

**THE POLITICS OF CARE AND TRANSNATIONAL
MOBILITY**

Hywel Bishop

School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University

*For my parents Angela and Roger
& my daughter Seran who put up with my long absences*

Acknowledgements

First I would like to thank my supervisors Dimitris Papadopoulos and Theo Nichols for their unfailing support and guidance throughout and without whom this thesis would have not have reached completion. Their consistent advice and critical, yet patient, engagement with my work has been invaluable at every stage of the thesis. I would be hard pressed to imagine better supervisors and mentors.

So many people involved in no borders activism and related forms of solidarity with migrants have contributed to this thesis without ever reading a word of my writing and to name anyone would do an injustice to others. The thesis emerged and was brought to fruition from within such movements and if I have ever met or spoken with you about issues relating to freedom of movement and the regimes that attempt to control mobility then something of what follows is yours and you, dear reader, have my heartfelt thanks.

I would also like to give a special thank you to all those who have been associated with no borders south Wales over the years for your insights, friendship and passion to fight for what you believe is right.

I would also like to thank the numerous people who participated in the research by agreeing and taking the time to be interviewed. I would especially like to extend my gratitude to all those migrants who let me into their lives and allowed me to share those moments with them. I cannot thank you enough.

The Department of Social Sciences at Cardiff University has provided a stimulating environment in which to carry out my studies and the completion of the work would not have been possible without the numerous friends, colleagues and administrative staff there. In particular Liz Renton who was always at hand to answer and assist with any problems or queries, no matter how obvious or bizarre. I would also like to acknowledge the generous support of The Economic and Social Research Council under grant number ES/FO19327/1 without which the research would have not been possible.

Finally, my parents Angela and Roger, my brothers Justin, Gethin and Rhys, my partner Neesha and my daughter Seran have been there throughout this journey and offered unconditional, care, love and support. It is to them that I am ultimately indebted.

Abstract

This thesis explores the politics of care and transnational mobility – through a multi-sited ethnography of the everyday lives of a variety of migrant populations. Utilising a mixed-methodology it investigates the interconnections between care, mobility, labour and control.

The *care labour process* is examined, particularly that of care homes for older people. It is seen that mobility controls shape the working and living conditions, employment relations and forms of exploitability experienced by differentially included migrants. As well as such dynamics the thesis also explores the strategies that emerge from within the workplace itself that migrants utilise in order to negotiate such conditions.

Care is also examined from the vantage point of the lives of asylum applicants and their experiences of the *asylum support regime* that has emerged in recent years. Welfare and support services are argued to have increasingly come to be utilised as regulatory mechanisms. The numerous ways this occurs and the effects this has on such migrants are examined as is the dual function that NGOs have come to play within such processes as both providers of support and sustainability and agents of control.

A further aspect of care concerns the self-organised *networks of care* that migrants create amongst themselves. The concept of the ‘mobile commons’ is developed to argue that both the transnational and local networks of care that migrants craft, as well as the caring relations afforded through institutions such as churches are key in enabling migrants to become mobile, negotiate their caring commitments and sustain themselves while in transit or in a given location.

By thinking the relationship between care and migration from these interrelated perspectives the thesis aims to contribute to a reappraisal of existing forms of social movement organising and political mobilisation around the issue of mobility.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Mobilising care: making mobility / controlling mobility	
1.1 Introduction: the autonomy of migration	1
1.2 The politics of care	13
1.3 The politics of mobility	21
1.4 Care and the regulation of mobility	26
1.5 Structure of thesis	33
CHAPTER 2	36
‘Activist-research’: exploring the politics of care and mobility with migrants across their multiple sites of existence	
2.1 Introduction	36
2.2 Research Trajectory	37
2.3 Research Methods	41
2.3.1 <i>Interviews</i>	42
2.3.2 <i>Ethnographic Fieldwork</i>	43
2.3.3 <i>‘Drifts’</i>	44
2.4 Sites and participants	45
2.4.1 <i>Migrant labour in the care industry</i>	46
2.4.2 <i>Support services and the asylum regime</i>	50
2.4.3 <i>Migrant networks of care</i>	51
2.5 Ethical considerations	53
2.6 Activist-research	54
CHAPTER 3	58
The care industry: the working conditions & everyday experiences of migrant care workers	
3.1 Introduction	58
3.2 Labour process in the care industry	63
3.2.1 <i>Social composition and the emerging migrant division of labour</i>	63
3.2.2 <i>Embodied caring: “body work” and “affective labour”</i>	66
3.2.3 <i>Control over the care labour process</i>	70
3.3 Financial forces and the wage nexus	77
3.3.1 <i>Skilled labour for the price of unskilled</i>	81
3.3.2 <i>Learning to deceive, deceiving to learn</i>	82
3.3.3 <i>Same job, different pay and other means of exploitation</i>	84
3.4 Status, labour market mobility and exploitability	86
3.4.1 <i>Institutionalised immobilisation (1): work permits</i>	87
3.4.2 <i>Institutionalised immobilisation (2): the adaptation process</i>	88
3.4.3 <i>‘Tied in’: financial forces and immobilisation</i>	92
3.5 Contractual arrangements	94

3.5.1	<i>Post-contractual dependency: The production of insecurity and the amplification of exploitability</i>	96
3.5.2	<i>Post-contractual dependency: constant availability?</i>	97
3.6	Protection	103
3.6.1	<i>Trade Unions</i>	103
3.6.2	<i>Networks of care at work</i>	107
3.7	Conclusion	110
CHAPTER 4		113
The asylum support regime: emerging institutional aggregates and the regulation of migrants		
4.1	Introduction	113
4.2	The emergence of the asylum support regime	116
4.3	New institutional aggregates: the NGOisation of care	120
4.4	From care to control	125
4.4.1	<i>Differential inclusion</i>	125
4.4.2	<i>Forced movement and immobilisation</i>	130
4.4.3	<i>Temporal regulation, waiting and life lived in limbo</i>	137
4.4.4	<i>Control of asylum applicants at a distance</i>	142
4.4.5	<i>Produced dependency</i>	147
4.4.6	<i>Precarisation of living conditions</i>	150
4.5	Caring relations and the creation of sustainability	157
4.6	Conclusion	161
CHAPTER 5		167
Networks of care and the making of mobility		
5.1	Introduction	167
5.2	The ethos of the jungle: care at the borderzone of Calais	171
5.3	Transnationalised networks of care	181
5.4	Local informal networks of care	189
5.5	Institutional connections and the creation of caring	196
5.6	Conclusions	200
CHAPTER 6		202
Conclusion: The politicisation of care		
6.1	Introduction	202
6.2	The politicisation of care and the labour process	204
6.3	The politicisation of care and the asylum ‘support’ regime	211
6.4	Networks of care and the mobile commons	218
6.5	The question of organising and rethinking our political imaginaries...	221
RERERENCES		228

Appendix A	259
Appendix B	260
Appendix C	261

List of Acronyms

ARC	Application Registration Card
CCC	Cardiff City Council
CCW	Care Council for Wales
CEMACH	Confidential Enquiry into Maternal and Childhood Health
CHAT	Cardiff Health Access Team
CMS	Calais Migrant Solidarity
CRASW	Cardiff Refugee and Asylum Seeker Welcome
CRB	Criminal Records Bureau
CRI	Cardiff Royal Infirmary
CSSIW	Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales
EEA	European Economic Area
EU	European Union
EURODAC	European Dactyloscopy
FRONTEX	Frontières extérieures (<i>European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union</i>)
G8	Group of Eight
GP	General Practitioner
GPS	Global Positioning System
HO	Home Office
ILR	Indefinite leave to remain
IOM	International Organisation of Migration
LA	Local Authority
MCO	Migrant Community Organisation
NASS	National Asylum Support Services
NCADC	National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns

NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NMC	Nursing and Midwifery Council
NVQ	National Vocation Qualification
NHS	National Health Service
OSS	One Stop Shop
PBS	Points Based System
POVA	Protection of Vulnerable Adults
PCSAS	Primary Care Service for Asylum Seekers
RC	Refugee Council
RCe	Reception Centre
SIS	Schengen Information System
UKBA	United Kingdom Border Agency
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WRC	Welsh Refugee Council
WSMP	Wales Strategic Migration Partnership

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Mobilising care: making mobility / controlling mobility

Throughout the history of modernity, the mobility and migration of the labor force has disrupted the disciplinary conditions to which workers are constrained. ... Mobility and mass worker nomadism always express a refusal and a search for liberation: the resistance against horrible conditions of exploitation and the search for freedom and new conditions of life. It would be interesting, in fact, to write a general history of the modes of production from the standpoint of workers' desire for mobility ... rather than running through that development simply from the standpoint of capital's regulation of the technological conditions of labor (Hardt and Negri 2000: 212)

1.1 Introduction: the autonomy of migration

The contemporary conjuncture is witness to an unprecedented movement of people across the globe. At no point in history have so many of the planet's human inhabitants been on the move. Whether it be for tourism, travel or adventure, for work, family or educational purposes, or whether fleeing poverty, war or climate change induced ecological destabilisation and disasters, the reasons for such movements are as mixed and varied as the desires, hopes, fears and dreams that drive and accompany people across their mobile trajectories. These movements have in turn given rise to a proliferation of borders, to new machines for the canalisation and control of mobility, which seek to both "secure territorial and political borders of states, while at the same time facilitating a high degree of controlled circulation of

mobile populations” (Rygiel 2011: 143)¹. As mobility and the exploitation of migrant labour in both formal and informal economies become increasingly central to globalised capitalism’s reproduction and sustainability, it has attempted to institutionalise new modes of biopolitical control over people’s movements in order to guarantee its continued survival. But the more mobility becomes necessary to capital’s continued productivity, the more it threatens the social, political and organisational formations of Western societies.

It is these dynamics that what has come to be referred to as the ‘autonomy of migration’ perspective attempts to think through and explore (Bojadžec and Karakayali 2010; Mezzadra 2004; Mezzadra and Neilson 2003; Mitropoulos 2006; Moulier Boutang 1998, 2001; Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos 2008; Papadopoulos and Tsianos 2007). To speak of migration as autonomous does not mean that mobility and migrant movements take place outside of, or somehow beyond economic, social and geopolitical realities or the mechanisms that attempt to control and exploit such movements. Rather it points to how by its very existence migration becomes a *constituent force* (Negri 1999) that can challenge the formations and mechanisms of control and power. Whether authorised or clandestine, regular or irregular, migrant movements can be conceptualised as a “collective force” (cf. Proudhon 1969) that undermines and destabilises modes of governance and control and can therefore not be ignored. As such, migration and migrant movements become the ‘objects’ of political intervention, provoking a reorganisation of the state and wider regimes of governance and the emergence of new *dispositifs* of exploitation and domination. From this perspective then, migrant movements should be understood as giving rise to a field of struggle, with migrants as *active* agents, indeed as *the* fundamental protagonist, within the contested ecologies that emerge from such

¹ This dual function of both a facilitator of certain mobility and a curtailer of other forms of mobility problematises conceptualisations of the emerging European space in terms of a ‘Fortress’ (cf. Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos 2008). Papadopoulos and colleagues point to the porosity of borders, with emerging regimes of mobility control increasingly configured in order to manage the fact that movement cannot be curtailed. While it is clear that the border regime stratifies mobile populations into a multiplicity of categories, into ‘wanted’ vs. ‘unwanted’, citizens vs. non-citizens these categories are not clear cut. For instance, a number of writers have written about how a central feature of border regimes is the production of an illegalised strata of migrants, without social rights, who are hence far more exploitable and disposable (De Genova 2002, 2005; Mezzadra 2011). They are wanted in certain ways but not others and only for certain periods of time and once no longer needed they are simply discarded (see Bauman 2004 on ‘human waste’ for an argument along similar lines). Furthermore, it is imperative to see such distinctions in terms of a *continuum* whereby the processes through which ‘illegalisation’ and ‘irregularity’ are produced impact on the working and living conditions of migrant populations more broadly, and indeed, the wider working classes (cf. Mezzadra 2011).

entanglements.

It is important to note that the autonomy of migration perspective is not a unified theoretical current, or for that matter a political movement in itself. As Walters (2008: 188) points out, it is perhaps more useful to “regard it as an emergent ethos operating within thought spaces that bridge academic and activist milieus”.² It is an ongoing attempt by social movement actors to develop a different perspective and analytic framework in terms of how to conduct research on mobility. To “acquire a different sensibility” (Papadopoulos et al 2008: 202) or “gaze” (Mezzadra 2011: 121) with regards to the specificities of contemporary migrant movements and the dynamics of power, control and exploitation in which these emerge. To question and rethink existing discourses, vocabularies (for instance with respect to citizenship and rights) and approaches to the dynamics of migration and through such means cultivate new modes of organising and intervention around such issues. I will return to the issue of organising in more depth below (see chapter 2 and 6).

As well as such a focus, its proponents do share a number of other presuppositions and concerns in common. Chief amongst these is the foregrounding of the centrality of mobility as a vector of social transformation. Drawing on the theoretical current of autonomism, which, emerged within Italy in the 1960s and, amongst other things, proposed and developed an analysis of the primacy of ‘working’ class struggle as the driving force of capitalist development (e.g. Tronti 1979), various scholars have more recently begun developing the related concepts of exodus, desertion, flight, and escape, pointing to these as important practices of subversion and struggle (Virno 1996; Hardt and Negri 2000; Mezzadra 2004; Papadopoulos et al 2008). While such concepts have applications beyond the issue of migration, ‘escape’ and ‘flight’, when related to mobility can, as Angela Mitropoulos points out, be viewed as akin to a strike for better working conditions or a refusal of one’s labour from impoverished segments of the market (Mitropoulos 2006).

From the standpoint of the ‘autonomy of migration’, then, migration is conceived as a social movement in a literal sense (Papadopoulos et al 2008). That is, as ‘collective forces’ capable of bringing about various forms of social transformation. This maybe the result of direct political mobilisations by migrants themselves, the *sans papiers* movement across Europe being the most noteworthy example, but such transformations are not predicated on such activities and indeed, those working from

² I will return to the connection between academic and activist practices and the notion of ‘activist-research’ in the next chapter.

the autonomy of migration perspective have tended to foreground the political nature of mobility per se. As important as such direct interventions are, only a very small fraction of migrants actually engage in such overtly political activities and, as I will highlight at various points below, instead tend to find other less directly antagonistic ways of negotiating and subverting the forms of exploitation and domination they encounter (cf. Scott 1985, 1990).

This is not to romanticise such movements, or to figure migrants as the new historical subject that will topple capitalism. Of course, when viewed at a more local, singular level, such a perspective is open to contestation. Mobility as a strategy of escape is not always successful. Migration does not always lead to a better life for those who utilise it. Many migrants end up in hyper-exploitative conditions, or unable to find work, or end up turning back. Many migrant trajectories end in deportation, or worse death, with thousands having died trying to cross into the promised land of Europe³. However, even at such a level, as I hope to demonstrate during the course of the thesis, migrants should be seen as actively, cooperatively and collectively constructing the realities they move through and find themselves in during their mobile trajectories. Migration can open up new possibilities for migrants, their families and friends. And, as set out above, when viewed in more abstract terms, such movements are a vector of transformation, they create conditions that cannot be ignored by the state and capital and have a considerable impact on forms of governance and control and the wider polity that these regimes attempt to manage.

At this point it is worth exploring in a little more detail the terms – ‘migrant movements’, ‘mobility’ and ‘migrant’ – as a means of providing some conceptual clarity as to how and why they are defined and used as I do during the thesis. I have chosen to use the term ‘migrant’ in place of the arguably more commonly utilised one of ‘immigrant’ for both analytic and political reasons. The word ‘immigrant’ evokes connotations of an act of mobility from one country to another that is permanent in nature. The term ‘migrant’, however, does not carry such teleological associations and instead merely refers to the fact that someone has moved to another country for the purpose of work (or other reasons such as to claim asylum) whether that be on a short or longer term basis. Many of the migrants that I interviewed did not know whether they would be able, or indeed whether they wanted, to settle permanently in the UK. Indeed, during the course of writing the thesis, some have already returned to

³ There is a large body of work that has documented such issues, as well as the solidarity that such migrant movements give rise to (e.g. Hsiao-Hung 2008; Nevins 2008; Shelley 2007)

their ‘country of origin’ or moved on to another country and as such I feel the term ‘migrant’ more adequately captures the realities of the mobile trajectories of the people whose lives populate this thesis and the potential transitoriness and turbulent, non-linear dynamics of migrant movements.

As alluded to above, the phrase ‘migrant movements’ is employed as a means of foregrounding and capturing the collective character of migration. Migrant movements are incessantly cohering and dissolving networks. They are “collective assemblages” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) that migrants forge with one another along the ever changing routes that they open up and traverse in order to become and sustain their mobility. The term ‘mobility’ is used in a number of distinct, yet overlapping ways that need to be distinguished from one another. First of all, then, ‘mobility’ is used in its more conventional, literal sense as the act of physically moving from one geographical location to another that migration necessarily involves, which, in the case of the kind of migration I examine in the thesis, means moving across the border between different nation-states⁴. In a related way I also use mobility with regards to the field of labour and the differential “mobility power” (Smith 2006) – that is the relative ability/inability that different strata of migrants experience in terms of their capacity to move employer, or from one sector of the labour market to another – created through the mechanisms of the regime of mobility control that must be negotiated by different migrant populations. As such there is a need to distinguish ‘labour market mobility’ from that of ‘geographical mobility’.

Finally, ‘mobility’ is conceptualised in a less conventional sense to cover the entire duration that a person spends as a migrant living and working in a country other than the one in which they were born. The usage of ‘mobility’ in this way means that the time migrants reside in the country they are moving through, or have migrated to, is one spent ‘in mobility’. This I have termed ‘mobility trajectory’. Such a conception of mobility points to a need to consider migration as being a *process* that does not stop once a given ‘destination’ is reached but rather as something that continues for the entirety of such a period. At various points during the thesis I make reference to how

⁴ It is important to note that while the notion of *border* commonly refers to the boundary demarcation between discrete nation-states that a number of people working within the field of migration studies have pointed to the growing diffusion of borders beyond the spaces that previously marked their presence, such as airports, ferry terminals, railway stations, into that spaces of the social more generally, for instance in the streets, restaurants, places of work and so on (e.g. Khosravi 2010; Pallitto and Heyman 2008; Tsianos and Karakayali 2010). A perspective pithily summed up by Étienne Balibar: “some borders are no longer situated at the border at all” (2002: 84).

migration as a strategy is contingent upon the ability of migrants to remain or sustain mobility in order for it to efficaciously open up new possibilities for those by which it is employed. ‘Mobility trajectory’ captures this aspect of a migrant’s existence, living and working in a particular country over an extended period of time, needing to remain mobile, and to develop forms of attention and alertness and mobilise different practices and strategies in order to continue doing so. This is also the case in relation to the process of claiming asylum, which can often take several years, requiring the mobility of asylum applicants to be adequately sustained while they wait for the decision on whether or not they have been granted asylum. The sustainability of mobility as conceived through the notion of ‘mobility trajectory’ is vital as to cease being so would end with a return to the country from where a given migrant is a national. In the case of an asylum seeker or an undocumented migrant this would most likely result in forcible deportation. As these examples highlight, the use of a term like “mobility trajectory” is helpful in that it captures and foregrounds migration as a process of becoming without the suggestion that migrants are continuously on the move across geographical space. It highlights the importance of maintaining mobility as a central dimension through which the mobile trajectories of migrant movements unfold and develop. The process of migration is being in movement. To be a migrant is to be in mobility.

It is important to note that when I underline being ‘in mobility’ and the concept of ‘mobility trajectory’ as a defining facet of what constitutes a migrant I am not referring to all mobile populations, or people on the move. Rather, I am alluding to those who are still subject to the mechanisms of mobility control and who do not receive any lessened restrictions on their mobility due to for instance material wealth, or citizenship status. Of course, I am not suggesting that once migrants cease being subject to such controls they should no longer be analytically categorisable as migrants. To do so would mean that asylum applicants cease to be ‘migrants’ once they are granted refugee status, or that migrant workers would no longer be perceived as migrants if they obtain citizenship status after working in the country the requisite number of years. Rather, my point in highlighting mobility and its processual character here is to affirm both its importance, along with the practices and strategies through which it is maintained, as a defining feature of the lives of migrants, while at the same time foregrounding the decisive role that controls on such mobility play in creating the living and working conditions that migrants subject to them must negotiate in order to

sustain their mobile trajectories.

What then does such a conception of ‘mobility’ mean in terms of the definition of the term ‘migrant’ that I adopt for the purposes of this thesis? As Bridget Anderson points out “[t]he figure of the migrant is first and foremost constructed by the state”, and while this does not mean that the desire to move is simply the result of the state or capitalism, how such movement is shaped and controlled “its channelling and endless categorisation, is in part a manifestation of state relations to both capital and labour” (Anderson 2009: 408). The category of ‘migrant’ is a direct result of a world composed of sovereign nation-states and the legal frameworks that emerge within such a context. Who counts as a migrant, then, is produced by the legal mechanisms of the regime of mobility control and citizenship legislation. However, ‘the migrant’ is not simply shaped through legal mechanisms (Anderson and Blinder 2011). It is not just through the state but from the practices and discourses of an array of other bodies and agents – from NGOs, the media, trade unions and academics, as well as individuals (both citizens and non-citizens) – that the figure of the migrant comes to be imagined and defined (Anderson 2009). While the state is without doubt one of the primary agents within such a nexus, such bodies work with and against each other in the construction and classification of ‘the migrant’. As such, the question of who counts as a ‘migrant’ is highly politicised and one replete with contradictions, with how such a question is ‘answered’ very much dependent on from which vantage point this is approached as well as the underlying purpose of such an endeavour.

Within studies of migration, whether these are conducted by governmental agencies, NGOs or academics (either working for or independently of such bodies) the definitions of ‘migrant’ utilised vary considerably across such datasets. Among other possibilities, migrants may be defined as foreign-born, foreign-nationals, or people who have moved to the UK for a year or more, which is standard in demography and the one used to define the category ‘migrant’ by the United Nations (UN) (Migration Observatory 2011). Regardless of the specific definitions of ‘migrant’ that such bodies work from, a significant tendency amongst them, as well as in wider mass media and public discourses, is for migration to be constructed in terms of a ‘problem’ and as a potential threat. Migrants and hence migration are here figured as ‘objects’ of concern that needs to be solved by being properly managed and monitored (Anderson 2009). Interestingly, the International Organisation for

Migration (IMO), who in 2009 had over 400 field sites around the world (Ashutosh and Mountz 2011) argues that a lack of a uniform definition of migrants across nation-states has been one of the barriers to the development of a global migration management structure (e.g. IOM 2004)⁵.

The category of 'migrant' is also a racialised one (Anderson 2009). For instance, the racialised aspect is observable with regards to the phrase 'second generation immigrant', which as Anderson points out, intimates that people born within the United Kingdom to people who themselves are British citizens are somehow still considered 'immigrants'. This demonstrates the significant overlap and blurred boundaries between the categories of 'migrant' and 'ethnic minority' that exists both within academic discourses and those of the wider 'public sphere'. Most large-scale surveys and datasets do not generally ask for parents' country of birth and hence only those who categorised themselves as 'ethnic minorities' can be identified as 'second generation immigrants' (Anderson 2009).

The 'migrant' as a category also intersects with gender and class dimensions. A recent study conducted by the Migration Observatory into public perceptions of (im)migration found that when people think about (im)migrants they are most likely to think of 'asylum seekers' (62%) and least likely to mention student (29%). This is despite Office of National Statistics figures from 2009 indicating that the obverse is in fact that case with students comprising the largest group of migrants (37%) and asylum seekers the smallest (at only 4%) of the entire migrant population (Migration Observatory 2011). Of particular interest here are those who do not come to mind when people are asked to think of the category 'migrant'. Conspicuous by their absence are those from higher up the class hierarchy as well as white migrants. For the most part, then, those foreign born people in well paid work or who do not fit the racialised conflation of migrant and ethnic minority are not generally imagined as 'migrants' (cf. Anderson 2011).

As for the parameters that define the migrant's whose lives form the basis of this study; all of them were born outside the UK and had lived, and where relevant,

⁵ The IOM has received substantial criticism from various quarters including NGOs and activist groups. Despite the IOMs self-presentation as a humanitarian organisation that works for the benefit of migrants and to protect their human rights, Ashutosha and Mountz (2011) in a study of the operations of the IOM found that, contrary to such a portrayal, that in fact the IOM enforces the marginalisation and subordination of migrants seeking asylum and maintains and reinforces the central role of nation-states in ordering global flows of migrants. See also Anonymous (2004) for a detailed critique of the role of the IOM in the governance of mobility and the emergence of new technologies for the control of migrant movements.

worked, in the UK for between one and ten years. All of them were still subject to the dictates of the regime of mobility control, albeit in different ways, and all of them fall within what could be characterised as the global ‘working class’. It is worth pointing out at this point that when I alluded to ‘migrant movements’ as a transformative force above I was not referring to all strata of mobile populations. The kinds of migrants I am concerned with here are those whose mobility is still very much entangled with labour. I am not then talking about the mobility of the independently wealthy, or the broader capitalist class. This is not to say that such ‘elite’ forms of mobility are not in themselves important or worthy of scholarly attention, but rather that for the vast majority of the world’s migrants, labour and mobility continues to be inextricably fused⁶. In light of this, the migrant movements I am referring to here can be usefully explored in class terms, with such movements composed of people who fall within a broad global ‘working’ class.

The concept of class and class dynamics are of course highly problematic, and for the most part have not been adequately engaged with by those working from within the autonomy of migration perspective. The position I adopt here is one which conceives of the *working* class in more inclusive terms than the narrower conception of ‘orthodox Marxism’ waged labour (cf. Cleaver 2003; Wright 2002)⁷. As I discuss in more detail below (section 1.2) this requires a conceptualisation of ‘working’ class that includes the unwaged, domestic labour, students, informal labour, as well as undocumented migrant workers. Such an approach also necessitates a more nuanced reading of class than that of the sociological *class*-ifications of ‘working class’ ‘middle class’ ‘upper middle class’ and so on. Class, E. P. Thompson reminds us, is not a ‘structure’ or a ‘category’. It is not a social position that someone objectively occupies. Rather, it is, he continues, “something which in fact happens (and can be shown to happen) in human relationships”, relationships and which “must always be embodied in real people and in a real context (Thompson 1991: 8): class is a social relation; a relation that is historically and situationally specific and always in process (Beynon 1973; Nichols and Beynon 1977; Nichols 1980).

Such a processual, relational and historically sensitive approach to class is also

⁶ There are of course large and growing bodies of mobile populations whose migration leaves them outside of capital’s labour relations altogether. I am referring here to the millions of refugees who, for the most part, are stuck for extended periods of time in the various ‘refugee camps’ around the world and whose mobility is conventionally conceptualised as being ‘forced’.

⁷ A similar conception of class is elaborated by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their discussion of the *multitude* (Hardt and Negri 2005).

observable in the theory of *class composition*⁸, which emerged from the autonomist movements mentioned above (Cleaver 2000; Kolinko 2002; Wright 2002). As a theory, class composition foregrounds and attempts to understand the antagonism at the heart of the capital-labour relation. It seeks to map the present conditions – or composition – of the working class, taking into consideration the various internal divisions and conflicts between its diverse populations in order to explore both the means through which the “various sectors of the working class, through the circulation of their struggles, “recompose” the relations among them to increase their ability to... achieve their own ends” (Cleaver 2003: 43) and how capital responds to and attempts to manage and “decompose” such movements. Of particular use for my purposes here is the distinction that class composition theorists make between ‘technical’ and ‘political’ composition and the relationship they have with one another. The ‘technical class composition’ refers to current working and living conditions, the mechanisms and forces through which such conditions are organised and how these may differ across particular industries, sectors and populations. The ‘political class composition’ on the other hand refers to the strategies, forms of organising and so on that the working classes use in order to struggle against and transform a particular technical composition. An exploration of such dynamics with respect to the different strata of migrants whose experiences form the basis of this thesis, will provide us with an understanding of both the forces through which their particular working and living conditions are produced and maintained as well as a grasp of the strategies that different migrants develop in order to negotiate, subvert and potentially overcome and transform such conditions. I will return to the political potential of class composition analysis below (see chapter 2).

Other research on migration has also taken the autonomy of migrant movements into consideration. For instance, Rodriguez argues that migration and the communities they create across national borders have become increasingly autonomous from governmental policies arguing that what he calls the “battle for the border” is one that the state will eventually lose (Rodriguez 1996). Echoing such a stance, although admittedly without the speculative dimension, Stephen Castles and Mark Miller in a recent edition of their influential work, state that “international

⁸ As Harry Cleaver notes, this theory has a long and complex history with similar themes also emerging within anarcho-communist and council communist thought. However, it began to be more systematically developed within the Italian autonomist milieu during the 1960s, with this development and application continuing in US and French elaborations through the journals *Zerowork*, *Midnight Notes* and *Futur Antérieur* (Cleaver 2003).

migrations may possess a *relative* autonomy and be impervious to governmental control” (Castles and Miller 2003: 278, my emphasis). Of course, as just discussed, and as the ‘relative’ in the quote above foregrounds, migration does not happen in a vacuum. As such an understanding of the economic, social, political, as well as numerous other contextually specific factors and processes within and through which migration is shaped are important if we are to adequately comprehend the conditions through which the becoming/s of migration are crafted, negotiated and experienced⁹. And equally importantly the specific forms of labour relations and exploitation they encounter due to their differential statuses as migrants. As Theo Nichols reminds us, such questions are crucial if we are to examine such forces and open onto “questions about how men [and women] are exploited, how they fight back, how this effects the techniques of exploitation, how and why power – including labour-power works” (Nichols 1980: 41). In other words, for any political understanding of migration as a form of ‘class struggle’ it is imperative that such issues receive detailed investigation.

Despite the talk of the relative autonomous nature of migration by Castles and Miller (2003) their approach, as with many others (cf. Wills, Datta, Evans, Herbert, May and McIllwaine 2010), still frames the forces driving migration in principally economic terms and as being underpinned by the logic of capital. While, given the hegemony of capital’s synthesis this is in part undoubtedly true, what many of those working with the autonomy of migration perspective have attempted to do is unsettle an *a priori* assumption that economic factors play *the* leading role. Many migrants do indeed employ mobility as a strategy for largely economically motivated reasons and hence move in order to find work that is better paid, or for better living conditions but the impetus and *desire* for mobility cannot be reduced to such factors. Thinking migration from the perspective of its autonomy points to how such desires are always in *excess* of both *macro-* and *micro-*structural processes. While such factors may limit options and act as either constraints or catalysts of mobile trajectories, by pointing to migration’s autonomy, we are able to see how mobility always exceeds such dimensions. In this way the autonomy of migration perspective foregrounds the irreconcilable, and productive tension, between what Vicky Squire refers to as the ‘politics of control’ and the ‘politics of mobility’ (Squire 2011).

⁹ The concept of *becoming* is borrowed from the co-authored work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987). It is important to note that as a concept it doesn’t imply a *telos*. Rather, it points to processuality and transition, to a subject, or better, a singularity in movement. For an interesting Deleuzo-Guattarian inflected reading of the politics of mobility see Papadopoulos and Tsianos (2007).

This *excess* of mobility, then, lies at the heart of the politics of mobility and the various struggles of migrant movements that will be explored during the thesis. As alluded to in the quote from Hardt and Negri's *Empire* with which this chapter began, the history of mobility with respect to capitalism can be read as an incessant and unpredictable succession of events whereby different sectors of the working classes constantly attempted to escape their conditions of existence, exploitation and subordination and capital kept on responding and developing ever newer forms of control and exploitation in order to guarantee its own survival (see Moulier Boutang 1998; Steinfeld 2001; Papadopoulos et al 2008; van der Linden 2008). On the one hand then we have the constituted power of capital, which, through the state and other apparatuses of capture, attempts to tame labour's excess of mobility and subordinate it to its command, in order to better exploit it. And on the other hand, living labour's excess of mobility is continuously transformed into new material conditions, practices and forms of life through which escape and justice are actualised. Through a foregrounding of the excess that lies at the heart of this tension we are able to see how migrant movements push at the limits of regimes of control, opening up new lines of flight for mobile populations.

During the course of this thesis, I will focus on the situated experiences of migrants and explore how they work with and sometimes transform the material conditions they move through and in the process may open up new potentials for themselves. I will be concerned with examining how such forms of life and trajectories of escape are sustained. What practices do migrants develop in order to become and remain mobile? The short answer to this question, an investigation of which will occupy considerable space in the thesis, is through care: *Care is a precondition for mobility*. Of course, 'acts of care' are bound up with a whole host of strategies and practices that migrants mobilise, draw on and develop in order to actualise and sustain mobility. At various points during the thesis (see especially chapter 5, as well as sections 3.6.2 and 4.5) I draw on and develop the concept of the 'mobile commons' (Papadopoulos and Tsianos forthcoming) in order to highlight how affective relations and the networks of care they create are a key component of the practices of commoning that migrants create and develop and are essential in enabling them to connect with the broader dimensions of such commons – which are composed of an ever changing array of knowledges, material resources and so on – which migrants utilise in order to become and remain mobile. Below (section 1.3) I will examine the

literature on transnationalism and related literature that have focused on the various networks that migrants craft and connect with in order to flesh out my assertion regarding the importance of both an ethos and practices of care in enabling mobility. Before this however, I will in the next section unpack more fully what it is we are talking about when referring to ‘care’. This will involve exploring the field of care in more detail and in particular the struggles over the division of such labour and the effects this has on how the field of care is organised before turning in section 1.3 to the place that migration plays in such processes.

1.2 The politics of care¹⁰

Over the past thirty years or so, the issue of care has come to occupy an increasingly prominent place within feminist thought. Discussions of care have cut across disciplinary boundaries and foci, with care being utilised, debated and explored within areas as diverse as moral and political philosophy (Held 1993, 2006; Tronto 1993); developmental psychology (Gilligan 1982); geography (Lawson 2009); science and technology studies (Mol 2008; Puig de la Bellacasa 2011); international relations (Robinson 1999); social policy (Dalley 1996; Williams 2001); ecofeminist (Shiva and Mies 1993) as well as numerous others. An important precursor to these debates of particular relevance to many of the ideas that I that will be developed during the thesis (especially chapter 6) came from the autonomous feminists associated with the political campaign “wages for housework”¹¹, which was a significant force within wider discussions and disputes concerning the *gendered division of labour*, the role of housework and reproductive labour – of which caring labour is a vital element – more broadly within the circuits of capitalist accumulation, and the place of the ‘women’s question’ within radical social struggles (e.g. Dalla Costa and James 1975; Malos 1982; Cox and Federici 1975; Federici 1980; Fortunati 1995; James 1975).

These activist-theorists challenged the Marxist orthodoxy that, since Marx,

¹⁰ As well as the works cited in this section, my thinking in relation to care, understandings of the dynamics of caring and the potentials that the *doings* of caring offers, have been particularly influenced by the work of the Spanish based feminist ‘activist-research’ collective *Precarias a la Derive* as well as that of the work of Maria Puig de la Bellacasa and the debates that have emerged from within the nextgeneration network (see www.nextgeneration.net). The notion of ‘activist-research’ will be delineated and discussed in more detail in chapter 2.

¹¹ It is important to note that this campaign was not primarily about getting paid for housework, but rather about generating conflict around the issue of housework and domestic labour and finding means of struggling against and liberating women from capitalist-patriarchy’s division of labour and the modes of exploitation and domination entangled within such a social order.

held that the unpaid care and domestic work, traditionally carried out by women in the domestic sphere, was a “natural” and hence “freely appropriated” form of labour and as such did not constitute properly “productive labour” (Marx 1973, 1977).

Reproductive labour of this sort was seen as being merely involved in creating “use values” and hence was not involved in the production of “surplus-value”. Given its unwaged status it was assumed that such labour somehow occurred outside the workings of capitalism and was therefore of no, or at best marginal, relevance to class struggle. Contrary to this perspective, autonomous feminists argued that the creation of surplus value does not only occur through the production of commodities but also through the work – commonly performed by women – necessary for the production and reproduction of “the most precious product ... on the capitalist market: labour power” (Cox and Federici 1975: 4). That is through reproductive labour¹². The division and hierarchical relationship between waged and unwaged work was seen as a key means through which the exploitation of the work of women (and other labour more generally whether waged or unwaged) was organised, with this being “even more effective because the lack of a wage hid it” (Dalla Costa and James 1975: 28)¹³.

Such arguments have had a significant impact within many social movements and have led to major changes in terms of the conceptions of social struggle with which the majority of the radical left has, since the birth of syndicalism and organised labour, operated (cf. Caffentzis 1999). Prior to this the primary site of class conflict was seen as the factory, with the wage labourer as the antagonistic political subjectivity that emerges from within such relations. It was the (male) wage labourer that was figured as the protagonist, as the historical subject, that would bring about radical transformation and (in time) the end of capitalist relations. All other strata of the working class were viewed as being of marginal significance for such processes. But if domestic and caring labour – and unwaged work more broadly – is also intertwined within capital’s productive circuitry then struggles on these terrains become important aspects of class struggle. As Steven Shukaitis succinctly points out:

[b]y demanding that housework and caring work be recognized as work, that

¹² This is of course a highly controversial topic and one that space does not allow me to explore further here. However, regardless of the theoretical validity of whether such labour is in fact productive of surplus value as conventionally conceived, what these arguments point to is that caring, reproductive and unwaged labour more generally are important forces within the productive circuitry of capital.

¹³ Indeed, many on the ‘left’ have long argued that a principle way in which the capitalist-state operates is through division and fragmentation.

labor takes place not just in the physically bounded workplace, but also exists all through the tasks of social reproduction and community life, autonomous feminism opened a space for reconsidering many of the concepts and tactical baggage that had been held on to [by the left] (Shukaitis 2009: 149).

The rendering visible of domestic and caring labour has then played a fundamental role in struggles against the gender division of labour, women's oppression as well as wider class struggle. This, as Massimo De Angelis argues, draws attention to the fact that as well as the reproduction of labour power, such sites and practices also maintain and develop ways of being together *beyond* and *against* capital (De Angelis 2007). As with the conceptualisation of mobility set out above, the modes of sociality and caring that emerge from within kin, friendship and the various other networks and relationalities coproduced and crafted during 'our' day to day lives are from this vantage point always in *excess* of capital's apparatus of capture and therefore can not be reduced to it¹⁴. Such relations are generative of an "excess of sociability" (Tsianos and Papadopoulos 2006) that, as I shall discuss in more detail at various points during the thesis (see especially chapters 5 and 6), are instrumental in crafting and maintaining the *forms of life* that enable living labour to transform the material conditions of their existence, open up new potentials for themselves, and in so doing subvert and escape capital's control. Care is vital in opening up "lines of flight" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987): care is a precondition for escape.

From this perspective, care is not just something that needs to be struggled *against* but also struggled *for*¹⁵. That is, struggled against in terms of how care – whether waged or unwaged – is valued and managed within patriarchal capitalist society, while struggled for, in terms of the caring relations and networks developed –

¹⁴ Of course, this does not mean that capital does not capture care at all. As has already been discussed, care as an integral element of 'domestic labour' is rendered productive by capital and as will be highlighted below 'acts of care' are put to work (captured) by capital in numerous other ways, with care homes (see chapter 3) being a prime example of such processes. The thesis will also highlight how the caring relations through which migrants become and sustain their mobility are also arguably appropriated by capital even while paradoxically they are a central means through which migrants are able to escape state border controls, particular employment relations and forms of exploitation (see chapter 5). Furthermore, caring relations such as friendship have in recent years become increasingly commodified as the proliferation of dating sites attests. What I am pointing to here is that despite such processes the various *doings* that caring relations are built from always remain, to a large degree, beyond capital's logic.

¹⁵ The arguments developed here borrow extensively from John Holloway's conception of the pervasiveness of struggle and conflict, which he sums up nicely in the arguments that 'we' exist both *within-and-against* capital, with capital being "nothing other than the *product* of the working class" (Holloway 1995: 163).

with friends, family, ‘strangers’ – as part of people’s daily lives. The struggle against the way caring labour is socially organised and valued under capitalism is also a struggle for a more caring world. A world, which arguably is already here. A world that develops and is sustained through cooperatively crafted caring relations and networks. A mobile commons.

The discussion so far points to the ambivalent place that care and caring occupy within feminist thought and practice. On the one hand feminists have pointed to capitalist-patriarchy’s gendered division of caring, and reproductive labour more broadly, and the detrimental effects this can have on women, as well as for wider libertarian struggles. While on the other hand ‘acts of care’ are seen as central in the creation and sustenance of forms of life through which struggles against exploitation and domination are nurtured and developed (cf. Federici 2010).

But what exactly do we mean when talking about care and caring? What kinds of doings does caring refer to? As alluded to at the beginning of this section, what constitutes caring and its significance for social organisation, the complexities of people’s relations and forms of sociality and the dynamics of power that interweave these, has given rise to a variety of conflicting perspectives, definitions, understandings and meanings. This is perhaps not surprising of a topic that as Fine (2007: 24) points out, “is at once profound and deeply philosophical, and at the same time experienced as a basic everyday activity and a common attitude concerning all manner of things that people value”.

An important conceptual distinction that runs through much of the feminist analyses on care is that between care as a *doing*, as a set of practices involved in the material provisioning of care – both corporeal and affective – that, as will be discussed more fully shortly, are best thought as intertwined and perhaps inseparable (cf. Twigg 2000; Wolkowitz 2006; Wolkowitz and Warhurst 2010), and care as an *ethical disposition*. Such a position is apparent in the distinction between *caring about* and *caring for* that emerges from the work of Hilary Graham (1983), which as Fine (2007) points out, is one to which the vast majority of the research on care that has followed has referred. While these are closely related, they are not, according to Graham, synonymous. *Caring about* denotes the concern we feel for another, whether this is acted upon or not. Thus, it is possible for us to care about the wellbeing of a neighbour or relative, while not necessarily engaging in actual direct acts of care with them. *Caring for*, on the other hand, is used to refer to all those acts that make up the

complex dynamics that supporting, nurturing, developing, tending and sustaining another involves.

Although Graham's work points to both the embodied dimension of caring and the often hard physical labour that this entails, as well as foregrounding the affective labour that caring encounters comprise, the interrelationship between the two is not fully drawn out in her work. Indeed, the embodied aspect of caring is an issue that has overall received scant attention in the extant literature. Furthermore, those who have focused on such issues have pointed out that as well as its embodied character, what is generally referred to as care work, is in large part concerned with 'body work' (Gubrium 1975; Twigg 2000; Wolkowitz 2002), that is tending to the physical needs of another. Such labour often involves a high degree of intimacy with another person: washing, cleaning, toileting and so on. It is these aspects of care, that Twigg (2000) argues, have led to care as paid work being frequently denigrated as 'dirty work' (cf. Anderson 2000; Jervis 2001). Twigg points to the 'schizophrenic' orientations that can be exhibited towards care, in that it is also lauded as a 'special' kind of work, involving supreme virtues of 'love' and selfless devotion (cf. Graham 1983). The perception of care work as 'dirty work' goes some way to accounting for its extremely socially and financially devalued status. However, according to a number of writers, is also attributable to the fact that it is perceived as being unskilled and not requiring any special qualifications or proficiencies, because despite the major advances made by the feminist movement, care is still generally seen as something that women are 'naturally' socialised to perform (e.g. England 2005; Schultz 2006).

Another significant contribution to the understanding of caring that emerged from within the 'ethics of care'¹⁶ debate, which has, amongst other things, foregrounded the centrality of care to social life, and attempted to explore some of the ethico-political possibilities that 'thinking with care' (Puig de la Bellacasa forthcoming) might offer, is Joan Tronto and Bernice Fischer's oft cited characterisation of care and caring as:

a species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our 'world' so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies,

¹⁶ In fact, this important body of work has for the most part tended to be referred to in the singular as an 'ethic of care'. Here I follow Held (2006) in pluralising the term in order to underline the contested, dialogic, and ongoing quality of the debates that has been, and indeed, continues to be, carried out utilising this notion.

our selves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web (Tronto 1993: 103 emphasis in original).

While I partially agree with Peta Bowden (Bowden 1997) when she argues that such a definition is undermined by its universal quality, in that it fails to grasp and account for the situationally and relationally specific ways that practices of caring differ, this broadness is also, to my eye, one of its major strengths. The generic quality of Tronto and Fischer's definition draws our attention to the ubiquitous quality of care. In so doing, it highlights how as an array of practices, caring cannot be limited to those relations that are conventionally conceived as being ones where care is, or should be, present, such as for instance that between mother-child, or between nurse-patient. The pervasiveness of caring, also points, as Puig de la Bellacasa (2011) reminds us, to the crucial ethico-political matter that care is something none of us can do without, despite the deepening tendency to elevate the capacity to be autonomous, self-sufficient, independent, self-sustaining beings above our mutual interdependence (López Gil 2007). Of course, we need to be careful of overdetermining the role of care, or seeing its salience where there is none. But the foregrounding of those seemingly inconsequential, mundane acts, the "petty things" (Puig de la Bellacasa 2011) that daily life is composed of as being of vital importance to the sustainability of life, is of major significance to the ideas and perspectives that I will develop in this thesis: that caring constitutes the affective glue through which the forms of life that sustain our existence are woven together. Caring is indispensable for the flourishing of life.

I am however, more persuaded by Bowden's argument that the majority of the more philosophical work carried out on caring, especially that of the 'ethics of care' debate, which she is for the most part dismissive of, has been conducted at an overly abstract, theoretical level. In order to understand the nuances of the dynamics of caring and to achieve a more thoroughgoing grasp on how different caring relations actually work, she argues, that analysis needs to be grounded in actual concrete examples and should take into consideration the situational specificity and diversity of forms that different caring relations and practices exhibit. Thus, the caring relations between family members may differ considerably from those between friends, between paid and unpaid care, formal and informal care provision and so on.

The need for such sensitivity to the different ways in which care matters and

the different forces that shape how care materialises will become clear during the thesis: as I explore the different experiences and forms of care provided by migrants who perform care as paid labour, as well as the caring relations and forms of cooperation they develop with one another in order to sustain each other during the often long and exhausting workdays (chapter 3); or, as I investigate and map out the various networks of caring relations and forms of social cooperation that different strata of migrants compose and move through at various points along the radically divergent mobile routes that together they collectively create (chapter 5); and indeed, as I will discuss in more detail shortly, we also need to be attuned to the effects that lack of care and the potential denial or limiting of access to even the most basic subsistence provision can have on people's lived experiences and abilities to sustain themselves (see particularly chapter 4 as well as aspects of chapter 3).

Before moving on to the 'politics of mobility' and an examination of the ways in which migrant movements intersects with the field of care, I want to return to some of the longer term effects of the women's liberation struggles with which I opened this section. In conjunction (although not necessarily in a coordinated fashion) with the various other local and global social movements of the working classes and 'new social movements'¹⁷ of the 1960 and 1970s, these struggles had profound transformative effects on the ways the field of care and wider social processes with which it is entangled are organised. These 'movements from below' were (along with many other factors of course) instrumental in bringing about the economic crisis of the early 1970, which provoked a radical counterattack 'from above', consisting in a far reaching global program of re-structuring: neoliberalism. As well as capital flight and the violent so-called 'primitive accumulation' of the 'new enclosures' enacted through structural adjustment programs that drew 'peripheral' countries and their populations more fully into capital's networks of accumulation (usually referred to as globalisation), the neoliberal project also involved the dismantling, albeit unevenly in different locales and nation-states, of the Fordist-Keynesian model of economic and social planning and the welfare state provisions and social protections that had emerged as part of the post-war¹⁸ social compromise in North Atlantic countries (cf.

¹⁷ These include: the anti-nuclear and peace movements, decolonisation movements, civil rights movements, indigenous peoples movements, students movements, countercultural movements and so on (see Chesters and Welsh 2011, for a useful introduction to some of the key issues related to social movements).

¹⁸ Unless indicated otherwise this and subsequent references to 'post-war' refer to World War II.

Midnight Notes 1990; De Angelis 2008; Dalla Costa 2008; Federici 1999)¹⁹.

With manufacturing and industrial production relocated and increasingly taking place in the global South, North Atlantic countries witnessed a significant rise in forms of paid labour within the ‘service industry’²⁰. With respect to the field of care, many of the functions that had previously been provided through the state and administered by statutory bodies, such as local authorities, became increasingly marketised and subsumed within capitals logic, with “the structures of public assistance and distribution, which were constructed through public funds... being privatised and expropriated for private gain” (Hardt and Negri 2000: 301). Of particular relevance to the concerns of the thesis, given the later focus on migrants working in care homes and the labour process within such institutions, care homes acted as a vanguard for processes of privatisation within the field of care in the UK (cf. McGregor 2007). The period between the mid 1970s and mid 1980s witnessed a doubling of residents in such institutions²¹, a trend that, through its institutionalisation brought about through various social policy interventions, has continued to this day.

Many of the jobs within the social care and wider service industry were, and continue to be, filled by women who, driven by the desire for emancipation from the drudgery of housework and the increased self-determination that this promised, although often in large part by economic necessity, increasingly opted to enter the paid labour market. In many cases the entry of women into such relations has merely meant that they now have had to carry out the ‘double burden’ of both paid labour, while continuing to perform the lions share of unpaid reproductive activities in the form of domestic and caring labour (Hochschild 1997; Hochschild and Machung 1997). However, it has also led to the emergence of ‘market solutions’ to deal with the fact that women were less willing and able to perform the reproductive tasks that they had previously undertaken. As various writers have pointed out, it is often women, or populations from lower down the class-hierarchy – particularly migrants and women

¹⁹ It is important to note that these transformations have encountered substantial struggle from both within the global North and South. Struggles which have achieved considerable successes and which through various incarnations have continued to develop to this day (Midnight Notes and friends 2009).

²⁰ Again, we must be mindful of the fact that such trends are not uni-linear and are experienced unevenly across different countries. While all North Atlantic countries witnessed a decline in manufacturing industries, countries such as Germany and Japan continued to have higher levels of such work than for instance the UK and the USA. See Castells (1997) for an overview of how these trends have unfolded differently in various European countries as well as in the US, Canada and Japan.

²¹ In 1974 there were 43,000 residents in private care homes, by 1984 there were 82,000. The private sector now accounts for over two-thirds of the available places in care homes in the UK.

from ‘established’ ethnic minority communities – who have increasingly come to perform such labour (Anderson 2000; Sassen 2000; Williams 2011). The questions of who cares, for whom, where and under what conditions, are of central importance to my concerns here. It is to these, as well as wider issue relating to migrant movements, that I now turn.

1.3 The politics of mobility

Since their emergence in the post-war period, the labour of both recently arrived and more long-term migrant populations has been an essential, although for the most part invisible and unrecognised, element in the construction and maintenance of welfare regimes and the provision of both formal and informal care across North Atlantic countries (Kofman, Phizacklea Rughuram and Sales 2000; Sales 2007). In Europe, at the beginning of this period, the majority of such migrants came from neighbouring countries or ones that were fairly close, with the exception of the post-colonial countries, which also drew substantially on migrants from former colonies (Schierup, Hansen and Castles 2006). In the UK for example, the viability and continuation of the National Health Service (NHS) was highly dependent on nurses who had migrated from such countries, especially African-Caribbean and Irish women (Hardill and MacDonald 2000; Yeates 2009; Williams 1995). However, as with other sectors of the labour market, the growth of the care industry over the previous three decades has been accompanied by a significant increase in migrant labour and although colonial ties still account for many of these, there has been a significant diversification in terms of where in the world such migrants move from (Kofman et al 2000).

The processes of planetary integration outlined above, which has deepened connections on a number of terrains – from the economic, cultural, political and semiotic – has led to the emergence of a *globalised division of labour*, or what is more commonly referred to as the ‘new international division of labour’. While, as Yeates (2009) points out, the majority of analyses have tended to focus attention on the sphere of ‘production’ there has also been a significant body of work that has sought to highlight how such processes have been accompanied by parallel processes in the sphere of reproduction, with such labour also taking on an increasingly globalised dimension (Anderson 2000; Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003; Federici 1999; Mies 1986; Parreñas 2001; Yeates 2009; Williams 2011). Indeed, according to Sassen (2000)

the restructuring of social reproduction, both paid and unpaid, which the care industry is but one element of, is *the* driving force underpinning economic globalisation.

With respect to the place of migrants in such processes, the bulk of the analyses of the care industry have tended to focus on the growing prevalence of migrant labour performing caring and other reproductive labour in private domestic settings (Anderson 1997, 2003, 2009; Ehrenreich 2003; Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2007; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001, 2003; Litt and Zimmerman 2003; Parreñas 2001). This important body of work has pointed to the gendered and racialised composition of such labour. While this is undoubtedly true with the majority of such labour being carried out by migrant women coming from outside Anglo-European countries, there is also a growing tendency for care work in Western European countries to be provided by migrants from Eastern Europe (Morokvasic 2004; Hess and Puckhaber 2004). Pointing again to the increasing heterogeneity of the compositions of migrant movements, these studies have largely explored the forms of exploitation that these migrant women experience under such (predominantly) informal working conditions. These have highlighted how such relations are mediated through, amongst other things, the different residential statuses of migrants, and hence their differential relations with the state, as well as the wider implication that such migration has on the families and wider societies of such migrants (cf. Erel 2002 cited in Sales 2007; Parreñas 2003, 2005a). Furthermore, such migrants do not only 'flow' to North Atlantic countries. Various studies have drawn attention to the increasing frequency of intra-regional migration of women within the global South, as well as to Middle Eastern countries, with also a growing number of east Africans taking on such work (e.g. Constable 2007; Chang and Ling 2000; Cheng 2003; Lan 2006; Williams 2003, 2011).

Despite the principal focus on domestic labour under largely unregulated and informal working conditions, a number of studies have pointed to the wider involvement of migrant labour, particularly women, in the more formal 'skilled' sectors of the care industry, particularly in the UK (e.g. Kofman and Raghuram 2005; Sales 2007). These have highlighted that as well as the continued reliance on migrant nurses in the UK, there is also a large use of skilled migrant labour in other domains of the formal care industry, such as social work as well as in care homes for elderly people (Cangiano, Shutes, Spencer and Leeson 2009; McGregor 2007; Moriarty,

Manthorpe, Hussein and Cornes 2008). However, for the most part there has been a dearth of such studies. As well as the need to augment those that do exist, Yeates (2009) has pointed out that while the majority of migrant labour in the care industry continues to be carried out by women, given the recent growth of male migrants beginning to take up such employment, research needs to take such gender, as well as other demographic factors, more fully into consideration.

Over the past twenty years the concept of transnationalism has emerged as an important lens through which to think through and map out the issues of mobility, migrant movements, the strategies and practices migrants create and the social relations they must manage in order to become and remain mobile. Although the literature represents a number of divergent approaches it does share a range of perspectives in common. There is a strong tendency in such work to explore migrant movements ‘from below’ – that is from the situated perspectives of migrants themselves – which chimes with the work carried out from the ‘autonomy of migration’ perspective. More importantly however, a number of key themes and foci have emerged from within the literature on migrant transnationalism, many of which shed light on the issues and processes relevant to my concerns during the thesis.

To begin with, while there is still a tendency in such research to foreground the structural features that increase the likelihood of people leaving a country, or which draw people to a given country, for instance for work, like the ‘autonomy of migration’ perspective, mobility is conceptualised as a *purposive strategy* that migrants utilise in order to open up new possibilities for themselves, their families, wider kin networks and so on. Although there is an understanding that migrants are not totally disconnected from local constraints and moorings, for the most part they are not rendered as victims of transnational forces acting on them from above. Instead, as with the perspective developed here, migrants are figured as *active agents* within these processes, who, through their mobility and other social practices, actively forge transnational networks from below (Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Drainville 1998; George 2000; Ong 1999).

The perspective of transnationalism has thoroughly problematised the classical assimilationist conceptions and their unidirectional orientations towards migration (Basch, Glick-Schiller and Blanc 1994; Morokvasic 2004). As Hess (2005: 229) points out “[t]he transnationalization of migration research is an overdue act of scientific myth-breaking, as even the migration projects of former migrants, the so-called guest

workers who went to Germany in the 1960s and 1970s, did not follow the imperative of integration of the receiving countries, but kept their ties with their home countries". Migration is not, and for the most part never has been, reducible to a linear movement from point A to B, whereby memories and connections with A eventually recede into the mists of time once migrants have become integrated and properly embedded within their new homes of B. Rather, as Hess' comment and various other works from a transnational perspective have highlighted, migrants create and maintain a multiplicity of economic, social, political and personal connections both with their countries of origin, as well as those they have migrated to, or are in transit through. Such 'transnational ties' (Smith and Eade 2008), which span two or more countries, are a key means through which migrants become and sustain their mobility, with the possibilities and ease with which such connectivity can be made augmented through new forms of communication technology as well as cheaper and more readily available forms of transportation (Horst 2006; Panagakos and Horst 2006; Vertovec 1999, 2009).

The literature on the transnational activities and practices of migrants encompasses a diverse array of foci. For instance, a considerable amount of work has focused on the issue of identity and how such connections enabled migrants to maintain a sense of belonging across the borders demarcating different nation-states (e.g. Basch, Schiller and Blanc 1994; Glick-Schiller 1997; Portes 1999) while other work, which I draw on more during the thesis, highlighted the importance of families, different forms of kinship, friendships as well as other kinds of connections and the complex networks of caring relations that migrants form and through which migrant trajectories are shaped (e.g. Boyd 1989; Bryceson and Vuorela 2002; Sinatti 2008; Goulbourne, Reynolds, Solomos and Zitoni 2010; Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Yeoh, Huang and Lam 2005). Although, as Parreñas (2003) points out, transnationalised family structures are not in themselves a new phenomenon, what has changed in recent years is both the intensity of such movements and formations as well as the number of women who are at their heart. It also needs to be pointed out that despite the importance of these networks in enabling and sustaining mobility, these studies have also highlighted how migrant trajectories do not merely follow the routes beaten by family members or compatriots, but often open up new pathways and in so doing forge new routes and lines of flight.

An important area of such work that has begun to receive increased attention

is that focused on the ‘transnational family’ (Goulbourne et al 2010). This work challenges the image of the rational cost-benefit calculating individual so beloved of the neoclassic economic perspective on migration (see Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino and Taylor 2006, for a overview of this approach) as being the central protagonist of migratory movements, pointing instead to the importance of the ‘household’ and wider familial networks as a key decision making locus, driving migratory projects, their trajectories, duration and so on. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the desire to become mobile can be driven by a variety of factors from the wish for education, knowledge and skills acquisition to simply the desire for adventure (cf. Benmayor and Skotnes 2004). As such, although labour and the forms of exploitation that different strata of mobile populations encounter remains of central importance to an understanding of the experiences of migrants (see chapter 3), as pointed out above, such movements while in part conditioned by economic forces cannot be reduced to them.

In terms of care there has been a tendency for those working from the perspective of transnationalism to focus on how child or elderly care is managed. This has led to the elaboration of a number of important concepts. One of the earliest of these was Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila’s notion of ‘transnational motherhood’, where they discuss the strategies migrant women employ in order to engage in caring relations with their children who have remained behind (Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997). Discussing similar processes Parreñas (2001) refers to such forms of sociality as ‘care at a distance’. Another important concept that has emerged to explore similar processes is Arlie Hochschild’s ‘global care chains’²² which was developed in order to better understand the “series of personal links between people across the globe based on the paid or unpaid work of caring” (Hochschild 2000: 131). As with literature just mentioned above, Hochschild’s focus was on the transnationalisation of caring labour, the role that migrant women play in such provision, and the wider networks of care that are drawn on in order for this to happen. A common ‘global care chain’ then might involve:

- (1) an older daughter from a poor family who cares for her siblings while (2) her mother works as a nanny caring for the children of a migrating nanny who, in turn (3) cares for the child of a family in a rich country (Hochschild

²² See the series of important works by Nicola Yeates which have usefully critiqued and substantially extended the concept and its theoretical and analytic value (Yeates 2004a, b, 2005; 2009).

2000: 131).

The focus on such issues is undoubtedly of paramount importance; particularly give the continued role of women as primary carers. Indeed it occupies a considerable amount of space during this thesis (chapter 5). However, as discussed above, caring spans a far more diverse set of relations and forms of sociality than that between mother-child and indeed family members. As such, in order to understand the centrality of care for the making of mobility and the different ways in which care matters for different migrant movements such relations and how they operate need to be drawn more deeply into our analyses.

There is however, as Sandro Mezzadra cautions, a need to be mindful of uncritically utilising referents such as family and community networks (Mezzadra 2011). It is clear from the discussion so far, and as I will discuss in more detail in due course (see chapter 5), migrants undoubtedly utilise such networks in order to become and remain mobile, however, people (most often women but men as well) also often migrate precisely to escape the patriarchal and heteronormative control that such formations can often exert (cf. Parreñas 2001; Goulbourne et al 2010; see also chapter 5 below). Furthermore, care is, as numerous feminists have pointed out over the years, more often than not a 'responsibility' or 'obligation' that falls squarely on the shoulders of women. In this way families and the gendered responsibilities they place unevenly on women can at times curtail the ability to become mobile. Despite these problematic aspects, the work on transnationalism when brought into conjunction with the autonomy of migration perspective provides us with important tools through which to think the connections between migrant movements, caring and subversion. A point I shall return to and develop in the thesis' conclusion when I consider the political implication of thinking mobility through care. Next I will flesh out and explore the connection between care and control as it relates to the field of mobility.

1.4 Care and the regulation of mobility

So far I have approached care as a form of *sociality*, as a *doing* and *ethical disposition* and examined the importance of caring relations in enabling and sustaining mobility. I have also discussed how formalised care services that form part of the welfare state are organised and the increasingly important place that migrants play within such a

division of labour. In this section the focus changes slightly. Here I trace how the state came to administer those aspects of care that fall under the umbrella of the welfare state (including financial assistance of various kinds, housing benefits and more direct forms of care that enable people to reproduce themselves, such as healthcare, childcare assistance, counselling and so on) and how denying or limiting access to such resources and services can shape particular working and living conditions for certain strata of migrants and hence can be utilised as mechanisms for the regulation of mobility. I also consider the changing institutional composition of what I will refer to as the *regime of mobility control* and the increased involvement of Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) within such arrangements and question whether this has any implications for the operations of such bodies and the kinds of services and care they provide.

The relationship between the ‘field of care’ and mobility control has a long and enduring history. State managed social assistance, embodied in the contemporary welfare regimes of the nation-states of the global North can be traced to the violent, turbulent and prolonged shift from feudalism to capitalism. It was during this period that emergent state-forms across the territory that is now referred to as Europe, began experimenting (in different, yet comparable ways) with public assistance as regulatory mechanisms (O’Brien 2000)²³. The feudal system of production and control relied on the sedentary nature of the population. Peasants had to be tied to the land in order to extract their productive energies and mobility was viewed as a severe threat to this order. As early as the twelfth century the ruling elites of the time began enacting laws designed to control mobility. For instance, in England the Statute of Labourers of 1351, reinforced by the Poor Law Act of 1388, tried to fix wages to their pre-plague days of 1325 with legislation in the years immediately following this designed to control mobility which was seen as a key element in the bargaining power of the poor (Charlton 2000). Workers who had left their place of work were forbidden from

²³ We need to be mindful here, as Silvia Federici points out in her wonderful and path breaking examination of this period, that the exact aims of such programs are still debated. However, here I follow Yann Moulier Boutang who insists that its principle objective was “The Great Fixation” of the proletariat: in other words the attempt to prevent the flight of labour (Federici 2004; Moulier Boutang 1998). Even outside such contentions, the implementation of state managed assistance was the first recognition that capitalist relations could not be sustained through hunger and terror alone. It was also as Federici notes “the first step in the reconstruction of the state as guarantor of class relations and as the primary supervisor of the reproduction and disciplining of the work-force” which was of primary importance in that it also “enabled the ruling class and employers to relinquish any responsibility for the reproduction of workers, in the certainty that the state would intervene, either with the carrot or with the stick, to address the inevitable crisis” (Federici 2004: 84).

working anywhere else and in some cases absconding from work was punishable by a prison sentence (Papadopoulos et al 2008).

In many places across Europe over the next few centuries further laws were implemented designed to control mobility and block forms of solidarity amongst the poor. For instance, in Augsburg Germany, permission to beg was only permitted for those who were sick and infirm, with begging outside of one's home town strictly forbidden (Geremek 1994). Similar laws were also imposed in other areas, but disciplinary measures alone began to be seen as unsustainable and as such many localities augmented this with relief for the poor, punishment and relief of the poor began to go hand in hand (Piven and Cloward 1993; Federici 2004). In England, up until the 15th Century, what little formal public assistance provision that existed, had come mainly from the church, through Monastic infirmary almshouses. However, in 1536 Henry the VIII began to expropriate and dissolve the monasteries and relief of the poor became increasingly controlled by the state. Over time public assistance became a key components of an array of solutions that the emerging nation-state implemented in order to capture, tame, channel and transform the various subversive forces that were refusing the existing order and threatening the basis of its rule.

From the outset then the state's foray into public assistance administration was a *response* by the ruling elites across Europe to the peasants' refusal of the feudal order. Symptomatic of this refusal were the escaping subjectivities that came to be defined through the figure of the vagabond. Following its initial usage in the late middle ages, the term vagabondage became progressively broadened until it came to refer to any kind of uncontrollable, undesirable form of mobility or nomadism (Papadopoulos et al 2008; see also Slack 1988a, 1988b; Geremek 1994). The attempts of the ruling elites by means of the growing reach of the state to territorialise mobile populations through social assistance mechanisms reached its zenith during this period with the institution of the workhouse (Federici 2004; Foucault 1977; Ignatieff 1978). As Anderson, Sharma and Wright (2008: 10) point out the criminalisation of "people's mobility and denying access to resources, services, and rights to those deemed to be illegally migrating and residing in a place was an important part of how the modern proletariat was formed". Such mechanisms were a key means through which those designated as vagabonds were coerced into accepting waged labour. As such, formal state public assistance played a significant role in the production of certain subjectivities and the wider transformational processes and constitution of the 'social

order' that emerged.

Over the coming centuries 'the state' enacted a variety of laws that connected social assistance with having being resident in a given locale for a specified (and usually extended) period of time; Laws that in one way or another have continued until the present period²⁴. A key occurrence in terms of the emergence of the control of mobility across national boundaries came with the passing of the 1834 Poor Law Amendments Act, which meant that central government took a progressively prominent role in welfare, initially in its administration and latterly in terms of its financing (Driver 1993). While, it was through the central governmental apparatus of the state that the various laws relating to welfare and the internal migration of the poor were enacted, it was local structures in the form of the civil parish that were responsible for their implementation. With central government in charge of resource allocation the question of what welfare assistance overseas migrants were entitled to increasingly became scrutinised (Feldman 2003).

