

Editorial

The shadows of enlargement: Theorising mobility and inequality in a changing Europe

ANNA AMELINA[♦]

ANDREAS VASILACHE^{*}

Abstract

This introductory article of the special issue is based on the criticism of the sedentarist lens used in migration studies on social inequalities. It is organised around two questions: In what ways have forms of inequality and patterns of migration in the enlarged Europe been changed, and how should the nexus between migration and social inequality be rethought after the ‘mobility turn’ in the social sciences? First, the article proposes that the mobility turn and transnational sociology be combined to approach varieties of geographic mobility in the current Europe and that inequality analysis be conceptualised from a ‘mobile perspective’, meaning that forms of mobility and patterns of inequality be considered as mutually reinforcing. Second, Europe is considered as a fragmented and multi-sited societal context, which is co-produced by current patterns of mobility. The article discusses recent societal shifts such as supranationalisation and the end of socialism in the Eastern part of Europe (among many others) and identifies the concept of assemblage as a useful heuristic tool both for migration studies and European studies. Third, the final part illustrates how the contributions collected in this special issue address the challenges of the sedentarist lens and provide conceptual solutions to the analytical problems in question.

Keywords: Migration; mobility; social inequalities; Europe; enlargement; mobility turn

Introduction

In the past few years, experience of subordination and exploitation in the ‘West’ has become one of the most popular topics in fiction and non-fiction writings produced in the new EU member states and the EU borderland countries. One such piece of writing, *Allergy to Magic Mushrooms*, is an autobiography by a highly skilled Estonian lawyer who has been working in Ireland

[♦] Anna Amelina is Junior Professor of Sociology of Migration at Goethe-University Frankfurt, Germany. E-mail: amelina@soz.uni-frankfurt.de.

^{*} Andreas Vasilache is Professor of European Studies at Bielefeld University, Germany. E-mail: andreas.vasilache@uni-bielefeld.de.



for several years. At one point in the book, he writes, “Every day I toiled at a mushroom farm. While chopping the mushrooms my fingers developed an unbelievable speed...” (Ivanov-Tsarevokokshaiskii, 2012: 3, transl. by the authors). *Skype-Mama* (Brunner et al., 2013), an essay collection that gives a detailed account of the experiences of distant motherhood and of the pressure on female Ukrainian migrants in the EU to accept the ‘dirty’ jobs.

These examples hint at the fact that migration and mobility since the enlargement of the EU have been accompanied by the emergence of new forms of inequality. These examples not only contradict the official rhetoric, according to which EU-internal mobility contributes to a wealthier and more prosperous Europe (see Kahanec and Zimmermann, 2009), they also indicate that there is a fundamental difference between the experiences of EU citizens and those of non-EU citizens because the latter group faces considerably greater restrictions and limitations to mobility than the former (Bigo, 2009; Tsoukala, 2005). The purpose of this special issue is to provide a new perspective – a *mobile* perspective, as we would like to call it – on the nexus between migration/mobility and the formation of social inequalities in the context of the post-enlargement Europe.¹ This issue consists of five contributions, all of which are concerned with the question of how new patterns of migration and mobility that have emerged since the EU enlargement are interlinked with the transformation of social inequalities. To address this question, social inequalities are defined as hierarchies of wealth, power and knowledge which result in unequally distributed life chances and life opportunities (Tilly, 2000). This special issue thus addresses migration and mobility both within the enlarged European Union and from the non-EU to the EU countries. The contributions do not reduce ‘Europe’ to the ‘EU’, but take into consideration that the process of EU enlargement changes the image of Europe, the regulations of migration and the mobility practices of mobile individuals. The contributions focus on two sets of questions.

The first is about how new patterns of temporary movement, including seasonal, rotational and circular mobility, contribute to inequality of life opportunities for different categories of mobile populations. Building on empirical studies, the contributions reveal the particular mechanisms of inequality formation at work. For example, the contribution by Emma Carmel addresses the emergence of a new hybrid migration regime that includes national and supranational elements, while the article by Natalka Patsiurko and Claire Wallace elaborates on the minority integration regimes in the new EU member states. Magdalena Nowicka illuminates the mechanism of the de-skilling of educational degrees and shows its transnational preconditions, and Kenneth

¹ This special issue is based on papers presented at the international conference ‘Changing Patterns of Migration: Changing Patterns of Inequalities? Borders and Boundaries in the Enlarged Europe’, which took place at Bielefeld University from 12 to 13 April 2012 as a cooperation project of the Collaborative Research Center “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities” (SFB 882), the Centre for German and European Studies (CGES/ZDES) and the Institute for World Society Studies (IW).

Horvath addresses the inequality of life opportunities for temporary migrants that results from the governmental securitisation of migration.

