Migration and the Infrastructural Politics of Urban Arrival

Chapter · March 2018

DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-91167-0_1

CITATIONS
0

READS
490

3 authors:

Bas van Heur
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
50 PUBLICATIONS **404** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Karel Arnaut
KU Leuven
42 PUBLICATIONS **161** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Bruno Meeus
Université de Fribourg
36 PUBLICATIONS **121** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Chapter to be published in:
Arrival Infrastructures: Migration and Urban Social Mobilities
Edited by Bruno Meeus, Karel Arnaut and Bas van Heur
Palgrave Macmillan, 2018

Migration and the Infrastructural Politics of Urban Arrival

Bruno Meeus, Bas van Heur, and Karel Arnaut

Introduction

This book project introduces a strategic interdisciplinary research agenda on arrival infrastructures. We broadly define arrival infrastructures as those parts of the urban fabric within which newcomers become entangled on arrival, and where their future local or translocal social mobilities are produced as much as negotiated. This composite concept of arrival infrastructures combines two aspects. First, by focusing on processes of arrival, we want to direct attention to how and where people find some stability in order to move on. To date, states and activists have mainly quarreled with regard to migrants' rights to arrive and stay permanently in a national territory and community. Building on the call to "liberate temporariness" by Latham and colleagues (2014), we argue that liberating the notion of arrival challenges the dominance of national normativities, temporalities, and geographies of "arrival" without neglecting migrants' search for forms of stability. Second, an infrastructural perspective on processes of arrival allows for a critical as well as transformative engagement with the position of the state in the management of migration. States have continuously produced new layers of supportive and exclusionary governmental infrastructures, funneling particular groups into "permanent arrival" and others into "permanent temporariness." As noted by Graham and Thrift (2007), a considerable amount of labor from diverse actors is needed to continuously maintain, repair, and update state infrastructures. At the same time, migrants and various other actors incrementally build up sites or vantage points of temporary deployment with whatever is at hand, including parts of these governmental infrastructures. The notion of arrival infrastructures hence emphasizes the continuous and manifold "infrastructuring practices" by a range of actors in urban settings, which create a multitude of "platforms of arrival and take-off" within, against, and beyond the infrastructures of the state. Moreover, it opens up avenues to examine and align the resistance against exclusionary

bordering practices in a multitude of sites, and to rethink the role of a supportive state that is not conditional on permanency and assimilation.

In adopting this approach, this edited volume builds on but also moves beyond existing research on cities as privileged places of arrival, which was summarized to great popular success in Doug Saunders' book *Arrival City* (2011). In this work, Saunders develops an optimistic narrative of arrival cities across the world, not as ghettos or areas of social deprivation, but as lively neighborhoods characterized by vibrant modes of formal and informal exchange. Cities, according to Saunders, can lift whole communities out of poverty and contribute to the upward social mobility of migrants. While we broadly share this sentiment of cities as sites for progressive social change, in an earlier research project on the prospects of social mobility for Bulgarians, Romanians, and Poles in Brussels, Bruno Meeus had already highlighted the problematic teleological approach toward arrival that underlies Saunders' global narrative of arrival cities: migrants are seen to occupy a certain place and temporality of arrival, and are ascribed the identity of urban entrepreneurs who, through hard work, can gain upward social mobility and enter the middle class. This is much too narrow a conception of urban arrival, which does not do justice to the diversity of migration trajectories that shape our cities today. In trying to acknowledge this diversity, emerging literature on urban infrastructures has turned out to be very useful. Initially inspired by the work of Jan Blommaert (2013, 2014) on infrastructures of superdiversity, an infrastructural approach seemed to have such a potential, and a working definition of arrival infrastructures was created to further guide the fieldwork (Meeus 2014).

It was this preliminary thinking on urban arrival infrastructures that shaped a two-day workshop we arranged in Molenbeek (Brussels) in December 2015. Organized in the context of a larger research project on "Cities and Newcomers" at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, various papers presented at this workshop return as chapters in the edited volume here. Considered as one of the communes of Brussels most heavily transformed by generations of migrants from around the Mediterranean, Molenbeek had recently also been associated with terrorist attacks that were persistently classified as "Islamist." Just around this time, three of Molenbeek's (former) residents were identified as perpetrators of the Paris attacks of 13 November 2015. Hence, by the time of our workshop, many of its participants were keenly aware that through widely mediatized associations of "migrants" and "terrorism," Molenbeek had rapidly become a locus of the criminalization of migration, and concomitantly, of the problematization of infrastructural provisions for migrants. Another layer was added to this debate, because by the time the participants in the workshop began to seriously engage with

the emerging concept of arrival infrastructure, the so-called "refugee crisis" was challenging them; much as it did many other scholars, activists, and large sections of the population in Europe and far beyond. More than a marginal phenomenon situated at the emblematic shores of Europe–the Mediterranean and the Aegean sea (Dalakoglou 2016; Trimikliniotis, Parsanoglou, and Tsianos 2016)–the migration crisis reverberated deep into the European hinterland, in political centers, and in the heart of many cities (Catterall 2015; Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2016; Wessendorf 2017).

Our workshop and this book project, in other words, could not have been more topical, and tackle head-on questions relating to migration, multi-scalar state politics, and the role of cities as transnationally embedded places of arrival. The combination of migratory turbulence and polycentric interventions of reception, regulation, and repression across urban spaces formed the vantage point for thinking through the notion of urban arrival infrastructures. The conceptual elaboration subsequently took place in the aftermath of the Brussels workshop, in myriad conversations among the editors and the authors, which were boosted by the rapidly expanding and entwining bodies of literature on infrastructure and the spatiotemporality of migration from different corners of the social and human sciences (Green 2017; Arnaut, Karrebæk, and Spotti 2016; Blommaert 2014; Kleinman 2014; Hall, King, and Finlay 2015). In these conversations, the concept of "arrival infrastructure" was further expanded by connecting it to a range of different literature, including works on transnational migration and superdiversity, the mobilities paradigm, the autonomy of migration approach, governmentality literature, and the broad field of what can be called infrastructure studies. In the remainder of this chapter, we will not chronologically trace the development of the concept, but will focus on the two most important conceptual shifts that occurred as the research and the debates unfolded: the opening up of "arrival" along three dimensions of political struggle (section two), and the gradual move toward an infrastructural conceptualization of the spatiotemporal and material conditions of the process of arrival (sections three and four). In section five, we briefly introduce the chapters in the volume by describing how the authors use and develop the notion of arrival infrastructures. In the conclusion (section six), we highlight the key contributions of this edited volume and point to important avenues for future research.

The Politics of Arrival

In thinking through the politics of arrival in the context of a diverse and interdisciplinary range of literature, we can identify at least three political dimensions: politics of directionality, politics of temporality, and politics of subjectivity.

For decades, migration research was caught in a frame in which migration was seen as having a one-way directionality, in which ahistorical subjects were assumed to "jump" from one spatial container to another (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992). While this interpretation frame still dominates public debates about migration (Walters 2004), in the 1990s migration scholars formulated the need to conceptualize migration as operating in transnational fields of relations that continuously relate migrants to a number of places. "Present-day migrants," Schrooten and colleagues (2016, p. 21) argue, "engage in lives in different places, countries and cultures." Migrants carry histories, attachments, and legal and social statuses that link them to a range of places. These insights gave way to a recent tradition of "transnationalism" studies (Portes et al. 1999), coining concepts such as transnational social spaces (Faist 2000), transnational communities (Al-Ali et al. 2001), and transnational social fields (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004), accompanied by an increasing interest in the multidirectional sending of finances, ideas, goods, and emotional labor (Baldassar 2008; Huang and Yeoh 2007), and a new turn in the migration and development nexus debate (De Haas 2005, 2010; Glick, Schiller, and Faist 2010). Accompanying this rising interest in the transnational dimension of migration, the methodological nationalism inherent in migration studies became increasingly criticized (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002). Always already implying the aspiration to settle in a country and the need for assimilation in a national society, prevailing methodological nationalism in migration studies was accused of uncritically reproducing nation-state building efforts (Favell 2003, pp. 59–60). Where arrival takes place is "an open question that can only be answered a posteriori" (Papadopoulou-Kourkoula 2008, p. 5). This body of scholarship points to a first dimension of the politics of arrival, which we choose to term **politics of directionality**: migration and arrival cannot be socio-spatially "fixed"–either on the national or on the urban level–but is oriented toward the future, with migrants shifting their relative engagements toward certain places for a variety of reasons over time.