That said, migration controls as we know them today – that is, as both an attempt to control population flows *into* a given nation-state territory, as well as in terms of devices productive of certain working and living conditions once in a territory – are a distinctly twentieth century phenomenon²⁵, at least in the UK. It was not until this time and the passing of the 1905 *Aliens Act* that the first *systematic* controls on *immigration* came into being (S. Cohen 2002a, 2005; Hayes 2004)²⁶. The *Aliens Act* was the result of a considerable amount of racist agitation, both from the right and left (in the form of certain elements of the labour movement) of the political spectrum, aimed against Jewish migrants escaping anti-Semitic pogroms in Tsarist Russia. In terms of the policy mechanisms of the 1905 *Act* poverty tests were

²⁴ For a more general analysis of the ways in which 'social assistance' has been used to regulate labour, focusing particularly on the North American context, see the important work of Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward (1993).

²⁵ While mobility controls across nation-state boundaries, as well as other methods of population management, such as deportation, have existed since the time of William the Conqueror, these have been largely ad hoc in terms of their implementation and have emerged and disappeared, for extended periods of time, sometimes centuries, depending on the political climate of the day (cf. R. Cohen 2006). Furthermore, as Anderson, Sharma and Wright (2008) citing Torpey (2002) point out, early passports were more concerned with regulating the movement of people *out of* rather than *into* a given territory.

²⁶ Much of the information and argumentative thrust of the subsequent paragraphs, as well as the analyses developed in Chapter 4 below, owes a considerable debt to the important work of the late Steve Cohen who wrote extensively on the interrelationship between migration controls and welfare controls and was an important figure in the emergence and development of the group 'No one is illegal' in the UK, which continues to mobilise around the issues of freedom of movement and the rights of migrants. For an important paper that provides a very useful historical analysis of the relationship between welfare and mobility controls exploring both internal migrants and those crossing national borders see David Feldman (2003).

instituted, whereby migrants who could not demonstrate that they had adequate funds or were in a position to find the means of supporting themselves or dependents could be refused entry or deported. Welfare was also central in terms of the justification for the 1905 *Act*, and indeed has remained so for *all* subsequent justifications for calls for controls on *immigration*, with the pre-1905 agitation mobilising the issue of housing shortages, holding Jewish migrants responsible for overcrowding (S. Cohen 2003).

Significantly, the 1905 *Act* became operative during the same period that huge welfare reforms were instituted. The two major legislative mechanisms during this period – the 1908 *Old Age Pensions Act* and the 1911 *National Insurance Act* – which are seen by a number of commentators (e.g. Daly and Lewis 2000; Fraser 1984; Hill 1993) as being the precursors to and hence ushering in the contemporary welfare state both connected the entitlements that this legislation enshrined with that of residency and nationality status. However, while the 1908 *Old Age Pensions Act* excluded both ‘aliens’ and the British wives of ‘aliens’ from state old aged pensions, a campaign from the Jewish benefits societies led to the formation of a cross-party coalition of members of parliament who were able to win large concessions for ‘aliens’ with respect to the national insurance scheme, despite Lloyd George originally planning to exclude ‘aliens’ from the legislation (Feldman 2003). As Feldman points out:

[t]his new pattern of state provision was further developed in the inter-war years as contributory old age pensions, unemployment insurance and unemployment assistance outside of the poor law were introduced; each of these was a major and new source of support, and all were extended to immigrants (Feldman 2003: 96).

While at the level of central governmental policy this trend was one whereby welfare provision would make “no distinction on the ground of nationality”, it seems that throughout the interwar and the post WWII period there is evidence that in terms of implementation there was considerable discrimination towards migrants (cf Cohen 2003). Interestingly, this tension actual state policy and how this translated in practice was most prominent, according to Feldman (2003), with respect to those aspects of welfare provision that remained the principle responsibility of local government such as education, personal social services and, particularly, housing. It is in these areas that anti-migrant sentiments have been most conspicuous and in which the entitlement of

migrants to welfare has been most acutely brought into question.

Following the 1905 *Act* only two other substantial pieces of legislation related to the control of mobility were instituted until the passing of the 1962 *Commonwealth Immigration Act*, which was aimed at restricting the entry of black commonwealth citizens, who previously had, like other commonwealth citizens, free movement in and out of the UK. Since the early 1960s, then, migration policy in the UK has increasingly restricted the rights of entry and settlement of growing bodies of people. While, up until this point, as the previous discussion has highlighted, the connection between status and welfare entitlement has been ad hoc and subject to local whims and particularities, with the passing of the 1966 *Supplementary Benefits Act*²⁷, which related to non-contributory benefits the relationship between status and welfare entitlement became systematic (S. Cohen 2001). From this point on access to welfare provision, both in terms of financial benefits and other forms of care provision, truly became a key means through which the UK state has sought to manage migration and mobile populations.

As access to welfare has become more conditional, welfare providers have been drawn into scrutinising 'immigration status' (Hayes 2004). As will be demonstrated below (chapter 4) such processes have continued into the present period, with new policy mechanisms intensifying the entanglement between mobility controls and welfare provision. In this way an increased hierarchisation between different migrants has emerged in terms of their access to social rights – such as welfare entitlements – produced through an increasingly differentiated and complex stratification of 'residential statuses'. This stratification has recently been conceptualised in terms of *differential inclusion* (Deleuze and Guattari 1987; Hardt and Negri 2000; Mezzadra and Neilson 2003, 2008) and as I shall discuss below (chapter 3) this has a variety of potentially significant effects in terms of the exploitability of different migrants and the living conditions that such different statuses can create (cf. Anderson 2009; Neilson 2009; Sharma 2008).

There have then been a number of shifts in terms of the institutional architecture, roles that different actors have been drawn into performing and how these fit in with wider mechanisms of mobility control. A useful concept for thinking through such processes and exploring the conjunction between the fields of care and mobility and how these are managed is that of the *regime of mobility control* that I

²⁷ In 1988 Supplementary Benefits became Income Support.

borrow from the work of Dimitris Papadopoulos and colleagues. A regime of control refers to an unstable aggregation between different institutions, actors and the devices through which they attempt to manage a particular field. They are historically specific and contested yet relatively “effective alliances between different forces of power” (Papadopoulos et al 2008: 77). Unlike the notion of *system*, which was commonly used to conceptualise migration and how it was managed, the concept of a regime allows for the inclusion within such a governance framework of a multiplicity of actors who may not necessarily share a common logic or perspective, which as will be highlighted below (chapter 4), better captures the array of bodies involved in the administration of the border regime within the UK. A field, on the other hand, designates the conjunction of all those institutions, practices and discourses, through which a given regime is held together and maintained while at the same time including all those practices and experiences and the forms of life they generate that exceed and escape a given regime, pushing at its boundaries and in so doing provoke it to recompose itself.

The contemporary regime of mobility control is “structurally hybrid” and increasingly transnational in character (Mezzadra 2006). It is constituted by, and emerges from, the conjunction of a number of bodies including nation-states; private actors such as security and airline companies; ‘post-national’ arrangements like the European Union; organisations such as the International Organisation of Migration (IOM) and various kinds of Non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Various studies have pointed to how, over the past four decades or so, North Atlantic states have attempted to encourage countries to ‘roll back’ state involvement in welfare provision (Fitzpatrick 2001; Le Grand and Robinson 1984; McMaster 2008; Pollock with Leys, Price, Rowland and Gnani 2004). With respect to the regime of mobility control this has meant that increasingly ‘non-state’ actors of the sort set out above have been drawn into roles previously executed by the state and governmental bodies (Gill 2010; Lahav 1998, 2000; Guiraudon and Lahav 2000). For instance, as Feher (2007) highlights:

there are instances where nongovernmental agencies get involved in tasks that fall under the purview of government. This is the case when the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) delegates the actual management of refugee camps to humanitarian NGOs... (Feher 2007: 13)

In many ways then the distinction between governmental and nongovernmental politics has become increasingly complicated. This emerging regime opens up a number of problematics that social movements and academics as well as migrants themselves will need to deal with. An obvious but key question with respect to the new role that NGOs are increasingly playing becomes: what are the implications of such bodies been drawn into such relations with the state? This refers both to what this means with respect to the operation of the state and interrelated forms of governance (cf. Andrijasevic 2006) but also, and to my mind more importantly, in terms of the potential effects this may have on the lives of migrants and how this may affect the provision and quality of the services to migrants that such bodies offer. Furthermore, does such a role undermine the potential antagonistic force of such bodies? These are key questions that need to be addressed if there is to be any chance of moving towards more effective social movement mobilising around mobility.

This section has set out the emergence of state involvement in welfare service provision and the ways in which such services have increasingly been mobilised in order to control mobility and shape the working and/or living conditions of different mobile populations. Such forces will be empirically examined at numerous points during the course of the thesis. For instance, I will explore how the denial of access to the resources of the welfare state plays a central role in the creation of the forms of exploitability experienced by migrants working in the care industry (see chapter 3). In a related manner, I will, through an examination of the support services that are provided to asylum applicants (see chapter 4), explore the effects that both the administration and kinds of support provided have on the lives of such migrants and how these are connected with the wider regime of mobility control and hence broader processes through which the regulation of mobile populations are actualised.

1.5 Structure of thesis

To summarise, the thesis takes care as a conceptual lens through which to examine a variety of processes relating to mobility and by doing so explore the various ways in which, what I refer to as ‘politics of care’ and the ‘politics of mobility’ are interrelated. As has been pointed out during this opening chapter the intersection between care and mobility is important in a number of ways and operates at a number of different levels. This is reflected in the structure of the thesis and the contents of chapters 3 to

6.

Firstly, the domain of privatised care provision that is emerging through the *care industry* is a growing field within which migrants are increasingly finding work. Chapter 3 therefore provides an investigation of the care labour process within the care industry through which it is hoped it will be possible to better understand: i. the kinds of labour that care within such a context entails and the ways in which these are controlled; ii the working conditions and employment relations that migrants experience within this sector of the labour market; iii. the mechanisms and forces through which such conditions are produced; and finally iv. the practices and strategies that differentially stratified migrants develop in order to negotiate such conditions and cooperatively deal with the forms of exploitation they encounter.

Changing the aperture of the conceptual lens slightly allows us to explore the relations between care and mobility at a slightly different, although related level, namely that of how care is utilised as a device for regulating mobility. The focus in chapter 4 is therefore on the *asylum support regime*. The focus on the asylum support regime builds on the analysis in chapter 3 of how access to welfare creates particular employment relations, living conditions and potentials for labour exploitation. An investigation of the asylum regime and the field of welfare and support services as they relate to such mechanisms will afford us a more in-depth and nuanced understanding of the ways in which care, mobility and control intersect. This chapter will map out the emerging institutional architecture as a means of exploring the place of NGOs within the asylum support regime and the role that they play within it. A principle focus of this chapter will also be on the effects that the wider mechanisms of the asylum regime have on migrants who have claimed asylum. It is in this respect that it will be possible to get a better picture of the ambivalent place that NGOs occupy within the asylum regime. On one level, they perform an administrative role and facilitate the operation of the regime of mobility control. While on another, they provide much needed assistance to asylum applicants, and along with other agents, enable such migrants to sustain themselves.

The next substantive focus requires another change of the conceptual lens in order for it to be possible to investigate the importance of relations of care and the mobile *networks of care* that migrants cooperatively forge with one another in the making and sustaining of mobile trajectories. This is attempted in chapter 5. Care is important from this perspective in that it is a *doing*, a form of *sociality* that is a central

force in making mobility possible. Care, then is something that needs to be dealt with, to be managed in order to become mobile. For some people this applies more than others, particularly for women. How is this achieved? The focus here will be on both the transnationalised and localised strategies that migrants develop in order to manage their reproductive, caring responsibilities and commitments. Throughout this section I will also explore how an *ethos of care* animates and makes possible the caring relations that migrants craft and connect with and how different institutions, particular churches acts as spaces where such relations can be made and nurtured.

Finally, chapter 6 draws this journey through the various fields in which care and mobility intersect to a close. Here I summarise the numerous issues that have been explored in order to interrogate the various ways in which care has become politicised within the different fields that have been focused on during the thesis and how such dynamics shape the lives of different strata of migrants and the strategies and networks migrants mobilise in order to negotiate and transform such conditions. A central concern here is to place such issues within a broader context of capitalist restructuring and the regimes of control that have emerged in an attempt to institutionalise mobility. The chapter, and hence the thesis, ends with a discussion of the implications of such findings for our conceptions of the political and our political imaginaries and how they relate to questions of organising for social movements and other actors who work in solidarity with migrants. To begin with, however, chapter 2 turns its attention to methodological issues. This chapter sets out the methods utilised during the thesis and provides an overview of the different participants with whom the issues were explored and the range of research contexts in which the research took place. It then highlights the various ethical considerations that emerged during the unfolding of the thesis and how these were managed and negotiated and finishes with an examination of how the subject matters mapped out and analysed relate to, and form an integral part of, my wider activism with migrants and around issues pertaining to mobility.

CHAPTER 2

‘Activist-research’:

exploring the politics of care and mobility *with* migrants across their multiple sites of existence

2.1 Introduction

What role can processes of research and inquiry play in social struggles? How can research be used as a means of generating knowledge that enables social movements to better understand their activities and to build enduring connections with others? Such questions have, in recent years, increasingly occupied participants in social movements. This chapter sets out to explore these questions and how this thesis might contribute to such a debate.

I begin by tracing the trajectory of how I came to explore the various themes and issues that form the principle foci of the thesis. The chapter then goes on to provide an overview of the various ‘field sites’ where the primary ethnographic fieldwork that the thesis is based on were conducted. I set out the methodological tools that were drawn on and developed for the purpose of data collection and the different rationale for experimenting with the methods that I used. I then set out some of the ethical issues and considerations that I had to grapple with in my decisions to choose certain methods over others, and indeed, over whether the knowledge generated through the writing of the thesis would in fact be counter productive to the very people – that is, the differentially stratified segments of the migrant population – that when I started the thesis I hoped it would prove useful to and for.

Finally, I conclude the chapter by looking more closely at the notion of

‘activist-research’²⁸. Here, I discuss how it questions and problematises more conventional social scientific approaches to research and knowledge generation. Such approaches operate from an epistemological and ontological perspective that sees research as a process of representation, of rendering visible aspects of reality and social phenomenon that would otherwise remain opaque and largely hidden. While activist-research does not deny this aspect of research, it sees investigation and the knowledge it produces in more *materialist* terms: Activist-research posits writing and knowledge generation and the wider research processes this is connected with as a form of *social action*; as a process of world-making, and hence as potentially subversive and transformational. By working at the conjunction *between* activism and research, such praxis aims at an immanent critique and subversion of the social order and at creating connections and affinities, and intensifying struggles and building alliances and composition between different sections of an increasingly fragmented and stratified ‘working class’.

2.2 Research Trajectory

The focus of the thesis emerges directly out of my longstanding participation in various struggles that form part of what has been referred to as the ‘anti-globalisation movement’, ‘alterglobalisation movement’, ‘global justice movement’, and ‘movement of movements’ amongst others (e.g. Bishop 2007; Brecher, Costello and Smith 2000; Maeckelbergh 2009; Notes from Nowhere 2003; Mertes 2004)²⁹. In July 2005, the rulers of the Group of Eight (G8) most powerful industrialised nation-states³⁰ travelled to Gleneagles, Scotland for their annual summit, and, as had become commonplace since just prior to the turn of the millennium, they were met with large and diverse counter-mobilisations (see articles in Harvie, Milburn, Trott and Watts 2005 for a variety of interesting accounts of these). Following the summit, a small group of us who had been active in the counter-mobilisations, set up a no borders

²⁸ Such forms of engaged research have also been referred to as militant research, research militancy, militant investigation, co-research, workers inquiry amongst others (see Malo 2004a, b). For an overview of the contemporary diversity of such modes of investigation see a number of articles in Shukaitis and Graeber (2007), Team Colours Collective (2010) and Amster, DeLeon, Fernandez, Nocella and Shannon (2009).

²⁹ These movements are composed of a heterogeneous set of multiplicities and singularities. They range from large (global) NGOs, trade unions, leftist parties and organisations to the more libertarian, anti-authoritarian, autonomist and anarchist groups that I have worked with and formed part of.

³⁰ The G8 is made up of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the UK and the USA.

group in south Wales³¹. Following the Euro May Day protests³² that occurred in various cities across continental Europe and which sought to connect migrant struggle with the issue of precarity many of us had become increasingly interested and engaged in migrant struggle and the issues surrounding mobility control and wanted to find ways of more effectively connecting with and intervening in these processes.

Since the 'collective' was set up we have engaged in various forms of activism relating to issues of migration, mobility control and migrant movements and struggles. This has involved amongst other things: media activity and analysis of the operations and effects of migration controls; direct action against the activities of the UK Border Agency (UKBA) and the numerous private companies and other agencies involved in implementing migration management policies; as well as direct solidarity with different strata of the migrant population. This solidarity has principally involved working with migrants embroiled in the processes of claiming asylum, with the majority of our work here concerned with assisting with set up and mobilising for anti-deportation campaigns and wider struggles to regularise their statuses. These activities led to the forging of a number of very close bonds and friendships with many of the migrants we have worked with as well as the wider migrant communities they are embedded within. Such relationalities have enabled strong and enduring connections and feelings of mutual trust that have significantly impacted the direction that my research took during the course of the thesis. A point I shall return to in more detail below (section 2.4).

In April 2006 I attended the first network wide meeting of the then budding no borders network in the UK. Here I met Dimitris Papadopoulos who had recently taken up employment in Cardiff University and we spoke about the possibility of collaborating on a project exploring migrant labour on our return to Cardiff. I was already working as a research assistant at Cardiff University on a large project focusing on issues relating to language, globalisation, diasporic communities and subjectivity

³¹ The no border movement is a loose, transnational network of autonomous collectives who advocate freedom of movement and equality for all. The no border network emerged in 1999 following a protest 'camp' on the German, Polish and Czech borders, which was largely organised by German anti-racists and 'no one is illegal' groups. Such camps are designed as direct interventions aimed at countering media and state rhetoric that legitimise the intensification of migration control across Europe. Over the years the practice of no border camps has continued with ones taking place in Italy, France, Greece, the U.S. Mexico, Spain, Slovenia, Australia and so on. In 2007 the first no border camp in the UK took place and aimed at halting the building of another detention centre at Gatwick Airport and in 2009 a no border camps was held in Calais, France, which I shall discuss in more detail below. See <http://www.noborder.org>. For further information on no borders south Wales see <http://noborderswales.org.uk/>

³² See <http://www.euromayday.org/>

and the opportunity to more explicitly connect my activist and academic engagements through such an undertaking seemed both a fruitful and logical progression.

As already indicated, as well as the various forms of direct solidarity, a considerable amount of the time of those of us involved in no borders south Wales (and indeed many of the other groups that make up the wider no borders network in the UK) was taken up with collective research projects aimed at mapping the ‘border points’ in the local area as a means of exploring how these articulate with and connect to the broader regime of mobility control and many of the insights and findings gained from such research have feed into and had a direct impact on the shape and scope of the thesis. Here, we took our lead from the wider no border movement on continental Europe, who, as part of their mobilisations against various agencies involved in the governance of mobility across the globe have produced an array of materials and findings about the operations of such agencies. Most notable amongst these being a booklet published as part of the European wide mobilisation against the operations of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) (Anonymous 2004) and the information uncovered about the roles played by various airline companies – particularly Lufthansa – during the deportation of migrants (deportation-alliance). Furthermore, while the European no border network itself has ceased functioning as a platform for networking, organising and collaboration many of the groups continue to work on such issues, such as the Frassanito network which produces a regular newsletter on migrant struggle called *Crossing Borders*³³.

My interest in politically driven modes of investigation that I am here calling ‘activist-research’ and the political and transformative potential of practices of research and knowledge production began with my first reading of Marx’s seminal paper on the topic of workers inquiry (Marx 1880). This interest was further stimulated through my engagement with the work of Italian *operaismo* (workerism) and the related social movements of *autonomia* that emerged from it³⁴ following the publication of Hardt and Negri’s much debated *Empire* (2000)³⁵. While a small amount of English language analyses and work under the broad umbrella of autonomist-Marxism already existed (e.g. Cleaver 2000; Midnight Notes 1990) it was not until

³³ See http://noborder.org/crossing_borders/index.php

³⁴ See Wright (2002) for the definitive history of these schools of thought and the ‘introduction’ of Cleaver (1979) for a shorter yet stimulating analysis of how autonomist-Marxism relates to other schools of Marxist thought.

³⁵ Two published collections with a number of interesting critical appraisals of *Empire* are those of Balakrishnan 2003, and Passavant and Dean 2004.

Empire that this current of thought became more easily accessible to an Anglophone audience. However, it was with more contemporary investigations by a growing number of collectives around the world that my interest in the potential of activist-research and politically driven modes of investigation was truly sparked. I will discuss three of these, although there are numerous others.

Most notable amongst these was the work of a German collective Kolinko (2002) who conducted a three year inquiry into the working conditions and experiences of call-centre workers and the possibilities for struggle and subversion (or lack of such things) that emanated within such situations. The trajectory of the thesis has also been significantly influenced by the ‘research militancy’ of the small group working mainly in Argentina, Colectivo Situaciones (e.g. 2004; 2005). Colectivo Situaciones have instigated a variety of experimental ‘encounters’ with some of Argentina’s ‘new social protagonists’ that emerged prior to and following Argentina’s protracted crisis, including – MTD of Salano (a movement within the broader *piquetero* movement, composed predominantly of unemployed workers’); H.I.J.O.S (a human rights group formed by children of the disappeared) and MoCaSE (a *campesinos* group made up of peasants) – as well as a number of other ‘encounters’ with different groups both in Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay and Mexico. Finally, of all the activist-research initiatives that have fused activism and research as a means of experimenting with novel ways of ‘doing’ politics that I have encountered, both prior to the commencement of the thesis, as well as during the course of my inquiries, it is the feminist collective based in Spain called *Precarias a la Deriva* (which translates to ‘Precarious Women Adrift’) that have had the most profound impact and influence on direction of this thesis – both in terms of overall focus and content, as well as on a methodological and theoretical level.

Precarias’ extensive body of work has focused on precarious feminised work and the labour (largely carried out by women) generative of what they conceptualise in terms of the nexus of care—sex—attention (*Precarias a la Deriva* 2003a; 2003b; 2004; 2005a; 2005b; 2006). As well as the foregrounding of the political potential of care, *Precarias*’ work has also pointed to the salience of mobility for contemporary capitalism. Furthermore, *Precarias* have been central protagonists in the debates around the concept of precarity that has occupied a central focus for many of the autonomous social movements, especially on continental Europe, in recent years. As well as these clear affinities between the project developed during this thesis and the

work of *Precarias*, I was also drawn to their work due to their interesting fusion of Marxist, feminist and post-structuralist theories. Finally, as I will flesh out in more detail in the next section, I have also been influenced by and drawn from their methodological innovations, principally their adaptation of the Situationist inspired *dérive* (Debord 1958) that *Precarias* develop into the cartographic action research and reflective tool of ‘the drift’.

What all these projects share is a commitment to everyday, embodied experience and communication as “primary material for the political” (*Precarias a la Deriva* 2003) as points of potential conflict and hence as catalysts for social and political struggle. By grounding their analyses in the everyday struggles with which they were involved and connected such groups attempt to open up spaces for subversion and transformation of the present social order. I now turn to explore such methodological concerns in more detail, where I will also provide an overview of the various research sites and participants of the thesis.

2.3 Research Methods

The investigation utilised a number of techniques drawn from a range of traditions of ethnographic research. It is heavily influenced the innovative research developed by those working under the umbrella of what has come to be called ‘global ethnography’³⁶ (Burawoy, Blum, George, Gille, Gowan, Haney, Klawiter, Lopez, Riain, and Thayer 2000). In the spirit of such research the thesis is a multi-sited ethnographic (Marcus 1995; Marcus and Fisher 1986) engagement with the subject matter under consideration. It was felt that such an approach would provide the most appropriate means of analysing the multiple stratifications, survival strategies, sociabilities, affective and caring relations and forms of cooperation of different strata of migrants that form the basis of the study. Such techniques would also enable me to trace the diverse emergent connections across national borders forged through such movements and the changing political, economic, cultural ecologies within which these occur. Finally, by concretely mapping the various spaces and temporalities that these migrants traversed on a daily basis, I hoped to gain an insight into how such migrants experienced, negotiated and undermined the multiplication of regulatory mechanisms

³⁶ The precursor of this approach was initially referred to as ‘unbounded ethnography’ (see Burawoy, Burton, Ferguson, Fox, Gamson, Gartrell, Hurst, Kurzman, Salzinger, Schiffman, and Ui 1991).

that attempt to canalise and constrain their mobility, labour market and welfare access.

Data gathering and fieldwork took place in a number of different sites and mixed qualitative methods were utilised to analyse the various materials accumulated. Before embarking on an exposition of various field sites where the research itself took place I will first provide a brief overview of the different methods employed and a rationale for why certain ones were selected at particular points during the research.

2.3.1 Interviews

During the thesis I have conducted an extensive number of ethnographic interviews with a variety of different kinds of actors³⁷. Interviews took place in an array of settings, depending on circumstances. They were often held at the participant's home but also took place at cafeterias or restaurants, offices, as well as places where migrants would meet, such as a local drop-in that was frequented by asylum applicants. Many of the interviews were audio-recorded, or failing this detailed notes were taken. Whether or not the interviews were recorded was dependent on a number of factors. While the vast majority of those with more stable residential statuses were happy for this to take place, many of the migrants whose statuses were more insecure in this regard (e.g. asylum applicants; but most of all migrants working without proper authorisation) felt more comfortable, and spoke more freely, when only notes were taken. Interviews lasted between thirty minutes and an hour and a half and took one of the following two formats:

- a. *Unstructured interviews*: these were open-ended, casual and spontaneous, yet purposive in terms of gathering information relevant to the overall goals of the research. They were often used as a means of gathering information on life stories and histories, the reasons why people had migrated, but allowing such issues to emerge spontaneously during the interaction.
- b. *Semi-structured interviews*: these largely followed a set pattern but were open-ended enough to explore issues outside of the planned focus of the interview, allowing for often unexpected findings to emerge. Like the unstructured interviews they were used to elicit information about migration trajectories but the more structured frame guaranteed that certain key issues were covered in sufficient depth.

³⁷ Actual numbers are provided in the following sub-sections (see also Table 2.1).

As well as the formats above a small number of the following kind of interviews took place:

- c. *Small-group interviews*: These were attended by between three and six participants. Overall they were largely unstructured, with issues being allowed to emerge and be explored relatively spontaneously by the participants. They were also used as a means of exploring specific issues that had emerged in other one-to-one interviews, which had remained unclear, I wanted to have further clarified or explore in more detail.

Interviews regardless of the specific format outlined above were generally conducted in an informal, relaxed, yet no less rigorous, manner. As I already had close friendships developed through my activism with many of the migrants who participated in this study, to follow a more formalised procedure (especially with them) would have felt overly artificial and may have been potentially detrimental to the objectives of the research. Participants were encouraged to treat the interviews in dialogic, conversational terms, to ask questions, to guide the interactions onto issues and to explore the topics they felt most relevant.

2.3.2 *Ethnographic Fieldwork*

A substantial amount of the insights gained about the dynamics of the various research sites and the subjective experiences of the various migrants whose lives form the basis of the thesis were gleaned from conducting non-participant observations. Such observations of the different research sites, as well as time spent with migrants in the various situations that made up their daily lives was a crucial factor in enabling me to get an understanding of the migrants lived realities, how they experienced their working conditions, the wider effects of governmental migration management policies on their day to day lives and how these were navigated, struggled against and subverted. As will become apparent below when I discuss the research sites in more detail, as well as the analysis of sites such as care homes and a number of agencies that provided support to asylum applicants, I also spent a considerable amount of time in more everyday situations that made up the different migrant's lives, following along as they went about their daily routines. As they went shopping, travelled to and from work, visited the GP, went to collect their children or to visit friends. As asylum

applicants picked up their vouchers, or as migrants in transit in Calais walked to and from the food distribution place in Calais or collectively cooked their evening meals.

Similar methods have been developed by other researchers, such as Kusenbach (2003) in what she refers to as ‘go-along ethnographies’. Such methods have largely been used as a means of exploring how people experience urban spaces. However, my concern was a broader one and aimed at mapping out and developing a subjective cartography of the daily routines of migrants and the various situations, scenes, affects, forces, relations and networks out of which their day to day lives were immanently composed and how these were experienced, negotiated and crafted. Such methods have the advantage of making visible aspects of everyday experiences and routines that might otherwise be missed if interviews only were conducted and which allowed me to explore the “affective territories” that migrants produced and moved through (cf Guattari 2000). By moving with migrants through their daily lives in such ways I was able to gain a far more in-depth understanding of the intricacies of their lived realities, their relations with one another and how they remained mobile and negotiated the various demands and problematics that life as a migrant can involve. Insights, which I was then able to feedback into and use as discussion points during more conventional interview formats.

As well as the insights I gained from being with the migrants in these ways, spending so much time with them enabled me to ask further questions about their lives and experiences (although very often such personal narratives were offered without any elicitation on my part) and as such functioned very much like the ‘mobile interviews’ of the ‘drifts’ I shall discuss in the next section. Spending time with the different migrants also on occasion provided the opportunity for impromptu ‘group interviews’ of ‘focus group-like’ sessions, where with a little prompting, although again this was often not necessary, the migrants would collectively reflect upon their subjective experiences of their living and/or working conditions. Such observations enabled me to compile a large amount of extremely rich field note data about both the commonalities and differences in experiences between various sectors of the migrant population that were then systematised according the different themes and foci that emerged during the research process.

2.3.3 *‘Drifts’*

As part of the participant observation I also experimented with a less conventional method called ‘drifts’ mentioned above, adapted from the work of *Precarias a la Deriva*.

Precarias' use of 'drifts' as a situated mode of collective research emerged from their desire to find ways of articulating, capturing and exploring the commonalities between the lived experiences and working conditions of a diverse group of women who despite the diffuseness of their working conditions, working as they did in a variety of different sectors and kinds of work – from care and domestic workers to sex workers to university lecturers to translators – shared a common experience of precarity. They wanted to develop a methodology that would be both relevant to their particular circumstances while at the same time being able to provoke conflict and generate struggle. Taking seriously the earlier feminist movements dictum 'the personal is political' they began experimenting with drifts as a way of exploring the multiplicity of forms of precarity that formed part of their quotidian existence, as a means of generating situated and affective understandings of these realities, so as to be better able to intervene and transform these. Unlike the Situationist's practice of "drifting", where movement through the city was far more random and dictated by the various micro-events, interactions, sights and sounds they encountered, *Precarias'* method of drifting was a far more systematic with their trajectory through the city directed by the particularities of the daily routes they traversed and experienced during their everyday lives.

During the course of the thesis I conducted 4 drifts of this sort. Myself and between two and five migrants care workers would meet at a designated point of relevance – one of their houses, outside the care home where they worked – and then would be guided through the city by a different migrant each time. As we moved through the city the migrants would discuss their different experiences – their hopes, desires, the long hours they had to work, how they missed their children, their various conflicts, struggles and joys – finding points of commonality, as well as difference, in their respective life trajectories and current realities. These drifts, like the less organised ones discussed as part of the participant observations above, provided some very rich data that more conventional, less situated, experiential methods might have otherwise overlooked.

2.4 Sites and participants

The remainder of this section provides an overview of the different field sites and participants, organised according to the three principle themes that emerged as the

main foci of the thesis:

- a. *Migrant labour in the care industry* (see chapter 3)
- b. *Support services and the asylum regime* (see chapter 4)
- c. *Migrant networks of care* (see chapter 5)

It needs to be born in mind at this point that there is considerable overlap between these in terms of participants. For instance, the inquiry into *migrant labour in the care industry* was mainly based on the experiences of various care workers but also involved the experiences of asylum applicants, working under illegalised conditions, whose experiences form the principle basis for theme b. *Support services and the asylum regime*. Similarly, the experiences of both migrant care workers as well as asylum applicants were used to explore theme c. *migrant networks of care*, as were the experiences and realities of migrants in transit in the Calais region of France.

While the majority of the research was conducted in one city in Wales, data was also gathered in other areas and contexts, often, as just indicated, as part of my activist work. Indeed, given my longstanding activism in the area of migration it was often difficult, if not impossible to untangle my activism from the research process. In fact, as I will discuss in the final section (section 2.5), the more I engaged with the research the less I felt that making such a distinction was useful, necessary, or even tenable. However, this does not mean that one was not more prominent, or that I did not switch between the two, as well as other standpoints depending on the contexts and the nature of the research being carried out. Commenting on the methodological orientation(s) adopted during her detailed and stimulating ethnographic exploration of the agencies that provide support to ‘women who sell sex’, Laura María Agustín (2007: 141) offers a useful summary of how one’s subject position alters during different moments in the research processes, stating that her “position in the field was a mix of insider, outsider, stakeholder, political actor and researcher-with-a-self-interest, and shifted according to the conditions of the moment”. In a similar way, the stances I took, and how I presented and conducted myself, altered depending on a variety of factors at particular times during the different phases of the thesis’ development. An issue I will expand on more extensively in my discussion of some of the ethical considerations that emerged during the various phases of the research.

2.4.1 *Migrant labour in the care industry*

In order to explore the issue of migrant labour and the working and living conditions that migrants working in the care industry experienced I spent just over four months –

between the middle of November 2008 and the end of March 2009 – conducting ‘covert non-participant observation’, working in a care home³⁸. Gaining access to a care home was no easy task however. I initially contacted five different care homes asking them whether they would be willing to participate in the research. Two responded in the negative, stating that this would be too problematic and disruptive to the workings of the home. The other three, following numerous attempts to contact them, never responded. I decided to change my approach and conduct the research in a covert manner. I registered with an agency but without previous experience they stated that they would only be able to offer me work as a domestic worker in care homes. As I wished to experience and observe as closely as possible the working conditions of care workers I decided to also contact homes directly. After a number of rejections I decided to change approach and ask the care homes whether it would be possible to undertake voluntary work in order to gain experience. This approach immediately bore fruit and following an informal interview, the completion of my POVA form check³⁹ in early November 2008 I was able to start working within a week. During my interview the manager remarked on the strangeness of someone with my educational background wishing to work in the care industry, and especially a care home, which she described as “a dead end job”. I informed her that I wished to see what working in a care home was like and that I had an interest in the care industry more generally. I will discuss the ethical issues of not disclosing fully my motives for wishing to take up employment, both to the managerial staff, as well as many of the care workers who I worked with on a daily basis in more detail below (see section 2.5).

Although my time in the care home was on a voluntary basis, I was able to work the same shift patterns (of twelve hours) as the regular staff. I was provided with the same induction and ‘on the job training’ that other staff in my position would receive and as – from the management’s point of view – my voluntary work was meant to see whether I was suitable to work in such an environment I was treated much the same as other workers. The majority of my time was spent shadowing different workers as they went about their daily routine. During this time I was able to speak to the workers about how they felt about their working conditions, their future

³⁸ My motivations and ethical issues surrounding my decision to utilise this and other techniques used during the different ‘phases’ of the research, as well as other ethical considerations that emerged during the research process are discussed below in section 2.5.

³⁹ Protection of Vulnerable Adults, which along with Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) checks, is now legally required in order to work in the ‘formal’ care industry.

plans and past experiences and so on. Furthermore, unlike other workers who largely spent their time on one floor (unless there was a shortage of staff on another) once it was felt by the management that I had gained enough experience on one floor, I was sent to others, where different ‘categories’ of residents lived. In this way then I was arguably able to gain a far greater insight into the various rhythms of the home than I might otherwise have if I was a paid member of staff.

The care home was a fairly large sized one with over fifty residents and provided both nursing and residential care, and was administered by one of the large private care home providing companies. It had a sizeable migrant workforce, which I would estimate as comprising around 70-80 percent of overall staff conducting care related activities, including nursing staff. The majority of migrants worked in care work posts, with a small number also working as domestic/cleaning and catering staff, although the majority of these positions were made up of white ‘working-class’ women from the local area. The choice to conduct the non-participant observation in the care home proved highly valuable. It enabled me to gain first hand experience of the care labour process, the mechanisms through which this was managed and the working conditions experienced by care workers. It also provided me with a rich level of insight into the forms of exploitation migrants experienced and the various strategies they adopted in order to negotiate and mitigate such processes and forces.

Along with the non-participant observation carried out in the care home I also interviewed eighty two migrant care workers (see Table 2.1 below) and conducted three interviews with Trade Union organisers who have represented migrants who work in the health and social care industry. Some of the migrants interviewed I met while conducting the ethnography in the care home. Others I was put in contact with by friends, or I had known prior to the commencement of the thesis. Despite the reported drawbacks of the methodological technique of snowball sampling (Bryman 2004) the other migrants interviewed I was able to access through utilising this method and these provided me with an adequate cross section of migrants from all the relevant categories of residency status:

- i. *EEA Accession 8 (A8) and Accession 2 (A2) Nationals*
- ii. *Work Permit*
- iii. *Student visa (non-EEA)*
- iv. *undocumented*

Table 2.1 provides an overview of the numbers of migrants broken down according

to their countries of origin for each of the migrant's from the different categories of i-iv who participated in the research through being interviewed. It also supplies information regarding the number of asylum applicants interviewed based on their country of birth (see section 2.4.2) as well as information about the numbers of a variety of other relevant participants interviewed.

Table 2.1: Overview of numbers of participants formally interviewed⁴⁰

Numbers of migrant care workers based on residential status and country of origin		
Residential Status	Country of origin and number of migrants	Overall number of migrants for each residential status
<i>EEA (A8 and A2) Nationals</i>	Poland (14); Hungary (2); Romania (1)	n = 17
<i>Work Permit</i>	Philippines (22); Zimbabwe (8); Nigeria (5); South Africa (3); Ghana (2)	n = 40
<i>Student visa (non-EEA)</i>	India (5); Columbia (2); Nigeria (2); Zimbabwe (3); Brazil (1); Ghana (2)	n = 15
<i>Undocumented</i>	Zimbabwe (3); Uganda (2); Cameroon (1); Nigeria (3); Malawi (1)	n = 10
Overall number of migrant care workers		N = 82
Number of asylum applicants		
<i>Asylum applicant</i>	Iraqi Kurd (6); Sudan (6); Nigeria (5); Zimbabwe (5); Eritrea (3); Cameroon (3); Democratic Republic of Congo (3); Ethiopia (3); Afghanistan (2); Albania (1); Sierra Leone (1); Uganda (1)	N = 39
Overall number of migrants (both care workers & asylum applicants)		N = 121
Other relevant participants		
<i>Trade Union organisers</i>		n = 3
<i>Asylum support NGO case workers</i>		n = 3
<i>Asylum support NGO management staff</i>		n = 1
<i>Asylum support council workers</i>		n = 3
<i>Asylum support service co-ordination worker</i>		n = 1
<i>Primary care service staff</i>		n = 4
<i>Calais Migrant Solidarity activists</i>		n = 5
Overall number of formal interviews conducted		N = 142

As part of the non-participant observation into the working and living conditions of

⁴⁰ Table 2.1 only contains information on migrants and other relevant participants 'formally' interviewed and therefore does not account for the full extent of the interview research. As will become apparent below the thesis is also based on informal interviews with numerous more asylum applicants in the UK as well as on discussions with a number of migrants living in the Calais region of France as they attempt to clandestinely cross the border into the UK (see chapter 5).

migrant care workers I also spent time with them in more everyday setting. Many I would meet after work and then travel with them as they made their way home, or went shopping, collected their children from friends and so on. I also spent a considerable amount of time at a number of their homes, discussing their experiences as they went about their daily lives. Again, this enabled me to gain an in-depth insight into their daily routines and how their daily lives were structured.

2.4.2 Support services and the asylum regime

While the thesis was initially conceived as an exploration of the working conditions of migrant care workers my connection with asylum applicants through activity with the no border movement convinced me that a useful means of exploring how care and support regimes functioned to control the mobility of migrants could be achieved through a systematic exploration of the daily lives of asylum applicants. Formal ethnographic fieldwork for this section of the thesis took place at two principle sites and was conducted from the beginning of June to the end of September 2008. During this period I spent the bulk of my time at the offices of the Welsh Refugee Council (WRC), an NGO that provided support services and advice to asylum applicants. I also made eight visits to the Primary Care Service for Asylum Seekers (PCSAS) clinic, which as its name suggests, provided primary care services specifically to asylum applicants. At the clinic I sat and observed in the waiting room. As a means of augmenting my observations from the clinic I also carried out brief interviews with four of the workers – two with nursing and midwifery staff, one with a reception worker and one with the manager (see Table 2.1).

The WRC is one of the principle NGOs dealing with asylum applicants and refugees in Wales with affiliated institutions operating across the UK. It has a number of offices in the main areas in Wales where migrants are dispersed as part of the process of claiming asylum and it receives the majority of its funded directly through the Home Office (see chapter 4 for a more detailed overview of such issues). Throughout this period I was able to speak with a considerable number of asylum seeking migrants about their experiences as they waited to be seen by a case worker. I also sat in on around forty consultations, which along with my broader observations, enabled me to obtain a detailed understanding of the daily functioning of the services and the effects the asylum regime could have on asylum applicants. I also conducted three formal interviews with case workers. Here I wanted to get a better insight into the perspectives of those who worked with asylum applicants and administered certain

aspects of the support services migrants received, how they felt about this role, and how they saw support services as fitting into the wider asylum regime and regime of mobility control more broadly.

The ethnography of support services also involved interviewing two senior council workers who played a role in administering support services, principally through the provision of various forms of accommodation. I also interviewed a senior worker at an NGO that ‘co-ordinates’ support provision and acts as a space within which different institutional actors involved in such activities were able to meet and discuss policy issues, implementation and so on. Similarly to the fieldwork I conducted with migrant care workers, I also spent a considerable amount of time with asylum applicants themselves as they went about their daily lives. Again, this provided me with a rich and detailed understanding of the operation of support service, how it was administered, the impact it had on the lives of asylum applicants and the strategies they developed in order to mitigate, negotiate and sometimes subvert its machinations.

During the course of the thesis I also conducted thirty nine ‘formal’ interviews with asylum applicants from a number of countries (see Table 2.1) as well as an incalculable number of informal discussions. Since prior to the beginning of the thesis I have attended a weekly ‘drop-in’ for migrants seeking asylum all of which have proved extremely useful in terms of my understanding of the lived realities of asylum applicants. As I have already mentioned my contact with many of the migrants has come about largely through my activism, which has led to strong and enduring friendships developing. As such, as well as the formal period of research conducted at the sites set out above, I am also in regular contact and spend a considerable amount of time with a substantial number of asylum applicants. Again, the observations that I have gleaned from the times I spend with migrants in this way has provided me with a significant amount of rich insights into the everyday realities of asylum applicants and to the wider network of semi-formal support services within which their lives are entangled.

2.4.3 Migrant networks of care

As the research progressed and I spent evermore time with various kinds of migrants the important role played by what I conceptualise as *networks of care* in enabling migrants to become and remain mobile, to manage their reproductive commitments, to negotiate and struggle against and collectively sustain themselves despite the often

precarious living and working conditions they face became increasingly apparent. As such, it was felt that as well as the focus on the working conditions of migrant care workers and the ‘support services’ for asylum applicants, that this needed to become a substantive thematic focus on the thesis and that in order to do such I needed to explore more systematically and develop a detailed cartography of how such *networks of care* were constituted and operated and similarities and potential variation across migrants with differential legal statuses.

The inquiry into these *networks of care* took place in a number of settings, involved a variety of different migrant categories, and was achieved through experimenting with a range of source materials. Much of my understanding was gleaned by spending time and socialising with different migrants as they went about their day-to-day lives both over the course of the thesis and prior to its commencement, which I have already discussed in relation to the other themes set out above. On a number of occasions during an interview the topics of friendship, of support and care and the affective communities such relations crafted and were embedded within, were brought up by migrants themselves, or else I would guide the conversation onto such issues. I have also extensively discussed the subject with migrants in more informal interactions as I have spent time with migrants both as part of the research and my solidarity work with migrant communities.

Since mid 2009 one of my social movement activities has involved spending time in Calais, Northern France working in solidarity with migrants who are attempting to enter the UK without proper authorisation as a participant in a project that since August of that year has been called Calais Migrant Solidarity (CMS). Between 23 – 29 June, 2009 a ‘no border camp’ was held in Calais as a means of drawing attention to the circumstances for migrants trying to cross the channel and to explore ways of intervening in and transforming this situation⁴¹. Following the camp a number of those who had participated decided that they wished to continue working in Calais and engaging in everyday solidarity with the migrants moving through Calais and the wider region, which led to the formation of CMS⁴². As well as seeing the living conditions of migrants in Calais prior to the camp as part of its organising I have been to Calais on four occasions since this period each time for around a week.

⁴¹ Since 1998 no border camps have been at various borders and locations of strategic importance to the regime of mobility control across Europe as well as in North America when in 2007 a camp was held on both sides of the US—Mexico border.

⁴² For more information on the work of CMS see calaismigrantsolidarity.wordpress.org

As of July 2011, Calais was one of, if not, the principle points where transitmigrants attempting to cross clandestinely into the UK congregated. While in Calais migrants live in informal encampments known as ‘jungles’ or squatted in disused buildings, which I shall discuss in more detail below (see chapter 5). Much of the solidarity work undertaken in Calais involves spending a considerable amount of time with the migrants and during my time there I have slept in some of the ‘jungles’ and ‘squats’. This enabled me to observe the daily lives of the various migrant populations that lived there, how they relate to one another, the forms of life and social cooperation they develop in order to sustain themselves and to speak to them about their experiences. As well as these observations I have also conducted interviews with five activists who had spent extended periods in Calais. This enabled me to build a detailed appreciation of the way care operates amongst the migrants in the Calais region. Including Calais in my study has allowed me to get a more nuanced insight into the role that caring relations and the worlds that such acts and affective conjunctions make possible from the perspective of a highly diverse number of different strata of migrants and migrant movements.

2.5 Ethical considerations

The choices involved in deciding on which techniques and methods of investigation to employ during the different phases of the research involved a variety of ethical dilemmas. The most significant of these was whether or not to conduct covert or overt participant observation in the care home. My decision to carry out the research in a covert manner was influenced by two interrelated issues. Firstly, the difficulties discussed above (section 2.4.1) regarding accessing a care home led me to attempt to gain access without disclosing my identity as a student studying the care industry. As well as this covert research had been a consideration from the very beginning due largely to my desire to gain as ‘natural’ an insight as possible into the ecology of the care home, which I felt would only be truly possible through carrying out the research in such a manner.

However, it must be borne in mind that the distinction between covert and overt research is not always a clear cut one (Bryman 2004; Bulmer 1982). In practices the research process involves a continuous movement between the two as part of the choices made by a researcher at particular times during the period of research based

on a variety of different practical and ethical considerations. As I stated above, the stances I took and how much I disclosed about my identity changed during different phases of the research. While in the care home I told my co-workers about the fact that I was a student but only those who I developed a close relationship with were eventually told the full extent of my identity as a researcher studying the working conditions of migrants in the care industry. It was felt that to speak more openly about my motives may have jeopardised the research and led to difficulties with management. For those that I did disclose my identity as a researcher all were more than happy to be interviewed and many proved very useful in connecting me to other care workers they knew working in other homes in the area.

In the case of my non-participant observations in other sites my decision to conduct 'overt' research meant that those who had been informed of my research were aware of my presence as a researcher. However, during these times I came into contact with many people who were unaware of my research role. While I endeavoured to inform as many of these people about my study in order to ensure that they consented to me using any observations I was able to glean this was not always possible or feasible.

This was particularly so in relation to my activism (which I discuss in more detail in the next section). Many of the insights I have gained about the lived realities of asylum applicants for instance came from contexts whereby I was attending more as an activist than as a researcher. This was very much the case for the time I spent in Calais. Again, while I was able to inform those migrants and activists that I developed a more intimate relationship with about the fact that I was also conducting research on the subject of migration, the situation in Calais in terms of people coming and going was so fluid that it would have been impossible to have made everyone I came into contact with aware of this. Despite these dilemmas, overall the collaborative nature of the research process meant that many of the participants, and particularly the migrants, who as I will discuss in the next section played an important role in the development and trajectory of the research, were fully aware of my dual role as 'activist-researcher'.

2.6 Activist-research

This thesis locates itself within a growing body of work emanating from numerous

collectives, both within Europe and beyond, whose political organising and activism is increasingly being practiced at the conjunction between thought/knowledge production and the political (cf. Osterweil and Chesters 2007)⁴³. Rather than being seen as something outside and separate from political praxis, such initiatives view research and the knowledges it generates as an integral part of such activity. As various trends in social theory have indicated, knowledge production, as with other forms of social action, is not merely a way of grasping and understanding the world, but is itself implicated in the production of the worlds investigated. With such perspectives in mind, activist-research can usefully be conceptualised as both a reflexive and critical engagement with the world, as well as a process of world-making.

As well as insights drawn from contemporary social theory many of the activist-research projects discussed above (see section 2.2) have been heavily influenced by certain strands of thought within the feminist milieu. Feminist theorists have long challenged the assumption of a value-free, neutral and objective science, pointing instead to the always partial, incomplete and situated character of knowledge production (e.g. Collins 1991; Haraway 1991, Harding 1988; Hartsock 1983). With this in mind such engaged forms of collective research do not aim at producing definitive answers and representations of social life and the processes through which it is composed. Indeed, given what we have just said about the partiality of all knowledge, such an endeavour would be somewhat disingenuous. Rather, activist-research is an open-ended interrogation and mapping of the constantly shifting dynamics of the present order that explicitly aims at intervening in and transform it. Activist-research is a process of collective reflection that emerges from within movements themselves and provides tools for (self)-reflection analysing forms of organising, enabling these to be reworked and redeployed as a means of opening up new potentials and possibilities for struggle and subversion. As with the work of *Precarias* and *Collectivo Situaciones* discussed above, much activist-research involves working with and attempting to generate encounters with strata of society that a more narrow definition of social movement might not consider as such. Like *Precarias*, my investigation into the dynamics of migrant movements has been driven by an attempt to explore points of commonality – without of course effacing the radical diversity and heterogeneity of the subjective experiences and standpoints of the different participants – as a means

⁴³ For a useful genealogy of forms of investigation and ‘self-exploration’ similar to what I am calling ‘activist-research’ see Malo de Molina 2004a, b.

of crafting new subjectivities, relationalities and affinities and forging connections and building alliances between struggles. This is done not from the traditional leftist perspective of the scholar as a leader, or vanguard of struggles (cf. Graeber 2009) but rather from one based on openness to encounter, to collective understanding, learning and experimentation embodied in the Zapatista saying ‘walking, we ask questions’.

Similarly to research practices under the umbrella of Participatory Action Research (Borda 1985; Borda and Rahman 1991; Bennett 2004) my aim during the course of the thesis has been to blur the boundary between subject and object of research. As such, the thesis is conceived as less a project of ‘research-on’, or even ‘research-for’ but rather one of ‘research-with’, whereby the conventional relationship between researcher-and-research is transformed into a more horizontal one, with the migrants who participated in the research engaged with and treated as peers in an ongoing dialogue about a specific set of concrete dynamics within which they are entangled. However, a slight dis-ease has accompanied me during the course of conducting the research. The exigencies of the PhD process has meant that such a collaborative endeavour has not been realised to the degree that with less institutional constraints might otherwise have been possible. While, I have extensively discussed my findings with many of the migrants during all phases of the thesis, as a means of including them in the production process as much as possible and enabling them to suggest alternative interpretations and perspectives the final say of how their lives are represented lies with me alone. Despite these issues, it is hoped that this thesis can make a small, modest contribution to deepening and advancing the various struggles – both from migrants and those social movements working in solidarity with them – against the border regimes that are multiplying across the globe.

In the introduction I discussed the distinction between the *technical* and *political* composition of the working class. As has been pointed out by various scholars and activists, the principle rationale behind investigating the *political* composition of different sectors of the working class – that is the methods and modes of organising they develop in order to struggle against the particular working and living conditions they face – is that the knowledge and understanding of such dynamics and process that such an inquiry can generate may offer glimpses at ways in which such struggles can be intensified. With respect to migration and migrant movements a central concern of this study is to think through the dynamics of contemporary mobility, the conditions different migrants find themselves in and move through and the ways in

which they negotiate and overcome such conditions in the hope that these might generate knowledge that enable social movements to enhancing the existent forms of solidarity with such populations. That is, it is hoped that such understandings will hint at new directions for political engagement around the issue of mobility. While the majority of studies that have examined such processes have tended to focused on more overt forms of struggle, such as union organising and other methods of mass collectivised struggle, it is my contention that approaching such issues with care in mind can open up new imaginaries of the political which question and challenge existent modes of organising. It is hoped that such an approach will enable us to *work from* the diverse realities that migrants finds themselves in, and *work with* the various practices and strategies they develop in order to deal with and transform such conditions and, by organising from such a perspective, to more effectively act in solidarity and build movements with different mobile populations. I shall return to such issues in chapter 6.

CHAPTER 3

The care industry:

the working conditions & everyday experiences of migrant care workers

3.1 Introduction

Migrants, and in particular undocumented ones, are often cast as a paradigmatic figure of the precarious worker: lacking in social rights and occupying the most low-paid and exploitative forms of employment (Frassanito Network 2005; Mitropolous 2005; Neilson and Rossiter 2005). Such processes of precarisation, the working and living conditions and employment relations that they give rise to have gone hand in hand with the intensification of border regimes across the globe over recent decades.

However, migrants are not homogeneous with respect to how they experience and negotiate such processes. As previously discussed (chapter 1) and will be highlighted at numerous points throughout this chapter, border regimes and the regulatory machinery they comprise of, are constitutive forces that create multiply stratified and differentiated migrant populations. While such mechanisms are important, they are by no means the only ones through which the field of labour as experienced by migrants is mediated. In order to ascertain which other forces are productive of such experiences this chapter takes as its principle focus the working and living conditions of a number of different strata of migrants working in the care industry. Through such an investigation it will be possible to better understand the relative impacts and the material and subjective effects of these various forces and how they intersected with one another. Importantly, this does not mean that migrants are passive victims of forces beyond their control. As will be highlighted, migrants are able to use the

conditions they find themselves in, instrumentalising them for their own purposes. As such, throughout the chapter I also look at how migrants work with and negotiate these potential constraints and the imperatives and forms of exploitability they can give rise to, as well as the strategies they develop, often emerging from within the labour process itself, to mitigate and manage such eventualities.

The chapter begins with an examination on the *labour process* in the care industry. Following an overview of the social composition of the social care industry and the place of migrants within such a division of labour, this section moves on to explore in more depth the specific kinds of labour that the care industry comprises of. Focusing specifically on the care labour process in care homes for older people this section will examine what exactly is being put to work and exploited within such a context and how such labour is organised. This section will also involve an analysis of how management attempts to control the labour process as well as the effects of wider regulatory mechanisms through which the social care industry is regulated has on the organisation of the care labour process itself.

Following this, the chapter will then explore how *financial* considerations impact on the working conditions of migrants and the levels of exploitability they may experience. Here the focus will be on both how issues relating to funding within the care industry and the fact that care homes are profit driven enterprises, as well as how wages and other financial aspects relevant to migrants themselves can be productive of their working conditions. The chapter then moves on to explore *contractual arrangements* and the effects these have on the working conditions and wider lived realities experienced by migrants.

Equally important as a regulatory mechanism is *residential status*⁴⁴ (cf. Anderson 2010a) and as with financial forces and contracts the focus here will be on how these mediate the various modes of exploitability and dependency that migrants live with, how these can *immobilise* migrants reducing their labour market mobility, tying them to a particular employer. Residential status is potentially productive of both differential access to the labour market as well as enabling different working conditions and levels

⁴⁴ The phrase 'residency status' is used throughout the thesis to refer to what in many other studies is referred to as 'immigration status'. Residential status itself is determined by a variety of factors, most importantly citizenship (nation/region of the world they were born and familial connections with UK) but also other factors such as skill levels, age, gender, with 'residency status' affecting access to clusters of social rights – free hospital treatment, unemployment or housing benefit and so on (cf. Anderson 2009) (see Table 3.1 below). The rationale here was similar to the one that underpinned my decision to use the term 'migrant' rather than 'immigrant' discussed above (chapter 1, section 1.1).

of exploitability to emerge for different migrants. Drawing on the concept of “mobility power” (Smith 2006, 2010) this section will look at how the potentially intersecting dynamics of contracts, finances and residential status as a site of conflict and explore how different migrants work with and negotiate these constraints using them for their own purposes and desires, potentially transforming their wider lived realities and opening up lines of flight and new horizons for themselves. Finally, the chapter will end with an examination of different forms of *protection* open to migrants in the care industry. How these can be used by migrants to negotiate and to directly or indirectly challenge the kinds of exploitation they may experience. This includes an examination of institutional forms such as Trade Unions as well as more informal networks of care – or what Ghandi (2006) refers to as “affective communities” – that emerge from within the labour process itself and which form an important element of, and means through which, migrants connect with the wider ‘mobile commons’, (see section 1.2) a concept that will be return to and develop more thoroughly at various points throughout the thesis (see chapter 4, section 4.5 and especially chapter 5)⁴⁵.

As highlighted in chapter 2 the migrants can be placed within four different categories of residency status: i. *EEA Nationals* ; ii. *Work Permit* holders; iii. *Student Visa* holders; iv. *Undocumented*. It must be borne in mind at this point that a small number of the migrants interviewed worked, or had worked, in other kinds of institutional settings from that of care homes for older people, such as those for people designated as having physical disabilities or mental health and learning difficulties. It also needs to be remembered that such categories are not mutually exclusive, with for instance older people in nursing care homes often having a variety of mental health problems (Waine, Tunstill, Meadows and Peel 2005). A number of the agency workers, due to the nature of the means through which they access employment often alternated between these different settings. While other migrants (principally EEA Nationals) who due to less restrictions on their labour market access and mobility had moved back and forth between such institutional settings. The most

⁴⁵ Of course, as well as the networks of care that emerge from the workplace, migrants also develop and connect with wider migrant *networks of care*. These networks of care are key means through which different strata of migrants are able to access the ‘mobile commons’ and through this negotiate and transform the working and living conditions they find themselves in and move through (see chapter 5). It is important to note here that, while the focus of the thesis is predominantly on the networks of care that migrants develop amongst themselves, many of the migrants have considerable contact with ‘non-migrant’ populations and as will be demonstrated at various points below such contacts can be important means through which they sustain themselves and remain mobile.

common trajectory for many of the EEA migrants was, however, to have begun work as a care assistants in a care home for older people and then to have moved on to other kinds of care providing institutions, or, as a number of the migrants interviewed had, to take up employment as ‘support workers’ in less institutional settings (see Table 3.1). Furthermore, other than in terms of the labour process itself, the levels of exploitability and the ways in which regulatory mechanisms operate are similar across the care industry. As such, I have included the experiences of migrants who have worked in all these settings and I will not be attempting to make comparisons between them in terms of working conditions.

As well as this a number of migrants were engaged in paid labour in more than one field of the labour market – with many of these having entered on student visas or did not have stable residential status. The majority of these worked in other jobs in what can be defined as the ‘service sector’ (fast-food, restaurants), as well as in cleaning. Of those that combined care work with other work five also worked in the fast-food industry, and another three worked in ‘up-market’ restaurants. Another combined care work with restaurant work, as well as in the fast-food industry. Two of the migrants had moved in and out of care work and cleaning for many years, often combining the two. Another migrant engaged in work as a ‘self-employed’ developmental psychologist. This work was highly paid – for three hours work he could make £150 – but infrequent. Finally, three of the migrants were also engaged in what is often referred to as ‘the cultural industry’, two as actors/performers, and one as a musician. These three migrants were all from EEA countries, which, as will become apparent below provided them with more ‘flexibility’ and labour market ‘mobility’, and they all tended to move in and out of work within the care industry depending on their ability to achieve contracts for their arts and music focused work.

Before I move on to discuss the experiences of migrants of the care labour process in care homes for older people I want to provide a brief typology of the different kinds of care workers and discuss the main differences between them (see Table 3.1). It needs to be pointed out that in many job advertisements and descriptions a variety of terms are used often interchangeably. Indeed, throughout this chapter, unless specifically indicated, I use care worker as a short hand for any form of direct care work, whether that be the kinds of care and assistance that will be the predominant focus of this chapter, such as feeding, toileting, bathing and so on, or forms of care that involve a more supportive role, such as helping with shopping,

taking a ‘client’ to the cinema an other roles that assist a person live an independent life (cf. Manthorpe and Martineau 2008). These distinctions in the kinds of care provided are then the fundamental delineating factor that differentiates care assistants and senior care workers (who perform the former forms of care) from that of support workers (who perform the latter).

Table 3.1: Different categories of care worker and tasks they perform

National Vocational Qualification (NVQ)	Job Title	Indicative overview of roles and tasks performed	Degree of Supervision
Level 2 in Health and Social Care	Care assistant	Washing; bathing; toileting; feeding, making bed; lifting residents; putting to bed	Supervised
Level 3 in Health and Social Care	Senior care worker	Same as above. Also responsible for coordinating the labour process (e.g. allocating tasks, deciding on the sequence in which tasks are carried out etc)	Supervised Also supervisory
Level 3 in Health and Social Care	Support worker	Assistance with shopping; filling in forms; taking on errands; generally assisting people supported live as independent a life as possible	(often) unsupervised

Although care assistants and senior care workers both provide the same forms of direct care, as Table 3.1 indicates, they differ in terms of the level of qualification that a person should hold in order to be employed in such a post. However, many of the care assistants reported that when they initially started work in the care industry they held no qualifications and indeed some of them continue to be unqualified. That said, the majority had during the time they had been working undertaken NVQ qualifications to at least NVQ level 2. Furthermore, while both are supervised by management (although as I will highlight at different points in section 3.2 they are generally expected to be self-directed) senior care workers are expected to supervise care assistants and to organise the work that must be carried out during a particular shift. With respect to ‘support workers’ as with care assistants a number of those who worked as support workers said that they did not have such qualifications when they got the job, although as with the care assistants just mentioned many had, as a means of obtaining better paid work, undertaken NVQ’s while working as ‘support workers’. The next section will explore such roles (especially that of care workers in care homes for older people) in more depth, through a detailed analysis of the care labour process in such institutions.

3.2 Labour process in the care industry

As just stated, this section examines the labour process of the care industry. This will involve an exploration of the kinds of labour that are performed in care homes for older people and how this is experienced by migrants, as well as an investigation of the various (both direct and indirect) means through which control over the care labour process is actualised and exerted. First however, I will provide an overview of the social composition of the social care workforce, focusing particularly on Wales, as well as an examination of the place of migrants within this emerging division of labour.

3.2.1 *Social composition and the emerging migrant division of labour*

The care industry has grown rapidly in recent years, with an estimated four to six percent of the UK labour force currently employed in some capacity as part of the social care workforce (Moriarty et al 2008). Within Wales the size of the whole social care workforce, including child care learning and development was estimated at approximately 89,000⁴⁶ in 2006 accounting for around 7% of the entire workforce, slightly higher than the average for the UK as a whole (Care Council for Wales 2006). This figure represents a marked increase from that of 2001, which stood at around 72,000 or 5% of the workforce (Care Council for Wales 2001). In terms of the social composition of the social care workforce existing statistics are patchy at best. No detailed breakdown of the social composition of the workforce was made in the most recent Care Council document (Care Council for Wales 2006). However, figures from a previous report provide us with a fairly useful demographic overview in terms of gender, ethnicity and age; the size of the residential care workforce relative to other parts of the sector providing (paid) care to older people; as well as in whether they were employed in the private, statutory, or voluntary sector (Care Council for Wales 2001). All subsequent figures, unless otherwise stated refer to this document.

Around 38,900 (54%) of the whole social care workforce were employed in private sector; 26,100 (36%) in statutory; and 7,500 (10%) in voluntary. The residential and nursing home sector was by far the largest sphere making up nearly half the social care for adults sector with 35,000 (48%) employees, with 23,800 (68%) of these being in private 7,000 (20%) statutory; and 4164 (12%) voluntary. The next largest sphere was for those employed in the domiciliary sector with 14,157 people. Interestingly, we

⁴⁶ All statistics in this section are rounded up to the nearest hundred in terms of numbers and to the nearest unit with respect to percentages.

see a very different pattern here in terms of sphere of employment with the vast majority working in statutory services, with approximately 9200 (65%); followed by private 3700 (26%); and voluntary 1200 (9%). These figures underline the discussion above (chapter 1, section 1.2) about the place of institutionalised care in the form of care homes as vanguard for the increasing privatisation and marketisation of care that has been a hallmark of neoliberalism.

As with care and reproductive labour more generally the social care industry in Wales has a distinctly gendered division of labour and is highly feminised. Based on figures from 1998/9, 81% of the workforce were women (compared to 45% of Wales workforce as a whole) with men accounting for 19%. This however represents a 7% growth from 1994/5, 89.1 female; 10.9% male. Between 1994/5 and 1998/9 the workforce became younger with the numbers employed who were under 25 doubling in number from 4,000 to 8,000⁴⁷. There was a significant decrease in those aged between 35 and 49 who have traditionally been the mainstay of the social care workforce. There was a small drop in numbers of workers in those 50 and over, although this group continues to make up around 25% of all those working in social care.

Unfortunately for our purposes here, the Care Council (2001) report did not contain a detailed breakdown of the proportion of migrant labour within the social care industry. The closest it comes to such an overview is in terms of the numbers of workers classified as being from an ethnic minority group working within the care industry, which it estimates at 2% of the workforce, around the same percentage as those of working age within the wider population. The Care Council (2006) document has this figure as slightly higher at 3%, but this is based on equal opportunities data from care workers who have registered with the Care Council and hence it is far from representative of the wider workforce. It is arguable that this greatly underestimates the proportion of such workers. Based on the time I spent working in a care home, as part of the ethnographic study that this chapter is based on I would argue that the percentage of migrants working in the care industry – in care homes at any rate – is far higher than this figure. In the care home where I conducted my non-participant

⁴⁷ While a lack of statistical evidence makes it difficult to make any claims as to either why this is the case, or indeed the wider characteristics of this age group, during my time working in care homes as part of the ethnographic inquiry that informs this chapter, as well as through my interviews and conversations with migrant care workers, it is arguable that this increase might be attributable to the growth of university students – both migrant and from the wider population – working in the care industry as a means of paying their way through university.

observation I would estimate that roughly 80 percent of direct care staff were either recently arrived or more settled long-term migrants. On one of my first days at the home a senior care worker who had worked at the home for over fifteen years and was one of the few who was born in the area reported her shock to see someone local beginning work at the home as the vast majority over recent years had been migrants. Further anecdotal evidence from many of the migrants spoken with and interviewed indicates that care work jobs in care homes are increasingly being filled by migrants, with many stating that well over half of the care staff in the homes they worked in were migrants, with the majority coming from Ghana, India, the Philippines, Poland and Zimbabwe. That said, it is almost too obvious to have to point out that no firm generalisation can be made from such accounts.

