2000), in which access to and the development of expertise for all citizens are regarded as vectors of democratisation and the extension of citizens' rights, the investigations presented in this book present nuances. If the investigations do not refuse to be associated with this movement so as to take account of profane initiatives and arts of doing things, they nevertheless point to limits and risks. Some of them emphasise the strategies or states of affairs which tend to dissimulate or to protect the real spaces of initiatives, where taking a place in the polis is not necessarily achieved through the public assertion of rights.

On the one hand, putting forward contributions of lay initiatives in the field of citizenship (a posture which does not exempt us from vigilance, given that these ambivalent contributions take part in the polemical spheres of public debate) does not necessarily lead to positions opposed to experts or science, but instead puts the scope of the knowledge of scholars into a more relative perspective. If such expert knowledge is not always presented as being instrumentalised in the logics of power, surveys nevertheless remind us of the conditions under which it is stated and the authority of what makes experts participate in the definition of what is normal or 'evidence-based' (G. Verstraete, W. de Graaf). From this point of view, positions defended in this book point to a greater pluralism in forms of knowledge, the way propositions are validated, and forms of publicising and disseminating the findings of expertise. It is with a view to a legitimate confrontation in which the knowledge of experts and lay persons are recognised that a creative enterprise may be undertaken, opening up a scene of compatibility which should allow us to transcend the incompatibilities or misunderstandings which may for instance result from jargon or languages.

On the other hand, other investigations pointed to the risk or even emphasised the refusal to participate in logics of activating citizenship or empowerment imposed from on high. These investigations observe that positions of vulnerability (of the deaf, illiterate or asylum seekers) are produced as though they have already been framed through procedures and logics of labelling, of differentiating among minorities, inherent to policies and by forms of mobilising around 'causes' which reproduce forms of 'sub-citizenship' in the very name of these categories. Concerned researchers claim forms of relationships to their investigation which spare the persons or groups which have been contacted a super-determination which would correspond to their identification/ stigmas. For a certain notion of 'competence' has become hegemonic today since it left the milieu of education in which it was developed so as to become a substitute for 'qualification' in human resource management by way of evaluation. According to a normative conception, competencies have to be found depending on needs and re-mediations and training have to be offered which would make it possible to respond to social and/or economic expectations. Thus, auditing companies and evaluators face the task of speaking about the tasks themselves (Milner J.C., 2005) so that politicians can take decisions which cannot be contested and replace political action, which always

creates tension, with an 'objective' and thus consensual management of the situation. To the contrary, reflection upon profane citizenship is conducted with no reference to this predominant model.

Some investigations, which preferred long-term accompanying or the principle of working with people and sharing moments and situations, point to initiatives, assets and qualities which assert themselves alongside, underneath or away from the official or administrative frameworks of recognition: one example is an illiterate who succeeds professionally, thus 'usurping' a place which would not logically be accorded to him; another is the refugee who is an artist who is ignored because the logic of the institution only evaluates him by applying an economy of identity which values in refugees only the 'victim'; a third is the isolated deaf person who elaborates a singular sign language with those around him which allows him to assert a right, without necessarily stating it publicly. The question of the profane also reaches a point of limitation when exposing a handicap or a demand in the public realm would run contrary to arrangements made by the persons themselves, seeking to find their place in discretion.

Capabilities and democratic competencies. Other investigations raise the problematic issue of relations between expert and lay knowledge anew; they contribute to confusing the issue to the extent that questions on notions such as capabilities, empowerment, performances and competencies do not leave the problematic of the profane unscathed and without debate. If we take inspiration from the scheme of reasoning put forward by Amartya Sen (2004), who defines the notion of capability as a link between individual freedom and a 'social organisation the various combinations of functioning of which form a whole in which a person is capable of choosing his or her life', these investigations deem that gestures which are apparently minor and issue from individual freedom may be perceived and interpreted as gestures for asserting a right to have rights related to the public cultures, the various combinations of which form a whole which gives them meaning and determine their scope.

In the case of ethnic businesses, particularly kebab businesses, these apparently minor gestures are choices of display which themselves are tested by their commercial and public attractiveness. These gestures do not take on the same appearance of gestures of public assertion of a right to be somewhere unless they are related to public cultures - and the term is understood here in a broad sense, encompassing cultures in cities, just as the cultures of cities, of which each is suffused with national cultures and related to social cultures.

It is in taking account of this analytic tie between public cultures and gestures which assert a right to be that performances of displaying and bringing people together (publics and

clients) can be read as being part of the competencies of city dwellers (I. Joseph, 1996), notably in the case of ethnic businesses and kebab businesses in particular. On the one hand, these competencies depend upon the individual freedom to choose appearances and in this case upon the awareness of having a right to have rights. On the other hand, the performance of displays which have been carried out - in the case of a halal display consisting of displaying a convention for a transaction - are tested with a view to their social acceptance and their attractiveness in ordinary city dwellers' practices. They take on distinct meanings according to cities, national contexts and the moments at which they appear.

Various public cultures thus contribute to giving meaning to gestures and performances of displaying. In the creation of society in Europe, gestures of displaying can be understood as one of the elements of movements of cosmopolitisation of public and urban life, which has become more or less commonplace in the practice of city dwellers. Depending upon the public cultures which have an impact, they can also give rise to controversies, reservations and strategies of avoidance or even restrictions aimed at reducing their importance, size or number, particularly by applying administrative measures. These variations show that the meanings of these businesses in public and urban life are situational and contextualised. In certain situations and contexts, the choices of display are interpreted as though they have the scope of assertions of a controversial right to be, whereas they do not have the same meaning in other contexts. These performances of display and rallying people together at any rate point to micro-political competencies of negotiation in situation, pointing as much to the competencies of city-dwellers and to critical competencies (M. Breviglieri, C. Lafaye, D. Trom, 2009) as to capabilities configured by the public cultures in which they are exercised (A. Battegay). To take up a part of Sen's terms again, according to a perspective that is as analytical as it is normative, individual freedom which is at work in these performances also depends upon the social responsibility of urban democracies.

Other investigations take up this both analytical and normative link between individual freedom and social responsibility in their own way. The investigation of the profoundly deaf thus shows that in analytical and ethical terms their freedom of choice of the language they communicate in is a social responsibility that the bilingual schools tend to impact and implement. In this sense, the notion of competence this perspective opens up is unlikely to be confused with the notion of competence developed in literature on management (Stroobants 1993) which tends to take the place that used to be attributed to the notion of qualification. It does not lead to describing individual competencies as against knowledge with which the individuals are equipped or should be equipped, but to indicate that individual capacities to act are delimited by the working of groups, which in turn depend upon social responsibility or responsibility towards society. It is at this scale that the notion of democratic competence, which as yet remains to a large extent to be elaborated, is immediately both individual and collective, and creates a dynamic relationship between the feeling of having a right to have rights with the institutional and public configurations necessary for their exercise.

