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Abstract

We investigate the effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security through a qualitative case-study of Bradford politics during the 2015 General Election. Territorial stigmatisation and ontological security are important constructs in political geography but there is relatively little research on how territorial stigmatisation effects ontological security in everyday lived experience – in this case the lived experience of political contests. We conducted thirty in-depth interviews, generated three themes and present and analyse these three themes in the form of three ‘created dialogues’ as outlined by Sullivan (2012), with a smaller sample of ten out of thirty of our participants. Drawing on Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of ‘chronotope’ we identify three key effects of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security: 1) A negative reputation of ‘parallel societies’ has the potential to create double meanings for the inhabitants of that society; 2) Local reputation enhances ontological security through linking particular places to particular personalities but potentially decreases ontological security for a district as a whole; 3) Everyday lived experiences sometimes acquire charged emotional symbolic significance, which could encourage the reflexive side of ontological security. Our findings went through a positive member-checking process with five of the participants.
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Academics are used to focussing their energies on strange cases and unusual phenomena. In the case of politics, the British city of Bradford is a strange case that has excited much attention among academics and policy makers but also among the wider population. There is a vast academic literature on Bradford as a place of race and criminality (Samad, 1992; Bolognani, 2009) urban race riots (Hussain and Bagguley, 2005; Alexander, 2004; Macey, 2009); the subject of television programmes (e.g. ‘Make Bradford British’) and Government scrutiny on ‘parallel lives’ (Cantle, 2001; Ouseley, 2001; Phillips, 2006) and the project of multi-culturalism and lived diversity (Modood, 2013; Husband et al., 2014; Alam, 2016, McLoughlin, 2014). Bradford occupies a unique place in the UK in that it is often used to ‘test the temperature’ on issues around ‘Islam in the UK’ and policies around minority place and belonging, a topic which has become increasingly important to the discipline of human geography (Hopkins, 2007; Dwyer, 2008; Phillips, 2009; Hopkins and Gale, 2009; Gale 2013). Demographics and history can, to a large extent, explain the scrutiny. It was through key events in Bradford in the 1980s that questions around integration first garnered public attention and rose to the top of the policy agenda. The Honeyford Affair (1986) highlighted cultural specific issues in multicultural education; the Rushdie Affair (1989) bought to the fore Islam in the public sphere; urban riots in the early 1990s and then again in 2001, in which large numbers of young Asian men clashed with police cemented the city’s status as integration barometer. Bradford has long provided fertile ground for anthropologists (Khan, 1976; Dahya, 1974) and historians (Lewis, 1994), more recently, social scientists (Burlet and Reid, 1998; Macey, 2009; Husband et al 2014;
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Bolognani, 2009; McLoughlin, 2014) interested in the issues of immigrant and in particular Muslim communities in the Bradford.

In the remainder of the article, we will argue that this level of surveillance is consistent with Wacquants’ (e.g. 2008, 2015) concern with ‘Territorial Stigmatisation’. Once we can establish this, we can then move on to the question of how it interacts with ‘ontological security’ in everyday ways. While there is much in the literature on both of these concepts, there is little on how territorial stigmatisation impacts on ontological security in everyday ways. For our purposes we take the lived experience of political contests and will report on our findings of an ethnographic exploration of the 2015 General Election in Bradford.

**Bradford as a site of territorial stigmatisation**

Territorial stigmatisation is an innovative concept that combines Bourdieu’s ‘symbolic power’ (of authority’s ability to make representations stick) with Goffman’s stigmatised identity, where people are discredited as legitimate actors on the social stage for being stigmatised (e.g. through bodily abominations). Wacquant, Slater and Pereira (2014) outline six characteristics of stigmatised territories: 1) tied to but autonomised from poverty and subaltern identity, imputed morality and street crime: 2) They become nationalised and democratised - that is they become notorious across the country as synonyms for social hell: 3). They are regularly denounced as ghettoised: 4) ‘racialisation through selective accentuation or fictive projection’. This is where cultural differences (particularly religion) are exaggerated and taken as opposite to national values (such as the Honeyford affair outlined earlier or the 2014 Trojan Horse affair in Bradford), while good news stories are downplayed (such as the new City Park – Paganoni, 2012). Finally, they elicit overwhelmingly negative emotions and corrective reactions.
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These indications of stigmatised territories are relevant to Bradford. It has suffered from negative connotations as a place of inner-city decay and demise (Carling, 2008). A 2014 YouGov poll in the UK found the majority of people rated Bradford as the most dangerous city in the UK (YouGov, 2014) even though there is no evidence for this; Bradford was ranked the worst place to live in the country in 2015 (USwitch, 2015); the first three auto-fill in google results for ‘Bradford is’ are ‘Bradford is a dump’ ‘Bradford is a ghetto’ and ‘Bradford is Asian’ while the city has seen multiple attempts at ‘regeneration’, ‘prevent’ strategies and social housing policies.

The role of the State here in producing stigma should not be overlooked. ‘Prevent’ strategies are deeply contested and perceived as Islamophobic in unfairly targeting the Muslim population (Alam and Husband, 2012). This is because any Government employee (youth worker, teacher, council) could be involved in surveillance. The State’s social housing strategies has followed the two-track system identified by Larsen (2014) in the context of Copenhagen’s ‘West End’ where subsidised private profit housing and enterprises are/were historically privileged over publicly funded enterprises. This in turn leads to further decline due to a disconnect between properties and facilities that are out of reach for many and in an undesirable area for outsiders.

While ‘race’ and ‘class’ are crucial in understanding the production of a stigmatised territory, Bradford’s mix is more complex than a basic parallel-lives or social class reading of the city. We can see evidence of less segregation over time (Finney and Simpson, 2009; Finney, Catney and Philips, 2015). For example, while between 2006 and 2016, the highest number of migrants into the district are from Pakistan, the second higher are from Poland (Data Mill North, 2018). People can also come and go more easily (and in 2015/16, there
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was more emigration from rather immigration to Bradford) (Data Mill North, 2018). Equally research such as Philips (2006) demonstrate that the lived reality of British Muslims is quite different to the parallel society reading.