Further corroborating evidence does however come from the extremely important recent study of migrants working in the health and social care industry conducted by scholars at the Centre for Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), Oxford University (Cangiano et al 2009). Drawing on a diverse set of statistical sources (including the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and the National Minimum Dataset for Social Care (NMDS-SC) as well as data obtained through postal and online surveys) they argue that the proportion of foreign born workers has more than doubled over the past decade or so, with such workers making up around 19 percent of all social care workers in the UK. Although this figure drops slightly to 12 percent if only migrants who have entered the UK in or after 1998 are considered. Of particular significance was the finding that migrants made up 28 percent of care workers recruited in 2007. With respect to the figures for migrants working in residential settings caring for older adults the survey indicates significant disparities – both regional and with respect to urban vs. rural differences – in terms of the numbers of recent migrant workers. For instance, migrants account for around 44 percent of the workforce in London, while in Yorkshire and Northumberland they made up around 5 percent. Of particular interest to my concerns here is the figure for Wales, which was slightly higher and accounted for around 10 percent of workers in residential care for adults. With respect to the urban vs. rural differences the figures here were not linear. In cities, migrants comprised just under 25 percent, in towns just under 20 percent, in villages around 13 percent, while they made up slightly more in rural/remote settings, accounting for around 15 percent.

Cangiano et al (2009) study provides us with a rich insight into the proportion

of migrant labour across the UK and how these differ both regionally as well as in terms of geographical area. While the figure in Wales of 10 percent is considerably lower than my estimate of 80 percent – and of course given the far more wide ranging scope of their study it would seem that what I witnessed was in part an anomaly (which I would account for by the fact that the company where my research was conducted made considerable use of overseas recruitment agencies as a means of filling staff vacancies) – their highlighting of the fact that urban areas tend to have a markedly higher number of migrant workers than other areas goes some way to accounting for this disparity and given that Cardiff represents the largest urban area in Wales it is arguable that the numbers of migrants working there would be somewhat higher than the 10 percent for Wales as a whole.

Other than these figures scant attention has been paid to the labour relations within the care industry in the UK, particularly that of care homes for older people⁴⁸. As useful as figures like those just discussed are, they are clearly insufficient. While we get an insight into the division of labour along the lines of gender, age and ethnicity they tell us nothing of the labour process of the care industry, of the different working conditions of its various spheres, of its mechanisms of exploitation and how these dimensions are produced and maintained. We learn nothing of how often or for how long people work, or when they work. We are left blind to the kinds of contracts workers are on, whether these are permanent or part-time, whether they work for an agency or are contracted directly to a particular employer, or both and the effects that these can have on the labour process. Neither do they inform us of patterns of pay, and probably most importantly about the potential impacts of these different forces on the lives of migrants and the means and strategies – both within and outside the workplace – they develop to negotiate, cope with and subvert them. All of which will occupy us during the course of this chapter⁴⁹.

3.2.2 *Embodied caring: “body work” and “affective labour”*

Drawing on my time spent working in care homes, as well as from my discussions with

⁴⁸ The recent report by Moriarty et al (2008) and the study by Cangiano et al (2009) are the exceptions to the rule here, as is that of a recent study by McGregor (2007) which explored the experiences of Zimbabwean migrants working in the care industry in London. Of course I am not including here the large body of work that has been carried out on the experiences of migrants working in domestic settings (e.g. Anderson 2000, 2003; Chang 2000; Cock 1980; Parreñas 2001).

⁴⁹ It needs to be pointed out here that as well as the statistical aspect of the study by Cangiano et al (2009) they also explored the experiences of migrants and their working conditions with many of their findings being in line with a number of the insights I gleaned through my interviews and ethnographic fieldwork.

migrant care workers, this section will examine the kinds of labour carried out by care workers. Drawing on the important work of Arlie Hochschild (1983, 2003) much of the work that has examined the burgeoning ‘service industry’ (e.g. Bolton and Boyd 2003; Gatta 2002, 2009; Korczynski 2003)⁵⁰ has tended to focus on the issue of “emotional labour” at the expense of both the embodied character, as well as the “body work” that such labour often involves (Wolkowitz 2002, 2006). Taking each of these in turn: the elision of the corporeal aspect of such labour has meant that the demands that such labour places on the body of the worker herself, in terms of the stress and affective exhaustion that workers often report can easily be overlooked; while the notion of “body work” brings to the fore the often intimate bodily contact that labour so often entails. As the discussion in this section will highlight both of these aspects are very much prevalent in the work involved as part of the care industry. Of course care work also involves significant levels of affective work. In place of the concept of “emotional labour” I use that of “affective labour” both as a means of differentiating the approach taken here from previous work but also as a means of foregrounding the material, corporeal component of such labour.

The utilisation of the concept of affective labour however is not without similar problems. Affective labour has often been conceptualised as a particular type of immaterial labour (see Hardt and Negri 2000; 2004; Lazzarato 1996). For Hardt and Negri affective labour “is immaterial, even if it is corporeal and affective, in the sense that its products are intangible, a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement, or passion” (Hardt and Negri 2000: 293). Making explicit reference to the labour involved in care they continue that “caring labour is certainly entirely immersed in the corporeal, the somatic, but the effects it produces are nonetheless immaterial”. The important point to note here then is that it is not that the labour involved in such processes is immaterial but rather its product, what is produced are “social networks, forms of community, biopower”⁵¹. While it is clear that the affective component of care work is indeed productive of social relationships (Lazzarato 1996) the notion that such ‘products’ are immaterial is a problematic one, especially when considered in the

⁵⁰ As just mentioned above care work has for the most part been overlooked in this literature. This is not to say that care labour broadly conceived has not been explored but that when such labour has been examined it has tended to focus on the work of nurses and nursing assistants (e.g. Bolton 2001; James 1992) or care labour in domestic settings (e.g. Stacey 2005; Twigg 2000) with caring labour carried out in institutional settings as analysed here so far remaining largely unstudied (see Jervis 2001 and the studies referred to above for important exceptions).

⁵¹ As Ned Rossiter (2006) points out, such a conceptualisation contrasts with Paolo Virno’s concept in *A Grammar of the Multitude* of virtuosic labour whereby productive activity such as this, is “[l]acking a specific extrinsic product” altogether (Virno 2004: 52).

context of the care labour process. The immaterial labour thesis has led to some important advances in terms of our understandings of productive processes of contemporary post-Fordist capitalism. However, reducing the products of this labour to the dimensions that such orientations do, leads to the elision of other, equally important, ‘products’ (or outcomes) that are central to the labour process of much of the care industry.

An example might help to clarify. Much of the affective labour undertaken by care workers in care homes is bound up with more physical, task oriented labour, carried out as a means of providing intimate bodily care. For instance, the morning routine in the care home involves the highly coordinated activities of waking, washing, dressing and feeding the care home residents. The labour involved in the care labour process then is productive of more than just social relationships, of certain sentiments, of “a feeling of ease, well-being [and] satisfaction”: it is also productive of clean, fed and (ideally) pain-free bodies (cf. Bolton 2008, 2009). As such, caring labour is a materially trans-formative activity that is essential to both the affective and physical well-being of those being cared for⁵². Much of the work that care workers engage in involves highly intimate labour and contact with the actual bodies of those being cared for. Indeed, given the time constraints that (as will become apparent shortly) care workers in institutional settings such as care homes must manage and work within, the vast majority of such affective labour takes place while performing other tasks such as washing, carrying, moving, toileting and feeding residents. The affective labour of care then is intimately interwoven, bound up with and largely inseparable from what Wolkowitz (2006) following Gubrium (1975) calls “body work”.

In the care home where I conducted my non-participant observation the shift patterns were twelve hours long. Day shifts began at 8am and finishing at 8pm, and a night shift beginning at 8pm and ending at 8am. Workers also undertook ‘half-days’, which lasted 6 hours and began at 8am or 2pm respectively. The concept of affective labour is used as a means of capturing the labour that workers – both individually and collectively – mobilise in order to negotiate the various routines and multiple demands that are made of them during the course of an average shift. Returning to the

⁵² Furthermore, as Rossiter (2006) notes, the positing of affective labour as immaterial labour, also (surprisingly perhaps given both Hardt and Negri’s thoroughgoing immersion in the work of Deleuze and Guattari) fails to adequately take into account the far more nuanced and thoroughly material understanding of affect developed by Deleuze and Guattari (e.g. 1977, 1987) and is creatively built on in the work of Brian Massumi (Massumi 2002).

morning routine alluded to above. At 8am, once all relevant care staff are present, they will, following a quick negotiation of who will perform which tasks, immediately begin the various activities that this routine entails. The home is a large one, with a number of floors, with the one I spent the bulk of my time during my ethnography, and utilised in the analysis here having twenty eight residents in all. Two staff deal with the fourteen residents located at the front of the building, two take those at the back, while the fifth care worker will prepare the dining room (lay the tables) and feed the residents once they have been brought in.

On my second shift Nancy [P9, CW]⁵³, a 35 year old senior care worker from the Philippines who I was shadowing, spoke of how it was really important that they worked together as a team, that if anyone did not pull their weight it would cause a lot of problems; without working cooperatively it would be very difficult to deal with the intensity of the workload. On another occasion another Filipina called Ronda [P10, CW] who had been at the home for three years spoke of how the work was difficult, stressful and very tiring but how over time you get used to it. Like the majority of the others I worked with she spoke of the rewards of getting to know the residents of “doing the job properly” of “making sure that the residents got the best care that they could”. While the basic routine throughout the day is relatively fixed there is always a need to adapt how the work is organised, to react to potentially unforeseen circumstances as they unfold. The move towards ‘person centred care’⁵⁴ and more individualised ‘care plans’ for each resident that has been at the forefront of government policy and changes to the delivery of welfare state services more broadly over the past decade or so, has intensified such imperatives and means that workers must fit these into their routine and adapt according to the various requirements that the different residents or their families might make. Ken [P11, CW] one of two Filipino men who worked at the home reported that, while this made his job a little

⁵³ A list of all the migrants care workers (including relevant demographic information) who participated in the study and whose comments made during interviews are used in the thesis can be found at the end of the thesis in Appendix C. The key to the code in the square brackets is explained in the Appendix. No information about other participants interviewed and who are quoted in the chapter, such as managerial staff are included in the Appendix

⁵⁴ ‘Person centred care’, or ‘person centred planning’ is an umbrella term that refers to a number of specific approaches to assisting people who use social care services with the planning of their own lives (Stalker and Campbell 1998). It aims to increase self-determination and independence through tailoring care delivery as much as possible to the desires and wishes of the care service users themselves (Dowling, Manthorpe, and Cowley with King, Raymond, Perez, and Weinstein 2006). As a philosophy it also firmly underpins recent policy developments such as ‘direct payments’ and ‘personal budgets’ whereby recipients of care are allocated a certain amount of funds which (to a greater or lesser extent) they then use to ‘purchase’ the care services they want/need.

more difficult, it was only right that the residents should be treated in this way.

The heavy workload, due largely to the fact that management allocated the minimum number of care workers that would be required to get the job done (see section 3.2.3 above), led to a situation of ‘hyperactivity’ whereby staff were almost constantly on the move. Once one person or task was dealt with there was always another waiting to be performed. The lack of staff often meant that residents had to sit and wait to be attended to for considerable periods of time. This was not because staff were not doing their jobs properly. Rarely did I see anyone standing idle. Within the care homes I worked in the residents to staff ratio was approximately 7: 1, with the other care workers indicating that the homes they worked in were much the same.

The care labour process then involves “body work”, the affective labour provided to residents, as well as the affective labour that is apparent in the capacities and skills that care workers develop in order to keep going, even despite the affective exhaustion that such work can lead to. A central feature of the labour process that care work involves is that of affect management (cf Bolton 2005 on ‘emotion management’) and as well as the modes of relationality discussed above, it is precisely these forms of sociability and co-operation that are being harnessed and put to work during the care labour process. Affect and the forms of relationality and sociability with which it is intertwined are also salient in other ways that have a direct bearing on the organisation of the care labour process as experienced by migrants. Later in the chapter (sections 3.2.3 and section 3.6) I will look at the various strategies that care workers cooperatively created in order to deal with increased work intensification and manage the affective stresses and strains and the potential consequences of these that the rhythms and routines of the care home created.

3.2.3 Control over the care labour process

This section will explore the various forces that possibly exert a constitutive influence on the working conditions and wider ecology of the care home and the various strategies that management employ in an attempt to control the care labour process. The deeper penetration of a market logic into the field of care, and welfare services more broadly have arguably had a significant impact on the labour process within care homes. Large companies, like the care home where I conducted my ethnographic research, are very brand conscious. As such it is probably most useful to conceive of care homes as being private spaces with a public face. While not open to the public, family members and friends of residents were able to visit with a number of residents

having their partners or children coming to the care home on a daily basis, particularly during meal times. Management in the home was extremely strict in terms of the way that care workers were supposed to look while at work. All staff wore a standard uniform and male staff were expected to be cleanly shaven and to have hair cut short. No facial piercings were allowed, including the wearing of earrings.

Driven by a variety of factors – not least those relating to the media ‘scandals’ of neglect and mistreatment of residents within institutions such as care homes – recent years have witnessed a variety of moves to create more accountable modes of welfare provision. A hallmark of such processes has been increased levels of standardisation and bureaucratisation. 2001 saw the establishment of new regulatory bodies across the UK, the principle ones in Wales being – the Care Council for Wales (CCW) and the Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW)⁵⁵ charged with lifting ‘standards’ in the care industry and monitoring the ‘quality’ of care service provision. A central element of the CCW’s remit was the drawing up of a Code of Practice delineating best practice for social care workers and they have also been instrumental in the development of a register for social care workers. Although registration is not as yet compulsory for migrants working as care assistants, senior carers or domestic staff within the institutional settings that are being examined here it is likely that over the coming years the increased regulation of the social care industry will represent another regulatory hurdle that undocumented migrants would have to navigate in order to carry on working in such contexts. Indeed, during the course of writing this thesis, of the ten such migrants who were working in the care industry around the time I began conducting the research over half (seven) have left to work in sectors that are less stringently regulated, with only three continuing to work in the care industry. With one of these three, Virginia [P30, CW], now having indefinite leave to remain (ILR) following a successful claim for asylum.

The code of practice is the visible form of an attempt to regulate the workforce through an interlinked set of moral imperatives. It is the institutionalisation of a form of “moral management” (Kennedy and Kennedy 2007). Rather than control being exerted explicitly, such a method attempts to control the workforce

⁵⁵ Similar regulatory bodies have been set up across the UK. For those with the same remit as the CCW there was the establishment of the General Social Care Council in England; Scotland set up the Scottish Social Services Council, and the establishment of North Ireland Social Care Council. As for institutions whose remit was like the CSSIW to carry out inspections, England saw the establishment of what is now the Care Quality Commission; in Scotland there is the Scottish Commission for the Regulation of Care; and in North Ireland the role is carried out by The Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority.

through encouraging self-regulation based on a sense of moral accountability⁵⁶. It is arguable that the attempts to instil a sense of professionalism within what has previously been categorised and oriented to as a relatively unskilled labour force functions as a means of inculcating “...a form of moral surveillance and a means of managing emotional labour in ways amenable to organisational goals” (Kennedy and Kennedy 2007: 102). It is a form of control that operates by attempting to not only govern the productive behaviour of care workers but crucially their subjectivity (cf. Fournier 1999). To inculcate in them a particular ethos and sense of the ‘ideal’ care worker with this (ideally) becoming the framework through which their caring practices within various care settings are negotiated⁵⁷.

Management’s attempts to infuse the home with a normative moral framework of what constituted good quality care, and with it standardised practices of care were visibly apparent throughout the home. There were numerous, strategically placed posters with key word information about best practice in caring placed on them. For instance, one of these – that was placed directly opposite the lift on the ground floor so that it was seen every time workers left the lift – extolled the importance of dignity for the care process and the kinds of practices through which dignified treatment were realised.

Such management methods are important as the direct intervention and penetration of management control into the care labour process is limited by the nature of the work itself. As the discussion above (section 3.2) highlighted in order for a given routine – whether that is the morning, lunchtime or night time – to be completed successfully there is a need for care workers to work autonomously, to be able to make quick decisions without direct management intervention. Indeed, in the home I worked in, given the number of staff at work at any one time, it was necessary to almost constantly bend the regulations relating to how many people should be performing a given task. Again to focus on the morning routine: within a tight time frame, all the residents had to be woken, washed, have their pads or catheters changed,

⁵⁶ Such processes arguably parallel wider changes discussed by Jacques Bélanger and Christian Thuderoz who in exploring emerging forms of worker opposition argue that under post-Fordist conditions there has been a growing use of what they refer to as “responsibilisation” in contrast to that of subjection (characteristic of Taylorism) as a form of management control in recent years (Bélanger and Thuderoz 2010).

⁵⁷ As Kennedy and Kennedy (2007) state in their analysis of the nursing labour process that such modes of regulation are predicated on an ethical accountability that has a firm basis in Kantian-informed deontological approaches to an ethics of duty to care, pointing out that it is particularly well suited to the self-regulation of nurses because of its commitment to a set of universally binding abstract principles of duty.

dressed, taken to breakfast, fed and then taken to a lounge. Regulations state that there should always be two people to deal with certain parts of this routine – such as washing and dressing – but this almost never happened. Instead one worker would attend to a different person each. Following the rules to the letter meant that they would be unable to get the work done, while bending them also had the added advantage for the workers that they might – if they were lucky and if they could coordinate the work quickly enough – have a few minutes breathing space once all the residents had been transferred either back to their rooms or more commonly to the lounge, following breakfast, before they had to start preparing for lunch. It is difficult to know if senior management were aware of such practices, but when the deputy manager was on a given floor as part of her ‘daily rounds’ of the home the workers swiftly and quietly informed one another of her presence changing their practices accordingly in order to follow ‘health and safety’ as well as the other regulations.

Care homes undergo annual inspections from the CSSIW as a means of monitoring and controlling the standards of care they provide. They are also expected to carry out at least four internal inspections every year and to record these findings. A recent inspections report by CSSIW found that 85% of care providers met these criteria (CSSIW 2008). Such processes have led to an increased ‘audit culture’ and have been instrumental in the bureaucratisation of the care industry just mentioned. Care homes are expected to keep individual records for each resident (or what are more commonly referred to as ‘service users’ or ‘clients’). Again during the morning routine care workers are required to fill in a ‘personal hygiene record’ for each resident. These record information on a variety of dimensions such as whether they were bathed, or showered; finger and toe nail care; hair; shaving; teeth cleaning; whether their bedding and clothing had been changed (which were on a daily basis) and so on. Different letters were used to indicate whether A: assistance was required with the task; or I: whether the ‘service user’ completed the task independently; or R: whether a given service was refused by a resident. Management was extremely strict with respect to the filling in of these forms and checked on a regular basis whether this was being carried out. Protocol governing this record keeping stipulated that the form for each resident should be completed for before moving on to the next resident. However, due to a variety of factors – the most prominent being time constraints, or when the carer was called to give assistance to a co-worker – they were often completed later in the shift or during time that they should have been on a break.

The forms of “moral management” and “responsibilisation” (Bélanger and Thuderoz 2010) just discussed, are then, a way in which management and the wider institutional hierarchy governing the care industry attempts to manage the tension between needing workers to have relative autonomy while at the same time needing them to provide certain kinds of care in certain ways. Care home management also attempted to exert “remote control” as a means of managing the labour process in various other ways. Staff were expected to keep busy at all times. Sitting and talking to a resident was outside the remit of their job descriptions, unless this also involved another activity such as feeding. As there was always work to be done, a good employee, when they finished one task, was expected to find another to do, which meant, engaging in some sort of visibly measurable activity. So if not seeing to the physical needs of residents – moving, washing, toileting etc – then workers should do some cleaning, make sure the kitchen area was tidy, go and see if a co-worker needed any assistance and so on. Productive activity here then becomes confined to a certain set of activities, which does not include engagement with residents, talking with them, listening to them, apart from when they were also engaged in task based activities. Merely talking to residents was seen as idle, unproductive, time wasting.

During the time that I worked in the care home all the senior care workers that I worked with were migrants (although there were a small number of non-migrant senior care staff working in the home). They were responsible for coordinating the operation of the work routine during a shift, making sure that care assistants remained busy and generally making sure that care was provided in line with managerial regulations. In practice however, senior care workers felt much ‘closer’ to the care assistants than they did to senior management, as they worked closely with them and developed strong affective bonds with one another. Furthermore, as discussed above, how a given routine was implemented was for the most part cooperatively negotiated between the workers, although senior care workers had the final say and when unforeseen tasks emerged it was their responsibility to allocate staff to carry these out. Such worker hierarchies did on occasion led to tensions between workers. For instance, one of the locally born women complained that she was always the one asked to deal with the more difficult residents and she stated to me on more than one occasion that this was because the Filipina and other migrants from ‘Asia’ “stick together”. Racialised labour process dynamics were also invoked as being operative in other ways. Nancy reported how the general manager of the previous care home she

had worked at was always checking on what she were doing even though she had been a qualified nurse with over ten years of experience⁵⁸:

“I was one of the first overseas people to work at the home. Before me all the workers had been old white women [laughs]. It was obvious that she didn’t trust me. It was like every time I turned around she was watching me, seeing if I could do the job. This went on for the first few months. And it wasn’t just the manager. I don’t think any of the staff trusted me. But after a while, once they saw I was able, that I was good at the job, they left me alone. I think they just got bored and let me get on with it [laughs]” [P9, CW]

Similar experiences were recounted by other migrants. For instance, Erin [P1, CW] from Poland commented that when she first arrived she felt like staff in the home were just waiting for her to make a mistake. Overall, however, the picture that emerged was one whereby staff were expected to be self-directing, with senior care workers taking on a coordinating, supervisory role with direct managerial intervention in the labour process being very much hands off, particularly in the larger care homes where such surveillance would be difficult if not impossible to implement.

The moral dimension of the control exerted over the labour process is also produced through discourses of the home as a kind of family (cf. Dodson and Zincavage 2007). The expectation here then is that residents should be looked after as if they were a close relative. Laura from Poland stated how in one of homes she had worked in management constantly criticised her using the discourse of the family:

“He’d say things like “how would you like it if this was your mother?” “Would you like her to be treated like that?” Any thing like that, you know to... to make you feel guilty. No matter what you did it wasn’t good enough. If he thought you were being slow with attending to someone, taking someone to the toilet, responding to someone’s buzzer or whatever.... He was constantly on your back”. [P2, CW]

On a number of occasions during my first few weeks at the home various workers spoke about how the care they provided was always underpinned by a belief that you should treat residents as if they were a member of your own family, as Ken pointed out “you’ve got to imagine it’s either yourself or one of your family lying there. How would you want them to be treated” [P11, CW].

⁵⁸ Nancy, like four of the other migrants from the Philippines who were qualified nurses, was currently working as a senior care worker. I shall discuss below the reasons why they, as well as other migrants, had been unable to access work within a profession in which they were trained and qualified (see sections 3.3.1 and 3.4.2).

The discourse of family life extended beyond just how residents should be treated to also include the wider care home and its staff. In a discussion with Alex [P4, CW] and Lucy [P5, CW] mentioned how a previous company they had worked for put pressure on them to work when ill, stating: “the company, if you’re were sick, if only 60% they’d expect you to work. You should come in because you should think about the team”. In other words there was an expectation that unless someone was extremely unwell they should come to work and that not doing so was considered letting your work colleagues down. While of a slightly different nature from that of the trope of the family it operates within a closely related semantic network, with both of them attempting to manage behaviour and intensify productivity through appeals to an ‘ethos of togetherness’. One with respect to how they felt residents should be treated and the other in terms of how workers should feel and act towards their fellow workers. As we will see later (section 3.6.2) there was indeed a strong sense of togetherness amongst the care workers, but this did not extend to the care home management, or the care home provider. Interestingly when I asked my co-workers about how they felt about the management I got noticeably different responses from migrant care workers and those born in the UK about the general manager. Those born in the UK spoke about her as someone firm but fair, as someone who you did not want to cross but you knew where you stood. Migrants on the other hand stated almost the complete opposite, that she could be really nice one minute and then biting your head off in front of the rest of the staff the next. That she was someone who it was better to stay out of the way of.

Finally, it needs to be pointed out that despite the heavy and intense workloads (as well as the various other aspects of their employment relations and conditions) many of the migrants also spoke in positive terms about the work they did. The majority of the migrants spoke of the value of the work that they did both for those that they cared for and for themselves and how care work needed to be seen as more than just a job. Such a “moral economy” is observable in Ken’s [P11, CW] statement above about the need to treat those cared for like one of your own family, as well as in Ronda’s [P10, CW] comment (section 3.2.2) about providing the best possible care for residents. My discussions with migrant care workers were replete with comments of this nature. Similar sentiments were found by Jane Wills and colleagues in their study of low-paid migrants, who found that the migrant care workers they interviewed expressed a strong “moral commitment” to the work that they did and those that they

cared for (Wills et al 2010: 83). As well as the various other modalities of control that have been discussed during this section, it is arguable that it is this very ethos of care that forms the embodied and affective basis upon which strategies of control over the care labour process rests and indeed it is this ethos that the care industry draws on and puts to work.

3.3 Financial forces and the wage nexus

The fact that the cash nexus is productive of working conditions and exploitation seems almost too obvious to comment on. Capital's synthesis affects all our lives (unless you happen to be independently wealthy). However, there are a number of less obvious ways in which financial forces are potentially productive of the working and living conditions that migrants may experience. These will be examined in this section. This involves two broad, interrelated foci: firstly, those relating to care home providers themselves, which encompasses structural forces connected to wider governmental and Local Authority (LA) funding, the management of budgets, as well as of course the profit motive; and secondly, wage and other financial concerns relating more specifically to migrants themselves.

Care work and the social care industry more broadly is one where workers are low-paid⁵⁹ (cf. Wills et al 2010; Datta, McIlwaine, Evans, Herbert, May and Wills 2010). Before the introduction of the minimum wage in 1999, care assistants were among the lowest paid occupations in Britain (Player and Pollock 2001), and remained at the bottom of local authority pay rolls thereafter (Wills 2003). There is evidence to indicate, however, that workers in this part of the care industry enjoy slightly higher wages relative to workers who inhabit similar positions within other sectors where low pay is prevalent, such as the hospitality and cleaning industries (Datta et al 2010; Wills et al 2010). Workers employed directly to homes as care assistants tend to be paid the minimum wage or slightly above in the case of senior care workers. In the care home I worked in care assistants were paid £5.83 an hour, which increased by 15p if they obtained NVQ level 2 or higher, with senior care workers paid £5.98. This is generally less per hour than most agency workers, although agency workers do not get any sick or holiday pay. Conditions surrounding sick pay differed across different institutions

⁵⁹ I am of course not including nurses in this definition. While nurses working in nursing care homes fall within the remit of the care industry they inhabit a far better position within the wage hierarchy, generally paid at least double that of other care staff.

and companies. The company where I conducted my ethnographic fieldwork paid a very small amount of sick pay with a worker who missed a week of work being paid £65. If workers were absent for more than this they did not receive any further pay. Other migrants employed directly by a care home reported that their place of work provided no sick pay at all. This often meant that migrants worked when they were ill. However, such activity was driven by more than merely financial concerns. As will be discussed in more detail below (see sections 3.4 and 3.5) the precarisation that can be produced by mechanisms such as visas and work permits and non-guaranteed contracts, can lead to a heightened sense of existential insecurity and dependency which meant that many of the migrants reported feeling a need to demonstrate their reliability as a means of securing their potential future employment. Such a scenario is an example of how not only do certain migrants live with an increased intensification of precarious working and living conditions but with its extensification as the requirements of the labour market subsume their supposedly non-work time.

As previously alluded to, a common trajectory for those who were able to, was to use employment in care homes as a stepping stone for better paid care industry jobs. A number of the EEA migrants from Poland who had been working in the care industry for some time had moved from working as care assistants in the institutional setting of the care home or smaller institutional settings such as residential units to working as ‘support workers’ in domiciliary settings (see discussion above and Table 3.1). Pay for ‘support workers’ was generally better than that of care assistants and senior care workers in care homes (especially those who worked through agencies) and many of the migrants spoke of how it enabled them to develop better relations with those that they cared for and hence tended to experience their work as more fulfilling. Some of the support workers did however report problems with support work. For instance, Alex [P4, CW] stated that in one of the agencies she had worked for they did not provide travelling expenses, which depending on the number of clients she had in a particular day could significantly eat into her wages. Furthermore, as Lucy pointed out “when I worked for an agency where I had lots of clients to see during the day I was working for twelve hours a day but only getting paid for eight because of all the travel between them”. Such comments were common among migrants who had taken up work as a support worker (cf. McGregor 2007). However, a lot of ‘support work’ involved providing assistance to one client during the day and as Marcos [P3, CW] and others stated it was just a matter of finding the right company in order to secure more

favourable working conditions of this sort.

While wages are uniformly low there is significant variation in the ways that different homes and agencies remunerate the workforce. For example, some agencies paid a flat rate regardless of when a shift would be carried out. Others (and this seems slightly more common) had a wage structure that differentiated along two axes: day-night and week-weekend, with the lowest being day/week and highest night/weekend. Many of the migrants work a significant number of hours during an average week, and while this is driven by a number of factors the desire to make as much money as possible is a central concern and one that most definitely kept many of the migrants from leaving their job. On average it was migrants from outside the EEA who reported undertaking the most amount of hours with those from the Philippines doing slightly more than the others. There were a number of reports of a tendency to be 'rotaed' to do more than what was felt to be their fair share of weekends or nights, often for no extra pay than other working times.

Financial concerns were also at the heart of management decisions on who and who not to employ. Many of the migrants stated that while agency staff were frequently used in the homes they worked in they would only be employed if managers could not find someone who already worked at a particular home, or in the case of institutions that were part of a larger company, from within the company. A Filipina migrant nurse who had worked and lived in the UK for over ten years and was now employed as an 'assistant manager' made a similar comment claiming that, while she was not directly responsible for managing such issues financial concerns were central factors in such decision making process. Agency workers were paid more than regular staff and as she pointed out:

“the general manager is responsible for the budget and what with the big cuts in government funding over the years to deal with it's getting harder and harder for her to balance the books. It's a really tricky job. Better pay in house staff who are cheaper than agency and you also know for sure what you're getting”⁶⁰

As well as financial issues she also spoke of other potential concerns, which are apparent in the final part of her comment “you also know for sure what you're getting” that highlights the fact that agency staff were also seen as being unpredictable

⁶⁰ As this is an extract from an interview with a member of the management staff it is not included in Appendix C.

and the fact that they on occasion turned out to have inadequate experience with working in the care industry was also a significant consideration when making such decisions. Despite these factors, the majority of agency staff reported no major difficulties in obtaining work. However, as I shall discuss below, this did not mean that such workers did not speak of the insecurity they experienced that were shaped in part by the employment relations generated through working for an agency⁶¹.

Financial concerns also impacted on the workload and hence on how intensively migrants and other care workers had to work. Many of the migrants reported that the homes were often understaffed meaning that they had to work more intensively. At the home where I conducted my fieldwork, it did indeed seem that the minimal amount of staff that could sufficiently manage to get the work needed done were allocated to a particular shift. A number of the migrants attributed this, and rightly so it seems to me, to the desire of the company or care home they worked for to save money and to maximise their profits. While public sector involvement in the provision of social care services has significantly diminished as the private sector has taken an increased central role in providing such care, Local Authorities are still responsible for managing and allocating public funds provided by central government within the social care industry. For the most part funding allocated by central government for social care remains insufficiently low for high quality service provision to be realisable (cf. Cangiano et al 2009) as such funding undoubtedly has a significant bearing on both staffing levels and wages received. While such issues will almost certainly impact on the care labour process as a whole, with, as just pointed out, companies operating on the minimal number of staff possible in order to maintain their profits, for those working in nursing homes with residents who may have conditions such as Alzheimer's (or other forms of dementia) and can be potentially violent, this was a significant concern. But it was those that worked in institutional settings where they were looking after adults with mental health difficulties who were most vocal about such conditions, feeling that this was just another instance of the company putting money before their safety and, connectedly, that of those they were charged with caring for.

⁶¹ A report published in 2008 indicates that migrants to the UK are far more likely to be employed through agencies than other sectors of the working population. The report found that one in seven migrant workers that had arrived in the UK since 2004 accessed work through an employment agency, compared to one in fifty of those employed within the 'permanently-employed' workforce (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions 2008).

3.3.1 Skilled labour for the price of unskilled

Many of the migrants reported how regulations relating to their qualifications meant that these were not recognised and accepted as valid within the UK and that as such they had taken work as care assistants, senior care workers or support workers instead (see Table 3.1 for an overview of the differences between these different categories). Two of the male Filipino migrants had worked as doctors in the Philippines (one as a surgeon) but were now working as care assistants following their migration to the UK to join their wives, one of whom worked as a nurse and the other as a senior care worker. In a similar way Eduardo [P26, CW] a trained clinical psychologist from Brazil who's partner was a Portuguese woman and had lived in the UK for six years had, until very recently, been unable to practise in this field. Using the care industry as a way of financially supporting himself he had spent the first five years following his migration to the UK re-training in order to obtain the required qualifications in order to legally be able work as a psychologist in the UK. However, the issue with respect to qualifications is far broader than this. While I have focused here on those with care related qualifications that are not recognised in the UK a significant number of the migrants from both outside the EEA and within it were educated to at least undergraduate degree level or higher. However, as Erin [P1, CW] from Poland stated, as these had not been obtained within the UK they did not carry the equivalent value with potential employers. Like others who wanted to access the UK labour market she, like a number of other migrants from the EEA had 'chosen' the care industry route as the one that she saw as offering the most potential for future development and advancement.

In order for migrants with nursing qualifications from outside the EU to work as nurses in the UK they must undergo a probationary period known as 'adaptation', which they undertake while working. The adaptation process should usually take between three to six months. They can then obtain a pin number from the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) and legally be entitled to practise as nurses⁶². All the overseas qualified nurses spoken with who were working as senior carers (which amounted to five in total) had come to the UK having been told by the nursing care home, or the agency that recruited them, that they would initially be employed as care assistants but that once they successfully undergone the adaptation process the care home would then employ them as a nurse for the remainder of their work permit and

⁶² The regulations relating to overseas nurses changed with the introduction of the Points Based System (PBS) which was implemented in phases between 2008 and 2010.

contract. All of them had experienced significant problems with this process and indeed none had successfully completed the adaptation process, despite having worked in the country for a number of years (see section 3.4.2 for a further discussion of such issues and the regulations governing the adaptation process). It is for this reason that those who found themselves in situations where it was clear that they were never going to get through their adaptation instead attempted to move to another home and work as senior carers, where at least they are able to obtain the higher wage that this provides them. While all of them had eventually managed to move to another care home, as we shall see below, due to regulation on labour market mobility linked to residential status such a process is not without its difficulties.

It is clear from the comments of these and other workers who knew people who had been through similar experiences that this procedure was used by many care home managers as a means of obtaining more highly skilled labour for the least amount of financial outlay. During the period in which overseas nurses undertake adaptation they are not paid on the nurses pay scale, but rather receive the same as care assistants, which in the vast majority of cases was less than half what they would be earning as nurses, and hence translated to a significantly reduced wage. This coupled with the fact that it is the care home that employs a particular overseas nurse that is ultimately responsible for approving whether they have adequately demonstrated that they are competent to practice in the UK represents a state of affairs ripe for abuse. There is, as Anderson and Rogaly (2005) point out, a clear financial incentive for care homes to delay approving an employee for as long as possible. They are legally allowed to extract the migrants (often considerable) expertise (all those that I spoke with had worked as nurses for at least five years, with one having worked for over fifteen years as a nurse), skills and knowledge while paying them a significantly lower wage. They get the (often highly) skilled labour power and expertise of a nurse for the price of a care assistant. I will return to the issue of adaptation and its capacity to regulate and produce certain forms of labour below.

3.3.2 Learning to deceive, deceiving to learn

Fifteen of the workers from outside the EEA were on student visas. At the time the research took place the regulations relating to student visas meant that migrants who had entered in such a way were only legally authorised to work 20 hours per week⁶³.

⁶³ As will be apparent by now policy and regulations pertaining to the field of migration management change on what seems like an almost daily basis. During the course of writing the thesis new

However, for the majority of migrants this was not a sufficient amount of hours with which to be able to fund their time during their courses, which included paying course fees, accommodation and other living necessities. Indeed, of the fifteen only two were able to live without working more hours, and this is because they were living with family members and did not have to pay for accommodation. These examples point to the significant impacts that family and friendships and the ‘networks of care’ they form can have on shaping the living and working conditions of migrants and how they experience their mobile trajectories, a point I shall return to in more detail below (see section 3.6.2 and chapter 5 for a detailed exploration of migrants networks of care). For the remaining thirteen students the need to work more than twenty hours meant having to breach the terms of their visa. There are a number of ways in which people get around this in ways that minimised the likelihood of being detected. The most common seemed to be through doing a number of different jobs and working for twenty hours or less for each. For instance, one student worked in a care home two nights a week, at times at a local shop for cash in hand, as well as in a fast food restaurant a number of evenings a week. As well as working multiple jobs some of the migrant students stated that they opened more than one bank account. When renewing their visas Home Office regulations require the submission of bank statements, in this way the extra income from other work is not registered. However, opening back accounts could be difficult and those who experienced such problems were pushed into more informal arrangements, which often intensified their exploitation.

A few reported how they had managed to negotiate such informal arrangements with the homes themselves. For some this had caused problems. For instance, Erica [P27, CW] from Columbia stated how the home had insisted that they had paid her on one occasion for a number of hours overtime she had done (cash in hand) but they never did. A number of the students had signed up to agencies and some of them had encountered problems here as well. For instance, Andreas [P28, CW] from Zimbabwe reported how when he was working during the summer (when he was legally entitled to work more hours) he had undertaken a number of extra shifts during the first month of this period (working approximately 60 hours per week) but was only paid for the 18 hours (one full shift and one half) that he usually

regulations were introduced as part of the states response and attempt to close down education as a route to the labour market with non-EEA migrants now only legally authorised to work ten hours a week.

worked. When he challenged the agency management on this they told him that there was no record of him having worked the extra hours but as he had worked with them over the stipulated 20 hours during term time on a number of occasions and hence had breached the regulations he did not feel able to challenge them further.

The example of those in breach of regulations governing student visa applicants renders problematic the category of 'illegal immigrant'. In the case of these students they are 'legal' in terms of their right to be in the country but are in breach of the conditions of their visa. As Bridget Anderson and colleagues have pointed out, the complex web of rules governing migration and the different entitlements that these allow and disallow are obscured in the simplified dichotomy between 'legal' and 'illegal' migration, so often at play in public and media discourses. They argue that it is more precise to distinguish between different forms of *compliance*, with these differences existing on a continuum from full compliance (in breach of no rules) to semi-compliance (in breach of certain rule, as in the case of the students) to non-compliance, whereby a migrant has no legal residency rights or employment rights whatsoever (Anderson 2007; Ruhs and Anderson 2006). Such an argument resonates with that of the work of Nicholas de Genova who has explored the legal mechanisms through which 'illegality' is produced (de Genova 2005). As such, by examining the myriad of entangled dynamics involved in such processes of 'illegalisation' it is possible to get a more nuanced understanding of the operation of such mechanisms, how they shape the lives of different migrants, the effects this can have on them and the strategies they develop in order to negotiate such conditions.

3.3.3 Same job, different pay and other means of exploitation

A number of other examples of how differential levels of exploitation coupled with the wages for different categories of migrant as well as between the labour force more generally emerged during my conversations with these migrant care workers. Nyasha [P20, CW] a Zimbabwean said that when she first started working in the UK the care home she worked in as a senior care worker paid her the same as the care assistants, despite the fact that senior care workers from the UK were paid a higher wage, a fact that particularly angered her. However, when she brought this up with the manager she was told that this was because of regulations that this home was not allowed to pay overseas staff more than a certain wage. As we will discuss in more detail below (see section 3.4) some of the migrants recounted stories of how both agencies and care home management had held wages back from them, which can be seen as an

attempt to 'bond' them to a particular workplace (cf. Anderson and Rogaly 2005; McGregor 2007).

For those working without proper documentation, wage related difficulties as with other forms of exploitation could at times be especially acute. Both agencies and care homes can often exploit the unstable residential status of such workers often taking considerable deductions from their wages, telling them it is for tax or National Insurance (even if they are working with borrowed documentation). Others reported how they had been charged large amounts of money for training, with this then being deducted directly from their pay. Virginia, from Zimbabwe reported how one care home where she worked would give workers different wages for doing the same work: "when pay packets would come there were often very big differences between what people were paid. We looked at them but couldn't work out why" [P30, CW]. However, given her unstable residential status she did not feel able to query this. Another Zimbabwean woman Anna who had initially entered on a student's visa and had lived in 'irregular status' for over eight years stated that when she initially arrived in the UK she had found it hard to find work without the proper documentation: "I had very little money and was scared to tell people that I didn't have papers in case someone told the Home Office" [P29, CW]. However, after just over a month she found work through a friend who was working in a small care home (the importance of migrant networks for such purposes, as well as numerous others, forms the subject of chapter 5). She continued:

"I worked for £50 a week and stayed in a room at the top of the home. They gave me food as well, so it wasn't so bad. But I was getting much less money than the others who had proper papers and often I was asked to do some extra shifts and was never paid for these" [P29, CW].

Whilst with time Anna was able to find the means to create more bearable employment relations there was a sense that while her treatment and the level of exploitation was not right, that it was an acceptable trade off in order to remain within employment⁶⁴.

Like others, Anna said that recent changes in legislation regulating care homes (in particular the increased strictness relating to CRB checks)⁶⁵ had made it far more

⁶⁴ After around a year or so working in this care home Anna was able to use her contacts to access residency papers and with this find employment in the care industry through an agency.

⁶⁵ For instance, while up until 2006 it was possible to begin working in care homes before a CRB had

difficult for new arrivals to find work in the care industry without the proper documentation. It had also meant that many of the homes that had employed people without checking their papers properly had asked people to leave because there had been a number of ‘raids’ on care homes and many of the homes were scared that if caught they would have to pay large fines. This had pushed people into other forms of labour, with often even more precarious and exploitable working conditions, in particular cleaning. For those who were living in homes, or who were living in accommodation provide by their employers, this had also meant that many had to find alternative accommodation.

This section has explored the impact that financial issues and wages can have on the care labour process as experienced by migrants and how such forces in connection with other mechanism can shape employment relations and augment the forms of exploitability experienced by different strata of migrants. In the next section I examine some of these mechanisms in more detail focusing particularly on the ways in which residential status functions, the effects such devices can have and the ways in which different categories of migrants manage such dynamics.

3.4 Status, labour market mobility and exploitability

It should be clear from the discussion so far that residential status and the social rights (or lack of them depending on the place in the residential status hierarchy a person occupies) that are connected with them are powerful mediating devices productive of the differential forms of exploitability that different strata of the migrant population may experience. Mobility controls do not then merely filter particular people as they cross nation-state borders but also produce and modulate the conditions and relations that migrants must attempt to live with and negotiate as part of their working and everyday lives (cf. Anderson 2010a; Sharma 2008; Neilson 2009). As such, as will be highlighted below mechanisms such as residential status do not only lead to the intensification of exploitability but to its extensification, in that in order to remain productive they must increasingly bend and transform themselves in line with the dictates of the market (see section 3.5). In this section I examine more fully how certain regulations linked to residency status couple with labour regulations and other forces can function in ways that decrease the labour market mobility of certain

been processed, these must now have been completed before work can begin.

categories of migrants and how this can be used by employers to amplify the exploitation of migrants they employ. I refer to such processes as *immobilisation* and examine how the heightened exploitability that it can produce is mediated through: (i) the residential status; (ii) the adaptation process; and (iii) financial bondage.

Over half (55) the migrants interviewed were employed directly with the care homes themselves. As will be explored in more detail below, these could be either fixed term contracts (for those outside the EEA usually lasting the duration of a particular work permit) or more infrequently, informal arrangements with the care home, whereby migrants worked completely informally without any kind of contract whatsoever. While immobilisation as a process is also experienced by migrants from the EEA, or those working through agencies, such migrants generally have better “mobility power” (Smith 2010) and exploitability as realised through immobilisation is more apparent for migrants who are employed directly with a particular care homes or care providing company.

3.4.1 Institutionalised immobilisation (1): residential status

For a large number of the non-EEA migrants their employment with a particular care home was a condition of their work permits. It is not migrants themselves who apply for a work permit but a particular care home or care home providing company and although the regulations linked with work permits did not prohibit moving employer they did make this process far more difficult. In this way then immobility is produced and augmented through the terms of work permits, which link them with a particular employer, as well as meaning they could not move between sectors. As such, in order to escape conditions they found particularly exploitative migrants on work permits must find another care home that is willing to apply for another work permit for them. Given the potentially time consuming, and complex aspects of such procedures, many employers “couldn’t be bothered with the hassle”, as a Filipina migrant Nancy [P9, CW] pithily put it. Employers are also responsible for paying for the work permit. Two of the migrants working on work permits reported that in the past they had actually paid for the work permit themselves as a means of negotiating this potential barrier to their moving to a different employer. However, with work permits at the time the ethnographic fieldwork was carried out (between November 2008 and March 2009) costing £190 (as well as other procedural costs) such expense (whether borne by the employer or the worker themselves), as well as the time this might take, considerably curtail their ability to move, thus increasing their dependency and

amplifying their exploitability.

A large number of migrants from the Philippines were recruited directly through an agency in the Philippines, or were the dependants of one who was. Many saw this process as a key time in determining the kinds of employment relations they subsequently worked under once in the UK, with a number saying they were told many things that turned out to be untrue. As Jasmine stated:

“When I took the job they [the recruitment agency] told me I would have this amount for a salary, that I would have these days off, that I would be guaranteed employment for three years and that at the end of it I would be able to apply for citizenship. All of it turned out to be lies. I didn’t even end up in the city they said I would [laughs] They said I’d be in London where I have friends already working. It was all a bag of lies just to get me here” [P12, CW]

However, due to the nature of their work permits many reported feeling that it would be dangerous to complain or challenge practices they felt were particularly exploitative for fear of losing their jobs or damaging the prospects of getting their contracts renewed (see section 3.5). For instance Jasmine, like a number of the others whose employment was mediated by her work permit, reported feeling “trapped” and that rather than voicing complaints she spoke of how “it’s best just to try and get on with it. It’s not so bad, I enjoy my job most of the time but it does get to me sometimes ...well quite a lot but I just try and forget about it” [P12, CW]⁶⁶. In contrast to this, due to an absence of such restrictions, those from EEA countries often had far better “mobility power” and hence were much more able to move employer. That said, for those who had just entered the labour market in the UK their inability to access the welfare entitlements that citizens have access to did act as a constraint on their ability to move and did on occasion mean that they could not so readily escape from working conditions they were unhappy with.

3.4.2 Institutionalised immobilisation (2): the adaptation process

Continuing the analysis of the adaptation process discussed above (see section 3.3.1) I want to look more closely at the ways in which adaptation can function both as a means of controlling mobility and in the production of forms of exploitability. It is clear from the discussions with overseas qualified nurses working in nursing homes

⁶⁶ During the course of writing the thesis Jasmine was, albeit after considerable effort and time, able to use her friendship networks in London to secure work there in a nursing care home as a senior care worker.

that had unsuccessfully undergone the adaptation process and were working as senior care workers, that employers use this regulatory mechanism as a means of intensifying the exploitation of migrant workers and increase their pool of lower paid labour. Care homes can exploit the fact that migrants are dependant on them to authorise the completion of their adaptation process and the increased docility amongst the migrants that this can produce. Adaptation is a device that can be productively used by employers to diminish the mobility power of workers, 'bonding' them more tightly to their particular place of employment. This has enabled employers to extract the capacities of more highly trained labour while paying them the lower wages of senior care workers or often care assistants (see Table 3.2).

Similar patterns emerged from the migrants who had experienced problems with the adaptation process. All were told that they would be able to undergo adaptation, which was a formality and then they would be employed as nurses, with Nancy [P9, CW] reporting how she had been told this by homes that turned out to be unapproved institutions. However, those who were working in approved institutions also experienced difficulties. In such institutions migrants spoke of how when undergoing adaptation that no matter what they did it was not sufficient and that management would constantly require them to demonstrate their competencies at different tasks. Malaya [P13, CW] a Filipina migrant's story provides a stark illustration of the control over the lives of migrants that the way the adaptation process is structured made possible. "At first I just thought they were being thorough, you know, making completely sure" she said. "I'd heard the stories of course, of other Pinos who'd had bad experiences" and encountered problems during the adaptation process, "I suppose I just didn't want to believe it was happening to me ...especially as I was now in debt because I had to pay for the adaptation myself... although deep down I knew it was ...it just took me a while to admit it". After nine months of what Malaya referred to as them "always changing the target" she decided to confront the management. This was a difficult decision. She was scared that if she angered them or got on the wrong side of them, that this might mean that they took even longer to sign her off. She finally went and asked why, after she had done everything possible, was she still not being signed off.

"She [the manager] got really angry. It was very scary, I'd seen her angry before, shouting at staff but never like this... she said that she'd never sign me off. That I'd have to work as a care assistant until my work permit expired. She

said that if I made any more complaints she'd get me deported" [P13, CW]

Table 3.2: Intersection of residency status, exploitability and social rights for different categories of migrant*

Residency Status	Social Rights	Exploitability
<i>EEA Accession 10 countries** (excluding Malta and Cyprus)</i>	Free movement in/out of UK but restrictions on access to employment Access to welfare (income support and social housing) more restricted than citizens of other EAA member state; regulated through Habitual Residence Test (HRT) Free movement between places and sectors of work	More vulnerable when first enters employment. Required to register to work – workers registration scheme – within one month of finding a job; contact or letter of employment needed to register Must remain in continuous employment for at least 12 months in order to gain full free movement and social rights, although a break during this period of up to 30 days will be discounted. Makes difficult to leave employment
<i>Work permit (WP) (non EEA)</i>	Stay in UK restricted to time specified on work permit 'No recourse to public funds' – no access to welfare provisions; access to health system limited...	Employment linked with particular employer as 'sponsor'; employer makes application to have particular job vacancy met; Can change employer but new employer will need to apply for new permit. Many employers can't be bothered with hassle.; Mobility decreased; Sector specific; can only work in sector and kind of job for which initial permit was granted; all these restrictions augments exploitability Nurses need to undergo 'adaptation'. Care home responsible for determining when necessary conditions for adaptation to have been passed have been met; System very much open to abuse
<i>Student visa (non EEA)</i>	'No recourse to public funds' – no access to welfare provisions	Restricted to working twenty hours a week ^a ; can work more out of term time. many need to work more than twenty hours in order to pay fees. No sectoral restrictions
<i>Undocumented</i>	No social rights	No legal access to labour market

* During the course of the research a new Points Based System (PBS) was introduced. The PBS is a system of migration management modelled on that of the Australian regime of mobility control and represents a significant shift in the operation of migration controls within the UK. Amongst other things, the PBS has replaced the work permit scheme for non-EEA nationals. While the vast majority of the migrants interviewed that were affected had managed to renew their visas before the system was introduced, its implementation meant that a large number of senior care workers had to leave the UK. It has been widely criticised from a number of key quarters of the care industry and has caused it considerable problems, with organisations such as Bison UK who provide advice and assistance with finding employment in the UK predicting that it will have a significant and negative effect on overseas recruitment in the social care industry.

** A2 (Bulgarian and Romanian) migrants are subject to further restrictions to both access to social rights and the labour market. These restrictions do not apply to certain categories such as students. As the migrants coming from these countries that participated in the research were both students we will not provide details of these restrictions and there effects here.

^a This has now been reduced to ten hours per week as the Home Office attempts to 'close down' student migration as a route to other forms of migration, particularly that of labour migration.

A little later in our conversation Malaya reported how her manager had told her that there was no point trying to find another job as she would give her a bad reference. After this she was constantly given the worst shifts and was shouted at on a number

of occasions in front of other staff and residents. It was making her very depressed. She dreaded going into work, although as I will discuss in more detail below (see section 3.6.2) the support of her friends in work was a “massive help”. She also felt that she needed to make as much money as possible so that she could at least get something out of the situation.

Along with some of the other Filipina workers who had come over at the same time as her, she had joined a union when she went to an induction day at a hospital. However, they had not helped after she contacted them. They said they would look into it but when she contacted them again they told her that they had spoken to the care home manager and as it related to my performance there was nothing they could do. After that things carried on as they had done for about 5 months, until the deputy manager, herself a nurse from the Philippines who now had citizenship status in the UK, approached her at the end of a shift and said that she would provide her a reference so that she could find another job. After a few months she managed to find another care home and handed in her notice and is now working as a senior care worker, although the home does not carry out adaptation.

I heard a variety of similar stories and experiences and of people who knew of others that had undergone analogous experiences during the period in which I undertook my research. For instance, Nancy [P9, CW] who had experienced similar problems herself stated how a friend, after a protracted period of attempting to get signed off and through adaptation, ended up moving to London to work as a nursing assistant/auxiliary nurse. Claire [P18, CW] another of the other overseas qualified nurses from the Philippines currently working as senior care workers stated how she had initially been recruited by a care home that offered her supervised placements on the basis that she come over on student visas for the duration of her supervised experience. As pointed out above, the regulations attached to student visas stipulate that migrants are legally only allowed to work twenty hours per week, which did not enable Claire to get the required hours of ‘practice’ time dictated by the procedures of adaptation. As such, she had to work the extra hours for no pay, which amounted to the home getting an average of twenty hours a week of free labour. Even then however, she was not signed off and in the end like Malaya [P13, CW] she had to find the means through which to leave the care home and is now working in another home as a senior care workers. While the experiences of Malaya and Claire [P18, CW] as well as other migrants highlight that following a certain amount of struggle it was possible

to become mobile and move employer they nevertheless indicate how regulations connected with the regime of mobility control create certain conditions of exploitability and make escaping these far more difficult and problematic than for other migrants or those whose labour market access are not subject to such controls.

3.4.3 *'Tied in': financial forces and immobilisation*

The increased immobilisation of migrants is also realised through financial means (see the section 3.3 above for a fuller discussion of the role of the financial dimension in the production of the working conditions of migrants). This can happen in a range of ways. A number of migrants pointed out how care homes and agencies had held back their wages, making it more difficult for them to move on and try and find less exploitative working conditions. While all categories of migrants reported experiencing problems with payment of wage on occasion, those subject to such treatment on a more regular basis were most likely to be those without proper documentation, or some of those on student visas who had had more informal working arrangements with the agencies or care homes. These workers largely felt that they were unable to complain, or felt that any complaint would be pointless when such things occurred because they either feared that they would be reported to the authorities and deported if they did so (cf. De Genova 2002, 2005 on 'deportability'⁶⁷) or if they had complained they had been threatened in this manner.

The principle way in which migrant's financial situation tied them to their employers was through "debt-bondage", which coupled with legislation governing residential status is a considerable problem (Anderson 2000: 32). Many of the migrants had paid considerable amounts of money to come to the UK, either to private agencies or care homes themselves. For many these included loans for plane tickets, visas, work permit, other administrative procedures and initial accommodation.

⁶⁷ According to De Genova the power of 'deportability' lies less in its actual use and more in the ways in which it functions as part of a wider regime of control through which employment relations, forms of exploitation and migrant subjectivities are shaped. Focusing in particular on the ways in which migrants, and particularly Mexican migrants, are 'illegalised' in the USA he states that "the legal production of migrant "illegality" has never served simply to achieve the apparent goal of deportation, so much as to regulate the flow of Mexican migration in particular and to sustain its legally vulnerable condition of *deportability* – the possibility of deportation, the possibility of being removed from the *space* of the US nation-state. It is deportability, and not deportation as such, that has historically rendered Mexican labor to be a distinctly disposable commodity" (De Genova 2005: 8). While De Genova's principle focus is on undocumented migrants, he points out that the legislation governing mobile populations can be seen as a continuum with all those subject to mechanisms such as Work Permits (which as I have discussed means that in order to stay in the country migrants must remain in employment) experiencing the insecurity and potential for removal that this brings.

Others had been told that all such costs would be borne by the care home or company itself only to find on arrival that this was not the case. As Nyasha a woman from Zimbabwe stated:

“I wish I knew then what I know now. I should’ve known really it was all too good to be true. In my interview they [the recruitment agency] told me that that everything would be paid for, the visa the plane ticket, even my first month’s accommodation. It all turned out to be lies. None of it was true. When I got here the home told me that that the agency must have misinformed me ...that in fact I had to pay it all back to the home ...now as well as everything else I’ve got a huge debt to pay off” [P20, CW]

As Nyasha [P20, CW], said later, what with having to support her two children back home and other family obligations back in Zimbabwe how could she afford to leave her job or go back home. And Nyasha was not alone. I heard similar accounts from a number of the migrants who had been told that they would not have to pay for visa, work permits, travel and so on only to find out that this was not the case. Some of the care workers who worked for the same large UK wide care provider reported that the company had paid the fees for their visas and work permits but that this was contingent on them remaining in the companies employment for the duration of their contract and that if they left the company before the end of this period (which were usually between three to five years⁶⁸) they would have to pay this money back. Alison [P14, CW], a Filipina migrant said that she also had to pay a large sum of money she received a loan for as a fee for carrying out her adaptation course, which was never completed successfully, while Rosie [P15, CW] reported how the manager of the care home where she previously worked had charged her a large amount of interest on a loan for her flight. Many of the migrants in such situations reported how the management in the homes where they worked had insisted they take on extra shifts in order to pay loans back more quickly. With such loans often leaving migrants hundreds, and in the case of Nyasha [P20, CW] and some others, thousands of pounds in debt, it was often difficult for them to refuse such ‘requests’ and it also made it extremely difficult for them to leave a given place of employment.

These workers are clearly not ‘free labourers’ as conventionally conceptualised (cf. Anderson and Rogaly 2005; Baines and Sharma 2002). While they are not bonded

⁶⁸ As will be highlighted below (section 3.5), such contractual arrangements are less stable than they seem, with probationary periods acting as mechanisms through which exploitability can be created and intensified.

in the strict sense of the word it is clear that care homes and agencies use a variety of means through which to reduce the ability of certain migrants to leave their employment and in the process maximise cheap labour extraction and intensify levels of labour exploitation. It is worth pointing out that although migrants from both within the EEA and outside it had incurred some kind of debt in order to obtain employment in the care industry it was only those from non-EEA countries who experienced such debt as a significant barrier to their mobility. This was due to a variety of factors not least the larger size of potential debts that non-EEA incur due to travel as well as visa and other expenses relating to mobility controls. This highlights how those with more stable residential status and the rights that these afford are arguably in a far less precarious and less open to more exploitable situations.

Overall workers from EEA countries spoken with were more mobile in terms of their ability to leave working environments that they felt were exploitative. Although a number reported having experienced difficult employment relations, especially when they first arrived in the UK, with both their lack of knowledge of their rights and no recourse to public funds impacting on such processes, the increased rights that they enjoyed by virtue of being citizens of countries within the EEA meant that they did not have to meet the various demands, such as visa restrictions or work permits that migrants from outside the EU are subject to. This was also true of those workers who were here with their partner, especially those that were not the principle visa holder and were here as dependants on their partner's visa. Such migrants are not required to work as part of the conditions of their visa and as such they were more mobile, which was reinforced by the fact that they could rely on their partner's revenue and were therefore better placed to absorb the potential difficulties that being out of work might entail. This situation is further complicated however by demands that were placed on many workers, from family and other obligations back in the countries from which they migrated. A situation that (as will be explored more in chapter 5) was particularly apparent for workers from outside the EEA, and especially those who were the only member of the family working overseas.

3.5 Contractual arrangements

The shift in the nature of contracts is a key dimension through which precarious labour relations and working conditions are produced and maintained. There is

widespread agreement that the shift from more secure, permanent contracts with relatively stable working hours seen as a characteristic of the Fordist mode of production, to more insecure, non-standard forms of contracts involving less predictable and flexible work hours said to be a hallmark of post-Fordism has created particular conditions of exploitability. This section looks more closely at contractual arrangements and explores how these can modulate the working conditions migrants' experienced and the strategies that different migrants develop to negotiate such employment relations.

All of the migrants spoken with were employed through various forms of non-standard, atypical or casual contractual arrangements (e.g. Heery and Salmon 2000; Rodgers and Rodgers 1989; Thompson and Warhurst 1998; Vasta 2004). They can be broadly divided into those whose employment was mediated through an agency and those who were contracted directly to a care home⁶⁹. The boundaries between these are however not clear cut, with some who were contracted directly with care homes also often signing up to and undertaking work through agencies (in most cases because they could get more money working overtime through an agency than from the care home itself). As has already been highlighted, migration controls can have a significant impact on the kinds of contracts open to different categories of migrants, with those on work permits being dependent on their contract with a particular employer in order to remain legally in the country. Partners of visa holders on the other hand did not have such restrictions and could thus also sign up for agencies. For those that were contracted directly to a care home their contractual arrangements can be broadly grouped according to the degree of formality / informality of the arrangement as follows: (i) Formal, fixed-term contracts (linked with work permit if applicable); this group was by far the bigger group and made up of workers from all categories of migrant (although only one of these was an undocumented migrant who was working using his brother's passport); (ii) Informal employment arrangements with a given care home. This group was far smaller with only four of the migrants having such arrangements. Two of these were students from outside the EEA and the other two, not surprisingly perhaps, were migrants without legal residency status.

⁶⁹ When talking about agencies here I am referring to those that provide care workers (migrant and non-migrant) who are living in the UK and not companies, whether based in the UK or abroad that recruit workers from overseas.

3.5.1 Post-contractual dependency: The production of insecurity and the amplification of exploitability

The tendency towards non-standard, flexible contract relations can shape forms of exploitability that are augmented by the fact that the contract does not provide any long term – or in the case of many of the agency worker spoken with – *any* guarantee of securing the necessary work time required to financially sustain themselves. This situation poses workers and particularly some categories of migrants a number of problems and helps shape and mediate a form of exploitability that Papadopoulos et al (2008: 233) refer to as a “post-contractual form of dependency”, a dependency that without the social rights of the welfare state to fall back on migrants arguably feel even more intensely (see table 3.2)⁷⁰. This form of exploitation manifests in the following ways: (i) it produces an intensified dependency on the employer, who provides only short term contracts, or in the case of many of the agency worker, zero-hour contracts, with no guaranteed hours of work and shifts often allocated one shift at a time; and crucially (ii) it is an intensified dependency on oneself. Under such working and living conditions one is under increased pressure to transform and mold oneself. To align oneself with the needs of capital, in order to provide oneself with the guarantees that do not come from the state and have ceased (or at least has become severely weakened) to come from the ‘employer’. It is then a form of contractual arrangement that is productive of particular kinds of subjectivities. Migrants (and indeed many other categories of living labour) increasingly need to make sure that they possess the requisite capacities and dispositions (for instance flexibility) in order to be ‘competitive’ in ways dictated by the market (cf. Frassanito Network 2005; Neilson and Rossiter 2005; Read 2003).

The imperative towards self-transformation that underpins post-contractual dependency is also a form of “self-exploitation” (Ehrenstein 2006) that operates at the temporal level by appropriating the future within the present. I have already discussed how the heightened dependency on the employer produced by migration controls can lead to the extensification of exploitation, with numerous migrants

⁷⁰ As Table 3.2 highlights none of the migrants that make up this study apart from those from the EEA (who have been in the country working continuously for a year) can rely on such guarantees. And although these are becoming increasingly threadbare they still provide a modicum of cushioning. That is, unless like an increasing number of people there is the further cushion of credit. Which as the events of October 2008 and its aftermath highlight only offsets risk further into the future.

working while ill. In the following subsection I will explore in more detail how the precarious, non-guaranteed, short-term nature of the contracts that migrants work under can augment such processes. Such contractual arrangements help shape employment relations whereby migrants feel the need to demonstrate they are hard working and dependable as a means of heightening the likelihood of being employed in the future or getting their contracts and work permits renewed. While such forces and relations have arguably always exerted a certain influence over workers and their willingness to comply with particular working conditions out of a desire to remain employed what I hope to highlight in the next section is the ways in which contractual arrangements can strengthened such tendencies.

3.5.2 Post-contractual dependency: constant availability?

As I have already pointed out many of the migrants accessed the labour market through agencies (34 in all, 7 of whom were also employed directly with a care home). Apart from those who were also employed directly by a care home none of these migrants had stable contracts; instead they ‘negotiated’ their working times in the short-term depending on what was available, or offered. Contracts can be short term, lasting anything from a single shift to a few weeks, although they are often for an extended period of time, with the longest of all those spoken with being three months. There was a general feeling amongst many of the migrants, whether agency or not, that the companies who own, manage or provide care of various sorts have a preference for staff that were employed directly with them. As such they would try and deal with staff shortages by asking in house staff whether they could cover shifts first before contracting staff through an agency⁷¹. Despite this, none of the migrants working through agencies reported experiencing any significant problems in terms of getting sufficient work time to subsist, with many of them stating that they were able to accumulate funds and to send money to family back in their country of origin (I shall discuss the issue of remittances in more detail below, see chapter 5, section 5.3). A number of them did however complain that agencies would often cancel shifts they were due to work at very short notice with the agency providing no explanation, which could at times cause financial problems and make budgeting somewhat difficult.

While such dynamics, as well as not knowing for sure when one was working,

⁷¹ Agencies varied in size for ones with no staff apart from the manager / owner, with such agencies tending to be sector specific (although a number of small agencies did operate across a number of sectors), to large organisations employing many staff with different ‘consultants’ responsible for managing ‘staffing solutions’ for particular sectors, such as Health and Social Care.

caused a certain amount of insecurity, the general consensus from those working through agencies was that if you tried hard enough it was always possible to find an adequate amount of work. As Janet from Uganda stated, “if you want work, it is there for you you’ve just got to be willing to take it. If you don’t take it then it might not come ...you know I’ve got to keep working I’ve got mouths to feed back home” [P34, CW]. Janet’s comment is indicative of a state of affairs pointed out by a number of migrants. That in order to get into a situation whereby they will be offered regular work the vast majority of migrants working for agencies stated that they have to make themselves almost constantly available for work as a means of demonstrating to agencies that they can be relied on. As Virginia an undocumented Zimbabwean pointed out “if they know you’re always available then they will want to keep you. They need to know they can rely on you” [P30, CW]. What capital is getting here then is more a disposition than a capacity: namely a willingness (for a price that is) for flexibility. Such a state of affairs can clearly lead to heightened exploitability and given that many of the non-EEA migrants in such situations were those on student visas some reported feeling exhausted trying to manage both their educational workload and that of care work and other jobs that they may do. It often meant working in the “worst homes” with the most demanding residents. A number of migrants also indicating that they had endured racism from care home managers or owners but had said nothing because of fear that this would mean the agency would not find them work in the future. Such employment relations also meant that they often had to fill the worst shifts, such as nights and weekends. Furthermore, many of the agency workers reported that accessing the labour market in this way often lead to them taking on work with often minimal notice and some of the migrants also stated that they had on occasion agreed to take two shifts in quick succession with only a very short break between them.