Profane citizenship and democratic appropriation. Certain investigations explicitly place the subject of profane citizenship into scientific work itself, when the very conditions for collecting experiences, formalising them and disseminating them give rise to the possibility of establishing communication and mutual understanding with the persons being interviewed. Knowledge and science in such cases are no longer considered for their utility and their potential of historic effectiveness, but also in their controversial practical procedures, when the commitment of citizens within this scientific work can also take various paths so as to make sense.

Drawing from a sociology of absence (Boaventura Santos, 2002b), the investigation of the deaf, and particularly of the isolated profoundly deaf emphasises these transforming movements of alternative practices of citizenship, assuming more or less visible and organised forms of struggle, which simply follow a logic of non-subordination to what the dominant power intends to attribute, impose and colonise. Experiences of profane citizenship emerge as relational spaces at the crossroads of claims to citizenship and the attribution of citizenship, which is situated at their interface. This concept of profane citizenship escapes the rationality of identity imposed by conceptions of attributed citizenship and of claimed citizenship.

Profane citizenship then becomes manifest in the exercise of a citizenship which is not planned and which is not attributed, but which is also often not claimed, although it may be constructed 'against the flow' as an inherent process in the simple fact of being. 'Being deaf, the deaf look, the culture of looking, deaf-deaf marriages, sign languages… are examples of cultural markers which have survived mechanisms of extermination, biomedical manipulation, eradication, prohibition, punishment, exclusion, normalisation or on the other hand tolerance and generosity that one can identify in the history of the 'deaf people' ' (O. Coelho).

Being and doing thus emerge as hybrid forms of claiming rights to have rights. Profane citizenships which accept themselves in the form of determined life styles through assertive practices of democratic appropriation will not stop the flow of the river. They make it possible to analyse and understand relational dynamics in which processes of asserting identities, rights and citizenships are constructed, and within these dynamics, differences and singularities acquire a new status in a framework of equality of intelligences (Rancière).

From this point of view, the investigation of isolated prelingual profoundly deaf persons is revealing, while presenting an extreme situation. While they do not inherit any language and do not use any standard sign language they might have learned, the isolated deaf invent

their own unique means for communicating with those around them, and the stakes here touch the very roots of the question of access to any citizenship in context. For if the exercise of an articulated language is a condition for a being to belong to the human species (according to Aristotle), what happens when deafness means that a being is not able to learn his 'mother' tongue; outside his language, he lives outside the realm of any possible communication with their fellow human beings. Everything therefore depends on the one hand on access to the only language within reach through learning, sign language, and on the other hand the recognition of sign language as a fully fledged natural language by common sense. In our society we see that only attributing the term 'natural language' to sign languages allows the deaf, whose status between the animal and the monster is uncertain (Benvenuto, 2010) to enter the human species as a citizen by law (M. Derycke).

These questions of labelling explicitly raised in research on the deaf were also to be found again in other investigations, particularly those concerning the illiterate in France and the undocumented in Belgium. The researchers, who were vigilant in not adding a reductionist identification with their subject of research to the effects of domination, mobilised strategies for their investigation which circumvented labelling, so as to go beyond official labels and allow the hidden dimensions of the private space of the persons being investigated to emerge. For the illiterate, the investigation thus went beyond the people in the panel to literate members of the network of their environment; for the undocumented in Belgium, the participation of the researcher in legally accompanying the subject or a public artistic creation made it possible to develop personal bonds making it possible to broaden identifications based upon the person’s sole status as a refugee to the human person.

Scientific work and civic commitment. In this work, the investigations present a relatively open gamut of methods for doing and making sense in the framework of a collective investigation on citizenship. Contributions show that the scientific work itself is challenged with regard to the civic commitment of the researcher and his or her work. The same thing no doubt applies to the effect of introducing the profane in an area which depends on various fields of expertise and also on the fact that conducting investigations may led the researcher to have the experience of being a layperson himself or herself. 'To what extent can a researcher only study profane citizenships by profaning scholarly knowledge and orthodox methodologies, himself developing profane knowledge and action? ', O. Coelho asks. 'Profaning methodologies means re-creating and re-inventing them, even if they always become methodologies; not those we disposed of at the beginning, but new profane methodologies, those which we were able to construct throughout the research process in places of exchanges and interactions with partners and interlocutors in the field. The position of the researcher as a specialist is broadened so as to allow the researcher, who does not lay hold of a power he does not possess, to look for an agreement and approach for what is specific to the object he is studying, on a profane basis and in relational movements. Here, we talk about knowledge as expertise, but knowledge which remains

linked to the field of research, thus adding to scientific work the requirements and specificities of the target group and taking account of the engagement between research work and social transformation. ' (O. Coelho)

In the case of the erased in Slovenia, the object of research involves the notion of citizenship on the basis of a public problem in the context of the passing from a socialist, self-managing society to a capitalist society which was constructed in a climate of xenophobia and nationalism. Thus, it was both a research question and an issue of citizenship for researchers who were themselves citizens. Nevertheless, the recourse to science in this case aimed at elucidating what had made such an illegal act possible.

The position of the researcher 'working with' candidates for asylum who had sought asylum in Belgium was another alternative. On the one hand, it consisted in seeing things from the vantage of those concerned, sharing part of their social experience while discovering a world which had been unknown to him until then. The researcher, working together with the refugee candidates, then explores the both social and cultural practices which redefine the borders of juridical citizenship both for obtaining legal status and for exercising forms of political activities. By doing so, he experiences injustice, incompetence and ignorance among refugee candidates, their interlocutors, governmental agencies and himself. His position oscillates between the role of spokesman which may personally be attributed to him and his activity as a researcher.

During work sessions which brought together health professionals, researchers and representatives of education and non-profit organisations in France and Portugal, the developments in relations between the lay and experts were examined in various fields of handicaps and chronic illness, together with the place of the social sciences in these evolutions in the two countries. The importance of a contextualised approach to each type of handicap or chronic ailment was emphasised, making it possible to understand differences in practical questions put to both patients and doctors. In each case, the challenges and practical stakes of persons living with their illness vary, as do their relations with official medicine, which considers them differently itself. Each case may take place in a whole, pointing to evolutions in practices which invest in collective intelligence so as to open perspectives of 'negotiated care', without pre-supposing an equality of knowledge. This suggests that in relationships between healthcare and society, the notion of profane citizenship may make it possible to inextricably link an individual dimension of 'coping better' with participation in a broader movement which acknowledges that something is at stake for society as a whole.

Finally, documenting 'profane practices' which may produce an effect of citizenship makes it necessary to address not just the discourse, but also and necessarily the acts, deeds,

'experience' and 'tangible experience'. This may either consist of a sensitive being there, which is consistent and has been made observable in 'minor gestures' and 'ordinary actions' relatively distant from what 'denies' or 'ignores' them. This approach leads us to be vigilant so as to neutralise to the greatest possible extent the connection with the entity that stigmatises. For these tangible existences are grasped by those who dress wearing the 'colours of the invisible' (P. Williams, 1987), the 'absent' or those who are only too visible, such as young people, largely citizens of their countries of residence, who because of their outward experience are categorised as the 'non-Western' foreign born in the Netherlands and Belgium. Here, we can see capacities to 'resistance' to being assigned to categories of identity, but also capacities for integration, innovation or the invention of a daily life, i.e. the democratic appropriation through ways of existing the subject of which was supposed to have neither the cognitive or social 'competencies'.