In addition to the multidirectionality of the histories and the potential futures of migrants, the temporal dimension of migration has also attracted attention (Cwerner 2001; Griffiths et al. 2013; Griffiths 2014). Methodological nationalism plainly categorized migrants as either permanent or temporary (King et al. 2006). The former were assumed to integrate as quickly as possible in an imagined national "domos" (Walters 2004), while the

latter were supposed to go back as soon as possible. This dichotomy between temporariness and permanence still plays a crucial role in imaginings of national citizenship rights (permanence) and in the eligibility criteria to obtain these rights (the right to permanence). From notions of temporary labor migration to questions of eligibility for the status of refugee, political debates keep revolving around this crucial binary distinction: who has the right to escape the status of the temporary? Intrigued by this dichotomy, scholars have argued that more and more migrants are being kept in a state of "permanent temporariness" (Collins 2011; Vosko et al. 2014) or "permanent transience" (Isin and Rygiel 2007) by means of a proliferation of new temporary statuses that remove the right of migrants to permanence or full citizenship. Critics of national integration policies argue that the path to full inclusion grows longer and longer for those who are portrayed as not yet adapted to fit into an imagined homogenous national culture, since "states … create more categories of exclusion by categorizing some people as incapable of integration and others as temporarily temporary, creating a middle (indeed a 'testing') ground for the potential extension of secure legal residency and associated citizenship rights." (Latham et al. 2014, p. 7). Along with the "multiculturalism has failed" discourse (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010), all over Europe procedures for an official newcomer policy establish integration trajectories including moral examinations (Scheibelhofer 2016) through which "defective" newcomers are expected to become citizens who can be integrated (Lentin and Titley 2011).

However, this dichotomy between permanency and temporariness hampers a nuanced understanding of temporal politics in the process of arrival. Fernandez and Olson (2011) conclude that undocumented people's political actions are not necessarily claims for (permanent) citizenship, but can equally entail claims for their *right to be mobile*. Scholars should therefore be careful in their analysis of the politics of temporality to avoid taking sides in a dichotomous debate where the problems of precarious temporariness can only by solved through pathways to permanence. Instead, scholars should leave space to "liberate temporariness" (Latham et al. 2014), and to look at precarious and less precarious forms of temporariness. In urban geography, empirical and theoretical work that opens up temporariness can already be found in the context of protracted displacement in the Global South. Focusing on refugee camps in the Global South, scholars such as Sanyal (2011), Ramadan (2013), Minca (2015), and Jamal (2016) have investigated the different ways in which citizenship rights are negotiated through material interventions in camps where temporary arrival turns out to be long-term in practice, while a future of permanent settlement

is not desired. Hence, moving beyond the dichotomy between temporariness and permanence opens up a second dimension for analysis that we call the **politics of temporality**.

Migration scholars drawing on the governmentality approach have emphasized the weakness of migration studies with regard to taking policy categories (refugee, asylum seeker, economic migrant, migrant in transit, human smuggler, etc.) as a starting point for research (Lindley 2014; Mezzadra 2015). Papadopoulos and Tsianos (2013, p. 185) discern between the theoretically endless multiplicity of migrants' own and collective subjectivities on the one hand, and on the other, the narrow objects of governance (forced/voluntary, economic migrant/asylum seeker, etc.) clearly defined by the regulating state. The creation of these objects of governance effaces the multiplicity of migratory subjects and struggles, and as a result: "sovereignty breaks the connectivity between multiple migratory subjects in order to make them visible and render them governable subjects of mobility," a connectivity which they suggest is (or could be, we would add) the basis of a range of solidarities between migratory (and non-migratory, we would also add) subjects. In short, for the authors, national sovereignty assigns identities and hampers the transformative potential of migration. However, the politics of subjectivity should not be limited to how migrants negotiate their "future becomings" vis-à-vis the regulatory apparatus of the state. Recent scholarship on the role of desire and aspiration in migration has further explored this dynamic of "being-becoming": "People do not aspire to migrate; they aspire to something which migration might help them achieve" (Bakewell, in Carling and Collins 2017, p. 9). Hence, "The significant relation to study … is not between subjects and migration possibilities, but rather between subjects and their potential transformation through migration" (Carling and Collins 2017, p. 9). Migrants negotiate who they are with a range of actors such as traffickers, humanitarian and civil society organizations, and other (non-migrant) residents who imagine and objectify them respectively and to varying degrees as commodities (Bilger et al. 2006), animals (Papadopoulos et al. 2008), victims (Pallister Wilkins 2018), deserving and non-deserving illegals (Chauvin and Gares-Mascarenas 2012), but potentially also as allies in particular social struggles (Agustin and Jorgensen 2016; Featherstone 2017). This debate points to a third dimension of arrival politics, which we label **politics of subjectivity**.

Having discerned these three dimensions of the politics of arrival, we investigate in the next sections how we can build on insights in urban geography, infrastructure studies, and other disciplines to better understand the spatial and material constellations in which these politics of arrival unfold.

Teleological and Territorial Traps

Neighborhoods of arrival and transition

The notion of the urban transition zone, conceived by the Chicago School of Social Ecology in the early 1930s, is part of a theoretical model of concentric urban development that continues to inform urban studies scholars and policymakers. Examples of ethnic neighborhoods such as Little Italy were first described in these densely inhabited zones: neighborhoods with ethnic shops, church communities, village associations, and social work initiatives that supported newcomers in their process of arrival. The concentration of population groups with similar needs was crucial for the development of this supportive neighborhood-based infrastructure; a concentration resulting from the particular concentric model of urban development, so typical for nineteenth and early twentieth century industrial cities (Schillebeeckx et al. in this volume). By climbing the social ladder through employment in urban manufacturing industries, the offspring of these former migrants would become middle class and leave the zone of transition in favor of the leafy suburbs around the city (Alba and Logan 1991). Almost a century old, this spatial model has deeply influenced urban geography, and not least the academic debate on the extent to which ethnic concentration and segregation hamper or enable integration and social mobility (Werbner 2001; Murdie and Ghosh 2010; Bolt et al. 2010a, 2010b). While still a fascinating starting point for spatial analysis, the abovementioned insights into the multidirectional histories and forms of belonging of migrants challenge in a number of ways the established paradigm in urban geography literature of the logic of migrants' process of arrival.

First, scholars working on the transition zone and its successors (enclave, suburban ethnoburb, etc.) often implicitly adopt a teleological settlement approach (Collins 2011, p. 316) in two stages: migrants temporarily arrive in a "port of first entry" before settling for good in the broader metropolitan region. In these accounts, migrants either move in the direction of wealthier residential areas, a process of "spatial assimilation" (Massey 1985), or they remain in their zones of arrival. While the evidence Massey and his colleagues assembled (see Alba et al. 1999 for an overview) initially demonstrated the existence of this process, such a two-step directionality (and temporality) of arrival should not be taken for granted.

Second, in the wake of the success of Doug Saunders' bestseller *Arrival City*, a particular reading of the logic of the transition zone has gained some currency among urban policymakers. Saunders underlines that slums in the Global South, and particularly arrival

neighborhoods in the Global North, function as the point of first entry for rural migrants. His work has attracted friendly criticism from among others Ash Amin (2013), who takes issue with the normative subjectivity of the "migrant as entrepreneur" and the normative vector toward middle-class becoming inherent in the arrival city discourse (Meeus 2017). Moreover, Amin also convincingly argues that limiting the focus to neighborhood dynamics tends to produce a "telescopic urbanism" (Amin 2013); a tendency to overemphasize the level of the neighborhood. This is problematic, since it risks losing sight of the politics at the urban level that produce unequal access to collective resources in the first place.