This heightened situation of exploitability is created by a number of factors but most important here are: (i) their residency status; and (ii) by the fact that their access to the market is mediated by employment agencies. This means that as well as having to work in poor environments and often do the ‘worst’ shifts, the migrants have to remain on good terms with agency staff. A Nigerian called Patrick’s comment highlights some of the processes involved well:

“You’ve got to stay on their good side you know, even if you don’t like them, you’ve got to pretend you do. Even if they’re always sending you to the homes

from hell or whatever, they're the ones with the jobs, if they don't like you, you don't eat. You know what I mean? You you've got to make sure they like you. You've got to play the game" [P32, CW]

Patrick's comment is interesting on a number of levels. It highlights that, as well as the intensified imperatives to take work whenever it is offered, such precarious employment and contractual relations also increase the need to build and maintain personal relations with employers, that this requires a certain amount of effort on the part of migrant workers and that feigning friendship is also often necessary for such purposes (cf. Tsianos and Papadopoulos 2006). A similar comment made by Flora [P23, CW] from Ghana further underlines these *relational* and *affective* dimensions. Importantly, this also points to how she views the processes involved in acquiring and remaining employed as being one that is also based on everyday *forms of sociability*:

"when you've worked closely with someone for some time you get to know that person. They start to know some of your problems. So they might think 'Ok I'll give this person this and this person this', you know. Yes they are making money from you but they can also help you out" [P23, CW]

The feeling of being compelled to work or to take on work at short notice that can be created in such a situation was for some of the migrants spoken with managed by foregrounding the fact that they are choosing to work and not being forced. As a Zimbabwean student Sara stated:

"I do it because I want the money, I don't have to take a job if I don't want to, I don't need to... but then its not a good idea to turn work down if you can help it, you know they might not offer it again in the future and go to someone else" [P25, CW]

There is a clear ambivalence in Sara's comment between the self caught within the dictates of the market and the imperative to work and maintain the self as marketable, while on the other hand to assert one's agency within this situation, to reclaim ones subjectivity, to position oneself as making a free choice and as being self-determining. Some of the migrants spoken to managed the tightrope of securing employment through agencies, while at the same time maintaining a sense of autonomy and feeling able to refuse their 'demands', by employing the potentially risky strategy of signing up to multiple agencies. In this way if work in one agency dried up for whatever reason they could find it through one of the others. However, such a relationship had

to be carefully managed, as Faith from Malawi stated:

“you can only say no once or twice in a row and then you’ve got to take whatever they give. Also it’s good to tell them that you can’t do it because of something important. You can’t tell them you just don’t want to do it or that you’ve got another job, never tell them that you’re working for someone else, that will be the last time they call you, you’ve got to tell them your child is sick, or your friend’s died, y’know something serious” [P33, CW]

Faith’s position highlights a well thought out strategy. One she’d no doubt developed over the many years she’d been working for agencies. When asked why she had not got, or tried to get a job directly with a home her reply mirrored that mentioned by some of the others who continued to work in agencies for many years. That, despite the potential problems just alluded to it enabled her to be flexible and maintain a feeling of having more control and a sense of autonomy. Furthermore, and more importantly, Faith is undocumented and agencies (at least some of them) she felt were less stringent with their document checks. Whatever the truth in this, we can see in Faith, how certain migrants were able to develop strategies as ways of dealing with and mitigating the potentially negative impacts of being ‘constantly available’, which so often led to the sense of affective as well as physical exhaustion that many of the migrants alluded to.

Faith [P33, CW] had been working for many years without documents (or more precisely with documents that had been given to her by a friend who had now left the country). Now while some of the others in her situation reported heightened levels of insecurity created by this situation, with some reporting how they felt agency staff ‘coerced’ and ‘pressurised’ them to take certain shifts, knowing that they did not have the proper documentation, we see through Faith how, despite the instability of her situation she was able to find ways of moving through and managing her employment relations in ways that also diminished potential feelings and experiences of insecurity. That said, as I pointed out above (section 3.2.3), Faith [P33, CW], like the majority of those working without proper documentation had, due largely to fears over the tightening of checks on identity, which in the care industry were augmented by the imperatives created by CRB checks, decided to move to Manchester when her CRB was due for renewal. She had a number of friends and now works as a cleaner in the hospitality sector. Although the work was far less well paid she felt that it was far safer, especially in what she (and rightly so) felt was an environment increasingly

hostile to migrants.

So far we have concentrated on the experiences of agency staff and how this dimension intersects with residency status to amplify exploitability. However, as I have already highlighted those with more ‘stable’ contractual arrangements, who were employed directly with homes also experienced similar forms of exploitation. Many of the migrants, both from within the EEA and outside, stated that when they were first employed within the care industry they were initially employed on a 6 month probationary basis and for those on work permits the dependency that this created heightened their sense of vulnerability.

While this did create the conditions that meant that they were less likely to complain and heightened the potential of management to make demands on them to take on extra shifts and so on this should not however be read in terms of them being docile. Many of them had over the time they had been working in a particular home managed to negotiate certain conditions with management that were mutually beneficial. For instance Rosie [P15, CW] a senior care worker from the Philippines worked at least one extra shift beyond that she was contracted to do every week, often extending this to two. But this was on the condition that she never worked Sundays. Similarly, Karl [P24, CW] from Nigeria stated that when he first arrived the management were always trying to get him to do extra shifts, which for financial reasons he often did. However, because he was not looking to get indefinite leave to remain (ILR) and was instead aiming to follow his brother to Canada at the end of his contract he was not afraid of the potential negative repercussions of turning down such requests if he did not want extra work.

With respect to migrants from the EEA a number of them stated that management ‘demands’ for them to take on extra shifts were something that they had to endure much more when they first arrived and now that they were more aware of their rights (see section 3.6 below) they were far less likely to allow an employer to treat them in ways that they might have in the past. It is clear from such perspectives that the effects of contractual arrangements on the forms of exploitability and employment relations also intersects with and is influenced by a variety of other forces not least the desires and wider circumstances of particular migrants.

Before I move onto the next section I want to return to the issue of dependability and how migrants might be able to instrumentalise the fact that they are perceived as ‘hard working’ and use it to their own advantage to improve their working

conditions. Such a state of affairs is well illustrated with the example of Patrick [P32, CW] an undocumented Nigerian migrant I referred to above who had been in the country for almost seven years. Samuel had lived in various parts of the UK. He reported that after he had been working for his current employer for about a year he went to talk to the agency manager (this particular agency was like many, a small business run for all intents and purposes by one person) about getting more wages. Patrick worked predominantly as a cleaner and although he preferred not to he had worked for this particular employer in care homes:

“He knows I’m a hard worker and that I hardly ever turn down work [...] He knew I didn’t like doing work in the homes but I’d done it many times for him when he really needed someone. So I asked him for more money. He knows I have helped him and he knows I am a hard worker. They will pay you more if you work hard because they will want to keep you. If you’re not then they don’t care, they will pay you less, they don’t care if you go” [P32, CW]

While we can analyse this in terms of employers using wages as disciplinary mechanism it is also clear that Patrick was able to use his ‘image’ as a hard worker in order to negotiate higher wages. Now while this only meant a rise of 50p an hour it indicates that despite his heightened precarity Patrick was able to use his reliability to negotiate better working conditions. Later in the same conversation he stated:

“He [the agency manager] was always complaining about people letting him down, telling him they’d work and then not turning up and how this made him look bad and wasn’t good for business. He knew he could depend on me and some of the other foreigners he had working for him. You know, it’s too easy for you people [UK residents] to sit around and claim benefits, so you don’t work hard. Whereas we, we need to struggle for every penny we can get. So when we get work we don’t care how hard it is as long as it puts food on the table” [P32, CW]

Patrick here reiterates his dependability but also points to how the shortage of people who his manager can trust places him and other migrants in a position of relative power. It is not only migrants who are dependent on agencies for work but the agencies are dependent on migrants. In the same way that Patrick and other migrants like him needs the agency to find them work without migrants who will take particular work at short notice and can be relied on to turn up and do the job which when it does not happen is damaging for the agencies reputation. Patrick was aware of this situation and used the fact that he can be depended on and value this conferred on

him as a means of leverage and bargaining power to improve his working conditions and increase his earnings.

3.6 Protection

So far I have examined the ways in which various forces constrain and regulate the labour market mobility of differentially stratified migrants and the kinds of employment relations and forms of exploitation that they may experience due to such mechanisms. As well as this I have looked at how different migrants negotiate these and how migrants can use the care industry for their own purposes and mobile trajectories. This section examines in more detail the strategies utilised by migrant care workers to protect themselves and each other and attempt to work through or challenge the exploitative employment relations they encounter. As well as insights gained from my time in a care home and my discussions with migrants in this section I will also draw on conversations I had with three union representatives working in the wider health/welfare industry. The section will begin with a brief examination of the use of and engagement in trade union activity amongst migrant care workers. I will then move on to consider more informal forms of action that migrants collectively develop in order to manage the labour processes and possibly escape their working conditions and provide one another mutual support within the care home.

3.6.1 Trade Unions

There is now widespread consensus amongst commentators that union activity and the extent of collective bargaining is extremely low across the UK. At the time of writing union density fluctuates at around 30 percent, with recent Labour Force statistics indicating that less than 29 per cent of employees are members of unions, while around 40 per cent have their pay and conditions determined through collective bargaining (Grainger and Crowther 2007). Significantly, unions play a far smaller role within the private sector – which is where the majority of social care workers are located – with membership being just 16 per cent (Moss, van Ewijk, Hens, and Lammersen, 2004). The anti-union and anti-collectivist legislation within the UK brought in during the Thatcher years continued under New Labour (Bain and Taylor 2007). The cumulative effects of these shifts has created the conditions whereby on the one hand it has become increasingly difficult for workers to take effective, legal, industrial action while on the other hand the position of unions as centralised

corporate bodies that 'police' their members activities in any disputes with employers has become further entrenched (Bain and Taylor 2007).

The trade unionists spoken with all said that union activity and representation amongst care workers and particularly those working in care homes has traditionally been low. Within the contemporary period low level of unionisation could be attributed to the fact that unions have not tended to recruit within the social care workforce. One of them indicated that in terms of the people she had represented that the vast majority of these had previously worked in the NHS and had remained with the union after their subsequent move to working in the social care industry. Given that her remit was to provide union support to NHS workers, the representations she had carried out were undertaken in her own time, as they were not part of the NHS.

Just under a quarter (18) of the migrants in this study were members of a union. There were clear patterns with respect to which categories of migrants these were, with 6 EEA (all from Poland) and 12 non-EEA (10 from Philippines and 2 from Zimbabwe). Unsurprisingly, none of those working 'irregularly' nor any of the students had union membership. Interestingly, of those from the Philippines five of these were nurses working as senior care workers and the other five had connections with the NHS through the wider Filipino community.

From my discussions with all the migrants it is apparent that very few of them were aware whether their workplaces were covered or not by collective bargaining arrangements. There was a general lack of confidence in the efficacy and power of unions with a number giving this as the reasons they had not joined despite having experienced problems at work. Even many of those who were union members reported that they did not feel that unions would be able to assist them with potential grievances with their employers or to achieve better working conditions. Indeed, in many ways the most negative comments about the perceived usefulness of unions came from many of the actual members. Earlier I discussed (section 3.4.2) how the trade union that Malaya [P13, CW] from the Philippines was a member of had, following her request for assistance, failed to provide her any. Not surprisingly then perhaps, when we spoke in more detail about the value of unions she was extremely sceptical and that they were a waste of money. She said that the only reason she was still a member was that she had got around to leaving yet due to a lack of time: "they took her [the manager's] word over mine. They believed her when she told them that I

just wasn't competent enough. And that's it! They did nothing more. What use is that to me?" [P13, CW]. Ken [P11, CW] also spoke in particularly negative terms about how useful unions were, commented that his friend also from the Philippines who was now working as a nurse for the NHS, had, with the help of a union, gone to an employment tribunal because of the way he had been treated during his period of adaptation. However, this failed to resolve the issue and it was through other informal means that he managed to move into the NHS and complete his adaptation.

Not all the comments from migrants who were union members were so negative and not all union interventions in the care industry were unsuccessful. One of the migrants from Zimbabwe, Ruth [P19, CW], who had worked in the UK for almost five years at the time we spoke reported how her union was able to get money back that her previous employer had taken directly out of her last wage payment, when she had left to work in another home. Another success story came from Jasmine [P12, CW]. When she first arrived in the UK she had moved into a house provided by the company of care home where she worked. The house was shared with nine other migrants, all the bedrooms were small and there was a lack of space. After about a year living in the house she told the care home manager that she intended to find herself alternative accommodation only to be told that her contract stipulated that she lived in the accommodation provided for the duration of her contract. Union intervention however enabled the contract to be renegotiated, which meant that she was able to move into larger and less expensive accommodation. While this caused wider problems with her employer for the remainder of her contract, she said that she was glad that she had not just accepted such conditions.

While not actually involving union intervention interesting examples of the potential power that can be exerted through collective action was relayed to me by Alex [P4, CW] and Lucy [P5, CW] two young migrant women from Poland, who had when they first arrived, both worked in the same care institution for the first couple of years or so and while there used the threat of union involvement on two occasions as a bargaining tool with management: once to push the company into paying them for their breaks and on the other occasion to bargain for better pay for certain unsociable hours. On both occasions they and numerous other staff providing care (migrant and non-migrant) met, discussed their grievances, drew up demands and then took these to management. In the case of the issue of 'paid breaks' the central conflict animating the workers was that they had become aware that, in another institution owned by the

same company, breaks were paid. On both occasions they succeeded in getting the institution's management to accede to their demands.

These examples are of particular interest as it was the workforce as a whole (or at least a significant portion of it) that made the demands and not particular individuals. They highlight how the workers had informally organised and cooperatively pushed for such changes and as such provide interesting instances of planned *informal collective action*. However, while there are examples of migrant mobilisations within the care industry (the inspiring activities of Kalayaan and its organisation of domestic workers since 1987 being a significant case in point, see Anderson 2010b) for the most part when migrants do utilise unions this is largely individualised with union involvement being reduced to helping with individual applications and cases through employment tribunals. This is largely in line with wider political processes. Although strike action has risen of late especially when compared with their historically low level in the 1990s (Waddington 2003) the trend remains one of a growth in action against employers carried out on an individual basis. These have undergone a huge increase, with individual applications to employment tribunals having grown exponentially over the same period (McKay 2001). We do, however, live in interesting times and it remains to be seen whether, as the cuts and job losses connected with the current government's austerity measures what part unionism will play in any fight back and what role if any migrant labour plays in such processes.

When asked about unions many of the migrants from outside the EEA (especially those without authorised documentation) stated that they would rather find other, less potentially directly confrontational means of managing any problems they may experience. Some reported being too scared to join a union because they thought it might antagonise the company or employer they work for, which might jeopardise their long term employment. Bethan [P21, CW] from Zimbabwe spoke of how union activity was strongly discouraged in her place of work. On one occasion another migrant had brought a union application forms to work so that she could talk about membership and potentially joining with some of her migrant work colleagues and was told that bringing such documentation into the workplace was 'illegal'.

Alex [P4, CW] reported that she thought the company she worked for deliberately hired non-EEA migrants because they were more exploitable as they were less likely to join a union or question the company in ways that the UK workforce or EEA migrants who knew their rights would:

“The company is aware of what it’s doing. It’s fully aware that they [non-EEA migrants] are scared to say anything. Scared of losing their jobs and being sent home. They don’t have knowledge and can be easily bullied [...] They would rather have them because they know whatever they say we’re going to stay in the country and fight against them” [P4, CW]

Regardless of the veracity of this statement a number of points discussed during this chapter point to how a variety of factors may impinge on the desires or abilities of migrants with less stable social rights and residential status from directly confronting employers about their employment relations let alone in terms of engaging in other overtly political and antagonistic activities. Furthermore, other major barriers to such activity was the related issues of the long hours that they worked, coupled with the exhaustion that a number of them stated they felt at the end of a shift and for those with family and care responsibilities outside of work it is hard to see where they would find the time even if they wanted to become more politically active. In the next section I will turn attention the networks of care that develop within the workplace and how such

3.6.2 Networks of care at work

Although the discussion in this section highlights a reasonable number of migrant care workers being connected with a Trade Union my conversations with them points to how the majority tended to look for ‘protection’ and ways of negotiating their employment relations from the networks of care that they developed with other migrants as part of their mobile trajectories. In this section I will briefly examine how such informal networks of care and the affective support they can provide emerge within the workplace itself and how such relations are an important dimension of the ‘mobile commons’ for migrant care workers. I will explore how migrants develop such networks to negotiate the labour processes and to manage their working conditions. I will also highlight the potential problems that certain employment relations, such as working for an agency, may cause in terms of the ability to connect with and nurture such workplace derived networks of care.

In her study of call centre workplaces Korczynski (2003) examined the “communities of coping” that workers created and the collective affective support they are able to provide one another and the importance of such work based networks for managing abusive working environments – in this case the abuse they had to on a

daily basis endure from customers – and diminishing managerial control. These workers, despite the highly individualised nature of the service work being performed where the majority of workers labour time was spent interacting with customers with little opportunities for interacting with co-workers, were able, through fleeting meetings in corridors, toilets, lifts and during breaks, to develop collective ways of supporting one another and diminishing the potential subjective impacts of such abuse.

The care labour process on the other hand offers a far more conducive space for such relations of reciprocity and mutual support to thrive, and indeed they do. As highlighted in the discussion above of the labour process (section 3.2), such sociability and relation practices are key factors that underpin the care labour process. That is, without such forms of sociability and cooperation it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get the job done. Such ‘communities’ then are constituted through “associational solidarity” (Heckscher 1988) and emerge and develop out of the collective dimensions of the care labour process.

Korczynski (2002) points out the ambivalent nature of such ‘communities’. On one hand they might prove useful to the requirements of management, by absorbing conflict, maintaining a certain amount of order and in the process lowering staff turnover, while equally they can create a sense of collective strength amongst workers and in so doing make the labour process they are part of less susceptible to management control. I would speculate that such a sense of mutuality and togetherness – that emerged both through the labour process itself as well as outside it – is what underpinned the sense of powerfulness that must have accompanied the *informal collective action* taken by the migrants that I mentioned in the previous section. Accompanied of course with a good understanding of their legal rights and “mobility power” (cf Smith 2010). Furthermore, my time conducting ‘non-participant observation’ in the care home highlighted how migrants would use humour as a means of affectively supporting one another and maintaining their ‘spirits’ in what as I have hopefully demonstrated were affectively and physically draining work schedules.

The mutual support and affective bonds that migrants create and develop with one another during the labour process are a key means through which they are able to endure the often difficult working conditions as well as the demands and responsibilities of their wider lives. As the story of Malaya [P13, CW] recounted above mentioned (section 3.4.2) the affective solidarity and support she received from her

co-workers was decisive in carrying her through the difficulties she experienced at work, which she summed up succinctly with: “I have a few really good friends at work. It was knowing they were there that made going into work bearable” [P13, CW]. Without such networks of care within the workplace it is arguable that Malaya would have been less able to endure the difficult employment relations she experienced.

As well as such forms of affective support the networks of care and friendships created within the work context also served a variety of other functions. A number of migrant care workers reported how such relations were often used as a way of negotiating work and non-work commitments. Nancy [P9, CW] described how she and a friend (who she had met in the home) often covered each others shifts if required and like other migrants stated that such friendship also extended to providing both affective and more directly ‘practical’ support in their day to day lives. With respect to more practical mutual assistance, Paula [P6, CW] from Poland, reported how she and a friend in the care home where they both worked often collected each others children from school and cared for them while the other was working. Such forms of support were key in enabling migrants with children in the UK to manage these aspects of their lives.

As alluded to above (section 3.2.3) networks of care within the workplace created a sense of togetherness and solidarity amongst care workers, which in many ways also bolstered a sense of antagonism and an ‘us’ and ‘them’ mentality between care workers (and other staff carrying out ‘domestic’ tasks such as cleaning and food preparation) and those in more direct managerial positions. However, Malaya’s [P13, CW] story (section 3.4.2) also highlighted how the affective solidarity between migrants within the workplace did at times transcend such divisions. The support she received from the deputy manager, which enabled her to change employer, was in part, it seems to me, mediated by a sense of ‘ethnic obligation’ that derived from their shared connection with the wider Filipino ‘community’. However, as I will discuss in more detail below (chapter 5) such practices can cut across ethnic lines, with migrants from different ‘nationalities’ and ‘ethnicities’ often engaging in forms of reciprocal care and solidarity, with many also connected with ‘non-migrant’ networks of care.

A few of the temporary agency workers indicated that in terms of protection and support from other workers that they were at a disadvantage. The employment relations under which they worked made it difficult to create affective bonds with other workers largely due to the fact that they rarely spent long enough in a particular

care home for such relations to develop. As Andreas explained: “You don’t really get to know people, you don’t get to know your colleagues. You don’t really even know the other agency workers” [P28, CW]. He felt that any such potential was further undermined by the fact that there was a perceived split between agency workers and those employed to a given care facility, with this for him being largely due to wage relations: “we don’t get the same wages so other workers can envy you because of what you’re being paid” [P28, CW]. Support with any problems he experienced with respect to working or living conditions, like many other migrants, came from networks of care he was connected with outside the actual workplace (see chapter 5).

The forms of affective solidarity that migrants develop with one another from within the workplace therefore play an important role in enabling certain migrants to negotiate their employment relations as well as their wider living conditions. As pointed out in the introduction to this chapter (section 3.1) the networks of care that migrants develop within the workplace are an important element of the ‘mobile commons’. In chapter 5 I examine the importance of wider networks of care, the practices of mutual aid and affective support and solidarity that compose such networks. I explore how such networks of care function as important means through which different strata of migrants are able to draw on and create ‘mobile commons’ and through such means sustain themselves and each other while in transit or in a particular location.

3.7 Conclusion

I have during the course of this chapter explored a variety of devices through which particular stratifications of migrants are produced and examined how these intersect with other forces particularly those relating to the wage nexus. The chapter has highlighted how such dynamics shape the kinds of exploitability that migrants may experience and the subjective impacts these can have on different migrants. However, despite the often “cramped spaces” (Deleuze and Parnet 1987; Thoburn 2003) that migrants of all strata found themselves in, it was shown how they negotiated such employment relations and often found means through which to open up ‘cracks’ for themselves (and more often each other) that enable them to escape and improve their working and living conditions. Furthermore, while there are clearly observable patterns in terms of how for instance differential residential status or contractual

relations impacted on different migrants it was also shown how a variety of other forces beyond those relating to mobility controls were constitutive in this regard. For instance, I also discussed how the level of exploitability experienced, or that a particular migrant was willing to put up with, were also highly dependent on a number of other factors. These included, whether they had children, whether one had a partner and what job they did, with those whose partners were nurses generally reporting not having to work so many hours and feeling more able to refuse extra shifts if they were asked to do them due largely to the higher wages earned by nurses. Such factors were also dependent on issues relating to whether a particular migrant wanted to attempt to regularise their status and stay in the UK or whether they were thinking of returning home or moving on to another country. All in all, such issues point to the fact that as important as the mechanisms and forces explored during the chapter are in shaping the conditions that migrants must negotiate they alone do not determine and are insufficient as a framework for account for the working conditions and lived realities of migrants. As such there is a need, as those working within the autonomy of migration perspective have foregrounded, to be mindful of a whole host of other desires and subjective factors when exploring such issues.

As was pointed out in the introductory chapter there is a growing reliance on migrant labour within the care industry in the UK. It is therefore arguable that as well as the labour power and forms of cooperation being directly exploited during the care labour process itself that the capacity to become mobile and the networks and resources that migrants mobilise in order to actualise and sustain such mobility (see chapter 5) are also being drawn on and appropriated by capital. As mobility increasingly becomes a structural necessity it is instrumentalised and put to work by capital in order to reproduce itself. The emerging regime of mobility control in the UK and its Point Based System (PBS) is state-capitalism's attempt to institutionalise this growing need for migrant labour and to create the more precarious, exploitable workforce that has been the focus of this chapter. Such issues pose considerable problems for the various bodies, such as unions, community organisations and activist groups and networks that organise around the issue of mobility. If we are witnessing the emergence of a regime that increasingly operates through legislative means and by instituting increasingly complex and restrictive regulations that produce the multi-tiered hierarchy that has been a central concern of this chapter then it would seem that to focus primarily on 'fixing' such problems through 'fairer' or 'better' regulations

closes down other potential approaches and limits the forms of organising and solidarity that might otherwise emerge. I am not arguing that such strategies are futile or that they should be abandoned but rather drawing attention to the fact that if we are to more adequately engage in solidarity with migrants then there is arguably a need for a broader approach to such issues. I will return to this conundrum in more detail in the final chapter of the thesis when I consider the implications of my findings for social movement organising around the issue of mobility and migrant movements. Next however, attention is turned to an examination of the issue of care from the vantage point of asylum applicants, the welfare services they are provided access to and how the state uses these as mechanisms for regulating the lives of such migrants.

CHAPTER 4

The asylum support regime: emerging institutional aggregates and the regulation of migrants

4.1 Introduction

The last two decades of the twentieth century saw the genesis and birth of a new social category – the ‘asylum seeker’. As numbers of refugees coming to Europe seeking asylum increased such migrants have increasingly been figured as a ‘problem’ and hence as in need of control (Nyers 2006)⁷². As previous discussion (see chapter 1) has pointed out, the social and political forces and processes underlying migration are multiple and complex but at the risk of oversimplifying, it can be argued that a significant contributing factor to the rise in asylum applicants during this period was the emergence of more restrictionist migration controls themselves. As the possibilities for entry, and more importantly, remaining and settling within another state’s territory were narrowed, asylum became one of the only viable options and was increasingly utilised as a strategy by many migrants in order to do so (cf. Karakayali and Rigo 2010). There is a problematic element to such an argument in that it very easily leads to a perspective that sees the bulk of those migrants who claim asylum as ‘bogus’; as not being ‘genuine’ refugees. The separation between ‘economic’ and ‘political’ motivations for flight, which is the central means through which states attempt to filter those with ‘legitimate’ claims to refugee status and those who do not are extremely difficult to delineate, since, as Liza Schuster in her important comparative work on asylum regimes points out “all human decisions are constrained or compelled by a variety of factors” (Schuster 2003: 3) and as the autonomy of

⁷² It must be noted that while numbers of asylum applicants increased they remained and continue to remain low relative to the total number of migrants coming to Europe.

migration perspective highlights the reasons people employ mobility as a strategy are too complex to be captured in so simple a framework.

The category of 'asylum seeker' has become infused with negative characteristics and connotations within the social imaginary. The figure of the 'bogus asylum seeker' and its closely related counterparts the 'illegal' or 'economic' migrant are prevalent features in contemporary political and media discourses across Europe (Greenslade 2005; Harding 2000; Kaye 1998). Through calling into question the authenticity of a migrant's claim to refugee status such categories create a distinction between deserving and undeserving migrants (Sales 2002). Asylum applicants are depicted as 'spongers', 'diseased', 'criminal', with migrant movements more generally increasingly evoked in apocalyptic terms, with imagery of 'hordes' of migrants 'flooding' and 'swamping' the country and burdening 'our' already overstretched public services. Such discourses have created a highly racialised climate of disbelief. Migrants applying for asylum now have to undergo an often lengthy period where they must prove their genuineness. Those who are unable to do so are most commonly referred to in government documents and media reports as 'failed' asylum seekers. Such a categorisation clearly highlights how refugee status is something that must be *earned* and will only be granted once the required tests have been passed.

There is widespread belief that different EU member state's welfare regimes have acted as 'pulls' to migrants seeking asylum (Düvell and Jordan 2002; Sales 2002). Within the UK context despite research (Robinson and Segrott 2002; Gilbert and Koser 2003; Crawley 2010) that challenges the perception that refugees are drawn to the UK by its welfare benefits, such a position continues to animate right-wing media and remains strong in the public imaginary (Crawley 2005; Saggat and Drean 2001). Furthermore, such a perspective is also based on an overly simplistic and outmoded 'hydraulic' conception of migration (Mezzadra 2006) that fails to grasp the contemporary realities and radical diversity of migrant trajectories and 'flows', and their increasing turbulence (Papastergiadis 2000). While there are still extensive differences amongst them along the lines of both asylum procedures and respective welfare entitlements for migrants seeking asylum (Jubany-Baucells 2002; Liedtke 2002; Sitaropoulos 2002; Schuster 2000), EU harmonisation processes have meant that member states have been required to bring into closer alignment their procedures dealing with these fields (Düvell and Jordan 2002; Sales 2002). The rationale being that this would make no one state more attractive to migrants than any other. The

overall effect of these policies has been a levelling-down of welfare provision to asylum applicants; especially in countries like the UK and Germany, where their respect welfare regimes have traditionally being more ‘developed’ (Düvell and Jordan 2002).

This chapter will trace the transformations that have occurred to the field of care as it relates to the regime of mobility control through an examination of what I refer to as the *asylum support regime*: that is the forms of welfare services provided for asylum applicants in the UK. It will examine the new institutional arrangements that have emerged in order to administer such services, the impacts such processes have on the lives of asylum applicants and how such forces are negotiated by migrants. By welfare here, I refer to an array of interconnected services and resources. This includes financial assistance and other resources such as housing provision as well as those more direct forms of support and care, such as physical and mental health care that are vital for human subsistence and enable people to socially reproduce and sustain themselves. Importantly, it also refers to those services (which as will become apparent below are generally performed by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that assist with the accessing of such resources and provisions and with dealing with any problems that people may encounter in this regard.

The chapter begins by tracing the emergence of this *asylum support regime* and proceeds to map out the various institutional bodies involved in administering and operating certain aspects of the regime and the support services provided to asylum applicants. Here I explore the assemblages such institutions form with other bodies within the wider field of welfare provision, paying particular attention to the changing role played by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) within such a nexus. A central argument of the chapter is that, through its reconfiguration, welfare provision has become an increasingly important terrain through which the biopolitical regulation of asylum applicants is realised. The concept of the ‘biopolitical’ has over the years been utilised by a number of different thinkers, with the most prominent in recent years being that of Michel Foucault and Antonio Negri both of whom develop it to describe significantly different dynamics and relations⁷³. Here I adapt the notion of

⁷³ While a detailed overview of their respective theories is beyond the remit of this thesis and would involve a substantial detour it is worth giving a brief outline of these in order to provide some background as to my own use of the concept. Foucault utilises ‘biopolitics’ to describe and delineate the technologies of power – the new “art of government” – that he saw as having emerged around the 18th century and which he referred to as biopower (e.g. Foucault 1978, 2007, 2008). What was novel about this kind of power for Foucault was that it was not merely concerned with controlling

biopolitics to refer to how the apparatuses of regulation of the asylum regime become diffused and take hold within the daily lives of asylum applicants and in so doing shape the “affective territories” (Guattari 2000) that they inhabit. It is my contention that an analysis of the composition of the asylum support regime and how support services can function as regulatory mechanisms provides us with a more nuanced understating of, and important insights into, the nature and operation of the wider regime of mobility control. However, it would be a mistake to analyse the field of welfare provision to asylum applicants purely as regulatory mechanisms. As Sales and Hek (2004) point out state intervention into the lives of individuals and families through the mechanisms of the welfare has always been about both care and control. What I hope to demonstrate during the course of this chapter is the complex and often contradictory positions that certain institutions involved in providing support find themselves in. How formal support provision and the relations that workers within such institutions develop with migrants can be both life sustaining, playing an important role in enabling migrants to reproduce themselves, while at the same time these very same services are also involved in the administration of the asylum regime and hence form part of a wider regime of regulation and surveillance of asylum applicants. Furthermore, as I shall highlight in more detail below (section 4.5) recent years have also see the proliferation of various semi-formal and formal institutions of support that are less bound to the regime of mobility control and provide asylum applicants with much needed care and support, often enhancing their capacity to endure in what is an increasingly punitive asylum regime.

4.2 The emergence of the asylum support regime

As previously discussed (see chapter 1, section 1.4) social assistance and mobility control have a long and enduring historical connection, and state organised welfare

society or individuals but rather took as its object entire populations. As such biopolitics according to Foucault is a form of power that aims to shape every aspect of human life and conduct within a given population. Negri on the other hand mobilises biopolitics to think through the dynamics of contemporary capitalism and how, as capital has increasingly spilled out of the factory gates and becomes diffused more deeply throughout social life such sites become sites of struggle and hence politicised (e.g. Negri 1989; Hardt and Negri 2005). Despite the tendency for Negri and collaborators to overemphasise the paradigmatic nature of such a shift, in that while it may be true that such processes are becoming more acute social relations beyond the factory gates have arguably always been drawn on by capital to a lesser or greater degree and hence have always involved conflict (as the discussion in chapter 1, section 1.2 on ‘domestic labour’ highlighted) his work has nonetheless informed this thesis in significant ways.

provision continues to be a key terrain through which the regime of mobility control operates. The discourse of ‘welfare nationalism’ – the claim to a privileged standard of socioeconomic welfare for nationals of a given territory – has been evident in the UK since the early incarnations of what is now referred to as the welfare state and has surfaced and subsided at different times depending on the prevailing socio-political climate. For instance, during the interwar years in the UK (as well as France and the Netherlands) such issues were hotly contested with the object of contempt during this period being refugees coming from Germany, Italy and Spain (Marrus 1985). More recently such a discourse has re-emerged with increased intensity since the neoliberal offensive of the 1970s, with its cuts to social benefits and intensification of precarious labour conditions (Boswell 2006). As was highlighted in chapter 3, curtailment of access to welfare state provision can have a significant effect on employment relations and is productive of particular forms of working conditions and intensified exploitability of certain strata of migrants. However, it was not until the mid 1960s that the regime of mobility controls and access to welfare provision became truly legislatively coupled and moved away from a largely ad hoc to a systemic institutionalisation (S. Cohen 2001). This institutionalised coupling gathered pace from the mid 1980s when a number of different pieces of legislation barring migrant workers from welfare provision were enacted (Feldman 2003) and in the early 1990s a raft of new legislation within the UK was enacted that has made welfare an even more central dimension of the operations of the regime of mobility control, with the issue of asylum taking on a particular salience (Cohen 2003; Hayes 2000; Humphries 2002; Sales 2002; Sales and Hek 2004). This preoccupation with asylum was mirrored across other European states and coincided with wider debates concerning the ‘crisis’ of the welfare state. This led to issues of welfare and asylum becoming “linked in the political arena and the public imagination, leading to demands that the access of asylum seekers to European states and, in some countries, to their welfare system to be curtailed” (Bloch and Schuster 2002: 393).

In the UK the initial piece of legislation came in the shape of the *Asylum and Immigration Appeals Act* 1993. Until this, asylum had largely occupied a subsidiary feature of the Immigration Rules and had no more salience than other kinds of migration (Schuster 2001, 2003). The principle features of the Act were the introduction of finger-printing of migrants making asylum applications and their children and the withdrawal of mandatory local authority housing provision for

asylum applicants. This was then swiftly followed by the 1996 *Asylum and Immigration Act*, that amongst other things, was to extend ‘fast-track’ procedures for asylum applicants from designated ‘safe countries’ and to withdraw welfare benefits from applicants who made their claim in-country, as well as from those who were appealing against a negative decision. In addition it also denied asylum applicants access to local authority housing lists, a clause which was further reinforced through the implementation of the 1996 *Housing Act* (Griffiths, Sigona and Zetter 2005). These changes culminated in the 1999 *Immigration and Asylum Act*. The 1999 Act represents what is arguably the greatest intensification of migration controls since they were first introduced in the UK in 1905 (Cohen 2001; Hayter 2000) leading some to assert that the measures contained in the Act inaugurated a “new apartheid”⁷⁴ (Mynott 2002). The 1999 Act led to the wholesale segregation of asylum applicants from mainstream welfare state provision. All rights and entitlements to welfare benefits and a raft of formal community care support services, as well as access to local authority housing were abolished. What asylum applicants have access to in place of welfare state provision is a ‘support service’. What this amounted to was subsistence of either money or vouchers⁷⁵ (for migrants whose asylum application has been rejected) that are roughly 70 percent of basic income support⁷⁶. Housing provision became

⁷⁴ See also the important work of Étienne Balibar, in particular a number of essays in the collection *We, the people of Europe?* (2004) which deals with, amongst other things the issues of borders, citizenship, exclusion and the formation of Europe. The work of Nandita Sharma also provides us with a number of interesting investigations of “border regimes” and the role of the state in the production of such stratifications in terms of a global apartheid (e.g. Sharma 2007a, 2007b).

⁷⁵ Luncheon vouchers were initially introduced for all asylum applicants but due to public pressure they were withdrawn in October 2001, only to be reintroduced through the back door for those in receipt of Section 4 support in April 2005. Section 4 (commonly known as ‘hard-case support’) is the part of the 1999 Act that details the support, and the conditions upon which this support is based, that are provided to asylum applicants who have come to the ‘end of process’ in their asylum claim but who can not return home through ‘no fault of their own’. This can mean many things. For instance, that there is no viable route back to their nation of origin due to the conditions there being too ‘unsafe’. Applicants must also meet one or more of the following criteria: they must be destitute and be able to provide evidence of this, and they must be either: (i) taking all reasonable steps to leave the UK or place themselves in a position in which they can leave the UK; or (ii) unable to leave the UK by reason of a physical impediment to travel or for some other medical reason; or (iii) unable to leave the UK because in the opinion of the Secretary of State there is currently no viable route of return available; or (iv) permission has been obtained to proceed with a judicial review against a decision relating to the person’s asylum claim; or (v) the provision of support is otherwise necessary to avoiding a breach of a person’s human rights (this normally applies when fresh evidence for an applicants claim for asylum is produced). Even if these criteria are met there is no guarantee that support under Section 4 will be provided. Amongst other reasons the National Asylum Support Service (NASS) needs to be satisfied that there is no other avenue of support available.

⁷⁶ At the time the ethnographic fieldwork on the asylum support regime took place (June – August 2008) a single asylum applicant over 25 years old was entitled to £42.16, compared to basic income support of £60.50 for someone the same age. Asylum applicants living as a couple (either married or cohabiting) receive £66.13 a week, while a couple on basic income support receive £94.95. As of

organised through consortia of local authorities, voluntary organisations and private companies, with asylum applicants being dispersed to designated areas around the country with no choice where they are sent. Asylum applicants are required to give an unprecedented amount of personal information, and must notify the Home Office of any changes of circumstances⁷⁷. The new support service contains a number of other disciplinary, regulatory and surveillance mechanisms and procedures, such as being required to report to a designated place such as a police station or United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA) reporting centre to the requirement to carry an ARC – Application Registration Card – the equivalent of an ID card. The punitive character of these transformations has been pointed to by numerous commentators (e.g. Jordan 2001; Cohen 2002b; Fell 2004; Squire 2009) and the effects they have on migrants will form the bulk of the latter parts of this chapter (see section 4.4).

The mainstream welfare and care provision that migrants seeking asylum previously had access to were the same as those of those born in the UK, and as such (in theory at least) configured in order that the social, physical and affective needs of their recipients could be met. We must be mindful here not to idealise contemporary mainstream welfare provision, or any state welfare provision for that matter. Recent cuts and changes to state social welfare (e.g. the recent ‘welfare-to-work’ or ‘workfare’ programmes, with their focus on, amongst other things, individual responsibility (Byrne 2005; Fairclough 2000; Prideaux 2005) have meant that the quality of assistance provided to citizens and other migrants have also been affected. However, the changes in terms of those provided to migrants who have applied for asylum are of a different magnitude altogether. The new ‘support scheme’ for asylum applicants is clearly designed to be as minimal, and to make life as difficult as possible, for those that it is putatively designed to support. As such, the scheme has intensified the precarious status of migrants seeking asylum, making it far more difficult for them to access the adequate resources needed to maintain themselves, be that physically or

the 6th of July 2009 this was changed so that *all* applicants over 18 (apart from lone parents will receive only £35.13 a week. Along with numerous other budget cuts to the asylum support and related services such as that for legal aid, as of October 2009 the financial allowances provided to asylum applicants were drastically reduced from what was already far too little, with those over 25 years of age now only receiving £35.13 a week, which translates to a fraction over £5 per day.

⁷⁷ This includes if an asylum applicants: name is changed; any dependants reach their 18th birthday; move address; get married or divorced, or separate from their partner; are hospitalised; they, or their partner, become pregnant or have a baby; any children leave school, or leave home; any other family members join them in the United Kingdom, or leave them; anyone else joins them in their accommodation or leaves them; they go to prison; receive or gain access to money that they had not previously told the Home Office about; receive or gain access to money after selling something; or if they no longer want the Home Office to provide them with accommodation.

affectively. The formal state provision that has become accessible, following the shifts in the welfare regime, allows for just enough material support to enable migrants social reproduction. And in many cases asylum applicants are denied even this provision. A statement from the UKBA is indicative of the level of ‘support’ that asylum applicants are legislatively entitled to. It states:

If you meet the requirements to receive support, you will be given suitable housing and your case owner will arrange for you to collect money from a post office near where you live. The money will enable you to buy essential things such as food, clothing and toiletries. If you do not require accommodation but need money for essential things, or you need accommodation but not money, we will be able to give you this partial support⁷⁸

The above statement highlights that the support scheme is concerned merely with providing asylum applicants with housing and financial support. In terms of the financial element this is described as enabling migrants to access only those things that are *essential* for their physical survival and well being. There is advice contained on the website about how to access specific kinds of support, such as for those with disabilities or special care needs, as well as that provided to victims of torture. However, there is no mention of other kinds of care or support services. It is clear from the above, that the ‘support scheme’ that asylum applicants will receive from the Home Office is only designed to provide for immediate physical needs and subsistence with very little or no concern for providing for the social and affective well-being and sustainability of such migrants.

4.3 New institutional aggregates: the NGOisation of care

Recalling the previous discussion (see chapter 1, section 1.3) about the historical specificity of a particular regime of control, the related questions that need to be answered here are: How are the potentially conflicting bodies that gravitate around the issue of asylum, and specifically the issue of asylum support, managed? What institutional constellations have emerged through which such power dynamics are

⁷⁸ <http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/asylum/support/>

effectively governed? This section will explore these issues by mapping out the various bodies that make up the *asylum support regime*. I will then move on to consider (section 4.4) in detail the related issues of how such institutional arrangements impact on the lives of asylum applicants as well as the ways in which they potentially affect the care and services provision that asylum applicants are able to access.

The 1999 Act instituted a double movement of recomposition: On the one hand we have processes of *decentralisation* or what could be referred to as an externalisation and delegation of state functions, and on the other, a firm *centralisation* of command over support provision allocation. Centralisation occurred principally through the creation of a new body the National Asylum Support Service (NASS) that took the responsibility of managing support services out of the hands of local authorities. The NASS became operational on 3rd April 2000, with the Wales branch set up in 2003 when NASS was reorganised along regional lines. The NASS is the division of UKBA that is charged with overall responsibility for managing the accommodation and support services provided to asylum applicants. It is NASS that decides whether a migrant who has applied for asylum qualifies for support provision. It is also the department that makes decisions on whether asylum applicants whose claims have been rejected will be provided with further financial and housing support, with those that do not qualify for such provision, rendered destitute (chapter 5 will explore in detail the means through which migrants subject to such conditions deal with such processes).

The decentralisation of support services drew various ‘non-state’ actors – most notably NGOs and private bodies – into the circuitry of governance (cf. Lahav 1998; 2000; Guiraudon and Lahav 2000). These processes should be seen in terms of wider transformations to the welfare state compromise discussed briefly above (chapter 1, section 1.1). Since the late 1970s onwards, the capitalist-states’ neoliberalism offensive has led to the outsourcing a number of the functions previously executed directly by the state (Chomsky 1998; Fisher 2009; Harvey 2007;). The result of this has been the emergence of a radically pluralised social economy, or what some have termed “mixed economies of care” (Lewis 1993; Williams 2001). This has involved a growing privatisation, and a huge increase in the corporate involvement in the provision of public and welfare services, largely implemented in the UK through what are referred to as Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) and Public Finance Initiatives (PFIs) (Pollock with Leys, Price, Rowland and Gnani 2004;

Mooney and Law 2007). As a number of commentators have pointed out, increased voluntary sector involvement, has been a key constituent element in these emerging welfare regimes (Milligan 2001; Milligan and Conradson 2007; Powell 1999; Salamon, Anheier and List 1999; Wolch 1990). The regime of support services for asylum applicants is no exception. One of the most significant features of the 1999 Act was in terms of the role that it afforded NGOs (Cohen 2002a; Griffiths, Signoa and Zetter 2005; Zetter and Pearl 2000). The State directly sought to utilise NGOs in the implementation of the 1999 Act. The white paper that preceded the 1999 Act, *Firmer, Faster, Fairer* (1998) stated “that the voluntary sector has an important role to play in helping asylum seekers”. However, as we shall see, many of the processes that the 1999 Act makes possible are directly antagonistic to the overall well-being and interests of the migrants they are putatively meant to be supporting. This role is one that NGOs have not previously performed – it is a completely novel aspect of the 1999 Act (Cohen 2002a).

The management of the new institutional relations wrought by the decentralisation of support services has been operationalised by aggregating the various institutions through a process of ‘partnership governance’ (cf. Balloch and Taylor 2001). The most significant of these have been the 11 regionally divided networks, established in 2001, known as ‘Strategic Migration Partnerships’, with Wales being one such region and having the aptly named *Wales Strategic Migration Partnership* (WSMP) – formerly the *Welsh Consortium for Refugees, Asylum Seekers & Migrants*⁷⁹. There are also a number of other important networks that have been set up since the policy of dispersal began, in order to more effectively coordinate the management of asylum ‘support services’. One of these is the *Welsh Local Authorities Consortium for Refugees and Asylum Seekers*. This was set up in 1999 following the implementation of the 1999 Act and is made up of many of the same bodies that make up the WSMP, although significantly it does not include UKBA. Another important network is the *All Wales Refugee Policy Forum*, set up in November 2003 and is made up a diverse set of statutory and voluntary bodies. Its major function is to manage strategy for refugee ‘inclusion’.

The WSMP is composed of a broad range of statutory, voluntary and private bodies. These include, the UK Borders Agency (UKBA), the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG)⁸⁰, the police (at the level of the Welsh Association of Chief of

⁷⁹ See <http://www.newport.gov.uk/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=refugeesasylum.homepage>, last accessed 19.3.10)

⁸⁰ Since the 2010 elections WAG has changed to Welsh Government (WG).

Police), Accommodation Providers (both private companies and council) the Association of Directors of Social Service, Local Health Boards, Job Centre Plus, the Welsh Refugee Council (WRC) and Faith Communities⁸¹. Initially set up to “facilitate the effective dispersal of asylum seekers across the UK”, the remit of the Partnerships grew into that of providing a medium through which to “facilitate and promote effective contact, co-ordination and partnership working” between the different bodies involved in provision of support services, as well as those involved in wider regimes of control, many of whom have different priorities – that are conflicting and antagonistic to each other.

But this is no equal ‘partnership’. Given that the consortium is largely focused on issues of mobility control and the management of migrants the primary agent within this assemblage is clearly highlighted in the following quote describing the operation of the consortium as “the prime vehicle for consultation, liaison and partnership working between the UK Border Agency (UKBA) (formerly the Border & Immigration Agency) and other public, voluntary and private sector stakeholders”. Despite its rhetoric of ‘partnership’ and ‘consultation’ there is no doubt where ultimate authority lies. In terms of the regime of mobility control this falls squarely with UKBA. However, the hierarchy is more fluid than this. WAG has devolved powers in terms of the governance of certain fields of life within Wales, such as education, healthcare (a point I will return to in more detail in section 4.4 below) and some aspects of support services to asylum applicants, but this does not extend to that of wider migration policy and its implementation. This is still very much controlled by the UK state and UKBA is the body charged with the overall management and implementation of migration policy. Even here though the picture is not that clear cut with the wider terrain of the regime of mobility control at the European level needing to be taking into consideration. The UK (along with Ireland and Denmark) occupies an anomalous position with respect to European scale migration and asylum provisions. Certain protocols appended to the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam enable them to remain outside of European Directives, unless they chose to opt in. Interestingly however, with respect to asylum policies the UK has opted into the majority of provisions and indeed has spearheaded many of the deterrence measures and much of the more restrictive measures relating to asylum that form the

⁸¹ See Appendix A for a full list of institutions that make up the WSMP.

juridical foundations of the European border regime (cf. Clayton 2008)⁸².

Looking more specifically at the institutions that play a role in the provision of support service the most significant of these who are aggregated through the WSMP is the Welsh Refugee Council (WRC). The Refugee Council (RC) is the largest of the principle NGOs dealing with asylum applicants and refugees in the UK (Griffiths, Sigona and Zetter 2005: 52). It has four offices in Wales, one in each of the major dispersal areas of Wales – Cardiff, Newport, Swansea and Wrexham. As with the majority of other regions in the UK, the RC is also responsible for running the One Stop Shop (OSS) service provided for asylum seekers, through which it provides a range of advisory, advocacy and case worker services⁸³. This service is directly funded by the Home Office. The RC's role in the administering the OSS as well as its relationship with the Home Office has received a certain amount of criticism (e.g. Cohen 2002a) with evidence pointing to the loss of critical voice that accompanies such incorporation into the mechanisms of governance (Flynn 2006). In the years 2006-2007 the Home Office provided £2,380,156 of the WRC's funding, which stood at 3,608,388 overall. The vast majority of the remaining funding was supplied by the WAG. This accounts for a substantial proportion of their overall funding. We will return to the potential implications of such 'connections' in more depth in the thesis' concluding chapter.

Finally, another important body involved with the management and provision of support services is Cardiff City Council (CCC). As well as its contract with NASS to provide accommodation it is also involved in control of certain aspects of the fields of education, housing and health. Its social services department has an *Asylum Team* that provides outreach services and is a point of contact for asylum applicants to

⁸² During the period the research was conducted the EU passed legislation commonly referred to as the 'Returns Directive' aimed at harmonising procedures for deportation. This legislation also contained directives relating to maximum length of detention, bans on re-entry and so on. Interestingly, the UK chose to not participate in the legislation. According to the EU document announcing the passing of the policy the decision by the UK to do this was due to the fact "that the Directive makes returning illegally staying third country nationals actually more difficult and more bureaucratic - by introducing restrictions on detention, obligations to provide legal aid to irregular migrants, and increasing the possibilities for challenging the return decision - over and above the strong protections already in place in EU law for refugees and asylum seekers". It would seem then that the abstention from this policy was largely due to the fact that it was not 'harsh' enough.

⁸³ Each asylum applicant has a designated care worker. It is case workers who are responsible for inducting asylum applicants following the dispersal process that will be discussed below. The role that case workers see as their primary one however, is in assisting asylum applicants with any difficulties they may encounter, applying for any support provision they maybe entitled to and generally advocating on their behalf. As I shall highlight below the asylum regime creates a relationship of dependency (4.4.5) and as such case workers are key people in the lives of asylum applicants. More details of the role they perform will emerge during the chapter.

report any difficulties they may have if they are accommodated in CCC property. Again, further services that CCC provides, and the role that it plays in the regulation of migrants will be fleshed out at different points during the remainder of the chapter.

4.4 From care to control

So far the chapter has discussed the emergence of what I refer to as the *asylum support regime*. It has set out some of the forces that led to the formation of this regime and mapped its institutional architecture as a means of better understanding the different bodies involved in the administration, coordination and control of the asylum regime as a whole. In this section I explore the numerous ways in which the *asylum support regime* intersects with that of wider *asylum regime* and *regime of mobility control*, how this is utilised as a means regulating and exerting control over the daily lives of asylum applicants and the effects this has on such migrants. The section begins (section 4.4.1) by discussing the most useful ways that such processes may be conceptualised. I argue that the notion of *differential inclusion* provides such a perspective and illustrate this through an investigation of the ways in which the healthcare provision that asylum applicants can access differs to that of other strata of the population. I then move on to consider how the lives of asylum applicants are spatially regulated (section 4.4.2) and how the movements of asylum applicants are controlled and curtailed. Following this I examine the related issues of temporal regulation (section 4.4.3) and the ways such processes are enabled, amongst other things, through a variety of forms of technology (section 4.4.4). Following this the chapter considers in more detail the impacts that such mechanisms have on the lives of asylum applicants. A central argument here is that the way the *asylum support regime* is organised leads to both a form of what I refer to as *produced dependency* (section 4.4.5) as well as a generalised *precarisation* (section 4.4.6) of the lives of asylum applicants.

4.4.1 *Differential inclusion*

What then is the most useful way of conceptualising such processes in terms of their effects on migrants? Migrants who enter the procedures of claiming asylum find themselves occupying a position that at first glance completely ‘outside’ of the social rights and means of representation open to other sectors of the society. Unable to work they are, as will become apparent later (section 4.4.5), largely dependant on the

support services that the NASS, if it deems them eligible, offers. Looked at from this perspective it should not be too controversial to argue that asylum applicants represent a paradigmatic figure of the socially excluded subject, with only those migrants living in illegalised conditions with less access to social rights and the services these afford. However, while I am in agreement with the claim referred to above that the transformations that crystallised in the passing of the 1999 Act, brought about a ‘new apartheid’, with similar processes observable across other European states (e.g. Balibar 2004, 2005; Düvell and Jordan 2002; Jubany-Baucells 2002; Liedtke 2002; Sitaropoulos 2002) what I want to suggest here, is when viewed within the context of welfare state provision more generally, as well as in relation to the social conditions of other migrants (see chapter 3), that it is more constructive to conceptualise the stratification of asylum applicants in terms of ‘differential inclusion’ (e.g. Anderson 2010a; Andrijasevic 2009; Hardt and Negri 2000; Mezzadra 2005; Mezzadra and Neilson 2003; Sharma 2008; Neilson 2009).

At the most general level the dichotomy between inclusion on the one hand and exclusion on the other, runs the risk of oversimplifying at the theoretical level what are highly complex processes, especially if, as Sandro Mezzadra cautions, they are taken too literally (Mezzadra 2006). You are either in or you are out. Included or excluded. While the support services of the NASS are, as will hopefully already be apparent, clearly inferior to those accessible through mainstream welfare state provision, it is support none the less. Of course there are those whose claims for asylum are rejected (so called ‘failed asylum seekers’) who by virtue of this have the financial assistance and other subsistence services such as housing provided through the NASS cut. But even these migrants are not wholly excluded from all services and provisions. Under policy changes in 2004 asylum applicants who had their claims refused but could not leave for various reasons, would be charged for secondary care, other than that provided in A&E department. However the WAG announced in mid 2008 that from then on all asylum applicants would be provided with free healthcare, unlike asylum applicants in comparable situations living in England at the time the research was carried out, although as I will discuss below this has now changed. This is further illustrative of how access to certain social rights and services is subject to local particularities. While there is relative homogeneity in terms of the NASS provision, access to other services are dependant on various factors particular to a given locality that have influenced the development of support services to migrants.

The most significant being the existence of established migrant networks within a given area. For instance, while Cardiff has a number of well established migrant communities, particularly from Somalia, it was for the most part institutionally ill prepared for the needs of asylum applicants who were dispersed there. Apart from the WRC and a few local charities there was initially very little institutional infrastructure that could offer support, advice and advocacy to such migration. However, over time various semi-formal bodies and networks have emerged following the encounter between the local population and refugees with relatively durable support services now in place (see section 4.5 for a further discussion).

As with my discussion of the care industry (see chapter 3) and the ways in which migration control produce ‘differentially included’ strata of migrant labour, the asylum regime produces a multiplication of statuses and divisions. Within the UK there are at the time of writing four broad socio-legal statuses produced by the asylum regime (Dwyer and Brown 2008). Those with: i. *refugee status*; ii. *indefinite leave to remain* (humanitarian protection); iii. *asylum seekers*; and iv. *refused asylum seekers*; all affording migrants differential rights to access to social and welfare entitlements, as well as other clusters of social and political rights. While certain generalisations can be made about these different statuses, the subjectivities they can create and the effects they can have on the lived experiences of the migrants who are coded as such, each pathway through the process of claiming asylum is arguably singular and specific. Each asylum claim has its own particular and variegated temporal routes through; its own subjective effects; and its own dynamics that need to be negotiated and hopefully overcome. All of which, a conceptualisation of the asylum process merely in terms of exclusion runs the risk of obscuring.

The notion of differential inclusion also enables us to see how the border regime, and the multiplication of statuses, lines of division and access to social rights that it produces are connected to wider mechanisms of governance that include all strata of the population, migrant and non-migrants of a given territory – whether regional, national or in the case of the EU, supranational. In this way the notion that “we are all in this together” takes on a different political value. In other words while migrants may experience such devices of exploitation and control most acutely, with, as was highlighted above (chapter 3), these not being experienced in the same ways by all migrants, such dynamics arguably forms of continuum of precarisation that effects all sections of the working class. I shall return to in the thesis’ concluding chapter (see

chapter 6 below).

In the remainder of this section I want to exemplify the notion of ‘differential inclusion’ through the example of healthcare that asylum applicants are able to access, drawing on data gathered from the ethnographic fieldwork I conducted at the Primary Care Service for Asylum Seekers (PCSAS) clinic. This included non-participant observation, interviews with a number of different members of staff who worked at the clinic as well as interviews and discussions with asylum applicants about their experiences (see chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of such processes). At the time the research was conducted healthcare in Cardiff was organised by the Cardiff Health Access Team (CHAT) whose primary role was the running of the PCSAS clinic, a service provided to all asylum applicants when they are initially dispersed to Cardiff. The surgery is hidden away in the old Cardiff Royal Infirmary (CRI) building just on the edge of the city centre. There is no sign to indicate that this is what this part of the building is now used for. Indeed, the old faded signs for Accident and Emergency are still visible on the walls outside. Unlike accessing a GP in a ‘mainstream’ practice there is no prior appointment system in place apart from those for antenatal care. In order to see the GP prospective patients must come into the surgery on the day and wait their turn. A list is “put out” daily at 12.00 for people to put their names on and the GP then sees patients between 1.30-4.30pm. The system operates on a first-come-first-served basis so if your name is at the tail end of the list there is no guarantee that you will get seen. On an average day the GP sees around twelve patients per session. Patients who know the drill will turn up around ten or eleven well before the list goes up, ready for another day of waiting (see section 4.4.3 for an extended discussion of asylum and temporality). A day like so many others.

While, as I stated above, all migrants have access to primary healthcare in Wales, those who attend the clinic are still as a matter of routine asked to provide proof of identity through presenting their Application Registration Card (ARC). All asylum applicants are entitled to register with a GP, and many only go to the PCSAS for their initial assessments and immunisations when they are first dispersed to Cardiff. However, many asylum applicants stated that when they had attempt to enrol with a GP other than that of the PCSAS, things had not been that straightforward. A number of migrants said that they were told that the surgery was full with some ascribing this to the fact that they were asylum applicants and hence to racism. Sales (2002) has pointed out that GPs may remove patients from their lists without

providing any explanation, a practice used to 'exclude' what are seen as 'expensive' patients such as the elderly and migrants seeking asylum. Such institutionalised and structural inequalities mean that many of the asylum applicants decide to continue to go to the PCSAS either because they have experienced difficulties first hand or because they know of others that have experienced difficulties. While access at PCSAS is sometimes problematic it is better than no access at all. Furthermore, prior to the introduction of free healthcare for all asylum applicants, charges for secondary healthcare for 'refused' asylum seekers were in place, making it almost impossible for them to access these services. Bodies such as the WRC had expressed concern about the effects that this has, especially with respect to pregnant women and children. There is evidence that charging meant that many women did not access the maternity services they required. There is also evidence that the children of asylum applicants in receipt of Section 4 support have been refused treatment because their parents could not afford to pay.

One of the medical staff at the PCSAS informed me that the antenatal section of PCSAS was set up in 2004 in the wake of the Confidential Enquiry into Maternal and Child Health (CEMACH) enquiry (Weindling 2003). This report highlighted that women asylum applications were eight times more likely to die during childbirth than the rest of the population. The enquiry found that this was due to a variety of factors, including: (i) communication issues and lack of resources for translators (in all the consultations I sat in on where there could be possible language difficulties a service called Language Line⁸⁴ was used, which according to a member of staff at PCSAS was now standard practice); (ii) lack of continuity of care largely caused by people being moved around through dispersal; or (iii) due to the fact that such asylum applicants had received no antenatal care at all. One of the staff at PCSAS informed me that when the services that comprise PCSAS were initially being designed there was a belief amongst those coordinating the service that it would be mainly men who were dispersed to Cardiff, which she attributed to their stereotypical conceptions of the asylum population as being principally composed of men. Whatever the reasons for such a stance, it meant that initially there was no provision for antenatal care. This, as well as the issues mentioned above, clearly highlights how the asylum regime creates differential conditions that lead to asylum seeking migrants not having the same quality of care as other strata of the population. Of course, the experiences of UK

⁸⁴ Language line is a provider of telephone interpreting and translation services. See <http://www.language.co.uk/>

women will differ greatly in terms of their antenatal care, with class, race, age, geographical location all undoubtedly playing a part in the kinds of care that people receive. As such we should, as pointed out above, be mindful of treating these different ‘groupings’ as homogeneous. However, even when these factors are taken into account, the CEMACH enquiry clearly highlights the extremely detrimental effects that the differential inclusion of asylum seekers can have on the quality of healthcare they receive.

On April 10 and 11 2008 a judicial review took place regarding whether a migrant seeking asylum whose application had come to an end but could not be deported for ‘humanitarian reason’ should be able to receive free hospital treatment. The resultant ruling in the High Court makes it possible for all those defined as ‘failed asylum seekers’ to be considered ‘ordinarily resident’ in the UK, and, consequently, be entitled to free NHS hospital treatment. The Department of Health stated that it was considering appealing the judgement, but unless the decision is overturned the Judge’s decision is (for the time being at least) legally binding. A month or so after this, Edwina Hart, the then WAG Minister for Health and Social Services, made an announcement that no asylum applicants, regardless of status, would be charged for NHS treatment in Wales. This move was largely brought about by public pressure following the deportation and subsequent death of Ama Sumani, a migrant worker from Ghana who had overstayed her visa and at the time of her arrest was being cared for in the University Hospital Heath, Cardiff. In July 2009 the then government announced that it would resume provision of free healthcare to refused asylum applicants in England.

It is clear then that migrants occupy a multiplicity of differential statuses which mediate their access to various social rights and the support services these afford access to. Of course migrants are excluded from certain entitlements. But this is not the same as saying they are excluded, it merely points to the exclusionary dynamics and tendencies of such processes (cf. Squire 2009). The concept of differential inclusion enables a more nuanced understanding of how the institution of the border produces particular stratifications and how the emerging regimes of governance, both within the context of UK and the EU operates.

4.4.2 Forced movement and immobilisation

The forced movement (through deportation) and confinement (through detention) of migrants has received substantial contemporary critical analysis (e.g. Andrijasevic

2010; Coutin 2010; De Genova 2010; Gill 2009a; Gibney 2008; Khosravi 2009; Schuster and Welch 2005). Indeed, in the work of Giorgio Agamben, the figure of the camp has come to occupy the central philosophical position in his theorisation of the operations of what he refers to as ‘sovereign power’, an issue I will return to in more detail in chapter 5 (section 5.2) below (Agamben 1997; 1998)⁸⁵. The forced movement of migrants imprisoned in detention centres through intra-detention estate transfers is a ubiquitous feature of their operation. The vast majority of those migrants who had been detained, especially those that were detained for more than a month, had spent time in a number of different detention centres, with movement from one to another coming with little, or no warning. While such technologies of management and control play an increasingly significant part in the operation of the regime of mobility control, this section will focus its attention on the spatial regulation – through both forced or involuntary movement and immobilisation – of asylum applicants in more mundane everyday life settings and how such processes are experienced and managed by migrants⁸⁶.

A principle means through which the regulation of the bodies of asylum applicants along spatial lines is actualised is through the technique of dispersal. Dictating where people can live becomes a central biopolitical mechanism through which the state attempts to institute control over the lives of migrants who claim asylum. As discussed above (section 4.3), since the inception of the NASS (on April 3rd 2000) and the wider reconfigurations to the field of care brought about through the setting up of the *asylum support regime* inaugurated by the 1999 Act, dispersal has come to occupy a pivotal position within the wider operations of the asylum regime. However, it was not until April 2001 that dispersal to Wales began, with CCC signing its first contract with the NASS in Cardiff, while the other three main dispersal areas in Wales mentioned above – Swansea, Newport and Wrexham – signing contracts later still (Dunkerley, Scourfield, Maegusuku-Hewett and Smalley 2006). Given Cardiff’s role as initial site of dispersal for asylum applicants in the Wales and South West Region, the number of applicants passing through it fluctuates on a daily basis. However, statistics do exist in terms of those who are made to stay in Wales on a

⁸⁵ Although differing in emphasis and the conclusions they reach, see both Mezzadra and Neilson (2003) and Papadopoulos et al (2008) for insightful critiques of Agamben’s totalising and reductive reading of the functions of camps. See also Squire (2009) for a more general critique of the usefulness of Agamben’s work for the study of migrant movements and the politics of mobility.

⁸⁶ For a thought provoking analysis along similar lines to those developed in this section see the paper by Nicholas Gill and his discussion of what I would call the ‘politics of stillness’ that traverses the conflictive field of asylum (Gill 2009b).

more 'long-term' basis. As of December 2007, there were 2,270 asylum applicants (including dependants) living in the four main dispersal areas of Wales, with a very small unquantified number living outside these areas. This accounted for 4.3% of the total number of asylum applicants living in the UK at that time, which stood at 43,035 (excluding those imprisoned in various forms of detention facilities). By far the largest number of those asylum applicants living in Wales lived in Cardiff, accounting for just under half of all applicants with 1,130 (49.7%). This is followed by Swansea, 700 (30.7%), Newport, 395 (17.4%), with Wrexham accounting for only 50 (2.2%) of the overall population (Home Office 2008).

While dispersal is not a completely compulsory scheme it is the only way for those who have no other means of accommodating themselves to receive such support. Although some asylum applicants who receive subsistence support live with family or friends (what case workers at the WRC refer to as 'subs only' support) the vast majority are accommodated through NASS contracted accommodation and as such they are subject to dispersal. In order to be eligible for such support migrant, as part of the *Asylum Support Agreement* that they sign, must submit to "travel to the housing we provide as your case owner has arranged" and have no choice where they will be sent⁸⁷. The connection between compulsory dispersal and welfare subsistence provision is a clear example of the field of care being utilised as a means of exerting control over the lives of asylum applicants and as will be highlighted below such power has a number of potentially detrimental effects on the physical and mental wellbeing of such migrants.