The answers to these questions on the posture of research in the subject area of profane citizenship have not been aligned according to a single format in the present work. Each investigation, each form of presence in the field, each problematic, each academic or cultural context, each position taken by researchers and their teams in their national context or discipline has had effects on the choices adopted and on the way material was collected and interpretations were developed. This variety of positions is per se a potential bearer of meaning in which sciences are not necessarily synonymous with instrumentalisation, but given the equality of difference, make it possible to open up spaces of collective experimenting which might contribute to a possible democratic opening up.

It is in this sense that the considerations and discussions of this work surpass the situations and experiences on which the investigations were conducted. They point to substantial trends as much as to ways of thinking about them. Profane citizenships are a means of taking account of movements which cut across citizenships. The pluralism of the research that has been conducted corresponds in part to the pluralism of the research object itself: it is also a tool with which we can understand uncertainty at a time at which European societies are presented with the challenge of unachieved and contrasted versions of types of citizenship they are meant to hold. Science is invited to reposition itself in the context of experiences which it had not understood before approaching them. Rather than adopt a dominant position from above which the social sciences have on occasion attributed to themselves by taking on the role of explainer, a position which is at times moreover falsified by the later developments of their objects, the authors of the present work have explored the possible gamut of postures for accompanying, relating to and elucidating the situations they have studied. In doing so, they believe they have developed the dimension of citizenship in the heart of the scientific vocation as a citizenship which feeds into science.

References

BENVENUTO A., 2010. Qui sont les sourds?. In: GAUCHER C., and VIBERT S. (Eds.). Les sourds aux origines d'une identité plurielle.. Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter lang, pp. 85-116

BONAFE-SCHMITT J-P., 2010. La médiation de quartier ou communautaire : retisser des liens sociaux. Cahiers scientifiques, n°112, p. 109

BREVIGLIERI M., LAFAYE C., and TROM D., 2009. Compétences critiques et sens de la justice. Économica, 460 p.

CARBONNIER J., 2000. Flexible droit. Pour une sociologie du droit sans rigueur. Paris: LGDJ.

ENGIN F.I., and NIELSEN G-M. (Eds.), 2008. Acts of citizenship. London: Zed Books.

FUSELLIER-SOUZA I., 2011. La création gestuelle des individus sourds isolés. De l'édification conceptuelle et linguistique à la sémiogénèse des langues des signes. AILE Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Étrangère, n° 15, pp. 61-96

JOSEPH I. (Ed.), 1996. L'espace du public. Les compétences du citadin. Recherche/1praus, 152 p.

MARSHALL, 1992. Citizenship and Social Class. London: Pluto Press, [1950], 92 p.

MILNER J-C., 2005. La politique des choses. Paris: Navarin; Seuil

MINDUS P., 2010. Européanisation de la citoyenneté dans l'Union européenne : perspectives et ambiguïtés (27 mai 2010). Jean Monnet Working papers (Centre européen d'excellence - Trento). [on-line]. Available at http://ssrn.com/abstract=1616722

MINDUS P., 2007. An entangled Model for Assessing Some New trends in EU-Juriprudence. [on-line]. Cinefogoworking papers n°10. Available at <see http://www.cinefogo.cuni.cz/getfile.php?&id_file=1110 online>

RANCIERE J., 1987. Le maître ignorant. Paris: Fayard.

ROSALDO R., 1993. Culture and truth: the remaking of social analysis. Beacon Press.

SANTOS B.S., 2002B. Para uma sociologia das ausências e uma sociologia das emergências. Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais, 63, pp. 237-280

SCOTT J., 2008. La domination et les arts de la résistance. Fragments du discours subalterne Paris: Éditions Amsterdam.

SEN A., 2004. L'économie est une science morale. Paris: La Découverte; Poche/essais, n° PES, 126 p.

SEVE L., 1986. Droit et liberté selon Marx. Paris: PUF.

STROOBANTS M., 1993. Savoir faire et compétences au travail – Une sociologie de la fabrication des aptitudes. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'université.

WILLIAMS P., 1987. Couleurs de l’invisible : Tsiganes dans la banlieue parisienne. In: GURVITCH J., and PETONNET C. Chemins de la ville.. Paris: CHTS.

Potential Impact:

A - Policy advice and policy implications

In order to sketch the possible policy implications that could be drawn from the PROFACITY project, it is necessary to reiterate its main focus: 'profane citizenship' referred to the different ways the actual concept of citizenship could be transformed by actions of people who are considered as 'profane' - i.e. without an expertise concerning the situation they experienced - and are excluded from regular rights or barred partial access to take part in society and to contribute to it. Profane citizenship was therefore not so much a well-defined state of citizenship, but rather a continuing process of reflecting on and of (re)constructing current forms of citizenship, a process based on the actions of persons organising their 'rights to have rights' where these rights seemed to be missing or to be out of reach.

In the PROFACITY research project, by dealing with different matters varying from illegality to deafness, we developed three lines concerning policy implications that could be inferred from such a perspective:

-The first line is to look at the national level and the EU level for the necessary support of new constructions of citizenship by deploying experts and by reconsidering expertise in a different way.

- The second line concerns the establishment of so-called translation milieus (translating environments), in which experts and non-experts, citizens and non-citizens cooperate in varying ways in order to develop new forms of knowledge and create innovative practices of citizenship, and their role in stimulating, sustaining the empowerment of the actors concerned.

- The third line concerns the policy implications that could be formulated regarding the (scientific) methods ('sensing') used to enhance the involvement of experts and non-experts, citizens and non-citizens in research practices, which also includes the research strategy, in hybrid situations, to take account of the lesser visible actions that are contributing to new forms of citizenship.

European forms of citizenship. At the European level, policies that pertain to the topics dealt with in PROFACITY have been developed. Illegal immigration, biometric instruments in identity documents, migration policies, deafness, illiteracy - they are all the subjects of EU policies. This sometimes happens in terms of regulations such as the biometric data in travel documents or in terms of programmes such as the Stockholm programme on security and citizenship, sometimes in the form of taskforces e.g. the expert group for illiteracy or for awareness-raising projects on deafness and sign language. The attention to these topics is

framed in the context of EU citizenship and the charter of basic rights. Our studies in PROFACITY showed that it is not enough to have formal goals of equity and participation, but it is also important to develop a perspective of the views of the vulnerable groups themselves, to hear what their daily practical problems were, and to find means to incorporate their voices in policy measures. This could also involve the contributive acts of (non-)experts/ (non-)citizens in the public space, but not per se at the political level, since politics was not only something to be found in a separate, exclusive sphere, but also in daily life.