The second set of questions is about the challenges involved in identifying the changing social contexts of migration, mobility and inequality in Europe. Current social and societal transformations such as EU supranationalisation, EU enlargement and post-socialist shifts together appear to generate hybrid and multi-sited societal settings.² For example, Emma Carmel's contribution sketches out the European post-enlargement situation, showing that it is produced at the national and supranational scales of governance, while Magdalena Nowicka highlights the emergence of multi-sited transnational settings generated by cross-border migration. In addition, the article by Roland Verwiebe, Laura Wiesböck and Roland Teitzer outlines the current patterns of migration and mobility within this hybrid societal framework.

These two sets of questions provide a fertile ground for new conceptual debates about the unequal distribution of life opportunities in the process of migration and mobility. However, before we address these conceptual innovations in detail, we will first discuss the challenges in the study of mobility and inequality in the enlarged Europe.

Sedentarist bias in studies of migration, inequalities and Europe

The contributions to this special issue are integrated around the criticism of the so-called sedentarist lens in migration studies of social inequalities. This 'immobile' perspective takes the sedentarist way of social life as self-evident (if not outright natural) while problematising the practices of mobility as being exceptional (for detailed criticism, see Büscher and Urry, 2009). First, we argue that the naturalisation of immobility prevents a fruitful analysis of the mutual constitution of mobility and social inequalities. Second, we insist that this *immobile perspective* neglects the emerging mechanisms of social inequalities which result from and are rooted in the new forms and patterns of mobility. Our third argument is that the immobile perspective reproduces the image of Europe as a stable, homogeneous and immobile social space. The next paragraphs elaborate on these three challenges of migration studies on social inequalities in more detail. As will become clear, there appears to be an analytical need for a *mobility turn* that takes *mobility* as the more general and more inclusive term and understands *migration* as a specific form of mobility.

The first challenge has to do with the fact that migration studies usually address the formation of unequal social positions and the disparate distribution of life opportunities *from the immobile perspective*, that is, as something generated in the context of immigration countries only (see e.g. Koopmans et al., 2005). Therefore, the formation of social inequalities is analysed as a multi-layered process that includes migrants' economic mobility in the country of

² On the challenges of regional and in particular EU integration and enlargement, see, for example, Bingran and Junbo (2008); Vasilache et al. (2011); Zielonka (2006).

destination, their access to rights and welfare arrangements (Pfau-Effinger, 2005) and the emergence of gendered and radicalised hierarchies in the context of destination. In short, nation state strategies of migration governance and the social, cultural and economic resources of mobile populations that are brought in are conceptualised as the main producers of inequality. However, this approach predominantly contextualises the genesis of social hierarchies by focusing on the framework of the immigration country and on one-way permanent migration (for a critique, see Amelina, 2012). These studies thus centre on inequality genesis in the process of post-migration settlement. But the observation of increasing new forms of mobility (including seasonal, rotational and circular patterns) (Aradau and Blanke, 2010; Engbersen et al., 2013; Herrmann, 2014; Wallace, 2001; Wallace and Vincent, 2007) that are already acknowledged by European institutions and policymakers (Council, 2007) is an indication of the inadequacy of this immobile lens: the heterogeneity of the various forms of mobility requires new conceptual tools and empirical investigations into the nexus between mobilities and inequalities.

The contributions of this special issue address this challenge in various ways. They follow the premise that mobility and immobility are socially produced, but by questioning the sedentarist accounts, they avoid overgeneralising mobility practices (see, for example, the article by Emma Carmel). At the same time, the articles consider a variety of forms and patterns of intra-European mobility to avoid the sedentarist perspective (see, for example, the contribution by Verwiebe, Wiesböck and Teitzer).

Second, the epistemology of sedentarism contributes to the neglect of the multi-sited and multi-local quality of subordination and inequality patterns. Although researchers are in agreement that temporary mobility is on the increase in the enlarged Europe, the unequal distribution of life chances is analysed mainly in the context of post-migration settlement. In other words, although there is an emerging consensus in the research literature that the life-worlds of mobile EU (and non-EU) citizens are increasingly characterised by multi-locality (meaning that both the sending and the receiving sites play a role in the biographical and family projects of mobile individuals), the literature still tends to overlook multiple sites of subordination and underprivileged treatment that are emerging in the context of new temporary mobility patterns. And although there are various books and special issues of academic journals on new forms of social inequalities in Europe (e.g. Brady, 2011; Dolton et al., 2009), these publications do not consider the changing forms of migration and mobility, but conceptualise inequality genesis either as a process that is emerging in nation state contexts or as a result of new supranational regulations. None of these contributions systematically examines how new forms of migration and mobility are associated with a cross-border and multi-sited distribution of life chances and opportunities.

