URBAN CITIZENSHIP AS ASSEMBLAGE? WHAT WE CAN GAIN FROM THE DEBATE AROUND ASSEMBLAGE THINKING

Lara Hansen

Against the background of global mobility and political demands made by various actors such as formal ›non-citizens‹, political parties and social movements, the debate on the topic of ›citizenship‹ has increased considerably in recent years.

In this context, the classic embedding of citizenship is being called into question, a development which anthropologist Aihwa Ong has analyzed as »mutations in citizenship«[1]. She describes how the state as a regulating system is challenged and how citizenship is integrated into neoliberal processes of exploitation, thus revealing itself as a capitalist assemblage. In this understanding, the term ›citizenship‹ describes different relationships of individuals to state and society through rights, duties and practices, while current research perspectives are based on the fundamental understanding that citizenship is to be understood as a practice rather than a pure status.[2] These aspects are linked to questions of boundaries within society and mechanisms of inclusion/exclusion, which becomes particularly evident in cities as spaces of social conflicts.

In this field of tension, the concept of ›Urban Citizenship‹ is currently being widely discussed at several levels – in an academic context, at the level of urban policy and in social movements.[3] All these debates have in common that they address ›the city‹ as the central political-administrative unit for the distribution of rights and access to municipal resources. Therefore, practices and networks that emerge at the district level play an important role for demanding concrete claims such as Urban Citizenship. As a municipal concept in the United States and Canada, it is to be contextualized against the background of state-specific migration policy issues. In these, it is often related to ›Sanctuary Cities‹, which use strategies like the Don't Ask Don't Tell-Politics in the form of an active refusal to pass on information to state authorities

---

1   *Aihwa Ong:* Mutations in Citizenship. In: Theory, Culture & Society 23 (2–3) 2016, pp. 499–505.

2   *Engin F. Isin:* Theorizing Acts of Citizenship. In: Engin F. Isin/Greg Marc Nielsen (eds.): Acts of Citizenship. London/New York 2008, pp. 15–43.

3   *Michael P. Smith/Michael McQuarrie* (eds.): Remaking Urban Citizenship. Organizations, Institutions, and the Right to the City. New Brunswick 2012. *Henrik Lebuhn:* Local Border Practices and Urban Citizenship in Europe. In: City 17 (2013), 1, pp. 37–51. *Rainer Bauböck:* Reinventing Urban Citizenship. In: Citizenship Studies 7 (2003), 2, pp. 139–160.

such as federal immigration services to avoid the implementation of a national migration policy, which would lead to the deportation of non-citizens.[4]

These practices of Urban Citizenship and the attempt to adapt such approaches in Germany as well as the negotiations that are part of this process are particularly revealing for cultural anthropological research since this process shows how different forms of citizenship are integrated into context-specific imaginaries of how a society should live together – today and in the future. The integration of Urban Citizenship into everyday practices is not uniform; it ranges from the use of city identification cards to actively stopping the disclosure of information to anonymous medical certificates and is connected to the movement of ›Solidary Cities‹. Their aim, in the words of philosopher Thomas Nail, is:

> »not just a legal formality – it is a social and political project to network with other community organizations to establish organizations that actively assist nonstatus migrants, including clinics, schools, food banks, and women's shelters that will (1) provide access to anyone regardless of status, (2) have frontline staff who adhere to this commitment and will be sensitive to nonstatus issues, and (3) create a larger culture of antagonism with federal immigration enforcement and solidarity with precarious migrants.«[5]

Since 2015, the label ›Solidarity City‹ has been used to describe various political and civil society initiatives – whether in the context of Berlin's accession to the EU Forum *Solidarity Cities*, the nationwide bottom-up *Solidarity City* network, or individual local initiatives such as the *Solidarity City Campaign Hamburg*.

If we understand citizenship as a status with rights and duties, it is a good example for a Foucauldian apparatus that controls and governs society.[6] But when we look from a praxeological perspective at such alternative, some-

---

4   *Jean McDonald*: Building a Sanctuary City: Municipal Migrant Rights in the City of Toronto. In: Peter Nyers/Kim Rygiel (eds.): Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement. London 2012, pp. 129–145.

5   *Thomas Nail:* Sanctuary, Solidarity, Status! In: Reece Jones (ed.): Open Borders. In Defense of Free Movement. Athen 2019, pp. 23–33, here p. 30.

