

Introduction

Migrants' Inclusion and Exclusion in the Context of Precarization of Working Lives in the Post-Enlargement EU

Olena Fedyuk and Paul Stewart

The spectre of migration will never become a new working class.

Papadopoulos and Tsianos (2013: 187)

The last two decades have seen the EU grappling with what seems to be a direct conflict of interests; a struggle between securitization of its external borders and the demand for an exploitable and disposable low-cost workforce which, in various sectors of the economy, is increasingly represented by migrants. During this process the EU has multiplied its borders by pushing them both outwards and inwards, fragmenting the process of their policing into moments of bodily and identity surveillance irrespective of the geographical proximity to national borders. The so-called Global Approach to Migration most vividly marked the externalization of the borders as, in the early 2000s, the EU migration policy framework shifted its focus from strengthening its own borders towards cooperation with non-EU countries for control and management of the migratory flows that eventually lead to Europe (Casas-Cortes et al. 2015). For our book, however, the inward multiplication of national borders is more interesting; it is characterized by extending borders not so much in geographical and physical spaces but to the arenas of rights, permissions, qualification, differentiated and point-based access to labour markets, social benefits, mobility and political rights (De Genova 2013; Mezzadra and Nielson 2013). Many of these fragmentations of status are linked directly to the work and employment status of mobile individuals. The cumulative outcome of the fragmented status, permissions and exclusions dividing mobile people into hierarchal, privilege-based systems, often recycle more traditional inequalities linked to race, ethnicity, class and gender.

This book pursues two interconnected objectives. One is to take the debates about inclusion and exclusion and migrants in Europe out of strictly migration debates. By this, we mean a shift from treating migrants in a certain state of exception, in which rights and freedoms have different limitations. With this we seek to reintroduce power relations between capital and labour and the hierarchies of race, ethnicity, gender and class into the discussion in the new context, which since 2015 has been deemed a ‘migration crisis’. We add our voice to those arguing that the ‘migration crisis’ should be attributed not to so much to the new situation in migratory flows but to a failure in Europe to respond to it humanely. Specifically, this is an ongoing European crisis of humanitarian and democratic values including a failure to respond to the continuous encroachment on workers’ rights and the ongoing precarization of working lives (e.g. see debates on the *FocaalBlog* by Bojadžijev and Mezzadra 2015; Rajaram 2015). To have a more focused debate from this point of view, we introduce our second objective, which is to explore the ways in which the fragmentation of migrant workers’ statuses fits with other, more lengthy, transformations of labour relations in the EU. The latter we see as broadly characterized by a shift from a system of full employment in industrial society to a multiplicity of flexible, decentralized and fluid forms of underemployment integrated into a range of employment regimes (Beck 1992; Standing 2011).

This book looks at the experience of migration precisely at the intersection and overlap of these main shifts in both migration and employment regimes. On a theoretical level, we set out to investigate the applicability of the existing research frameworks and map out further analytical agendas for linking labour and migration studies. As a cross-disciplinary exercise, methodologically this book scrutinizes both the life of institutions and individual experiential knowledge about migration. We then build on both in exploring the possibilities of mobilization and collective action at the intersection of migration and worker activism, the nature of which we are still to fully recognize and comprehend. Through critical research we seek solidarity with workers in various precarious circumstances and argue that defending collective processes can lead to better circumstances for disadvantaged non-migrant and migrant workers alike.

It is no accident that we put work at the heart of the migration experience; some of the classic migration studies emphasized the centrality of labour in migration (e.g. Burawoy 1976; Sayad 2004). As this book will further elaborate, the possibility of work and working conditions determines not only migrants’ daily experiences but increasingly chances for transnational mobility and the scope of rights that accompany it. To move beyond the perspective that situates migrants’ exclusion and inclusion solely in migration processes, we contextualize migration in the larger transformations of the local, national

and transnational labour markets and relations that point to the ongoing processes of precarization of working lives. As Wills et al. (2010) point out, today's immigration is taking place against the background of a sufficient native labour force, ongoing crumbling of the welfare states' provisions, and austerity measures that increasingly remove European job security, pushing further flexibilization of contracts and precarization of employment and life. Unemployment also can be seen as a critical part of this new complex of insecurity. These trends, Wills argues, 'have thus placed the migrant at the centre of the contemporary labour process. While subcontracting is now the paradigmatic form of employment across the world, the migrant is the world's paradigmatic worker. ... Even those who cross borders legally find themselves politically disenfranchised' (2010: 6).