This had at least two implications for the EU: 1. reconsideration of the balance between the economic and socio-democratic spheres at the political level; and 2. reconsideration of the role of experts. The first implication was of course difficult to achieve, since the practice of policies had been dominated by macro-economic considerations. The so-called 'social Europe', including its democratic dimensions, has been formulated where possible to co-exist with an economic agenda, explicitly established since Lisbon 2000, but has, in effect, turned out to be a project that cannot be achieved, even when advocates of a so-called social investment pact have been active on the political floor (see e.g. Vandenbroucke, Hemerijck, Palier, 2011, Abrahamson, 2010).

But this turn could, particularly in the longer term, be helped by the second implication. The mobilization of experts was a well-known but also a limited strategy, as experts tended to have an instrumental view of the matter (what is the problem, what can be done?) and were less oriented to the perspectives of the people concerned. Experts were specialized policy-makers, researchers, professionals or advocates who defended the rights and interests of certain groups and so on. So there was a great deal of expertise available that could be used and possibly applied in other ways. It would be a challenge for the EU to look for strategies to involve the view of the (vulnerable) people concerned in their policies by inviting all these kinds of experts to listen and take notice of their problems. Given the sometimes barely visible nature of the actions of (non-)experts/(non-)citizens on the margins of society, it is not so easy to integrate them in policies and institutions. In that sense, the EU could contribute to the formation of translation milieus that could stimulate the cooperation of professionals and citizens with (non-)experts/(non-)citizens in order to act upon innovative forms of participation and contribution, and to push matters of rights from the margins to the centre of attention.

'Translation milieus' and empowerment. Translation milieus are those social actors and facilitating factors that contribute to the exercise of citizenship of (non-)experts and (non-)citizens, to how they take initiatives and contribute towards enhancing their own positions. These milieus which sustain profane citizenship, could also operate as restrictive and closing. To see how they function was a matter of continuously analysing their working methods and of weighing the results and the processes they install.

These milieus could consist of NGOs, civil society organisations, informal groups, networks, one-issue projects, the Internet, including 'traditional' expertise of researchers and professionals and even established institutions where efforts are made to resolve questions of exclusion and discrimination. These milieus also include a great number of contact persons helping in daily life services who interact personally and as 'a public' with those who experience these situations. Their action, that relates to individual social situations, also assert the rights of others (citizens and non-citizens; experts and non-experts) as a consequence. Subsequently, such assertion is subject to the judgements of the public, experts and citizens alike.

It is not possible to give beforehand a rule of thumb about what forms of translation milieus are most useful or preferable. This depends on the context and the specific problems involved in hybrid situations where the quality of citizenship is not so clear. What the researchers in PROFACITY learned from the practices is the complexities of such a web of translations: there are many levels of interpretation in the fields of study concerned and many forms of governance involved in this topic of vulnerable citizenship, and the translation milieus can operate between the opening or closing workings of the possible.

The only minimum criterion seemed to be that the chosen form should have facilitated the efforts of marginalised citizens to express themselves and to find ways of being accepted as people having rights to have rights. This could involve a varying range of dimensions (regarding education, labour, care, race, sex, etc.), and a multiplicity of activities. But as said before, these activities could also be undertaken in such a way that full deployment of these efforts was blocked and impeded and bound them to the actual situation of denial or even repression.

This also stressed the role of experts: they had to be reflexive on their knowledge and to be aware of the often tense relations with (non-)experts and (non-)citizens. It was not enough for them to offer their expertise to solve problems, but they should have also reckoned with the implicit suppositions of their knowledge about the nature of the problems and the direction in which to tackle them. Only when such an effort is made, could the empowerment of citizens possibly develop because then a fruitful combination of research results and interests of the people involved could be constructed. In this respect, the role of the media as an important messenger/constructor of dominant views could not be overlooked. When certain groups were already publicly stigmatised or seen as a problem, it is extremely difficult for them to develop or negotiate their own perspectives. In this playing field, experts have a certain influence as corroborating public views or as discussing their assumptions and effects. This is not to say that this was an easy task, but it is a role they had to reflect on and act upon.

In this context, attention had to be paid to how administrative authorities dealt with the demands that came up in these interactions organizing 'the right to have rights'. When (non-)experts (non-)citizens expressed their perspectives, the authorities did not always react in a way that could be understood: they retreated behind formal or procedural arguments, denied the possibility of other approaches, or even refused to communicate. This could contribute to a situation in which the views of the administrations are difficult to identify and to understand, even when they are written in official documents or took the form of (complicated) regulations and proscriptions. It is therefore crucial, in the efforts to constitute translation milieus and in the ways of analysing their effects, that role of the administrations should have been involved in the reflection on how citizenship forms could be developed.

Science and participation. The development of social science has had many directions, with different orientations on practice and interaction with subjects. At the moment, mainstream social science has evolved in a rather evidence-based direction, often with an implicitly policy-based outlook (see also Glasby and Beresford, 2006). This can already be seen as a restricted approach of social reality, and can contribute to an expertise that is underdeveloped as it involves acknowledging the views of the subjects studied. But this is a tension that is inherent in all science: there is inevitably an asymmetry between researchers and studied citizens, be it because of funding or of differences in ways of theorizing. On the one hand, the PROFACITY project proposes to consider the opposition between experts and non-experts as a dynamic one and to re-design it in a distributive manner, in relation to citizens' affairs which are at stake. That means to consider that everyone has a kind of expertise, and that no one is competent or non competent in every domain, and especially in citizenship affairs: this is a way to refer to the 'equality of intelligence' without supposing that everybody has the same kind of expertise.

On the other hand, this also means that research is the responsibility of the researcher, and is not to be equated with action on behalf of (non-)citizens. This responsibility of the researcher implies that the researcher is accountable for the decisions he or she makes in the ways the research is set up. The most common rules for doing this include not organizing the research in a way that would harm the (non-)experts/(non-)citizens or formulating conclusions that conflict with their interests. Attention should be paid in particular to the matter of not 'doubling' existing ways of marginalizing or discriminating citizens by taking over the dominant perspective of their problems as 'to be solved' in a certain way. Furthermore, the researcher should attempt to set up interaction with concerned people, citizens and non-citizens at the same time, in which correction or feedback can be arranged. In this interaction, reflection on the research process and its implications for policy, public discussion, other studies etc. can be stimulated and made part of the research. When publishing the results, the role of the media should be taken into account, especially with a view to the possible harmful aspects of media translation of the results. In any way, the context of power should be recognized and dealt with when conducting the research and

producing knowledge (Flyvbjerg, 2001). This aspect of power already questions the so-called neutrality or objectivity of science: normative matters are inextricably involved in the undertakings of science, either in the direction of the research questions, of the theorizing or the choice of method. Most social scientists recognize the researcher can develop a practice that includes interaction with the citizens, and recognize this interaction (most notably in disability studies, but also in other social fields) as a necessary part of their research, although there are some who do not (Becker, Sempik, Bryman, 2010). The pros and cons of research with people standing up for their rights are still being debated, and are still not part of mainstream scientific research, but this type of research is certainly to be taken as an illustration of the approach advocated here (Beresford, 2010).