Third, the socio-spatial structure of the postmodern metropolis that developed due to suburbanization and gentrification has increasingly diversified the spaces of arrival (Waldinger 1989; Zelinsky and Lee 1998). While the current urban service economy in the Global North attracts a bifurcated labor force, there is–arguing against Downey and Smith (2011)–no particular reason why this functional need would translate into the spatial concentration of newcomers and would then result in a similar logic of locally grown supportive infrastructures. Furthermore, the governmental regulation of forced migrants in the Global North and South has generated a "borderscape" (Brambilla 2015) of processing, detention, and waiting spaces that are predominantly and often purposefully located outside the historically produced urban fabrics (Isin and Rygiel 2007; Darling 2017). This means that if bordering practices are now potentially everywhere, so are the acts to transgress and resist them (Nicholls 2015; Gill 2016; Nikolaeva in this volume). That said, there are a number of historical and superdiverse neighborhoods in cities that have accommodated subsequent waves of newcomers and still have this function (Albeda et al. 2017; Schillebeeckx et al. in this volume). These concentrations remain an important focus for research, since migrants who temporarily arrive in such neighborhoods will not be the only urban subjects who negotiate formal and informal practices on a daily basis (Darling 2017, p. 188). However, these concentrations are only one spatial setting in the contemporary metropolis.

Urban emplacement

Scholars such as Mitchell (1997), Smith (2001, 2005), Leitner and colleagues (2008), Bunnell (2010), Samers (2010), and Riaño (2017) have pointed out that the first transnational accounts in migration studies constructed transnationalism on the basis of often aspatial ontologies of networks. In order to better situate the agency of migrants in particular, Smith (2005, p. 237 [our emphasis]) argues for: "a concern with the historically mediated context in which transnational practices take place … because it forces us to think about the *emplacement* of

mobile subjects. It guards against the macro-analytic view of transnational mobility as occurring in a hyper-mobile 'space of flows'." With the notion of "transnational urbanism," Smith made it possible to situate the mobile subject geographically without falling into either linear "methodological nationalism" or teleological "spatial assimilation" by emphasizing the relevance of emplacement; of being somewhere. Smith's notion of emplacement remains relatively open, without necessarily choosing one particular level such as the neighborhood or the city as the most important scale for analysis; however, his account received limited acceptance. In recent years, transnationalism scholars have increasingly been turning to geographical concepts such as the city, as a strategy to avoid the reproduction of problematic categories such as nation state and ethnicity in their research designs (see for example Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2013; Dahinden 2016).

Influential migration scholars including Glick Schiller and Çağlar (2009, 2010, 2013, 2016; Glick Schiller 2012) firmly position the politics of arrival at the level of the city with the notion of urban emplacement. "Unlike neighbourhoods, cities generally have their own governance regimes, economic and spatial development plans," the authors argue (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2016, p. 19). Their intervention draws on the rescaling literature in urban geography that analyses how the city as a scale of governance has become increasingly important as a result of nation states' neoliberal restructuring and rescaling processes, in which cities are forced to compete for resources and urban governments embrace entrepreneurial narratives (Harvey 1989). Cities and towns are differentially situated in global power geometries, and urban authorities are increasing their efforts to brand and market their city to compete for and attract global capital (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009). In migration studies, the authors argue, "cities, if approached comparatively and within a global perspective, can serve as important units of analysis in exploring the interface between migrants' pathways of incorporation and the materialisation of broader neoliberal processes" (2009, p. 179). Migrants, then, "may serve as scale-makers" (2009, p. 189), since urban policymakers could in different ways evaluate the presence of migrants and diversity in their city as an asset in this global competition. As a result, "migrant emplacement … focuses analytical attention on the relationship between the economic, political and cultural positioning of cities within broader networks of power and the ability of migrants to forge a place for themselves within a specific locality" (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2013, p. 1). Although promising, this perspective has also been criticized by Collins (2011, p. 332) for its "teleological reading of the histories of migration," in which the city becomes the "key site for arrival and settlement" and more in particular for assuming "the capacity for migrants to

remain in urban areas long term or at least to have access to state facilitated means of settlement." For Collins, such a teleological interpretation results from the Euro-American empirical context, where metaphors such as the gateway city are based on "a notion of long-term settlement and dispersal within nation states from major points of arrival that concurs with the perceived orthodoxy of migration in North America, Europe and to a lesser extent Oceania" (Collins 2011, p. 323). Collins then aims to offer "different analytical starting points that theoretically and geographically expand the existing scope of scholarship" (2011, p. 324) through an empirical engagement with the Asian-Pacific context, where not permanent settlement but permanent temporariness and a "use and discard" (Yeoh 2006) form of migrant governance is the order of the day.

Multi-scalar territorialities

These voices from the Asian-Pacific context also demonstrate the importance of keeping in view the multi-scalar emplacement of migrants, and "to speak to the differential opportunity structures, barriers to settlement, and variant institutional structures of different urban and rural locations within specific nation states as well as to the pan-national setting of the European Union as they vary over time" (Glick Schiller 2015, p. 2278). This, of course, is easier said than done, and to date there is only a very limited amount of literature that analytically and empirically adopts such a multi-scalar perspective. Glick Schiller and Çağlar were obviously inspired by the sprawling body of literature in human geography on scale, but conceptually and empirically their work only incorporates to a limited extent an analysis of the multi-scalar territorialities through which migration is governed. We can observe at least three bodies of research that are relevant for a more sophisticated multi-scalar analysis of urban arrival infrastructures.

The first is actually situated outside the human geography debate on scale: researchers in political science, public policy, and European studies have for decades been investigating the "layering" of government competencies and responsibilities in an era of globalization and Europeanization through the notion of multilevel governance (Bache and Flinders 2004). Across policy domains, we can observe both an upscaling of policies to the international level (the European Union and international organizations) and a downscaling to the subnational level of regional and local governments. As Adam and Caponio (forthcoming) argue, this also applies to the policy domain of migration, with a tendency for research on migration policy to analyze the interaction between upper governmental tiers (in particular the European Union and nation states) and research on migrant integration policy to focus on the lower

governmental tiers (nation states and local authorities). This work directs attention to the ways in which, for example, European migration policies strongly interact with national and local policies, and in doing so influence the shape and content of urban arrival infrastructures "on the ground." At the same time, this body of work remains very institutional and state-centered: across this literature, there is very little sense of migrant agency or indeed any social action outside of the state–what Julie-Ann Boudreau (2016) has called the "informalization of the state"–and which directs attention to urban politics beyond more narrowly-defined institutional politics. Accordingly, this body of work all too often falls into a territorial trap in the sense that it takes for granted the centrality of the state on various levels and the inherited ordering of these levels. Having said that, and as also pointed out by Adam and Caponio (forthcoming), recent work has started investigating the role of NGOs and other associations, as well as transnational city networks, in influencing and informing European, national, and local politics (Geddes and Guiraudon 2004; Penninx 2015).

A second body of literature brings us closer to political and urban geography, drawing on a wider body of work that investigates the proliferation of borders, border control, and the regulation of migrants' bodies across space (Mezzadra 2015). As Darling highlights, cities are "central to the diversification of borders into everyday life" and are often complicit in translating "policies and enforcement measures from the nation-state to specific urban contexts" (Darling 2017, p. 183). Urban arrival infrastructures, in other words, are shot through with the actions of supra-local state power due to the deterritorialization of national and European border regimes. However, politics of course also works in the other direction, and many city governments play an important role in contesting national imaginaries and migration and refugee policies. This has become most visible in the debates on so-called sanctuary cities, which "can be interpreted as the attempt to rescale migration and refugee policies and practices from national to urban scales" and which potentially "constitute a threat to national sovereignty" (Bauder 2017, p. 181). More critically, sanctuary cities also point to the limits of urban autonomy, since the most cities can do is to provide basic services to undocumented migrants without being able to offer more substantive rights that would abolish their precarious situation. This research overlaps with a third body of research on citizenship, and which has pushed the argument beyond formal citizenship questions to more situated and practice-oriented notions of citizenship. Cities, in this strongly normative literature, are positioned as the privileged site for performing democratic citizenship. Rainer Bauböck provides the classic argument: "we should conceive of the city as a political space inside the territorial nation-state where multicultural and transnational identities can be more freely

articulated than at the provincial or national level. New forms of urban citizenship might promote a cosmopolitan transformation of national conceptions of membership from below and from within" (Bauböck 2003, p. 142). Achieving this cosmopolitan transformation demands not an abolishment of the nation-state (Bauböck is very clear that urban citizenship complements the existing state structure and its formal procedures of democratic representation), but a transformation of "national identities and nationalist ideologies from below and from within" (Bauböck 2003, p. 157). How this can be realized in practice has been investigated in some detail by geographers through their work on scale jumping; investigating how migrants and migrant support organizations have pushed for more-progressive welcoming policies on a variety of scales, often by seeking support for local struggles at higher scales of government (Leitner and Strunk 2014).