In order to address this challenge, the contributions in this special issue analyse inequality and mobility patterns as being interrelated and as generating one another in a reciprocal way. Several articles in this issue (such as those by

Roland Verwiebe, Laura Wiesböck and Roland Teitzer; Emma Carmel; and Madgalena Nowicka) try to overcome the exclusive focus on the receiving setting for inequality genesis and to provide evidence of the relevance of various sites of subordination and privilege distribution.

The third challenge is that the immobile perspective on the ‘production’ of Europe results in an unintended conceptualisation of Europe as a ‘fixed’ container. Garelli and Tazzioli (2013), for example, criticise what they call the “methodological Europeanism” and the “methodological EU-ropeanism” as problematic sociological imaginations of ‘Europe’ as a fixed container. This immobile lens prevents migration studies from paying attention to the great societal transformations in and of ‘Europe’ (Castles, 2010), which include the continuous transformation of Western European welfare states (Carmel et al., 2011) and the post-socialist transition in the Eastern part of Europe (Black et al., 2010; Rupnik and Zielonka, 2013). Also, the process of EU integration and in particular the current EU enlargements,³ which generate new political borders, new European peripheries and new borderlands, are rarely considered in recent studies on migration in general and in studies on social inequalities in particular. There are several volumes on migration and mobility in Europe that address the impact of the EU enlargement on migration, among other issues (Black et al., 2010; Bonifazi, 2008), but these important publications do not focus explicitly on the production of unequal life chances among mobile and immobile populations, nor do they involve any explicit, inequality-related approaches. Even studies that address the transformation of institutional contexts (e.g. Boswell and Geddes, 2011; Rupnik and Zielonka, 2013) rarely link migration and inequality studies.

To address this challenge, the contributions of this special issue not only rethink societal contexts of migration/mobility and inequality formation as national and ‘fixed’, but re-conceptualise them as temporary settings. For this reason, hybrid multi-institutional and multi-scalar settings – national, transnational and supranational (including the ‘mobility’ of EU borders) – are acknowledged as contexts relevant for the genesis of unequal life chances of mobile populations.

However, it is necessary to think about elements and approaches which could be helpful in overcoming the immobile lens in studies on the nexus of mobilities and inequalities in the enlarged Europe.

³ There are 28 member states of the Union. This special issue refers to the common sub-groups of countries. ‘EU-15’ refers to the 15 countries which were member states of the Union prior to 2004: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Austria and Luxembourg. ‘EU-8’ refers to the eight 2004 accession countries in Central and Eastern Europe: Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia. ‘EU-10’ refers to all 2004 accession countries: EU-8 plus Malta and Cyprus. ‘EU-2’ refers to Bulgaria and Romania, which joined the Union in 2007. Croatia (EU-1) joined the EU in 2013.

Conceptual tools to overcome the immobile lens in migration studies on social inequalities

This special issue attempts to provide elements of a new conceptual perspective which allows us to address the three previously introduced challenges that result from the sedentary and immobile premises of migration studies with regard to social inequalities. First, we explain why the *mobility paradigm* of current social sciences should be combined with *transnational sociology*; second, we suggest that inequality analysis be conceptualised from the *mobile perspective*; and finally, we make a case for moving beyond the idea of a ‘fixed’ Europe in the analysis of mobilities and inequalities.

Combining the mobility paradigm and transnational sociology

In order to address the first challenge – the immobile perspective in studies of post-enlargement migration – this special issue makes a case for combining the ‘mobility turn’ of migration studies (Büscher and Urry, 2009) with the transnational approach to migration (Amelina and Faist, 2012; Faist 2000; Pries 2008). The mobility paradigm criticises the sedentarist epistemologies of a large proportion of migration studies and approaches social practices of mobility and immobility as dialectically produced. For example, the contribution by Kenneth Horvath shows that the forms of political governance of temporary mobility between Austria and the new EU member states cannot be elaborated without understanding political discourses about sedentarist forms of organisation of social life as supposedly normal and mobile lifestyles as supposedly risky. According to the premises of mobility paradigm, the analytical distinction between ‘permanent’ one-way migration and ‘temporary’ forms of mobility is increasingly blurring. Thus, the most effective way to benefit from the mobility turn is to accept ‘*mobility*’ as the more general and inclusive term and to approach ‘migration’ (in the sense of one-directional movement with the implication of permanent settlement) as one specific form of mobility. Recent research on post-enlargement European mobility (Engbersen et al., 2013) provides evidence of an increase in temporary patterns (including rotational, seasonal and circular patterns).