Asylum applicants dispersed to Cardiff first experience of the city will be Lynx Hotel operated by the private company ClearSprings⁸⁸. In Cardiff ClearSprings is contracted to provide housing to asylum applicants in Cardiff. It has a number of properties in Cardiff, with Lynx House, where the Welsh Refugee Council (WRC) also has one of its two Cardiff offices, being by far the largest and is the principle building where 'Initial Accommodation' (IA) is provided, with space for 70 people. Once the

⁸⁷ For full details of the UKBA 'Asylum Support Agreement' see Appendix B and www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/asylum/support/agreement/

⁸⁸ ClearSprings is one of a number of large housing providers in the UK and along with Cardiff City Council provided all the accommodation at the time of writing for asylum applicants in Cardiff. Prior to the commencement of the thesis another large housing provider in Wales was Astonbrook Housing Association. Between 2006-9 the contracts in Wales were as follows: Clearsprings £19.2million (not including its contract to run Section 4 (see below) accommodation); Cardiff City Council £14.5million; and Astonbrook £6.0million (see <http://services.parliament.uk/hansard/Commons/ByDate/20100223/writtenanswers/part004.html> accessed 23.2.10)

private security firm ‘unloads’ them (one case worker said that employees of one the companies that are used to move people seeking asylum around the UK to Cardiff referred to asylum applicants as “deliveries”) they will be booked in and provided with a welcome pack. This contains a list of migrant community organisations (MCOs) and associations in the area (including the WRC) as well as a list of relevant local contacts including solicitors, church groups, post offices, police stations and so on. Overall the conditions in Lynx House are cramped and sometimes those living there have to sleep three to a small room. All single males share, although as one case worker mentioned, if specific needs are identified then certain people have a room to themselves.

Soon after they have been booked into IA (depending on what day of the week they arrive) an appointment will be made for migrants to go through their induction. Most of these sessions are carried out at Lynx House itself but some happen at the main WRC building. This is not compulsory but as most migrants do not have any prior knowledge of how the procedure works the vast majority attend. Many of the case workers at WRC see their role with asylum applicants while they are in IA as having two separate functions: (i) the procedural aspect that makes up the induction; and (ii) what they see as proper ‘support’ work, that is advocating on behalf of their new ‘client’s’ more immediate support needs. The procedural aspect involves providing them with a breakdown of what the process of applying for asylum will entail. One case worker stated that although it was very tempting, under the terms of their contract with the Home Office they are prohibited from providing *any* information concerning the kinds of questions that applicants might be asked during the ‘substantive interview’.

Not all migrants dispersed to Cardiff will remain in the city for an extended period of time. The Cardiff office of UKBA is the regional headquarters of the Wales and South West region. As such, migrants initially dispersed to Cardiff in order to be processed (with the WRC playing a key role in this procedure) and to have their ‘substantive interview’ can then be dispersed on to various other specified locations that fall within this region – include Bristol, Gloucester, Newport, Plymouth, Swansea, Swindon, Wrexham as well as other smaller towns within the region. This procedure, as does dispersal more generally, often leads to families and friends being separated. Alem [P08, AA] a young Eritrean man who had just turned twenty, had been accommodated in Cardiff while his older brother had been sent to Plymouth⁸⁹. While

⁸⁹ Other people have experienced worse and had family members sent to other European countries

the WRC (and other MCOs/NGOs) had tried to make representations on their behalf it had been nearly a year since they were separated. Alem reported how difficult this was:

“We travelled from Eritrea with each other. It took us almost two years. We have always been together. Even before we left our country we were like a special team. He has always looked after me, made sure I was ok, and I try and do the same for him. I don't understand. Why do they keep me here and send him there? I don't understand. It is very hard for me. It is very hard for us both” [P08, AA]⁹⁰

Losing such a key form of care, affective support and stability had had a significant impact on both Alem and his brother's lives, making life far more unstable and intensifying their sense of precariousness (see section 4.4.6 below). While Alem spoke of the close friendships he had made while in Cardiff (especially with other Eritreans and Ethiopians) he also mentioned how he felt that, without his brother, he had no one he could really count on and turn to when he found things difficult. Although he had visited his brother and vice versa on a few occasions, limited financial resources made this difficult. They were also able to keep in contact over the phone but as Alem pointed out, this lacked the intimacy of face to face meetings and was also too expensive. He had never spent any significant amount of time away from him and he felt the separation as a profound loss.

Forced movement through dispersal can in theory happen at any point during the time waiting for a decision on an application for asylum, with many migrants telling me that they had been moved on numerous occasions. However, ‘secondary’ dispersal to another region or city tends to be carried out when a migrant makes a claim for Section 4 support. A number of migrants I met had also been dispersed to Cardiff following the lodging of a ‘fresh claim’⁹¹ for asylum. Many of these had lived for years in another city, where they had made a number of friends and were connected to both formal and informal support and care networks (see chapter 5 for an extended investigation of such networks). Dispersal was experienced by them as

because they had fingerprints on the EURODAC database (see section 4.4.4 below for a discussion of EURODAC).

⁹⁰ The fact that a number of the asylum applicants who were interviewed are still awaiting decisions on their claims means that the demographic information provided in Appendix C is often more limited than that provided for the care workers.

⁹¹ A ‘fresh claim’ for asylum is when a new asylum claim is lodged using new evidence that had not been previously considered during the previous claim, for instance if evidence that had previously not been so becomes available. These generally get lodged at the end of process, once all other appeals have been exhausted.

highly disruptive. For many dispersal also disconnected them from their solicitors (if they are lucky enough to have one), and as Hannah [P021, AA] from Uganda noted, it also meant that she would have to work out where to go to access more formal support services. Being forced to move to another property in the same city was also a common occurrence. Debbie [P013, AA] a mother of four from Nigeria said that in the three years she had lived in Cardiff she had been moved five times. As well as being unsettling for her, it was particularly difficult for her children, especially the older two, both of whom, she said had found the process of settling into a new school (they had had to move schools on 3 occasions) especially problematic.

The asylum regime also puts welfare provision (in the form of accommodation administered through the NASS) to work as a means of spatial regulation and surveillance of asylum applicants in a variety of other ways. As part of the *Asylum Support Agreement* migrants must agree to “live at the address that is officially approved”, a requirement that is reinforced through their ‘occupancy agreement’ with the bodies contracted by the NASS to provide accommodation (either Cardiff City Council or ClearSprings). Under the ‘occupancy agreement’ migrants “can not stay away from the property for a period exceeding 7 days”⁹², and if they wish to do so they must ask permission from the NASS. This they can do by contacting an officer of the body that provides the property who will then contact the NASS with the request. If they do not go through this procedure they may be deemed as having vacated the property. Property providers are also required by the NASS to carry out monthly inspections of the property. This is framed as an ‘obligation to you’. However, given that the asylum applicant is *required* to be present during this inspection it is clear that this also acts as another subtle form of movement control⁹³. The property provider can phone and give a day or time when the property is to be inspected. Sometimes they will call and inform the occupant that they will be there in an hour. If on these occasion the occupant is not in the house it is possible to organise some other day and time. A number of migrants said that they often have to wait for hours before the inspector arrives, and when they do arrive the inspection usually just involves a few quick questions, walk around the house before the signing of a form to say that the property has been inspected. As Hassan stated:

⁹² The text of the occupancy agreement analysed here refers to the one provided by Cardiff City Council. (CCC) However, migrants living in ClearSprings properties are subject to the same regulations.

⁹³ Given the rundown condition of many of the properties where asylum applicants live that I have visited it is difficult to see exactly what at times is being inspected.

“when you first move in they come and look in wardrobes, ask you about the appliances, check light switches but after a while he just comes you sign and he goes. They can keep you waiting all day. Sometimes they say they will come at twelve but they don’t come until maybe three or four. You never know when they are going to come” [P019, AA]

While ostensibly about ‘quality control’, these inspections also function as a means of curtailing and regulating the movements of migrants that are subjected to them. The NASS insists on these checks in its contracts with the various public and private bodies that provide accommodation, as a means of utilising them as agents of control. The council workers that I spoke with were uncomfortable with the regulatory role that their contracts with the NASS compel them to perform. This, as well as other examples discussed below, illuminates the tensions internal to the regime of mobility control and the emerging and hybrid institutional assemblage set out above (section 4.3) and apparatuses of control more broadly and warns against overly static, monolithic conceptions of the state-form and the exercise of its powers (cf Gill 2010; for a wider discussion of the conflicts internal to the state see Poulantzas 1978: 154-60). Such examples provide us with interesting illustrations of how actors, outside of what is conventionally conceptualised as ‘the state’, are drawn into its orbit, becoming functionally incorporated, if only partially and momentarily, into its apparatus of management and control.

The biopolitical regulation along the spatial axis does not end however if migrants are actually granted refugee status. During the time undertaking this research I have come to know a number of people whose claims for asylum have been successful. One of these Gaynor [P03, AA] who I met at the WRC just after she had received the letter informing her she had been granted Indefinite Leave to Remain. She had received a swift decision on her claim (“one of the lucky ones” as one of the case workers put it) and wanted to go and live in London where she had a number of friends. However, during her visit to the WRC that day she had been notified that if she did this she would not be entitled to housing provision. She said that her move on case worker had told her that this was the law under recent policy. Under the Asylum and Immigration Act 2004, the Home Office sought to restrict the “secondary migration” of successful asylum applicants. On getting refugee status they are now not allowed to access social housing outside of their dispersal area. Even once an application has been successful they continue to be subject to the regime of mobility

control with the field of care in the form of welfare provision continuing to be used as a mechanism through which the state attempts to curtail their movements. In the next section I move on to consider a variety of related ways in which the welfare services that compose the asylum support regime are utilised as a tool for the regulation of the lives of asylum applicants and the ways in which this affects both their everyday lives as well as abilities to plan for the future.

4.4.3 Temporal regulation, waiting and life lived in limbo

Time has become an increasingly salient dimension through which the conflicts at the heart of the field of asylum are animated (cf. Cwerner 2004). Home office attempts to reduce the backlog of those waiting to receive a decision on their asylum claim resulted in the establishment of the New Asylum Model (NAM) in 2007, designed to streamline administrative operations and through the creation of fast-track procedures, speed up the asylum decision making process (Harvey 2000; Home Office 1998; Schuster 2001; Schuster and Solomos 1999). These have been widely criticised with campaign organisations and solicitors questioning the quality of such quick decisions, especially given the complexity of many asylum cases. This section will limit its focus to a consideration of two ways in which time becomes a conspicuous factor in the field of asylum. Firstly, by providing an analysis of the ways in which welfare provisions and services through their connection with the wider asylum regime are bound up with the temporal regulation of the lives of asylum applicants; and secondly, through an examination of the effects that the processes of claiming asylum can have on migrant's experiences of time and what this means for their lives more broadly. As with the section on spatial regulation (section 4.4) this will be achieved through ethnographic descriptions of the procedures involved in claiming asylum, as well as an analysis of the ways in which biopolitical regulation operates through modulating the daily rhythms of the lives of migrants (cf. Lefebvre 2004).

During their time in Initial Accommodation (IA) asylum applicants receive no financial subsistence allowance. Meals are provided at set times, three times a day, so if people want to eat they must be in the building at such times. It is during their period in IA that migrants will undergo their 'substantive interview'. This is the major interview upon which their subsequent asylum claim will be based. This interview according to a number of case workers can often take a very long time. Eshe from Nigeria stated that due to a long interview she returned to the premises after the evening meal had been served:

“The interview started early in the morning. They kept asking me the same questions, over and over, it was very tiring. It went on until quite late in the evening and by the time I was taken back to Lynx Hotel it was already dark and we’d missed food. We had no money, so I had no way of getting food for my daughter or myself and we had to go to bed hungry” [P014, AA]

Like many in her situation Eshe had no financial resources at the time and as such she and her daughter had to wait until the following morning before they could get food. A similar account was provided by Tariana [P022, AA] from Zimbabwe, although like a number of the other asylum applicants interviewed, she was lucky enough to be connected with a network of care composed of friends from Zimbabwe who were living in Cardiff and after she contact them they were able to provide her with a meal (see chapter 5 for a detailed discussion of the importance of such networks in the lives of a variety of strata of migrants). According to case workers at the WRC such incidents were not uncommon, although pressure from the WRC had meant that things had, at the time I conducted my first period of fieldwork at the WRC and PCSAS clinic between June and August 2008, improved somewhat. When ClearSprings initially took over the running of Lynx House in 2006, there had been as one case worker put it during our interview “awful problems” with the way the accommodation was run and the way migrants were treated.

For those migrants who remain in Cardiff (see section 4.4.2 above for discussion of processes of dispersal) they will either (if they are to be housed through ClearSprings) remain in IA until a more ‘permanent’ property is available, or if they are to be housed by Cardiff City Council (CCC) be sent to its Reception Centre (RCe), Bronte Hotel. As a member of CCC’s Asylum Team informed me, how long they remain in Bronte Hotel will depend on a variety of care related factors, such as accessibility needs, with people who have babies or small children generally not being allocated accommodation above the first floor of a property. Often those who are perceived as having mental health needs, or as being vulnerable in other ways are kept at the RC so that they can be assessed, all of which means that they may spend a protracted amount of time waiting to be housed. A number of the migrants that had spent over three months at Bronte, often considerably longer.

While in the RCe, as with IA, there are a number of rules regulating their lives and conduct within these spaces. Of particular relevance here is the fact that “[r]esidents who intend to stay out of the Reception Centre later than 10pm or

overnight must inform staff of this intention”. As with the ‘occupancy agreement’ (see section 4.4.2 above) those who do not stay in the RCe “for more than 7 nights, without prior arrangement with staff”, may have their support terminated, with both CCC and ClearSprings being contractually obliged to inform UKBA of requests of this nature, or if such events occur. I was told by CCC staff that such problems were rare but that if they did occur they would normally try and deal with the problem “in house” by talking to people who broke the rules themselves. However, in cases where this did not work they had informed UKBA of the situation. Initiating such procedures was described as a “last resort” and “a very difficult decision to make” but as one of the CCC staff members put it “you have to be business like. No one wants to see people lose their support, to be out on the street, but like lots of other parts of the job you’ve just got to get on with it. It’s hard”. Such issues highlight the “dual function” and tension between care and control referred to above that Sales and Hek (2004: 60) identified as being endemic to welfare state intervention. Like a number of case workers at the WRC, those employed for CCC interviewed stated that they would prefer that they did the job rather than potentially less scrupulous bodies, such as those in the private sector, with many perceiving these as providing sub-standard services and resources.

It will hopefully be clear by now that the initial period following an asylum claim is a highly structured one, with much of this control being exerted through mechanisms connected with the *asylum support regime*; that is with the field of care and welfare services. However, the analysis has also demonstrated how regulation of the daily lives of migrants through such means, is something that continues for the duration of the time that a migrant’s asylum application is being processed. As well as dispersal the *Asylum Support Agreement* specifies a number of other conditions that must be met in order to continue to receive subsistence support. One of these relates to methods of access of financial subsistence payment. In order to access their financial subsistence migrants are obliged to collect this at a designated post office on a weekly basis. This can be any time Monday to Friday during opening hours. For those on Section 4 things are even more tightly regulated. Migrants can only collect the vouchers they receive one day a week with only one CCC office in the whole of Cardiff distributing these. A number of migrants said that this meant a long journey for them, and given that they have no access to public transport (unless they sell, or exchange their vouchers) this can take a very long time (see section 4.4.6 below for a

discussion of ‘voucher exchange initiatives’).

Both these modes of accessing financial subsistence support function as another mechanism of spatio-temporal regulation. If people do not access this money during the time specified then they lose their entitlement to it. As such the ability to travel away from their place of dispersal becomes severely restricted without other means of financial subsistence. Tavon [P04, AA] from Cameroon stated that this made it very difficult to keep in connection with friends in other parts of the country. Having been dispersed from Manchester to Cardiff following a Section 4 application, the fact that he was also on vouchers intensified the issue, as it was, without exchanging his vouchers for money, impossible for him to buy a ticket for public transport.

Another mode of spatio-temporal regulation that migrants undergoing the process of claiming asylum are subjected to as part of the *Asylum Support Agreement* is the requirement to report to a designated place at an appointed time. This can either be once a week or once a month, and for some it can be a few times a week. This designated place is normally either a police station, or if there is one in the area (as there is in Cardiff) a UKBA building. This can often mean a lengthy journey, and for migrants who do not receive financial support or who only receive this in vouchers, this can mean a walk of miles. I met migrants with very young babies, who were ill or had physical disabilities or injuries making this journey extremely difficult. Yet often no allowances were made for such people and when they were this was largely only due to considerable ‘lobbying’ on behalf of such migrants from case workers at the WRC.

Many of the asylum applicants talked about the intense fear that the process of signing created; especially for those nearing the end of the asylum process. For Aiesha [P018, AA], who signed on a monthly basis, in the days leading up to the time when she had to sign she would, like many others, become increasingly nervous, finding it difficult to sleep. “The night before I will hardly sleep at all. I get so worried thinking that this could be the time when they take me and put me and my daughters into detention. I just lie there, it is impossible to sleep at these times” [P018, AA]. Zemar [P01, AA] a young Afghani man who was required to sign once a week recounted similar experiences. He had been in the UK for three years awaiting his decision but continued to worry about what might happen to him when he signed:

“You try and forget about it but it is hard. Every time I go I worried that they will snatch me, put me in a deportation centre and send me back to Afghanistan. My life is in danger if I go back. I can’t go back. So you see this is what it is like every time I go sign I am scared that they will deport me” [P01, AA]

Nesim [P09, AA] an Iraqi Kurd spoke of how he tried to read the movements of the workers at the UKBA office for signs of whether he was going to be “snatched” or not. One’s sense of time was altered, he continued, as if one has entered another mode of being. Fear and the imagined possibility of being put in detention and then deported become actualised and intensified within this context. Time slows. It is clear then that the process of signing has significant consequences for many in terms of the overall effect it has on their lives. For hours afterwards, another person, Abbas [P017, AA], referred to how he felt paralysed, while Aiesha [P018, AA] and others spoke of how the process of signing followed a particular pattern, a recursive loop of: concern which becomes increasingly intensified leading up to the actual signing, which was for many an extremely fear inducing experience – then a *short* lived relief – before the beginnings of concern again... and so on.

These accounts of both the time leading up to, during and following signing highlight how its effects become diffused into everyday life and how such processes impact on their sense of existential security and stability (see section 4.4.6 for a fuller discussion of such processes of precarisation). Signing, according to many of the migrants that I have spoken with, also affected their lives in other ways. For instance, Umit [P010, AA], another Iraqi Kurd spoke of how it made it difficult to make any long term plans, living instead week to week. This was a familiar story, although a few who had been in process for a long time, such as Zani [P02, AA] a middle aged Albanian, who claimed asylum in 2001 and had been living on Section 4 for over four years spoke of how after time he had got used to living with the uncertainty.

“You just gotta get on with things. Try an get on with your life. Try and forget. It’s not easy but what else can I do? You know, what choice do I have? This system will break you if you let it. I just try and get on with it, keep myself busy, go to college, volunteer, you know, its difficult, like something always hanging onto you.” [P02, AA]

Zani, like many of the others filled his waiting time with college courses (although many experienced considerable barriers when trying to access these courses) with the majority of those from non-English speaking countries seeing these as extremely

beneficial and as a way of feeling more connected with 'local life'. Like Zani [P02, AA] many others also volunteered as a way of filling their time. For those who had yet to receive an initial decision, or were waiting of the results of an appeal, or fresh claim this also functioned as a way of taking their minds off their wider circumstance.

Leeto [P015, AA], who had left Nigeria in early 2005, said that everyday he wondered whether he would get a letter with his decision, a sentiment expressed by nearly all asylum applicants with which I spoke. It had been over six month since Leeto's last appeal but he still had heard nothing. Waiting here was filled with mixed emotions. On the one hand wanting the letter to come, to find out once and for all, while at the same time fearing a negative decision. Like a number of others though, he had already made plans for the worst eventuality. If things didn't work out, he would disappear, go to London where he had connections. People who could put him up, find him the right documents so that he could get work. This was without doubt his plan B, but like others I met in similar circumstances one that he would embark on if, after all the waiting for status, he was refused.

Waiting, as Hage (2009) points out, occupies a significant, yet often overlooked, place in the rhythms of everyday life⁹⁴. As the analysis above has demonstrated the waiting that asylum applicants experience arguably has a specific consistency, marked as it is by its omnipresence, as an indeterminate point, where when, if at all, it is reached, life (hopefully) can (properly) begin again. As well as this *long duree* of waiting for the asylum decision, there are numerous more concrete forms of waiting that the Kafkaesque mechanisms of the asylum regime make necessary, which will be considered in section 4.4.5 below. Before I explore these, and the wider effects they can have on the lives of migrants, attention in the next section is turned to an examination of the new technologies that are being employed as part of the asylum regimes apparatus of regulation and control. Here I examine such processes in terms of how such technologies of regulation are connected to the *asylum support regime* and the means through which asylum applicants are able to access welfare provisions.

4.4.4 *Cyber-surveillance: control of asylum applicants at a distance*

New technologies (and the corporate interests developing them) have become, along with migrants themselves (see chapter 1, section 1.1), a central protagonist, in the

⁹⁴ For a number of other fascinating accounts of the various ways and contexts in which waiting forms part of daily life, and the different kinds of times – such as existential and social – through which waiting structures our life worlds, see the other contributions in Hage 2009)

contemporary transformations that the regime of mobility has recently undergone⁹⁵. At the time the research was carried out, migrant's initial claim for asylum (if made in the UK) had to be lodged in either of two screening units: Lunar House, Croydon (which is also the Headquarters of the UKBA) and Liverpool. During the screening process they will be interviewed, have their photographs and biometric details (i.e. fingerprints) taken. In 2002 biometric identity cards were introduced as a standard measure of the asylum regime in the UK, with all asylum applicants being issued with an *Application Registration Card* (ARC – or “arc card” – as many asylum applicants and case workers at the WRC called it) which as I shall discuss below is connected to the asylum support regime and amongst other functions regulates the means through which asylum applicants access certain welfare provisions. This card contains a picture and other personal details on it (name etc) including fingerprints, stored on a secure chip. Asylum applicants had the dubious pleasure of being the guinea pigs for the implementation of a broader ‘identity card for foreign nationals’ scheme for migrants from outside the EEA (and Switzerland)⁹⁶. As of November 25, 2008 it became compulsory for all such migrants to be issued with an ID card. Migrants who are currently in the UK and wish to make an application to extend their visa, as well as non-EEA migrants who wish to enter the UK for a stay of six months or longer must now also make an ID card application.

The card itself is in reality of secondary importance. Rather, it is the database that the biometric and other information provided will become part of that is the crucial factor here, in terms of the regulation of the movements and wider lives of such migrants. As of the January 15, 2003 the fingerprints of all asylum applicants have been stored virtually on the EURODAC database, administered by the European Commission, a database that was subsequently extended to include the fingerprints of

⁹⁵ My arguments here are influenced by the intense debates over the past couple of decades regarding the place of ‘objects’ and ‘technics’ within human non-human networks. One particularly influential line of thought has been that of Actor Network Theory (ANT) (e.g. Latour 1993; Law and Hassard 1999; Mol 2002) which has attempted to foreground the agential quality of objects within such networks. ANT draws inspiration from a variety of sources, chief amongst these being Michel Serres (2007) and while not always explicitly acknowledged the co-signed work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (e.g. 1987). See the work of Jan Ll. Harris for a highly original analysis of such connections (Harris 2005). For more feminist inspired readings of the relations between human and non-human actors see the work of Donna Haraway (e.g. 1991, 1992). Amongst other things, Haraway and other feminists have rightly criticised Latour's ontology for conceptualising such networks in overly ‘flat’ or ‘smooth’ terms and for down playing, or failing to adequately theorise, the highly stratified character of such networks and the power dynamics they are entangled with and produce.

⁹⁶ The ‘identity card for foreign nationals’ has been renamed the ‘biometric residency permit’. See: <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/while-in-uk/do-i-need-brp/> for further details.

all third country nationals apprehended in relation to ‘irregular entry’ into the emerging European space. During the screening processes those migrants who are found to be on the database will be detained in a short-term holding facility before being taken and imprisoned in a detention centre. If they have already made an asylum application in another country they then face the prospect of being deported back to this country. For those caught by the police, or border patrols on route to the UK, in one of a number of countries through which migrants enter the EU without authorisation, such as Greece, Italy, Spain, the Ukraine, they will, in line with the regulations set out by the Dublin II Regulation (previously the Dublin Convention) that dictates that migrants must apply for asylum in the first safe country they reach, be deported back to the country they were caught and fingerprinted⁹⁷. At the risk of oversimplifying a highly complex set of processes, it is arguable that the reduction in asylum applications over recent years in the UK has more to do with the fact that once they manage to clandestinely enter the country many migrants are (for a variety of reasons) opting to remain ‘off radar’ and to utilise any informal networks they may have to find work than it does with the tightening of the external border controls (see chapter 5). During the times I have spent in Calais I met numerous migrants who have subsequently managed to cross into the UK, with many of those whose fingerprints had been captured disappearing into the subterranean circuitry of the UK’s multi-ethnic cities. It is important to note that despite such uses of technology the system of fingerprinting is far from watertight. I have also met a number of migrants who have successfully claimed asylum in the UK and been granted ‘Indefinite Leave to Remain’ despite the fact that they had been fingerprinted and detained on numerous occasions following their entry into Europe.

Returning to the ARC and its regulatory, surveillance and other functions within the *asylum support regime*, its principle uses are in terms of identity verification when asylum applicants access various services, such as collecting their subsistence payments at their designated post office, or when they visit a GP at the PCSAS clinic. They are also used when reporting, although in places like the UKBA building in Cardiff, where fingerprint scanning technologies are now in place, such technologies

⁹⁷ Following considerable pressure from activist groups and humanitarian NGOs the UK government announced at the end of September 2010 that it was suspending Dublin II deportations to Greece and since a case at the European Court of Human Rights which deemed all such deportations unlawful due to the detention conditions no Dublin II regulation deportations are permitted from any country in the EU to Greece (see <http://freemovement.wordpress.com/2010/09/22/removals-to-greece-suspended/>). At the time of writing (July 2011) such deportations have yet to resume.

are now used without the need to also show the ARC. Reporting is one of a set of emerging practices called ‘contact management’ a key dimension of which is ‘electronic monitoring’. I have already discussed how reporting is used as a means of spatio-temporal regulation, as well as its less apparent effects. But there are various other forms of ‘electronic monitoring’ being developed and utilised and while such technologies of regulation are not currently in widespread use if they were used in a more generalised way, they could have profound effects on the lives of migrants subjected to them.

Section 36 of the Asylum and Immigration Act 2004, which came into force in October of that year allows various sorts of ‘electronic monitoring’ for those ‘subject to detention’⁹⁸. Pilots using various forms of new technology began in Wales, England and Scotland immediately on implementation of the 2004 Act. These monitoring technologies include voice verification or voice tracking using biometric voice recognition technology. Here the body’s unique voice characteristics are used against itself. This technology enables a form of ‘virtual’ reporting through requiring a person to be at a particular place at a fixed time and day in order to receive a land line telephone call.

Another form of electronic monitoring being tested is that of electronic tagging. When tagging technology was first introduced it was only used with the ‘consent’ of the migrant subject to such a procedure. However, if the Home Office wish to impose the use of tagging on a given migrant such a requirement is now enforceable. One case worker spoke about two people who visited the WRC that she was the case worker for who had been forced to wear tags, which were fitted on their ankles. They were required to be at home at certain times on particular days a number of times a week. The tag sends a signal to a monitoring unit installed in their home, which communicates to a monitoring control centre run by a private company. The case worker stated that one of these people was extremely distressed at having to wear the tag. His case worker after much persuasion to the particular migrant’s UKBA case owner⁹⁹, managed to get the tag removed. The case owner was initially sceptical about allowing the tag to be removed because he was worried that the person would

⁹⁸ Under changes to the immigration rules implemented with the passing of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 asylum applicants are now ‘subject to detention’ at any point during the asylum process.

⁹⁹ Under the New Asylum Model all asylum applicants are allocated a UKBA case owner who is meant to deal with their asylum application from start to finish. The stated reasons for this were that it would improve continuity of service and mean that claims were dealt with more efficiently. In practice this is often not the case.

abscond if his claim for asylum was finally rejected. The case worker reassured him that this would not happen. When his case was refused he, of course, disappeared.

“To be honest I thought that he probably would. He was so scared of going back to Afghanistan, I’m not surprised he disappeared. I lost a lot of trust with the case owners at UKBA over this. I don’t think they’ll ever trust me again actually. But I did my job. I did my best for the client”

She finished our discussion with “I’m not here to do the Home Offices job for them. We shouldn’t make it easy for them”. This sentiment mirrors that of many of the other staff at the WRC and highlights a distinct antagonism that was apparent between the WRC, or at least a large portion of its frontline staff and the UKBA and wider Home Office. However, as I will discuss below, the close proximity between WRC and the Home Office and the role of the WRC in implementing many of the measures that have been brought in since the 1999 Act meant that in the eyes of many of the asylum applicants the difference between the WRC and UKBA was negligible.

At present tagging technologies are still in their infancy. However, types of hardware already exists that using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology, or a variant, are able to track the precise movements of people as well. In a policy document from 2005 the Home Office indicated that it saw such technologies as a viable form of its long term mobility control strategy (Home Office 2005) and, as the discussion in this section highlights, we are already witnessing the use of other form of technology to regulate the movements of asylum applicants. Surveillance ‘hardware’ of this sort, especially that of GPS technologies – coupled with that of ‘cyber’ or ‘virtual’ database such as the Schengen Information System (SIS) and EURODAC – if implemented on a wider scale would represent an extreme intensification and tightening of the regime of mobility control and its power and command over the lives of certain mobile populations.

The growing fusion between the asylum support regime and technological mechanisms for regulating the lives of certain asylum applicants is further apparent with respect to the recently implemented Azure card, which are now issued to migrants in receipt of Section 4 support. As already discussed, financial subsistence was previously provided to those on Section 4 in the forms of vouchers but as of December 2009 the £35 a week that such migrants receive is now placed on a card that can be used in certain participating shops. Unlike Vouchers, any money that is not spent by the end of the week is lost, with a balance of £5 only being left on the card.

Azure cards utilise the same chip and pin technology as bank cards, making it possible for transactions made with the card to be monitored both in terms of where and when and on what the card was used. Kesia from Cameroon said that she knew of people who had been called into UKBA and subsequently had their support withdrawn. One of these was a person who during the month period in between when he had to sign at the UKBA he was living with his partner in London. Following the card being used in London for two consecutive weeks he was called into UKBA to explain. Another incident Kesia informed me about involved someone who was giving his card to a friend with stable status in exchange for money. His friend then used the card to buy petrol, which UKBA considered to be an inappropriate use of his funds. Both people had their support cut.

4.4.5 *Produced dependency*

Apart from very few exceptions, asylum applicants are legally not allowed to work¹⁰⁰. Unless they decide (as some do) on the risky strategy of working under illegalised conditions, they are dependant for their financial subsistence and accommodation needs on the state administered forms of support provided through the *asylum support regime*, or for those who for whatever reason have had this support cut, on informal ‘networks of care’ (see chapter 5). But migrants seeking asylum are dependent on support services in other less immediately apparent ways. The modes of operation of asylum support regime – its procedures and rules, functional routines, how its component parts connect and interrelate – are productive of a more generalised experience of dependency amongst asylum applicants on the services of certain elements of the support services, in particular the WRC.

Like any similar institution the WRC has a number of procedures in place that migrants must follow in order to access the services it provides. Here’s how it works: when migrants visit the run down WRC building and do not have an appointment to see their case worker they will be put on a list by the security guard upon entering the building. When their turn comes they will see a case worker operating as a screener. Screening involves an initial assessment of the kind of ‘problem’ that a ‘client’ wishes to have dealt with. The rationale behind the system of screening was described to me by a senior member of the WRC staff as having been implemented in order to (i) provide as quick a service as possible; (ii) reduce any unnecessary waiting; and (iii) diffuse any potential conflict and aggression. Preference is given to what are perceived

¹⁰⁰ Permission to work was withdrawn by the Home Office on July 23rd 2002.

by the screener as being the more urgent problems. In a number of the screening interviews that I sat in on as a non-participant observer I witnessed people coming in because they were experiencing technical problems with their ARC cards, with the majority of such problems having been discovered on encountering difficulties when they tried to access financial support at their designated post office. Saad [P011, AA], an Iraqi Kurd that I met on a number of occasions at the WRC, said that he was constantly having problems with his ARC with the only way of resolving these being a visit to the WRC. During our interview he explained:

“I have problems with my ARC card all the time when I go to get my money. I go to the post office and they say they can't read it. Or that it's broken. My card has been sent back and I've been given a new one three times now. Every time I have a problem I have to come to the WRC. Wait to see someone. Sometimes, if it's busy like a Monday, it's always busy on Monday's, I might have to wait for a long time. If I have some money saved I often wait until the next day. But even when it's not busy you have to wait a little. When you see someone they fill in the right forms and you can then take this to the post office and get your money. I'm an expert now on how things work it's happened to me so many times” [P011, AA]

Cases such as problems with ARC cards will generally be dealt with by the screener. An *Emergency Cash Payment* (ECP) form will be filled in and that can then be taken to the post office in order to get their money. For people with more urgent problems that need to be dealt with in more depth or by someone with more specialist knowledge they will either be put on the list to see the Duty Officer or be sent to the receptionist to book an (emergency) appointment to see their designated case worker. In any eventuality, all this invariably means a lot of waiting. To see the screener. To see the duty officer. “Come back tomorrow, you will be first on the list” was a common refrain from the security guard, himself a refugee (“so I know what they're going through”). A lack of resources and funding, meant that there were only 4 designated case workers, with very large workloads. As a result, Griffiths and colleagues (Griffiths et al 2005) point out that work (which the refugee council previously performed) in community development and settlement work was neglected and perhaps more importantly with respect to the immediate care needs of asylum applicants also meant that often migrants had to wait considerable amounts of time to have their problems looked at by their designated case workers. I saw the same people over and over during my time at the WRC. Back and forth day after day. Coming to get help with letters from the Home Office that were in English only. Coming to find out whether

their Section 4 application had been processed. A thousand different problems. Some big others small but all requiring a trip to the WRC. As another asylum applicant Nesim put it, as we smoked outside the WRC while he waited to see the screener, “it’s like they own us. Without them we can’t get anything done. We’re like their children and we have to run to them every time we’ve got a problem, or things will never get sorted out” [P09, AA].

When people did try and sort out certain issues independently they often found that getting those was resolved problematic. For instance, Aiesha [P018, AA], reported how she had been waiting for over 5 months to get the £300 maternity payment she was entitled to. She had phoned the NASS on a number of occasions and they had told her that they were still processing her claim and had not yet decided whether she was entitled to receive the money. After about 3 months she went to the WRC to see if they could sort it out and within a little over a month the payment, which all mothers in her situations are legally entitled to, had been paid.

Of all the problems that people visited the WRC to try and get assistance with, it was various form of support service provision (services administered and provided by the NASS) that was most often on their lips. Support necessary to subsist while waiting to hear about their asylum claims and which under the 1999 Act was often ‘legally’ denied. In a WRC report, based on figures of visits to the One Stop Shop (OSS) service from the last quarter of 2006 (Welsh Refugee Council 2006), NASS payment problems were the most frequent reason people came for assistance, accounting for 1007 (15.7%) visits, with problems with housing 758 (11.8%) and Section 4 648 (10.1%) also accounting for a substantial number of visits. A number of WRC staff commented how they felt that people at the NASS were often purposefully obstructive and often took considerable time dealing with routine issues in order to make life as difficult as possible for asylum applicants (cf. Squire 2009). A perspective summed up by Edith one of the WRC case workers’ when she said that:

“They often take a very long time to deal with really minor issues, stuff that you should be able to process fairly quickly. Sometime I wonder if they do it on purpose. It happens so often. They can’t all be incompetent! We’re always chasing them up to find out what’s happening with someone’s application for support. Even for routine issues, black and white stuff, where it is clear that the person is eligible for support, or for particular things like maternity payments, y’know, things like that that someone is simply meant to get, I mean, even then they drag their feet and you have to keep calling them and calling them until they get it processed.”

So far in the subsections that make up section 4.4 I have analysed a number of concrete procedures through which regulatory mechanisms become diffused and take hold in the everyday lives of asylum applicants and explored the impacts of such processes. In the next section the emphasis shifts slightly and discusses such effects in more detail. It explores how the differential inclusion actualised through the *asylum support regime* produces certain subjectivities and how the operation of certain aspects of the asylum support services and the forces that generate such conditions are bound up with the precarisation of the lives of asylum applicants.

4.4.6 Precarisation of living conditions

With respect to ‘frontline’ support services such as that provided by the WRC’s One Stop Shop (OSS), one of the major issues impacting on the operations of such services is a deficiency of resources. This is due in large part to a lack of funding, which significantly curtailed the activities that bodies such as the WRC can engage in and hence their ability to meet the needs and demands of asylum applicants. Earlier (section 4.4.3) we discussed how migrants often spent prolonged periods of time at the WRC office waiting to see a case worker. This was in large part due to a lack of staff, which also had wider impacts on the service that WRC was able to provide. Most significantly for the analysis here was the fact that the small number of people employed as case workers led to extremely heavy workloads for such staff. Due to such working conditions the WRC office was closed on Wednesday and Friday afternoons. This enabled case workers to deal without being interrupted (at least in theory) with a various tasks that related to their service provision to asylum applicants, such as chasing the NASS for details of a support application, filing support applications, catching up on ever increasing paperwork requirements and so on. This procedure did not prove too much of a problem on a Wednesday, as asylum applicants who came at this time could always be persuaded to come back on Thursday. However, things were very different on a Friday, as migrants would then have to wait until the following Monday to have whatever problem it was they had come for looked at. On a number of occasions people would turn up and on being told by security, or another member of staff at the front desk that the building was shut and they could not enter, would become highly distressed. While this ‘rule’ was relatively flexibly administered, with a lot depending on who was at the front desk at the time, overall the policy to not carry out direct casework consultations after midday was adhered to.

On one occasion an asylum applicant who lived the other side of the city had come for clarification concerning a letter he had received from the Home Office. As often was the case the letter was in English only and with poor English reading comprehension he was not surprisingly unable to understand its content. The security guard had refused to allow him into the building, but he could see other migrants who had an appointment to see their case worker, who because other appointments had taken a long time were still waiting. Not understanding the situation he read this as favouritism. Why were they allowed in and not him? He became increasingly agitated, and it was only by coincidence that his case worker passed by and was able to console him and subsequently deal with his problem. A similar scenario ended with the man, who had become increasingly enraged at the situation, leaving threatening to commit suicide. These examples clearly highlight how the lack of funding, and the service strain this caused when linked with a variety of other factors, not least the practices of UKBA, language skills of migrants as well as the dependency of migrants on the WRC discussed above (section 4.4.5) both reinforces this dependency, while at the same time intensified a sense of powerlessness, lack of agency, frustration and ultimately conflict between the WRC and those that to the best of their abilities they were trying to support.

As well as dissatisfaction in relation to the rules and regulations governing access to case workers, feelings of powerlessness were further compounded by the fact that many asylum applicants saw the WRC as being ineffectual in terms of its ability to intervene in any meaningful way on their behalf. For instance, Gina [P023, AA] a mother from Zimbabwe, who had begun her claim for asylum seven years previously, and whose daughter was beginning her GCSE courses the following academic year, spoke in fatalistic terms about how the WRC was never able to do anything for her and that no matter how many times she came to see them her situation would stay the same. This was life. You suffered. It was the way things would always remain. Leeto [P015, AA], echoed these sentiments but like many others attributed this to the structural position the WRC occupied and the constraints imposed on it by the fact that the majority of its funding came from the Home Office: “Many of the people at the Refugee Council are there for you, they’ll help you fill in forms an all that but go there with any real issues and you won’t get any help. They can’t, the Home Office won’t let them” [P015, AA].

Here then we have a scenario whereby migrants know that if they have

problems they have to rely on the WRC to sort these out, while at the same time knowing that they occupy a subordinate institutional position within the asylum regime in relation to UKBA and the Home Office. In the time that I undertook my research a well-known member of the migrant community was detained in one of the UK's twelve detention centres, many of which are run by private corporate bodies, such as G4S and GEO. Many migrants said that they felt that they had been completely abandoned by the majority of staff at the WRC and felt that given their role as an agency meant to support and advocate on behalf of migrants seeking asylum they should have done far more to support him. This issue highlights one of the problems outlined by Cohen (2002a) that the position of the Refugee Council *vis-à-vis* the Home Office makes it difficult for them to act once migrants have entered a stage in the asylum process that is beyond their remit as a support agency and which may cause conflict with the Home Office (HO). While the WRC has a policy in place for dealing with such eventualities (Welsh Refugee Council n.d.) there were no leaflets or posters about such issues on display in the WRC office. Indeed, the above mentioned document was only available via download on its website and only a small minority of the migrants spoken with were aware of its existence. Furthermore, the advice given in the document largely involves migrants acting on their own behalf and directing them to contact other bodies in a better position to provide support and assistance, such as the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns (NCADC)¹⁰¹. The WRC engages in a considerable amount of lobbying and is involved in various campaigns relating to the way the way asylum applicants are treated, such as to end the detention of children or to allow asylum seekers to work if they have not had a decision on their claim within six month and so on. However, it is arguable that by being drawn into the operation of the asylum support service they have, as Don Flynn points out with respect to NGOs and migrant community organisations (MCOs) more generally, lost its critical voice and hence ability to mobilise on behalf of migrant communities (Flynn 2006).

Returning to the more concrete processes of precarisation experienced by

¹⁰¹ The actual entry in the WRC document is *National Campaign Against Deportation*, which does not exist. NCADC is not a campaign as such but rather assists with disseminating information, predominantly through the medium of training sessions, as well as various online materials, about how to set up and run an anti-deportation campaign. It also plays a key role in mobilising support for campaigns, encouraging a variety of tactics to pressure both the Home Office and airlines involved in deportations to cease with a particular deportation. One of its key message is for migrants to not leave it until they have been detained, which is unfortunately often the case, before a campaign is begun.

asylum applicants, the issue of housing is another locus where such processes can become actualised. If we consider the contractual arrangements with respect to housing (discussed briefly above, see section 4.5) that the status of asylum applicant affords, it is evident that the diminished rights of asylum applicants in this field experience, can have potentially significant effects on their living conditions and existential stability. Unlike ‘citizens’ or migrants with regularised residential status, asylum applicants do not have the same tenancy rights and the security that such right entail. Indeed they do not have any tenancy rights under the Housing Act 1985¹⁰². The contract asylum applicants sign with their accommodation provider (the contract details below refer to the wording of those of CCC) is not called a *tenancy* agreement but an *occupancy* agreement¹⁰³. While this affords them a modicum of stability in that there are procedures of warnings and/or sanctions that need to be followed before an eviction takes place the occupancy agreements open to asylum seekers state that they ultimately do not “offer any security of tenure”. They are what are called in the agreement “a bare occupancy agreement”. The agreement states that the Council “does not have to apply to the County Court for an eviction warrant” unlike the procedures in place with a tenancy agreement, and as such offers asylum applicants no legal protection.

The differential rights that the status of asylum applicant confers (see section 4.4) has implications that extend beyond just the sphere of housing. Eviction through failure to “comply with the conditions of the occupancy agreement” has ramifications in terms of the support administered by the NASS more generally. If an asylum applicant is evicted then they may have their NASS support cut all together, both financial and in terms of further housing support. Once an intention to evict is decided upon the Council (or ClearSprings) will inform the NASS giving details for the reason(s) to evict. If an agreement is reached between the NASS and the housing provider the occupancy agreement will be terminated immediately. The locks will then be changed and while under the terms of the occupancy agreement reasonable notice must be given here, as the agreement states “[r]easonable notice can be anytime from 24 hours”. This is the standard contract that all those subordinated to the dictates of the asylum regime are housed under.

¹⁰² For details of Housing Act 1985 and amendments made under the Housing Act 1996 see Cohen 2007.

¹⁰³ The *Immigration and Asylum Act* 2004 lead to amendments to the *Housing Act* 1996, which made it illegal for asylum applicants, or anyone else with ‘irregular’ residential status to be provided with a Tenancy Agreement.

When I spoke with migrants about these issues, many were not aware of how this differed from tenancy agreements, although some were aware of the limited rights that it afforded them. However, I met a number who had been evicted, and hence had experienced first hand the material effects of the reduced rights that their status as asylum applicants produces. One of these, Jassim [P012, AA], had been made destitute through eviction. He had received no support for over 9 months having had his Section 4 support withdrawn as a result of his eviction. Following the eviction Jassim and his case worker at the WRC immediately made another application for Section 4. When his reapplication for NASS support was finally approved, after over three months waiting, this was done on the basis that he would have to be dispersed to Birmingham. He didn't want to go. Notwithstanding the overall difficulties of life under the asylum regime, he felt relatively secure in Cardiff. In the 5 years or so that he had lived in Cardiff he had developed a number of close friendships and links with the local Kurdish community that were major sources of his overall sense of well-being. Like Debbie [P013, AA] and Hannah [P021, AA] who I discussed above as well as numerous other asylum applicants that I have spoken with over the years, dispersal would make it more difficult to keep in contact with his solicitor, which could damage his chances with his 'fresh' claim for asylum. Through his WRC case worker Jassim [P012, AA] made an appeal to the NASS to allow him to stay in Cardiff. However, following his eviction CCC refused to provide him with accommodation, meaning that the option was limited to ClearSprings, who on being contacted by Jassim's WRC case worker had indicated that they did not have any vacancies in their housing stock for Section 4 support at that moment.

A life of sleeping on friend's sofas, most of whom were asylum applicants themselves, homeless shelters and on occasion sleeping rough was clearly wearing Jassim down. Another application for Section 4 support had been made and his case worker had spoken to the area manager of ClearSprings asking him if it would be possible to keep a space for him if one became available. But with no guarantee of getting his Section 4 support approved, particularly after he had refused it previously, it was, as his case worker pointed out, very unlikely that ClearSprings would do so. As a corporate body their primary motive was to make money. For them, like many of the other private bodies who are increasingly intertwined within the asylum regime more broadly, providing accommodation was first and foremost another source of revenue. Empty beds meant less profit. Asylum support services like so many other

fields of life have progressively been commodified, with the profit motive increasingly taking precedent over other values. While Jassim still maintained a semblance of hope that the approval of his application would coincide with a house being made available in Cardiff, he was by now ready to go wherever he had to in order to get a roof over his head and financial assistance. He had tried, but in the end in vain, to beat this most punitive, disciplinary element of the asylum regime.

We have seen both with the case of Jassim, and earlier in the chapter (section 4.8) how the procedures and criteria for ascertaining whether Section 4 will be provided, often leads to long delays in people receiving support provision, making life extremely difficult while a decision is being made. A similar story came from Samir [P020, AA] from Sudan. He had been homeless for a little over six months, when we first met at the WRC, and I saw him on numerous other occasions as he came in to see his case worker to see whether his latest claim for Section 4 had been approved. It was apparent that staff, especially his case worker, while sympathetic, were also frustrated with Samir. He had been offered Section 4 a number of months previously but had refused because a condition of this was that he would have to be dispersed to Birmingham. But as he explained:

“How can I leave my son? How would I be able to see him? It is not possible that I go from Cardiff. It is so far away and without money how would I come? My son needs to see me and I need to see him, it is important. We need to be together, it is not right that we should be apart. Living in another house from him is difficult but another city would be terrible. They want to send me away from my son but I will stay here. I will not go away. No, no never!”
[P020, AA]

He was insistent that he would remain in Cardiff where he could see his son. While he waited he lived a life moving between friend's houses in Cardiff and Newport. On the days he stayed in Newport he would wait until late in the day when the ticket inspectors were no longer at the entrance barriers at Cardiff Central Station. He would then jump on the train and if he saw a ticket inspector would hide in the toilet until he reached Newport. After nearly a year living like this Samir finally managed to secure Section 4 accommodation and support for himself in Cardiff. Samir's situation was an increasingly familiar one, with the number of destitute asylum applicants constantly rising (Brown 2008; Dugan 2009; Gentleman 2010; Lewis 2007). However, many people never receive Section 4 support and, as previously pointed out, unless they enter the market as illegalised labour, as is often the case, they must live a life

dependant on informal care and support from friends, family and the limited, yet important, formal institutional support available (see section 4.5 below for an extended analysis of institutional support of this sort).

So far this section has focused predominantly on the experiences of migrants at the end of the asylum process. But precarisation is a much more generalised phenomenon and takes hold in the everyday through less obvious means. Precarisation has been a current running throughout the chapter. The forced movement through dispersal, the uncertainty caused by waiting for decision, the differential rights they hold, all of these forces can lead to a generalised sense of instability for asylum applicants, with their potentials to act, to move, to freely associate become constrained and blocked. David [P016, AA] from Sierra Leone, spoke of how life claiming asylum had led to him increasingly withdrawing himself from social life:

“I used to go out all the time, now I’m not sure. If people ask me to come over, or if I’m going somewhere, well I now say ‘maybe’, because I don’t like letting people down, and I’m never sure any more if when it comes to the time I’ll feel able to go” [P016, AA]

The process of claiming asylum has led to his capacity for sociality becoming diminished, creating a tendency towards self-isolation. This destabilisation of social lives and mental ecologies of asylum applicants was echoed by numerous others. Abbas [P017, AA] spoke of how he often could not be bothered to go out any more and that he spent hours just hanging around his house doing nothing. Both of them, as well as others, spoke about how during their time waiting to hear about their claim it became increasingly difficult to remain hopeful that things would work out. How remaining positive was difficult. However, despite these difficulties, it must be noted that even under these conditions many migrants continued to endure and remain positive. While it is clear that the regulatory mechanisms of the asylum regime can diminish people’s capacities to act, there are numerous examples of how, through both informal and formal networks of care and support, they were able to endure the difficult living conditions and cruel limbo that they faced. A perspective well summed by Anthony [P06, AA] from the Democratic Republic of Congo who stated that:

“No matter what they throw our way really we are not going anywhere. We'll keep on going, surviving. The way we are treated, really it’s not right. We came

here thinking this was a country of human rights. But really there are no human rights here. We came here expecting really to find help against persecution but they're [the Home Office] the ones doing even more persecution to us, it's such a, it's something very very appalling. But no matter what they do to us really we are here to stay. We will keep fighting, whatever it takes" [P06, AA]

4.5 Caring relations and the creation of sustainability

An important component of this ability to 'keep fighting', to survive in the face of the subordination and regulatory mechanisms of the *asylum support regime*, comes from the various forms of caring relations developed through the support networks inhabited by a emergent nexus of formal and semi-formal institutional bodies. Equally, if not more so, this *endurance despite* comes from the affective encounters that such bodies open up and enable, encounters in which caring relations and connections between migrants, institutional representatives, and members of the local 'communities' are forged. In this section I will map out the kinds of material support and care that these institutions provide and think more carefully about the political potentials held by the 'worlds in common' that they generate.

Despite the criticisms that asylum applicants level at the WRC, as well as the problems generated by procedural aspects such as opening times and other feature of the overall running of the WRC discussed above (section 4.4.3), it is clear from the time I spent conducting ethnographic fieldwork at its offices, as well as at the PCSAS clinic, that the social relations developed within such institutional sites were important in enabling asylum applicants to affectively sustain themselves while waiting to have their asylum claims processed. During the numerous 'sessions' that I sat in on at the WRC I saw a clear commitment from caseworkers to meeting the emotional needs and support requirements of asylum applicants. All of the caseworkers at the WRC said that the interests of asylum applicants were their primary concern. One mentioned how regardless of why people came they needed to be given time and space in which to discuss their particular difficulties and that it was important to endeavour to "try and get something positive for them so they can leave the office with happiness and relief, with a smile on their face".

Both the PCSAS and WRC can offer asylum applicants a sense of stability in what are deeply insecure circumstances. Aiesha [P018, AA] recounted a story of when following, the dismissal of her claim, she feared being snatched by Home Office

representatives and put into detention and as such decided to leave the house provided through by NASS and to stay with friends. When she attended the PCSAS clinic she stated how, because they knew about her situation and fears, they called her into the reception and staff area instead of making her wait in the normal waiting room area. Knowing they were there for her and would make sure that nothing happened to her while ‘in their care’ made her feel secure and she was sure that if this was not a specialist clinic for asylum applicants and was instead a mainstream GP that this would not have happened¹⁰⁴. She also told of how her case worker at the WRC had told her that if she ever needed to she could get in touch and had provided her mobile telephone number so she could do so.

The WRC also creates sustainable living conditions by assisting asylum applicants to access other forms of support. For instance, Abbas [P17 AA] informed me of how his caseworker had managed to secure him stable accommodation despite having his claim for asylum rejected and hence his subsistence and accommodation support from NASS cut. His caseworker had helped him apply for emergency accommodation that was provided by a local church charity. On another occasion in one of the many sessions that I sat in on a case worker managed to secure an asylum applicant, whose support had also been cut, a place to stay in a local homeless hostel, despite the fact that under recent legislation migrants have no entitlements to such support.

As such, well as forms of direct support the WRC also connects asylum applicants with a wider array of other institutional bodies who provide other kinds of material support required for subsistence and whose practices can be productive of caring relations that enable migrants to endure the often harsh realities and precarisation processes that the asylum regime can produce. When I first met Jassim [P012, AA] (see section 4.4.6 above) he looked tired, like a part of him was missing. He seemed withdrawn, pacified, a “docile body” to paraphrase Foucault (Foucault 1977). However, this perception was only partially true. He was, as I discovered over time, also full of strength and endurance. In this way he was like so many others in similar situations, worn down by circumstances, but driven by a quiet defiance, resolved to persevere no matter how bad things got. But there was more than this, his life was not just one of endurance, it was also filled with happiness, with joy and laughter. Like others he was also dependant on the care and subsistence provision

¹⁰⁴ This arguably highlights some of the ‘unintended’ dynamics that the process of differential inclusion can lead to.

received from friends, mostly other migrants (who were either still undergoing the asylum process or had been successful in their application) and on occasion food parcels provided at a Church in the Roath area of Cardiff, which once a week gave away food parcels to destitute asylum applicants as part of the *Crisis Response Group* that the WRC along with the British Red Cross (BRC) coordinated. He was also occasionally able to get money from the WRC hardship fund, but due to the large number of people in similar situations this could not be guaranteed every week, and the most that anyone ever received was £10. These services and the institutions through which they are delivered form part of a growing network of bodies, from formal to informal, that provide asylum applicants with much needed material and affective support.

Both the WRC and BRC have a long involvement with providing such services but in recent years a variety of semi-formal institutions have emerged as a response to the increase in migrants living in such circumstances. An interesting development that came out of the encounter between migrants and such institutions was the growth of a voucher exchange programme. As discussed above vouchers were (until they were replaced by the Azure card; see section 4.4.4) issued to asylum applicants receiving Section 4 support. Kesia [P05, AA] reported that, prior to the establishment of 'formalised' voucher exchange programs, informal economies had existed since vouchers were reintroduced for asylum applicants on Section 4 in April 2005. These enabled migrants on Section 4 to sell their vouchers, though this normally meant making a loss, with weekly voucher payments of £35 being bought for £25 or possibly £30. Vouchers are another technology that amplifies processes of precarisation. Life on voucher support, as with the Azure cards that succeeded them, could be highly prohibitive, principally because they can only be used in designated supermarkets. At the time this research was carried out there were only two supermarkets participating in the scheme – Tescos and Asda. Both these supermarkets won the contracts to supply vouchers across the UK, thereby guaranteeing the sales that this generates on a weekly basis. In Cardiff all vouchers were for Tescos. As Kesia [P05, AA] pointed out, the vouchers scheme meant that they were unable to use local shops or those that they had found that provide the cheapest food. For Kesia, like other migrants in her position, being on vouchers meant having to travel a long distance to do her shopping. Vouchers also meant that migrants were restricted from accessing any goods or services that Tescos did not stock, such as public telephones

and hairdressers. It also meant that Section 4 recipients have limited access to culturally sensitive food, such as Halal meat, with Tesco's at the time the research was conducted not stocking such items.

Initially the voucher exchange initiatives were carried out informally by a few of the people who organised different groups for migrants, such as Cardiff Refugee and Asylum Seeker Welcome (CRASW) or Oasis Cardiff, both of which ran 'drop in' spaces aimed at migrants where they could go to socialise, practise their English and so on. Over time these groups (as well as other similar initiatives around the country) began to formalise their activities, with the idea being, as one of the organisers said, to make the voucher scheme redundant by swapping all vouchers for cash of equivalent value. Migrants could go to one of a number of places and get money for their vouchers. While it is, of course, impossible to know for certain, it is arguable that the azure cards came, at least in part, as a reaction to these initiatives. As previously stated such schemes spread around the country with voucher exchanges established in many cities across the UK, which meant that the purposes of vouchers were severely undermined. However, even with the implementation of the azure card migrants have found a way of overcoming the problems that they present. As Kesia informed me:

“It's simple all the azure card means is that we just buy vouchers and swap them like we used to. So far as far as I know this hasn't been a problem, although, I've heard they [UKBA] monitor what you spend it on and they know where and when as well but up until now that's what I've been doing anyway” [P05, AA]

The voucher exchange programmes provide us with an interesting example of how certain elements of the institutional support nexus that has emerged in relation with asylum applicants were able to subvert a punitive mechanism of the asylum support regime and in doing so ameliorate the living conditions of those forced to live on vouchers.

The activities of Oasis Cardiff and CRASW are important in other ways as well. They help create spaces of encounter both between migrants themselves and between migrants and the wider 'local' community. In the light of the discussion above (section 4.9) about how the asylum regime can produce a sense of isolation, hopelessness and disconnection, spaces like the 'drop in' can undermine such affective experiences, and enable migrants to remain connected or to reconnect with wider social life. For Umit [P010, AA] the 'drop in' was an important part of his week. It

made him feel part of a community and knowing that there were people who cared, wanted to get to know him and other migrants, gave him hope and enabled him to endure the often abjectifying (Nyers 2003) asylum process. Equally importantly, are the effects they can have on other members of the community, creating relations between them, a sense of reciprocity, a deepened sense of commitment to migrants, which can become consequential, generative foundations for more conventionally conceived solidaristic practices such as providing migrants a place to stay if they become destitute, or assisting them when they are threatened with deportation. In this way the institutional nexus, the bodies that they are composed of and the relations of care that they provide form an important element of the ‘mobile commons’ that asylum applicants access and develop in order to sustain themselves, an issues I will return to in more depth in the next chapter.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has highlighted how various aspects of the field of care have increasingly come to be used as mechanisms for the purpose of mobility control. While it is clear, as Vicki Squire has pointed out that the recomposition of the asylum regime and its support services has been driven in part by a “deterrence rationality” (Squire 2009) which has led to the more punitive approach towards asylum, it is also the case that such transformations when viewed within the context of the wider regime of mobility control form part of the state’s strategy of ‘migration management’, which approaches migrants as economic units and in terms of the benefits they can bring to the ‘nation’. Such processes of selective migration and the mechanisms through which it is actualised aims not so much to block and halt mobility but instead to institutionalise it. As mobility has become evermore central in order for capital to reproduce itself it has through the state increasingly sought to find ways of canalising migrant movements in order to capitalise on them. As was highlighted in chapter 3 such dynamics and forces play a central role in shaping particular employment relations, subjectivities and forms of exploitability. Arguments I shall return to in more detail in the final chapter (chapter 6).

During the course of the chapter I have explored the emergence of the asylum regime and particularly what I have conceptualised as the *asylum support regime* and explored how various forms of support provision are utilised as mechanisms for

regulating migrants who have claimed asylum and the effects this has on their daily lives and long-term well being. I mapped out the institutional composition of the *asylum support regime*, setting out how the regime was coordinated and managed and how this was achieved through the institutionalisation of what I called partnership governance (cf. Balloch and Taylor 2001). Here I examined how NGOs have been drawn into the administration of the asylum regime and pointed to some of the potential consequences that this incorporation may have on both the ability of such institutions to challenge the way the asylum regime functions and as well as on the services they are able to provide. However, the chapter also highlighted the complex nature of such dynamics and discussed how the Welsh Refugee Council (WRC), along with a number of other formal and semi-formal institutions that have emerged in recent years, are important nodes within a nexus of bodies that are generative of caring relations and practices that enable asylum applicants to sustain themselves and endure the often lengthy process that the process of claiming asylum can entail.

The bulk of the chapter (sections 4.4.1 to 4.4.6) examined the multiple sites and mechanisms through which the circuitry of biopolitical regulation become diffused throughout the fabric of the lives of asylum applicants and the role of welfare provisions and services in the actualisation of such processes. Thus we saw how regulation occurred both spatially and temporally and how various forms of technology are increasingly employed for such purposes. I also examined how the operation of the *asylum support regime* placed asylum applicants in a position of dependency, impacted on the quality of support they receive and how the interconnected dynamics of such regulatory mechanisms were productive of a tendency towards the precarisation of the lives of asylum applicants.

Asylum applicants are caught within a double-bind scenario. Barred from legally working, unless financial support can be accessed through ‘networks of care’ composed of family or friends (see chapter 5), the only source of financial subsistence through which they are able to social reproduce themselves and survive open to them is that of the meagre welfare provision offered by the state. In this way then the field of care can be employed as leverage in order to gain the compliance and submission of asylum applicants to an array of regulatory procedures, procedures which are in part administered by NGOs such as the WRC. It would not be going too far to claim that the conditions under which asylum applicants are compelled to live if they wish to continue receiving financial and other forms of welfare provisions resemble those

of an open prison – indeed for those who are required to wear electronic tags the criminalisation that this produces represent a severe restriction on their movements and quality of life. But even disregarding such extreme cases it is clear that the lives of asylum applicants can be dramatically affected by the operations and requirements of the asylum regime. The regulation of their lives along spatial and temporal axes’ means that they are unable to leave the country, they are legally barred from entering the labour market and if they want to obtain financial support and state assistance with accommodation they must agree to being dispersed to wherever the NASS send them. The majority must ‘sign’ at a designated place once a week. Their houses are inspected, under the guise of quality control, with this being a way of guaranteeing they are in a given place at a given time. Those in receipt of Section 4 support can have what, where and when they buy something scrutinised and surveyed.

The chapter highlighted how the process of claiming asylum itself means that life, to a certain extent, is put on hold. This is the time of stasis, of inertia, where life becomes endlessly deferred into some indeterminate point in the future and which means that long-term, concrete plans become extremely difficult to make. A future whereby they are granted refugee status remains an almost unthinkable dream. Unthinkable, because to think it only magnifies the uncertainty of their present and also opens up the possibility that things might be different and they will be deported. Unthinkable, but also that which pervades and colours virtually all other thoughts. The long wait that many asylum applicants must endure before receiving a decision means that the future is always now and can never be any different. Until *that* day comes there can be no future apart from that day. The day that they will finally become that sought after category that promises an altogether different existence. The becoming-refugee of the asylum seeker is time slipping away, an image that was vividly highlighted to me by an asylum applicant who, as we smoked outside the WRC told me of his friend who had waited nine years for his decision. A decision when it came, despite being positive, was not met with elation but with sorrow. A sorrow for time lost.

There was also various processes of waiting that were more immediately related to the materiality of everyday embodied rhythms with much of these dynamics being intimately connected with the field of care and the operations of the *asylum support regime*. For instance, there was the waiting to see a doctor at the PCSAS or a WRC case worker, which as I highlighted, was more often than not due to difficulties experienced with certain aspects of support provision, such as problems with their

ARC, waiting to pick up emergency fund money as well as more long term problems such as the often lengthy time waiting to hear whether support under Section 4 had been approved or not. All of this meant a considerable amount of time moving between places relating to support provision. Back and forth to the WRC, to the post office to access financial provisions or to the voucher collection point, all of which occupied a considerable amount of their daily lives. For those migrants that I met that had remained within the asylum regime and endured its punitive character on a daily basis their lives are experienced, as Abbas [P017, AA] an asylum applicant from Sudan pithily put it, as a “hell life”.

As well as such dynamics the chapter highlighted how the asylum regime was productive of a number of forms of dependency amongst asylum applicants. Most obvious here was the dependency on the financial assistance and accommodation provided through the asylum support regime created by barring of asylum applicants from legally working, which as I just mentioned this is one of the central forces by which asylum applicants are compelled to submit to the wider regulatory dictates of the asylum regime. However, the chapter also highlighted how the ways in which the regime was structured and administered contributed to other forms of dependency. With respect to such processes, it was shown how asylum applicants were, for the most part, functionally dependent on the WRC in order to sort out any problems they encountered with accessing the various forms of subsistence support administered and distributed by the NASS. Such dynamics were compounded by the fact that the NASS often took a considerable amount of time processing whether certain forms of subsistence provisions should be allocated or not. Furthermore, the frequency with which such problems occurred, even for seemingly routine incontrovertible instances, led a number of WRC staff to attribute such delays to workers at the NASS deliberately taking longer than needed to processes such claims.

Along with the production of dependency, the chapter highlighted how the operations of the support services and the wider mechanisms of regulation of the asylum regime that they form an integral part of, led to what I referred to as the precarisation of the lives of asylum applicants. Alongside the numerous ways that such processes manifested themselves due to the differential rights and access to welfare provisions that the category of ‘asylum seeker’ conferred on such migrants the section on precarisation (section 4.4.6) also discussed how NGOs such as the WRC had been co-opted and drawn into the regime of mobility control, neutralising the

potentially antagonistic force of such institutions. It is clear that their relationship with the Home Office (HO) makes it more difficult for them to maintain an autonomous, critical position, which undoubtedly has effects on the radicality of the positions they might adopt and arguably also on the support they provide. However, it was shown that despite the institutional proximity between the HO and the WRC that caring relations were nurtured and crafted between WRC staff and asylum applicants. Furthermore, I also highlighted how migrants are both individually and collectively able to negotiate and mitigate the effects of the processes of precarisation and how the nexus of institutions composed of bodies such as Oasis Cardiff and CRASW that has emerged since asylum applicants began being dispersed play a vital role in creating sustainable living conditions and helping migrants maintain existential equilibrium. These institutions offer much needed care and support that enable migrants to endure the increasingly punitive quality of the asylum regime. In this way the caring relations that are often forged in such spaces are productive both of material sustainability and affective sustainability, helping to create habitable worlds and existential territories of hope. They function as spaces of encounter between migrations and wider social networks, with the conjunctions between the bodies of migrants and others creating and nurturing a sense of “we are in this together” with the relationalities that such spaces open up forming the foundations for subversive potentialities. A point I will return to in more detail in the next chapter.