In the EU context the connection between migration and labour was made explicit as citizens of East European expansion in 2004 and 2007 accepted limitations to labour market participation in several pre-2004 EU countries in exchange for freedom of movement within the expanded EU. Some of these limitations were removed after almost a decade. This effectively pushed many new European citizens towards irregular and substandard employment. This connection gains new significance in the light of the 2016 Brexit vote. While this book is not directly concerned with the consequences of Britain's decision to leave the European Union (EU) on the mobility of people within the EU, or on those seeking entry to it, nevertheless we feel it necessary to state our position on migration and the so-called migration crisis given the febrile context in which we write. In this regard we would agree with the argument made by Teresa Hayter at the turn of twenty-first century that immigration controls represent an attack on a person's right of movement, on their freedom, with all the consequences this brings. She writes,

By far the most important reason for opposing immigration controls is that they impose harsh suffering and injustice on those who attempt to migrate, or to flee for their lives and liberty. (2000: 7)

Through focusing on intra-EU mobility (seven out of nine core chapters in this book), we hope to tackle other lines of fragmentation central to migration experience but not limited to it, that is, flexible and low protection level contracts (including the posted workers programme and temporary agency workers) and differentiated access to welfare, intra-sectoral job hierarchies of high- and low-skill profile jobs. By no means does this suggest that experiences of intra-EU and non-EU migrants are the same. However, we seek to explore fragmentations in migration status that go beyond this division situating it further at the intersection of race, gender and class. This book brings forward results of original qualitative research carried out in Germany,

Poland, Spain and the UK, with Poland standing out as a sending country. We thus want to emphasize that the sending country context is crucial for understanding migrants' trajectories and, in particular, opportunities for organized resistance, as sending countries often come out as the forerunners of what Woolfson and Sommers describe as a new economic logic and a political structure promoting labour migration (2008: 56).

The distinctions between migrants' statuses are of importance for our discussion about inclusion and exclusion to the extent that it serves the purpose of the state to differentiate, divide and legitimize control over the right to freedom of movement. (Ir)regularity, (il)legality and (non-)citizenship in European migration policies have been continuously portrayed as black-and-white issues to effectively produce and sustain an analytical, political and practical divide that obscures 'shadowy, publicly unacknowledged or disavowed, obscene supplement: the large-scale recruitment of illegalized migrants as legally vulnerable, precarious, and thus tractable labour' (De Genova 2013: 2). The policies construct irregular migrants as 'unskilled', 'poor' and 'unwanted' and often criminalize them, while they construct the category of 'skilled' migrants as 'good' and 'wanted', granting them distinct access to rights and benefits (De Somer 2012). The EU's acknowledged priority for high-skilled labour (which found its reflection in the EU Blue Card Directive) is shadowed by the escalation of the posted workers programmes (Lillie 2014), deskilling of certain sectors (e.g. care and social work) and further privatization of formerly public sector jobs, which often enables hiring deskilled migrant workers through private companies (e.g. PIQUE 2009; Lutz and Palenga-Möllenbeck 2011). All these trends reinforce the principle of cataloguing migrants by their skills, nationality, age, gender and, ultimately, ability to generate income. This principle has not only widened the gap between the 'good' (high-skilled and prosperous migrants) and 'poor' (unwanted migrants) (De Somer 2012; De Genova 2013) but also effectively legitimized intensification of control over various labour flows justifying the differential provisions for migrants, such as prospects for long-term residence, renewal of contracts, family reunification, prospects for studying and career advancement, and access to social benefits. These processes not only point to a distinct paradigm of inclusion and exclusion, or the categories of insider/outsider, but also hint at the intriguing changes in the role nation states reinvent for themselves in neoliberal economies.