The transnational approach to migration and mobility requires that a distinction be made between social practices of mobility (including immobility) and transnational linkages that mobile individuals and their significant others maintain across borders, because transnational linkages and contacts may continue to exist without individuals being mobile themselves.⁴ Therefore, researchers have reconstructed different degrees of mobile individuals’ attach-

⁴ Two categories of transnational phenomena have been addressed and discussed in the recent research literature. Some studies, such as Faist (2000), propose different types of transnational formations from short-term to long-term (e.g. transnational networks, kinship groups and organisations, which also include diasporas), while transnationally oriented studies, such as Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004), have noted the emergence of domain-specific transnational social fields (politics, economics, education, the media, science, etc.).

ment (i.e. cross-border contacts and linkages) between the sending and the receiving countries in the context of post-enlargement Europe. For example, Engebersen et al. (2013) distinguish between

- economically motivated short-term mobility (including circular and seasonal mobility), which is characterised by a stronger attachment to the sending context and a weak attachment to the receiving context;
- pluri-local mobility,⁵ which can be both temporary and long-term and which is characterised by strong linkages of the mobile individuals to both the sending and the receiving context;
- “footloose” mobility, a type of mobility which has a temporary nature and a circular quality and which is characterised by the mobile individuals’ weak linkages to both the sending and the receiving context; and
- “settlement migration”, which may be economically or non-economically motivated and which is characterised by the mobile individuals’ strong attachment to the country of destination and a weak (but still persistent) attachment to the country of emigration.

This useful typology indicates the emergence of multi-local life-worlds for all categories of mobile individuals who are involved in post-enlargement mobility (though with some variations), even for those who migrated once and then decided to resettle. The combination of the mobility paradigm and a transnational lens thus allows for a differentiated analysis of both varieties of mobility (including permanent migration) and for a differentiation of transnational linkages (in terms of durability and orientation [home- and/or host-centred]). But in what way does this outlook contribute to the analysis of mobility and social inequalities?

Inequality analysis from the mobile perspective: The hypothesis of a migration system and the call for fine-grained mechanisms

Adrian Favell (2008) proposes that the current migration dynamics between the ‘Western’, ‘Central’ and ‘Eastern’ European countries be approached as a process that is embedded in a constitution of a new European migration system. Using this diagnosis as a heuristic framework, we could address the emerging institutional conditions and dependencies between the old EU member states, the new EU member states and the EU-borderland countries (which are connected to the EU by specific agreements) as the centres, semi-peripheries and peripheries. The old EU member states (EU-15) could be understood as the centre, the new EU member states (EU-10 + EU-2 + EU-1) as the semi-periphery of such a migration system and non-EU borderland

⁵ The authors use the term ‘transnational migration with bi-national orientation’; however, in the context of transnational studies, the terms ‘pluri-local’ and ‘multi-local’ appear to be more appropriate.

countries⁶ as the periphery. In contrast to the classical theory of migration systems (Fawcett, 1989), it is not the pairs or triads of sending and receiving countries, but the categories of states according to the incorporation into the process of enlargement that are decisive for the constitution of such a migration system. Isomorphic institutional conditions⁷ contribute to the movement of high-skilled, semi-skilled and low-skilled labour from the new to the old EU member states, while the emergence of complex regulations on migration appear to be determinants of geographic movement from the non-EU borderland countries to the old EU member states (Zaiceva and Zimmermann, 2008).

However, in order to be able to specify this general (and generalising) image of emerging migration systems and to better understand evident differences between the life chances of the mobile EU and non-EU citizens, the articles in this special issue suggest that the more fine-grained mechanisms of inequality genesis be analysed. Building on empirical studies, the contributions reveal the particular mechanisms of inequality formation at work. For example, the contribution by Emma Carmel addresses the emergence of a new hybrid migration regime which includes national and supranational elements by exploring the differences in life opportunities between the mobile EU and non-EU citizens. The article by Natalka Patsiurko and Claire Wallace compares the impacts of integration regulations that affect Russian minorities in two new EU member states, indicating that those regulations (which emerge from national and supranational elements) are decisive for the life opportunities of potentially mobile EU citizens with a minority status. Magdalena Nowicka illuminates the mechanism behind the de-skilling of educational degrees and its impacts on the life chances of mobile EU citizens from Poland and their access to the labour markets in the United Kingdom. By looking at both the sending and the receiving sites, Nowicka analyses transnational conditions of de-skilling and also details how migrants evaluate their own skills. Kenneth Horvath draws on insights from governmentality studies and Jessop's approach to state power to address the inequality of life opportunities for temporary migrants⁸ which result from the governmental securitisation of

⁶ For the purposes of this special issue, 'EU borderland countries' shall be defined as countries which are 'bound' to the EU by specific association agreements, such as Stabilisation and Association agreements (SAA) and the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). The countries of the western Balkans (official candidates Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, applicant Albania and potential candidates Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo) are attached by SAA, while the countries of the Mediterranean (Algeria, Morocco, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, the Palestinian Authority, Syria and Tunisia) and the Eastern European neighbours (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine) are included by way of the ENP.