Similarly, in terms of class, while Bradford could be described as “marginal” due to problems of disconnect from the wider economy (it has as a lower rate of employment (65.1%); a higher claimant count (2.7%) than the national average (Data Mill North, 2018) and rising inequalities, it still has strong community ties that allow extensive work in the ‘informal economy’ (Athwal et al, 2011), the maintenance of place identity, and the continuing “hinterland”. Yet, similar to Slater and Anderson’s (2012) ethnographic study of St.Paul’s in Bristol, everyday realities do not stop the ‘reputational ghetto’ emerging in the discourse of ‘specialists in cultural production’ such as journalists, academics and politicians, as we saw in the introduction. The ‘reputational’ ghetto arguably sticks because of the historical ‘othering’ its inhabitants along the lines of race and class.

In the next section, we will examine whether ‘territorial stigmatisation’ has an impact on ontological security. For Wacquant (2011), it appears to (although he refrains from using the term) through the strategies that inhabitants of stigmatised areas adopt to deal with stigmatisation Before this discussing this, however, we need to outline what we mean by ‘ontological security’ as there are a number of debates in this area (Browning and Joennemi, 2017, Browning, 2018).
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The impact of Territorial Stigmatisation on Ontological Security

The effect of globalisation on political identity has driven much discourse around the concept of ‘ontological security’ and ‘existential anxiety’ (as outlined by Laing, 1960, and developed by Giddens, 1991). While for Laing, it refers specifically to the interpersonal threat of an individual’s identity being engulfed by another, more powerful person and the anxieties that this engenders, Giddens (1991) developed it into a complex sociological description of ‘trust’ in the stability of social realities (even if the reality is inequality) and ‘reflexivity’ in the ability to move away from traditional habits and structures in order to cope with change. Browning and Joennemmi (2017) make the point that there tends to be a one-sided concern in the literature (particularly they argue in International Relations) with ‘trust’ in social realities and identity preservation and insufficient regard to ‘reflexivity’ in adapting to a changing reality. For example, ‘anxiety’ does not only threaten the stability of habits and identity but may also prompt reflexivity, through, for instance, developing new strategies to cope with change and evolving identity to adapt to new circumstances.

Ontological security as ‘identity preservation’ (or trust in continuity) tends to inform much of the literature on migrant integration, particularly discourses of parallel societies (e.g. Kinnvall and Nesbitt Larking, 2009). In this reading, lack of recognition of one’s subjectivity leads to insecurity, existential anxiety and efforts to ‘securitise’ subjectivity by creating stable and familiar structures around the migrant community (Burbandt, 2005).

Securitising subjectivity can actually be read in several different ways. It is not just a synonym for ontological security (or security of the self). It could also mean the way in which threats and threatened subjects are socially produced through practices of governance. Each case is different however. Benwell (2017) for instance describes intergenerational differences in
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This reading is problematic however. For example Botterill et al (2016) critique Kinnvall’s focus on stability and biographical identity as part of ontological security. Using the example of the Scottish referendum, they point out that nationalism, or securitising subjectivity, can be pluralistic and inclusive allowing comfort in diversity. This diversity and evolution of identity, Browning and Joennemi (2017) would suggest is facilitated by reflexivity.

The problem with ‘trust’ in continuity is the clear impact of stigma on subjectivity, identity and politics, which unsettles stability. For example, Garbin and Millington (2012) examine the impact of stigma on La Courieuve (a Parisian Banlieu) and point out the impact on subjectivity in the ambivalence felt between the internal image of normality and the external image (reputation) of exceptionality in lived experience. Similarly Arthurson et al (2014) draw attention to the conscious use of negative stereotypes to foster positive collective identities by social housing tenants (who had been caricatured in a televised programme). In both cases, everyday acts are subject to scrutiny and different interpretations leaving their participants sometimes at a loss as to how their actions will be interpreted or over-interpreted and sometimes with clear strategies of coping with stigma.

Waquant’s (2011) eight strategies for coping with the stigma of place are relevant in terms of articulating the reflexivity needed to maintain ontological security. Here, we follow Walach’s (2015) clarification of these strategies - they are: 1) Dissimulation or concealing securitising subjectivity between older and younger Falkland islanders with regard to poor relations with Buenos Aires, suggesting a divide between a geopolitical and a psychological sense of ontological security.
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where one comes from; 2) Mutual distancing or emphasising micro-differences between parts of the neighbourhood that outsiders would not be familiar with; 3) Lateral denigration or demonising a subset of the population in the territory; 4) Retreating to the private family sphere and not going out in public; 5) Exit; 6) Indifference or disregarding or denying the reputation; 7) Defense of neighbourhood; 8) Hyperbolic claiming or stigma inversion (claiming advantages to the stigma). Strategies one to five are a form of submission to stigma while six to eight are a form of resistance to stigma (Wacquant, Slater and Pereira, 2014).

Empirically, research has shown that resistance to stigma takes many forms, which criss-cross these distinctions - from counter-narratives, to simple identification with the area and as Garbin and Millingont (2012) point out, can even happen when people “are busy doing other things” such as participating in flower contests, where resistance is peripheral to the joy of the activity itself. This is a finding picked up Kirkness and Tijé-Dra’s (2017) examination of Nimes (in Marseilles). They examine the lyrics of a rap song which ironically shows how normal it is to experience inequality (e.g. it's normal to be turned down for a loan). Even so, however, as Botterill et al (2017) demonstrate, event pre-emptory resistance against a stigmatised identity (such as projecting extra good versions of self or ironically mocking the status quo) can be fraught with self-surveillance, ambivalence and contradiction.

