Europe, migrations, and cosmopolitanism*

Europa, las migraciones y el cosmopolitismo

*A Europa, as migrações e o cosmopolitismo**

Octávio Sacramento**

Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Departamento de Economia, Sociologia e Gestão
Centro de Estudos Transdisciplinares para o Desenvolvimento Vila Real, Portugal

Abstract

The analysis outlined in this paper discusses the attitudes of the European borders in relation to the challenges posed by external migration flows. Special attention is given to the way Europe, through the Schengen Agreement, establishes a strategic combination between the free movement of certain categories of people and the blocking of many other "unwanted" mobilities. At the same time, the paper briefly considers the identity policies underlying the selectivity of the Schengen area and their impact on a post-national and cosmopolitan European project.

Keywords: Europe, External migration, Borders and boundaries, Selectivity, Cosmopolitanism.

Resumen

En el análisis esbozado aquí se analizan los posicionamientos de las fronteras europeas en relación con los retos planteados por las migraciones externas. Se presta especial atención a la forma como Europa, a través del Acuerdo de Schengen, establece una combinación estratégica entre la libre circulación de ciertas categorías de personas y el bloqueo de muchas otras movilidades "no deseadas". Se consideran también, brevemente, las políticas de identidad subyacentes a la selectividad de la zona Schengen y sus impactos en la construcción de un proyecto europeo post-nacional y cosmopolita.

Palabras clave: Europa, Migraciones externas, Fronteras, Selectividad, Cosmopolitismo.

Resumo

A reflexão aqui desenvolvida discute os posicionamentos das fronteiras europeias face aos fluxos migratórios externos que as interpelam. É prestada especial atenção à forma como a Europa, através do Acordo de Schengen, estabelece uma conjugação estratégica entre a livre circulação de determinadas categorias de pessoas e a obstrução de muitas outras mobilidades tidas como indesejadas. São ainda consideradas, resumidamente, as políticas de identidade subjacentes à selectividade do espaço Schengen e os seus impactos na construção de um projecto europeu pós-nacional e cosmopolita.

Palavras-chave: Europa, Migrações externas, Fronteiras, Selectividade, Cosmopolitismo.

1. Introduction

It is often said that the present is a time of mobility and connections on a planetary scale. With this notion of social life's fluency, people tend not to give the right amount of attention to the political economy of the global movement of people and things, forgetting that not everything and not everyone live in a world overflowing with liquid fluidity (Bauman, 2000). What is happening in the Mediterranean Sea is a tragic living proof of it. The borders of the repressive "fortress Europe" (Carr, 2012; Linke, 2010), filtering and restricting exaggeratedly a large contingency of external migratory flows regarded as undesirable, are a clear evidence that most people's relationship with the world leans towards immobility. In Europe a continent that opens their borders and welcome certain people and economic interests, does exactly the opposite when faced with mobilities constituted by citizens that are poor and/or belong to ethnic minorities, most of the time imagined as a threat to their socioeconomic harmony and internal security. It is this paradoxical coexistence of freedom of movement and denial of that freedom which is discussed in the following text, trying to highlight the profoundly negative impact of such a policy setting in the necessary process of building a "cosmopolitan", based on a matrix of identity post national (Beck & Grande, 2007; Delanty, 2005).

Although it assumes a format which is relatively close to the test, the analysis developed here is empirically raised and sustained by the participation of the author of three experiments on ethnographic research themes (immigration detention illegal in Portugal, prostitution in the Iberian context, intimacies and mobility transatlantic Euro-Brazilian)[1] that somehow intersect with the issues of borders, migration and mobility of the European cosmopolitanism in space. On the other hand, this same analysis summarizes and develops some discussions initiated on previous works (Sacramento & Ribeiro, 2009; Sacramento & Ribeiro, 2011) and closely follows the lines concourses reflected in a recent communication (Sacramento, 2015) on the functioning of the Schengen area with its free circulation for europeans and its perverse consequences.