⁷ The right to free movement, the harmonisation of tertiary education and the portability of social security rights are some key conditions that contribute to the institutional isomorphism within the enlarged EU.

⁸ Horvath's analysis includes regulations affecting both non-EU citizens and the citizens of the new EU member states, whose mobility was affected by the transitional regulations on and provisional limitations to mobility after the EU enlargements.

migration. He also points to the highly precarious situation of those temporary mobile individuals who are assigned temporary status and thus become “potentially deportable” (de Genova and Peutz, 2010).

The contributions of the issue not only highlight the multi-locality in configurations of European post-enlargement inequalities, but also specify the heuristic metaphor of ‘migration system’ by reconstructing concrete mechanisms behind the unequal distribution of life chances and their multi-local effects and implications. However, in order to understand these multiple mechanisms and processes of inequality genesis, we must examine the strategies by which authors contextualise and frame the subjects of their studies.

Moving beyond the idea of a ‘fixed’ Europe: Europe as an assemblage

The concept of assemblage appears to be a beneficial resource to approach ‘Europe’ in a way that goes beyond the idea of a fixed social space. This concept indicates heterogeneous, relationally connected elements as a temporary stabilised setting (see Ong and Collier, 2004; Sassen, 2008). Therefore, the EU rhetoric of a wealthy and prosperous Europe, the implied distinction between insider EU citizens and outsider non-EU citizens, and the hybrid⁹ migration regime(s) could be approached as elements of such an assemblage. In addition, we could consider border technologies¹⁰ (including the categorisation, selection and exclusion of mobile individuals), bodies of migrants and the unequal distribution of life opportunities as elements of this assemblage which are created and co-shaped by the process of EU enlargement (including the extension of the EU’s political-territorial border) and which in turn shape European governance patterns.

Using the concept of assemblage frees us from having to analyse Europe as a fixed and stable container; instead, ‘Europe’, or ‘Europes’, can be conceptualised as an outcome, or outcomes, which is or are constantly produced by a variety of discursive and social practices. The concept of assemblage also enables us to avoid the “*methodological Europeanism*” and the “*methodological EU-anism*” (Garelli and Tazzioli, 2013), which reduce the social production of Europe to particular political and geographic entities or spaces, and it allows us to acknowledge the multiplicity of Europe(s) (Biebuyck and Rumford, 2012): the semantics and governance of ‘Europe’ may also be produced beyond the territorial-political configurations of the EU.

All in all, the concept of assemblage provides a flexible and non-essentialist tool for the contextualisation of the nexus between geographic mobility and social inequalities in the post-enlargement context. It acknowledges the fact that contexts of migration and mobility are changeable and undergo complex societal transformations. Accordingly, the contributions to this

⁹ ‘Hybrid’ means that this migration regime is organised on the national and supranational scales.

¹⁰ For more details, see Bigo and Guild (2005); Karakayali and Rigo (2010); Mau (2010).

special issue take into consideration that the immigration state alone can no longer be seen as the only context of inequality formation. By taking a more general perspective of European Studies (cf. Rumford, 2008), migration scholars benefit from acknowledging the multi-layered changes in the European societal landscape, such as the end of socialism (see e.g. the article by Patsiurko and Wallace) and the process of supranationalisation (Emma Carmel). Scholars of European studies do not simply argue that nation states are becoming irrelevant contexts of analysis; rather, they emphasise that national contexts are embedded in the supranational level of governance (Boswell and Geddes, 2011; Vasilache, 2012), in the evolving European borderlands (Scott and van Houtum, 2009; Anderson and O'Dowd, 1999) and in the emerging transnational spaces (see the article by Magdalena Nowicka).

Incorporating the mobile perspective into inequality analyses: The structure of this issue

Sociologists working in the areas of migration and social inequality and social scientists researching the nexus between European transformation, the production of social inequality and migration have submitted contributions to this special issue. Not only do they exemplify how patterns of migration and mobility have changed in contemporary Europe since the enlargement of the EU; they also provide insights into the role of these changing patterns in the transformation of hierarchically structured life opportunities of mobile populations.

The proposed collection has two main strengths. First, it provides conceptual tools to address the mutual shaping of migration, mobility and inequality patterns in Europe.

The articles of this special issue relate to various different conceptualisations and categories of inequality: class-related inequality analysis in the article by Roland Verwiebe, Laura Wiesböck and Roland Teitzer, the theory of political economy in the contribution by Emma Carmel, the concept of governmentality in the paper by Kenneth Horvath, the theory of capital forms in Magdalena Nowicka's article and, finally, the concept of inequality in rights in the contribution by Claire Wallace and Natalka Patsiurko. What they all share, however, is the premise that the reinforcement of forms of mobility and patterns of inequality is organised reciprocally, so there is no need to assign a causal primacy to either one of them.