In the case of Bradford, some of these strategies of individual coping can also be seen in our data, as we will see, while others are already on the public record. For example the strategies of resistance (6-8) can be identified in the local University's (2016) marketing
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video entitled ‘Don’t go to Bradford’ to ironically engage with negative outside views (University of Bradford, 2016).

Reflexivity in Ontological Security and the Study of Bradford Political Contestation

All of this brings us to our central question. What is the impact of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security in the lived everyday experience of political contestation for a stigmatised territory? With Browning and Joenniemi’s (2017) clarification of ontological security, it seems apposite to narrow this focus down to political contestation. This is because political contestation involves both trust in democratic processes; trust in the predictability of outcome and political argument and campaigning to cope with change, using reflexivity in strategies to adapt to change, e.g. in political emphasis on different identities, political leadership in altering an identity narrative and shifting identity entirely in response to popular movements.

In the next section, we will talk more about how we collected and analysed our data. Before doing this, however, we need to signpost that our ambition is not to simply identify the strategies that inhabitants adopt to cope with territorial stigmatisation (although this is possible). Instead, we would like to draw attention to how coping strategies co-exist with sense-making of a messy social realities - involving an intermix of value, emotions and competing narratives. Others, such as Parker and Karner (2010) also draw attention to the role of places as repositories of affect, sites of memories and indicators of status but there is little on the context of political choices that people make as politics is also part of coping with territorial stigmatisation, tied to place.
The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security

To give this aim more analytic focus, we will draw on Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of chronotope to analyse our data. Bakhtin (e.g. 1990) makes the point that identity is fractured between how others (imagined and real) view and judge us (what he calls ‘soul’) and how we view and judge ourselves (what he calls spirit). In this reading, both ‘spirit’ and ‘soul’ constitute identity but this identity may divide between “outer” and “inner”. For Laing, this divide leads to ontological insecurity; Bakhtin is more optimistic, suggesting that dialogue offers a reflexive subjectivity, because in dialogue, final judgements become more fluid and open; can be tested with others and provide the context for action (Burkitt and Sullivan, 2009). Political identity, in this view, is affected by judgements of others and self but through dialogue with these judgements, this identity is provisional, tentative and malleable. Hence, our examination of the effect of reputation on ontological security is one that has to involve dialogues with this reputation (when reputation is understood as fractured between outer and inner judgements).

Currently, as we’ve seen Bradford’s stereotypical reputational chronotope is one of ‘parallel lives’ and this narrative implicates two different value-systems with which the members of each community are seen to express, which lead to different features of the landscape (mosques and churches), different kinds of schools (segregated), different areas to live, different rhythms of life (e.g. Friday prayers versus Sunday Service) and different political methods (e.g. bloc voting as opposed to individual voting). At least these are some of the features of the chronotope of that narrative, as stereotypically understood. As we saw earlier, the actual reality is different. This breaks down the reputation of Bradford into a particular kind of genre (the reputation of parallel lives) with a particular chronotope attached to it (divided space and time). We are interested in how this reputational genre
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effects the ontological security of that place (Bradford) or in other words, interpenetrate and respond to other genres, particularly a political genre concerned with change.

This framework for ontological security provides an understanding of place that is multiple and shaped by competing, interpenetrating genres of place, identity and values. As these change, so too does ontological security.

**Data Collection.**

The paper draws on primary qualitative research in the form of 30 in-depth interviews with a mixed demographic of University of Bradford students, staff and members of the public on their personal political biographies alongside an interview with the area’s sitting MP Naz Shah. The interviews were semi-structured, lasted between 40-110 minutes and covered four core areas: how politics was conceptualised, political behaviour, political campaigns and views on local politics and specifically the city of Bradford and its reputation. We also attended political rallies, distributed questionnaires and trawled newspaper coverage on Bradford. The data reported here however is from our interviews with two pertinent quotes from newspapers incorporated into the final data analysis section.

The University is a particularly good location as a site of plurality, reflexive dialogue and political differences to base this study. Access to participants was not difficult in this location. This begs the alternative question however as to whether we should have also gone to some of the most ‘notorious’ parts of Bradford, e.g. those most associated with the riots of 2011. While some of our participants are from these districts, in future work we will ethnographically extend the study to these locations.
The participants here include 15 who identified as Muslims and, 15 who we identified as non-Muslims in lieu of their response to a question on religious affiliation. Ages range from between 18 years to 60 years and 14 were female and 16 male. They are given anonymous ‘names’ here apart from our local MP (Naz Shah) who was happy to be named. Participants were gathered through a number of different ways, including advertising the study at the University of Bradford, attending rallies and political gatherings and keeping a stall outside a Polling Station in University Ward during the 2015 General Election. The sample was self-selective in that individuals could decide to opt-into the study. All the interviews were conducted by the authors and transcribed by professional transcribers. Alongside the interview dataset we also attended hustings events and political campaigns allowing us to observe political behaviours and interactions and conversations in the city.

The incumbent MP for the constituency of Bradford West which includes University ward where a large proportion of our observation took place and where all our interviewees had a connection through either living working or studying was at the time of the 2015 General Election, George Galloway. Galloway, with his international profile and penchant for discursive hyperbole features significantly in the political narratives of our respondents. Galloway had been the MP for 3 years after winning the seat in a shock by-election victory in 2012. At the time, he had caused a ‘mini political earthquake’ (Baston, 2013) by defeating the Labour Party candidate Imran Hussein. Subsequently, there was much written on the way politics was conducted in the city from ‘clan politics’ imported from South Asia (Goodhart, 2012) and the use of kinship networks in the political mobilisation of South Asia communities (Akhtar, 2013, Akhtar, 2015, Peace and Akhtar, 2016) – pointing to a parallel
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politics in the city. This paper interrogates the readings of such narratives by those who live work and study in the city.