6   Citizenship is often analyzed with governmental approaches, especially when it comes to the governance of citizens, as Rose and Isin demonstrate. *Nikolas Rose:* Governing Cities, Governing Citizens. In: Engin F. Isin (ed.): Democracy, Citizenship, and the Global City. London 2000, pp. 95–109. Citizenship as a dispositive is constituted through a network between different elements of a heterogeneous ensemble, changes of position and shifts of function within this network, strategic responses to a state of emergency, such as the need to control society. An extreme entanglement of knowledge and power occurs. Thus, the dispositive acquires both an instructional dimension in the legal sense (e.g. through laws and judgments), a technical dimension that describes both the arrangement of parts within a machine and the mechanism itself, and the actions within a strategy as a whole, as in the military sense. *Michel Foucault/François Ewald:* Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit. Berlin 1978, pp. 119–120.

times post-national practices of »citizen making«[7] as mentioned above, we find ›lines of flight‹ within this allegedly stable concept of citizenship. This supports taking an anti-structural approach to this field which can provide a glimpse at contradictory efforts, idiosyncratic actors and unpredictable relations between these elements, as the ›autonomy of migration‹ has taught us. These multiple aspects of instability, negotiation and fluidity characterize an assemblage perspective. Traced back to philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, in the French original referred to as »agencement«[8], it describes the interconnectedness of heterogeneous elements in sociomaterial contexts. These elements can include human and non-human actors, discourses, institutions, emotions, different knowledge bases, laws etc. Citizenship as an interplay of various aspects, from pure legislation to materialization in passports with biometric pictures and fingerprints to emotional identification, illustrates very well how assemblage is an interplay of different actors. It includes »multiple determinations that are not reducible to a single logic«[9] and therefore focus on the process of synthesis.

The position from which we look at our field influences what we look at. In a poststructuralist tradition, for example, the constitutional effects of discourses are in the foreground, while actor-network theory conceives of materialities as equal actors. By using assemblage in our research as a lens on the social, we construct our field in a specific way.[10] Geographer John David Dewsbury has phrased this as follows: »Assemblages are therefore absolutely an ontological statement that parse out the world and frame it in particular ways.«[11] Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that the cultural-theoretical orientation of research, for example as an assemblage, says less about the phenomenon itself than about the form of knowledge production in the respective perspective. In this article, the starting point for knowledge production is the attempt to grasp citizenship as a sociomaterial reality and to trace processes of stabilization and destabilization within this assemblage.

7   *Aihwa Ong/Virginia R. Dominguez/Jonathan Friedman/Nina Glick Schiller/Verena Stolcke/ Hu Ying:* Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making. Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States. In: Current Anthropology 37 (1996), 5, pp. 737–762.

8   With reference to discussions of ›Assemblage Theory‹, I use the term ›Assemblage‹ for a critical consideration of the linguistic inaccuracy of the translation, cf. *John Phillips:* Agencement/Assemblage. In: Theory, Culture & Society 23 (2–3) 2006, pp. 108–109.

9   *Stephen J. Collier/Aihwa Ong:* Global Assemblages, Anthropological Problems. In: Aihwa Ong/Stephen Collier (eds.): Global Assemblages. Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems. Malden, Mass. 2005, pp. 3–22, here p. 12.

10 The necessity of locating the discussion of assemblages in constructivist debates is also pointed out by *Ben Anderson/Colin McFarlane:* Assemblage and geography. In: Area 43 (2011), 2, pp. 124–127, here p. 125. For field construction by assemblage perspective cf. *Sabine Hess/Maria Schwertl:* Vom »Feld« zur »Assemblage«? Perspektiven europäisch-ethnologischer Methodenentwicklung – eine Hinleitung. In: Sabine Hess/Johannes Moser/Maria Schwertl (eds.): Europäisch-ethnologisches Forschen. Neue Methoden und Konzepte. Berlin 2013, pp. 13–37.

11 *John David Dewsbury:* The Deleuze-Guattarian Assemblage: Plastic Habits. In: Area 43 (2011), 2, pp. 148–153, here p. 149.

Against this background, this paper is a first attempt at examining to which extent the much-discussed assemblage perspective can be useful as a heuristic for a cultural-analytical approach to new forms of citizenship in context of social movements such as Solidarity Cities. Therefore, I highlight some arguments in the broad discussion about assemblage as a concept and research perspective,[12] and the question arises what the added value is in contrast to other approaches such as the dispositive. After that, I use the example of city identification cards to illustrate the interlacing of the different elements and processes of change within the assembling process of Urban Citizenship. Finally, I explore the limits of this article and what further considerations are necessary to do justice to the assemblage approach.