The City of Arrival Infrastructures

Recent work on relational geography aims to avoid teleological framings of the subject of research, and to avoid treating cities and neighborhoods as delimited containers where networks of migrants arrive. Instead, migrants–bringing along their "multiple and hybrid affiliations of varying geographical reach" (Amin 2002, p. 972) and passing through the city–constitute socio-material trajectories that continuously shape and reshape the territory of the city. Trajectories "imprint places with layers of investments and practices" and "give rise to interpreted histories and spatial connotations, some of which come with more weight and influence than others" (Lagendijk et al. 2011, p. 165). Lagendijk and colleagues (2011) and Collins (2011) have experimented with such a perspective. Drawing on the work of Doreen Massey (2005), they have tried to embrace what Collins (2011) calls the "productive tension" between the territorial and the relational character of the city. While Lagendijk and colleagues (2011) start from "the multiple worlds in a single street" to examine "the consequences of [the] plurality of 'trajectories' for actual place-making," Collins aims to look at the city as a whole as "both a relational and territorial configuration connected to other places yet marked by its own specificities" (2011, p. 317). For Collins, the aim is to "tease out the ambiguities of transnational mobilities and their emplacement in urban space in ways that recognize how this emplacement is both facilitated and blocked" (2011, p. 320). Such a focus on socio-material trajectories avoids the territorial and teleological "trap" in prevailing research and fits well with the three-dimensional politics of arrival previously outlined. In what follows, we therefore suggest thinking through these trajectories using an infrastructural perspective. We think such a perspective will be insightful in at least three ways.

First. Arrival infrastructures as step-wise pathways

Existing scholarship describes infrastructure as a "system of substrates" (Star 1999, p. 380) through or upon which humans and non-humans are moved. This is a crucial duality in mobility studies; a duality that the concept of infrastructure seems to grasp better than the notion of "assemblage" (Collins 2017). Hannam and colleagues (2006, p. 3) write that: "Mobilities cannot be described without attention to the necessary spatial, infrastructural and institutional moorings that configure and enable mobilities." Mobility always needs "multiple fixities or moorings" and for Hannam and colleagues, the language of infrastructure points to the "immobile" material worlds that constrain and enable particular forms of mobility. Migration, being "a key mobile phenomenon of our time," is a "product of infrastructures too" (Lin et al. 2017, p. 168). As spelled out by Graham and Marvin (2001), the language of infrastructure thus emphasizes the logic of selective "channels," which privilege access for some and construct barriers for others (van Heur 2017). This sorting or channeling is a function of what authors have called border externalization (De Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles 2014: 19) and processes of border internalization (Lugo 2000), variably understood in terms of the multiplication (Mezzadra and Neilson 2012, p. 65) or the thickening of borders (Mutsaers 2014), effecting differential inclusion (De Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles 2014, p. 25). Hence, with the notion of infrastructure, migrants can be imagined to be selectively channeled through the urban landscape. The politics of arrival–politics of directionality, politics of temporality, and politics of subjectivity–that we identified earlier, can then be operationalized in an analysis of how arrival infrastructures select, give direction to, and retain or accelerate certain migratory subjects.

With retention and acceleration being a central dimension of the politics of arrival, the concept of arrival infrastructures therefore adds an important dimension to notions such as "migration infrastructure" (Xiang and Lindquist 2014). The concept of arrival infrastructures firmly focuses on the step-wise process of channeling, with the politics of temporality–the negotiation of retention and acceleration–as an inescapable but unequally provided dimension of mobility**.** The philosophical starting point here is the work of Papadopoulos and colleagues (2008, p. 210) who state that: "Migrants' material becomings do not end in a new state of being; rather they constitute being as the point of departure on which new becomings emerge." They go on to state that "Arrival has a longue durée … one is always there and always leaving, always leaving and always manifesting in the materiality of the place where one is. You never arrive somewhere." While arrival manifests itself materially through a

temporary territorialization, it does not mean that aspirations as purposeful constructions of the future (Boccagni 2017, p. 1) and desires for a "new becoming" (Carling and Collins 2017) come to an end. On the contrary, if we conceptualize arrival as a temporary territorialization mediated by infrastructures, arrival infrastructures are "similar to the transit spaces where migrants rest for a while, reconnect to their communities, call their relatives and friends, earn more money to pay the smugglers, collect powers, prepare their new becomings" (Papadopoulos et al. 2008, p. 217). Arrival in the arrival infrastructure is always temporary, but its length is in negotiation.

Second. Arrival infrastructures and artifacts of governmentality

Infrastructures have a particular robustness: "Migration flows can be fragmented and short-lived, but infrastructure retains a particular stability and coherence" (Xiang and Lindquist 2014, p. 132). This apparent stability and coherence of infrastructure makes it possible to investigate and compare different migration trajectories. Xiang and Lindquist (2014, p. 122) coined the notion of infrastructural involution to emphasize how the intensification of the migration infrastructure–through the systematic interlinking of the technologies, institutions, and actors that facilitate and condition mobility–makes the infrastructure "self-perpetuating and self-serving and impedes rather than enhances people's migratory capability." The cause of the endurance, fixity, and stability of infrastructure can be located in its material dimension of artifacts and the routinized procedures employed by the actors that use these artifacts (Star 1999). Similar to governmentality research on governmental technologies (Rose and Miller 1992), artifacts "act at a distance" through the mobilization of infrastructures. As Latham and colleagues (2014, p. 11) point out, there is a "large number and variety of artifacts that help shape contemporary experiences of temporariness," made material in documents such as work permits, citizenship papers, medical files, and language certificates; and spatialized in institutions such as detention centers and border crossings. Hence, as Xiang and Lindquist (2014, p. 124) point out, "it is not migrants who migrate, but rather constellations consisting of migrants and non-migrants, of human and non-human actors." Hence, governmental arrival infrastructures are constituted by a multitude of interception methods, waiting techniques, corridor building, mustering by state and non-state actors, etc.–operations which lead from far beyond to deeply behind the geopolitical borders. Accordingly, the concept of arrival infrastructures allows us to address how subsequent waves of governmental programs imbue artifacts, bureaucracies, institutional spaces, and partnerships with civil society actors with particular arrival normativities, and hence consolidate these normativities into new layers of

infrastructure that channel particular forms of migrant arrival. Moreover, such a perspective also makes it possible to avoid treating the state as a monolithic bloc, but instead to approach it as a performance of potentially conflicting forms and fractions of statehood by different actors, spaces, and materials (Jeffrey 2012, p. 39) that are integral parts of arrival infrastructures but never completely determine it.

Third. Arrival infrastructures as emerging from social practices

Although infrastructures can possess a particular robustness, the impression of a coherent whole also mystifies the fluid and transforming nature of the infrastructures themselves. This is most clearly emphasized in anthropological literature, which indicates that infrastructures emerge out of continuous infrastructuring practices (Arnaut et al. 2016; Calhoun et al. 2013). Drawing on Star (1999), Graham and Thrift (2007) therefore argue for an academic engagement with the myriad practices of the continuous maintenance and repair that sustain infrastructure. The move proposed by these and other authors (e.g., Lindquist 2017; Lin et al. 2017) reflects a methodological strategy of infrastructural inversion (Bowker 1994), which involves an investigation into the inner workings of infrastructure in order to be able to analyze its process of construction and maintenance: it requires "going backstage" (Star 1999) and studying infrastructure "in the making" (Star and Bowker 2002). This logic of inversion has regularly been described in situations of infrastructural failure. Well-functioning infrastructures tend to disappear into the background and only become visible when they fail, potentially producing apocalyptic fears (Graham 2010). In that respect, the 2015 European "refugee crisis" can be read as a spectacular case of infrastructural failure, which led to an otherwise largely invisible and only occasionally contested asylum infrastructure being placed in the foreground, which under regular circumstances should "work in the background, effectively and silently" (Walters 2004, p. 255).