**Method of data analysis and presentation**

Our analysis proceeded in two steps. We did a top-down thematic analysis of the data set (Braun and Clarke, 2006). That is, we looked for themes that would help us to understand and elaborate on the effect of reputation on ontological security. We identified three common themes from our analysis of the data set: ‘outsiders and insiders views of Bradford’; ‘differences and fractures within the Bradford ward’ and ‘integration and transgression’. Whilst these themes were not equally distributed across the data set, they did nonetheless feature significantly in all the interviews with Muslim respondents and over half of the interviews with non-Muslim respondents.

Our presentation of these themes involves a further analysis. Typically, the presentation of findings in a qualitative paper involves the explication of themes via a small sample of exemplary quotations. For example, Binks and Cambridge’s (2017) phenomenological analysis of British Military Veterans. Following Sullivan (2012) we go one step further here in presenting the data as three ‘conversations’ where the participants’ words seem to address one another, and our interest in ontological security and reputation, from different perspectives – e.g. where Muslims and non-Muslims seem to speak to one another directly, even though both are actually absent interlocutors. We use ten participants (five Muslim and five non Muslim) to do this – although it should be noted that some participants appear more than others (e.g. ‘Aqeel’) in the ‘conversations’. This echoes the presentation of qualitative findings more generally, where some quotations are longer than others – or may draw on the same participant more than once – but for us in particular
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it was important to both cover as many participants as possible and to reflect the central and peripheral role of these participants to our analysis of ontological security and reputation. A further significant reason to present the raw data in this way, however, was to exemplify the ‘thinking aloud’ dynamic sense in which positions are negotiated and thought through with absent and actual others.

We subsequently examined these dialogues from the point of view of Bakhtin’s chronotope in order to unpack the narrative organisation of trust and reflexivity in response to processes of territorial stigmatisation – paying particular regard to the relationship between the lived experience of the everyday political and Political choices.

As part of a ‘member-checking’ exercise, five of the participants presented here (three Muslim, two non Muslim) read a draft of the paper and agreed with their presentation in the ‘created dialogues’ and more generally offered no ethical objections in this ‘re-presentation’ of their words.

Findings and Analysis

Dialogue One: Reflecting on the “Outside” ‘Stigmatised’ Reputation from the ‘inside’

| Aqeel | I mean social scientists don’t visit Bradford, academics, journalists, TV makers don’t visit Bradford because of anything good that’s going on in the city, and is there anything good going on in the city? There’s loads of stuff you know but that’s not newsworthy, that’s not dramatic. If you can count something as a problem then at least you can conceptualise it....they allow their |
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assumptions to dominate their disgust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom

before I came anywhere near Bradford people were asking "What on earth are you going there for?" ....And identified it as one of the worse places to be in the whole of the UK, they still do if I mention that I’m from here or that I work here or that have a connection here, so it always draws that, it has a very poor I think image outside this area and this region and it’s seen as a certain type of city.... dominated by let’s say, dominated by a Muslim perspective, I mean it’s not accurate necessarily but that’s what it’s perceived as outside, poor, backward looking, you know kind of lacking in investment and so on

Rob

the problems looked at from outside are very different from how you would see them from within. I think most people in Bradford knock along together fairly okay and yes you have problems but certainly with second and third generation people from immigrant backgrounds they see themselves as Bradfordians and they see themselves as Yorkshire men and women, that’s I would say my overview of it, which might be very different from somebody looking, certainly people coming up on the train from Bermondsey who know absolutely nothing and nobody in Bradford wants them to come in whatever colour you are, you know, nobody’s inviting them, they’ve invited themselves to come and solve the problem.... so I think people from the outside see it as almost a testing ground in a sense. And if we go back to 2001 and the riots, you know, I remember them well, it’s often forgotten that there was no
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tom.</strong></td>
<td>maybe there is very little evidence for it but there seems to be a view abroad that and you move further into the centre of the city, that there is more corruption and so on in the voting system itself and also among the people who get elected, you know, councillors and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewers</strong></td>
<td>Do you think that other people can influence how individuals end up voting? So for example community leaders, do you think community leaders can influence...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aqeel</strong></td>
<td>this question is coming from: ‘is there anything particularly ethical about this’? Is there anything particular to certain communities in Bradford that enables this transmission of corruption? That’s what the question’s about, the question is you know, are Pakistanis for example more likely to be corrupted? And I’d say possibly, but corruption itself has many forms so I don’t really care, I think that’s kind of a, I think that’s a bit of a red herring to be honest with you, and you know the interesting thing about Pakistanis in this city is that, very young population you know something like, it’s got the sort of largest percentage of people between eighteen, or actually under 25 or something right, so very, across the board there’s a big balloon amongst the young people. The majority of them young people are British born and bred, they’re not like their grandparents, their grandmas might have been who might not have been fully engaged with the process, who might not have been able to make their own mind up and who might have been likely...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to trust somebody else who was saying the right things. That generation is you know like all things dying out, the younger generation is actually swelling, I find it difficult to believe that that generation is going to take that kind of pressure likely, is going to be willing or compliant to the same extent that other generations might have been, that’s why I think it’s a bit of a sort of red herring, I think it’s evolving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Dialogue One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This dialogue moves from talking about the reputation of Bradford towards the insinuation that there is a corrupt voting pattern in Bradford. We argue that territorial stigmatisation has the potential to create double-meanings for the inhabitants which can foster mistrust but enhance reflexivity in ontological security. Under the gaze of academics (such as ourselves), the media, and groups with vested interests, the everyday actions of participants are open to selective reporting and misconstrual - with a skewed focus on bad news stories (something regularly picked up in the research on territorial stigmatisation – e.g. Garbin and Millington, 2012).