»What is the Power of Paper?« Assemblage as Research Perspective on Citizenship

In an exhibition at the *Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg* in 2021 on the theme of ›Heimaten. Questions on Home and Belonging‹, one work asks: »What is the power of paper?« (Fig. 1 and 2) and thus gets to the heart of the tension between material and contextual involvement. The artist, Tahir Karmali, used self-made paper for the installation, which he created from photographs and immigration papers of his family. Although undertaken in an artistic way, this work explicitly addresses citizenship as a socio-material field, e.g. materialized in passports, rental agreements or tickets for public transport, and thus offers a stimulating starting point for thinking about processes of (de-)stabilization of assemblages and reassembling elements into something new like in this artwork.

In the anthology »Global assemblages. Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems«, Stephen Collier and Aihwa Ong assemble citizenship as a ›global form‹, where ethical problematics are unleashed and at the same time, existing structures are challenged by the articulation of new forms of citizenship. »As global forms are articulated in specific situations – or territorialized in *assemblages* – they define new material, collective, and discursive relationships.«[13] Collier and Andrew Lakoff offer »regimes of living« as a »tool for mapping specific sites of ethical problematization«[14] in regard to ethical orientations in practices within bio-technological infrastructures. Especially in the field of the moral mobilization of solidarity while

---

12 See among others *Ong/Collier*, as in fn. 9; *Manuel DeLanda:* A New Philosophy of Society. Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity. London 2006; *Ignacio Farías/Thomas Bender* (eds.): Urban Assemblages. How Actor-Network Theory changes Urban Studies. London 2010; Special Issue of *Anderson/McFarlane*, as in ft. 10; *Ian Buchanan:* Assemblage Theory and Method. An Introduction and Guide. London 2020. For further considerations, see Hansen/Koch in this issue.

13 *Collier/Ong,* as in fn. 9.

14 *Stephen J. Collier/Andrew Lakoff:* On Regimes of Living. In: Ong/Collier, as in fn. 9, pp. 22–39.

WHAT IS THE
POWER
OF PAPER?

PAPER:work
Installation
Tahir Karmali (b. 1987)
USA, since 2017
Handmade paper, metal
Loan: Tahir Karmali

With his *PAPER:work* series, the US-Kenyan
artist goes on a quest for his Indian roots.
The paper from which the work is constantly
reassembled is handmade by Karmali himself.
His source material consists of photographs
and immigration papers from his father's side
of the family, who migrated to Kenya in 1890,
along with sieves used in paper making – who
gets through, who doesn't? – as well as his own
immigration papers for the USA. Each sheet
tells its own story, which is then overlaid by the
next one, and each official form has the power
to lastingly change the immigrants' existence.
The pile of paper has something fragile about
it – metaphorically as well: It could easily topple
at any minute and take entire lives down with it.

Fig. 1 and 2: »What is the Power of Paper?« By Tahir Karmali, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg 2021

addressing the question of ›how we want to live together‹, this heuristic is fruitful, as I have explained elsewhere.[15]

Highlighting processes of orientation and gathering assemblage perspective brings practices of forming the present and future into view and allows us to look not only at the historical processes of genesis, but also to delve into the anthropology of near futures in Paul Rabinow's sense, and thus also to illuminate the role of temporality for research.[16] Based on her research on community forest management, geographer Tanja Murray Li offers a systematization of these ›to assemble‹-practices into »forging alignments, rendering technical, authorizing knowledge, managing failures and contradictions,

---

15 Cf. *Lara Hansen:* Solidarische Städte und Urban Citizenship. Moralische Aushandlungen zwischen Alltagspraxis und politischer Agenda. In: Jan Lange/Manuel Dieterich (eds.): Stadt – Migration – Moral. Analysen zur lokalen Moralisierung der Migration. Tübingen 2022, pp.137–157.