Adopting a logic of inversion as a methodological strategy implies not only "going into the backstage" of the arrival infrastructures that are well known, but also that one strategically describes an infrastructure from the bottom up (Simone 2004; Elyachar 2010, 2011). In the context of migration, Kleinman (2014) for instance describes how West Africans gain access to employment through a social infrastructure in the Gare du Nord station in Paris "that partially transforms this space of transportation … into a hub of encounter that translates the social infrastructure of African migrants into a French public space." The European "refugee crisis" is again a case in point. The collapse or transformation of the existing asylum infrastructures and the emergence of new ones was gaining visibility by being constantly

politicized, contested, or indeed accompanied by popular mobilization and infrastructural work. El Moussawi and Meeus (2016) for instance show how activist groups built an arrival campsite in the center of Brussels in September 2015, which can be understood as an attempt at "world building" (Zigon 2014); providing the basics of shelter, food and clothes distribution, medical support, exchange of information, etc. Through their intervention, the activists exposed the carelessness of the refugee reception services in Brussels as a "spectacle of 'illegality'" (De Genova 2013). As refugees waiting for their turn to register as an asylum seeker chose to spend the night in the activists' camp instead of in the temporary accommodation provided by the state, the camp actually exposed the poverty of the official reception centers by building a richer and livelier infrastructure (Amin 2014).

The chapters

The authors contributing to this volume represent various academic disciplines–ranging from political science to architecture, urban planning, sociology, and geography–and productively develop research on arrival infrastructures in different directions.

The contribution of **Charlotte Räuchle** zooms in on the sorting or channeling function of arrival infrastructures, and shows how differential inclusion could operate along the intersectionalities of ethnicity and race, class, and gender in the case of late nineteenth-century Hamburg. As a city state, Hamburg could allocate urban citizenship and Hanseatic *Bürgerrecht* rights, which it distributed unequally among different groups of newcomers. Räuchle reveals a division of labor regarding the regulation and supervision of these groups. While many foreigners were controlled and inspected with panoptical precision by the registration office and the so-called "foreigners' police," female servants for instance, ambivalently qualified as submissive but sexually licentious, were partially ushered into girls' homes where they were said to be protected and disciplined. Mechanisms of sorting or channeling are further explored in the chapter by **Mara Sidney,** who investigates the role of the NGO infrastructure in Newark (U.S.) and Ottawa (Canada) in constituting pathways to inclusion for immigrants. Sidney's case studies clearly reveal the multi-scalar emplacement of migrants, as national regimes of NGO state relations deeply influence the process of political claim-making in cities such as Newark and Ottawa. Inspired by urban infrastructure literature, Sidney also explores the processes of incremental shapeshifting of the NGO infrastructure over time, when new groups of migrants arrive. In this process, established NGOs are "sites of contestation," whose interests in self-preservation are challenged by new groups.

In her analysis of the biopolitical handling of newcomers in Flemish newcomer reception offices in Brussels, **Eva Swyngedouw** investigates the politics of subjectivity. Although the focus of the reception offices on bureaucratic survival strategies could be a useful skillset for newcomers to get easily "plugged in" in the world of forms and procedures, there is a darker side exposed by the author. The valuing and training of "not telling one's life story in a bureaucratic environment" in order to not disturb the bureaucratic processing, has serious effects on whether the real issues, problems, and talents of newcomers can be heard. Swyngedouw also demonstrates the gradual infrastructural involution of the Flemish reception office infrastructure as more and more actors and artifacts of governmentality became involved over time. **Anna Nikolaeva** subsequently investigates how social workers in a particular NGO in Amsterdam engage with the effects of increasing bordering processes in Europe, as a result of which a growing and diversifying foreign population arrives in precarity. Over time, the social workers here moved beyond teleological settlement perspectives (permanent arrival in Amsterdam) and started construing arrival as a step-wise pathway. As she argues insightfully, "What is negotiated [here] is often the relative stability of precarious existence *somewhere* and *for now* in Amsterdam," indicating the multidirectionality of the politics of arrival.

The theme of the urban emplacement of arrival is investigated in the chapter by **Elise Schillebeeckx, Stijn Oosterlynck, and Pascal De Decker**, who explore the current relevance of the notion of the "urban zone of transition." The authors reconceptualize it in terms of the concentration of material and non-material resources for social mobility, in particular in urban neighborhoods. By mobilizing a Polanyian approach, they connect the provisioning of these resources with urban and national welfare policies, thereby suggesting the multi-scalar constitution of the locally situated and historically accumulated concentration of resources in the neighborhood of Antwerp Noord in Belgium, and avoiding telescopic urbanism. The two subsequent chapters investigate processes of arrival in urban areas that have a much less established history of accommodating newcomers. **Didier Boost and Stijn Oosterlynck** investigate the "soft" urban arrival infrastructure for Sub-Saharan newcomers in the periphery of the Brussels metropolis. More and more newcomers end up in such municipalities, which often lack the public institutions to deal with their emotional, informational, and instrumental needs. Resonating with AbdouMaliq Simone's (2004) notion of "people as infrastructure," Boost and Oosterlynck's contribution unravels how the lack of a governmental infrastructure in these places is compensated for by a multidirectional social infrastructure that taps into the historically accumulated infrastructures of arrival in the metropolitan center, but equally

draws on pre-migration relations. **Anna Steigemann** subsequently analyzes the infrastructuring work of setting up arrival infrastructures for asylum seekers in shrinking towns in Eastern Germany with no experience of hosting asylum seekers. Here, the question is to what extent the arrival of asylum seekers represents a further burden on already fragmenting urban communities, or instead, offers an opportunity for these communities to obtain finances, new economies, and new people. As Steigemann illustrates, civil society in her case studies seems deeply divided on this matter, with on the one hand xenophobic organizations arguing against investments in "Islam" and even using violence to make their point, and on the other hand, diverse alliances of citizens, state employees, and NGOs constructing additional arrival infrastructures and informing the local public. Steigemann's analysis suggests that the success of the latter actually depends on the extent to which the investment in asylum arrival infrastructures benefits the communities at large.

The spatial confinement of migratory populations outside urban centers, as part of governmental strategies to control and govern the direction, temporality, and subjectivity of migratory populations, is an important theme in three further chapters that take the governmental categories of the "refugee" and the "asylum seeker" as a starting point. **Ragne Øwre Thorshaug** analyzes how the aesthetics, the location, and the architecture of asylum centers in Norway hamper the recognition of asylum seekers as fully-fledged members of society. Opening up the politics of temporality, she argues that the mobility of these people is temporarily kept "on hold" in these centers, constituting a middle ground between two entirely different master statuses: permanent settlement or return. However, as the everyday energies of people cannot be kept on hold, Thorshaug examines the everyday frictions between people and their material settings, and among asylum center residents, revealing how these frictions create a restlessness that makes a temporary territorialization of "being" almost impossible. **Lucas Oesch** similarly zooms in on this middle ground in the protracted Al-Hussein Palestinian refugee camp in Jordan. Initially set up in 1952 near but outside the center of Amman and following a logic of confinement, incremental urbanization has blurred the difference between camp and urban space. Through time, the arrival of the initial residents of the camp has re-territorialized. This re-territorialization can be taken quite literally under the form of consecutive infrastructural investments that reflect the shifting meaning of Palestinians' temporary presence. Through an analysis of the political negotiations around these infrastructural investments, Oesch discovers these historical shifts and the different perspectives on the temporariness of Palestinians' arrival that informed the initial production and subsequent transformations of the camp. **René Kreichauf** develops the

notion of "campization" to explore the processes through which refugees in the aftermath of the 2015 refugee crisis are increasingly placed in peripheral camp-like forms of accommodation across Europe. Kreichauf insightfully observes how forced migrants in Europe experience a "forced arrival" in a situation of protracted temporariness, in which only the subject of the "voluntary returnee" is stimulated.