In PROFACITY, we developed the procedure of Sensing in order to meet the requirements of the above-mentioned steps (CICI-UGhent, 2011). Sensing referred to the effort to open up the research to non-experts (in the first place to (non-)citizens but also to other people involved in their predicament) and to try to involve the different perspectives in the research. This could take several forms: e.g. negotiation with administrative boards about the aims and application of the research results, or the bringing together of different expertises in order to discuss the scope of these expertises vis-à-vis the perspectives of (non-)experts/(non-)citizens, or the confrontation of legal and social aspects with the experiences of the excluded. More generally, instead of considering that expert is that one who comes to deliver results to the public when the research is considered as achieved, the methodological added value of PROFACITY consisted in experimenting the association, during the research itself, with professionals and the people involved - both actors being implicated in different ways in the situations which were the subjects of the research. For each of those actors and between them, their participation in the elaboration of surveys about knowledge and practices implements reflexivity which itself is valued as material for analysis and which allows to shift perspectives as well as to make explicit points of view. These are elements for politics of knowledge, continuously being tested through its consequences. Instead of considering that experts clearly understand what is proposed when they try to listen to the experiences and positions of (non-)citizens, processes of exposition and “translation” are to be conceived, which allows to manage the way they give not only voice but also a place and an opportunity to vulnerable groups adequate to how they perceive and interpret their own situations.

In many cases, different 'definitions of the situation' appeared to exist. People who are the more concerned by those situations (depending on them for a large part of their lives) could sometimes feel negated by the 'definitions of the situation' by experts, considering that they are too narrowly bounded to their expertise, while experts could analyse the perspectives of (non-)experts/(non-)citizens and as a way of internalizing their marginalized positions (see e.g. Cowden and Singh, 2007). This could imply that further work needed to be done between the partners in the discussion in order to unravel the underlying suppositions and points of view. It was, however, important to note that experts could never claim to possess

the ultimate truth or the definitive solution: they would have to reflect on their assumptions, theorizing, methods and power position. As the criterion of inter-subjectivity demands: researchers have not only to respond to those who commission the research and their own peers, but also to the subjects of their study. There is no hiding behind the walls of so-called neutral methods: choices have to be made, and are made, though often oblivious of the consequences in practice.

Conclusion. It is evident that policy implications connected to a profane citizenship perspective are entangled in a web of uncertainties. The questions posed at the beginning of this text still stand: policy is not just a matter of diagnosing a problem and then finding the right solution; it is more an ambiguous undertaking of negotiation between several interest groups about desirable aims for whom and when, of all kinds of difficulties in understanding the policy and the implementations thereof, and of the unintended outcomes. It is better to recognize this state of affairs than to fall for the illusions of a straightforward designable world. There are no dumb rules to be distributed.

Some guidelines could be elaborated and refined in connection with PROFACITY.

One of the main findings was that scientific or professional experts should not have dominated when attempting to resolve questions of exclusion or marginality, in short, about forms of citizenship, but they should have been part of the problem to be analysed. Expertise or specialized knowledge was involved in the construction of the boundaries between normality and deviance, between belonging and exclusion. These implications had to be disentangled, and only then could these experts reflect on their role as contributing or not to the policies and the practices of (non-)experts/(non-)citizens, and could their actions be heard and be included in the knowledge base of science and policy. However, such a change was not sufficient.

Another main finding was that this reflection should have been extended to include administrative authorities, as they symbolized the sphere of policy decisions. In their decision making, they had to deal with their constituencies, in whatever form, and this could open up the opportunity to ask them to account for the policies they constructed. In that sense, this accountability also referred back to the involvement of everyone concerned with the democratic level of society: what to do with our representatives?

The predicament of the groups studied in PROFACITY showed that their status as (non-)experts/ (non-)citizens was highly problematic and called for new ways of constituting new forms of social, political and civic rights. This could only happen in a process where the

voices of (non-)experts/(non-)citizens could be articulated and realized, a process that needed both lived practices in daily life and the legal establishment of citizenship rights. Profane citizenship is a never ending endeavour, a continuous struggle for the right to have rights, and as such it was also subject to the risks of failure and success of the engaged strategies. It was always situated in the concrete there and then of actual struggles, and was as fragile as ever.

References

ABRAHAMSON P., 2010. European Welfare Sates beyond neo-liberalism: toward the social investment state. Development & Society, 39(1), p. 61-95

BECKER S., SEMPIK J., and BRYMAN A., 2010. Advocates, agnostics and adversaries: researchers perceptions of service user involvement in social policy research. Social Policy & Society, 9(3), p. 355-366

BERESFORD P., 2010. Re-examining relationships between experience, knowledge, ideas and research: a key role for recipients of state welfare and their movements. Social Work and Society, 8(1), p. 6-21

CICI-UGHENT., 2011. Final sensing report, Wp 5. Lyon: PROFACITY.

COWDEN S., and SINGH G., 2007. The “user”: friend, foe or fetish?; a critical exploration of user involvement in health and social care. Critical Social Policy, 27(5), p. 5-23

FLYVBJERG B., 2011. Making social science matter? Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GLASBY J., and BERESFORD P., 2006. Commentary and issues: who knows best? Evidence-base practice and the service user contribution. Critical Social Policy, 26(1), p. 268-284

VANDENBROUCKE F. van, HEMERIJCK A., and PALIER B., 2011. The EU needs a Social Investment Pact. Bruxelles: OSE.

B - Main dissemination activities and exploitation of results

Scientific dissemination

PROFACITY BOOK

BATTEGAY A., DERYCKE M., ROUX J., and TÊTU M. T. (eds.), 'Testing and sensing profane citizenship in Europe', Editions Le Manuscrit, Paris, mars 2012. Published in French and English version.

Articles by MOCNIK Rastko and BREZNIK Maja, MAIER Robert, BATTEGAY Alain, FELIZES Raquel, MENDES Bruno, COELHO Orquidéa and VAZ Henrique, VERSTRAETE Ghislain, ROUX Jacques, DE GRAF Willibrord and GERRITSEN Debby, DERYCKE Marc, ROTTIERS Franc, BROUCKAERT Tine, KRZAN Marco, TÊTU Marie-Thérèse.

Scientific committee : Jean-Yves Trépos (Professeur de sociologie, Université de Metz), José Alberto Correia (Professeur et Directeur de la Faculté de Psychologie et Sciences de l'Éducation de l'Université de Porto), Jean-Pierre Bonafé Schmitt (juriste et sociologue, CNRS Centre Max Weber Lyon), Jacques Ion (sociologue, directeur de recherche CNRS).

This book closes the PROFACITY program, whose publication accepted by a scientific committee will be published in French and English. The first chapter presents different approaches to "profane in Citizenship," and explains how the notion of profane citizenship and concepts associated with translation milieus and hybrid situations have been formalized to serve as a benchmark in defining and conducting investigations. The following sections highlight four nodes and transversal questions from situations and experiences that formed the sites of investigation.