16 Cf. *Paul Rabinow:* The Accompaniment. Assembling the Contemporary. Chicago 2011.

anti-politics and reassembling«[17]. The focus on practices and dimensions of critical potentialities, »where assemblage functions as a potentiality of gathering for working towards a form of critique that is constantly generating new associations, knowledges and alternatives«[18] offers an important perspective for the field of alternative forms of national citizenship that distinguishes itself from concepts such as apparatus, which appear static, fixed and unitary. Within Urban Studies, geographer Colin McFarlane sees the strength of assemblage thinking on three levels:

> »a descriptive focus – where explanation emerges through thick description – on inequality as produced through *relations of history and potential,* or the actual and the possible; a rethinking of *agency,* particularly in relation to distribution and critique due to assemblage's focus on sociomaterial interaction; and a particular critical *imaginary,* through the register of urban cosmopolitan composition.«[19]

I think that the emerging of new forms of citizenship is a good example of these layers becoming visible: e.g. the historical embedding and potentials of discourses about who belongs to the solidarity community, rethinking of agency as illustrated in the artwork mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph and the imaginary of a utopian vision of another world that motivates actors to take part in the reconfiguration of citizenship.

Urban ethnologist Alexa Färber criticizes the debate within the Urban Studies journal CITY as truncated and makes a strong case, from an empirical cultural studies perspective, for the reassessment of the urban as a socio-material configuration[20] following Nigel Thrift, Stephen Graham, Robert Shields and others in the anthology »Urban Assemblages. How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies«.[21] Färber emphasizes that assemblage as a cultural analytical perspective is fruitful in the study of the urban, especially in the context of everyday life research, because it can illuminate linkages without determining them in advance. Furthermore, this perspective asks which forms of the social emerge and which potential for transformation underlies them.[22]

17 *Tania Murray Li:* Practices of Assemblage and Community Forest Management. In: Economy and Society 36/2 (2007), pp. 263–293, here p. 264.
18 *Colin McFarlane:* Assemblage and Critical Urbanism. In: City 15 (2011), 2, pp. 204–224, here p. 212.
19 Ibid. p. 205.
20 *Alexa Färber:* Potentiale freisetzen: Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie und Assemblageforschung in der transdisziplinären kritischen Stadtforschung. In: sub\urban 2014, Band 2, Heft 1, pp. 95–103, here p. 97.
21 *Farías/Bender*, as in fn. 12.
22 *Färber*, as in fn. 20, here p. 98.

These different assessments illustrate the problematic reception of the assemblage perspective.[23] Philosopher Thomas Nail sees one reason in the fact that Deleuze and Guattari have not framed and structured their thoughts as theory and that this leads to »manipulability«[24]. Therefore, Nail offers a formalization of assemblage that he adapts in research.[25] He identifies four major kinds of assemblages that overlap in reality: territorial (focus on the concrete elements »divide the world into coded segments«), state (focus on the concrete machine »unify or totalize all the concrete elements and agencies«), capitalist (focus on quantitative relations »divested of their qualitative relations and codes in order to circulate more widely«), and nomadic (focus on trajectories »able to change and enter into new combinations«)[26]. To grasp different practices and processes of change from an assemblage perspective, there are four ways related to ›deterritorialization‹ as the

> »the way in which assemblages continually transform and/or reproduce themselves […]: (1) ›relative negative‹ processes that change an assemblage in order to maintain and reproduce an established assemblage; (2) ›relative positive‹ processes that do not reproduce an established assemblage, but do not yet contribute to or create a new assemblage – they are ambiguous; (3) ›absolute negative‹ processes that do not support any assemblage, but undermine them all; and (4) ›absolute positive‹ processes that do not reproduce an established assemblage, but instead create a new one.«[27]

Following Nail, I will look at what kinds of assemblages can be found in my field and which (de-)stabilizing factors play a role in the assemblage around Urban Citizenship.

(Urban) Citizenship as an Assemblage?

Basically, the Solidary Cities movement can be understood as part of the movement for a world without borders, which proclaims the goal of providing access to state/municipal services such as health care, housing or the labor market to all people living within the city, regardless of their formal status as citizens. Following Nail, citizenship classically appears as a primary ›state assemblage‹ in which official state actors try to define the rights and duties of the inhabitants by laws, to transform the population into a calculable mass to make it governable in the classical Foucaultian sense and to form a unit

---

23 For a fundamental critique of the reception of Deleuze/Guattari in the debate on assemblage research, cf. *Buchanan,* as in fn. 12.

24 *Anderson/McFarlane*, as in fn. 12, here p. 126.

25 Cf. *Thomas Nail:* Deleuze, Occupy, and the Actuality of Revolution. In: Theory & Event, Vol. 16/1 2013.

26 *Thomas Nail:* What is an Assemblage? In: SubStance 46 (1) 2017, pp. 21–37, here p. 28–32.