Conclusion

In this introductory chapter to the volume, we have developed an analytical reading grid that situates our interest in arrival infrastructures in a much wider, interdisciplinary debate on migration, infrastructure, and urban change. As an initial heuristic, we describe our notion of arrival infrastructures as those parts of the urban fabric within which newcomers become entangled on arrival, and where their future local or translocal social mobilities are produced as much as negotiated. On a very basic level, we argue that conceptions of migrant arrival as oriented toward settlement within a national territory and/or within a particular urban space need to be questioned, since such an understanding does not do justice to the diversity of the migration trajectories that shape our cities today. Moving beyond these approaches, we identify three dimensions to the politics of arrival that are key in this respect: politics of directionality, politics of temporality, and politics of subjectivity. The politics of directionality refers to the ways in which migrants are linked to a range of places due to their particular biographies, social attachments, and legal statuses; but also to the ways in which migrants shift their engagement with places over time. Arrival, in other words, can never be reduced to one location and one community (a city within a nation state), but is multidirectional by definition. The politics of temporality questions imaginaries of (national or urban) belonging, which link citizenship rights to permanence by emphasizing the right to be mobile, while at the same time supporting migrants' search for forms of stability. Current debates posit a clear dichotomy between the permanence (with citizenship rights) and temporariness (with no or limited rights) of migrants, which ignores or creates obstructions for the much more "messy" everyday realities of an increasing number of people living in our cities today. Further, the politics of subjectivity directs attention to the ways in which subjectivities of moving people gradually transform along their unfolding pathways. Migrants create subjectivities for themselves in relation to their individual life course, their physical and social emplacement in particular settings, and to actors such as for example family and friends, traffickers, humanitarian organizations, and state integration offices.

With the help of this threefold distinction of the politics of arrival, we reviewed an interdisciplinary range of literature–mainly drawing on migration studies, urban geography, and infrastructure studies–to gain a better understanding of the spatial and material constellations in and through which these politics of arrival unfold. We point to some of the limitations, but also specify how we build on these streams of literature to further theorize the notion of arrival infrastructures and the politics of arrival. Instead of offering a summary, here we highlight the two main analytical lessons that we draw from this: these lessons inform the chapters that follow in this edited volume, but at the same time point to areas for further research into arrival infrastructures.

First, arrival infrastructures are best understood as expressing urbanity in the way proposed by Julie-Anne Boudreau (2016) in her analysis of global urban politics. Following her logic of reasoning, "global urbanization affects the architecture of state power" (p. 13) in the sense that politics becomes decentralized, with multiple centers of power instead of a sovereign state. From this perspective, urbanity is "not about a specific settlement, namely the city, but rather about a specific worldview and its ensuing logic of action and interaction" (p. 23). Boudreau might overemphasize the networked and fluid nature of this type of interaction (downplaying the multi-scalar structuration of state power), but it is clear that such an understanding of urbanity, and thus urban arrival infrastructures, exceeds the territorial and often quite localist concerns that characterize most research on cities and migration. Thus, depending on the trajectories focused on, politics of arrival can be found in historical urban neighborhoods and in smaller cities and towns, in detention centers in peripheral areas, and in the offices of state employees. Moreover, research into multilevel governance clearly shows the extent to which supra-local levels of government (the national state, the European Union, and international organizations), as well as translocal networks such as NGOs, interact with local and regional municipalities and, in doing so, strongly influence the form and content of the urban arrival infrastructure. Research into political and urban geography has highlighted how this multilevel structure is at the same time deterritorialized and reterritorialized, with migration policies and management from the European and national level implemented within particular urban contexts. Lastly, relevant literature indicates how infrastructures–maintained and repaired by myriad actors–"channel" and select, offering privileged access for some and barriers for others, leading to a multiplication of borders and creating differential inclusion. Research regarding infrastructures also points to the ways in which multi-scalar migration regimes create an intensification of the arrival infrastructure through a systematic interlinking of artifacts, institutions, and actors, allowing for the monitoring, control, and regulation of

people's arrival across space. On a more positive note, city governments and urban citizens also play key roles in contesting national state politics. In relation to migration, this becomes most clear in the discussion on sanctuary cities, which potentially subvert national sovereignty, but also in the wider body of literature on urban citizenship and migrant activism, which sees a key role for urban citizens to effect a transformation of national to cosmopolitan identities. All this implies that the arrival infrastructure should not be solely understood as urban in the sense of city based, but that is has become multi-scalar and to some extent deterritorialized, shaped by a geographically diverse combination of (cooperating but also conflicting) forms of statehood.

Second, and to return to how we started this introductory chapter, if we understand arrival as a temporary territorialization of "being," a presence that is not per se oriented toward permanence, then we will have moved closer to an understanding of migration that challenges national normativities and assumptions of arrival without ignoring migrants' search for forms of stability. Then we can start to listen to the temporary and their claims to employment, housing, education, and civic participation without translating these into pathways to permanence. We can also start envisioning the city and other urban spaces as consisting of more robust platforms for arrival and take off, to search for the fractions of statehood that prefigure a common urban infrastructure, the access to which is not dependent "upon the concessionary state, benefaction, proofs of deservingness, the return of the poor as future tax payers, consumers, labourers and entrepreneurs," but which is grounded in "a narrative of inviolable human rights" (Amin 2013, p. 23).

References

Adam, Ilke, and Tiziana Caponio. Forthcoming. "Research on the Multi-Level Governance of Migration and Migrant Integration: Reversed Pyramids." In *The Routledge Handbook of Migration Politics*, edited by A. Weinar, S. Bonjour and A. Zhynomirska. London and New York: Routledge.

Agustin, Óscar García, and Martin Bak Jørgensen. 2016. "For the sake of workers but not immigrant workers? Social dumping and free movement." In *Solidarity without borders: Gramscian perspectives and civil society alliances*, edited by Óscar García Agustin and Martin Bak Jørgensen, 150–168. London: Pluto Press.

Al-Ali, Nadje, Richard Black, and Khalid Koser. 2001. “The limits to 'transnationalism': Bosnian and Eritrean refugees in Europe as emerging transnational communities.” *Ethnic and racial studies* 24 (4): 578–600.

Alba, Richard D., and John R. Logan. 1991. “Variations on two themes: Racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence.” *Demography* 28 (3): 431–453.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, Brian J. Stults, Gilbert Marzan, and Wenquan Zhang. 1999. “Immigrant groups in the suburbs: A reexamination of suburbanization and spatial assimilation.” *American sociological review* 64: 446–460.

Albeda, Ympkje, Anouk Tersteeg, Stijn Oosterlynck, and Gert Verschraegen. 2017 (OnlineFirst). “Symbolic Boundary Making in Super-Diverse Deprived Neighbourhoods.” *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*.

Amin, Ash. 2002. “Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity”. *Environment and planning A* 34 (6): 959–980.

Amin, Ash. 2013. “Telescopic urbanism and the poor.” *City* 17 (4): 476–492.

Amin, Ash. 2014. “Lively infrastructure.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 31 (7-8): 137–161.

Arnaut, Karel, Martha Karrebæk, and Massimiliano Spotti. 2016. “Engaging superdiversity: The poiesis-infrastructure nexus and language practices in combinatorial spaces.” In *Engaging superdiversity: Recombining spaces, times and language practices*, edited by Karel Arnaut, Martha Karrebæk, and Massimiliano Spotti, 3–24. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bache, Ian, and Matthew Flinders. 2004. *Multi-level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baldassar, Loretta. 2008. “Missing kin and longing to be together: emotions and the construction of co-presence in transnational relationships.” *Journal of intercultural studies* 29 (3): 247–266.

Baubock, Rainer. 2003. “Reinventing urban citizenship.” *Citizenship studies* 7 (2): 139–160.

Bauder, Harald. 2017. “Sanctuary Cities: Policies and Practices in International Perspective.” *International Migration* 55 (2): 174–187.

Bilger, Veronika, Martin Hofmann, and Michael Jandl. 2006. “Human smuggling as a transnational service industry: Evidence from Austria.” *International Migration* 44 (4): 59–93.

Blommaert, Jan. 2013. *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Blommaert, Jan. 2014. “Infrastructures of superdiversity: Conviviality and language in an Antwerp neighborhood. *European journal of cultural studies* 17 (4): 431–451.

Boccagni, Paolo. 2017. “Aspirations and the subjective future of migration: comparing views and desires of the ‘time ahead’ through the narratives of immigrant domestic workers.” *Comparative Migration Studies* 5 (1): 4.

Bolt, Gideon, Deborah Phillips, and Ronald Van Kempen. 2010a. “Housing Policy, (De)segregation and Social Mixing: An International Perspective.” *Housing Studies* 25 (2): 129–135.

Bolt, Gideon, A. Sule Özüekren, and Deborah Phillips. 2010b. “Linking integration and residential segregation.” *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 36 (2): 169–186.