Aqeel’s suggestion that there is something (possibly racism?) behind the question of whether community leaders influence votes– “the question is, for example, are Pakistanis more likely to be corrupted”, something that Tom hints is a “view from abroad” is a good
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example of this kind of double-meaning. Aqeel, himself, is quite reflexive about this, in
drawing attention to the possible subtext in the interview context and interrogating it.
While the stated aim of researchers may be to examine the social and political life of those
in the “other space”, once the academics make that journey “inside” to represent
multiculturalism, their own motivations become subject to scrutiny. In representing
“Bradford”, they are possibly one of those academics/anthropologists “motivated by their
disgust” and would they allow their disgust to dominate their assumptions. In this sense the
space represents a mirror in which the researchers view their own reflection. In doing so,
researchers are also brought into a double-bind space where they are both legitimately and
illegitimately part of a surveillance apparatus.

We are not talking, here, of parallel lives, but rather of double-meanings, endemic to
territorial stigmatisation, which become part of being (ontology) in Bradford and demand
reflexivity as part of ontological security: questions which belie questions; the stereotypes
overlying the realities; curiosity alongside surveillance; unwanted visitors. There is more
here than just defense of neighbourhood by making the distinction between outsiders and
insiders (although that is one of the strategies we can recognise here from Wacquant), it is a
also a challenge of securing meaning among double meanings which mean that positive
news stories are ignored making it difficult to change the reputation (Aqeel). Moreover,
double-meanings is not an issue for Muslims only – it is an issue for a city which excites such
attention.

There is a divide between two chronotopes which helps create these double
meanings– the travel chronotope of anthropological fascination for ‘outsiders’ as agents of
stigmatisation and the chronotope of ‘historical emergence’ for ‘insiders’. In the former, the
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city’s reputation precedes it, “before I came anywhere near Bradford” (Tom).

Anthropologically, there is an academic fascination from outside, attracted by bad news such as riots and a city emblematic of ‘multiculturalism’ but there is also a lay fascination with the same issues, particularly from the far right – with far-right activists regularly making trips to Bradford to ‘reclaim’ it, coming from outside. Neither are ‘invited’ particularly (Rob).

The closer one gets to the centre of the space, the more corruption there is (Tom), from the ‘outsider’ point of view. From ‘within’, however, this is another example of ‘assumptions’ dominating disgust (Aqeel) where ‘outsiders’ meanings vie with “insiders’” meaning of events such as block voting (“corruption comes in many forms” – Aqeel). In chronotopic terms, this ‘character’ ripples out into a degenerating social space (one of the “worst” places to be, Tom). This is ‘epilogue’ time to the big events, from the “outsider” perspective – mass immigration and rioting, where nothing can undo this foundational reality.

The “inside” perspective, on the other hand, is one of “evolution” (Aqeel) where voting patterns are changing through a younger generation with different values. Voting is not just a symbol but a means of enacting social change. The younger population may have different values to older generations. This is a chronotope where the individual character shapes the future as much as the present historical context shapes the character.

While chronotope helps outline the experience of double-meanings from different perspectives, territorial stigmatisation through surveillance helps account for the dominance of the ‘outside/inside’ theme within the city (although this distinction is more complex insofar as there are also sympathetic ‘outsiders’ and hostile ‘insiders’ to Bradford).
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This act of surveillance is not passive but actively disrupts everyday life, whether it’s the far-right coming into the city or academics and t.v. programme makers. This surveillance is self-legitimating through bad news revolving around the key year of 2001 (Rob). Politically, it is the outsider who attaches the labels of ‘parallel lives’ (e.g. ‘Make Bradford British’ or the derogatory attribution of ‘Bradistan’ (McLoughlin, 2014)) when parachuted in to examine and diagnose the ‘problem’ city. What it represents, however, is the particular version of Britishness that outsiders see – effectively revealing their own lens of interpretation along with what they see or seeing double.

To sum up this analysis, we attempted to focus on one feature of ontological security – trust in the political process and the reflexivity involved in contesting elections - but this very quickly interacted with everyday issues of territorial stigmatisation and the complexity of contradictory perspectives (around time, character, multiculturalism) in dialogue with one another between and within people. We saw earlier that there are a number of strategies that the inhabitants of stigmatised territories adopt to maintain ontological security. What this analysis adds to the literature is the framing of both stigmatisation and the response to stigmatisation in different genres (or linguistic resources) which differently shape the past, present and future. While the genres clash in double-meanings, they afford a reflexive agency to the participants in understanding and taking on the challenges of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security. For instance, decline is not inevitable and change is worth fighting for, politically, as the future is open-ended.

That brings us to our next dialogue– which is to gain a more nuanced view of the everyday ways in which perspective is tied to place and how territorial stigmatisation impacts on ontological security in an undulating rather than even pattern across the district. To do this,
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we will look at reputation within different voting districts rather than the city as a whole - particularly as these relate to social class and Muslim and Non-Muslim identity. Our aim is to examine varying but everyday ways in which territorial stigmatisation impacts ontological security across the tapestry of the City.