A range of literature on the nature of the migrant labour demand in the EU (Ruhs and Anderson 2010; Wills et al. 2010) conceptualizes a utilitarian approach to migration (manifested in objectification of migrants through skilled/unskilled labels including deskilling) as a part of mechanisms devaluing it with the purpose of excluding people who deliver work and services from equal pay and rights. In their *Global Cities at Work* (2010) Wills et al.

consider similar mechanisms connecting labour deregulation and the ways of managing international migration, and offer a valuable Marxist reading of what happens to the reserve army of labour if we add international migrant labour flows into the equation. Their contextualization of migration in the uneven global geography of wages and welfare is then backed up by a number of qualitative research-based exemplars from various sites of migrant employment in London. Indeed, there is a strong temptation to draw an equation between migrant labour and an increasingly precarious workforce, as ‘migrant labour becomes increasingly precarised (especially after the 2008 economic crisis) and precarious labour becomes increasingly mobile’ (2013: 189). However, rather than a rise of solidarity movements what we see is the growth in populist anti-immigrant sentiment across Europe. Papadopoulos and Tsianos (2013) warn against making hasty comparisons as they argue that it would take much more for migrant precarious workers to rise as a mobilized collective, or a class: ‘The forms of political action that migrants engage [sic] cannot be confused with a mobilization that resembles the action of a collective historical or political subject. The very conditions of current migration defy the possibility of constructing a viable intentional and permanent subjectivity’ (2013: 187). In this case, how are we to make sense of the growing similarity and discord between the precarious and migrant work forces?

Specifically, this book looks at the inclusion of the migrant labour and exclusion of migrants through a system of differentiated and limited rights. On a more subtle level we explore spaces, tools of mobilization and identifications arising from the selective inclusion and exclusion of migrants, often through work practices and employment. In the context of an existing debate in migration literature, we interpret ‘inclusion’ not in a binary whose opposite is ‘exclusion’, but as a process within an endless range of practices, experiences and fragmentations of legal statuses. In this sense the selective or fragmented inclusion of migrants becomes a form of their disciplining, control and exclusion from rights and solidarities of and with non-immigrant workers. Following De Genova’s conceptualization of ‘inclusion through exclusion’, we see that immigrants’ ‘incorporation is permanently beleaguered with the kinds of exclusionary and commonly racist campaigns that ensure that this inclusion is itself, precisely, a form of subjugation. What is at stake, then, is a larger socio-political (and legal) process of inclusion through exclusion’ (De Genova 2013: 5).

Responding to the analytical challenge of the book, the conceptual inquiry of many of the chapters is closely linked to the question of the nature of neoliberalism (as an ideology and practice that transforms the relationship between labour and capital) and citizenship (as open to interpretation or formal membership that often sets aside migrant and non-migrant workers). Peck (2013: 153) argues that we should approach neoliberalism not as

‘a substitute for explanation’ but as ‘an *occasion* for explanation’. Thus many of the authors in this book pose the questions: ‘What is neoliberal in the current relationship between (migrant) labour and (global) capital?’ and ‘What is neoliberal in the role states play in shaping labour-capital relations through employment, migration and care policies?’ The state’s role intricately links the inquiry about neoliberalism to an investigation of the transformations of the meaning and practices of citizenship, as discussed from various perspectives in the majority of chapters in this book.

To map the connections between ideology, policies, states and individual migrants’ decisions, we found Vicki Squire’s (2011) notion of the *politics of mobility* a sound analytical starting point. Squire argues that while the state is actively engaged in the politics of control, migrating individuals are engaged in the politics of mobility, and in order to grasp the fluid and ever-changing picture of the lived practice of migration we need to look at the point of collision of these two types of politics. The distinction is indeed an analytically useful one, as it allows us to step aside from the perspective of migrants, as being passive subjects of the state’s politics and ideological shifts, and opens up space for the necessary investigation of the motives that guide migrants in their choices and practices. It also transcends the simplified perspective of migrants as free will agents operating within a fully informed and deterministic mindset. Instead the politics of mobility offers a more politicised and egalitarian frame in which states are involved in a politics of control and migrants as exercising the politics of mobility. This paradigm opens up a sharper perspective on individual experiences and dynamics as a part of collective, ever-changing migratory flows and practices.