27 Ibid., here p. 34.

in a kind of »imagined community«[28]. Here, the dimension of the ›territorial assemblage‹ also becomes quite clear. With their concept of »differential inclusion«[29], political theorist Sandro Mezzadra and globalization researcher Brett Neilson elaborate that the practices of citizenship and the control of migration are not only about the question ›who crosses the border or not‹, but that there is a differentiation regarding which migration is desirable (e.g. labor migration, international study programs, top athletes) and which should be prevented. This refers to a capitalist assemblage. A clear coding of social spheres can be further applied to the movement of forced migration, where the classification of countries of origin is central to the asylum claim. ›Nomadic assemblages‹ creates something truly new and »[…] thus offers a political alternative absolutely incompatible with territorial hierarchies based on essentialist meanings, state hierarchies based on centralized command, and capitalist hierarchies based on globally exchanged generic quantities«.[30] Are Solidarity Cities a kind of nomadic assemblage? In order to answer this question, I take the example of a city identification card to illustrate the manifestation of an Urban Citizenship as a reassembling process of something new. A first impressive example for the explicit materialization of Urban Citizenship in an identification document is the ID Card New York City from 2014, introduced under mayor Bill de Blasio. Those who can prove their identity and a residence in the city receive an official ID card: the IDNYC. This is recognized not only by administrations, schools and other public institutions, but also by many private companies and the New York Police Department (NYPD) and therefore has an important meaning because in the United States, there is no nationwide ID document such as an identity card in Germany.[31] The card itself was realized in a long process of negotiations between social movements and the government and therefore can be seen as culmination point from top-down and bottom-up efforts within the field of citizenship. The city administration explains its purpose as follows:

> »IDNYC is a card for all New Yorkers, from all backgrounds, and from all five boroughs. Your immigration status does not matter. The free municipal identification card for New York City residents, ages 10 and up, IDNYC helps New Yorkers access a wide variety of services and programs offered by the City. IDNYC cardholders also enjoy benefits and discounts offered by businesses and cultural institutions across

---

28 *Benedict Anderson:* Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London 1983.

29 *Sandro Mezzadra/Brett Neilson:* Between Inclusion and Exclusion. On the Topology of Global Space and Borders. In: Theory, Culture & Society 29 (4–5) 2012, pp. 58–75.

30 *Nail,* as in fn. 26, here p. 33.

31 Cf. *Henrik Lebuhn:* Urban Citizenship. Politiken der Bürgerschaft und das Recht auf Stadt. In: Anne Vogelpohl/Boris Michel/Henrik Lebuhn/Johanna Hoerning/Bernd Belina (eds.): Raumproduktionen II. Theoretische Kontroversen und politische Auseinandersetzung. Münster 2018, pp. 120–135, here p. 125.

the five boroughs, and the peace of mind that comes from having a broadly accepted government-issued photo identification.«[32]

In the following, I would like to highlight three passages from the self-description of the project: 1) »Your immigration status does not matter.« This quote refers directly to formal citizenship in the context of a state assemblage and the dimension of ordering and hierarchy within the population. In this context, the so-called practice of municipal disobedience is a central element with which municipal governments challenge the homogeneity and centralization of the state and thus destabilize the state assemblage. 2) »access a wide variety of services and programs.« Here, a paper card is related to substantial participation rights such as sending your children to public school. 3) »the peace of mind that comes from having a broadly accepted government-issued photo identification.« This highlights a great complex of emotions including fear of police controls etc. that is connected to this assemblage and materializes by inscribing itself in the body. This short example illustrates the different elements within the assemblage. But due to the limited validity of the pass to the respective city area in facilitating access to necessary services, this process can be understood more as a ›relative positive deterritorialization‹ at the administrative level, while it is an ›absolute positive process‹ at the level of social participation, which creates a new community. Following this model, various cities in German-speaking countries, for instance Bern and Zurich, try to destabilize state assemblages and stabilize the assemblage around concrete participatory practices. However, it becomes apparent that in many places, this is less a breach of the law than a practice that merely deviates from the hegemonic discourse, as the researchers around lawyer Helene Heuser show using the example of the possible implementation of an Urban Citizenship for Hamburg.[33] We can use Nail's framework as the field of tension in which different practices around Urban Citizenship in form of identification cards are oriented.

Solidarity as the Affective Desire within the Assemblage

»Assemblages are passional, they are compositions of desire. The rationality, the efficiency, of an assemblage does not exist without the passions the assemblage brings into play, without the desires that constitute it as much as it constitutes them.«[34] This quotation by geographers Martin Müller and Caro-

....