Boudreau, J. A. 2016. *Global urban politics: Informalization of the state*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bowker, Geoffrey. 1994. “Information mythology: the world of/as information.” In *Information acumen: the understanding and use of knowledge in modern business*, edited by Lisa Bud-Frierman, 231–247. London: Routledge.

Brambilla, C. 2015. “Exploring the Critical Potential of the Borderscapes Concept.” *Geopolitics* 20 (1).

Bunnell, Tim. 2010. “Routes of identity: Malay Liverpool and the limits of transnationalism.” *Pacific Affairs* 83 (3): 459–480.

Calhoun, Craig, Richard Sennett, and Harel Shapira. 2013. “Poiesis means making.” *Public Culture* 25 (2 70): 195-200.

Carling, Jørgen, and Francis Collins. 2017 (OnlineFirst). “Aspiration, Desire and the Drivers of Migration”. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

Catterall, Bob. 2015. “Editorial: To ‘the city of refuge’.” *City* 19 (5): 613–617.

Chauvin, Sébastien, and Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas. 2012. “Beyond informal citizenship: the new moral economy of migrant illegality.” *International Political Sociology* 6: 241–259.

Collins, Francis. 2011. “Transnational mobilities and urban spatialities : Notes from the Asia-Pacific.” *Progress in Human Geography* 36 (3): 316–335.

Collins, Francis. 2017. “Desire as a theory for migration studies: temporality, assemblage and becoming in the narratives of migrants.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2017.1384147.

Cwerner, Saulo B. 2001. “The times of migration.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27 (1): 7–36.

Dahinden, J. 2016. “A plea for the ‘de-migranticization' of research on migration and integration.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (13): 2207–2225.

Dalakoglou, Dimitris. 2016. “Europe’s last frontier: The spatialities of the refugee crisis.” *City* 20 (2): 180–185.

Darling, Jonathan. 2017. “Forced migration and the city: irregularity, informality, and the politics of presence.” *Progress in Human Geography* 41 (2): 178–198.

De Genova, Nicholas. 2013. “Spectacles of migrant ‘illegality’: the scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (7): 1180–1198.

De Genova, Nicholas, Sandro Mezzadra, and John Pickles. 2014. “New keywords: Migration and borders.” *Cultural Studies* 29 (1): 1–33.

De Haas, Hein. 2005. “International migration, remittances and development: myths and facts.” *Third World Quarterly* 26 (8): 1269–1284.

De Haas, Hein. 2010. “Migration and development: A theoretical perspective.” *International migration review* 44 (1): 227–264.

Downey, Dennis J., and David A. Smith. 2011. “Metropolitan reconfiguration and contemporary zones of transition: conceptualizing border communities in postsuburban California.” *Journal of urban affairs* 33 (1): 21–44.

El Moussawi, Hala, and Bruno Meeus. 2016. *Refugee Support During and After Moments of Crisis: The Case of the Brussels' Maximiliaanpark*. Paper presented at the RGS-IBG Annual International Conference, London 30 August–2 September 2016.

Elyachar, Julia. 2010. “Phatic labor, infrastructure, and the question of empowerment in Cairo.” *American Ethnologist* 37 (3): 452–464.

Elyachar, Julia. 2011. “The political economy of movement and gesture in Cairo.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17 (1): 82–99.

Faist, Thomas. 2000. *The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces*. Oxford: Clarendon-Oxford University Press.

Favell, Adrian. 2003. “Integration nations: the nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe.” in *Multicultural Challenge (Comparative Social Research, Volume 22)*, edited by Grete Brochmann, 13 – 42. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Featherstone, David. 2017. “Afterword. Solidarities, conjunctures, encounters.” In *Place, Diversity and Solidarity*, edited by Stijn Oosterlynck, Maarten Loopmans, and Nick Schuermans, 165–176. London and New York: Routledge.

Fernandez, Luis, and Joel Olson. 2011. To live, love and work anywhere you please. *Contemporary Political Theory* 10 (3): 412–419.

Geddes, Andrew, and Virginie Guiraudon. 2004. “Britain, France and EU anti-discrimination policy: the emergence of an EU policy paradigm.” *West European Politics* 27 (2): 334–53.

Gill, Nick. 2016. *Nothing Personal. Geographies of governing and activism in the British asylum system*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Glick Schiller, Nina. 2012. “A comparative relative perspective on the relationships between migrants and cities.” *Urban Geography* 33 (6): 879–903.

Glick Schiller, Nina. 2015. “Explanatory frameworks in transnational migration studies: the missing multi-scalar global perspective.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38 (13): 2275–2282.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Caglar. 2009. “Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: migrant incorporation and city scale.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(2): 177-202.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Caglar (eds.) 2010. *Locating Migration. Rescaling Cities and Migrants*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Caglar. 2013. "Locating migrant pathways of economic emplacement: thinking beyond the ethnic lens." *Ethnicities* 13 (4): 494-514.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Caglar. 2016. "Displacement, emplacement and migrant newcomers: rethinking urban sociabilities within multiscalar power." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 23(1): 17–34.

Glick Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton. 1992. "Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration." *Annals of the New York academy of sciences* 645 (1): 1–24.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Thomas Faist (Eds.). 2010. *Migration, development, and transnationalization: a critical stance* (Vol. 12). New York: Berghahn Books.

Graham, Stephen (ed.) 2010. *Disrupted cities: When infrastructure fails*. London and New York: Routledge.

Graham, Stephen, and Simon Marvin. 2001. *Splintering urbanism: networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition*. London and New York: Routledge.

Graham, Stephen, and Nigel Thrift. 2007. "Out of order: understanding repair and maintenance". *Theory, Culture, Society* 24 (1): 1–25.

Green, Sarah. 2017. "When infrastructures fail: an ethnographic note in the middle of an Aegean crisis." In *Infrastructures and social complexity: a companion*, edited by Penny Harvey, Casper Bruun Jensen, and Atsuro Morita, 271–282. New York: Routledge.

Griffiths, Melanie, Ali Rogers, and Bridget Anderson. 2013. “Migration, time and temporalities: Review and prospect.” COMPAS Research Resources Paper, March 2013.

Griffiths, Melanie. 2014. “Out of time: The temporal uncertainties of refused asylum seekers and immigration detainees.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40 (12): 1991–2009.

Hall, Suzanne M., Julia King, and Robin Finlay. 2015. “Envisioning migration: Drawing the infrastructure of Stapleton Road, Bristol.” *New Diversities* 17 (2): 59–72.

Hannam, Kevin, Mimi Sheller, and John Urry. 2006. “Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings.” *Mobilities* 1 (1): 1–22.

Harvey, David. 1989. “From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism.” *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 71 (1): 3–17.

Huang, Shirlena, and Brenda S.A Yeoh. 2007. “Emotional labour and transnational domestic work: the moving geographies of ‘maid abuse’ in Singapore.” *Mobilities* 2 (2): 195–217.

Isin, Engin F., and Kim Rygiel. 2007. “Abject spaces: Frontiers, zones, camps”. In *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror: Living, Dying, Surviving*, edited by Elizabeth Dauphinee and Christina Masters, 181–203. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jamal, Amal. 2016. “Conflict theory, temporality, and transformative temporariness: Lessons from Israel and Palestine.” *Constellations* 23 (3): 365–377.

Jeffrey, Alex (2012). *The improvised state: Sovereignty, performance and agency in Dayton Bosnia*. John Wiley & Sons.

King, Russell, Mark Thomson, Tony Fielding, and Tony Warnes. 2006. “Time, generations and gender in migration and settlement.” *The dynamics of international migration and settlement in Europe* 233: 68.

Kleinman, Julie. 2014. “Adventures in infrastructure: making an African hub in Paris.” *City & Society* 26 (3): 286–307.

Lagendijk, Arnoud, Roos Pijpers, Geert Ent, Renée Hendrikx, Bram van Lanen, and Laura Maussart. 2011. “Multiple worlds in a single street: Ethnic entrepreneurship and the construction of a global sense of place.” *Space and Polity* 15 (2): 163–181.