*Dialogue Two: Voting Fractures in Bradford.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ginine</td>
<td>I can see that we are quite a segregated city in terms of like you have, you know, the white woolly Liberals over in Shipley and you’ve got your Tory tossers in Bingley and so, and you’ve got like, you know, pockets of Asian families in part, different parts and then Queensbury, I think that’s quite a white estate, Byley white estate, white working, very, very poor estate in Byley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaya</td>
<td>(that’s) the class thing as well, the fact that, you know, we have a ward called Ben Rhydding and a ward called Bradford Moor, and whilst they may only be like 15, 20 minutes, you know, like drive difference or train ride difference between them, actually it’s a massive gap in terms of rich and poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naz Shah</td>
<td>there’d been a raised expectation since Galloway had come into Bradford in terms of he was going to do this and he... and then people had seen what a bad politician is after what the divisive politics that he applied...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huma</td>
<td>I’ve got cousins who live in Bradford 3, which is predominantly now Respect, in my opinion, like, you have to, like, Respect in that area, and you just can’t like anything else, and I know I’m stereotyping an entire area, but they are very forthright in, in getting their argument across and making sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td><strong>How do they do that? Are they...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huma</td>
<td>Well I remember once having an argument with, like, a cousin from the area, and he was, like, really pro Galloway and really, sort of, pro, like, Respect and stuff, and I was just like, “Yes, but he’s a bit of an idiot, isn’t it? Like, come on, like, why isn’t he going back to Glasgow, then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naz Shah</td>
<td>communities are so separate yet we’re on each other’s doorsteps. And a family that I met in Thornton in the Bronte café was they actually said to me, their children were visiting and they said, “We’d read about you nationally but we’d never seen an Asian face here,” and that was quite striking, so that was the issue around we’d neglected the white vote and we had very very non-integrated communities in Bradford West and yet we’re only six wards...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqeel</td>
<td>I’ve been told about people who’ve put their houses up for sale and have been pressured by the neighbours, “Whatever you do, don’t sell to an Asian.” “Don’t sell to Asians,” you know, we’ll never forgive you kind of thing. I think that’s probably less likely to happen now, I think you know, there is a diversity of locales in which South Asians...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Believe it or not that did happen to me when I put my house up for sale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqeel</td>
<td>Your neighbours told you what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Don’t sell to Asians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqeel</td>
<td>Fucking, well, what are you asking me for? You write this shit, you know right its there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Dialogue Two**

This dialogue progresses from a general discussion on the voting patterns and distinctions within wards in Bradford to a very specific particularity of selling a house to ‘Asians’ in a particular area. Our aim here is to demonstrate how the mundane politics of everyday life and the cyclical politics of elections intertwine in the fractures of wards and districts of stigmatised territories and examine what this means for ontological security. In particular, while race and class are increasingly viewed as “intersectional” identities in sociology, here they are talked about as sectional and segregated, with their own community, tied to local places. Each of these has a kind of “gated community” feel leading to different kinds of governance.

First of all this dialogue draws attention to a different kind of doubling than that of the first dialogue insofar as reputation fractures across a variety of “parallel” communities (rich and poor, political opposites, Muslims and Non-Muslims). These communities are relatively stable, reputationally and it is stability that affords both judgement from others and pride as well – i.e. pride in being associated with the identity that a place offers. This sense of trust
The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security in the fractures across districts affords ontological security. It is one of Wacquant’s coping strategies for territorial stigmatisation to exaggerate micro-differences within the area. There is also some reflexivity however. Huma’s debate with her friends about George Galloway’s unexpected election (‘yeah but he’s bit of an idiot’) in Bradford West is an example of this.

These patterns of trust and reflexivity in voting debates and contestation are articulated by our participants through the prism of ‘personality’ (e.g. ‘he’s a bit of an idiot’). In contrast to psychological traits, however, personality characteristics do not necessarily come from genetics or parenting style but instead are ascribed to location – such that there are ‘Tory Tossers in Bingley’ and and those in BD3 are ‘very forthright in getting their argument across’ in BD3 (Bradford West). Interestingly, personality types show that middle-class areas can be ‘stigmatised’ (in the everyday sense of stigmatised) and this works into the stability of both the area and the personalities who inhabit it.

Chronotope helps us to unpack two different ways in which personality-tied-to-territory is an important feature of trust and reflexivity in ontological security. First of all, it demonstrates the unchanging nature (trust) of a voting territory, even if that involves stigmatising ascriptions of personalities. Time-space and personal values intertwine to maintain this stability (in what Bakhtin refers to as the ‘idyllic’ genre). Secondly, however, it shows the importance of individual politicians is disrupting the idyll. This chronotope sets the stage for the entry of ‘epic’ adventures, with key characters. A key character here is George Galloway and his party ‘Respect’, who, according to his political opponent, Naz Shah, used ‘divisive politics’ in the city to his advantage. While this is rhetoric, from the point of view of chronotopic analysis, he is a ‘traveller’ into the space from Glasgow. As in
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the previous chronotope, he comes in from the outside but not to target the city as a whole but rather its reputed divisions. There is an ‘epic’ quality to this journey insofar as he surprised many by winning the by-election in Bradford West in the first place, disrupting the relatively predictable voting pattern of the ward. He raised expectations of the city (a feat of epic/heroic proportion) but then disappointed many (according to his political opponent, Naz Shah). Huma picks up on this by de-crowning him, mockingly referring to him as an ‘idiot’ and asking why he doesn’t return to Glasgow.

Naz Shah herself is both participant and epic hero – targeting the ‘neglected’ white vote but also recounting a story of how she was emblematic of the divisions within the city, becoming a previously unseen ‘Asian face here’. It is worth noting how this ‘outside’ voice is interweaved into her narrative in direct speech quote marks... “we’d read about you nationally but we’ve never seen an Asian face here”. That is, her journey even within her native Bradford rippled across the micro-political landscape but also left its trace on her own speech through the lodging of another’s quote in ‘her own’ speech.

While voting patterns traditionally are stable and predictable, in a chronotope of cyclical time, they are also open to hybridisation with these epic heroes who journey to different parts of the city (there is a ‘massive gap’ between parts) and disrupt the voting pattern. Change is therefore possible testifying to the reflexive dimension of ontological security. However, the change coalesces around epic heroes who may accentuate divisions or try to bridge them (literally and physically) but the divisions are the springboard for change – backwards and forwards in election cycles. For example the wealthier districts (Shipley, Keighley, Ilkley) have a sitting conservative MP (Philpiip Davies) and an ex-MP (Kris Hopkins) who support a break-away move from the centre of Bradford (increasing ontological
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security for them in terms of tax receipts but decreasing ontological security for the city centre inhabitants. (Enfield Independent, 2017).