32 City of New York: 8 Million New Yorkers. 1 Card For All Of Us! URL: https://www1.nyc.gov/site/idnyc/index.page (3.9.2021).

33 *Helene Heuser/Nele Austermann/Julia Gelhaar:* Soziale Rechte für Menschen ohne Papiere Zulässigkeit der Einführung einer city-ID in Stadt-Staaten. Universität Hamburg, 01.2020. URL: https://www.jura.uni-hamburg.de/lehrprojekte/law-clinics/refugee-law-clinic/forschungsprojekt-staedte-der-zuflucht/rechtsgutachten-cityid.pdf (23.10.2021).

34 *Martin Müller/Carolin Schurr:* Assemblage Thinking and Actor-Network Theory: Conjunctions, Disjunctions, Cross-Fertilisations. In: Trans Inst Br Geogr 41 (3) 2016, pp. 217–229, here p. 224.

lin Schurr asks to what extent desire acts as a stabilizing or destabilizing factor within an assemblage and can thus be understood as co-constitutive. For Deleuze and Guattari, however, affect comes into being with an assemblage, not as a result of it.[35] I emphasize this factor here because the inclusion of desire is necessary especially for the consideration of emotionalized fields like that of belonging and solidarity. In the field of the Solidary Cities, there are two dominant desires that become apparent at first glance: government actors in the European Forum on Solidarity Cities aim to reduce the administrative and financial expense and »want to manage the refugee crises«,[36] while in the social movement, the wish for a solidary way of everyday life brings the group together. The network is characterized by the idea that we will all find ourselves in a situation of needing solidarity one day, so it is also connected to the future potential and promise of interdependence. Solidarity as a reference value describes »not only a feeling of kinship, but specific tactics that go beyond the noncooperation and protectionism of sanctuary practices«.[37] Of course, the necessary existence of a desire by no means implies that it satisfies certain moral requirements; it can be economic interest, governing aspects, moral concepts or affective (re)actions. The motives why human and non-human actors join an assemblage need to be known and controlled just as little – it is precisely this moment of unintended association that is at heart of the assemblage. When Agamben claims that »[a]t the root of each apparatus lies an all-too-human desire for happiness. The capture and subjectification of this desire in a separate sphere constitutes the specific power of the apparatus«,[38] the question is how far desire plays a different role in assemblages. In my opinion, however, the question is not at which point desire is arranged, but how it emerges and which effects arise from it. While the apparatus tries to capture, guide and stabilize needs, the assemblage perspective illuminates needs that do not fit into the lines of the formation. Interests and needs are harder to fathom in the assemblage because of its ephemeral nature. This is exactly where cultural anthropological research should start – in Müller and Schurr's words, »[a]nalysing assemblages would then mean analysing the production of desire/wish«.[39]

Unfortunately, this can just be a first impression at this point, which in a certain way reproduces the homogenization within the field. To what extent the desire differs in depth and how partly different motivations lead to the same practices remains to be further investigated.

35 Cf. Ibid.

36 Solidarity Cities: About. URL: https://solidaritycities.eu/about (29.10.2021).

37 *Nail*, as in fn. 5. here p. 29.

38 *Giorgio Agamben:* What Is an Apparatus? And other Essays. Stanford 2009, p. 17.

39 *Müller/Schurr*, as in fn. 35, here p. 224.

Assemblage as Future Challenge?

The broad field of citizenship and especially the current debates and practices around Urban Citizenship are an interesting case to use assemblage thinking and analyzing because they improve our view of the interconnections and interdependencies between different actors, practices, sites and materials and take the complexity and messiness of the field and the research process into account. The different highlighted aspects of the assemblage such as the material dimension of social order through citizenship, the affective involvement by mobilization of solidarity, the interplay of bottom-up and top-down processes described above show how complex assemblage thinking and analyzing are and that they have to fail when you try to illustrate them in a format like a short article. Similar to some of my co-authors of this issue, I still have the feeling that some inconsistencies, open questions and the knot in the head remain, but I think that the assemblage perspective challenges us and thereby makes us more sensitive to the contradictions within the theory we use and the field we study.

Lara Hansen, M.A.
University of Hamburg
Institute for Anthropological Studies in Culture and History
Edmund-Siemers-Allee 1 (West)
20146 Hamburg
lara.hansen@uni-hamburg.de