Squire’s framework reflects an important turning point in migration studies, known as ‘autonomy of migration (AoM)’, which significantly redirects debate around migrants’ subjectivities from the narrow liberal perspective of the ‘free will individual’ to the ‘constituent powers of migrant journeys’ (Casas-Cortes et al. 2015: 2). AoM offers an analytical shift from the ‘apparatuses of control to the multiple and diverse ways in which migration responds to, operates independently from, and in turn shapes those apparatuses and their corresponding institutions and practices’ (Casas-Cortes et al. 2015: 2). Together with ‘border as method’ (Mezzadra and Nielson 2013), it enters a methodological debate that is particularly close to our book: how are we to understand the active role a mobile individual takes in migration, as well as to grasp the possibilities and forms of shifting collective actions or solidarities emerging out of migratory flows and experiences across borders and statuses? Papadopoulos and Tsianos (2013) warn us that first and foremost we need to deconstruct our own understanding of the political, in order to catch the politics of ‘migrants’ practices which neither attempt to integrate people into

an existing polity nor to systematically resist this polity: ‘Migrants’ politics are in this sense *non-politics* (that is, they are not seen as representable in the dominant existing polity) (2013: 188). In dialogue with these debates this volume’s contributions explore subtle, often ‘non-political’ politics of everyday migrants’ practices of compliance and subversion of existing migratory and work regimes. However, we also seek various forms of collective response, directed at challenging the hegemony of migration and employment regimes through the transformations of trade unions or the collaboration of various grassroots organizations and other groups.

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

Looking at the multifaceted processes of inclusion through exclusion at the level of national policies, individual practices and collective actions methodologically mean that we seek not only to contextualize individual ethnographically documented experiences of mobile individuals in the larger transformations of ‘global capital – local labour’ relationships, but also to understand the emerging forms of the political in these relationships. Thus, our book is set up to explore collective responses and contestations emerging in these reconfiguring contexts. In other words, if we talk about a transnational workforce, where can we trace transnational collective responses and, although possibly fleeting, but always emerging, acts of solidarity? Like most transnational practices, such forms of solidarity would take very specific local manifestations and mobilize allies and forms relevant to the local context. These localized contexts and emergence of alliances across migration, employment and social statuses, are where we seek new optimism for collective struggle in response to the rising precarization of the working lives of both migrants and non-migrants.

The book has three sections: the first looks at the macro-level political economy to contextualize the changes in employment and migration regimes with all three chapters paying attention to the reconfiguration of the role of the state in these changes. The second section takes a close look at case studies of individuals making sense of their mobility, in terms of both migration and employment. The third section brings back the collective perspective by focusing on the case studies of collective responses to growing precarity among migrants and non-migrants. All chapters are thus not only guided by the leitmotif of the book, but form a dialogue with all three sections as they contextualize their contribution at the macro, meso and micro levels of inquiry.

The first section sets the political economy background of recent transformations in the relevant EU and national employment and migration regimes by looking at changes in national policy-making, migration and employment

regulations. Several studies have noted that the unevenness of the global geography of wages, welfare provisions and consumption levels have ‘reconfigured the geography of the reserve army of labour’ (Wills et al. 2010: 7) transforming immigration into a lucrative business for the state. The role of nation states in running such a business has been a prominent and an intriguing one. By introducing a great variety of immigration systems that justify objectification and further stratification of immigrants by their perceived contribution, states have been claiming the legitimacy to exercise control over the conditions and price of immigrant labour. In exercising immigration controls, state immigration policies act as an instrumental feature of capital. This is a ‘political dimension’ (De Genova 2013: 9) favouring its own interests that increasingly strengthens employers’ bargaining power over the local labour force.