The first part, entitled "Citizenship between profane citizenship of non-citizens and non citizens citizenship", deals with processes that underpin and transform citizenship. It is based on the analysis of "the erasure of human residence in Slovenia" in the transition from one type to another citizenship after the collapse of the Yugoslav federation, an analytical overview of the tensions and dilemmas around of "citizenship problem of migrants" in European countries, and the "secular interpretations of the cultural dimension of citizenship" at stake in how the kebab shops are participating in regular practices, the development of cultures of statements public a right of presence and city.

The second part, "Methodologies of profane" questions the "account for the profane citizenship" as through the methodologies (sensing) research and the results. "The interview conversation as hermeneutics" problematizes the device methodology in place to make understandable, even in the interview, purposes from deaf particpant. "Confronting with citizenship. Work of bodies and "encitoyennement" "provides a glimpse, through the analysis of identity checks in public,to the realization of a general model of performed citizenship. "Sensing: actions in search of meaning" describes the methodological device ensuring the meeting between the researcher's work and profane experience parties

concerned, which can germinate translations between the active set sharing knowledge, meanings and created to impulse to do otherwise.

The third part, "Citizenship and interactions," focuses on the interactions in which people are stimulated to activate the potential rights of citizenship, or where are denied their rights as citizens. "The immigrant youth in the transition from school to work" focuses on the interactions with professionals in the education of groups of young second generation migrants who have an optimistic version of their own situation, as opposed to the teaching staff. "Deaf or surditude? "Is next to the story of a deaf adult, relatively isolated, with interviews with deaf students in a school bilingual reference for the Deaf. "So we liked. Small arrangements (and with) the company "juxtaposes two cases of illiterate and / or illiterate who develop their social and cognitive skills, which constitute a significant factor in decision-hand with the unexpected life of the city .

The fourth part, "Doing justice. Practices, usages and conceptions of justice and injustice, "explores the ways in which undocumented migrants in France and Belgium, and deleted in Slovenia are confronted with the discourse of the authorities and justice practices in everyday life and in ordinary life. "Two types of formal inclusion of immigrants' shows that the structural and functional analysis of the different strata of capitalist social formations allows to update the meaning given to different types of citizenship. "Undocumented migrants in France" questions the divide between justice as stated in the law and as interpreted by the undocumented and those who are responsible for enforcing the laws. "Take seriously the experience of refugees" proposes to explore the boundaries of legal citizenship as an indirect political activity while "The ambivalences of justice and their consequences" emphasizes the perspective of undocumented women, often family mothers.

The final chapter "Interpretations of citizenship profane" shows the different interpretations of the notion of profane citizenship emerged over the investigations closed to situations and experiences, and what to learn about it. It retains and emphasizes that they have in common, not to stop a definition but to think forms of citizenship at work and their transformations, and sketch models of secular citizenship. The relevance of the notion of translation milieus will be reviewed to measure the likely public policies and their ability to produce and report on the renewed sense of citizenship in our societies and contexts. Finally are underlined epistemological and political issues associated with dual display / hide, with the concepts of capabilities, skills and democratic ownership, even in the conduct of investigations and interviews, when the political question is already there, - highlighting the variety of research positions in the investigations that involve at least the civic engagement of the researcher.

PROFACITY PAPERS

PROFACITY Consortium's joint publication edited by the Centre Max Weber: Cahiers PROFACITY (PROFACITY Papers). This series of papers is a transcription of the seminars held in Lyon and Saint-Etienne (Fr) during the course of the research project PROFACITY. The researchers engaged in the research project organized the seminars on 'Symbolic systems' with an educational approach, and the seminars on 'Translation Milieus' with a research approach. The corresponding presentations and discussions were collected and edited: the papers are available (in French), upon request, at http://www.profacity.eu

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 1

BATTEGAY A., DERYCKE M., ROUX J., and TÊTU M.T. (Eds.). Les contours de la citoyenneté profane. Formats d'enquêtes et situations hybrides. In: CNRS/CMW, Journée MODYS. Lyon, Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, 16 January 2009. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 2

VERSTRAETE G. Individu, groupe, communauté : une proposition de grille méthodologique. Ed. by DERYCKE M. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Symbolic Systems'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 2 March 2009. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 3

ROUX J. La citoyenneté profane : premières approches. Ed. by DERYCKE M. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Symbolic Systems'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 6 April 2009. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 4

BATTEGAY A. Education publique, situations hybrides et citoyennetés profanes. Ed. by DERYCKE M. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Symbolic Systems'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 18 September 2009. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 5

VERSTRAETE G. Sphère privée, sphère publique. Ed. by DERYCKE M. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Symbolic Systems'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 19 September 2009. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 6

BATTEGAY A., and DOURLENS C. (Eds.). Les reconfigurations des rapports profanes/experts dans le domaine des handicaps et des maladies chroniques : vers quelles citoyennetés profanes? In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation Milieus'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 21 January 2010. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 7

TETU M-T. (Ed.). Rendre public. Les migrations irrégulières : épreuves de citoyenneté et milieux traducteurs. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation Milieus'. Lyon, Université Lumière Lyon 2, 25 May 2010. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 8

ROUX J. (Ed.). Epreuves de citoyenneté et contrôles d'identité dans l'espace public. Un format pertinent de milieu traducteur? In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation Milieus'. Lyon, Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, 8 October 2010. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 9

ROUX J. Participation/contribution et situations d'encitoyennement. Ed. by DERYCKE M. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Symbolic Systems'. Saint-Etienne, Université Jean Monnet, 5 November 2010. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 10a

BATTEGAY A. (Ed.). La complexité culturelle aujourd'hui. Rencontre avec Ulf Hannerz. Translated by DUBIEF J. Translation proofread by BATTEGAY A. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation Milieus'. Lyon, Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, 15 March 2011. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 10b

Ulf Hannerz. Cultural complexity today. Ed. by BATTEGAY A. Transcripted in English by DUBIEF J. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation Milieus'. Lyon, Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, 15 March 2011. Lyon: CMW

Cahiers PROFACITY numéro 11

DERYCKE M. (Ed.). Perspectives sur la constitution du sens et de la signification dans la recherche sur les citoyennetés profanes. In: PROFACITY, Seminar on 'Translation Milieus'. Lyon, Institut des Sciences de l'Homme, 14 January 2011. Lyon: CMW

JOINT PUBLICATIONS

In the framework of PROFACITY, some researchers from the Consortium's different partners worked together on several publishing projects - 5 of which are detailed hereinafter. These projects are either already published or in press.

BATTEGAY A. (Ed.), 2011. Les états ambivalents de la citoyenneté. Migrations Société, 23(136). Articles by KRZAN M., BREZNIK M., MOCNIK R., TETU M-T., HASSOUN J-P., BATTEGAY A., BROUCKAERT T., LONGMAN C., VERSTRAETE G., and GRAEVE K. de.