To sum up our second analysis. The double meanings identified in the first dialogue apply to ‘Bradford’ as a symbolic whole. We can see here that meaning is more straightforward between voting districts because voting districts take different (stigmatising) perspective on one another. However, what this analysis adds to the literature on territorial stigmatisation is that personality-tied-to-territory is key in maintaining both a stable pattern but also in allowing the potential for politicians to accentuate or reconcile reputed divisions between people. In election cycles this may lead to an increase in ontological security for particular districts (trust in stability of reputation) but a decrease for the city as a whole (as charismatic politicians use differences to their advantage to effect one-sided political change).

This brings us to our final extract where we will turn back again to the complexity of meaning for the City as a whole in the everyday lives of participants. We will focus on the emotion and symbolism attached to politics (and Politics) in order to draw out how the knotted levels of meaning (first dialogue) and fractured meanings (second dialogue) of stigmatisation are complemented by emotionally charged symbolic meanings embedded in ontological security

Dialogue Three: The “what if” moments of alternative presents, the past and future possibilities

<p>| Interviewers | Do you think the result, the national result will make much difference to the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student J</td>
<td>I don’t think it will, I think the Tories will be quite prepared to leave Bradford to sink even further. Yeah, I think it will go to Leeds, it will go to Manchester or whatever, I don’t think that it will have any, if it has any impact it will only be downwards,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>I think that Bradford probably, you know, Bradford Council will see probably faster and more radical cuts under the Tories than it would have done under a coalition and that it, or than it would have done under a Labour government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqeel</td>
<td>it is always a question of the usual suspects and that’s something that Bradford’s suffered from for a long time, going back to the 70s really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>I’ve been here a lot more has changed, like, regeneration-wise. I mean, like Leeds for instance is obviously, like, the big, so if you think Bradford isn’t enough, we’ll go to Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brady (Irish Examiner, 2018)</td>
<td>Leeds has redeveloped its entire city centre as an enormous pedestrian-only area, and it now has one of the most vibrant, impressive, and successful city centres (despite having a limited public transport offering) anywhere in the UK. Bradford adopted a different strategy, implementing a strong pro-car philosophy, and it is now possibly the easiest city centre in which to drive and park. The only problem with Bradford is that its city centre has been decimated, and the effect of decades of car-based policy is there for all to see — a blighted, hollowed-out urban core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial from Telegraph and Argus (2017)</td>
<td>(The Government) believe that jobs in Leeds are more valuable than jobs in Bradford and also that the type of people applying for jobs in Leeds are of a better quality and have more potential than the residents of Bradford and Shipley which is a terrible slur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arshi</td>
<td>I went to Leeds on Thursday with a mate, and one of the guys walking past, and he just goes to her, “ISIS”, in her ear, and I was like, this is ridiculous, like, and he just walked off. We were just shocked that in this day and age people are still saying, people are saying stuff like that, but I think Bradford, I don’t think it is that bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqeel</td>
<td>my girls, these were my girls, were working in clothes shops in the city centre and they used to get this shit and worse..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student J</td>
<td>I suppose its small groups of people making an effort. My husband always breakfasts with an Asian friend of his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginine</td>
<td>a few years ago when we had some really bad snow and everybody had to walk home and we were walking through Lister Park and there was a couple that we kind of seem to just keep, we were keeping abreast of each other at the same pace and we were just chatting and that and they invited us back to theirs for a cup of tea and we said no we’ll keep going because we were cold and we needed to get going. But I’ve often reflected back on that because they were an Asian couple and I was thinking “we should have said yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>but it’s a little bit like birds of a feather flock together, you know, I don’t think it’s a sign of a lack of integration if people choose the company of people from their own social or cultural group. I mean there’s a lot of Eastern European people in Bradford now and they’ve established their own shops, they’ve established their own sort of entertainment venues, they have their own society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Dialogue Three

This dialogue again segues from a larger political reflection on the comparison between Bradford and Leeds, with general ‘defense of neighbourhood’ to everyday examples of racism and regret, that parallel these political discussions. Our analytic tool of ‘chronotope’ is useful for drawing attention to the structure of time in the organisation of territorial stigmatisation and emotional reflexivity in ontological security in responding to this.

Morson suggest that alternative possibilities that enter into a chronotope of the present as ‘the shadows of time’. What could be or ‘should’ be is a side shadow structuring the space. In terms of stigmatisation, its an ‘if-only’ this or that had happened. ‘It would have done’ and “we should have said yes”. Its useful as it highlights the everyday wishes of regret, nostalgia and fantasy as they surround places and underpin the reflexivity attached to ontological security. Along with ‘sideshadows’, backshadows trace the current structure of a place as an inevitable consequence of the past and ‘foreshadows’ are portents of what will happen in the future because of the structure of place in the present (in this case, a stigmatised structure).

The dialogue starts out with J and Rob foreshadowing what will happen to Bradford now that the Tories got into power. Bradford will ‘sink even further’ and have ‘faster and more radical cuts’ than under Labour, because of the reputation the Tories have for this.. The future reputation of the city – regeneration (growth and potential) is both vulnerable to the
future cuts and from ‘the usual suspects’ who, by reputation of doing nothing, drag the City down to degeneration. Aqeel ‘backshadows’ the problems of ‘degeneration’ to the 1970’s since the “usual suspects” started being elected. This transcends ethnicity but generally refers to the state of the education system in the ward, the vibrancy of the town centre, unemployment and the state of the roads.