Second, most of the contributions compiled here focus on empirical studies which provide evidence of particular forms of inequality in mobility processes and of their conditions. This special issue thus promises to be a beneficial resource for scholars seeking material on the most current empirically validated conceptual tools to organise and conduct research on the nexus between migration, mobility and inequality in Europe. It is aimed at interdisciplinary-oriented researchers in various academic fields in the social sciences, such as migration studies, transnational studies, inequality research and Euro-

pean studies.

The issue opens with an original contribution by Roland Verwiebe, Laura Wiesböck and Roland Teitzer, which uses the most recent statistical data to provide a general overview of current trends in migration and mobility to and within the enlarged EU. The article begins with a historical overview of migration and the implications of the EU enlargements for the transformation of migration dynamics to show how patterns of temporary mobility have steadily replaced the recruitment-based forms of European migration of the past. At the centre of the article is a detailed analysis of a variety of migration and mobility patterns. The authors outline changes in social conditions and individuals' decision making which accompany the new mobility patterns. Furthermore, the authors discuss the social composition of migration populations. In the concluding section, Verwiebe, Wiesböck and Teitzer show how these forms of mobility have co-evolved with the newly formed transnational European labour markets. The authors' far-reaching conclusion is that the nexus between the transnational labour markets and the new forms of intra-European mobility shifts the logic of stratification between different categories of mobile populations.

The second contribution, by Emma Carmel, addresses the subject of policy regulation of migration and mobility in the EU and identifies the emerging inequalities on the institutional level. In particular, her contribution suggests that EU migration policy is becoming the central process used to restore power relations among the EU member states. Carmel builds on political sociology and political economy as well as on critical-governance perspectives to analyse EU migration policies in relation to three relevant areas: (1) the current national and local transformations in the migration policies of EU member states; (2) the mutual shaping of the migration policies and the national and local labour markets; and (3) the internal imbalances in the EU's political economy. The author illuminates how migration policies are produced by political bodies both within and outside the EU and how this hybrid form of policymaking reshapes the hierarchy of the EU member states. In addition, Carmel describes inequality-generating effects these migration policies have on mobile individuals.

After this detailed elaboration on the new forms and the political regulation of migration and mobility, the issue addresses new, changed conditions and mechanisms of inequality formation. The third contribution, by Kenneth Horvath, examines the governmental dynamics that underlie temporary migration programmes. Such programmes have gained political and numeric significance over the past decades and have become an important element of so-called migration management initiatives. Especially in the new European context, forms of short-term, seasonal or circular mobility have recently received considerable attention from scholars. Focusing on forms of enforced temporalisation, Horvath argues that most of these temporary migrant worker programmes hinge on complex political technologies which involve, above all, a differentiated deprivation of fundamental rights. These technologies are

therefore not self-evident capacities of a liberal state but are always contested and require a process of legitimisation. Horvath uses the example of the Austrian seasonal workers scheme to illustrate how the establishment and development of such a programme for temporary migrant workers are structured by the interplay of two political rationalities that are often conceived of as contradictory: the securitisation and economisation of migration. Horvath also points to the crucial politico-economic shifts in the 1980s and 1990s which led to both the need for and the possibility of establishing new forms of *enforced temporariness* in European migration regimes that are linked to extreme forms of marginalisation of those who do not enjoy privileged transnational labour market mobility, such as migrants from new EU member states who are negatively affected by transitional regulations and third-country nationals.

The fourth contribution, by Magdalena Nowicka, continues the discussion of inequality mechanisms involved in the process of mobility using a transnational lens. Nowicka's article addresses the de-skilling of migrants' educational degrees as one of the central inequality generators. Nowicka builds on empirical data on recent mobility between Poland (a new EU member state) and the United Kingdom to describe how the valuation of the migrants' skills in the emigration setting contributes to their devaluation in the immigration setting. In order to provide a conceptual basis to explain her empirical findings, she uses the transnational lens, which shows that both the immigration and the emigration sites are equally relevant elements of the transnational framework of analysis. The author insists that only this multi-sited approach to the process of skill validation allows for the complexity of the 'circulation of talents' to be explored appropriately. Her contribution discusses the various ways in which the multi-local social frameworks influence the valuation of skills and, consequently, migrants' access to the labour markets.