Of course we need to resist the temptation towards idealisation here, viewing such encounters as unproblematic, as devoid of conflict and hierarchies that may intersect such relationalities and spaces. Furthermore, we need to be watchful of reproducing potentially damaging orientations towards such eventual encounters in terms of ‘poor migrant’ being helped by kindly, benevolent others; conceptualisations alarmingly implicit in numerous political standpoints whose primary discourse evokes migrants in victimised terms and in the process undermining their agency. This chapter in many ways has produced such a reading, with migrants figured as captured and tamed by the mechanisms of the regime of mobility control. Now of course this is partially true because the process of claiming asylum is carried out within the representational plane. It involves the ‘asking’ to be included within the social order guaranteed by the state-form. However, as touched on briefly above (section 4.4.5) much of the sustainability that migrants collectively produce is done so through self-organised networks of care. Migrants whose claims are rejected and state subsistence

support cut must rely on other means in order to sustain themselves and each other. Many migrants choose to enter the labour market as 'illegalised' labour but there are also many who rely completely on semi-formal (e.g. church groups) and self-organised informal networks of care (e.g. friends, family) to maintain their existences. To move again. These networks are a key configuration within the lives of different strata of migrants both those seeking asylum and numerous others. They are the substrate of the 'mobile commons' through which mobility is actualised and sustained. It is to these that we now turn.

CHAPTER 5

Networks of care and the making and sustaining of mobility

5.1 Introduction

Along with ‘autonomy of migration’ perspective discussed in the opening chapter a number of other researchers have, in recent years, foregrounded the centrality of mobility as a constituent force in the making of social and political life (e.g. Aradau, Huysmans and Squire 2010; Hess, 2006; Morokvasic 2004). This chapter seeks to address a number of interrelated questions: if mobility does indeed play such a constitutive role, and I believe it does, through what means is such mobility sustained? How, other than through wage labour, do migrants endure and survive while on the move, or as they endeavour to ‘settle’ in a particular place? What practices, relations and forms of sociality do they develop that are adequate to such an undertaking? The short answer to these questions is, through care. Care is at the heart of what makes migration possible. Indeed, my central argument in this chapter is that care is a precondition for mobility. That care is the generative force through which the *forms of life* that facilitate the sustainability of migrant movements and the lives of migrants are created. That without care the mobility trajectories of the many migrants whose lives populate these pages would not be sustainable. Indeed, as will become apparent below, for some migrants, without care, becoming mobile in the first place would not be possible. What this chapter seeks to explore then is the ways that caring and the affective relations that ‘acts of care’ comprise of and the ethos of care that animates them operates and enables mobility. What is it about care that enables mobility? What is it that care does?

Of course, care is not something that can be abstracted from human relations

and doings. As mentioned in the introduction, care is a form of attention that holds worlds together, made up of the often trivial and at first sight insignificant acts. But it is these acts, and the sensibility that animates them, that deepen our engagements with one another and make our encounters and worlds more intimate. During the time I have spent with the different strata of migrant populations whose lives and experiences this study is made up of, it is perhaps the everyday, ordinary, seemingly banal forms of attention and sociality that have left the most indelible effect on me. I witnessed untold acts that could so easily be overlooked: The chance meetings in the street, the phone call made to a friend just to chat and see if they are alright, popping in to see a friend for a cup of tea despite (and possibly because of) an exhausting day in work, the walk back home together after church, playing football and singing with one another around a fire in Calais. It is not that such interactions are unusual or that migrants here are doing anything special. Much has been written about how social life is held together through seemingly trivial and purposeless details of everyday interactions. Rather, what interests me about such moments and relations is how they (re)affirm mutual bonds, a sense of togetherness, how through them *worlds in common* are assembled and an “ethos of care” (Puig de la Bellacasa 2011) is nurtured.

These apparently innocuous and often fleeting encounters are important components from which ‘communities’ are formed. They are the seemingly mundane practices through which the terrain of caring worlds are made possible and crafted, and as such, such *affective encounters* are an easily overlooked element through which mobility, escape and the forms of life that make these possible are produced and sustained. It was an ethos of care and the caring relations they had developed that led Rebecca a Zimbabwean woman with citizenship status who and lived in the UK for over twenty years to cut our meeting short on hearing that another African woman who attended the same church as her had received a letter informing her she was due to be deported and go around to offer support and see how she could help. Of course, such ‘acts of care’ are also driven by other factors, such as familial and kinship obligations and responsibilities, a sense of ethnic and national belonging but, as will become apparent below, such relations cut across and go beyond such dimensions.

My point is that networks, collectivities, communities are produced and maintained through everyday acts of care and it is such everyday acts of care that sustain mobility: mobility needs to be collectively actualised with care. As discussed in the introduction, mobility is a resource that can be utilised in order to enhance living

conditions and open up new possibilities for subsistence that might not be possible otherwise. However, for some becoming mobile is more difficult than others. As well as a variety of other factors for some care can potentially become a block to mobility. I am speaking here predominantly of women, who as in the UK, still bear the primary responsibility for unpaid childcare. As I pointed out above (chapter 1) while patriarchy manifests in numerous ways, and effects certain populations more than others, the gendered division of labour continues to persist and be maintained across the globe. Indeed, as various writers have pointed out, the rise of migrants (mostly women) who are now performing increasing amounts of the care work that used to be carried out by women in North Atlantic countries means that such caring responsibilities have merely been displaced to other ‘subordinate’ populations, leaving the gender order fundamentally undisrupted (cf. Anderson 2000; Sassen 2000). As such, in order for mobility to be actualised migrants with such commitments and especially women with children need to find ways of managing such dynamics. At this point it is worth remembering the caution made in chapter 1 that we should be wary of reducing care to an activity that is only observable in the interactions between mother and child, while at the same time we must not go too far the other way and see care everywhere (cf. Puig de la Bellacasa 2010).

The chapter begins with an analysis of the mobile care networks that migrants forge and access while in transit. Taking the situation of migrants attempting to enter the UK living in and around the *borderzone* of the Calais region in France this section maps out the forms of life that are produced within this context, focusing principally on how the various functions and effects, that caring relations enable, operate. What the discussion in this section points to is that migrant movements draw on and cooperatively produce, what borrowing from Papadopoulos and Tsianos (forthcoming) have been referring to as the *mobile commons*¹⁰⁵: occasioned and maintained through an ethos of care, the mobile commons is used here to conceptualise the constantly changing set of resources (both material and immaterial)

¹⁰⁵ Peter Linebaugh (2008) provides an important historical analysis of the struggle over the commons, practices of commoning, the processes of enclosure that Marx conceptualised as “primitive accumulation” (Marx 1973) and the centrality of such struggles for class struggle and indeed how the battle for the commons continues into the present. I also draw here on the thought of Hardt and Negri, particularly in their most recent work *Commonwealth* (Hardt and Negri 2009). Another key work utilised is that of Silvia Federici’s feminist analysis of the struggles for the commons as a source of social reproduction in various parts of the world (but especially in the global South). Federici examines the effects of the ‘new enclosures’ on people’s lives, especially those of women, the cooperative strategies people develop in order to resist such processes, pointing to the political importance of these struggles and movements for contemporary social movements across the world (Federici 2010).

and practices that are shared and distributed amongst migrants that enable them to move, to sustain themselves and in some instances to overcome the various borders that may block their pathways. Such commons do not, however, only emanate from within migrant movements alone. The mobile commons is also composed of all those acts of caring, of kindness, giving and sharing that the encounter between migrants and the people they meet along their routes. Such acts as will become apparent below are key to the social reproduction of transmigrants and to enabling their mobile trajectories to continue¹⁰⁶.

Following the investigation of the lives of transitmigrants in Calais the chapter then moves on to consider how migrants utilise and develop transnationalised strategies as a vital means through which they are able to manage their wider reproductive commitments and responsibilities. My arguments in this section draw on the growing body of literature on transnationalism (e.g. Goulbourne et al 2010; Morokvasic 2004; Guarnizo and Smith 1998) which amongst other things has highlighted the importance of family, kinship, ethnic and wider networks for making migration possible. This section sets out to examine the importance of such *transnational networks of care* as means through which different strata of migrants with differential relations to the state are able to enhance their possibilities for mobility and become mobile and in so doing create more sustainable forms of life for themselves, their families and wider kinship relations.

The chapter then moves on to consider how such reproductive and caring commitments are managed at a more local scale. Here I examine how this is achieved through informal, self-organised friendship networks as well as familial ties and explore the wider significance of such networks in the lives of different migrant populations. The final section of this chapter examines the importance of institutions as spaces where *affective communities* and caring relations can emerge. Earlier in the thesis (chapter 3, section 3.6.2) I briefly explored how such relations emerged through the workplace. Here I extend this analysis focusing in particular on institutions such as churches, how the relations of care that such spaces can facilitate operate.

¹⁰⁶ For a stimulating exploration of the politically disruptive dynamics of clandestine border crossing and how borders not only divide but also draw differentially stratified populations, such as ‘citizens’ and ‘non-citizens’, together, creating new relations and commonalities between them, as well as pointing to the “future convergences of relations yet to be formed” (see Soguk 2007: 284).

5.2 The ethos of the jungle: care at the *borderzone* of Calais

The Calais region of Northern France is a perfect illustration of the *borderzone* as a space of conflict. A space where multiple flows are processed, coded, filtered, blocked, overcome. They are spaces where migrant movements come into direct contact, rubbing up close to the regime of mobility control's apparatuses of capture. It is important to reiterate the point that borders do not merely represent lines of demarcation between nation-states. Rather, as has been demonstrated in the previous two chapters, borders and the regulation over the lives of migrants such multifarious mechanisms can exert have increasingly become internalised within nation-state spaces, with such controls intersecting and criss-crossing the lives of migrants at numerous points across their mobile trajectories and everyday lives (e.g. Bigo 2011; Cohen 2002b; Inda 2006). Within the context of the increased harmonisation of European migration policies, the emergence of the European regime of mobility control and the 'externalisation' of borders that have accompanied such processes (Karakayali and Rigo 2010; Rigo 2005) Calais represents something of an interesting anomaly. While the UK is part of the European Union, by virtue of the UK not being a member of the 'Schengen Area' the Franco-Britain border is, in effect, an external border of Europe (Migreurop 2009): an external border internal to the European space of mobility.

Located just twenty-one miles across the English Channel – the shortest distance between the UK and mainland Europe – the port of Calais, which from the mid 14th to mid 16th centuries was a territory controlled by the kingdom of England, has long been a contested terrain between England and France and an important transit zone between the UK and the rest of Europe. Calais is one of the busiest ports in the world. In 2008, 40 million journeys were made across the UK border, which since February 2004 when the UK and French governments agreed to exchange border control points, is once again located in Calais.

In 1999 the Red Cross opened a 'refugee camp' to 'manage' the increasing numbers of migrants, who were drawn to the area in their attempts to cross the channel to England¹⁰⁷. Sangatte during the period it was operating, and arguably, continues to function "as a signifier for a set of complexities and tensions related to

¹⁰⁷ As discussed in the previous chapter (chapter 4) the example of Sangatte is another example of the NGOisation of the regime of mobility control. While Sangatte is now closed the Red Cross run similar spaces in other countries in the EU, including Spain, Greece and Italy.

issues of asylum, borders, migration and citizenship in contemporary Europe” (Walters 2008: 182). When Sangatte initially opened the majority of migrants staying there came from Kosovo as a result of the war. Approximately 75,000 migrants passed through Sangatte before it was closed by the French government in November 2002 and while there are no verifiable statistics, there is much anecdotal evidence, that points to many of these migrants having made it across the border (Schwenken 2003)¹⁰⁸. Indeed many of the migrants I have met during the times I have spent in Calais have now reached the UK. Fast forward to the present and despite the closure of Sangatte, the proliferation of border technologies at the port and repressive police activities throughout the area, migrants are still coming.

When viewed from the perspective of control and domination the situation that migrants experience in Calais would appear to be the ultimate proof of the efficacy of the regulatory mechanisms of the border regime. From this vantage point all that can be seen is a ruthlessly policed border and the misery that this causes the migrants that congregate around Calais and surrounding areas as they attempt to make it through to the UK. Such an approach is visible in many of the reports of NGOs and humanitarian organisation who rightly denounce the treatment of migrants (see chapter 4). However, describing and imagining the movements of migrants, particularly those of refugee and stateless migrants, around the world in terms of abjection and misery, while undoubtedly true in many ways, only tells part of the story. Migrants in such narratives cease to be subjects. Rather such characterisations victimise migrants, reducing them to powerless objects of forces beyond their control. Perhaps more importantly, depictions of this sort have also been mobilised as a means of curtailing mobility and strengthening border regimes. As Papadopoulos and colleagues highlight, the pretext of averting and alleviating humanitarian crises has been used by states and other actors – principally the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), but also organisations such as the UNHCR – involved in the development and enforcement of border regimes, as a means tightening regimes of control¹⁰⁹. With the externalisation of the borders of the EU and the emergence of surveillance and interception bodies such as FRONTEX being the direct result of

¹⁰⁸ The reasons for the closing of Sangatte are complex and space does not allow a more in-depth appraisal. Most significant were, pressure from the UK government; xenophobic reactions from both the French and the UK press, certain elements of the populations of both countries as well as legal pressure from Eurostar being the most noteworthy.

¹⁰⁹ For an interesting study of the operations of the IOM and its role in marginalising asylum seeking migrants and subordinating migrant movements to regimes of mobility control see Ashutosh and Mountz (2011).

such discourses and political manoeuvring (Papadopoulos et al 2008).

At a theoretical level such an approach can also be found in Giorgio Agamben's influential exegesis of sovereign power (1997, 1998, 2005). This is a complex body of work and at the risk of oversimplification I will briefly point out a number of problems with it in light of the perspectives drawn on and developed during the thesis. Agamben conceptualises the operation of sovereignty as following a singular logic, that of the exception. The ultimate power of sovereignty resides in the ability to decide on the exception, on who is included within the political community and who is excluded and rendered as 'bare life'. The migrants in Calais would no doubt fall within the later category. Indeed, for Agamben 'the refugee' is a paradigmatic figure of 'bare life', stripped of their 'right to have rights' (Arendt 1968) and the political potential this confers and rendered mute in the face of sovereign power. However, the 'state of exception' through which sovereignty is said to function means that the potential to generalise the camp and render all human life *homo sacer* is an ever present possibility and that as such "we are all" according to Agamben "virtually *homines sacri*" (Agamben 1998: 115). While then the politics of exceptionality means that we are all caught within such a totalising sovereign logic, Agamben's conceptualisation rests on a false binary between citizens, that is, those with agency and hence who have a political life and the 'bare life' of *homo sacer*, or all those whose agentive, political potential has been torn from them by the operation of the sovereign exception (cf. Rygiel 2011). It is a conceptualisation of the body politic that is clearly delineated, citizens inside non-citizens outside.

Contrary to Agamben, the argument developed here, as I pointed out in the introductory chapter (chapter 1), draws on the 'autonomy of migration' perspective, with migrants and the movements they compose figured as *constituent* forces in the making of social and political life. Migrants are not depoliticised beings excluded from society, although many of the workings of the border regime function in ways that are depoliticising (cf. Squire 2009). Rather, migrants are active constructors of the worlds they inhabit and move through. Instead of telling the story of the *borderzone* of Calais (or for that matter any of the other situations and experiences of the lives of the migrants who populate these pages) from the perspective of the functioning of power, à la Agamben and his followers, I explore it from the standpoints of migrant movements themselves focusing on the practices through which mobility is actualised and the networks and relations through which migrants sustain themselves. How they

develop and draw on the mobile commons and work with and make use of the specificities of the situation in order to render them productive. This will be achieved through an analysis of the living conditions, the various networks that migrants create and draw on, the modes of care they develop and connect with in order to sustain themselves and each other in order to maintain their itinerant trajectories. I will also examine the various formal bodies (such as the different local associations and charities that emerged in the wake of Sangatte's closure, as well as more recent bodies in the shape of activist networks (no borders Calais / Calais Migrant Solidarity (CMS)) all of which provide different forms of support and act in solidarity with the migrants in Calais.

Migrants when in transit in the Calais region live in informal encampments known by the migrants as 'jungles' (or *jungal's*), or squat in disused buildings. The word 'jungle' in English derives from the Hindi word for waste or desert, uncultivated ground. These 'jungles' and squats were located on waste ground on the outskirts of the town or in more urban areas in dilapidated buildings such as houses or former factories. There are also numerous 'jungles' in ports both to the east (Dunkerque, Ostende; Zeebrugge, just across the Belgium border) and west (Saint-Malo, Roscoff) as migrants who have tried unsuccessfully a few times to cross the border move elsewhere. Given the transitoriness of the migrants it would be futile to attempt to provide a detailed overview of the composition of the different squats and 'jungles'. Indeed, since the times I visited, which the descriptions here are based on, I have heard from various activists who work under the Calais Migrant Solidarity (CMS) umbrella that things have changed significantly. That said, some demographic generalisations can be made. Nearly all were men, a large number of whom (between ten and twenty percent) were unaccompanied children. There were however small numbers of women (particularly from African countries, as well as Iran and Iraqi Kurds) as well as families with small children and babies. The migrants came from a diverse number of countries, the majority coming from Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Egypt and Palestine¹¹⁰. The 'jungles' and 'squats' are predominantly organised along national or ethnic lines, although there was a certain amount of mixing between groups. When the Eritrean and Ethiopian squats were evicted and destroyed they moved to the large warehouse known as 'Africa House'

¹¹⁰ There were also small numbers from Libya, Syria, Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Ivory Coast. Interestingly, the largest groups came from war torn countries where it is now far more difficult for people to obtain visas in order to legally enter a European country.

along with Sudanese migrants¹¹¹. It is perhaps here that the most change has occurred, with people now living in spaces that are far more mixed and integrated in ethnic composition. Many of those from CMS who have spent considerable amounts of time in Calais attribute this largely to the drop in the number of smugglers operating in the area due to many having been caught. Smugglers exerted considerable influence on certain communities, particularly the large Pashtun Afghani community, which I shall discuss below, with such observations being consonant with previous research on smuggling networks when the Sangatte camp was operating (Coureau 2003).

Since April 2009 when France's Immigration Minister made a speech in Calais stating that Calais would be made a "migrant free zone" the French state has significantly intensified its police activities within Calais and its environs. As well as this it has embarked on a program of clearing the migrant's settlements. A number of the 'jungles' and squats have been destroyed, the most significant being the mediatised spectacle of the 'Pashtun jungle' eviction in September 2009, the largest by far of the informal camps with between 600-800 people at any one time, possibly more, living there. It was like a small village of houses made from blue tarpaulin and aligned in row after row. A mosque surrounded by a raised flower bed and strawberries, even a shop. Although this has indeed had the effect of reducing migrant numbers in and around Calais itself it has largely resulted in displacing them to the other ports mentioned above. The list of the often brutal state repression towards migrants could fill a number of books. Migrants face perpetual harassment from the police. Daily, some amongst them are arrested, taken to the police station, only to be released within a few hours. Occasionally they are held for a few days. Even those who have claimed asylum in France or have other documentation (most frequently temporary residency papers from Italy) are not immune. Police raids on living spaces are common, often at dawn or in the middle of the night. Shelters are destroyed on a regular basis. Food and personal belongings – clothes, sleeping bags, blankets – are also destroyed or confiscated. Use of tear gas is common with clothes and sleeping equipment often being covered with it rendering them useless.

These informal encampments share much in common with the places where

¹¹¹ There are also other 'jungles' and squats that were a mix of Kurds from different countries as well as Egyptians and Palestinians. While another in jungle there were migrants from numerous Arabic speaking countries, including Morocco, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Iran but also a Nigerian and Eritrean. Furthermore, the Hazara 'jungle' while comprised mainly of people who identified as being from this ethnic group also had others ethnic groups from Afghanistan such as Tajiks and Uzbeks, as well as people from Iran, Iraqi Kurds and on one visit I made a Pashtun migrant was living there.

during the Great Depression the mobile homeless known as Hobos would congregate, sleep, cook and socialise (Anderson 1998; De Pastino 2003). Usually located in close proximity to the intersection of railway lines these “social centers” were coincidentally called “jungles” (Anderson 1998: 42). Like the ‘jungles’ and squats in Calais, they were self-organised spaces, where a sense of solidarity and togetherness was forged and maintained, with certain items such as cooking equipment held in common and food and other necessities shared. No one ever went hungry if they had no food of their own.

Likewise the ‘jungles’ and squats that transmigrants create are an essential substratum (although not absolutely necessary) from which they are able to transform the “object space” (Isin and Rygiel 2007) of Calais into a base from which to assay the various options and assemble the necessary elements and information for further passage across the border. For making the required contacts and working out which possibilities were open to them. They also provide a space where migrants can recover from an already long and arduous journey. The creation of habitable, convivial spaces for dwelling while in transit is an important element of the *forms of life* that the migrants collaboratively create and a key aspect of the mobile commons. One that enables them to connect with and access other aspects of it such as smuggler networks or knowledge about where best to try and board lorries and so on.

This is particularly so given the intensification of the mechanisms of border control now in operation, which includes: the passing of carrier sanctions, which means that vehicles caught with migrants on board can be fined, effectively turning drivers into border police; an increase in border agents checking vehicles and perhaps most significantly, through technologisation (see chapter 4 for a discussion of technology as a vector of transformation of contemporary regimes of mobility control). Detection devices, such as the *LifeGuard*, and other such devices designed to detect the low-frequency signals of a beating heart’s electromagnetic field and other forms of movement, or technologies that can detect the heat emitted when humans breathe, has meant that such crossings may now take many attempts (cf Verstraete 2003)¹¹². While I met migrants who were only in Calais for a few days or slightly longer, for the most part the intensification of borders controls has meant that the passage through Calais has for the majority of migrants become a more drawn-out

¹¹² While statistics are, for obvious reasons not available, many of the migrants met in Calais have, as pointed out above, now reached the UK and all the migrants I met in Calais know friends and/or family who had already reached the UK by crossing the border via Calais.

process. In such a context the living conditions that migrants are able to fashion take on added significance. Perhaps the best illustration of the efficacy of the ‘jungles’ as ecologies that enable migrants to adequately reproduce themselves in order to continue to attempt to breach the border, comes from the fact that heightened police operations within Calais since early 2009 has focused extensively on rendering them inoperative.

Much of the reproductive activities – preparing and cooking food, cleaning, chopping firewood, collecting water and so on – were carried out communally. Most things such as cigarettes and food were shared. Prior to the eviction of ‘Africa House’¹¹³, as there were a large number of migrants living in the warehouse, people tended to split into smaller groups and congregate around one of the many fire places to keep warm and drink tea and socialise. They also used the fires to cook and would generally only visit the food distribution point run by one of the NGO-type associations that provided support for migrants in Calais, which I discuss in more detail below, once a day and cook at ‘Africa House’ for the other meals. The warehouse was always full of laughter, although of course there was occasional conflict, but when this occurred such situations were generally diffused quickly. Once a week, usually a Friday, the communal space was cleared with people working collectively and cooperatively to do so.

Different jungles had different routines and these of course shifted as migrants moved on and others moved in. A similar sense of affinity and connection was apparent in the far smaller ‘Hazara jungle’, located near the old hover port in the middle of the sand dunes, which was covered in thick bushes. The feeling here was always calm and convivial, despite the threat of police raids, which were a constant possibility. The camp consisted of a main communal structure made from found materials, with the structures they lived in well hidden, scattered amongst the bushes. Migrants living here would spend most of their time together sitting around the fire. Again, everything but a few personal possessions was held in common and shared amongst the group. If anyone bought alcohol this was shared, as were cigarettes and marijuana when available. They often would play football on the beach during the day spending considerable amount of time with one another. They would go to most places as a collective, or at least a few at a time, be that food distribution, clothes

¹¹³ Despite the eviction of the ‘Africa House’ that I describe here there is now another large squatted building that migrant’s from Africa live in. Indeed, as was pointed out above, migrants from many different countries that had previously been more separated now live together in such places.

distribution on a Saturday or to weekend food distribution where they could get free food such as cartons of fruit juice and fruit that were brought back to the jungle and shared amongst everyone. Such practices and routines build strong affective bonds amongst the migrants, with such affective connections very much apparent when people returned after they had been arrested and detained. On one occasion when one of the ‘Hazara jungle’ inhabitants had not returned for sometime after being arrested there was considerable concern that he may have been deported. Although Dublin II policy (see chapter 4) was not used very much the potential for deportability of this kind was a constant concern whenever someone was arrested.

Like the other encampments, the ‘Hazara jungle’ was raided on a regular basis with this often (usually at least once a week) resulting in the main structure being destroyed. However, this was continuously rebuilt as a means of maintaining as comfortable a living standard as possible. There was always someone on ‘watch’ in order to look out for the police and alert the others when they were seen, which gave people plenty of time to run and hide. If the police discovered any of the structures where people slept then another hiding place had to be found. As with the other ‘jungles’ the housing was made out of pallets for a base, then cardboard on top of this and then bits of tent, tarpaulin and fencing on top, with multiple blankets inside. To move all of these heavy materials and find a suitably hidden spot could take a considerable amount of time, especially if done alone or by only the small number of people living in a particular dwelling. However, animated by a strong ‘ethics of care’ that they had to look after one another *all* present would work together to do so. As Nafis pointed out: “we have to look after one another. We are all here with the same dream and waiting for the same chance. Yes, you may cross alone but you must live together. If you don’t do so then maybe your chance will never come” [P002, CM]¹¹⁴.

As mentioned above, there are a number of associations in Calais that provide humanitarian support for the migrants. These include *SALAM* and *La Belle Etoile* who distribute hot food on a daily basis. There is also *Secour Catholique*, which provide a small number of shower and washing facilities that migrants can use, as well as a place where migrants can get a limited number of items of clothing, open every Saturday. Migrants were also able to access very basic medical facilities at a *Permanence d’accès aux soins de santé (PASS)* (Coordination Française Pour Le Droit Asile 2008). Migrants could also get basic first aid from volunteers at *SALAM* during the evening food

¹¹⁴ None of the migrants with double zero codes e.g. [P001, OM] are included in Table 2.1. See Appendix C for a list of such migrants.

distribution and many of those who work with CMS carried out first aid on migrants when they visited the different jungles. Members of *SALAM* often also collected wooden pallets and dropped these off at different jungles. Many of the migrants spoke very positively of *SALAM*, not just because of the fact that they provided them with food and other forms of support but because of the strong personal connection that existed between them and many of the staff and volunteers. For those migrants that (for various reasons, such as lack of money to pay smugglers, illness or injury) had been in Calais for some time these affective bonds, and the trust that developed over time, were important in enabling migrants to endure. However, there was also considerable amount of criticism of the overly paternalistic practices of some of the association's volunteers, with migrants often complaining about the way they were treated like children (cf Millner 2011).

There were also more informal circuits of the *mobile commons* through which migrants could access the material resources they needed for survival. A particularly important location in Calais for many of the migrants was the *Flamingo bar* and the *Hawaii Club*¹¹⁵. These were felt as a safe space where migrants could socialise away from the 'jungles', charge mobile phones, watch football and so on. Neither were friendlier to any particular ethnic group, with all migrants welcome. The owners of the bar also allowed migrants from the Palestinian jungle to use it as their water access point.

As well as such places, a number of the workers at fast food vans which are located at various places around the centre of the town would give left over chips, or out of date food to migrants they knew. Another example of how informal connections with Calais inhabitants created sustainable living conditions was of how the 'Hasara jungle', which was located a considerable distance from a public water access point, got its water supplied to them by a man who lived in the area. Every other day he would drive to the jungle and drop off 200 litres in plastic bottles. Informal connections between migrants and the local population also meant that the migrants who lived near the dockside in the 'Palestinian jungle' were frequent recipients of the excess catch from local fishermen, with any that the migrants in this 'jungle' could not eat being given to those living in other nearby 'jungles'. Again what is important to remember here is how this dimension of the *mobile commons* was underpinned and animated by a particular ethos of care and how such acts where

¹¹⁵ As with all the names of people in the thesis the names of both these establishments have been changed in order to protect their anonymity.

integral to the creation of sustainable forms of life for transmigrants in Calais.

All those groups and individuals who provide material and affective support with migrants are doing so at considerable risk. In response to growing activism in solidarity with various strata of migrants, particularly undocumented migrants and those seeking sanctuary, the EU passed the “2002 EU Directive and Framework Decision on ‘Strengthening the penal framework to prevent the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residency’ [which] required member state to create offences of directly or indirectly aiding the unauthorised entry, movement or residence of non-EU nationals” (Fekete 2009: 84). While ostensibly implemented in order to halt the activities of ‘people smugglers’, the laws that this directive have given rise to have been used by states across Europe as a means of criminalising the provision of assistance and support to ‘irregular’ migrants (Khosravi 2010; PICUM 2002). In France the law named the ‘offence of solidarity’ or what Derrida calls the “crime of hospitality” (Derrida 2002: 133) means that those providing accommodation or health care and other forms of support to undocumented migrants risk 5 years imprisonment and/or heavy fines.

When new migrants arrive at Calais, which was often at the railway station they would be taken by other migrants to a particular ‘jungle’. On one instance, on the way to the ‘Sudanese jungle’ this involved a stop over at the nearby ‘Ethiopian jungle’ where tea was made and food provided. This sense of togetherness was bolstered by the fact that movement was far safer in groups or at the very least in pairs. With respect to the Sudanese, Ethiopian and Eritrean squats people often moved freely between them and although the migrant population was by nature a transient one, in the smaller encampments such as these, people generally knew where friends were and would look out for one another. Like the other ‘jungles’ if there was need migrants would assist one another to build new dwellings and no one was left out when it came to food and other resources, with these being common and shared amongst all those present. In the Sudanese camp every week they would collectively take down and completely clean one of the dwellings. The list goes on.

While in Calais, migrants find themselves outside the field of labour and hence this means of subsistence. The usual fusion between migration and labour has been momentarily severed. This is why the jungles and the other forms of support they receive are so important. Through the care that they access and cooperation they craft through these self-organised networks the migrants at Calais are able to create spaces

in which they are able to endure outside the field of labour. But the 'Jungles' also afford them the time in which to work with the problematics that the border creates and transform them into resources for movement. Borders are thresholds that migrants must incorporate into their movements in order to overcome them. As William Walters points out, "'freedom of movement' cannot be taken for granted it has to be seized" (Walters 2008: 201). Free movement then is not a given, at least not for the majority of the world's populations. Rather, it is something that must be actively struggled for in order to actualise. For the transmigrants in Calais and those in similar circumstances this involves working with the matters at hand, those immanent and particular to a given situation and rendering them productive and in the process transforming the very conditions of existence. It is in this way that escape is enacted, and the forms of life that enable this, are produced.

Both the formal and informal forms of support and care that migrants produced and accessed were of considerable importance as nodes within the nexus of relations through which sustainability was created. Equally important, if not more so, are the connections that they made and nurtured with one another, as well as the *ethos of care* and camaraderie that animated their acts towards each other. These were of vital importance, especially affectively, in the crafting of *forms of life* that enabled them to endure the difficult circumstances adequately to cross the border.

5.3 Transnationalised networks of care

"It was a difficult decision leaving my son behind, probably the most difficult decision of my life" [P1, CW] Erin, a 27-year-old migrant woman from Poland commented during our first meeting. Like many of the other migrants that make up this study, Erin had utilised family networks – leaving her son with her parents – as a means of enabling her mobility. Such mobility strategies are not new. As Parreñas (2003) points out, migrants have long utilised such strategies in order to enable mobility, with families splitting themselves across national borders. However, what is novel about contemporary migrant movements, is the number of women who are on the move. Research on the processes of transnationalism severely undermines the stereotype of the migrant as a lone male (Hess 2005; Kofman 2004; Kofman and Sales 1998; Papastergiadis 2000). Many of the new migrants, especially those working in the care industry are women. While previously it was largely men (husbands) who migrated

with women (wives) remaining to care for children, one of the trends that defines contemporary migration flows is that of a growing ‘feminisation of migration’ with a considerable increase in the numbers of women migrating independently of men and who, if like Erin they have children, often leave them behind to be cared for by other family members. Such processes have led to the emergence of transnational migrant care networks. In this section, and the one that follows, I examine these networks and the variety of transnationalised caring strategies through which they are composed. Focusing on migrants – from both within and outside the EEA, with and without proper residency status – I explore how they develop and deploy these strategies in order to manage their various reproductive, caring commitments and to maintain long distance connections with family members – particularly children – not living in the UK.

Like a number of other Polish migrants, Erin had initially planned to come to the UK for a short while for between six months and a year, in order to make some money and then return. As she pointed out this was largely due to concerns over her son “I didn’t want to come for longer cos I thought I’d miss my son too much. ...I was worried about how it might affect him. I didn’t want him to forget what I looked like [laughs]” [P1, CW]. The lifting of visa and work permit restrictions since Poland joined the EEA meant however, that it was possible to move more freely and go back to Poland, if required, or desired, on a regular basis. The availability of cheap flights also meant that if she really felt that she needed to go back quickly she could do so, which made her decision easier.

A similar scenario was reported by Sophia [P7, CW], who came to the UK, following the breakup of her marriage. A friend had told her that the care home she worked for was looking for staff and that no experience in care work was necessary. Like Erin, she left her daughter who was three years old at the time with her parents – “my mother is unemployed so she was more than happy to look after Ela for me” [P7, CW] – and bought herself a ticket to the UK. Unlike Erin, who now has a partner in the UK and intends to stay, Sophia still saw her time in the UK as a temporary one. Echoing the plans of a number of other migrants from Poland spoken with, the desires animating her migration had the transformation of her future prospects in mind. As well as aiming to accumulate resources to set up business, or buy property in Poland she also aimed at broadening her future employment opportunities through education and the enhancement of her proficiency in English.

Other migrants from Poland who had children reported employing similar strategies in order to increase their mobility and in the process both their short and long-term (re)productive potentialities, with some, like Erin having managed to negotiate for themselves the conditions whereby they felt able to bring their children to live with them. Such a strategy was employed exclusively by migrants who intended to turn what had initially been conceived as a short term accumulation strategy (both financial and in terms of knowledge) into one where they had decided to settle in the UK. Regardless of whether these migrants intended to stay in the UK for an extended period or on a more short-term basis the use of close-family members – predominantly that of other women – back in Poland was key enabling them to combining their desire for mobility and the needs of dependants.

So far we have considered the lives of migrant women from within the EEA and the strategies they develop and employ, but transnationalised caring arrangements are equally utilised by a number of other categories of migrant from outside the EEA (cf. Asis, Huang and Yeoh 2004; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Parreñas 2001; Schmalzbauer 2004; Yeoh, Huang and Lam 2005). All of the migrant women with children without authorised residential status who have participated in the research rely on family members to care for their children. Janet [P34, CW] a mother of two from Uganda came to the UK in 2000 and claimed asylum. She had initially left her two sons (who were now thirteen and fifteen) in the care of her sister with the hope that, once safe, she would be able to find a way of getting them over to the UK to be with her. This was not to be. Too scared to be deported back to Uganda, when her asylum claim was rejected, she went into hiding, eventually finding work – first as a cleaner, then as a care worker for a number of years and during the course of writing the thesis she left care work, largely due to the tightening of CRB checks and started cleaning again. Despite having not seen them since she arrived in the UK, Janet maintained a close connection with her children and sent her sister a considerable amount of money for both their subsistence and education.

Similar processes were apparent in the caring arrangements employed by Filipino migrants. Various writers have commented now how migration outside the Philippines is increasingly becoming a “fact of life” for many Filipino families (e.g. Chang and Ling 2000; Parreñas 2005b; Zontini 2004). There is a growing dependency on income generated by migrants, with care being the country’s principle export. Remittances – the considerable amount of which come from the vast number of

Filipina domestic workers around the world – constituted the country’s largest source of foreign currency, which totalled almost \$7 billion in 1999 (Parreñas 2003). By 2007 this had more than doubled, to approximately \$14.7 (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco 2008), with the figure rising to an estimated \$17 billion when informal channels are taken into consideration (Camroux 2009). Over the years the Philippine state has experimented with various legislative measures and policies in order to institutionalise and govern such monetary flows, although these have been unenforceable in practice¹¹⁶. Nevertheless, all of the Filipino migrants reported remitting significant portions of their salaries. The money remitted was utilised for a variety of purposes. As well as for daily subsistence expenses, a number of the migrants reported having used the money to assist other family members to migrate overseas. Indeed, this was a strategy employed by migrants from other non-EEA countries, both those with legal residency status as well as those living in illegalised conditions. Remittances were also used to pay for children’s education as well as building houses as well as the purchase of household provisions and appliances (cf. Perreñas 2001).

All the migrant woman from the Philippines reported that it was they who migrated first, and then, if they had partners, it was possible that within time they joined them. As with a number of other migrant populations, many of these Filipinas stated that one of the factors influencing their decision to migrate was because of the economic situation in the Philippines. They said that as they could not earn enough money in the Philippines to meet their needs and desires and for those with families it was increasingly difficult building a sustainable life. As pointed out in chapter 3, one of the Filipino male care workers said that he had left a job as a surgeon back in the Philippines because he could earn more money working in the care industry overseas. Such a scenario is not uncommon, with many Filipino men retraining, either in the Philippines or once they have migrated to join their partners in the UK.

With respect to transnational kinship ties, all of the Filipino migrants continued to maintain strong links and relations with wider kinship networks (cf. Asis, Huang and Yeoh 2004; Zontini 2004; Parreñas 2000). This involved frequent contact with family members, such as mother and father, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles – and of course their children, if they have them – in the ‘home’ areas where

¹¹⁶ One such measure is the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration, Labor Code Provision on Overseas Employment, which specifies the amounts that workers employed in different sectors are obliged by law to remit. I thank Erol Kahveci for drawing my attention to this legislation.

they had previously lived, as well as with family members who had migrated to other parts of the world. Similar practices were also reported by migrants from the different African countries who have participated in the research. While all of the African migrants with stable residential status who had children had brought their children to live with them in the UK many maintained strong, close connections with extended family members. As well as for more affective reasons, that I will explore in more detail below (see section 5.4), such practices also involved sending money home to parents, or to assist with the education of siblings. A number of the migrants, including Ruth [P19, CW] from Zimbabwe spoke about how money they had sent home had also been used to facilitate the initial movement of siblings or other close-family members, providing them with a small amount of financial resources to use both to pay for travel expenses and also a means of subsistence while on the move and when they had settled in a particular location.

Such experiences are truly transnational in that they manage to maintain a sense of family togetherness and cohesion despite physical distance, bonding the different family members across geographical space (cf Bryceson and Vuorela 2002; Goulbourne et al 2010; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). As with migrants from A8 countries such as Poland, transnational family formations play an important role in augmenting the possibilities for mobility of particular members. Many of the migrants from the Philippines stated that when they first came to the UK their passage was facilitated by the fact that they could leave any children they had with family members in the Philippines. More often than not this involved the utilisation of gendered networks of care, with mothers, sisters or aunties taking on these caring responsibilities.

Such transnational caring arrangements are not only utilised by lone-migrant women who are either single or have migrated leaving husband and the rest of her family in the Philippines. A number of families with both parents working in the UK continued with the arrangement of their children being cared for by extended family in the Philippines, once the husband had migrated. One such couple were Rosie [P15, CW] and her husband Tony, both of whom worked as care workers (Rosie as a senior). Their situation highlights how a combination of structural factors as well as desires impact on the strategic choices that migrants make in deciding on how to manage the care of dependant children (cf. Parreñas 2005b). The time I spent with the Filipino community at various events and parties points to the fact that families in

similar situations where the woman worked as a nurse and therefore earned a considerable amount more money were more able to bring children over to live with them. Furthermore, the fact that Rosie and Tony had two daughters also played a substantial role in determining their decision to leave their daughters in the Philippines.

A comparable couple Alys [P16, CW] and Daniel, both of whom also worked in care homes with Alys as a senior care worker, had, largely due to the fact that they only had one six year old son, felt able to bring him to live with them in the UK after they had both lived in the UK for around a year. Rosie [P15, CW] and Tony on the other hand, in order to accumulate enough financial resources to pay for the subsistence and current and future education needs of their daughters had to work extremely hard. They both worked a considerable number of hours a week, often sixty or more each, leaving them exhausted. As such, they felt that it would not be possible for them to manage, and give adequate quality care to their daughters, if they brought them over to live with them. By delegating this responsibility to family members in the Philippines they felt that under the circumstances they were providing their daughters with the best possible living arrangements.

Not all the migrant women who utilised transnational family formations were able to leave their children with parents who could care for them on a full-time basis. When Laura [P2, CW] another single mother from Poland had initially come to the UK she (like Erin [P1, CW] and Sophia [P7, CW]) had left her young daughter with her mother and younger sister, with the sister taking principal role of caring for her. She was able to go back to visit regularly (at least once every few months) for weekends and sometimes longer. However, unlike Erin [P1, CW] and Sophia [P7, CW] and the bulk of the Filipino and African migrants, Laura, like the majority of other Polish migrants did not have family who could look after their children on a full-time basis. Both Laura's [P2, CW] mother and sister also worked and as such when they were not able to care for Laura's daughter they had to pay for this to be undertaken privately. As such Laura needed to send money back to both pay for her daughter's subsistence needs but also for the care outsourced outside the family. Migrants in such positions have to engage in more intensive work schedules, which potentially impacts negatively on their "mobility power" within the labour market (Smith 2006; see chapter 3 for an extended discussion of this concept and such issues). For instance, Laura when she first entered the care industry was recruited to work in a care home

that paid her less than the minimum wage and was severely understaffed. While after approximately six months she eventually found work as a support worker the need to generate the financial resources through which to pay for the care of her daughter meant that she was less mobile than migrants who did not have such commitments or whose families were able to attend to them in their place.

As alluded to above processes of transnationalised care do not however mean that parents severed their links with children following migration. In fact, many of the migrant women (and men) that I have met endeavour to maintain intense and intimate connections with their children despite their spatial and temporal separation. In her numerous studies of Filipino migrant domestic workers and the impacts that the ‘globalisation of reproductive labour’ has had on the lives of these migrants and their families, Rachel Parreñas (e.g. 2001; 2005a, b) highlights how Filipina migrant mothers continue to feel responsible for the affective security of their children. As such, they engage in what she, following Sharon Hays (1996), refers to as “intensive mothering” as they “struggle to nurture their children from a distance” (Parreñas 2005b: 323). Similarly to the migrant mothers that she spoke to, the migrant women who participated in this study, all engaged in nurturing of their children at a distance and developed a variety of practices through which this was actualised.

New communications technologies have provided important media through which such acts of care are achieved. This is particularly important for those migrants from outside the EEA for whom it is not so easy – both in terms of distance and economic cost – to go back to the country they migrated from to visit children and wider family members. On one of my first early shifts I worked at the care home (see chapter 3) I worked closely with a Filipina migrant called Nancy [P9, CW] who had lived in the UK for almost five years. During our short break together, which we took just after eleven, she spent most of the fifteen minutes texting. As we went back to the floor she apologised telling me that she was saying goodnight to her twelve year old daughter and seven year old son. “It’s about six thirty in the Philippines now so I’m a little early I know, but just in case I don’t get a chance later” [P9, CW]. During my time working in this care home it became apparent that this was a regular, almost daily routine. While mobile phones were not permitted to be used while on shift in care home, Nancy bent this rule at least once a day in order to connect with her children. And she was not the only one. A number of other Filipino care workers informed me that they maintained fairly regular SMS contact with their children in the Philippines,

particularly those with older children. While time differences often meant that such modes of communication were not as instantaneous as would otherwise be possible, these migrants valued such practices as a way of maintaining a constant presence in their children's lives and as a means of reaffirming intimate connections. As Nancy pointed out, "it's a way we get to feel close to each other, so they know I'm always thinking of them. I'm not sure if it really matters to them but it's important to me" [P9, CW].

This was especially so because work schedules coupled with the time difference between the UK and the Philippines – with the Philippines being seven hours ahead of the UK – meant that it was often difficult to speak over the phone during the week. As such, some of the migrants had developed routines of regular communication, whereby they would contact their children and speak to them over the phone at the same time every weekend (cf. Parreñas 2005b). Others utilised technology such as Skype, enabling them to see each other, which they said intensified the sense of intimacy. One Sunday morning I was invited to Rosie [P15, CW] and Tony's house for the weekly 'chat' with their daughters. Tony was working, but as previously pointed out, Rosie never worked on a Sunday a condition she had managed to negotiate with management by taking on an extra shift a week, usually two (see chapter 3, section 3.5.2 for discussion of the ways in which migrants negotiate such working arrangements with care homes). This was the one day she knew she would speak to her daughters. When they first started the routine it had been over the phone but very quickly they started using Skype. Now only Skype was used. Neither Rosie or Tony had seen their daughters for over four years, Rosie nearly five. During the conversation which went on for over an hour they spoke about various things: what the children had been doing in school, with Rosie [P15, CW] checking that they were keeping up and doing any homework required; How they were feeling; what they were watching on television and so on. The conversation was relaxed and intimate, they all seemed happy.

After the conversation Rosie spoke of the tensions that she lived with as a result of her transnational family arrangement. Such a strategy was not without its affective costs, especially in terms of the guilt she felt for not being able to provide her daughters with the kinds of care and love a mother should. She worried about the possible effects that such a separation might have on her daughters. However, overall she felt that it was the best solution for providing for their needs (cf. Anderson 2009;

Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001) and while modes of communication such as Skype were no substitute for face-to-face interaction, they did enable them to connect and maintain and develop relational ties at a distance.

5.4 Local informal networks of care

So far I have discussed how the strategies of mobility of migrants from both within and outside the EEA are highly dependent on transnational networks of care, with these being principally composed of transnational family formations. In this section attention is turned to more localised networks of care that migrants develop and draw on during their day to day lives. As Datta et al (2010) state, the majority of previous research has focused predominantly on the transnationalised circuits of care that migrants are connected with and create and how these are utilised to manage unpaid caring commitments with much less research focusing on the arrangements migrants are able to make if children move with them or if they give birth to children after they have migrated. For those with family in the same area there is the possibility to draw on such networks to meet local care needs. For instance, a young couple Emma [P17, CW] and Mike from the Philippines with a three year old son regularly got assistance with collecting him from nursery from Mike's mother who works as a nurse at the local hospital and tries to organise her shifts so as to not do certain afternoons. However, the majority of migrants from the Philippines as well as those from all other strata did not have such family members in the Cardiff area. As such, this section explores the various strategies they develop and employ in order to balance paid and unpaid caring and reproductive labour.

For the majority this takes the forms of gendered, ethnic networks, with groups of friends, most of them having been made since migrating, assisting one another with caring for each others children. Like others that we spoke with, Laura [P2, CW], over time, was able to create what she felt were the right working and living conditions in order to bring her daughter over to live with her. But this had been a difficult passage, and one that would not have been possible without the informal network of care provided by, and made up of, a number of friends – mainly Hungarian but some also from Poland – that she had met in Cardiff, “I don't know how I survived, well I know how I survived, because of my friends, they helped me” [P2, CW]. The financial pressure of providing for her daughter's care and subsistence

requirements led to a situation where Laura remained in a job in a care home with very bad working conditions. She had amassed considerable debts and in order to pay them off and be able to continue to pay for her daughter's subsistence she worked (nearly) every day for four months, doing twelve hour shifts, which meant that she often did 84 hours a week. She was exhausted, something had to give. The "last straw" came when the manager threatened to cancel her annual leave if she did not work another long day over the weekend. Having her annual leave cancelled was unthinkable as this would have meant not having the time to be able to go back to Poland to see her daughter and as she had nearly paid off all her debts she handed in her notice and left the following week: "things got so bad that I had to quit. I just told him [the care home owner] one day 'you can stuff your job'. But without my friends I would've been lost. I wouldn't have been able to cope" [P2, CW].

Unemployed, and without the social rights to claim any welfare state benefits, she had to rely on the care of her friends. They provided her with food, a place to live (as she had no money to pay rent) and pooled their finances to enable her to send money to support her daughter. She lived like this for two months until one of her friend who also worked in as a care assistant in a care home managed to find her a place to work in the same home as her. The working conditions here (as well as the pay) were far better and she stayed in this job for seven months until she found her current job as a support worker for people with mental health difficulties. The affective support provided during this two month period was also very important. On another occasion when we met Laura said that the time building up to and after she left her job was one of the most difficult periods in her life. She felt lost, emotionally drained, close to packing up and going back to Poland. Her friends were central in enabling her to remain:

"My friends are like my family. Better maybe because we don't fight. Well not much. [laughs] an when we do we usually sort things out pretty quick ... We try and look after one another, be there for each other, y'know ...without them when I left my job I think I would have cracked up. They were amazing" [P2, CW]

It is clear that without such caring relations, mobility would often not be able to sustained. Care is the glue that enables migrants to traverse and come through difficult times, stronger, more tightly bound, enduring despite the precarious conditions they have to live with. Care maintains, conjoins people; creates and holds together forms

of life that are essential to maintain existential equilibrium in a world where often all we have is one another.

Another example of the *productive potential* of care is observable in the life of Poppy [P22, CW], a migrant care worker from Zimbabwe, who came to the UK following her husband's recruitment to work as a social worker for the local council. Like many of the other African care workers we spoke with, Poppy talked of how the initial transition after moving to the UK had been a difficult one, stating that she felt isolated from the people in her local area. It was this lack of feeling part of a 'community' in the place that they lived that many of the migrants found most difficult. Poppy and others felt the way of life in the UK was individualised and atomised and like many others she could not understand how people did not know, let alone look out for their neighbours. Poppy spoke of how in Zimbabwe people help and care for each other regardless of whether they are related or not:

“If you've got any problems you go to them for help but here it's a different situation. You have to sort things out on your own. [...] In this UK you mind your own business, that's the only life that you have to live. ...When you go and meet other fellow Africans you feel part of something, but otherwise you're on your own” [P22, CW]

Later she underlined the ethics that underpinned the support and care that she and other Africans would provide for one another: “Because we are very far from home, we are all foreigners in this country, once you are a foreigner at least you intend to help each other where possible, you be like brothers and sisters” [P21, CW]. Similar sentiments were expressed by Ruth [P19, CW] who during a conversation we had while she cooked the evening meal stated:

“Africans we have to help each other. Like maybe I've got a problem, like maybe I'm stuck somewhere and I need someone to pick my son up from school and my husband is away. I'll phone a friend to help me. If she's at home she will come and pick him up and if I can help I will do the same ...we have to rely on each other” [P19, CW]

While, she did not have much time to see her friends, what with having to work nights, undertaking all of the domestic tasks as well as looking after the children, this sense that she could trust her friends to be there when she most needed was extremely important to her.

My times spent with all strata of migrants was replete with such encounters

and stories. Children being dropped off at a friend's before being taken to school or nursery. One friend collecting the children of a number of others, taking them back to her house, feeding them before they were collected by their respective parents – usually mothers, but often not – to be taken home. In the absence of wider family networks in the area, such informal (gendered) networks were vital for those with children as a means of balancing productive and reproductive labour. Such networks existed for all the different strata of migrants. Paula [P6, CW] from Poland stated that without the support provided by such a network she and her family would not be able to stay in the UK. While Paula's husband lived in the UK as well, he worked as a long-haul lorry driver so was often away for long period of time and was therefore unable to care for their daughter as often as otherwise might be possible. As highlighted above (see chapter 3) care work involves lots of shift work and this often meant working weekends, or nights. On such occasions her daughter stays with friends. Dawn [P8, CW] from Hungary and her friend Julia from Poland who met at the care home where they worked had got around this potential problem by moving in together. As Dawn pointed out “this way we can look after each other's kids and when Julia is working she knows her daughter is in good hands” [P8, CW]. And when they were unable to synchronise their shifts for some reason then they could always rely on the wider friendship network.

Emma [P17, CW] from the Philippines also spoke of the importance of friendship networks as forms of sociality that were key means through which both material and affective sustainability were created, especially without the possibility of welfare state social right entitlements to draw on. As we walk through the hospital grounds on our way to collect her son, Emma said that a few months before we met, she had been admitted to hospital and stayed there for just over a month. Her husband Mike, having no annual leave was unable to take the time off to care for their son. But their friends (again it is female migrants I am referring to here) rallied around and made sure that someone was there to collect, feed and put their son to bed, when Mike was working:

“It was then [when she was in hospital] that I truly realised that I had really good friends. They also came to visit, brought me food and most important of all my son so I could see him ...it's hard when you're so far away from family life, my friends are like my second family here” [P17, CW]

Emma's experiences whereby the affective bonds of friendship nurture sustainable

forms of life echo those of many of the other migrants spoken with.

So far we have considered the everyday caring relations of migrants from both within and outside the EEA. We now turn our attention to those from outside the EEA without proper residential status ('irregular migrants') and explore the collective strategies that such migrants developed. As with those migrants discussed so far the concern here is to examine how the connections that caring relations produce enable these migrants to both evade capture, remain mobile and create sustainable lives for themselves.

All the migrants living without residential status reported that family, friendship and wider ethnic networks were central factors in creating the required conditions that enabled them to continue to live in the UK and remain mobile: accommodation, employment, affective support during the more difficult times, and so on. Grace [P31, CW] from Nigeria who, at the time I conducted the research, was working through an agency in care homes in Cardiff using residency documents she had bought¹¹⁷, said that, when she first decided to stay in the UK after her visa had expired, that both her family and wider friendship networks were key to making this possible. She had come on a three month tourist visa in order to explore the possibilities for work. It was through her family's wider informal network that she initially found work as a domestic care worker in London, looking after the children of another African family while they were at work. When Grace first decided to remain she tried to find work and change to a working visa but was unable to. As such she decided to overstay and moved in with a member of her extended family (who worked as a nurse in the NHS) and her husband (a social worker) an arrangement that proved mutually beneficial as she was able to assist with caring for her cousin's children during the evenings and nights, enabling her to take on some extra shifts. But the conditions were cramped and she felt she needed to find accommodation of her own:

"They would never throw me out, we Africans would never treat our own family like that, besides I was helping with her children ...but I didn't want to become a problem for them. The house was small, the children had to share a room because I was staying and I wasn't paying any rent, I needed to find my own place" [P31, CW]

¹¹⁷ See Vasta (2008) for a discussion of the 'paper market' where illegalised migrants become documented by borrowing, renting or buying other migrants documents in order to find employment. In Grace's case she bought the documents for around a 1000 pounds using money borrowed from her family.

About a month after her decision to move Grace was told that the flat mate of a friend of the family was leaving in a month's time, so she decided to move in with her. She continued to help with caring for her cousin's children as often as she could, but high rent and living expenses in London meant that the small amount of money that she made as a care worker was not nearly enough to survive, so she had to take on a full-time job with agency as a cleaner – hotels, offices etc – mainly during the nights. She was finding it difficult.

During her first three months in the UK on a tourist visa she had visited friends and family in various parts of the country. She contacted these again to see if there was a possibility of finding work outside London where living expenses would not be so high “I just couldn't stand it anymore. I was so tired all the time. All I did was work and sleep. The pay was so bad that even then I only just managed to scrape paying the rent” [P31, CW]. A friend said she could stay with her while she found work and a place to live. She left London six months later and moved to Cardiff. She found work through an agency within just over a week and then lived with her friend for another four months before she found a place of her own, “My friend was really great about it, she made me feel really welcome. I would've never been able to make the move without her. I owe her a lot” [P31, CW].

Anna [P29, CW] a Zimbabwean who worked through agencies as a care worker, was not so lucky finding work when she initially overstayed her visa. As mentioned before, it was through her friend that she initially found work in a care home where she was also accommodated:

“The first few months were very difficult. I stayed with a friend that I trusted and it was her who found me my first job. A friend of hers was working in a care home and they said that they were looking for someone but most importantly they didn't care about papers. For them it was a way of getting someone that they knew would work for less money” [P29, CW]

Anna said that she relied on her friend during this period for both material and affective support. Her friend has also been an important source of affective life support, especially during her period in the first care home she worked in, which Anna found a very difficult working environment: “I used to go and see her often just to get out of the home. It's really difficult living and working in the same place, you know” [P29, CW]. On one occasion I accompanied Anna to her friend's house. We drank tea,

talked about the situation in Zimbabwe, the difficulty of living as a ‘foreigner’ in the UK, about life away from home, the weather. Afterwards Anna spoke at length about how what was most important to her was the sense of ‘homeliness’ being with her friend provided and the fact that, as her friend was one of only a few people who knew about her situation, that she could let her guard down and relax when around her.

When I first met Elin [P003, OM, C] in spring 2007 she was working as a cleaner in a hotel. She had done many jobs, including care work, since arriving in the UK in 2001, but given the lack of document checks she felt safer doing cleaning, despite it paying less than when she had worked in care homes. In early 2009 I got a call from her saying that the hotel where she worked was cutting back on staff (a fact that she attributed to the growing economic crisis) and that she and a number of other migrants (although those fired were not exclusively migrants) had been told that the hotel would “have to let you go”. She was leaving Cardiff in a month and moving to London, she had family there and they had found her a job as a live-in care worker. She was a little apprehensive about the move. She had good friends in Cardiff, was a valued member of her church and besides she did not like London, it was too big and impersonal and more importantly, expensive. The last time she had been there was two years ago, when she went to pick up her then twelve year old daughter who she had not seen for six years, after she had managed to get a visitor’s visa and was brought over by an aunty. They had stayed for a weekend, which was enough.

Despite her concerns, this was just one more factor that she had to deal with as part of her mobile trajectory, try and use it to her own advantage. Having family there would make the passage smoother. Her major concern lay in the isolated nature of the job, as previously work had been an important way through which she had made connections that eventually were nurtured into friendships. But there was always the church and she felt that the fact that the family she would be working for were black (the wife a Nigerian who had lived in the UK for over twenty years and the husband was the son of migrant from Ghana who had migrated to the UK in the late 1950s) could only be a good thing. However, things did not turn out as well as hoped. When I visited Elin in London she had just left her job after only two months and was living in a small spare room in her cousin’s house. She was low and was even contemplating finding a way of returning to Uganda¹¹⁸. She said that:

¹¹⁸ Elin’s situation highlights the ironic fact that the border regime often means that migrants who

“After the first month they told me that they were having some problems with money and that they would have to pay me next month but when the end of next month came they said that things were really tight so they would have to pay me less than originally agreed. I couldn’t believe it! I told her¹¹⁹ that this was unacceptable but she behaved like she was doing me a favour by giving me a job in the first place. I told her as calmly as I could that I would be leaving” [P003, OM, C]

Elin’s situation echoes many of the comments of other domestic workers interviewed by Bridget Anderson (2000) during her important work on domestic labour in Europe. However, many of those who Anderson interviewed were not as fortunate as migrants like Anna [P29, CW] or Grace [P31, CW] as they had entered the UK with their employer and were therefore dependent on them for their residential status. Anderson’s work highlights the often highly exploitative conditions that this can give rise to, but what is most interesting for my purposes here is how those who escape these conditions are generally only able to do so through the assistance provided by other migrants. In Anna’s [P29, CW] case the material support from her cousin was invaluable in enabling her to maintain her migration project while out of work and the daily telephone calls to her friends in Cardiff helped provide her with the affective life line she needed to endure the situation.

5.5 Institutional connections and the creation of caring

So far in this chapter I have explored the importance of informal networks – family, friends, people met while in transit and even fleeting connections – and the practices of care that develop from such relations in enabling migrants to negotiate their daily lives and remain mobile. In chapter 3 (section 3.6.2) I examined how such networks emerged within the workplace itself and in chapter 4 (4.5) I considered how semi-formal migrant community organisations were important institutional sites from which the connections generative of caring relations could emerge and grow. All of these sites it has been argued are central components of the *mobile commons* and hence play decisive (if somewhat different) roles in the creation of the *forms of life* through

actually want to leave are unable to because they have no legal means of doing so. See Kaufmann (2008) for a discussion (that while focused on the US is arguable applicable to other contexts) of how the intensification of borders controls has not led to decrease in migration itself but to a dramatic increase in unauthorised mobility and undocumented migrants.

¹¹⁹ Notice the ‘her’. Once again it is women who are responsible for managing the household space and in this case the wider employment relations that employing a domestic care worker entails.

which the mobility of different strata of migrants are made and sustained.

But are there other sites that play such a role? One particularly important one that a number of migrants mentioned and that were observable during my time spent with migrants was that of religious institutions, particularly churches¹²⁰. More specifically it was people that attended the church or people that ran particular organisations that used the church as a space within which they organised and held particular events. While it is not necessarily the church as an institution, or those whose institutional role is linked to the church (e.g. vicar) that does the caring, the church functions as a kind of attractor through which affectivity materialised as care is produced and distributed.

One migrant who accessed care through connections made through the church was Joan [P004, OM, C]. She stated that when her asylum claim was refused, Wendy, a woman who ran *Sunshine Planet*¹²¹ a small, informal charity that she had got to know during her time that her asylum claim was being processed, provided her with various forms of support that played a vital part in enabling her to remain in the UK. As Joan commented during our interview:

“When I got the letter¹²² I was very scared, I didn’t know what to do. I just left my yard as I didn’t want them to catch me there. I went to a friend’s place and asked if I could stay with her. But she had only just got status and was scared that if she helped me they could deport her as well. I didn’t know where else to go so I went to see Wendy. She had always been there for me, so I showed it [the letter] to her and her first reaction was ...she asked me what I wanted to do. I was a bit shocked at first. You know, I expected sympathy but not real help. We discussed what my choices were ... an when I told her that I couldn’t go back, she invited me to stay with her for a while” [P004, OM, C]

Fearful of going back to her flat Wendy collected as many of Joan’s things for her as possible. Joan lived with her for over six months, until she found work as a cleaner. Wendy also assisted Joan with accessing accommodation by renting her a flat in her name. Joan [P004, OM, C] reported of how Wendy had also supported her on another

¹²⁰ Although, it also must be noted that a number of migrants said that even though they had been going to the same church for a number of years they had not yet told any of the other people who attended about their residential status and did not envisage doing so in the future, not even if their situation became very difficult. This they attributed to two interrelated reasons. The first, was due to the fact that they would be ashamed if people knew about their status. The second, and relatedly, was due to the perceived ‘conservatism’ of church members. Interestingly, in Joan’s case, as well as those discussed later in this section, those who did draw on and receive support from church members had entered into illegalised residential status following their asylum claims being rejected.

¹²¹ Again, as with other such institutions the name has been changed.

¹²² From UKBA informing her that they had rejected her claim for asylum.

occasion when she had been out of work, providing her with food and a place to live. It is clear that in the absence of other forms of subsistence such caring relations are a core element in enabling the continued unfolding of Joan's movement.

Joan's migration trajectory is of further interest in that it highlights how lack of informal networks can be a constraint on mobility. She said that ideally she would have initially liked to have left Cardiff and moved to somewhere where she would not be known. However, having no family or friends outside the city made this very difficult. It also highlights how (for those migrants within the asylum system at least) fear of the potency of the Home Office's surveillance capacities acts as a barrier to the ability and willingness of migrants (both those whose claims are still being processed and those who have achieved refugee status) to support one another. That said, as we saw in chapter 4 there are numerous examples of where migrants seeking asylum build strong and enduring networks of care with one another, dense worlds in common and in so doing refuse and struggle against the abjectification (Squires 2009) that policy relating to asylum can produce.

Connections made through the church after his asylum claim was rejected were also an important means through which Jac [P005, OM, C] from Sudan was able to sustain himself. Living in both Cardiff and Manchester and working in a small fast-food outlets owned by the same family in both cities, he moves between them depending on where his employers decide he is needed the most at any given time. "He's like one of the family" Sioned, the woman whose house he lives in (rent free) when he's in Cardiff commented. "We love having him around... He's great with the children and we all miss him when he's not here". This relationship has been in place since December 2006, almost two years at the time I met Jac. When in Manchester he stays with friends:

"I don't have a stable place in Manchester but it's ok I have plenty of friends to chose from and I don't mind sleeping on sofas or on the floor if I have to, I'm just glad I've found a way of staying, I'm very lucky to have so many good friends, very lucky" [P005, OM, C]

About two months after Rebecca, who as I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, cut our meeting short, to see the woman from her church, we met again. I asked about what had happened to the woman, whether she was safe or had been deported. Initially, Rebecca was reluctant to speak about the subject; I did not press the matter. However, later in our meeting she said that the woman was now in

Manchester working as a cleaner. Rather than accept the decision to deport her, this woman, by drawing on the caring capacities and commitments of her friends was able to create a line of flight for herself, transforming her situation and open up new possibilities to sustain her migrant project.

In a similar way Dawit [P07, AA] from Eritrea who had his asylum claim rejected and all forms of state support cut, had, through both his connections in his church as well as through wider networks of migrants been able to find the means through which to subsist. Indeed, he spoke in terms of the richness of his life “I am the most wealthy man I know” [P07, AA] he commented during one of our meetings. Within the church he was well respected and he was never short of a place to sleep or food and he was given money by friends who were working. He had also managed to enrol on various courses in a local college and despite what would for many be perceived as the hardships of his life he remained positive.

A final example is necessary here to highlight the place of institutions like churches within the mobile commons as well as how initially fleeting connections and chance meetings can turn into enduring ones and play an important role in enabling migrants who move without authorisation and to endure, negotiate and possibly overcome the often bleak and challenging situations they find themselves in. I met Adom [P001, CM] a couple of days after he first arrived in Cardiff. I was put in contact with him by a friend and fellow activist who had recently been in Calais doing solidarity work with CMS¹²³. My friend had struck up a conversation with Adom at the food distribution and given him his mobile telephone number saying that he could contact him if he needed support once he reached the UK. Shortly after they met, Adom, after less than a week in Calais, managed to clandestinely enter the UK and ended up at the central bus station in Cardiff. Having no connections in the UK he phoned my friend who passed on my contact details. Minutes after this telephone call Adom got talking to a migrant from Israel who, on hearing that he had nowhere to sleep, invited him back to his flat where he was living with his wife and two young children, with Adom staying with them for around a week.

After a couple of days Adom [P001, CM] contacted me again and we arranged to meet. We discussed his options and following much deliberation he decided that the best course of action was to try and find work as he felt that the likelihood of him being successful with a claim for asylum was small and he was eager to make money. A

¹²³ Adom is not included in Table 2.1, chapter 2, which overviews the numbers of migrant care workers and asylum applicants interviewed.

few days after this he moved out of the Israeli migrant's flat and for around the next two weeks he stayed with various friends of mine in Cardiff. During this time he decided that, as there was a fairly substantial Ghanaian community in London, that moving there would offer him the best chances of making the required contacts in order to find work and more stable accommodation. Following his move to London he lived for around a month with our mutual friend that he had initially met in Calais. They found a local church that was attended predominantly by people from Ghana. He began attending and through the connections and friendships he made through the church he was able to find work at a carwash in Bristol. He moved into a shared house with a number of Ghanaians, initially sleeping on the sofa in the front room until about three months after he was able to find a bedsit in a house owned by a Zimbabwean family. While living in Bristol he attended a local church and after about a year he met a Ghanaian woman who was working as a nurse in the UK and fell in love. She had citizenship status in Belgium and they decided that the best course of action would be for them to return to Ghana and to get married in order to regularise his status. They have now got married and are now living in Belgium where he has stable residential status.