Latham, Robert, Leah F. Vosko, Valerie Preston, and Melisa Bretón. 2014. “Liberating temporariness? Imagining alternatives to permanence as a pathway for social inclusion.” in *Liberating temporariness: Migration, work and citizenship in an age of insecurity*, edited by Leah F. Vosko, Valerie Preston, and Robert Latham, 3–31. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Lentin, Alana, and Gavan Titley. 2011. *The crises of multiculturalism: Racism in a neoliberal age*. London: Zed Books.

Leitner, Helga, Eric Sheppard, and Kristin M. Sziarto. 2008. “The spatialities of contentious politics.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33 (2): 157–172.

Leitner, Helga, and Christopher Strunk. 2014. “Spaces of Immigrant Advocacy and Liberal Democratic Citizenship.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 104 (2): 348–356.

Levitt, Peggy, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2004. “Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society.” *International migration review* 38 (3): 1002–1039.

Lin, Weiqiang, Johan Lindquist, Biao Xiang, and Brenda S.A. Yeoh. 2017. “Migration infrastructures and the production of migrant mobilities.” *Mobilities* 1–8.

Lindley, Anna. 2014. “Exploring crisis and migration: Concepts and Issues.” In *Crisis and Migration: Critical Perspectives*, edited by A. Lindley, 1–23. London and New York: Routledge.

Lindquist, Johan. 2017. “Brokers, channels, infrastructure: moving migrant labor in the Indonesian-Malaysian oil palm complex.” *Mobilities* 12 (2): 213–226.

Lugo, Alejandro. 2000. “Theorizing border inspections.” *Cultural Dynamics* 12 (3): 353–373.

Massey, Douglas. 1985. “Ethnic residential segregation: a theoretical synthesis and empirical review.” *Sociology and Social Research* 69: 315–350.

Massey, Doreen. 2005. *For Space*. London: Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: Sage.

Meeus, Bruno. 2014. *Arrival infrastructures in Brussels: Romanians between individual and collective social mobility*. Superdiversity: Theory, Method and Practice. University of Birmingham 23-24 June 2014.

Meeus, Bruno. 2017. “Challenging the figure of the ‘migrant entrepreneur’. Place-based solidarity in the Romanian arrival infrastructure in Brussels.” In *Place, Diversity and Solidarity*, edited by S. Oosterlynck, M. Loopmans, and N. Schuermans, 91–108. London and New York: Routledge.

Mezzadra, Sandro. 2015. “The proliferation of borders and the right to escape.” In *The Irregularization of Migration in Contemporary Europe: Detention, Deportation, Drowning,* 121–135. London/New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2012. “Between inclusion and exclusion: On the topology of global space and borders.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 29 (4–5): 58–75. doi: 10.1177/0263276412443569.

Minca, Claudio. 2015. “Geographies of the camp.” *Political Geography* 49: 74–83.

Mitchell, Katharyne. 1997. “Different diasporas and the hype of hybridity.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15 (5): 533–553.

Murdie, Robert, and Sutama Ghosh. 2010. “Does spatial concentration always mean a lack of integration? Exploring ethnic concentration and integration in Toronto.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (2): 293–311.

Mutsaers, Paul. 2014. “An ethnographic study of the policing of internal borders in the Netherlands: Synergies between criminology and anthropology.” *British Journal of Criminology* 54 (5): 831–848.

Nicholls, Walter. 2015. “Policing immigrants as politicizing immigration: the paradox of border enforcement.” *ACME* 14 (2): 512–521.

Pallister-Wilkins, Polly. 2018 (OnlineFirst). “Hotspots and the geographies of humanitarianism.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.

Papadopoulos, Dimitris, Niamh Stephenson, and Vassilis Tsianos. 2008. *Escape routes. Control and subversion in the twenty-first century*. London: Pluto Press.

Papadopoulos, Dimitris, and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2013. “After citizenship: autonomy of migration, organisational ontology and mobile commons.” *Citizenship studies* 17 (2): 178–196.

Papadopoulou-Kourkoula, Aspasia. 2008. *Transit migration: the missing link between emigration and settlement*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Penninx, Rinus. 2015. European Cities in Search of Knowledge for their Integration Policies. In *Integrating Immigrants in Europe: Research-Policy Dialogues*, edited by Peter Scholten, Han Enzinger, Rinus Penninx, and Stijn Verbeek, 99–115. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Portes, Alejandro, Luis E. Guarnizo, and Patricia Landolt. 1999. “The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field.” *Ethnic and racial studies* 22 (2): 217–237.

Ramadan, Adam. 2013. “Spatialising the refugee camp.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38 (1): 65–77.

Riaño, Yvonne. 2017. “Conceptualising space in transnational migration studies. A critical perspective.” In *Border Transgression. Mobility and Mobilization in Crisis*, edited by E. Youkhana, 35–48. Bonn: Bonn University Press, V & R Academic.

Rose, Nikolas, and Peter Miller. 1992. “Political power beyond the state: problematics of government.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 43(2): 173–205.

Samers, Michael. 2010. *Migration*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Sanyal, Romola. 2011. “Squatting in camps: Building and insurgency in spaces of refuge.” *Urban Studies* 48 (5): 877–890.

Saunders, Doug. 2011. *Arrival city*. London: Windmill Books.

Scheibelhofer, Paul. 2016. “‘How Would You React If You Learned That Your Son Was Gay?’ Racialized Sexualities and the Production of Migrant Others in Europe.” In *An Anthology of Migration and Social Transformation*, edited by Anna Amelina, Ken Horvath, and Bruno Meeus, 295–306. New York: Springer International Publishing.

Schrooten, Mieke, Dirk Geldof, and Sophie Withaeckx. 2016. “Transmigration and urban social work: towards a research agenda.” *European Journal of Social Work*, 19 (1): 18–30.

Simone, AbdouMaliq. 2004. “People as infrastructure: intersecting fragments in Johannesburg.” *Public culture* 16 (3): 407–429.

Smith, Michael Peter. 2001. *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalisation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, Michael Peter. 2005. “Transnational urbanism revisited.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (2): 235–244.

Star, Susan Leigh. 1999. “The ethnography of infrastructure.” *The American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (3): 377–391.

Star, Susan Leigh, and Geoffrey C. Bowker. 2002. “How to infrastructure?” In *The Handbook of New Media. Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs*, edited by Leah A. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone, 151–162. London: Sage.

Trimikliniotis, Nicos, Dimitris Parsanoglou, and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2016. “Mobile commons and/in precarious spaces: Mapping migrant struggles and social resistance.” *Critical Sociology* 42 (7–8): 1035–1049.

Vertovec, Steven, and Susanne Wessendorf (eds.). 2010. *Multiculturalism backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vosko, Leah F., Valerie Preston, and Robert Latham. 2014. *Liberating temporariness*? *Migration, Work, and Citizenship in an Age of Insecurity.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Van Heur, Bas. 2017. “Creative Cities and the Infrastructural Fragmentation of Socioeconomic Space.” In *Unlocking the Creative City: Re-assembling why cities are agents of change and innovation*, edited by Ilja Van Damme, Bert De Munck. and Andrew Miles, 261–270, London and New York: Routledge,

Waldinger, Roger. 1989. “Immigration and urban change.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 15 (1): 211–232.

Walters, William. 2004. “Secure borders, safe haven, domopolitics.” *Citizenship Studies* 8 (3): 237–260.

Werbner, Pnina. 2001. “Metaphors of spatiality and networks in the plural city: A critique of the ethnic enclave economy debate.” *Sociology* 35 (3): 671–693.

Wessendorf, Susanne. 2017. “Pioneer migrants and their social relations in super-diverse London.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1–18. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2017.1406126.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2002. “Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences.” *Global networks* 2 (4): 301–334.

Xiang, Biao, and Johan Lindquist, J. 2014. “Migration infrastructure.” *International Migration Review* 48 (s1).

Yeoh, Brenda S.A. 2006. “Bifurcated labour: the unequal incorporation of transmigrants in Singapore.” *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 97 (1): 26–37.

Zelinsky, Wilbur, and Barrett A. Lee. 1998. “Heterolocalism: an alternative model of the sociospatial behaviour of immigrant ethnic communities.” *International Journal of Population Geography* 4 (4): 281.

Zigon, Jarrett. 2014. “An ethics of dwelling and a politics of world-building: a critical response to ordinary ethics.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 20 (4): 746–764. doi: 10.1111/1467-9655.12133.