Chapter I.1, by Jamie Woodcock, provides background to the main developments and debates relating to changes in the role of the state in the liberalization of employment policies, as well as in shaping national immigration priorities. The analysis focuses on the public sector and service work, where the state remains a major employer, albeit introducing fragmentation of work and outsourcing to (multinational) agencies that, in turn, often incorporate migrant labour. This intersection allows us to explore the impact of state reconfigurations, the changing position of trade unions and the specific pathway to precarization of labour. The main argument, that is, that the state is not retreating under neoliberalism, but rather reconfiguring its role to deregulate capital and employment policies while attempting to manage migration for employment, sets the background for most of the following contributions. Building on this discussion, Chapter I.2, by Ben Egan, is concerned with making sense of a contradiction at the heart of debates in Europe – economic systems that seek migrant labour within political systems that reject migrants themselves. It poses the question, ‘What would constitute migration employment relations in Europe, if we are to theorise such relations?’, and develops a model of the way in which institutions at various levels have the potential to affect outcomes with regard to employment relations at the point at which they intersect with migration. Making an exercise of applying institutional analysis that has underpinned much of the employment relations literature in Europe to institutions structuring labour migration, the chapter links developments in migration with the broader weakening of employment stability associated with neoliberal reforms. In particular, it sees migration as a new frontier of the precarization of employment per se. Chapter I.3, by Nina Shahraoui, Radosław Polkowski and Mateusz Karolak, shifts the focus to the regulation of migration by nation states and at the EU level. Drawing on the analysis of the utilitarian and market logics of formal polarization of EU versus non-EU migrants, the authors highlight the latent pitfalls of intra-EU mobility

regulations and the practical limitations of EU citizenship. Specifically, they look at the connection between the expansion of the EU and border closures to non-EU migrants and the rise of various precarious forms of employment resulting in the fragmentation of workers' statuses (e.g. differential access to social security for the members of the new accession states or the rise of the posted workers programmes). Finally, the chapter challenges another common binary in migration literature in rejecting the notion of citizens versus non-citizens, proposing instead an understanding of citizenship as a continuum of rights written into global inequalities.

The second section of the book comprises ethnographic case studies from Poland and the UK. It looks at the micro level of personal experiences and challenges in employment and labour relations triggered by individual mobility embedded within transnational employment, migration and care regimes. The qualitative methods applied by the authors in this section (such as biographic narrative and life story interviews) bring out migrants' voices in relation to the role employment and work play in shaping the sense of success or shame, self-esteem, exclusion, satisfaction or disillusionment with mobility. In line with the focus of the book, this section explores how neoliberal ideals of the self-sustaining, independent individual intertwine migrants' motivations and reasoning. Many respondents embrace these ideals as a moving force of their migration, while others feel betrayed by the promise of such self-sufficiency. The section broadly asks, 'What is neoliberal about the new striving after the supposed self-made character through migration?' For answers, it turns to sites of employment and work.

The chapters in this section focus on four case studies, dealing with a range of gendered experiences in various sectors of migrants' employment. Chapter II.1, by Radosław Polkowski, explores a new paradigm for discussing the role of the sending country (Poland) by looking at how its economy and ideologies shape and affect migrants' choices and practices. Behind many stories of successful (i.e. in economic terms) lives abroad lie 'structures of feeling' (Williams 1961) characterized by hidden injuries such as shame and fear of social failure, which the author traces through migrants' narratives. The chapter offers an interdisciplinary approach to migration by bringing in concepts not just from migration studies but also cultural and literary studies in addition to the psychology and sociology of emotions which are then linked to the macro-structural context on the new role of the state, that is the state as a 'community of value' (Anderson 2013). In Chapter II.2, Nina Sahraoui brings to the fore the importance of care regimes along with employment and migration. In her analysis of migrant workers' experiences in for-profit private elderly care in Greater London she explores the links between the rise of the demand for care workers and the construction of care as unskilled labour that channels into the sector a gendered and racialized workforce. The care

sector's reliance on migrant labour, argues Sahraoui, engenders structural pressures to maintain low labour costs while deskilling workers in the context of the commodification of care. Gendered understanding of care work leads to further barriers created by the articulation of migration and employment policies for workers' lives and employment trajectories. Karima Aziz, in Chapter II.3, explores work trajectories of female Polish migrant workers in the UK within the dynamics of changing employment in Europe. Ten years after the accession to the EU, female Polish migrants in the UK are not merely low-paid, low-skilled workers, but are now represented in a variety of sectors and occupations. Employing biographical narrative interviews conducted among Polish women in the UK and those who have returned to Poland, the author uncovers the relevant gendered and migrant employment patterns, as well as the agency these women seek and how they enact agency in their narratives of migration and work trajectories. While many respondents are happy with the chance of free movement in the EU that European citizenship provides, they feel the limitations of the implicit exclusion based on the gendered division of work resulting from the conceptualization of the mobile European citizen as a productive worker. This chapter examines the construction of Polish women and generational dynamics that affect the way women engage with their migration and work experience. Chapter II.4, by Mateusz Karolak, argues that mobility should not be seen as a unidirectional straight line, as he assesses the labour market experience of return migrants from the UK to Poland and double return migrants back to the UK. Challenging the assumptions about employment as an indicator of return migrants' 'reintegration' back home this chapter draws a dynamic picture of mobile Poles' experiences in the sphere of work and employment, against the background of the changing employment patterns and flexibilization of work in both countries. By comparing experiences of work abroad and in Poland, individuals try to make rational decisions about their mobility choices, while the author proposes a four-type classification of coping strategies employed by return migrants facing distress. The latter results from the perceived discrepancies between employment standards: re-emigration, activism, adaptation and/or entrepreneurship.