5.6 Conclusions

This chapter has explored the various means through which relations of care and the ethos that animate such acts enable and sustain mobility. As well as such relations the chapter explored the different strategies – from the transnational scale to those at a more local level – that migrants with child and other caring responsibilities are able to mobilise in order to negotiate these in order to become and remain mobile. The chapter also examined the importance of institutional bodies in the creation of networks of care through which migrants connect with the mobile commons and how such affective connections facilitate and sustain migratory projects.

As this chapter has demonstrated (as have in different ways both chapter 3 and 4) migration is a strategy that is utilised in order to open up new possibilities both for the person who moves as well as family and wider kinship networks. Throughout the chapter I have referred to migrant movements. When I say 'movements' here I see these as being mobile, more-or-less stable, more-or-less ephemeral, yet no less organised – albeit often on an ad-hoc basis – networks (see Rossiter 2006 for an

insightful exploration of networked cultures as agents of transformation) that have proven extremely efficacious in the making of mobility. These mobile networks, as this chapter has demonstrated, may be extremely local or transnational in scope with the reach of these in constant motion. For instance, the mobile networks of care that I observed and spoke to migrants about in Calais extend across Europe, along the pathways that migrant movements create and traverse and change as new routes are opened up as the capitalist-state attempts to close down escape routes. By approaching these with care in mind we are able to see not only how caring practices are distributed and organised in order that migrants can negotiate their reproductive and productive labour, but also how care as a mode of ‘being-together’, as the capacity to affect and be affected, catalyses an ethico-political responsiveness that creates and sustains mobile forms of life.

Seen from this angle movements are constitutive of communities, with care figuring as the glue that binds them together, for as Maria Puig de la Bellacasa reminds us: “Care is so essential to sustain interdependent living worlds that if there was no caring, nothing would hold together” (Puig de la Bellacasa forthcoming). Caring connections provide migrants with the required resources to utilise their most precious resource of all – their capacity for mobility. In this way care opens up a ‘space of possibilities’ (Marokvasic 2004) that exceed the regulatory mechanism of the border regime, providing themselves with a set of opportunities, albeit often unstable ones, to increase their sustainability and life potentials. It is through care then that “transnational communities of escape” are forged and held together. Care both opens up possibilities in a situation that may not have previously existed and provides the material and affective basis through which these ‘spaces of possibility’ are able to be sustained. From this perspective then, care is both an enabler and sustainer of mobility: migrants move and settle with care. Or put differently, it is by carefully moving that migrants sustain themselves. Of course migrant movements are composed of a whole host of other forces: networks that facilitate transportation (smugglers/agents), communication networks and so on. But it is my contention that thinking about these movements with care in mind provides us with a lens, a sensibility, with which to see the often imperceptible processes through which they maintain momentum.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion:

The politicisation of care

6.1 Introduction

How then has thinking migration through care contributed to our understanding of the experiences of different migrants, to the different forms of life they create and to the complex of forces and mechanisms that mobility is entangled with and that condition its pathways? While care has arguably always had a political quality, in what ways has such politicisation been intensified in the different fields that have been explored and what are the wider political implications of these processes, both for migrants themselves, as well as contemporary social movements working with migrants and on issues relating to mobility, its exploitation and control? This increased politicisation occurs at a number of different levels and is animated by the actions of a number of different actors.

Firstly, the state and capital and the regime of governance and labour extraction that emerges through their relations, mobilise care (and in the process augment its politicisation) in order to control mobility and shape particular working and living conditions that enable the amplification of the exploitability of migrant labour power. Secondly, care becomes politicised through the struggles of migrants and their utilisation of care as a means of overcoming the barriers to the three overlapping yet distinct forms of mobility set out at the beginning of the thesis. Thus migrants utilise care to become geographically mobile maintaining the long term

mobility of their mobile trajectories as well as using care to negotiate and overcoming the barriers to both their geographical and labour market mobility. Finally, it is hoped that this investigation and its findings might politicise care by enabling us to evaluate and invigorate existing modes of social movement organising and possibly open up new lines of engagement and intervention and by doing so deepen and enrich practices of solidarity with mobile populations.

In order to examine and cast light on such questions we need to first review some of the central findings and themes that have emerged and been explored during the preceding pages, placing these more fully within their contemporary and historical contexts. Such an undertaking will also necessitate a foray into recent studies on mobility and migrant politics (including some working from the autonomy of migration perspective) focused on migrant struggles which have manifest in overt political mobilisations by different migrant populations, which have been theorised in terms of ‘acts of citizenship’. Here I shall set out some of the problems with such approaches and argue instead that if we are truly to take to issue of mobility seriously, then, as well as a ‘mobilising politics’ (Squire 2011), there is also a need for a *politicisation of care*, this time *from below*.

The thesis has explored the concrete connections between migration and care from a variety of vantage points. Using care as a conceptual lens it has been possible to investigate – *through the eyes of migrants themselves* – the lived experiences of a variety of migrants, from those working in the care industry (which is itself composed of a variety of differentially stratified migrants), to asylum applicants, to migrants without documentation trying to cross clandestinely through Calais into the UK. These different experiences make any generalisations about political practice and organising difficult. However, as I hope to show below, it is here that a politics focused on care can prove useful. That thinking migration with care and by investigating the relations and networks of care that migrants forge and connect with, how these are sustained and for what purposes, can enable a shift in our political imaginary and facilitate the development of forms of more affective political engagement that cut across such differences.

The focus on the different fields in which care and mobility intersect, feedback into and interfere with one another allowed for an exploration of some of the salient dynamics of these processes and how these were affected by different ways in which the politicisation of care has been actualised or amplified in a particular field. Thus a

focus on migrant workers in the care industry (chapter 3) enabled me to explore the position of different migrants in wider class relations, how they were exploited and the mechanisms through which this was mediated. It also afforded me the opportunity to analyse how migrants negotiated and struggled against such mechanisms of labour controls and extraction, and how they were able, or not, to use such conditions to open up wider potentials for themselves, their families and friends outside the sphere of labour itself. The investigation of the asylum regime (chapter 4) and the restructuring of support services it has undergone allowed me to map out the new institutional assemblages that have emerged as part of these changes and examine in more detail how care is connected to wider apparatuses and technologies of mobility control. The examination here also demonstrated the various ways in which such institutional arrangements were utilised by migrants in order to create sustainability, negotiate the asylum application process and at times overtly struggling against the living conditions they experienced so that they could maintain their mobility and eventually settle if their applications were successful. The final substantive focus on self-organised forms of care and the mobile networks of care that migrants created amongst themselves (chapter 5) demonstrated how migrants regardless of the differential inclusion shaped by the regime of mobility controls mechanisms of stratification create and mobilise such networks, both in order to negotiate potential familial caring obligations – to children, parents, grandparents, and so on – to enable and sustain their mobility, to escape particularly exploitative working conditions, to endure and remain mobile despite the precarisation brought about by having access to asylum support services cut and so on. In the next few sections I will review in more detail the main findings of the thesis. I will then turn in the final section of the chapter (section 6.5) to an examination of what these findings might mean to existing forms of social movement organising around the issue of migration and to speculate about how by thinking these with care in the foreground might enable us to rethink, reinvigorate and develop current practices of solidarity.

6.2 The politicisation of care and the labour process

Migrants are labour on the move. Migration and labour are intimately interconnected. A time when movement will not be fused with labour through capital's synthesis in

this way is, sadly, at least for the migrants who populate the pages of this thesis¹²⁴, not yet on the horizon. Indeed, as mobility has become increasingly required for capital's reproduction, it has sought ways of more effectively extract and exploiting such labour. As such, the thesis has sought to understand the place of migration within the emerging composition of labour, as well as the forms of exploitation, of current capitalist relations in North Atlantic societies. As indicated on a number of occasions during the thesis (see especially chapters 1 and 3) capitalism in these, as well as a growing number of other societies, has increasingly drawn on migrant labour to perform a variety of caring roles both within the formal and informal sectors of the care industry. While these are largely concentrated in so called unskilled, low paid jobs, previously performed predominantly by local women, growing numbers of migrants are also working in more skilled, professional positions in the health and social care industry.

The exploration of the labour process and wider living conditions of the various migrants highlighted the variety of forces that impacted on how such conditions were experienced by differentially included migrants. Central amongst these were *status*, *contracts*, various *financial* issues as well as forms of regulation specific to the care industry, all of which impacted on levels of exploitation different migrant experienced, their differential "mobility power" (Smith 2006, 2010) and hence their abilities to negotiate and struggle against these, through for instance quitting and finding work somewhere else. As discussed in the introduction to chapter 1, such a conception of mobility, which foregrounds the differential labour market mobility of the various strata of migrants whose lives and experiences have been explored during the thesis, can be contrasted with that of the arguably more conventional usage of mobility to refer to physical mobility across geographical space.

With respect to the issue of *status* it was found that restrictions that the border and visa regime place on migrants in both their access to welfare state provision and protection, as well as regulations governing their mobility within the labour market, were important dimensions productive of the exploitability that different migrant workers in the care industry potentially experienced. Here, it was found that such

¹²⁴ Of course, as we have seen, this does not mean that all these migrants are in employment. For instance, the migrants in Calais have become temporarily disentangled from such relations. Furthermore, with respect to migrants seeking asylum, such migrants have through policy mechanisms become institutionally disconnected from the sphere of work. However, although this problematises the picture, it does not change the fact that unless they rely on forms of support outside of the sphere of work they would not be able to socially reproduce themselves and survive.

restrictions create a multi-tiered hierarchy of statuses within the migrant population, with those with the least rights generally experiencing the worst conditions, which includes working for considerably lower wages, often having pay deducted for no apparent reason, and/or working hours without getting paid. More often than not the most exploited strata of the migrant population were undocumented workers from outside the EEA. While it was the undocumented (or better, those without authorised documentation or residency status¹²⁵) who were more likely to have to endure more extreme levels of precarisation and exploitation, such conditions were experienced by all migrants to some degree, regardless of the positions they occupied within the migrant labour hierarchy just described.

As well as regulations relating specifically to the regime of mobility control, the thesis highlighted other mechanisms that contributed to the forms of exploitation that migrants experienced. Central amongst these were *contractual arrangements*. Many of the migrants, especially those from outside the EU, were on fixed- or short-term contracts, while many others were employed through agencies, and had no guarantees that they would be able to secure enough hours to sustain themselves. It was demonstrated how such conditions led to a heightened dependency on their employers. This had a variety of consequences. While none of the migrants working through an agency reported having any problems with securing an adequate amount of hours such a situation was achieved by generally taking on work whenever it was offered as a means of demonstrating to the agency that they were reliable, which increased the likelihood of these migrants securing work in the future. For those on fixed-term contracts things were slightly different, although how different migrants negotiated and internalised such conditions was very similar. For migrants in such positions the lack of guarantee of getting their contract renewed or the possibility that they could have their contracts terminated, created a situation whereby many felt that they needed to undertake extra shifts when asked, with many also working while ill, as a means of demonstrating that they were hard working and dependable.

The various forms of contractual arrangements then were a primary device through which a sense of needing to be (almost) constantly available emerged

¹²⁵ As the discussion in chapter 3 highlighted many of those working without state sanctioned residency status were doing so using documentation that they had either bought, borrowed or had rented from other migrants (see Vasta 2008 for a detailed discussion of such practices). Other migrants that I have met have also been able to access the labour market due to bureaucratic oversights or errors at the Home Office whereby they have been erroneously given permission to work while their asylum application is being processed.

amongst a number of different segments of the migrant population. Importantly, it was found that such a situation was less acute for the Polish and the small number of other migrants from the A8 countries within the EEA, with those who had been in the country for longer, or who were more aware of their rights and had been in employment long enough to access the (albeit limited) protections of the welfare state, feeling more able to refuse certain 'requests', or to exercise their greater "mobility power" (Smith 2006) and 'quit' and find work in other sectors of the care industry. Such pressures were however mediated by more than just contractual mechanisms. Indeed, it was found that in numerous cases this was due to an intersection of status, contractual as well as financial forces. For instance, returning to the issue of working while ill, many of the migrants did not have access to sick pay, or if they did, this was very limited. For those without recourse to public funds this made it very difficult if they should become ill for any length of time. The fear of losing their jobs made many work when, if they had access to sick pay or welfare protections, or the ability to more easily move employer, they may otherwise not have done so.

Financial concerns also fed into the exploitability and kinds of working conditions migrants experienced in other ways. Many of the migrants had borrowed considerable amounts of money to make their journey to the UK possible. A number of these – particularly those from outside the EEA (although not exclusively) who had been recruited in their home countries by an agency or large care home provider – had borrowed considerable amounts of money from the agency or care home. Indeed, for a number, if they left work before a year (and for some for the duration of their contract) then they would have to pay back the money that the company had spent on the visa, or various other costs such as airline ticket and so on. Such conditions it was argued 'tied' these migrants to their employer and in the process augmented their exploitability.

While it is true that many of these heightened forms of *immobilisation* and exploitability are not limited to the care industry but cut across all sectors of the labour market where migrant labour is concentrated (cf. Wills et al 2010) there were a number of regulatory mechanisms and forms of labour process control that were specific to the health and social care industry. Many of these are arguably related to the wider political climate in which care is provided. Concerns over abuse of 'clients' as well as issues relating to quality and standards of care more generally, have, in recent years, led to the health and care industry becoming a more highly regulated one.

There is a strong audit culture, which for those working in care homes especially, meant that they felt under especially high levels of managerial surveillance, even while they were expected to get on with the job and be autonomously self-directed. Furthermore, the increased formalisation and regulation of the sector, had led to stricter regulations relating to CRB checks. For those working without ‘proper’ documentation – that is with borrowed, rented or bought papers (cf Vasta 2008) – this meant a heightened sense of insecurity. Indeed, as previously pointed out, during the time of writing the thesis, nearly all those who had accessed the labour market through such means, had chosen to find work in other, more informal, less regulated sectors of the labour market, in often less well paid, more precarious, forms of employment, particularly cleaning. I will return below to the issue of regulation – both of the labour market and in terms of mobility controls – and the difficulties such issues pose, both for migrants and those (whether academics or social movements) focused on ‘the politics of mobility’.

As well as complying with regulations like CRB, migrants from outside the EEA who wish to work as nurses in either the NHS, private hospitals or care homes, have to complete the Overseas Nursing Programme (‘Adaptation’). This was found to often be used as another means of *institutionalised immobilisation*, with four of those that had undertaken ‘Adaptation’ in care homes encountering considerable problems, with reports of a number of other cases. As we saw above in the case of Malaya [P13, CW], this involved the care home management refusing to ‘sign them off’ so that they could ‘qualify’ to work as nurses. Instead, she and others that this happened to had to work as senior care workers or even merely care assistants, meaning considerably less wages, and potential deskilling. While all of those who encountered such problems eventually managed to find ways of moving employer none of them were able to move to a care home that was registered to carry out ‘Adaptation’, which again meant working for reduced wages as senior care workers. There were also those who had been told that they would be able to undertake ‘Adaptation’ only to find that on arrival this was not the case. Furthermore, due to the limited number of places available in institutions that carried out ‘Adaptation’ a number of migrants had been unable to find places on them and as such had decided to work as care workers instead. Indeed, with respect to the issue of deskilling, there were two male migrants that I met who had in the Philippines worked as Doctors, one as a surgeon, but due to regulations regarding qualifications had ended up retraining in order to work as care workers.

The precarisation of working and living conditions and the intensification as well as extensification of exploitation that they experienced resonates with wider theorisations and debates about the changing nature of class relations and modes of exploitation across society more generally that are said to have emerged over the past four decades or so, albeit unevenly, in North Atlantic societies (Beynon and Nichols 2006; Bowring 2002; Negri 1999; Berardi 2009). While some have pointed out that conditions under capitalism have always been precarious and insecure, and that the relatively stable period of employment between the post-war and the early 1970s was in fact the exception (Neilson and Rossiter 2008), it is clear that since this period – generally theorised in terms of a shift from Fordist to post-Fordist – there has been a variety of changes, not only in the mode of production but also in the kinds of employment relations people experience. Although the majority of migrants are clearly at the bottom of this hierarchy, processes of casualisation and a connected decrease in union participation and efficacy, mean that increasingly numbers of people are working in flexibilised, non-guaranteed forms of work. Such a situation has led to what some have referred to as a feminisation of labour, which refers not merely to the growth in the numbers of women entering the labour market, but also to the fact that conditions of employment have increasingly come to resemble those that women have long endured. Connected to this, is the way in which the boundaries between the time of work and the time of life, between reproductive and productive labour have become increasingly blurred, with capital infusing more and more aspects of our lives (Negri 1999; Frassanito Network 2005; Neilson and Rossiter 2005). In terms of how such labour is remunerated these boundaries are still powerfully policed, with workers only receiving pay for time in actual work. However, for many sectors of the labour market, particularly that of the creative industries, such a demarcation between the time of ‘work’ and ‘non-work’ becomes more difficult to delineate.

These processes of transformation have had significant impacts on the care industry, its employment relations and levels of exploitation. Most notable has been the growth in privatised care provision and the push for efficiency and ‘value for money’. This has meant that while expectations of higher quality of care have risen, the budgets for care have decreased, the direct result of which is that staff levels in care homes have dropped, meaning that the remaining staff, who are increasingly composed of migrants have witnessed an overall intensification of their workloads. Many of the migrants reported feelings of affective and physical exhaustion, of

having to be constantly alert and hyperactive at work, all of which was more than corroborated from my experiences working in care homes as part of my ethnographic fieldwork.

Despite these numerous difficulties and processes of precarisation that migrants experienced, the thesis has shown how they were able to develop numerous means of negotiating, working with and struggling against their employment conditions. For instance, in relation to the issue of constant availability some of the migrants who worked for agencies had adopted, the admittedly risky strategy of signing up to a number of agencies at one time and in this way they found that they were better able to manage their workloads. Others reported being aware of the difficulties that management experienced in recruitment of good workers, and therefore felt more empowered to turn down extra shifts and to stand up for themselves if, and when, the situation arose. As well as this, a number of migrants who had reported having worked in particularly bad working environments, had been able to utilise contacts within migrant networks in order to find work in homes where the conditions were less harsh and exploitative. A point I shall return to in more detail below (section 6.3). With respect to the actual workings of the labour processes, my time spent in the care home during ethnographic fieldwork, highlighted how migrants (as well as other non-migrant workers) were often able to work together in order to lessen the intensity of work for all of them, to find space to take a breather, outside official break times.

Furthermore, it needs to be remembered that many of the migrants used such conditions to open up new possibilities for themselves and their families. Many were able to assist in the education of close and wider family to access education as well as supplying the financial resources for others to become mobile. A number of the Polish migrants who initially worked in care homes were able to use such work to gain experience before, through using both wider migrant networks as well as their greater 'mobility power' within the labour market, moving into better paid jobs and jobs that they felt had more prospects, such as support workers. Others, had used working in the care industry in order to facilitate their access to education, with some managing to move from care work, through education into nursing. Indeed, for a number of migrants the primary reason they had migrated was for educational purposes and they used work as a means of facilitating such desires. While it is clear then that migrants are subject to potentially higher degrees of exploitability than non-migrant workers, it

would be wrong to only see their mobility within productionist term, as is the case when, following Marx, migrants are conceptualised as a “reserve army of labour” (cf. Schierup et al 2006) or as Jane Wills and colleagues rename it: “London’s New Labour Reserve” (Wills et al 2010: 40). As we have seen, mobility and migrant movements are subjectively connected to a variety of other desires, and to figure them as only being labour, despite their obvious interconnection, is to reduce their agency and confine them to being economic units caught within capital’s regime of flexible accumulation.

6.3 The politicisation of care and the asylum ‘support’ regime

The analysis in chapter 3 then explored how particular interventions within the care industry led to the increased politicisation of care in two important ways. Firstly, it highlighted how the focus on the means through which care should be provided as well as its growing privatisation and the efficiency driven dynamics underpinning such moves affected the care labour process. And secondly it reappraised the ways in which access to social rights and welfare provision are productive of certain labour relations, the effects this has on the labour process, the kinds of exploitation experienced by migrants as a result of these mediating forces and how migrants negotiate such conditions. The chapter on the asylum support regime (chapter 4) changed the focus slightly and explore in more detail on how care as social assistance has been mobilised as a form of biopolitical control, although it must be borne in mind that the treatment of asylum applicants should be seen as part of a continuum, that is as part of a wider regime that has historically attempted to control migrant movements and the mobility of labour more generally. Thus the politicisation of care operates by creating a hierarchy of access to welfare between on one hand citizen access to care and on the other the non-access for certain migrants to any provision whatsoever. At the top of the pyramid, then, are citizens with full access, lower down are migrants such as those from A8 countries with minimal access, or asylum applicants with access but to an impoverished standard of provision and clustered around the bottom are the majority of other migrants who have very little access the welfare state, or in the case of undocumented migrants no access at all.

As pointed out at the beginning of the thesis care in the form of what has come to called welfare or social assistance has long been used as a means of controlling mobility, and as such the emergence of the present regime of mobility

control must be seen as part of a long history of attempts by the state and wider regimes of governance at the subjectification and control of mobile and escaping populations. By curtailing access to forms of social assistance, states have attempted to interfere with the ability of mobile populations (as well as other strata of the working class of course) to subsist and access resources required for social reproduction that, for whatever reason, cannot access through the market. As far back as the early fourteenth century laws were implemented that utilised care – here in the form of Alms giving – as a means of population control. For instance, the Statute of Labourers of 1351, reinforced by the Poor Law Act of 1388, as well as trying to fix wages and curtail the mobility of the population made the provision of Alms to vagrants a punishable offence (Charlton 2000; O'Brien 2000), effectively criminalising social solidarity, beginning a long and enduring usage of care as a means of mobility control, with similar laws over the centuries utilising care for such regulatory purposes.

As in the past when vagrants and vagabonds were depicted as the harbingers of social disorder migrants are today presented by politicians, certain policy documents and the media as a 'problem' for social cohesion, as disrupting the social fabric. Politicians, whether from the 'left' or 'right'¹²⁶, figure migrants as risks to the body politic and promise to restore the health of the 'nation', which is of course an imagined, constructed myth (cf. Benedict Anderson 1991; Billig 1995; Bishop and Jaworski 2003; Smith 1999), through tighter controls over foreign influences that threaten 'our way of life' and the values that the UK, or any other nation for that matter, stands for.

It was in the context of such a history then that the analysis of the asylum support services and the wider asylum regime was carried out. This section of the thesis sought to explore a variety of related questions: What role does care, in the form of social assistance, play in the creation of the living conditions of asylum applicants? How do such support services connect with wider mechanisms of regulation and surveillance and how do migrants work with and negotiate these? The focus here was also on the wider institutional architecture that support services are embedded within and how these linked with wider changes in the welfare state. In this section I will flag some of the central points that emerged in the analysis and attempt to think in more detail about the implications of what, drawing on Susan Balloch and Marilyn Taylor (Balloch and Taylor 2001), I referred to as 'partnership governance',

¹²⁶ Of course within the current climate it has become increasingly difficult to differentiate between the major parties within the UK.

and what such 'partnership' means in terms of mobility control and the politics of mobility more generally.

Drawing on a variety of critical analyses of asylum, from a number of different perspective I discussed how in the late 1980s asylum emerged as a political issue in the European context (Bloch and Schuster 2002; Squire 2009) leading to a string of different pieces of legislation in the UK beginning in the early 1990s. It was discussed how as such legislation progressed the approach to asylum became increasingly 'punitive' (Schuster 2003), which was figured by some as a move from welfare to 'authoritarianism' (Humphries 2002), or what I referred to as from care to control. This it was noted could be seen in terms of a 'deterrence rationality' (Squire 2009) which was driven by a belief that by impoverishing the living conditions of those migrants who dare to claim asylum, by making it as difficult as possible for them to socially reproduce themselves, would act as a deterrent for other migrants from coming to the UK. As was pointed out, the 'generous' welfare benefits that the UK offered to such migrants were seen as a 'pull' factor, which was criticised as being based on an overly simplistic conception of the increasingly turbulent dynamics of migrant movements (cf. Mezzadra 2006; Papastergiadis 2000). However, it was also pointed out that such processes needed to be viewed within the context of wider transformations to the regime of mobility control as a whole, both that of the UK and the emerging European regime and the growing stratification of migrants that is occurring as states attempt to more effectively managed mobile populations for the benefit of capital.

The shift from care to control, which crystallised in the passing of the 1999 *Immigration and Asylum Act*, and the emergence of 'support services' completely separate from welfare state provision, meant that asylum applicants who from 23 July 2002 were forbidden from working, had to submit to a variety of procedures that both attempted to regulate and curtail mobility as well as subjected them to a variety of forms of intrusive surveillance, if they were to continue to receive the meagre support provisions provided and managed through the Home Office's NASS. Thus care becomes a means through which control over the lives of asylum seeking migrants can be exerted.

Through a utilisation of recent work exploring debates over the issue of social inclusion and exclusion (e.g. Byrne 2005; Munck 2005) it was argued that in terms of its operation the emergence of the NASS administered support services were best

viewed as operationalising a form of *differential inclusion*. While underpinned by an exclusionary logic and institutionalising a ‘new apartheid’ (cf. Balibar 2004; Mynott 2002) asylum applicants were not wholly excluded from social provision, but included in a subordinate position within a hierarchical regime, through which different states attempt to control the mobility and living conditions of different segments of migrant populations. With respect to asylum applicants, such modes of control are actualised in a number of ways, through an array of technologies that have a variety of effects on the lives of asylum applicants and their abilities to affectively sustain themselves.

Principle amongst these is the forced movement or dispersal. It was shown how this did not just occur at the beginning of the period of claiming asylum but could be implemented at any point during the often lengthy process, and often results in family members being separated. Another mode of direct mobility control, this time aimed at the immobilisation and close surveillance of asylum applicants is the process of ‘signing’. Here, it was highlighted how asylum applicants were required to present themselves to a specific place, either a regional office of the UKBA or a police station, on weekly, monthly, and often even more regular basis. Many of the asylum applicants spoke of the intense anxiety such a process caused them, as they knew that it was during such moments that they were most likely to be taken and placed in detention. A related, although less stressful form of mobility control that the thesis mapped out was that of accommodation checks. Ostensibly part of quality control procedures these were utilised as a means of control over the movements of migrants, with migrants required to be at their accommodation during such monthly checks.

Recent years have seen the increased usage of forms of technology on the asylum regime, with technological apparatuses becoming central protagonists in their own right in terms of the transformations the regime of mobility control has undergone both within the UK and the wider context of the emerging EU regime of mobility control. The thesis explored the effects of such technologisation on asylum applicants, analysing such processes in terms of *control at a distance*. I discussed the use of the ARC (Application Registration Card), which contains biometric information on particular asylum applicants, how this was used during the process of signing, when visiting their GP, accessing money at post offices, although in terms of signing, in places where there is a UKBA office, such technology is rapidly being superseded by the use of fingerprint reading technology as a means of verifying the holder’s identity.

Other usage of technology was discussed, such as electronic tags and other

forms of ‘electronic monitoring’ (what the Home Office refer to as ‘contact management’) which are increasingly used as a means of controlling and monitoring the mobility of asylum applicants deemed of high risk of absconding. Also discussed was the EURODAC database, which means that growing numbers of migrants are sent back to the first country in which they were apprehended and fingerprinted. Not all migrants I meet who had been fingerprinted were sent back following claims for asylum in the UK. But for some EURODAC and its connection with Dublin II regulations means that such migrants become caught in a pattern of circular movement, whereby they enter a particular territory are sent back to countries nearer the outer borders of the EU, only to come again, be sent back and so on. As well as such forms of technology asylum applicants in receipt of S4 support are now issued with Azure Cards instead of vouchers, which we heard were used by UKBA as another means of monitoring and controlling such migrants’ mobility.

The thesis pointed out that one of the central aspects of the emergent institutional nexus of the asylum support regime was the new role that NGOs played in the provision of certain aspects of the support services available to asylum applicants. It was discussed how in the UK this has largely involved taking on an information providing role, although contractually their hands are tied in terms of the kinds of information they can provide, especially at the beginning of the asylum claiming process. I discussed how the operation of the regime produced a dependency relation, with asylum applicants only being able to get certain problems dealt with through the NGO, who arguably acted as ‘buffers’ between asylum applicants and the Home Office.

As well as such forms of dependency, the thesis discussed how the various mechanisms of control were central ways in which the precarisation of the lives of asylum applicants were created. It was shown how the various practices and technologies of control and surveillance recapped on above had significant impacts on the lives of many of such migrants whose lives are the ground upon which this thesis rests. Not knowing if this time signing will be when they detain you or try and deport you, the potential that UKBA will move you to another accommodation, along with the prolonged period of waiting and not knowing that the asylum process more often than not involved all contributed to the potentially destabilising effect.

However, it was also highlighted how the relations developed between NGO case workers and volunteers, many of who were asylum applicants themselves, were

also important in creating conditions that enabled such migrants to sustain themselves. As well as this the thesis highlighted how case workers often were instrumental in finding ways for asylum applicants to access other forms of support that due to asylum regulations they were being denied, although it must be remembered that this was very much dependent on the expertise of the case worker in question. Also I discussed how in recent years various semi-formal institutions have emerged that provide important spaces that act as important hubs where important forms of sociability can be nurtured and where migrants can build relations with one another and with those from other communities. Furthermore, the thesis highlighted how even despite the often long and uncertain process of that the asylum process involves, many migrants refuse to be subjugated. As we saw, some had successfully used the institutional context and resources that they can draw from other NGOs to set up their own groups in order to provide 'spaces of hope', where they can collectively work together to struggle against the conditions the asylum regime can produce, where they can create relations and affective territories that together create more sustainable living conditions for each other.

It was argued that the new institutional aggregates that the asylum regime and its 'support services' are composed of, mirrored shifts in the wider provision of welfare discussed above. As pointed out in the thesis' introductory chapter the regime of mobility control is 'structurally hybrid' (Mezzadra 2006), with many of the roles previously implemented by the state now increasingly being outsourced to 'non-state' (Lahav 1998; Guiraudon and Lahav 2000) actors, such as private companies and of course, as the discussion of the asylum regime has highlighted, by 'third sector' organisations such as NGOs. As well as the roles analysed in detail during the thesis, humanitarian organisations, particularly the International Red Cross, are also heavily involved in the running of detention prisons in various countries in Europe, such as Germany Greece, Belgium, Italy, Spain and Greece. Barnardo's have recently agreed to the contract to provide children's play facilities in what the current UK ConDem coalition government are calling 'pre-departure accommodation', following a long struggle by various groups, including various coalitions of NGOs to end child detention. Such a move has been criticised from a variety of quarters, particularly on the grounds that by taking on the contract they are legitimising what is ultimately detention facilities under a different name (Aynsley-Green 2011; Webber 2011). A campaign began in early 2011 spearheaded by no borders groups in the UK, with

different forms of direct action taking place against Barnardo's, which aimed at both drawing public attention to Barnardos' involvement in such practices and, more importantly perhaps, pressuring them to pull out of the contract¹²⁷.

It can be argued that such reconfigurations of the state and the emergence both within the UK and across Europe of 'partnership governance' are means by which the state attempts to neutralise potentially antagonistic forces (e.g. Flynn 2006; S. Cohen 2002a). Although in many respects very different 'partnership governance' can be seen as a continuation of Race Relations policies and the project of multiculturalism, which have been analysed by a number of commentators as initially implemented as a means of resolving the disruptive and antagonistic force of Black and Asian struggles by drawing them within an institutional framework (e.g. Gilroy 2004; Davenport 2008).

As Steve Cohen has cautioned in a variety of places (e.g. S. Cohen 2002b; S. Cohen 2003), we need to be mindful of adopting a perspective that sees the role played by NGOs and the voluntary sector in the asylum regime as essentially a facilitating one that is helpful to migrants in that it provides advice and other forms of assistance with accessing the increasingly limited so-called support provision of the 1999 Act. He continues, that, while it could be argued that it is better that these services are contracted to NGOs and the voluntary sector and not some other less scrupulous organisations, such as private security firms (who play a leading role in the management of other aspects of the asylum processes, from housing, the running of detention centres, providing 'escorts' during deportations, moving migrants between detention centres, from one region of dispersal to another and so on) by playing such a role the voluntary sector's involvement serves to legitimise and hence strengthen the 1999 Act. In Cohen's words what has emerged is a situation whereby certain parts of the voluntary sector have become junior partners of the state. Given perceptions of the voluntary sector and its past role as an advocate against state authority – at least in terms of its advice giving element – its involvement adds a veneer of respectability to legislation and the practices they give rise to that would otherwise be viewed in a potentially far more critical manner.

By definition, NGO involvement in the provision of 'support services' to particular groups of migrants means that they have formal independence from the government. However, as highlighted in chapter 4 some of those providing support

¹²⁷ For an overview of the no borders campaign against Barnardo's see: <http://london.noborders.org.uk/barnardos>

services are (either partially or completely) dependent on state funding for their continued existence. This does not in itself necessarily mean that they are compromised in terms of where their loyalties lie. Nor does it mean that we should “doubt the honourable if mistaken nature of these agencies' motives and the sincerity of the belief that they are assisting asylum seekers” (Cohen 2002a: 142). It does mean however, that they, at least in part, have some financial stake in making sure that the 1999 Act and subsequent ones that build on it are implemented properly. Furthermore, NGOs and migrant community organisations (MCOs) that have become co-opted into the regime of mobility control in this way tend to lose their critical voices in terms of their orientation of the regime and hence the ability to speak out and mobilise on behalf of migrant communities (Flynn 2006).

6.4 Networks of care and the mobile commons

Moving away from how care and support services have been mobilised as a means of mobility control, I now want to reappraise the place of self-organised networks of care within the lives of migrants. A central argument of the thesis is that care is a precondition for mobility: without care becoming and sustaining mobility – whether this be in an attempt to settle in a given location (as asylum applicants attempt) or not – would be very difficult indeed, if not impossible. Throughout the thesis I have been less concerned with exploring and defining what care is and instead have examined how care works (cf. Zibechi 2010; Deleuze and Guattari 1987). Attention has focused on how care – as a central aspect of social reproduction – is informally organised and managed, who provides such care and hence how care both enables as well as potentially obstructs mobility and how such acts and relations differ across migrant populations. The exploration of these networks highlighted how the capacities to become mobile, as well as being modulated by state regulations and the racialised hierarchies of movement and labour market access these produce, also intersected with gender and class dimensions.

As previously pointed out, such class dynamics are not clear cut. While, the migrants whose lived experiences form the basis of this thesis are not homogeneous they share a number of things in common. They are not ‘members’ of the ‘mobile’ or ‘affluent’ classes whose position within an emerging global hierarchy confers on them an increasing ease when crossing national borders (cf. Rygiel 2011) and the ability to

transfer skills and qualifications from one country to another. Many of the migrants spoken with were highly educated, or possessed skills and capacities that if born in the UK would mean they were relatively affluent but due largely to the regulatory mechanisms connected to the regime of mobility control, were unable to have these recognised.

Perhaps not surprisingly given patriarchal-capitalism's continued, albeit reconfigured, gendered division of reproductive labour, creating and developing means of managing such caring 'obligations' was crucial for migrant women (although also for men) in the actualisation of their mobile trajectories. These ranged from transnationalised to more localised strategies, depending on whether any children were brought with them or stayed behind. As with other studies on the 'international' or 'transnational' division of reproductive labour (cf. Parreñas 2000, 2001) and 'global care chains' (Hochschild 2000; Yaetes 2004, 2009) that the thesis has drawn on, it was found that many of the migrant women with children left them to be cared for by family members – for the most part other women – or at times, if such options were unavailable, paid for other women in their country of origin to look after children for the periods when family members were unable to care for them. Migrants in such positions developed elaborate strategies of maintaining contact and engaging in forms of 'transnational motherhood' (Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997) and 'care at a distance' (Parreñas 2001). Such strategies have been significantly facilitated by new media and mobile phone technologies. These allowed women, or couples, in cases when both parents had eventually migrated to the UK, to stay in close contact with their children and despite the affective strain that such relations across distance undoubtedly created, without such strategies it would be impossible, or far more difficult for migrant women to become and sustain their mobility.

Transnational ties were also reinforced and sustained through the sending of remittances and maintaining contact with wider networks of family and friends, many of whom had themselves migrated. These were important in creating a sense of togetherness despite often considerable geographical and temporal distance. Remittances were often used as a means of opening up the potential of other family members to become mobile, or paying for education of children and other family members. In this way then migration becomes a development strategy and one that not only augments the potentials of close family but can assist with the social reproduction of extended family members as well.

Some of the migrants with husbands and children were eventually joined by them in the UK. Such family arrangements developed various localised strategies in order to care for any children they had. For the most part it was found that they would attempt to organise their times of work so that one of them was working, leaving the other able to attend to the care needs of their children. This was however not always possible. In such instances they were able to draw on wider migrant community networks that they were connected with, with these organising themselves in such a way as to cooperatively and collectively manage their respective childcare responsibilities.

However, such networks of care and the relations through which they are forged do not merely afford migrants with the means through which to manage childcare responsibilities. As the thesis demonstrated they also perform a variety of other functions. I have already recapped (see section 6.2 above) on how such networks are important channels through which migrants are able to find less exploitable forms of employment, as well as providing the support that migrants need in order to endure the often highly exploitative working conditions they find themselves in. With respect to the sphere of employment, we also saw how the caring relations between friends can be instrumental in both materially and affectively sustaining migrants through periods of unemployment, especially given the lack of access to welfare state provision that many of them were subject to. They were also important in more 'mundane' ways in terms of providing a sense of togetherness and support through the often difficult periods migrants had to endure.

Calais provided a useful context through which to examine how such mobile networks of care operate for migrants while on the move. Here it was found that such networks were indispensable in creating the *forms of life* that enabled migrants to endure the often harsh conditions and oppression they encountered from the police, and in doing so, find ways of escaping such conditions. In chapter 3 I discussed how networks of care emerged from within the workplace and for many of the migrant care workers how such networks played an integral role in connecting them to wider migrant and often non-migrant communities. Such networks were an important element through which migrants were able to negotiate their working conditions and employment relations and to manage the different forms of exploitability they experienced. It was also demonstrated how informal networks of care were often nurtured through connections made through institutional ecologies such as churches.

These act as nodes in transnationalised networks connecting mobile populations to one another. Acts of care and the relations and forms of sociability through which they are generated figure as integral element of what, borrowing from Papadopoulos and Tsianos (in preparation), I called the *mobile commons*. That is, the forms of knowledge, resources and relations that migrants cooperative craft and utilise in order to become and remain mobile. Indeed, a central argument of the thesis is that care is the glue that binds such commons together. It is an ethos of care that underpins the desire to maintain and expand such commons, to circulate information about opportunities for work, or of places of work where the conditions are less exploitative, to lend each other documents, to pass on knowledge about where best to attempt to cross into the UK without necessarily needing to utilise the services of smugglers and so on.

It is also important to remember that while such mobile networks of care and the commons through which mobility is actualised enable migrants to open up new pathways and possibilities for themselves and their families such networks are also drawn on by capital for its continued survival. As mobility becomes ever more necessary for capital's reproduction, transnationalised capital increasingly relies on migrants reproductive strategies, which for the most part continue to be performed by women, as a means of transferring such costs onto living labour, be it migrants or not.

6.5 The question of organising and rethinking our political imaginaries...

What then does all this mean for those of us who want to act in solidarity with migrants? What kinds of political practices might the findings of this investigation point to? How might current conditions be used to build such movements? And how might thinking such issues with care centre stage prove useful to the politics of mobility that might emerge through such political practices and imaginaries that my interest in exploring such issues has, as I pointed out in chapter 2, came out of my involvement with the no borders network, my arguments and thoughts here are addressed predominantly to others working within this as similar social movements. However, it is hoped that at least some of the critiques of current ideas, questions I raise, and suggestions I make about possible fruitful directions for political organising around the issue of mobility and migrant solidarity, will be of broader interest and of

use to other bodies engaged with such issues.

Throughout, the thesis has pointed to the power of mobility and migrant movements as forms of escape that can open up new potentials for migrants and highlighted the centrality of caring relations as the lubricating practices sustaining such movements. Of course, there is a need to be cautious of not falling into the trap of romanticising mobility as inherently liberatory. As the thesis has shown, migration does not happen in the smooth space of globalisation. Contrary to narratives that figure migrants as nomadic subjects freed from the constraints of nation-states, the thesis has in fact, highlighted the exact opposite. There has been an intensification of mechanisms of control and a growing stratification and hierarchisation between different segments of mobile populations. However, the thesis has also explored the various ways and practices that migrants develop in cooperation with other migrants in order to negotiate and subvert these increasingly striated transnationalised spaces. In this way the autonomy of migration perspective, which has underpinned my analyses, does not point to migration as happening outside of such conditions but rather foregrounds the means through which migrants craft mobile commons through which borders might be overcome and exploitative employment relations escaped. Strategies which when viewed at the level of migrant movements as a whole impel states and wider regimes of governance to reconfigure themselves in order to recapture and tame such movements.

Related to the need to avoid romanticising mobility is the equally important issue of not figuring migrants who have successfully crossed national borders as a new historical subject; as the new working class, and hence as the new central protagonist in the long struggle between labour and capital. Indeed, one of the clearest findings to have emerged during my time undertaking this research, as well as with respect to my migrant solidarity activism, has been that on the whole migrants are not interested in becoming-political as it is normatively conceived. For the most part when migrants do mobilise in such ways, such visibly antagonistic activities are carried out not as a means of challenging capital or the state, à la the alterglobalisation movements, or as the new social protagonists awakening across Europe and beyond, as a new cycle of struggle is emerging in the wake of capital's latest crisis and the politics of austerity that are being pushed from above as a means of managing and capitalising on these dynamics. Rather, when migrants do engage in overtly political activities it is usually for a short period of time and in order to right a specific wrong or to improve a particular set of

material conditions that effect their lives.

As discussed in chapter 3 the vast majority of migrant care workers who participated in this investigation do not engage in union based militancy. As well as the points just made this is also due to the fact that even if they wanted to the affective and physical demands of their workloads leaves many of them exhausted at the end of their shifts and as well as the long and often unsocial hours that many of them work means that they often lacked the time for such activities, at least not in any meaningful, engaged way. Equally important is the insecurity of their residential status, which dissuades those who may have under different conditions from taking part in such forms of organising. Another problem that the union model faces is the increased stratification of mobile populations', which means that any form of organising through such methods is destined to exclude large segments of the migrant population, with those without 'proper' papers being an obvious case in point, with rights in illegality remaining an oxymoron (Unterschreber 2008).

This does not mean that union organising should be abandoned. Indeed, unionism as a mode of political struggle is an indispensable means through which migrants and the wider workforce are able to improve their working and living condition. As I write this, hundreds of migrant domestic workers under the banner 'Justice 4 Domestic Workers' are demonstrating outside parliament about proposed changes to the visa regime which would severely curtail their labour market mobility and arguably intensify their exploitability¹²⁸. One of the bodies centrally involved in these mobilisation is the campaign group Kalaayan, which provides support services and struggles for the rights of domestic workers and has enjoyed various levels of success and won important concessions over the years (see Anderson 2010b). There have also been a number of similar mobilisations such as the recent 'Justice for Cleaners' campaign, the wider campaign for a living wage in London with which this was connected, the City of Sanctuary network and Strangers into Citizens (see Squire 2010). However, the major problem with such campaigns and Union organising more generally, regardless of the model adopted, is that these operate within the sphere of representation and as such require further legislation. While such interventions can as the example of Kalaayan attests undoubtedly improve the working conditions and empower migrants already in the country, further regulations, as a number of commentators have argued with reference to calls for amnesties or the regularisation

¹²⁸ This was on the 4th of September 2011. See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-14778107> for further details.

of undocumented migrants (cf. Verela 2009) and as we saw with respect to CRBs, can have unintended consequences and inadvertently close down the mobility options for future migrants as well as those migrants already here, who for whatever reason are not covered by the legislation enacted.

In a related fashion, recent analyses of the struggles of undocumented migrants have conceptualised such practices in terms of ‘acts of citizenship’ (Nyers 2008; Isin 2008; Isin and Nielson 2008). Rather than being a static formation, citizenship from such a perspective is foregrounded as a contested category, with the struggles of migrants figured as being a potentially constitutive vector in the remaking of the modern polity, an approach to such issues that bears distinct similarities to the conceptualisation of mobility from the ‘autonomy of migration’ perspective. The notion of ‘acts of citizenship’ usefully moves us beyond formulations that see the claims makings and doings involved in processes of citizenship as being only accessible and actualisable by those who are legally entitled to operate within a given polity. Conceived of as constitutive and disruptive acts, as “collective or individual deeds that rupture socio-historical patterns” Isin and Nielson (2008: 2) argue that ‘acts of citizenship’ are the everyday activities by which those to whom “the right to have rights is due” constitute themselves as such. They are moments when the habitual and settled conceptions and practices of political community, governance and belonging are unsettled.

However, there are a number of problems with this line of thought. Firstly, while thinking migrant struggles in this way enable us to view such activities from a post-territorial and post-national perspective (Squires 2009) they still remain wed to an image of polity and how migrants transform their conditions whereby the state-form continues to be the ultimate guarantor. Writing about the mobilisations of ‘non-status migrants’ Peter Nyers points out a major paradox with such mobilisation is that they pressure government to enact laws – albeit in the cases he is writing about complete regularisation of all non-status migrants – while on the other hand speaking and acting from within a zone of illegality (Nyers 2008). Ultimately citizenship as a concept is a form of governance. Of course, migrants gain in strength when they achieve rights but this is always at the expense of mobility somewhere else along the line. No matter how disruptive acts of citizenship may be they are caught within the master’s game. Checkmate!

Of course, it is precisely because of the state-capitalist conditions under which

we live and the increasing stratification and hierarchicisation of populations brought about through differential inclusion that mobilisations by migrants and others acting in solidarity with them occur in the first place. As I pointed out above, I am not saying that forms of organising and demands based political activism are pointless, or should cease. Far from it! Much of my activism over recent years has involved mobilising in solidarity with migrants on the very same anti-deportation campaigns explored by Peter Nyers. My main point of contention, both with respect to the forms of organising and activism that I have just discussed as well as with theoretical frameworks such as that of ‘acts of citizenships’ is that they are fundamentally too narrow in their conceptions of what constitutes ‘the political’ and hence in terms of how they conceive of struggle and what might be the most effective approaches, practices and modes of organising with respect to the issue of mobility.

Furthermore, the ‘acts of citizenship’ discussed above only account for the activities of a very small portion of migrant populations. What about all those who do not engage in overt forms of political struggle? As with union organising and indeed the general orientation across a variety of humanities and social science disciplines, such approaches remain wed to a conceptualisation of political activity and social transformation as being something that occurs through ‘mass’ action. As involving an ‘event’, a rupture in the social fabric that brings about a new reality (cf. Badiou 2001). In this way they are future oriented and remain trapped within state-centric logic that foregrounds demands – for better wages, for an amnesty, for freedom of movement and so on – as being the scene of the political.

As useful as such conceptions and the forms of organising they give rise to are I want to suggest that the current position that many migrants find themselves in requires that we also begin developing modes of organising that take the issue of mobility more seriously. This requires us to work more closely from within the realities that migrants find themselves in and to think from their perspective. If becoming and remaining mobile is what growing bodies of mobile populations under current conditions have embarked on and if the regime of mobility control has progressively precaritised the working and living conditions of migrants and made it increasingly difficult for them to gain citizenship rights and through this the ability to a semblance of stability through settlement then how do we work with them to create the conditions that enable such mobility in the here and now, in the present, as well as trying to organise with them for better conditions in the future. Furthermore, when

mobility and how migrant movements are sustained are approached from the perspective of care, as I have attempted in this thesis, then this sheds interesting light on such questions and on what constitutes politics and political practices.

A useful starting point for such an undertaking is that of the underground railroads and the sanctuary movement in the USA, which assisted (and continues to this day) thousands of migrants to flee oppressive and murderous regimes in South America, and due to the policies of the US government which was implicated in abuses of many of these. The networks of care that the sanctuary movement created were instrumental in ‘smuggling’ people out of such conditions, hiding them once in the US and working with such migrants in order for them to build new lives for themselves (Golden and McConnell 1986). As with the church groups discussed in chapter 5, this was a movement consisting almost entirely of faith based organisations. Like the mobile networks of care that migrant care workers, or asylum applicants or those in Calais forge with one another across transnational space, such networks were key in enabling migrants to escape and sustain themselves.

The power of such movements of solidarity and the ethos of care through which they are animated, lies less in their visibility, indeed, they require the complete opposite. This is not resistance as conventionally conceived but a form of subversion that requires concealment as opposed to visibility. It is a form of relational politics that involves a multiplicity of affective connections and small acts through which such networks of care are sustained. Writing about the invisible yet powerful networks through which what he calls the Black Atlantic was forged and maintained, Paul Gilroy (1993) theorises this space as one of a ‘secret sociality’ that exists outside of the articulations and optics of ‘mainstream’ society. The Black Atlantic refers to a transnational, transversal space created by the movement of blacks across the Atlantic (cf. Linebaugh and Rediker 2000), composed of a complex of forces – namely black people as both the object of slavery, colonialism and other oppressive forces or in motion and crossing borders in their struggle for freedom and search for autonomy. An underground, historically obscured, but no less real public sphere. A public sphere that, although largely invisible, was in fact a significant constituent force and had a considerable impact on the processes of social organisation and wider social life during this period. Indeed, from the perspective developed during this thesis, it is this invisibility, its imperceptibility, that was arguably paramount to its effectiveness as a strategy of escape.

When looked at from this vantage point places like the drop in for asylum applicants that I discussed in chapter 4 take on a different hue. They provide a space within which relations of care and friendships develop, which as I highlighted above were important in enabling such migrants to endure the often harsh conditions of the asylum regime. More importantly perhaps, is how the friendships forged in such spaces often become the basis for more overtly political activities such as anti-deportation campaigns. Across Europe there are initiatives within social movements that have semi-institutionalised such practices. For instance, the two (legalised) squatted social centres in Amsterdam that provide migrants without documentation a place to live as well as offering them other forms of support and legal advice. Similar projects exist in Greece, Spain and Italy to name but a few. Whether these connections through which the affective power of care flows exist in informal, or semi-formal (institutionalised) forms, through family or friendship networks, or from connections made through fleeting meetings, their effectiveness lies in the fact that they are part of a circuitry through which the mobility of migrants are enabled. Such networks, as do migrants when they defy borders and move regardless, do not wait to negotiate with the state or for the state to change things, but through their mobility and the caring networks that animate and sustain such movement, actualise what is needed now through carefully creating and nurturing forms of life that collectively and cooperatively transform the very conditions of existence. We need more of this and it is my sincerest hope this thesis can contribute in some way to the building of such movements. It is from such connections, affiliations, relations, friendships and affective networks of care that any other political projects that we may hope to build will emerge.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (1997) The camp as the nomos of the modern. In H. de Vries and S. Weber (eds.) *Violence, identity and self-determination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (1998) *Homo sacer: sovereign power and bare life*. (trans. D. Heller-Roazen). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2005) *The state of exception*. (trans. K. Attell). London: Chicago University Press.
- Agustín, L. M. (2007) *Sex at the margins: migration, labour markets and the rescue industry*. London: Zed Books.
- Amster, R., DeLeon, A., Fernandez, L. A., Nocella II, A. J. and Shannon, D. (eds.) (2009) *Contemporary anarchist studies: an introductory anthology of anarchy in the academy*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, B. (1997) Servants and slaves: Europe's domestic workers. *Race and Class*, 39(1): 37-49.
- Anderson, B. (2000) *Doing the dirty work? The global politics of domestic labour*. London: Zed Books.
- Anderson, B. (2003) The commodification of domestic labor. In B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild (eds.).
- Anderson, B. (2007) Battles in time: the relation between global and labour migration. *COMPAS Working Paper* 55.
[<http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/WP0755%20Bridget%20Anderson.pdf> accessed 2.2.09]
- Anderson, B. (2009) What's in a name? immigration controls and subjectivities: the case of au pair and domestic worker visa holders in the UK. *Subjectivity*, 29: 407-424.
- Anderson, B. (2010a) Migration, immigration controls and the fashioning of precarious workers. *Work, Employment and Society*, 24(2): 300-317.
- Anderson, B. (2010b) Mobilising migrants, making citizens: migrant domestic workers as political agents. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(1): 60-74.
- Anderson, B. and Rogaly, B. (2005) *Forced labour and migration*. Oxford: COMPAS/TUC.
[http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/Non_WP_pdfs/Reports_and_Other_Publications/Forced%20Labour%20TUC%20Report.pdf accessed 2.2.09]
- Anderson, B and Blinder, S. (2011) Who counts as a migrant?: definitions and their consequences. Oxford: The Migration Observatory.
[<http://migrobs.vm.bytemark.co.uk/sites/files/migrobs/Briefing%20->

[%20Who%20Counts%20as%20a%20Migrant.pdf](#) accessed 3.11.11]

Anderson, B., Sharma, N. and Wright, C. (2008) Editorial: why no borders?. *Refuge*, 26(2): 5-18.

Anderson, N. (1998) *On bobos and homelessness*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Andrijasevic, R. (2006) Lampedusa in Focus: migrants caught between the Libyan desert and the deep sea. *Feminist Review*, 82: 120-125.

Andrijasevic, R. (2009) Sex on the move: gender, subjectivity and differential inclusion. *Subjectivity* 29: 389-406.

Andrijasevic, R. (2010) From exception to excess: detention and deportation across the Mediterranean space. In N. De Genova and N. Peutz (eds.).

Anonymous (2004) *Stop IOM! Global movement against migration control*.

Arendt, H. (1968) *The origins of totalitarianism*. London: Harcourt.

Ashutosh, I. and Mountz, A. (2011) Migration management for the benefit of whom? interrogating the work of the International Organization for Migration. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(1): 21–38.

Asis, M., Huang, S. and Yeoh, B. (2004) When the light of the home is abroad: unskilled female migration and the Filipino family. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 25: 198-215.

Aynsley-Green, A. (2011) Who is speaking for Britain's children and young people?: a challenge to the children's sector. *Opendemocracy*.
[\http://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/al-aynsley-green/who-is-speaking-for-britains-children-and-young-people-challenge-to-chil accessed 25.6.11]

Badiou, A. (2001) *Ethics: an essay on the understanding of evil*. (Trans. P. Hallward). London: Verso.

Bain, P. and Taylor, P. (2007) A 'third way'? Industrial relations under New Labour. In G. Mooney and A. Law (eds.). *New Labour/Hard Labour: restructuring and resistance inside the welfare industry*. Bristol: Policy Press.)

Baines, and Sharma, N. (2002) Migrant workers as non-citizens: the case against citizenship as a social policy concept. *Studies in Political Economy*, 69: 75-107.
<http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/viewFile/6686/3686> access 3.2.11]

Balakrishnan, G. (ed.) (2003) *Debating Empire*. London: Verso.

Balibar, E. (2005) Difference, otherness, exclusion. *Parallax*, 11(1): 19-34.

Balibar, E. (2004) *We, the people of Europe: reflections on transnational citizenship*. Princeton,

NJ: Princeton University Press.

Balibar, E. (2004) *Politics and the other scene*. New York: Verso.

Balloch, S. & Taylor, M. (eds.) (2001) *Partnership working: policy and practice*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bartlett, H. and Blackman, T. (2001) Models of care. In T. Blackman, S. Brodhurst and J. Conveny (eds.).

Basch, L., Glick-Schiller, N. and Blanc, C. S. (1994) *Nations unbound: transnational projects, post-colonial predicaments and deterritorialized nation-states*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Bauman, Z. (1996) From pilgrim to tourist – or a short history of identity. In S. Hall and P. De Gay (eds). *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.

Bauman, Z. (2004) *Human waste: modernity and its outcasts*. Bristol: Polity.

Beier, A. L. (1986) *Masterless men: the vagrancy problem in England, 1560-1640*. London: Methuen.

Bélanger, J. and Thuderoz, C. (2010) The repertoire of employee opposition. In P. Thompson and C. Smith (eds.).

Benmayor, R. and Skotnes, A. (1994) *International yearbook of oral histories and life stories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, M. (2004) A review of the literature on the benefits and drawbacks of Participatory Action Research, *First Peoples Child & Family Review* 1 (1): 19-32.

Berardi, F. (2009) *The soul at work: from alienation to autonomy*. (Trans F. Cadel and G. Mecchia). Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Beynon, H. (1973) *Working for Ford*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Beynon, H. and Nichols, T. (eds.) (2006) *Patterns of work in the post-Fordist era: Fordism and post-Fordism*. (Volumes I & II). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar..

Bigo, D. (2011) Freedom and speed in enlarged borderzones. In V. Squire (ed.).

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bishop, H. (2007) Antiglobalization. In A. Mooney and B. Evans (eds.) *Globalization: the key concepts*. London: Routledge.

Bishop, H. and Jaworski, A. (2003) We beat ‘em: nationalism and the hegemony of homogeneity. *Discourse and Society*, 14(3): 243-271.

Block, A. and Schuster, L (2002) Asylum and welfare: contemporary debates. *Critical Social Policy*, 22(3): 393-414.

- Bojadžjec, M and Karakayali, S. (2010) Recuperating the sideshows of capitalism: the autonomy of migration today. *e-flux journal*, 17 [http://worker01.e-flux.com/pdf/article_154.pdf accessed 20.11.10]
- Bolton, S. C. (2001) Changing faces: nurses as emotional jugglers. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 23(1): 85-100.
- Bolton, S. C. (2005) *Emotion management and the workplace*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bolton, S. C. (2008) The lady vanishes: women's work and affective labour. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 3(1): 72-80.
- Bolton, S. C. (2009) Getting to the heart of the emotional labour process: a reply to Brook. *Work, Employment and Society*, 23(3): 549-560.
- Bolton, S. C. and Boyd, C. (2003) Trolley dolly or skilled emotion manager? moving on from Hochschild's Managed Heart. *Work, Employment and Society*, 17(2): 289-308.
- Bonefeld, W. (2008) (ed.) *Subverting the present, imagining the future: insurrection, movement, commons*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Borda, O. F. (1985) *Knowledge and people's power: lesson's from Nicaragua, Mexico and Colombia*. New Dehli: Indian Social Institute.
- Borda, O. F. and Rahman, A. (1991) *Action and knowledge: breaking the monopoly with Participatory Action-Research*. New York: The Apex Press.
- Boswell, C. (2006) The liberal dilemma in ethics of refugee policy. In A. M. Messina and G. Lahav (eds.).
- Bowden, P. (1997) *Caring: gender-sensitive ethics*. London: Routledge.
- Bowring, F. (2002) Post –Fordism and the End of Work. *Futures*, 34: 159-72.
- Brecher, J., Costello, T. and Smith, B. (2000) *Globalization from below: the power of solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Brown, D. (2008) *More destitution in Leeds: repeat survey of asylum seekers and refugees approaching local agencies for support*. York: The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust. [<http://www.jrct.org.uk/core/documents/download.asp?id=330> accessed 3.2.11]
- Bryceson, D. and Vuorela, U. (2002) Transnational families in the twenty-first century. In D. Bryceson and U. Vuorela (eds.) *The transnational family: new European frontiers and global networks*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bryman, A. (2004) *Social research methods*. (2nd Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bulmer, M. (ed.) (1982) *Social research ethics: an examination of the merits of covert participant observation*. New York: Holmes and Meier.

- Burawoy, M., Burton, A., Ferguson, A. A., Fox, K. J., Gamson, J., Gartrell, N., Hurst, L., Kurzman, C., Salzinger, L., Schiffman, J., and Ui, S. (1991) *Ethnography unbound: power and resistance in the modern metropolis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burawoy, M., Blum, J. A., George, S., Gille, Z., Gowan, T., Haney, L., Klawiter, M., Lopez, S.H., Riain, S. Ó., and Thayer M. (2000) *Global ethnography: forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Byrne, D. (2005) *Social Exclusion*. (2nd Edition). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Caffentzis, C. G. (1999) On the notion of a crisis in social reproduction: a theoretical review. In M. Dalla Costa and G. F. Dalla Costa (eds).
- Camroux, D. (2009) Nationalizing a 'transnational' diaspora?: the Philippine state and Filipino emigration. J. Tinio (ed.) *Changing dynamics in Filipino overseas migration: nationalism, transnationalism, regionalism and the State*. Quezon City: Philippine Migration Research Network & Philippine Social Science Council. [<http://www.ceri-sciencespo.com/cherlist/camroux/nationalizing.pdf> accessed 3.4.11]
- Cangiano, A., Shutes, I., Spencer, S. and Leeson, G. (2009) *Migrant care workers in ageing societies: research findings in the UK*. Oxford: COMPAS. [http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/Migrant_Care_Workers/MCW%20report%20-%20final%20-%20website%20version.pdf accessed 21.7.10]
- Care Council for Wales. (2001) *The social care workforce in Wales: definitions and challenges*. Cardiff: Care Council for Wales.
- Care Council for Wales. (2006) *The social care workforce in Wales: themes and trends*. Cardiff: Care Council for Wales.
- Castles, S. and Miller, M. J. (2003) *The age of migration: international population movements and the modern world*. (3rd Edition). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castells, M. (1997) *The power of identity, the information age: economy, society and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chang, G. (2000) *Disposable domestics: immigrant women workers in the global economy*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Chang, K. A. and Ling, L. H. M. (2000) Globalization and its intimate other: Filipina domestic workers in Hong Kong. In M. H. Marchard and A. S. Ryan (eds.) *Gender and global restructuring: sightings, sites and resistances*. London: Routledge.
- Charlton, J. (2000) Class struggle and the origins of state welfare reform. In M. Lavalette and G. Mooney (eds.).
- Cheng, S-J. A. (2003) Rethinking globalization and domestic service: foreign domestics, state control and the politics of identity in Taiwan. *Gender and Society*, 17(2): 168-186
- Chesters, G. and Welsh, I. (2011) *Social movements: the key concepts*. London: Routledge.

- Chomsky, N. (1998) *Profits over people: neoliberalism and the global order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Clayton, G. (2008) *Textbook on immigration and asylum law*. (3rd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cleaver, H. (2000) *Reading 'Capital' politically*. Leeds and Edinburgh: Anti/Theses and AK Press.
- Cleaver, H. (2003) Marxian categories, the crisis of capital and the constitution of subjectivity today. In W. Bonefeld (ed.) *Revolutionary writing: common sense essays on post-political politics*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Cock, J. (1980) *Maids and madams: a study in the politics of exploitation*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Cohen, R. (2006) *Migration and its enemies: global capital, migrant labour and the nation-state*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Cohen, S. (2001) *Immigration controls, the family and the welfare state*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Cohen, S. (2002a) Dining with the Devil: the 1999 Immigration and Asylum Act and the voluntary sector. In S. Cohen, B. Humphries and E. Mynott (eds.).
- Cohen, S. (2002b) The local state of immigration controls. *Critical social policy*, 22(3): 518-543.
- Cohen, S. (2003) *No one is illegal: asylum and immigration control past and present*.
- Cohen, S. (2005) *Deportation is freedom: the Orwellian world of immigration controls*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Cohen, S., Humphries, B. and Mynott, M. (eds.) (2002) *From immigration controls to welfare controls*. London: Routledge.
- Colectivo Situaciones (2004) Causes and happenstances: dilemmas of Argentina's new social protagonism Research manuscript #4, *the commoner*, 8. [\[www.commoner.org.uk/08situaciones.pdf\]](http://www.commoner.org.uk/08situaciones.pdf) accessed 29.1.11.
- Colectivo Situaciones (2005) Something more on research militancy: footnotes on procedures and (in)decisions. *ephemera* 5(4): 602-614. [\[www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/5-4/5-4colectivo.pdf\]](http://www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/5-4/5-4colectivo.pdf) accessed 29.1.11]
- Collins, P. H. (1991) *Black Feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Constable, Nicole (2007) *Maid to order in Hong Kong: stories of migrant workers*. (2nd Edition). Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

- Coordination Française Pour Le Droit Asile (2008) *The law of the jungles*.
- Coureau, H. (2003) "Tomorrow inch Allah, chance!": people smuggler networks in Sangatte. *Immigrants and Minorities*, 22(2/3): 374-387.
- Coutin, S. B. (2010) Exiled by law: deportation and the inviability of life. In N. De Genova and N. Peutz (eds.).
- Cox, N. and Federici, S. (1975) *Counter-planning in the kitchen: wages for housework a perspective on capital and the left*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
[\[http://caringlabor.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/counter-planning-from-the-kitchen.pdf\]](http://caringlabor.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/counter-planning-from-the-kitchen.pdf) [accessed 20.2.11]
- Crawley, H. (2005) Evidence on attitudes to asylum and immigration: what we know, don't know and need to know. *COMPAS Working Paper*, 23.
[\[http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/Heaven%20Crawley%20WP0523.pdf\]](http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/Heaven%20Crawley%20WP0523.pdf) accessed 2.5.08]
- Crawley, H. (2010) *Chance or choice: understanding why asylum seekers come to the UK*. London: Refugee Council.
[\[http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/Resources/Refugee%20Council/downloads/rcchance.pdf\]](http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/Resources/Refugee%20Council/downloads/rcchance.pdf) accessed 20.6.11]
- CSSIW. (2008) *Care services in Wales: annual report 2006-2007*. Nantgarw: Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales.
- Crowther, M. A. (1983) *The workhouse system 1843-1929: the history of an English social institution*. London: Methuen.
- Cwerner, S. B. (2004) Faster, faster and faster: the time politics of asylum in the UK. *Time and Society*, 13(1): 71-88.
- Dalla Costa, M. (2008) Capitalism and reproduction. In W. Bonefeld (ed.).
- Dalla Costa, M. and Dalla Costa, G. F. (1999) (eds). *Women, development and labor of reproduction: struggles and movements*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Dalla Costa, M. and James, S. (1975) *The power of women and the subversion of the community*. (3rd Edition). Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Dalley, G. (1996) *Ideologies of caring: rethinking community and collectivism*. (2nd edition). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Dalley, G. and Denniss, M. (2001) *Trained to care? Investigating the skills and competencies of care assistants in homes for older people*. Centre for Policy on Ageing Report 28. London: Centre for Policy on Ageing.
- Daly, M. and Lewis, J. (2000) The concept of social care and the analysis of contemporary welfare states. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(2): 281-298.
- Datta, K., McIlwaine, C., Evans, Y., Herbert, J., May, J. and Wills, J. (2010) A migrant

ethic of care?: negotiating care and caring among migrant workers in London's low-pay economy. *Feminist Review*, 94: 93-116.