The paper is a study of the transformations of citizenship so as to understand the dynamics, by focusing on the novel forms of citizenship that are implemented by individuals who have reinvented citizenship. The creation of new subjectivities in a transforming world is actually related to -and contributes to - the juridical construction of citizenship, and to the contemporary challenges posed to social citizenship. Based on different experiences and postures, the contributions to this paper cast a new light on the ambivalences of citizenship borne by profane interpretations of citizenship i.e. interpretations that are supported not by the expert knowledge of legal citizenship, but by acts that, in public life, design new forms of citizenship, of the right to be here and to take part in community life.

These profane interpretations may not necessarily correspond to those that are discussed on the juridical stage (definition of legal forms of citizenship), or on the local stage (participative democracy). This does not mean that they are totally outside the official definitions or redefinitions. Actually, they provide interpretations and updates of these (re)definitions according to rationales that are not juridical. Progressive thought is often prone to point out the interpretations that embody the trend towards progressively integrating new categories of populations in citizenship networks and circles that, initially, cast them out. However, the case studies herein show that these interpretations do not advocate for opening the boundaries of citizenship only; they can also advocate for closing and stringently controlling the boundaries.

BATTEGAY A., COELHO O., and VAZ H. (Eds.), (in press). Prendre soin, prendre part, vivre avec : enjeux et défis de la citoyenneté profane dans les rapports santé-société. Quelles médiations?

Articles by COELHO O., VAZ H., BATTEGAY A., DOURLENS C., LOVEL A., BENVENUTO A., DERYCKE M., CHAUVIN F., REGNIER V., SCHOENDORFF M., VAERSTRATE G., NUNES R., DUARTE I., SILVA R., SA CORREI F., AROSO S., and CORREIA J.A.

The book documents and provides a viewpoint on the contrasting transformations of the relations between expert and profane individuals with respect to how to 'take care of' and in the eyes of the challenges these transformations pose to citizenship. The book casts new light on these transformations, based on studies focusing on cancer, mental illnesses, and deafness in France (even though there are also some references to issues and initiatives in the US and Belgium), and on deafness in Portugal. The contributions to the book are mixed-voice: researchers, healthcare and education sector professionals, heads of associations, and patients provide analyses acting as testimonials, based on situated experiences. These contributions present states of the art, point out ways forward, and stress initiatives that are governed by challenges to citizenship that are - though differently - at work in each of the cases studied. Regarding treatment plans, these challenges concern the place of the patient and his/her relatives in protocols; how their profane know-how is taken into account alongside the expert skills of doctors; and the mediations at work in those situations. The analyses herein show some points of relevancy and the limits of the profane vs. expert opposition (which is different from one field to another), with regard to the knowledge base, contents of treatment plans, and relations with society. These analyses place the patient at the centre of i) the study of the relation between 'take part in', 'take care of', and 'live with', and ii) the higher integration of the challenges to citizenship into the relation between healthcare and society.

DERYCKE M., GARCIA B. (Eds.), 2010. Sourds et langue des signes : norme et variation. Langage et société, n° 131.

Articles by JOHNSTON T., SCHEMBRI A., CUXAC C., PIZZUTO E.A., BOUTET D., SALLANDRE M-A., FUZELLIER-SOUZA I., GARCIA B., and PERINI M.

The paper, co-edited by B. GARCIA (Université Paris 8), is about the description of the sign language by linguists from the universities of Sidney, London, Paris 8 (UMR 7023) and the Conseil National de la Recherche in Rome. The description of the sign language if of special interest as the issue precisely concerns the social and civil status recognized to serious deaf

people. Indeed, specialists (doctors, psychologists, social workers, politicians, and also most linguists...) considered the only language these people can have access to - sign language - as an artificial language, hence a language poorer than a natural language. This conception, that is still often prevailing today, was the reason why the Deaf were obliged to use the oral language. As a consequence, the Deaf were considered as second-class citizens because of their deficiency in communication skills: the Deaf were - and still are as far as serious deaf people are concerned - denied the use of the only tool - the language - by which they could have access to the right to express themselves. So, it is paramount that linguists demonstrate that the sign language is a fully natural language since, in the prevalent ideological situation, such a demonstration helps recognize that serious deaf people deserve full citizenship on a level with speakers of oral languages. The Deaf community showed a great interest in this topic since the issue n°131 of the journal was sold out within one year, and had to be reissued.

DERYCKE M., COELHO O., and VAZ H. (Eds.), (in press). Fécondités du « handicap » : prise de part des sourds et illettrés et renouvellement des approches. Revue française de pédagogie.

Articles by COELHO O., FELIZES R., MENDES B., VAZ H., DERYCKE M., BENVENUTO A., and PERINI M..

The paper, co-edited by O. Coelho and H. Vaz, draws a parallel between illiteracy and deafness. Colleagues from the University of Porto and from Paris 8 (UMR 7023) contributed to this paper. Illiteracy and deafness concern communication skills. Our society totally denies the Illiterate and the Deaf communication skills on the grounds of prevailing oral languages and partly prevailing written culture respectively.

1. The ideological construction of illiteracy and deafness as a handicap, be it cultural or physical, is the same. It is based on privative opposition: languageless people (with no command of a written or oral language) are considered as deprived of cognitive, social, etc. skills. i.e. a deficiency that must be remedied by the acquisition of the oral language or writing. The critique of such construction is based on the idea that illiteracy and deafness exist not per se but as a 'relation'.

2. To release illiteracy and deafness from the prevailing stereotype, this relation requires that they be designated no longer as 'differences' which are to be respected and taken into account, but as “singularities” disconnected from any normative consideration.

3. Nonetheless, illiteracy and deafness - even if they are not considered as existing per se - are likely to account for a true handicap that damages the individual concerned, according to hic et nunc contingencies.

4. The inegalitarian relation imposed by the social judgment is thwarted by the egalitarian relation that develops within the Illiterate or Deaf community, especially through cooperation or competition, contributing to the living and integration of these individuals.

5. Given the ideological construction of the status of both the Illiterate and the Deaf, the research methodology herein takes account of the dissymmetry between the surveyee and the researcher which can interfere with the quality of the data collected. Finally,

6. Beyond that parallel, this paper discusses the distinctions between illiteracy and deafness.

ROUX J. (Ed.), (in press). Citoyennetés sous contrôle. Traçabilité et régularité dans les sociétés démocratiques.

Articles by BANCHET B., BOSCHETTI L., BREZNIK M., KRZAN M., MOCNIK R., HADZOPOULOS A., ROUX J., STRUGALA C., and TÊTU M-T.