The third section considers migrants' collective responses to precarization of their working lives. Particularly, we want to explore what alliances and solidarities are possible beyond the status of the 'migrant'. We are interested in initiatives that seek to bridge the gap between migrant and non-migrant workers, thus creating the possibility for wide-ranging solidarity. This section steps away from the discussion of individual practices and experiences focusing rather on collective responses by posing the question: can collective experiences of precarization give rise to collective responses across the divisions of legal status, ethnicity, race, gender and class?

We open the section with a coauthored chapter that looks into a more traditional site of workers' organization – trade unions. Chapter III.1, by Aziz, Egan and Polkowski, analyses how well trade unions are prepared to meet the challenge of post-Fordist transformations linked to flexibilization of labour and increasing privatization and fragmentation of workplaces. This is, moreover, linked to the politics of infusion of migrant labour into certain sectors and jobs. The authors draw upon semi-structured interviews with migrant workers and trade union officials in Italy, the north of Ireland and England to examine how trade union organization, broadly conceived, impacts outcomes for migrant workers. Historicizing their inquiry, they argue that various traditions and cultures of European trade union movements, separated by borders, history, language and confederal structure, lead to inevitable differences in strategies, attitudes and outcomes in relation to all members (and non-members), inclusive of migrants and other groups of workers seen as under-represented in workplaces. The authors suggest a return to an examination of class as crucial to understanding the ways in which unions define the boundaries of what representation actually means. Chapter III.2, by Martin Lundsteen and Irene Sabaté, expands the scope of possible solidarity actions between migrants and non-migrants by looking into the anti-repossessions movement, PAH, in Catalonia. This movement, through different actions of disobedience and protest actions in the franchises of specific financial institutions, has gained a broad legitimacy and strong support, mobilizing otherwise excluded groups around a common identity of victims of mortgage fraud (as opposed to any kind of ethno-national identification). The research focuses on the work of the movement assessing to what extent it overcomes the usual divide between native and foreigner while nonetheless stopping short of an overall critique of racist structuring and class divisions that exist between the different participants.

As Raia Apostolova highlights in Chapter III.3, some of the EU open-border principles serve to reduce the possibility of solidarity in the face of fragmentation. By looking into the cases of the struggles of Bulgarian-day labourers in Munich and Romanian construction workers in Berlin, she points to the difficulties of collective responses to overexploitation as they emerge in the context of freedom of movement. The author looks at the very heart of the EU principle of freedom of movement in order to analyse its inherent contradictions while reclaiming some of its political potential. Chibuzo Ejiogu's Chapter III.4 looks into what seems to be the other end of the migration spectrum, that is, high-skilled migration of non-EU nationals. Drawing on his ethnographic and participatory research conducted with several networks of skilled Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority (BAME) doctors in the UK, the chapter analyses how the most recent changes to the UK regulations on high-skilled migration fragment the status of these workers in their workplaces,

despite their high-skilled positions. The author argues that high-skilled migrant workers experience a precarious migrant status that is socially and legally constructed by employment and immigration policies resulting in the institutionalization of uncertainty and a range of non-citizenship restrictions imposed on their status. The author then assesses the role of migrant networks in both resisting and reproducing the precarity experienced by high-skilled migrants as well as the role of networks in articulating the collective voice of migrant labour in the context of recent changes to UK immigration policy.