A key ‘side shadow’ space here is ‘Leeds’ which acts as a comparator for Bradford, particularly in terms of how Bradford could have been more like Leeds with better investment and policy decisions at local and national level. This is true of both ‘outsiders’ and ‘insiders’. For example an international newspaper (the Irish Examiner) has an article suggesting that Bradford could have been as successful as Leeds with a different transport strategy (and mentions nothing about parallel lives) while the local newspaper (The Telegraph and Argus) angrily refers to the ‘terrible Slur’ inflicted on the residents by a decision of central Government to move HMRC jobs from Bradford to Leeds. In this case, however, character is again invoked with the assumption that their decision was motivated by prejudice or that the people of Leeds are more important than the people of Bradford. These political decisions percolate to everyday shopping decisions. Our interviewees, like Chris, talk of going to Leeds if Bradford does not have enough.

This political ‘sideshadow’ of Leeds (what Bradford could have been) is replicated in everyday emotions and feelings when it comes to the narrative of the ‘parallel society’. There are two examples of this. One is where Bradford is a more positive comparator to Leeds. The age-old problem of ‘racism’ is still there in Leeds and according to Arshi and is worse than Bradford. They describe a verbal assault, in Leeds, of someone linking Muslim identity to terrorism and thereby importing what was to be a bygone reputation of 1970’s
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racism into someone else’s innocent “modern day and age” space of an urban walk. The past intrudes upon the present, undermining trust in structures of the modern day age and we assume, although we do not know, that it would heighten ontological (in)security from the lack of predictability.

The second example is where the ordinary moments become extraordinary opportunities to create a different world, albeit a temporary one, in Bradford and leads on from the speculation that Bradford is better than Leeds when it comes to racism. It could also be that the omnipresent discourse of the ‘parallel society’ leads to symbolic significance ascribed to the banal moments of everyday life. In other words, the vast social force meets the particularity of individual choices – allowing feelings of regret – and uniqueness; no such moment will arrive easily again. Having breakfast (as student J says) is a kind of political act insofar as it is not just about having breakfast with a likable personality, it is also having breakfast with a representative of a different group – which is in itself transgressive against the omnipresent parallel lives reputation. For Ginine, there is a missed opportunity to transgress into the space of another couple created by a set of extraordinary circumstances – this too is seeped in regret at the missed political opportunity (with a small p).

This is not to say that everything is deeply symbolic for everyone. Rob creates a chronotope of ordinariness among others’ extraordinariness. He does this by suggesting that ‘birds of a feather flock together’ or separation along lines of similarity is natural - and Eastern Europeans being a good example of this.

Overall, then, territorial stigmatisation has the potential to layer emotional connotations on everyday interactions. This is already well-established in the literature (e.g. Garbin and Millington, 2012). What we have see, here, however, with the help of chronotope is
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temporal quality of this: 1) alternative reputations to the present reputation (every day interactions symbolically laden as everyday opportunities for an alternative present) 2) past reputation (such as investment policies leading from a history of degeneration) and 3) future reputation (such as regeneration and cynicism). We suggest that this is a kind of emotional reflexivity important for starting and possibly maintaining the reflexive side of ontological security.

DISCUSSION

Arguably, all places are subject to a dislocation of identity to varying degrees: the perceptions of the outsider and the experiences (real and perceived) of insiders. And inevitably, all places are subject to the ebb and flow of change, gradual, piecemeal or punctuated by moments of crisis or accelerated change. Bradford is a place which has on occasions fascinated outsiders, attracting the gaze of public, policy and scholarship. It is a city which embodies the consequences of post-war migration and post-industrial decline. A city heralded as the test-case for multiculturalism and its perceived failures, an example oft cited example of which are the 2001 riots. A geographical place where parallel lives has come to signify the modus operandi of its inhabitants, and to some extent, it’s politics. Our participants, here, in these constructed dialogues and also through our conversations at political rallies, hustings and at the polling station show a much more nuanced, complicated, if at times contradictory set of views on the city in which they live, study or work. Some display an acute awareness of the national gaze under which they live, a gaze which sharpens at moments of crisis: crime, social unrest, terrorism. The reputational damage of bad news hangs over the city but there are attempts to ‘show the other side’, to share the
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positive with pride. At an institutional level there have been city successes. City Park for example, sitting in the heart of the city is testimony to every day lived conviviality (Barker et al, 2014) and the Bradford Literature Festival has, since its inception in 2014, been a success, gaining significant national attention and accolade. For those who do not have the option, by choice or by constraint, of leaving the city, such successes are the milestones by which they tell the story of their city.

Our story of the city is one centrally concerned with the relationship between ‘territorial stigmatisation’ and ‘ontological security’. These are key constructs to understand the assumed pervasiveness of the ‘parallel lives’ reading of the city because it ties Bradford to a wider story of globalisation, immigration, finding a home (Kinnvall, 2004) and political voice. What we hope to have added here is a reflexive understanding of stigmatisation for the inhabitants that places knotted meanings, symbolism and emotions as everyday lived experiences of the political and Political, which complicate the dramaturgical reading of strategies the inhabitants adopt to overcome stigmatisation. This is because these everyday lived experiences involve an emotional questioning of the reality upon which these strategies are premised. Such emotional questioning of a lived reality speaks, in particular, to the reflexive capabilities of ontological security.

Ontological security, as an historically global phenomenon of diasporic identities, helps us to understand resistance and integration for particular places in broad terms but a specialised focus on the exigencies of the local political situation can also help understand the ebb and flow of ontological security, the intertwining of it with the apparently mundane and everyday and the potential of threatening it in the research process itself.
References


The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security


The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security


The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security


The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security


The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security


The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security


Wacquant L, (2011), “Territorial stigmatization revisited: symbols, state, and space”, keynote address to the International Conference on Territorial Stigmatization and Advanced Marginality, University of Porto, 22 June

The effect of territorial stigmatisation on ontological security