The concluding article, by Natalka Patsiurko and Claire Wallace, also addresses the co-production of mobility and social inequality. It centres on the influence of the 'mobile' EU border on the potentially mobile minorities in the new EU member states. The authors show that the 'mobile' EU border (shifted through the accession) and its accompanying policies on the integration of minorities are the decisive conditions for the unequal life chances of potentially mobile populations. Patsiurko and Wallace present the results of an empirical mixed-methods study which compares policies on the integration of the Russian minorities in Latvia and Lithuania. One of the findings is that EU accession plays a special role in relation to the politics of integration (i.e. the assimilation of minorities) in that it has allowed for fixed Soviet-style identity politics to be transformed into multi-layered cosmopolitan types of belonging and membership. In sum, the contribution describes the impacts of EU accession on new forms of citizenship and belonging and the resulting unequal access to legal rights. Although this contribution does not focus on mobile populations, it convincingly demonstrates how the 'mobility' of the EU border co-determines the identity constructions of new minorities and

provides conceptual tools to avoid the problematic premise of a ‘fixed’ Europe.

Concluding remarks: Towards the mechanisms behind the reciprocal enforcement of mobilities and inequalities

The contributions in this special issue address new conditions of inequalities in life opportunities, which range from new hybrid migration regimes (see the article by Emma Carmel), to the transnationally organised de-skilling of the new EU citizens (Madgalena Nowicka), to the new forms of securitisation (Kenneth Horvath), to minority integration regimes influenced in part by the EU (Patsiurko and Wallace). These mechanisms reproduce multi-sited and fragmented hierarchies, which evidently differ from the 20th-century post-war inequality patterns in Europe (Soysal, 1994). While addressing the logics of emerging European inequalities, the contributions – which combine various theoretical elements – are organised around the mobility paradigm (see Büscher and Urry, 2009), transnational sociology and non-essentialist European studies (Rumford, 2008). They thus go beyond the mere observation that European migration is “fluid” (Black et al., 2010), providing instead conceptual elements and empirical evidence of patterns of social inequality that are emerging under the changing societal conditions.

In a nutshell, the major strength of this perspective is that it shows that mobility and inequality patterns are mutually co-produced and interrelated (see, for example, the contribution by Verwiebe et al.), while illuminating how mobility itself is becoming one of the co-producers of hierarchical life chances. This special issue addresses the political borders of Europe as being mobile themselves (as shown by Patsiurko and Wallace) and traces how the change of societal contexts co-shapes mobility and inequality patterns. It thus avoids the hitherto static perspective on social contexts in general and on the context of ‘Europe’ in particular, thereby offering both substantial conceptual tools and original empirical findings. By avoiding the synonymous use of the terms ‘Europe’ and ‘the EU’, the issue emphasises the idea of a multiplicity of Europes (Biebuyck and Rumford 2012).

References

- Amelina, A. (2012). “Socio-Spatial Scales as Social Boundaries? Or: How Do Migration Studies Profit from Including ‘Space’ in the Sociology of Social Boundaries?”. *Migration Letters*, 9 (3): 193-214.
- Amelina, A. and Faist, T. (2012). “De-Naturalizing the National in Research Methodologies: Key Concepts of Transnational Studies in Migration”. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35 (10): 1-18.
- Anderson, J. and O’Dowd, L. (1999). “Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance”. *Regional Studies*, 33 (7): 593-604.

- Aradau, C. and Blanke, T. (2010). "Governing Circulation: A Critique of the Biopolitics of Security". In: M. de Larrinaga and M. G. Doucet (eds.) *Security and Global Governmentality: Globalization, Governance and the State*, Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Biebuyck W. and Rumford, C. (2012). "Many Europes: Rethinking Multiplicity". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 15 (1): 3-20.
- Bigo, D. (2009). "Immigration controls and free movement in Europe". *International Review of the Red Cross*, 91 (875): 579-591.
- Bigo, D. and Guild, E. (eds.) (2005). *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement into and within Europe*. Aldershot/Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Bingran, D. and Junbo, J. (eds.) (2008). *The Enlarged European Union: Prospects and Implications*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Black, R., Engbersen, G., Okólski, M. and Panțiru, C. (eds.) (2010). *A Continent Moving West? EU Enlargement and Labour Migration from Central and Eastern Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bonifazi, C., Okólski, M., Schoorl, J. and Simon, P. (eds.) (2008) *International Migration in Europe: New Trends and New Methods of Analysis*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Boswell, C. and Geddes, A. (2011). *Migration and Mobility in the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brady, David (ed.) (2011). *Comparing European Workers Part A: Experiences and Inequalities*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Brunner, K., Sawka, M. and Onufriv, S. (eds.) (2013). *Skype-Mama*. Berlin: edition.fotoTAPETA.
- Büscher, M. and Urry, J. (2009). "Mobile methods and the empirical". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 12 (1): 99-116.
- Carmel, E., Cerami, A. and Papadopoulos, T. (eds.) (2011). *Migration and Welfare in the New Europe: Social Protection and the Challenges of Integration*. Bristol/Portland, OR: The Policy Press.
- Castles, S. (2010). "Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (10): 1565-1586.
- Council (2007). *Draft Council Conclusions on Mobility Partnerships and Circular Migration in the Framework of the Global Approach to Migration*. Brussels: Council of the European Union. Retrieved from <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/07/st16/st16283.en07.pdf>.
- Dolton, P., Asplund, R. and Barth, E. (eds.) (2009). *Education and Inequality Across Europe*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Engbersen, G., Leerkes, A., Grabowska-Lusińska, I., Snele, E. and Burgers, J. (2013). "On the Differential Attachments of Migrants from Central and Eastern Europe: A Typology of Labour Migration". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39 (6): 959-981.
- Faist, T. (2000). *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Favell, A. (2008). "The New Face of East–West Migration in Europe". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34 (5): 701-716.
- Fawcett, J. T. (1989). "Networks, Linkages, and Migration Systems". *International Migration Review*, 23 (3): 671-680.
- Garelli, G. and Tazzioli, M. (2013). "'We Are of the Connections': Migration, Methodological Nationalism, and Militant Research". *Postcolonial Studies*, 16 (3): 250-258.