The third section explores the way in which various collective actions aimed at bridging migrant/non-migrant divides are far from being harmonious or egalitarian; various groups pursue their interests dictated by political, economic and social struggles that often leave such actions fruitless, or, temporary and febrile, lacking genuine solidarity. However, we see solidarity actions (even if they are temporary) as important political manifestations in the imagining of alternative forms of struggle against deepening neoliberal transformations in both employment and migration regimes.

Following a short concluding section that ties together the threads of all three sections and highlights the impact of an integrated approach to the issues of migration and collective workers' struggles, we close the book with the transcript of a round-table debate that took place between the book's contributors and several external readers in October 2015. The discussion, addressing common themes and difficulties in the chapters, was recorded, transcribed and written up by the editors with the aim of reflecting collective ideas on the missing links and potential for further research around the theme of employment and mobility in Europe. We hope that this last contribution will reflect the ongoing discussions among the authors beyond the contributions in their chapters shedding light on their own political positions on these issues.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. 2013. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Beck, U. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bojadžijev, M. and S. Mezzadra. 2015. "“Refugee crisis” or crisis of European migration policies?" *FocaalBlog, Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 12 November 2015. <http://www.focaalblog.com/2015/11/12/manuela-bojadzijeve-and-sandro-mezzadra-refugee-crisis-or-crisis-of-european-migration-policies> (accessed 2 November 2016).
- Burawoy, M. 1976. 'The functions and reproduction of migrant labour: Comparative material from southern Africa and the United States'. *American Journal of Sociology* 81 (5): 1050–1080.

- Casas-Cortes, M., S. Cobarrubias and J. Pickles. 2015. 'Riding routes and itinerant borders: Autonomy of migration and border externalization'. *Antipode* Early View (Online Version of Record published before inclusion in an issue). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anti.12148/pdf> (accessed 19 December 2015).
- De Genova, N. 2013. 'Spectacles of migrant "illegality": The scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (7): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783710>
- De Somer, M. 2012. 'Trends and gaps in the academic literature on EU labour migration policies'. *NEUJOBS*: state of the art report no. 5. <http://www.neujobs.eu/sites/default/files/publication/2012/12/NEUJOBS%20D.18.1.pdf> (accessed 6 February 2015).
- Lutz, H. and E. Palenga-Möllnbeck. 2011. 'Care, gender and migration: Towards a theory of transnational domestic work migration in Europe'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 19 (3): 349–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2011.610605>
- Mezzadra, S. and B. Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Papadopoulos, D. and V. Tsianos. 2013. 'After citizenship: Autonomy of migration, organisational ontology, and mobile commons'. *Citizenship Studies* 17 (2): 178–196.
- Peck, J. 2013. 'Explaining (with) Neoliberalism'. *Territory, Politics, Governance* 1 (2): 132–157.
- PIQUE Summary Report. 2009. 'Summary report of the project "Privatisation of Public Services and the Impact on Quality, Employment and Productivity" (PIQUE)'. European Commission's 6th Framework Programme (Contract No. CIT5-2006-028478) Vienna. http://www.pique.at/reports/pubs/PIQUE_SummaryReport_Download_May2009.pdf (accessed 19 December 2015).
- Rajaram, P. K. 2015. 'Beyond crisis: Rethinking the population movements at Europe's border'. *FocaalBlog*, *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 19 October 2015. <http://www.focaalblog.com/2015/10/19/prem-kumar-rajaram-beyond-crisis/> (accessed 15 December 2015).
- Ruhs, M. and B. Anderson, eds. 2010. *Who Needs Migrant Workers? Labour Shortages, Immigration, and Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sayad, Abdelmalek. 2004. *The Suffering of the Immigrant*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Squire, V. 2011. 'Politicising mobility'. In *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity*, edited by Vicki Squire, 1–16. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Standing, G. 2011. *Precariat. The New Dangerous Class*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Wills J., K. Datta, Y. Evans, J. Herbert, J. May and C. McIlwaine. 2010. *Global Cities at Work: New Migrant Divisions of Labour*. London: Pluto Press.
- Williams, R. 1961. *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Woolfson, C. and J. Sommers. 2008. 'Trajectories of entropy and "the labour question". The political economy of post-communist migration in the New Europe'. *Debate* 16 (1): 53–69.