Davenport, N. (2008) Minorities, multiculturalism and the metropolitan experience. In D. Clements, A. Donald, M. Earnshaw and A. Williams (eds.) *The future of community: reports of a death greatly exaggerated*. London: Pluto.

De Angelis, M. (2007) *The beginning of history: value struggles and global capital*. London: Pluto Press.

De Angelis, M. (2008) Marx and primitive accumulation: the continuous character of capital's 'enclosures'. In W. Bonefeld (ed.).

Debord, G. (1958) Theory of the dérive. [www.bopsecrets.org/SI/2.derive.htm accessed 29.1.11]

De Genova, N. (2002) Migrant 'illegality' and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31: 419-447.

De Genova, N. (2005) *Working the boundary: race, space and 'illegality' in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, N. C: Duke University Press.

De Genova, N. (2010) The deportation regime: sovereignty, space and the freedom of movement. In N. De Genova and N. Peutz (eds.).

De Genova, N. and Peutz, N. (eds.) (2010) *The deportation regime: sovereignty, space and the freedom of movement*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1977) *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. (Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane). New York Viking Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia II* (trans. B. Massumi). London: Athlone.

Deleuze, G. and Parnet, C. (1987) *Dialogues*. (Trans. by H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam). New York: Columbia University Press.

Department of Health/Department for Education and Skills (2006) *Options for Excellence. Building the Social Care Workforce of the Future*. [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_4139958 accessed 14.10.08]

De Pastino, T. (2003) *Citizen hobo: how a century of homelessness shaped America*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (2002) *Negotiations: interventions and interviews, 1971—2001*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dobson, L. and Zinbarg, R. M. (2007) 'It's like a family': caring labor, exploitation, and race in nursing homes. *Gender and Society*, 21(6): 905-928.

- Dowling, S., Manthorpe, J. and Cowley S. in association with King, S., Raymond, V., Perez, W. and Weinstein, P. (2006) *Person-centred planning in social care: a scoping review*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
[\[http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/9781859354803.pdf\]](http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/9781859354803.pdf) accessed 23.3.10]
- Drainville, A. C. (1998) The fetishism of global civil society: global governance, transnational urbanism and sustainable capitalism in the world economy. In M. P. Smith and L. Guarnizo (eds.).
- Driver, F. (1993) *Power and pauperism: the workhouse system, 1834-1884*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dugan, E. (2009) Asylum-seekers hit by huge rise in homelessness: faster processing of applications deprives many of state support and forces them on to the streets. *The Independent*, Sunday 6 September. [\[http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/asylumseekers-hit-by-huge-rise-in-homelessness-1782525.html\]](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/asylumseekers-hit-by-huge-rise-in-homelessness-1782525.html) accessed 3.2.11]
- Dunkerley, D., Scourfield, J., Maegusuku-Hewett, T. and Smalley, N. (2006) Children seeking asylum in Wales. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(4): 489-508.
- Düvell, F. and Jordan, B. (2002) Immigration, asylum and welfare: the European context, *Critical Social Policy*, 22(3): 498-517
- Dwyer, P. and Brown, D. (2008) Accommodating 'others?': housing dispersed, forced migrants in the UK. *Journal of Welfare and Family Law*, 30(3): 203-218.
- England, P. (2005) Emerging theories of care work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31: 381-399.
- Ehrenreich, B. (2003) Made to order. In B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild (eds.).
- Ehrenreich, B. and Hochschild, A. R. (2003) Introduction. In B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild (eds.).
- Ehrenreich, B. and Hochschild, A. R. (eds.) (2003) *Global women: nannies, maids and sex workers in the New economy*. London: Granta.
- Ehrenstein, A. (2006) *Social relationality and affective experience in precarious labour conditions: a study of young immaterial workers in the arts industry in Cardiff*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Cardiff University.
- European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2008) *Temporary agency work and collective bargaining in the EU*. Dublin.
- Evans, Y., Herbert, J., Datta, K., May, J., McIlwaine, C. and Wills, J. (2005) *Making the city work: low paid employment in London*. London: Queen Mary, University of London.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, new language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairbrother, P. and Poynter, G. (2001) State restructuring: managerialism, marketisation and the implications for labour. *Competition and Change*, 5: 311-333.

Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (2008) Record high remittances to the Philippines lead to increased competition among Philippine Banks. *Asia Focus*, January: 1-3.
[http://www.frbsf.org/publications/banking/asiafocus/2008/Asia_Focus_Jan_08.pdf
accessed 23.3.10]

Federici, S. (1980) Wages against housework. In E. Malos (ed.) *The politics of housework*. London: Allison & Busby.

Federici, S. (2004) *Caliban and the witch: women, the body and primitive accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.

Federici, S. (1999) Reproduction and feminist struggles in the new international division of labor. In M. Dalla Costa and G. F. Dalla Costa (eds.).

Federici, S. (2010) Feminism and the politics of the commons in an era of primitive accumulation. In Team Colors Collective (eds.) *Uses of a whirlwind: radical currents in the United States*. Oakland, Edinburgh, Baltimore: AK Press.

Feher, M. (2007) The governed in politics. In M. Feher with G. Krikorian and Y. McKee (eds.) *Nongovernmental politics*. New York: Zone Books.

Fekete, L. (2009) Europe: crimes of solidarity. *Race and Class*, 50(4): 83–97.

Feldman, D. (2003) Migrants, immigrants and welfare from the old Poor Law to the welfare state. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 13: 79-104.

Fell, P. (2004) And now it has started to rain: support and advocacy with adult asylum-seekers in the voluntary sector. In D. Hayes and B. Humphries (eds.).

Fellows, N. (2001) *Disorder and Rebellion in Tudor England*.

Fine, M. D. (2007) *A caring society?: care and the dilemmas of human services in the twenty-first century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fisher, M. (2009) *Capitalist realism: is there no alternative?*. Ropley: Zero Books.

Fitzpatrick, T. (2001) *Welfare theory: an introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Flynn, D. (2006) *Migrant voices, migrant rights: can migrant community organisations change the immigration debate in Britain today?* London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Ford, J. and Sinclair, R. (1987) *Sixty years on: women talk about old age*. London: The Women's Press.

Fortunati, L. (1995) *The arcane of reproduction: housework, prostitution, labor and capital*. New York: Autonomedia.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.

- Foucault, M. (1978) *History of sexuality, volume 1: an introduction*. (trans. R. Hurley). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, territory, population: lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*. (Trans. G. Burchell). New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2008) *The birth of biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979*. (Trans. G. Burchell). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fournier, V. (1999) The appeal to professionalism as a disciplinary mechanism. *Sociological Review*, 47 (2): 280-307.
- Fraser, D. (1984) *Evolution of the British welfare state: a history of social policy since the industrial revolution*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Frassanito Network (2005) Precarious, precarisation, precariat? *Mute*, 2: 60-62. [<http://www.metamute.org/en/html2pdf/view/7057> accessed 1.2.09]
- Gandhi, L. (2006) *Affective communities: anticolonial thought, fin-de-siècle radicalism, and the politics of friendship*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Gatta, M. (2002) *Juggling food and feelings: emotional balance in the workplace*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Gatta, M. (2009) Balancing trays and smiles: what restaurant servers teach us about hard work in the service economy. In S. C. Bolton and M. Houlihan (eds.) *Work matters: critical reflections on contemporary work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gentleman, A. (2010) What happened next? The destitute asylum seeker. *The Guardian*, Monday 27 December. [<http://www.guardian.co.uk/lifeandstyle/2010/dec/27/asylum-seekers-living-on-street> accessed 3.2.11]
- George, S. (2000) “Dirty nurses” and “men who play”: gender and class in transnational migration. In M. Burawoy, J. A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L. Haney, M. Klawiter, S. H. Lopez, S. Ó. Riain and M. Thayer (eds.).
- Geremek, B. (1994) *Poverty: a history*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gibney, M. J. (2008) Asylum and the expansion of deportation in the United Kingdom. *Government and Opposition*, 43(2): 146-167.
- Gilbert, A. and Koser, K. (2003) *Information dissemination to potential asylum applicants in countries of origin and transit*. Home Office findings 220. London: Home Office.
- Gill, R. (2002) Cool, creative and egalitarian? exploring gender in project-based new media work in Europe. *Information, Communication and Society*, 5, 70-89.
- Gill, N. (2009a). Governmental mobility: the power effects of the movement of detained Asylum seekers around Britain’s detention estate. *Political Geography*, 28, 186-196.

Gill, N. (2009b) Longing for stillness: the forced movement of asylum seekers. *M/C journal: a journal of media and culture*, 12(1).
[<http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/123>
accessed 2.2.10]

Gill, N. (2010). New state-theoretic approaches to asylum and refugee geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 5(34): 626-645.

Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gilroy, P. (1993) *The black Atlantic: modernity and double consciousness*. London: Verso.

Glick-Schiller, N. (1997) The situation of transnational studies. *Identities*, 4(2): 155-166.

Golden, R. and McConnell, M. (1986) *Sanctuary: the new underground railroad*. New York: Orbis Books.

Goulbourne, H., Reynolds, T., Solomos, J. and Zontini, E. (2010) *Transnational families: ethnicities, identities and social capital*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Graeber, D. (2009) Anarchism, academia and the avant-garde. In R. Amster, A. DeLeon, L. A. Fernandez, A. J. Nocella and D. Shannon (eds.) *Contemporary anarchist studies: an introductory anthology of anarchy in the academy*. London: Routledge.

Graham, H. (1983) Caring: a labour of love. In J. Finch and D. Groves (eds.) *A labour of love: women, work and caring*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Grainger, H. and Crowther, M. (2007) *Trade union membership 2006*, London: Department of Trade and Industry, Office for National Statistics.

Greenslade, R. (2005) Seeking scapegoats: the coverage of asylum in the UK press. *Asylum and migration working paper 5*. London: IPPR.

Griffiths, D., Sigona, N. and Zetter, R. (2005) *Refugee community organisations and dispersal: networks, resources and social capital*. Bristol: Polity Press.

Guarnizo, L and Smith, M. P. (1998) The locations of Transnationalism. In M. P. Smith and L. Guarnizo (eds.).

Guattari, F. (2000) *The three ecologies*. (Trans. I. Pindar and P. Sutton). London: Athlone.

Gubrium, J. F. (1975) *Living and dying in Murray Manor*. New York: St Martins.

Guiraudon, V. and Lahav, G. (2000) A reappraisal of the state sovereignty debate: the case of migration control. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(2): 163-95.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E. (2007) Reading affect: on the heterotopian spaces of care and domestic work in private households. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2): art 11.

[<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/240/532> accessed 20.6.09]

Hage, G. (2009) Introduction. In G. Hage (ed.) *Waiting*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Haraway, D. J. (1992) The promises of monsters: a regenerative politics for inappropriate/d others. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. A. Treichler (eds.) *Cultural studies*. London: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1991) Situated knowledges: the science question in Feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. In D. Haraway. *Simians, cyborgs, and women: the reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.

Hardill, I. and MacDonald, S. (2000) Skilled international migration: the experiences of nurses in the UK. *Regional Studies*, 34(7): 681-692.

Harding, S. (1988) *Feminism and methodology: social science issues*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, J. (2000) *The uninited: refugees at the rich man's gate*. London: Profile.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2004) *Multitude*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2009) *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Harris, J. Ll. (2005) *Machinic Networks: Contemporary Theories of Technology*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Salford.

Hartsock, N. (1983) The Feminist standpoint. In S. Harding and M. B. Hintikka (eds.) *Discovering reality: feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science*. London: Riedel.

Harvey, C. (2000) *Seeking asylum in the UK: problems and prospects*. London: Butterworths.

Harvey, D. (2007) *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvie, D., Milburn, K., Trott, B. and Watts, D. (2005) *Shut them down!: the G8, Gleneagles 2005 & the movement of movements*. London and New York: Dissent! and Autonomedia.

Hayes, D. (2000) Outsiders within: the role of welfare in the internal controls of immigration. In J. Batsleer and B. Humphries (eds.) *Welfare, exclusion and political agency*. London: Routledge.

Hayes, D. (2004) History and context: the impact of immigration control on welfare delivery. In D. Hayes and Humphries, B. (eds.).

- Hayes, D. and Humphries, B. (eds.) (2004) *Social work, immigration and asylum*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hayter, T. (2000) *Open borders: the case against immigration controls*. London: Pluto Press.
- Heery, E., & Salmon, J. (eds.) (2000) *The insecure workforce*. London: Routledge.
- Held, V. (1993) *Feminist morality: transforming culture, society and politics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Held, V. (2006) *The ethics of care: personal, political and global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hess, S. (2005) Feminized transnational spaces: or the interplay between gender and nation. In Katschnig-Fasch. (ed.) *Anthropological yearbook of European cultures: gender and nation in Southern Europe*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Hess, S. (2006) 'I am not willing to return at this time...': Transmigration of Eastern European Women as Transformation Strategy. *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica*, 51(1-2): 31-42.
- Hess, S. and Puckhaber, A. (2004) Big sisters are better domestic servants!?: comments on the booming au pairs business. *Feminist Review*, 77: 65-78.
- Hill, M. (1993) *The welfare state in Britain: a political history since 1945*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Hitchcock, T., King, P. and Sharpe, P. (1997) Introduction: chronicling poverty – the voices and strategies of the English poor 1640-1840. In T. Hitchcock, P. King, and P. Sharpe, P. (eds.) *Chronicling poverty: the voices and strategies of the English poor 1640-1840*. London: Macmillan.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983) *The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling*. Berkley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1997) *The time bind: when work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2003) *The commercialization of intimate life: notes from home and work*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2000) Global care chains and emotional surplus value. In W. Hutton and A. Giddens (eds.) *On the edge: living with global capitalism*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Hochschild, A. R. and Machung, A. (1997) *The second shift: working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Avon.
- Holden, C. (2002) The internationalization of long term care provision: economics and strategy. *Global Social Policy*, 2(1): 47-67.

- Holloway, J. (1995) From scream of refusal to scream of power: the centrality of work. In W. Bonefeld, R. Gunn, J. Holloway and K. Psychopedis (eds.) *Open Marxism III: emancipating Marx*. London: Pluto Press.
- Home Office (1998) *Firmer, faster, fairer: a modern approach to immigration and asylum*. London: HMSO. [<http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm40/4018/contents.htm> accessed 19.8.11]
- Home Office (2005) *Controlling our borders: making migration work for Britain. Five year strategy for asylum and immigration*. London: HMSO. [<http://www.archive2.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm64/6472/6472.pdf> accessed 19.8.11]
- Home Office (2008) *Asylum statistics United Kingdom 2007*. London: HMSO. [<http://www.asksid.org.uk/bme/docs/AsylumStats07.pdf> accessed 19.8.11]
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2001) *Doméstica: immigrant workers cleaning and caring in the shadows of affluence*. London: University of California Press.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. and Avila, E. (1997) I'm here, but I'm there: the meaning of Latin transnational motherhood. *Gender and Society*, 11(5): 548-570.
- Horst, H. A. (2006) The blessings and burdens of communication: cell phones in Jamaican transnational social fields. *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 6(2): 143-159.
- Humphries, B. (2002) From welfare to authoritarianism: the role of social work in immigration controls. In S. Cohen, B. Humphries and E. Mynott (eds.) *From immigration controls to welfare controls*. London: Routledge.
- Humphries, B. (2004) Refugees, asylum-seekers, welfare and social work. In D. Hayes and Humphries, B. (eds.).
- Hsiao-Hung, P. (2008) *Chinese whispers: the true story behind Britain's hidden army of labour*. London: Penguin.
- Ignatieff, M. (1978) *A just measure of pain: the penitentiary in the industrial revolution, 1750-1850*. New York: Columbia UP.
- IOM (2004) *International migration law: glossary on migration*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration. [http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/published_docs/serial_publications/Glossary_eng.pdf accessed 3.2.11]
- Inda, J. X. (2006) *Targeting immigrants: government, technology, and ethics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Isin, E. F. (2008) Theorizing acts of citizenship. In In E. F. Isin and G. M. Nielsen (eds.).
- Isin, E. F. and Nielsen, G. M. (2008) Introduction. In E. F. Isin and G. M. Nielsen (eds.).

- Isin, E. F. and Nielsen, G. M. (eds.) (2008) *Acts of citizenship*. London: Zed Books.
- Jack, R. (ed.) (1998) *Residential versus community care: the role of institutions in welfare provision*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- James, N. (1992) Care = organisation + physical labour + emotional labour. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 14(4): 488-509.
- James, S (1975) *Sex, race and class*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Jervis, L. L. (2001) The pollution of incontinence and the dirty work of caregiving in a U. S. nursing home. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 15(1): 84-99.
- Jordan, B. (2001) Tough love: social work, social exclusion and the third way. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31: 527-546.
- Jubany-Baucells, O. (2002) The state of welfare for asylum seekers and refugees in Spain, *Critical Social Policy*, 22(3): 415-435.
- Karakayali, S. and Rigo, E. (2010) Mapping the European space of circulation. In De Genova and Peutz (eds.).
- Kaufmann, F. K. (2008) *Emigrant or sojourner?: the determinants of Mexican labor migration strategies to the United States*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Kaye, R. (1998) Redefining the refugee: the UK media portrayal of asylum seekers. In K. Koser and H. Lutz (eds.) *The new migration in Europe: social constructions and social realities*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Kendall, J. (2003) *The voluntary sector*. London: Routledge.
- Kennedy, P and Kennedy, C. A. (2007) Control and resistance at the ward-face: contesting the nursing labour process. In G. Mooney and A. Law (eds.).
- Khosravi, S. (2009) Detention and deportation of asylum seekers in Sweden. *Race & Class*, 50(4): 30-56.
- Khosravi, S. (2010) *'Illegal' traveller: an auto-ethnography of borders*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kofman, E. (2004) Gendered global migration: diversity and stratification. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6(4): 643-668.
- Kofman, E. and Raghuram, P. (2005) Gender and skilled migration: into and beyond the workplace. *Geoforum*, 36(2): 149-154.
- Kofman, E. and Sales, R. (1998) Migrant women and exclusion in Europe. *Journal of European Women's Studies*, 5(3/4): 381-398.

Kofman, E., Phizacklea, A., Raghuram, P. and Sales, R. (2000) *Gender and international migration in Europe: employment, welfare, and politics*. London: Routledge.

Kolinko. (2002) Hotlines: call centre inquiry.
[http://www.nadir.org/nadir/initiativ/kolinko/lebuk/e_lebuk.htm accessed 6.5.11]

Korczynski, M. (2003) Communities of Coping: Collective Emotional Labour in Service Work. *Organization*, 10(1): 55-79.

Kusenbach, M. (2003) Street Phenomenology: the go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, 4(3): 455-485.

Lahav, G. (1998) Immigration and the state: the devolution and privatisation of immigration controls in the EU. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 24(4): 675-694.

Lahav, G. (2000) The rise of nonstate actors in migration regulation in the United States and Europe: changing the gatekeepers or bringing back the state? In N. Foner, R. Rumbaut and S. J. Gold (eds.) *Immigration research for a new century: multidisciplinary perspectives*. New York: Sage.

Lan, P-C. (2006) *Global cinderellas: migrant domestics and newly rich employers in Taiwan*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.

Latour, B. (1993) *We have never been modern*. (Trans. C. Porter). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lavalette, M. and Mooney, G. (eds.) (2000) *Class struggle and social welfare*. London: Routledge.

Law, J. and Hassard, J. (eds.) (1999) *Actor network theory and after*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Law, A. and Mooney, G. (2007) Strenuous welfarism: restructuring the welfare process. In G. Mooney and A. Law (eds.).

Lawson, V. (2009) Instead of radical geography, how about caring geography? *Antipode*, 41(1): 210-213

Lazzarato, M. (1996) Immaterial labor. In P. Virno and M. Hardt (eds.).

Lefebvre, H. (2004) *Rhythmanalysis: space, time and everyday life*. London & New York: Continuum.

Le Grand, J. and Robinson, R. (1984) Privatisation and the welfare state: an introduction. In J. Le Grand, and R. Robinson. (eds.) *Privatisation and the welfare state*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Levitt, P. and Jaworsky, B. N. (2007) Transnational migration studies: past development and future trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33(1): 129-156.

Lewis, H. (2007) *Destitution in Leeds: the experiences of people seeking asylum and supporting services*. York: The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust.

[<http://www.jrct.org.uk/core/documents/download.asp?id=313> accessed 3.2.11]

Lewis, J. (1993) Developing the mixed economy of care: emerging issues for voluntary organisations. *Journal of Social Policy*, 22: 173-192.

Liedtke, M. (2002) National welfare and asylum in Germany. *Critical Social Policy*, 22(3): 479-497.

van der Linden, M. (2008) *Workers of the world: essays towards a global labor history*. Leiden: Brill.

Linebaugh, P. (2008) *The Magna Carta manifesto: liberties and commons for all*. Berkley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Linebaugh, P. and Rediker, M. (2000) *The many-headed hydra: the hidden history of the revolutionary Atlantic*. London: Verso.

Litt, J. S. and Zimmerman, M. K. (2003) Guest editors' introduction: global perspective on gender and carework: an introduction. *Gender and Society*, 17(2): 156-165.

Local Government Management Board. (1997) *Independent sector workforce survey 1996*. London: LGMB.

López Gil, S. (2007) Las Lógicas del Cuidado. *Diagonal*, (50).

Loux, A., Kerrison, S. and Pollock, A. M. (2000) Long term nursing: social care or health care?. *British Medical Journal*, 320: 5-6.

Maeckelbergh, M. (2009) *The will of the many: how the alterglobalisation movement is changing the face of democracy*. London: Pluto.

Malo de Molina, M. (2004a) Common notions, part 1: workers-inquiry, co-research, consciousness-raising. [<http://eipcp.net/transversal/0406/malo/en/> accessed 29.1.11]

Malo de Molina, M. (2004b) Common Notions, Part 2: Institutional Analysis, Participatory Action-Research, Militant Research.

[http://eipcp.net/transversal/0707/malo/en/base_edit accessed 29.1.11]

Malos, E. (1982) (ed.) *The politics of housework*. London: Alison and Busby.

Manthorpe, J. and Martineau, S. (2008) *Support workers: their role and tasks: a scoping review*. Social Care Workforce Research Unit. London: King's College.

[<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/kpi/scwru/pubs/2008/manthorpeandmartineau2008support.pdf> accessed 3.3.11]

Marcus, G. E. (1995) Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117.

Marcus, G. E. and Fischer, M. M. J. (1986) *Anthropology as cultural critique: an experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Marrus, M. (1985) *The unwanted: European refugees in the 20th Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marx, K. (1880) A worker's inquiry. *La Revue Socialiste*, April 20. [www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/04/20.htm accessed 29.1.11]

Marx, K. (1973) *Capital: a critique of political economy*. Volume 1. (Trans. Ben Fowkes). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Marx, K. (1977) *Grundrisse: introduction to the critique of political economy*. (Trans. Martin Nicolaus). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A. and Taylor, J. E (2006) Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal. In A. M. Messina and G. Lahav (eds.).

Massumi, B. (2002) *Parables for the virtual: movement, affect, sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press.

McGregor, J. A. (2007) 'Joining the BBC (British Bottom Cleaners)': Zimbabwean migrants and the UK care industry. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(5): 801-824.

McKay, S. (2001) Annual review article 2000: between flexibility and regulation: rights, equality and protection at work. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 39(2): 285-303.

McMaster, R. (2008) The welfare state and privatization. In J. B. Davis and W. Dolfsma (eds.) *The Elgar companion to social economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Means, R. and Smith, R. (1985) *The development of welfare services for elderly people*. Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Means, R., Richards, S. and Smith, R. (2003) *Community care: policy and practice*. (3rd edn.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Melossi, D. and Pavarini, M. (1981) *The prison and the factory: origins of the penitentiary system*. Totawo, NJ: Barnes and Noble.

Mertes, T. (ed.) (2004) *The movement of movements: is another world possible?* London: Verso.

Messina, A. M. and Lahav, G. (eds.) (2006) *The migration reader: exploring politics and policies*. Boulder, CO and London: Lynne Rienner.

Mezzadra, S. (2004) The right to escape. *ephemera*, 4(3): 267-275. [<http://ephemeraweb.org/journal/4-3/4-3mezzadra.pdf> access 5.5.09]

Mezzadra, S. (2005) Citizen and subject: a postcolonial constitution for the European Union? Paper presented at the *Conflicts, Law and Constitutionalism* conference, Paris, 16-18 February 2005. [http://cms.gold.ac.uk/media/mezzadra_citizen_subject.pdf accessed 24.6.11]

- Mezzadra, S. (2006) Borders/confines, migrations, citizenship. In Fadaiat (eds.) *Fadaiat: libertad de movimiento – libertad de conocimiento*.
- Mezzadra, S. (2011) The gaze of autonomy: capitalism, migration and social struggles. In V. Squires (ed.)
- Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2003) Né qui, né altrove—migration, detention, desertion: a dialogue. *borderland e-journal*, 2(1).
[http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol2no1_2003/mezzadra_neilson.html accessed 24.6.11]
- Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2008) The border as method, or, the multiplication of labour. [<http://eipcp.net/transversal/0608/mezzadraneilson/en> accessed 24.6.11]
- Mies, M. (1986) *Patriarchy and accumulation on a world scale: women and the international division of labour*. London: Zed Books.
- Midnight Notes. (1990) The new enclosures. *Midnight Notes*, 10.
[<http://www.midnightnotes.org/newenclos.html> accessed 24.6.11]
- Midnight Notes and friends. (2009) Promissory notes: from crisis to commons.
[<http://www.midnightnotes.org/Promissory%20Notes.pdf> accessed 24.6.11]
- Migration Observatory (2011) Thinking behind the numbers: understanding public opinion on immigration in Britain. Oxford: The Migration Observatory.
[<http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/migobs/Report%20-%20Public%20Opinion.pdf> accessed 3.10.11]
- Milligan, C. (2001) *Geographies of care: space, place and the voluntary sector*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Milligan, C. and Conradson, D. (2007) Contemporary landscapes of welfare: the ‘voluntary turn’? In C. Milligan and D. Conradson (eds.) *Landscapes of voluntarism: new spaces of health, welfare and governance*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Millner, N. (2011) From “refugee” to “migrant” in Calais solidarity activism: Re-staging undocumented migration for a future politics of asylum. *Political Geography*, 15: 320-328.
- Mitropoulos, A. (2005) Precari-us?. *Mute* 2: 60-63.
[<http://www.metamute.org/en/html2pdf/view/7057> accessed 1.2.09]
- Mitropoulos, A. (2006) Autonomy, recognition, movement. *the commoner*, 11: 5-14.
[<http://www.commoner.org.uk/11mitropoulos.pdf> accessed 24.6.11]
- Mol, A. (2002) *The body multiple: ontology in medical practice*. Durham, NC, Duke University Press.
- Mol, A. (2008) *The logic of care: health and the problem of patient choice*. London: Routledge.

- Mooney, G. and Law, A. (eds.) (2007) *New Labour/Hard Labour: restructuring and resistance inside the welfare industry*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Moriarty, J., Manthorpe, J., Hussein, S. and Cornes, M. (2008) *Staff shortages and immigration in the social care sector*. Paper prepared for Migration Advisory Committee. [<http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/aboutus/workingwithus/mac/239769/moriarty2008> accessed 24.6.11]
- Morokvasic, M. (2004) Settled in mobility: engendering post-wall migration in Europe. *Feminist Review*, 77: 7-24.
- Moss, P., van Ewijk, H., Hens, H. and Lammersen, G. (2004) *Care Work in Europe. Current understandings and future directions. A European research project on paid care*. London: Routledge.
- Moulier Boutang, Y. (1998) *De l'esclavage au salariat: économie historique de salariat bride*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Moulier Boutang, Y. (2001) The art of flight: Stany Grelet's interview with Yann Moulier Boutang. *Rethinking Marxism*, 13(3-4): 227-235.
- Munck, R. (2005) *Globalization and social exclusion: a transformationalist perspective*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Mynott, E. (2002) Nationalism, racism and immigration control: from anti-racism to anti-capitalism. In S. Cohen, B. Humphries and E. Mynott (eds.).
- Negri, A. (1989) *The politics of subversion: a manifesto for the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Negri, A. (1999) *Insurgencies: constituent power and the modern state*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Neilson, B. (2009) The world seen from a taxi: students-migrants-workers in the global multiplication of labour. *Subjectivity*, 29: 425-444.
- Neilson, B., & Rossiter, N. (2005) From precarity to precariousness and back again: labour, life and unstable networks. *Fibreculture*, 5. [http://www.journal.fibreculture.org/issue5/neilson_rossiter.html accessed 1.02.09]
- Neilson, B., & Rossiter, N. (2008) Precarity as a political concept, or, Fordism as exception. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 25(7-8): 51-72.
- Nevins, J. (2008) *Dying to live: a story of U.S. immigration in an age of global apartheid*. San Francisco: Open Media/City Lights Books.
- Nichols, T. (1980) Introduction. In T. Nichols (ed.) *Capital and labour: studies in the capitalist labour process*. London: Fontana.
- Nichols, T. and Beynon, H. (1977) *Living with capitalism: class relations and the modern factory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Notes from Nowhere (eds.) (2003) *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anti-capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Nyers, P. (2003) Abject cosmopolitanism: the politics of protection in the anti-deportation movement. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(6): 1069-1093.
- Nyers, P. (2006) *Rethinking refugees: beyond states of emergency*. London: Routledge.
- Nyers, P. (2008) No one is illegal between city and nation. In E. F. Isin and G. N. Nielsen (eds.).
- O'Brien, M. (2000) Class struggle and the English poor laws. In M. Lavalette and G. Mooney (eds.).
- Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible citizenship: the cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Osterweil, M. and Chesters, G. (2007) Global Uprisings: towards a politics of the artisan. In S. Shukaitis and D. Graeber (eds.).
- Pallitto, R. and Heyman, J. (2008) Theorizing Cross-Border Mobility: Surveillance, Security and Identity. *Surveillance & Society*, 5(3): 315-333. [<http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles5%283%29/mobility.pdf> accessed 3.2.11]
- Panagakos, A. N. and Horst, H. A. (2006) Return to Cyberia: technology and the social worlds of transnational migrants. *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 6(2): 109-124.
- Papadopoulos, D. and Tsianos, V. (2007) The autonomy of migration: the animals of undocumented mobility. In A. Hickey-Moody & P. Malins (eds.) *Deleuzian encounters: studies in contemporary social issues*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Papadopoulos, D. and Tsianos, V. (forthcoming) After citizenship: autonomy of migration, organisational ontology and mobile commons. *Citizenship Studies*.
- Papadopoulos, D. Stephenson, N. and Tsianos, V. (2008) *Escape routes: control and subversion in the 21st century*. London: Pluto.
- Papastergiadis, N (2000) *The turbulence of migration: globalization, deterritorialization and hybridity*. Bristol: Polity Press.
- Parker, R. A. (1988) An historical background to residential care. In I. Sinclair (ed.).
- Parreñas, R. S. (2000) Migrant Filipina domestic workers and the international division of reproductive labor. *Gender and Society*, 14(4): 560-580.
- Parreñas, R. S. (2001) *Servants of globalization : women, migration and domestic work* . Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Parreñas, R. S. (2003) The care crisis in the Philippines: children and transnational

- families in the new global economy. In B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild (eds.).
- Parreñas, R. S. (2005a) *Children of global migration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Parreñas, R. S. (2005b) Long distance intimacy: class, gender and intergenerational relations between mothers and children in Filipino transnational families. *Global Networks*, 5(4): 317–336.
- Passavant, P. A. and Dean, J. (eds.) (2004) *Empire's new clothes: reading Hardt and Negri*. New York: Routledge.
- Peace, S. M. (2003) The development of residential and nursing home care in the United Kingdom. In J. S. Katz and S. M. Peace (eds) *End of life in care homes: a palliative care approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peace, S. M., Kellaher, L. A., and Willocks, D. M. (1997) *Re-evaluating residential care*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- PICUM (2002) *Book of solidarity: providing assistance to undocumented migrants*. (Volume 1) Brussels: PICUM.
[http://picum.org/picum.org/uploads/publication/Book%20of%20Solidarity%20VOL%201_1.pdf accessed 23.6.11]
- Piven, F. F. and Cloward, R. A. (1993) *Regulating the poor: the functions of public welfare*. New York: Vintage.
- Player, S. and Pollock, A. M. (2001) Long-term care: from public responsibility to private good. *Critical Social Policy*, 21(2): 231-255.
- Pollock, A. M with Leys, C., Price, D., Rowland, D. and Gnani, S. (2004) *NHS plc: the privatisation of health care*. London: Verso.
- Portes, A. (1999) Conclusion: towards a new world: the origins and effects of transnational activities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 463-477.
- Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, power, socialism*. London: New Left Books.
- Powell, M. (ed.) (1999) *New labour new welfare state? The third way in British social policy*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Precarias a la Derive (2003a) Close encounters in the second phase: the communication continuum: care-sex-attention.
[http://www.sindominio.net/karakola/antigua_casa/precarias/close_encounters.htm accessed 24.6.11]
- Precarias a la Derive (2003b) First stutterings of "Precarias a la Derive".
[<http://web.archive.org/web/20061013073945/www.sindominio.net/karakola/precarias/balbucesos-english.htm> accessed 24.6.11]
- Precarias a la Derive (2004) Adrift through the circuits of feminized precarious work.

Feminist Review, 77: 157-161.

Precarias a la Derive (2005a) Bodies, lies and videotape: between the logic of security and the logic of care. [<http://caringlabor.wordpress.com/2010/12/14/precarias-a-la-deriva-bodies-lies-and-videotape-between-the-logic-of-security-and-the-logic-of-care/> accessed 24.6.11]

Precarias a la Derive (2005b) Precarious lexicon. [<http://precariousunderstanding.blogspot.com/2006/07/27/precarious-lexicon-by-precarias-a-la-deriva/> accessed 24.6.11]

Precarias a la Derive (2006) A very careful strike – four hypotheses. *the commoner*, 11: 33-45. [<http://www.commoner.org.uk/11deriva.pdf> accessed 24.6.11]

Prideaux, S. (2005) *Not so new labour: a sociological critique of new labour's policy and practice*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Proudhon, P. J. (1969) *What is property?*. London: William Reeves.

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2010) Ethical doings in naturecultures. *Ethics, Place and Environment: A Journal of Philosophy and Geography*, 13(2):151-169.

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2011) Matters of care in technoscience: assembling neglecting things. *Social Studies of Science*, 41(1): 85-106.

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (forthcoming) Nothing comes without its world: knowledge that cares. *Sociological Review*.

Read, J. (2003) *The micro-politics of capital: Marx and the prehistory of the present*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Rigo, E. (2005) Citizenship at Europe's borders: some reflections on the post-colonial condition of Europe in the context of EU enlargement. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(1): 3-22.

Robinson, F. (1999) *Globalizing care: ethics, feminist theory and international relations*. Oxford: Westview Press.

Robinson, V. and Segrott, J. (2002) *Understanding the decision-making of asylum seekers*. Home Office Research Study 243. London: Home Office.

Rodgers, G., & Rodgers, J. (eds.) (1989) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation : the growth of atypical employment in Western Europe*. Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies.

Rodriguez, N. (1996) The battle for the border: notes on autonomous migration, transnational communities, and the state. *Social Justice*, 23(3): 21-37.

Rositer, N. (2006) *Organized networks: media theory, creative labour, new institutions*. Rotterdam and Amsterdam: NAI Publishers/Institute of Network Cultures.

Ruhs, M. and Anderson, B. (2006) Semi-compliance in the migration labour market.

COMPAS Working Paper 30.

Rygiel, K. (2011) Governing borderzones of mobility through e-borders: the politics of embodied mobility. In V. Squire (ed.).

Saggar, S. and Drea, J. (2001) *British public attitudes and ethnic minorities*. London: Cabinet Office Performance and Innovation Unit.

Salamon, L., Anheier, H. and List, R. (1999) *Global civil society; dimensions of the nonprofit sector*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Centre for Civil Society Studies.

Sales, R. (2002) The deserving and the undeserving: refugees, asylum seekers and welfare in Britain. *Critical Social Policy*, 22(3): 456-478.

Sales, R. (2007) Giving more than they receive? Migrant women and welfare in Britain. *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care*, 3(3): 6-19.

Sales, R. and Hek. R. (2004) Dilemmas of care and control: the work of an asylum team in a London Borough. In D. Hayes and B. Humphries (eds.).

Sassen, S. (2000) Women's burden: counter-geographies of globalization and the feminisation of survival. *Journal of International Affairs*, 53(2): 503-524.

Schierup, C.-U., Hansen, P. and Castles, S. (2006) *Migration, citizenship, and the European welfare state: a European dilemma*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmalzbauer, L. (2004) Searching for wages and mothering from afar: the case of Honduran transnational families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(5): 1317-1331.

Schultz, S. (2006) Dissolving boundaries and 'affective labor': on the disappearance of reproductive labor and feminist critique in Empire. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 17(1): 77-82.

Schuster, L. (2000) A Comparative Analysis of the Asylum Policy of Seven European Governments. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 13(1): 118-132.

Schuster, L. (2001) Political Asylum in Britain and Germany, in S. Ghatak and A. Showstack-Sassoon (eds) *Migration and mobilities: the European context*. London: Palgrave.

Schuster, L. (2003) *The use and abuse of political asylum in Britain and Germany*. London: Frank Cass.

Schuster, L. and Solomos, J. (1999) The politics of refugee and asylum policies in Britain: historical patterns and contemporary realities, in A. Bloch and C. Levy (eds.) *Refugees, citizenship and social policy in Europe*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Schuster, L. and Welch, M. (2005a) Detention of asylum seekers in the UK and US: deciphering noisy and quiet constructions. *Punishment & Society: An International Journal of Penology*, 7(4): 397-417

Schuster, L. and Welch, M. (2005b) Detention of asylum seekers in the US, UK,

- France, Germany, and Italy: a critical view of the globalizing culture of control. *Criminal Justice: The International Journal of Policy and Practice*, 5(4): 331-355.
- Schwenken, H. (2003) 'Sangatte': a case study in the political self-organisation of refugees and migrants in the European Union. *Paper presented at the EPCR Conference, Marburg, Germany, 18-21 September 2003.*
- Scott, J. C. (1985) *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1990) *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scourfield, J. Holland, S and Young, C. (2008) Social work in Wales since democratic devolution. *Australian Social Work*, 61(1): 42- 56
- Serres, M. (2007) *Parasite*. (Trans. L. R. Schehr). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sharma, N. (2007a) A dot and a line: 'race', space and the making of a global apartheid. *Cultural Studies Monthly*, 71: 39-53.
- Sharma, N. (2007b) Global apartheid and nation-statehood: instituting border regimes. In J. Goodman and P. James (eds.) *Nationalism and global solidarities: alternative projections to neoliberal globalisation*. New York: Routledge.
- Sharma, N. (2008) Citizenship and the Disciplining of (Im)migrant Workers in the United States. In S. McKay (ed.) *Refugees, Recent Migrants and Employment: Challenging Barriers and Exploring Pathways*. London: Routledge.
- Shelley, T. (2007) *Exploited: migrant labour in the new global economy*. London: Zed Books.
- Shiva, V. and Mies, M. (1993) *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.
- Shukaitis, S. (2009) *Imaginal machines: autonomy and self-organization in the revolutions of everyday life*. London/New York: Minor Compositions.
- Shukaitis, S. and Graeber, D. (eds.) (2007) *Constituent imagination: militant investigations // collective theorizations*. Oakland, Edinburgh, Baltimore: AK Press.
- Sitaropoulos, N. (2002) Refugee welfare in Greece: towards a remodelling of the responsibility-shifting paradigm? *Critical Social Policy*, 22(3): 436-455.
- Slack, P. (1988a) *Poverty and policy in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman.
- Slack, P. (1988b) *The English poor law, 1531-1782*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. D. (2000) *Myths and memories of the nation*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, C. (2006) The double indeterminacy of labour power: labour effort and labour mobility. *Work, Employment & Society*, 20(2): 389-402.

Smith, C. (2010) Go with the flow: labour power mobility and labour process theory. In P. Thompson and C. Smith (eds.).

Smith, M. P. and Guarnizo, L. (eds.) (1998) *Transnationalism from below*. New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers.

Smith, M. P. and Eade, J. (2008) *Transnational ties: cities, migrations and identities*. New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers.

Soguk, N. (2007) Border's capture: insurrectional politics, border-crossing humans, and the new political. In P. K. Rajman and C. Grundy-Warr (eds.) *Borderscapes: hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Squire, V. (2009) *The exclusionary politics of asylum*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Squire, V. (2011) The contested politics of mobility: politicizing mobility, mobilizing politics. In V. Squires (ed.).

Squire, V. (2011) (ed.) *The contested politics of mobility: borderzones and irregularity*. London: Routledge.

Stacey, C. (2005) Finding dignity in dirty work: the constraints and rewards of low-wage home care labour. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 27(6): 831-854.

Stalker, K. and Campbell, V. (1998) 'Person-centred planning: an evaluation of a training programme', *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 6(2): 130-42.

Steinfeld, R. J. (2001) *Coercion, contract, and free labor in the nineteenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stewart, K. (2007) *Ordinary affects*. London: Duke University Press.

Team Colors Collective. (eds.) (2010) *Uses of a whirlwind: movement, movements, and contemporary radical currents in the United States*. Oakland, Edinburgh, Baltimore: AK Press.

Thoburn, N. (2003) *Deleuze, Marx and politics*. London: Routledge.

Thompson, E. P. (1991) *The making of the English working class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Thompson, P. and Warhurst, C. (1998) *Workplaces of the future*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Business.

Thompson, P. and Smith, C. (eds.) (2010) *Working life: renewing labour process analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Torpey, J. (2002) *The invention of the passport: surveillance, citizenship, and the state*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tronti, M. (1979) Lenin in England. In Red Notes. (eds.) *Working class autonomy and the crisis: Italian Marxist texts and the theory and practice of class movement, 1964-79*. London: Red Notes/CSE Books.
- Tronto, J. C. (1993) *Moral boundaries: a political argument for an ethic of care*. London: Routledge.
- Tsianos, V. and Papadopoulos, D. (2006) Precarity: a savage journey to the heart of embodied capitalism. *Immaterial labour, multitudes and new social subjects: class composition in cognitive capitalism*. King's College, University of Cambridge, 29th – 30th April. [<http://www.geocities.com/immateriallabour/tsianospapadopaper2006.html> accessed 7.3.08]
- Tsianos, V. and Karakayali, S. (2010) Transnational migration and the emergence of the European border regime: an ethnographic analysis. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(3): 373-387.
- Twigg, J. (2000) *Bathing: the body in community care*. London: Routledge.
- Unterschreber (2008) No one is legal. *Mute*, 2(7): 44-51. [<http://www.metamute.org/en/Mute-Vol2-7-Show-Invisibles-migration-data-work> accessed 2.9.09]
- Vasta, E. (2004) *Informal employment and immigration networks: a review paper*. Oxford: Oxford University, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.
- Vasta, E. (2008) The paper market: 'borrowing' and 'renting' identity documents. *COMPAS Working Paper 61*. [<http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/WP0861%20Ellie%20Vasta.pdf> accessed 2.3.09]
- Verela, A. (2008) Residency documents for all!: notes to understand the movement of migrants in Barcelona. *Refuge*, 26(2): 121-132. [<http://pi.library.yorku.ca/ojs/index.php/refuge/article/viewFile/32083/29329> accessed 2.9.09]
- Verstraete, G. (2003) Technological frontiers and the politics of mobility in the European Union. In S. Ahmed, C. Castañeda, A-M. Fortier and M. Sheller (eds.) *Uprootings/regroundings: questions of home and migration*. Oxford: Berg.
- Vertovec, S. (1999) Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 447-462.
- Vertovec, S. (2009) *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Virno, P. (1996) Virtuosity and revolution: the political theory of exodus. In P. Virno and M. Hardt (eds.).

- Virno, P. (2004) *The grammar of the multitude*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Virno, P. and Hardt, M. (eds.) (1996) *Radical thought in Italy: a potential politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Waddington, J. (2003) Annual review article 2002: heightening tension in relations between trade unions and the labour government in 2002. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 4(2): 335-358.
- Waine, B, Tunstill, J., Meadows, P. and Peel, M. (2005) *Developing social care: values and principles*. Social Care Institute for Excellence. Bristol: Policy Press.
[<http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/positionpapers/pp04/values.pdf> accessed 3.9.09]
- Walters, N. (2004) Secure borders, safe haven, domopolitics, *Citizenship Studies*, 8 (3): 237-260.
- Walters, W. (2008) Acts of demonstration: mapping the territory of (non-)citizenship. In E. F. Isin and G. M. Nielsen (eds.) *Acts of citizenship*. London: Zed.
- Webber, F. (2011) Does Barnardo's legitimise child detention?. *Institute for Race Relations*
[<http://www.irr.org.uk/2011/march/ha000029.html> accessed 25.6.11]
- Welsh Refugee Council (2006) *Impact report 2004-2006: empowering refugee to rebuild their lives in South Wales*.
[<http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/OneStopCMS/Core/CrawlerResourceServer.aspx?resource=92A73200-4861-4C97-9A78-D3F4407A9342&mode=link&guid=118190e89de94c29a3fb4584001b88bf> accessed 5.04.09]
- Welsh Refugee Council (2007) *Impact report 2006-7*.
- Welsh Refugee Council (n.d.) Detention checklist – friends and support groups.
- Weindling, A. M. (2003) The confidential enquiry into maternal and child health (CEMACH). *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 88: 1034-1037.
- Williams, F. (1995) Race/ethnicity, gender and class in welfare states: a framework for comparative analysis. *Social Politics*, 2(2): 127-159.
- Williams, F (2001) In and beyond new labour: towards a new political ethics of care, *Critical Social Policy*, 21(4): 467-493.
- Williams, F. (2003) Trends in women's employment, domestic service and female migration: changing and competing patterns of solidarity. In T. Knijn and A. Komter (eds.) *Solidarity between the sexes and generations: transformations in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Williams, F. (2011) Markets and migrants in the care economy. *eurozine*.
[<http://www.eurozine.com/pdf/2011-04-18-williams-en.pdf> accessed 1.6.11]

- Wills, J. (2003) *On the frontline of care: a research report to explore home-care employment and service provision in Tower Hamlets*. London: UNISON.
- Wills, J., Datta, K., Evans, Y., Herbert, J., May, J. and McIlwaine, C. (2010) *Global cities at work: new migrant divisions of labour*. London: Pluto.
- Wolch, J. R. (1990) *The shadow state: government and voluntary sector in transition*. New York: The Foundation Centre.
- Wolkowitz, C. (2002) The social relations of body work. *Work, Employment and Society* 16(3): 497-510.
- Wolkowitz, C. (2006) *Bodies at work*. London: Sage.
- Wolkowitz, C. and Warhurst (2010) Embodying labour. In P. Thompson and C. Smith (eds.) *Working life: renewing labour process analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wright, S. (2002) *Storming heaven: class composition and struggle in Italian autonomist Marxism*. London: Pluto.
- Yeates, N. (2004a) A dialogue with 'global care chain' analysis: nurse migration in the Irish context. *Feminist Review*, 77: 79-95.
- Yeates, N. (2004b) Global care chains: critical reflections and lines of enquiry. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6(3): 369-391.
- Yeates, N. (2005) *Global care chains: a critical introduction*. Global Migration Perspectives, 44. Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration.
- Yeates, N. (2009) *Globalizing care economies and migrant workers: explorations in global care chains*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yeoh, B. S. A., Huang, S. and Lam, T. (2005) Transnationalizing the 'Asian' family: imaginaries, intimacies and strategic intents. *Global Networks*, 5(4): 307-315.
- Zetter, R. and Pearl, M (2000) The minority within a minority: refugee community based organisations in the UK and the impact of restrictionism. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 26(4): 675-98.
- Zibechi, R. (2010) *Dispersing power: social movements as anti-state forces*. (Trans. R. Ryan). Oakland, Edinburgh, Baltimore: AK Press.
- Zontini, E. (2004) Immigrant women in Barcelona: coping with the consequences of transnational lives. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(6): 1113-1144.

Appendix A

FULL LIST OF AGENCIES AND INDIVIDUALS THAT CONSTITUTE THE EXECUTIVE GROUP OF THE WELSH STRATEGIC MIGRATION PARTNERHIP (WSMP)

UK Borders Agency (UKBA)
Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA)
Welsh Assembly Government (WAG)
Police (Welsh Association of Chief Police Officers level)
Association of Directors of Education in Wales (ADEW)
Association of Directors of Social Services (ADSS)
Local Health Boards
Local Authority Elected Members
Job Centre Plus
Welsh Refugee Council
British Red Cross
Refugee Voice Wales
Careers Wales
Faith Communities
Association of Directors of Social Services (ADSS) Cymru
Equality and Human Rights Commission
CYTUN (Churches Together in Wales)

Note: the list is as it appears on the WSMP website. See:
<http://www.newport.gov.uk/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=refugeesylum.homepage>
accessed 19.3.10.

Appendix B

ASYLUM SUPPORT AGREEMENT

This page explains the conditions you must obey if you are an asylum applicant who receives support from us. For details of the kind of support available, and who can receive it, see Asylum Support.

If you meet the requirements to receive asylum support, we will give you a document known as an asylum support agreement, which sets out the terms of your support. You should read this document carefully. You will be asked to sign it to confirm that you understand what you are required to do while you are receiving support and will keep to those conditions.

If you break the conditions, your support may be stopped temporarily or permanently.

The conditions of your support are that you must:

- travel to the housing we provide as your case owner has arranged;
- live at the address that is officially approved. You may not live anywhere else;
- make sure you and your family members follow any rules that apply at the place where you live. Disruptive or violent behaviour, and doing anything that results in deliberate damage to property, will not be tolerated. Violent behaviour may result in a criminal prosecution;
- collect your cash support once a week, on any day from Monday to Friday, from the post office where it has been arranged;
- obey any requirements for reporting to us and staying in contact with your case owner; and
- answer as quickly as possible when the UK Border Agency asks you for information about any aspect of your asylum application.

You must tell your case owner if your circumstances change, such as if:

- you change your name;
- any of your dependants reach their 18th birthday;
- you move to a different address;
- you get married or divorced, or separate from your partner;
- you are hospitalised;
- you, or your partner, become pregnant or have a baby;
- any of your children leave school, or leave home;
- any other family members join you in the United Kingdom, or leave you;
- anyone else joins you in your accommodation or leaves you;
- you are put in prison;
- you receive or gain access to money that you had not previously told us about;
- you receive or gain access to money after selling something; or
- you no longer want us to provide accommodation for you.

You should inform your case owner in writing, and sign the letter. This will prevent any delay in updating your records.

Appendix C

Biographical index of participants whose stories are explicitly referred to or quoted during the thesis.

Migrants are split into four principle categories: i. care workers; ii. Asylum applicants; iii. Calais migrants; iv. Other migrants.

Does not include details of other participants quoted, such as case workers, care home managerial staff, migrant activists and so on.

All information is correct at the time of interview. Although where relevant, such as if an asylum applicant has now been granted leave to remain, such information maybe included.

Key for codes used:

P =	Participant
CW =	Care Worker
AA =	Asylum applicant
C =	Cleaner
CM =	Migrant living in, or who had recently passed through, Calais
H =	Hospitality sector
OM =	Other migrants who participated in the study but not included in Table 2.1 chapter 2

Thus a participant who works as a care worker will have a P in brackets including a unique number identifying them, followed with CW e.g. [P4, CW]. Whereas a migrant living or who has recently passed through Calais or surrounding area would look like [P002, CM]

CARE WORKERS [CW]

EEA (A8 AND A2) NATIONALS

[P1, CW] Erin, a Polish 26 year old mother with a a degree in Child Psychology. She migrated to South Wales in 2005 with her son staying behind to be cared for by her parents. About two years following migrating, once she felt the conditions were stable enough to do so, she brought her son over to live in the UK. During the writing of the thesis she got a job as a coordinator at a support services provider working seven hours a day Monday to Friday so that she can care for her son. She is in a stable relationship with a 27 year old man from South Wales and her son now lives with her in Cardiff. She plans to get married in the near future.

[P2, CW] Laura, is a 28 year old single mother from Poland. She is separated from her daughter's father who does not have much contact with his son. She obtained her first job in a care home for older people in late 2004 through a recruitment agency operating in Poland. She initially left her young daughter in the care of her mother and sister when she migrated but also had to send money back to pay a childminder to look after her daughter when her mother and sister were working. She returned to Poland for short visits as often as possible. She has worked in a number of different care homes and now works as a support worker.

[P3, CW] Marcos, was born in 1979 and had worked as a long-haul truck driver for over two years until he was made redundant in 2005. After a few months without any luck finding work he decided to answer a recruitment agency advertisement for care workers in the UK. He moved to the UK in October 2005, initially working in a care home for older people. He continued with this job for about a year and then decided to sign up to an agency that provided domiciliary support services. He has moved agency on a number of occasions but continues to work as a support worker. He is married with a four year old son. His wife and son moved to live in the UK in late 2009.

[P4, CW] Alex, is in her early twenties and migrated to the UK at the beginning of 2005 following an initial trip to a friend who was living near London. She has worked in a variety of care settings including both care homes for older people and institutions for people with learning and mental health difficulties. She now co-ordinates the small residential unit she works in where 4 people with mental health difficulties live.

[P5, CW] Lucy, is twenty four and came to live in the UK in early 2006. She initially worked at a residential institution for people with learning and mental health difficulties where she met Lucy. They moved in with each other in 2007. She continues to work in care industry now as a 'support worker' in a small residential facility for people with mental health difficulties.

[P6, CW] Paula, lives with her husband and two year old child who was born in the UK following their migration a couple of month after Poland became part of the EAA in May 2004. Her husband is often away for considerable amounts of time working as a long haul lorry driver. She works in a care home for older people as a care assistant.

[P7, CW] Sophia, she migrated to the UK soon after her divorce after hearing from a friend about an opening in the care home where she worked. She migrated a little over 3 years prior to our interview in early 2009. Her son is cared for by her parents and she intends to return to Poland at some point.

[P8, CW] Dawn, from Hungary moved to the UK in September 2004 after obtaining a job in a care home for older people through a recruitment agency. She has moved jobs on a number of occasions. She has a young boy born in the UK and whose father is from Cardiff. She lives with a number of other migrants one of whom Julia also works as a care worker and has a four year old son.

WORK PERMIT HOLDERS

[P9, CW] Nancy, migrated to the UK over four years prior to our meeting in the care home. She is 35 years old and married with two children, a seven year old son and twelve year old daughter. Her husband and children continue to live in the Philippines. She is a trained nurse but due to the problems she encountered with the adaptation process she works as a senior care worker.

[P10, CW] Ronda, is a 30 years old Filipina who migrated to the UK just over three years prior to our interview and has worked in the same home as a care assistant ever

since. She has been married for five years.

[P11, CW] Ken, who is in his late twenties, lives in the UK with his wife who works as senior care worker in another care home. He migrated to the UK in late 2005 a little over a year after she did bringing their five year old son with him and works as a care assistant in a care home for older people.

[P12, CW] Jasmine, is 37 and has two children both of whom continue to live in the Philippines. She is divorced and came to the UK a year after this following a successful application through a recruitment agency.

[P13, CW] Malaya, has worked in the UK for just over four years. She is a senior care worker but is also a trained nurse. However, due to the difficulties she experienced with the adaptation process she moved to work in another care home that does not provide the possibility of adaptation. She is in her mid thirties and is married with three children all of whom live in the Philippines. She is considering migrating to the Middle East to work as a nurse there again.

[P14, CW] Alison, is a 39 year old Filipina migrant from the Philippines. She is a nurse with over ten years of experience but like a number of the other migrants experienced problems with the adaptation process and as such is working as a senior care worker. She is married with no children.

[P15, CW] Rosie, from the Philippines has worked in the UK as a senior care workers for just under four years. She is thirty four and is married to Tony who followed her to the UK around a year after she migrated. They have two daughters who continue to live in the Philippines.

[P16, CW] Alys, migrated to the UK from the Philippines in 2003 to work as a senior care worker in a care home for older people. She is married with a six year old son. About nine months following her move to the UK she was followed by her husband Daniel who works in the same care home as a care assistant. A year after Daniel migrated they brought their son over to live with them. They intend to apply for indefinite leave to remain.

[P17, CW] Emma, has been living in the UK for just over four years since she migrated from the Philippines. She is married to Mike and they have a two year old son who was born in the UK. They met each other in the UK at a sporting even organised by members of the Filipino community in South Wales, with Filipinos from all around the area attending. Mike migrated to Cardiff a little after Emma and initially lived with his mother who had migrated previously to work in the Hospital as a nurse. When we initially met Emma informed me that she intends to get Indefinite Leave to Remain (IRL) when possible and then to train as a nurse. If successful she will continue to work as a senior care worker in order to financial sustain themselves.

[P18, CW] Claire, is a thirty two year old trained nurse who due to problems with her adaptation is working as a senior care worker. She has worked a care home for older people in a town outside Cardiff for over two years and prior to this worked in Swansea. She has two children aged 7 and 9 both of whom continue to live in the Philippines.

[P19, CW] **Ruth**, is in her mid thirties. She migrated to the UK in 2002 and had been living there for almost five years at the time we met. She migrated at the same time as her husband who had been recruited to work as a social worker for Cardiff City Council. They have two children, both boys aged 10 and 8.

[P20, CW] **Nyasha**, is a widowed migrant in her early thirties from Zimbabwe with two children who still live there. She aims to regularise her status by applying for indefinite leave to remain and then bring them over to live with her once she has cleared her debts and is more financially stable.

[P21, CW] **Bethan**, from has worked in the care industry for over 3 years after initially entering the UK on a students visa and obtaining work in a care home through a friend.

[P22, CW] **'Poppy'**

Zimbabwe. Married. Two children. Lives with husband and children in the UK. Migrated to UK following husband being recruited to work as a social workers. Works directly to care home also does work on weekends with an agency.

[P23, CW] **Flora**, from Ghana has worked in the care industry in the UK for over seven years. She initially worked for two years as a care worker through agencies while completing her masters degree. She is now a work permit holder and plans to train as a nurse if she can successfully obtain indefinite leave to remain.

[P24, CW] **Karl**, is twenty eight and from Nigeria. He has worked in the UK for three years and plans to move to Canada where he has relatives who have settled there.

STUDENT VISA (NON-EEA)

[P25, CW] **Sara**, has lived in the UK since 2006. She works through agencies while she completes a degree at Cardiff university.

[P26, CW] **Eduardo**, is a Brazilian in his late-twenties trained as a clinical psychologist married to a Portuguese woman. Despite the fact that he is married to a EU citizen he had encountered considerable problems with regularising his status. He was currently retraining to be able to practice psychology professionally in the UK.

[P27, CW] **Erica**, moved to Cardiff around a year prior to our interview. She had initially migrated to London just over three years ago but came to Cardiff in order to continue her studies. As well as undertaking care work she also works in the hospitality sector.

[P28, CW] **Andreas**, is in his early thirties and from Zimbabwe. He is currently undertaking a degree in social work. He has previously worked on a work permit in two care homes for older people in South Wales and continues to work in the care industry through an agency on a part time basis. He finds juggling studying and work very difficult and looks forward to working as a social worker in the UK in the future.

UNDOCUMENTED MIGRANTS

[P29, CW] Anna, a Zimbabwean born in 1976 initially entered the UK at the beginning of 2001. She overstayed her visa and a few months after this found work through a friend in a care home in South Wales. She stayed in this job for around a year until she was able to access residency papers through another friend. She has worked in a variety of different institutional settings and obtains employment through a number of different agencies.

[P30, CW] Virginia, like the majority of undocumented migrants I spoke with Virginia accessed the labour market through employment agencies. She had lived in undocumented status for over five years when we met and in 2010 she made an asylum application. She received a fairly quick positive decision and now works in the care industry in London.

[P31, CW] Grace, since overstaying her tourist visa in 2002 Grace has had a number of different jobs from office cleaning, to domestic care work as well as care work in institutional settings. At the time of the interview she was working through an agency in the care industry in South Wales.

[P32, CW] Patrick, entered the UK in 2001 using a 'fake' passport and other documents and has lived in the country without authorisation since this time. He lives in Newport and continues to work through an agency.

[P33, CW] Faith, is in her mid thirties and from Malawi. She initially claimed asylum but once it was apparent that she was not going to be successful she obtained documents from a friend and began working as a care assistant employed through a number of different agencies in the South Wales region. She has two daughters who living in Malawi.

[P34, CW] Janet, is a mother of two from Uganda. She arrived in the UK in 2000 and has lived without authorisation since overstaying her visa. During the course of the thesis left and started working as a cleaner.

ASYLUM APPLICANTS [AA]

[P01, AA] **Zemar**, is a twenty year old migrant from Afghanistan and identifies as being from the Pashtun ethnic group. He claimed asylum as a seventeen year old and was almost twenty one at the time of the interview. He is still waiting to have his claim processed. Like many people the Home Office disputed his age and he was therefore treated as an adult and spent the first two months of his claim in a number of different detention centres.

[P02, AA] **Zani**, is a middle aged Albanian who claimed asylum in 2001. He is married to a UK citizen but had not at the time received a decision on his claim.

[P03, AA] **Gaynor**, is a Cameroonian woman in her late thirties. She has two children who still live in Cameroon and following her being granted refugee status she is in the process of getting them over to live with her through family reunion legislation.

[P04, AA] **Tavon**, is in his early thirties and from Cameroon. He is currently on Section 4 support and awaiting a decision after claiming asylum over four years ago.

[P05, AA] **Kesia**, has one young child born in the UK. She claimed asylum in early 2004 after fleeing Cameroon and is now in receipt of Section 4 support.

[P06, AA] **Anthony**, fled the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2001 and claimed asylum immediately upon arrival in the UK. He is still awaiting a decision on his claim and like many others from the DRC lives on Section 4 support.

[P07, AA] **Dawit**, is in his mid twenties and from Eritrea. He had all his support cut in 2006 after the NASS refused his Section 4 application. He is one of the happiest people I know.

[P08, AA] **Alem**, is in his early twenties and from Eritrea. He migrated to the UK with his brother and lived in Italy for around a year before crossing into the UK. He migrated with his brother but got separated during the period crossing into the UK. This meant that they made asylum claims at different times and got sent to different parts of the Country. Despite attempts to be reunited his requests have not been granted.

[P09, AA] **Nesim**, claimed asylum over four years ago. He is an Iraqi Kurd in his late twenties.

[P010, AA] **Umit**, is thirty one years of age and categorises himself as an Iraqi Kurd. He left Iraq in 2001 and claimed asylum in the UK in 2003. He is still awaiting a decision.

[P011, AA] **Saad**, is in his mid twenties. He fled Iraq in 2002 and claimed asylum in the UK in mid 2003. He has yet to have his claim processed despite the fact that his brother and parents who claimed asylum at the same time have all received positive decision and were granted refugee status. He lives with them in Cardiff on subsistence only support while he waits for his decision.

[P012, AA] **Jassim**, is 32 and from Iraqi Kurdistan. He claimed asylum in early 2003. His claim for asylum was rejected and he has had all subsistence support including housing cut. He is in the process of making a fresh claim.

[P013, AA] **Debbie**, is a mother of four from Nigeria and has lived in Cardiff for three years.

[P014, AA] **Eshe**, claimed asylum in 2004 after fleeing with her 2 year old daughter. She is from the Ogoni region of Nigeria.

[P015, AA] **Leeto**, is 29 and from Nigeria. He initially entered on a students visa and claimed asylum on entry. He was initially refused but lodged a fresh claim. He has been waiting over four years for a decision.

[P016, AA] **David**, claimed asylum nearly five years previously after leaving Sierra Leone due to political reasons. He is married with two children all of whom still live in Sierra Leone. During the writing of the thesis his claim for asylum was granted and he is attempting to bring his family over to the UK to live with him.

[P017, AA] **Abbas**, is in his late thirties and from Sudan. He has had all his support administered by the NASS cut following the refusal of his claim for asylum.

[P018, AA] **Aiesha**, from the Sudan is a 28 year old woman. She has been living in the UK for over four years and has a one year old child born in the UK. Despite the fact that the Home Office initially disputed where she was from she was granted indefinite leave to remain in late 2010.

[P019, AA] **Hassan**, is in his early thirties and from Sudan. He is in receipt of Section 4 support and is awaiting the decision on a fresh claim lodged through a local charity *Asylum Justice* that provides professional legal assistance on a pro bono basis.

[P020, AA] **Samir**, from the Sudan is in his late thirties. He is separated from his wife and they now have separate claims for asylum following the refusal of their claims. He has a two year old child. He has been waiting over a year to hear whether his claim for Section 4 support will be granted. During the writing of the thesis he was granted indefinite leave to remain. He currently lives in accommodation provided by a local charity after becoming homeless.

[P021, AA] **Hannah**, from Uganda claimed asylum at the beginning of 2002. She was dispersed to Cardiff in early 2005 with her four year old daughter. She received a positive decision on her fresh claim in early 2010.

[P022, AA] **Tariana**, is from Zimbabwe, she is widowed and has two daughter both of whom live with relatives in Zimbabwe. She claimed asylum in 2002 and is still awaiting the outcome of her application.

[P023, AA] **Gina**, is a mother of three from Zimbabwe. She began her claim for asylum seven years previously. She is in receipt of Section 4 support. Her eldest daughter was starting her GCSE's the following academic year.

CALAIS MIGRANTS QUOTED DIRECTLY IN THE THESIS [CM]

[P001, CM] Adom, is a 28 year old Ghanaian migrant who had recently passed through Calais and, after less than a week there, managed to enter the UK without authorisation.

[P002, CM] Nafis, is an Afghani migrant from the Hazara ethnic group. He had been in Calais for just under four months when we met. A couple of months after I returned to the UK he managed to clandestinely pass into the UK. He logged a claim for asylum and after around a year of waiting was granted indefinite leave to remain.

OTHER MIGRANTS QUOTED DIRECTLY IN THE THESIS [OM]

[P003, OM, C] Elin, is a Ugandan migrant who has lived in the UK since 2001. She is widowed and has a twelve year old daughter who still lives in Uganda.

[P004, OM, C] Joan, is a refused asylum applicant from Zimbabwe. She has lived without authorised documentation for a number of years. She has worked in a number of sectors including various forms of care work but when we met she was working through an agency as a cleaner.

[P005, OM, H] Jac, is a Sudanese asylum applicant who claimed asylum in 2001 and had his claim completely refused by 2006. He has been living in-between Manchester and Cardiff since this time. He hopes one day to find a way to regularise his status but his generally happy with his life.