- Genova, N. de and Peutz, N. (eds.) (2010). *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC/London: Duke University Press.
- Herrmann, G. (2014). "Ein Mehr an Freiheit durch ein Mehr an Sicherheit? Zur Organisation von Zirkulation in der Europäischen Union: Die Beispiele des Grenz- und Migrationsmanagements". In: A. Vasilache (ed.) *Gouvernementalität, Staat und Weltgesellschaft: Studien zum Regieren im Anschluss an Foucault*, Wiesbaden: SpringerVS.
- Ivanov-Tsarevokokshaiskii, A. (2012). *Allergija na magicheskie griby*. http://www.kp.ru/f/13/attached_file/47/64/3046447.pdf.
- Kahanec M. and Zimmermann, K. F. (2009). *Migration in an enlarged EU: A challenging solution?* Economic Papers 363. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs.
- Karakayali, S. and Rigo, E. (2010). "Mapping the European Space of Circulation". In: N. De Genova and N. Peutz (eds.) *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, Durham, NC/London: Duke University Press.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M. and Passy, F. (2005). *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Levitt, P. and Glick Schiller, N. (2004). "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society". *International Migration Review*, 38 (3): 1002-1039.
- Mau, S. (2010). "Grenzen als Sortiermaschinen". *WeltTrends – Zeitschrift für internationale Politik*, 15 (71): 57-66.
- Ong, A. and Collier, S. J. (2004). *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. Malden, MA/Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2005). "Welfare State Policies and the Development of Care Arrangements". *European Societies*, 7 (2): 321-347.
- Pries, L. (2008). "Transnational societal spaces: which units of analysis, reference and measurement?". In: L. Pries (ed.) *Rethinking Transnationalism: The Meso-Link of Organisations*, Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Rumford, C. (2008). *Cosmopolitan Spaces: Europe, Globalization, Theory*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Rupnik, J. and Zielonka, J. (eds.) (2013). *Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe: The State of the Art*. Special section of *Eastern European Politics and Society*, 27 (1).
- Sassen, S. (2008). *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, J. W. and Houtum, H. van (2009). "Reflections on EU Territoriality and the 'Bordering' of Europe". *Political Geography*, 28 (5): 271-273.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tilly, C. (2000). "Relational Studies of Inequality". *Contemporary Sociology*, 29 (6): 782-785.
- Tsoukala, A. (2005). "Looking at Immigrants as Enemies". In: D. Bigo and E. Guild (eds.) *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement into and within Europe*, Aldershot/Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Vasilache, A. (2012). "The Rise of Executive Sovereignty in the Era of Globalization". In: M. Telò (ed.) *State, Globalization and Multilateralism: The Challenges of Institutionalizing Regionalism*, Dordrecht/Heidelberg/London/New York: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.
- Vasilache, A., Seidemann, R. and Sales Marques, J. L. de (eds.) (2011). *States, Regions*

and the Global System: Europe and Northern Asia-Pacific in Globalised Governance. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Wallace, C. and Stola, D. (eds.) (2001). *Patterns of Migration in Central Europe.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wallace, C. and Vincent, K. (2007). "Recent Migration from the New European Borderlands". *Review of Sociology of the Hungarian Sociological Association*, 13 (2): 19-37.

Zaiceva, A. and Zimmermann, K. F. (2008). *Scale, Diversity, and Determinants of Labour Migration in Europe.* IZA DP No. 3595. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Zielonka, J. (2006). *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.