The book is in line with this series of publications that precisely aim to duly recognize practices that relate ways of doing things (by some administrative and state authorities) to attitudes (of individuals or groups that, due to certain features of theirs, constitute 'clients' for identity checks). Nonetheless, this book, that is the work of university researchers from different European countries, precisely provide an original approach. The investigation herein was conducted in the framework of a European research project whose purpose was to question the transformation of the very concept of citizenship in Europe (Profacity.eu). It was therefore with the transforming forms of citizenship in mind that we studied the identity check practices of administrations. To put it in a nutshell, we could say that the surveys herein discuss the two dimensions (sovereign and political dimensions) of identity checks not only as two overlapping ' vertical' rationales that could apply top-down to police assignments for instance, but also as they can be observed and documented through the interaction embedded in techniques used by public administrations to check the identity of populations. Not only can we see that tension at work in the very conduct of such operations or in the comments from 'operators', but also those situations or events are the leverage for the public and political expression of such interactions: the latter is our research hypothesis. Therefore, the surveys, herein, of the maintenance of law and order in the subway in Milan (It), the conditions of the administrative control of the undocumented in France, or the enforced 'erasure' of the Slovene people originating from former Yugoslav republics from administrative records, provide useful counterpoints to the investigation into identity checks in the public space and their juridical as much as technical frameworks.

Sensing dissemination

'As an experiment in evaluating social science research, and in the PROFACITY context, the Sensing procedure was established as a concept that engendered interesting results even though the Consortium's partners criticized Sensing in the first place. This conclusion will overview the research results as against the objectives initially put forward in the PROFACITY Work Plan and the questions therein.

Can Sensing be seen as or become a new methodological approach in the humanities? If so, how does it help, as the first objective to be addressed during WP5, to “interpret the degree of reactions of the translation milieus”?

Even though not all the consortium’s partners interpreted and/or developed the Sensing procedure in the same way, the inclusion of 'sensing' in PROFACITY did engender new ways of:

-getting into contact with research participants;

-doing research as such; and

-challenging and supplementing prevailing feedback procedures.

For all the partners, the Sensing procedure made it possible not only to come into contact with the translation milieus such as school boards, general welfare organizations, advocacy groups, lawyers, and so on, but also to commence discussion on the interim results with these translation milieus. Interestingly, one milieu remained absent from the forums: politicians. This was due to time constraints on the one hand, and the idea that it could be unfruitful to include politicians in the Sensing forums at this stage of the research on the other hand. Therefore, several partners indicated that the Sensing procedure could not be only limited to a mere methodological tool to be temporarily used during PROFACITY, as it also developed further, and was put into practice after PROFACITY.

Can Sensing become 'contagious' as a scientific approach to render public the voices of those that are not (allowed to be) heard given the uneasiness of the media and policy-makers to render public those voices for which there is, at least from their point of view, no social support? If so, how can the Consortium, as the second objective in WP5, 'proceed to the joint elaboration of the debates and results'?

The perspective in which the PROFACITY researchers approached their respective target groups - by focusing on transversal concepts such as profane citizenship, translation milieus, and contagion -, aimed to articulate the voices of those that are not (allowed to be) heard.

These articulations could be used in scientific contexts only, but due to the emancipatory nature of research and the fact that the reasons for not rendering these voices and articulations heard are often based on biased ('there is no social support for their cases') or economic ('our welfare system is under pressure') arguments, the need to render public these voices and articulations was deemed acute and necessary by most of the Consortium's teams.

The joint elaboration of debates and results is in play at two levels. At the Consortium level, the different interests in Sensing showed that there was still much work to be done in order to reach a 'common strategy' for elaborating debates and results. However, many partners argued that such a strategy might not be the prime concern then. Indeed, at the local level, Sensing, as a practice to 'render public' the voices of the research participants and the interpretations of the researchers, was just emerging, and had not yet imposed a commonly acknowledged scientific approach that must have been the focus of the joint elaboration of debates and results. With this report, the WP5 work was not yet done. In the following months, various teams would organize Sensing forums as part of their research procedure, and the debates and results would be published as part of it.

Can 'Sensing' become the procedure to follow for bringing together different members of different translation milieus (MT) in an overarching MT context in which expert and non-expert positioning is, at least during the Sensing event itself, suspended? If so, what can then be the surplus value related to the third WP5 objective to 'test the points of contact and the zones of overlapping and divergence between profane/expert/official citizenships, the boundaries between given and conquered right'?

As the Sensing events made it possible to bring the research context up to the level where the research participants could actively discuss the (preliminary) results of the PROFACITY research with other actors, its value regarding the 'testing of points of contact' was recognized.

Can the Sensing context overcome the ethical constraints inherent to performing fieldwork research? And, related to the fourth objective of WP5, what then are precisely the ethical questions linked to the participation of interviewees in the development of the sense of democracy?

Even though the Sensing forums implicitly aimed to 'render public', they were organized in 'private' contexts in which the researchers could provide 'vulnerable groups' with ethical and

deontological safeguards inherent to performing research (including Sensing), at least when the research participants were present.

As ethical issues emerged from these contexts, the safeguards were as follows:

-Should researchers not try to overcome the prevalent discourses on 'vulnerable groups' according which they are either 'victims to be helped' or 'victimizers to be expelled'?

-Given the fact that many rules and norms prohibit and limit 'vulnerable groups' from/in developing their life projects, should researchers not address the question: in what kind of society do we want to live in?

-Given the fact that current ethical standards often require the faces and names of people in target groups be rendered anonymous, should researchers not address the question whether or not this is not only possible in all cases, but also desirable - such as cases in which the research participants explicitly ask for showing their faces and names?

Can the Sensing procedure itself, hereby addressing the final objective of WP5, be regarded as a proper form of dissemination - among others - of the research and the results? Additionally, can Sensing be regarded as a procedure to be included in policy advice?

Though not included in the synthesis and assessment note on the way the research teams handled the Sensing procedures, one of the outcomes of the Sensing forums was that policy recommendations were formulated by most of the teams. For the Utrecht team, these recommendations were requested by the schools themselves, and focused on communication between the agents that make a school a school (directors, students, councillors). Nevertheless, the team kept focusing on addressing the absence of students, though it was not clear whether their position provided or not an expert solution to that problem that they apparently helped to raise 'as' a problem. For the Ljubljana team, though the need to include them in the Sensing forums was deemed unproductive, the message to policy-makers was that the team were closely looking into the veiled loopholes present in the way the 'erasure' issue was handled.

For the Ghent team, policy recommendations were inherent to the way the Sensing forums were organized as, in a lot of the forums, people were present and could signalize the results of our research at a higher policy level. For the French team, policy recommendations were formulated with a hawk's eye view. As the team explicitly helped the experiences of the target groups to emerge, they made an issue of policy-making recommendations, which might damage the target groups. For the Porto team, what jointly created mutual understanding between minority groups and those that hold on to a majority perspective was not so much policy recommendations at the political level, but rendering public the deaf

communities' concerns by means of the media. As the research of the Ghent team involved policy-makers, at least at the management level of social organizations, the results of the Sensing forums where those policy-makers were present were interpreted by them as policy recommendations. '

List of Websites:

http://www.profacity.eu/

http://joaoms.com/profacity>

http://www2.imageurs.com/test/profa/>

http://www.25images.ish-lyon.cnrs.fr>