2. Control and Sorting of Migratory Flows

When faced with international migration, Europe holds a deeply selective management of migratory flows and goods, and takes different discretionary positions: attenuates internal borders and hardens the boundaries of its external perimeter; accepts the mobilization of

certain citizens and at the same time, they start an all-out war with all others who do not meet with certain economic criteria of admissibility[2]. This paradoxical Europe has its genesis in the Schengen agreement which currently integrates a vast block of 26 countries in which it was abolished systematic control of internal borders (de-bordering)[3]. In contrast, and in order to enhance common security, a strategy, integrated on intense surveillance on the external perimeter border, has been outlined, tightening migration policies and sophisticating mechanism of detention and extradition of illegal immigrants considered (re-bordering).

During the process, big changes took place regarding the administration of borders. Always aiming to achieve sufficient flexibility and scope in order to intensify its surveillance on the european outer line space, the internal monitoring of foreign citizens and the deterrence of potential immigrants in the contexts of origin and transit migration (Broeders, 2007; Lechevalier & Wielgohs, 2013). The capacity of repression and screening of citizens of third countries seeking access to States belonging to the common area established by Schengen is increasing. This is due, above all, to the existence of a complex integrated system of surveillance and information[4] that extends in a diffusive way into the interior and exterior of the European continent. In this "European panopticon" (Broeders, 2009; Engbersen, 2001), migration control has become an operation virtually ubiquitous, going far beyond the management and inspection of transit in the border points.

The security sector became particularly intense after 9/11 and the spiral of social panic around terrorism, thereafter, began to take shape. A terrorist risk, often exploited in an exacerbated way, it was (and still is) the largest axle booster and legitimator of more restrictive migration policies under the pretext of a safer Europe (Karyotis, 2007). Underlining the majority of these policies are the social representations in which poor immigrants from the south tend to be presented as dangerous threats to European security and values (Anderson, 2013; Saux, 2007).

---

2   The double face of European migration policies is well illustrated by the borderless Europe - fortress Europe. Seen, among others, Houtum and Pijpers (2007), Maas (2005) and Rumford (2007).

3   The Schengen Agreement was celebrated in 1985 and incorporated into the framework of the European Union (EU) through the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997, after that, it was established the so-called Area of Freedom, Security and Justiceamong several European states. Currently, the countries that are part of the so-called Schengenland are: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the Czech Republic. Some EU countries (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Croatia, Ireland and United Kingdom) are not members of the Schengen area, while others (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland) are not part of the EU but are part of this free transit area (EU, Sd). For a more detailed knowledge of the history of Schengen and its institutions, principles and functioning, see, for example, Bacas & Kavanagh (2013) and Zaiotti (2011).

4   It is highlighted the European Frontiers Agency (Frontex), a complex information structure in which four major systems of registration and monitoring are of particular relevance(SIS II), the European Dactyloscopy fingerprint system (Eurodac), the Visa Information System (VIS) and the The European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur).

In this regard, the fight against terrorism and the promotion of internal security are frequently associated with the repression of immigration: "irregular immigration" is being subsumed into a European legal setting which treats it as a crime and a risk against legitimate administrative practices (Guild, Carrera & Balzacq, 2008, p.4). The criminalization of immigrants and the transformation of the European continent into a secure geography is well evident in the defense and combat logic prevailing in discourses and practices in the face of migration, as well as excessive recourse to the detention of illegal immigrants for later extradition (Giorgi, 2010; Leerkes & Broeders, 2010; Ribeiro, Baptista, Ribeiro & Sacramento, 2007; Turnbull, 2015).

In this framework of intense border and flow oversight, Europe under the auspices of Schengen operates in a particularly selective way, with a more or less restrictive depending on the geographical orientation (north / south) of transits, the type of migrants, types of mobility (e.g. tourist or migratory, people or capital) and / or the social or symbolic profile of the immigrants. Their borders don't present themselves in the same way to all people, nor are they experienced in the same way, thus configuring a cosmopolitan paradox, as Rumford (2007, p.337) points out: "the same border can be experienced in different ways by different sections of the population (in the sense that some people find it easier to cross the border than others) for whom the border

does not appear cosmopolitan at all". Certainly a tourist or a businessman, especially if they come from well-ranked countries in the global geopolitical scenario, will not have the same problems in crossing European borders, nor will they experience the same dread of experience as a low-skilled migrant woman from the periphery World. In general, borders are related in a different way to the "mobility regimes" (Schiller & Salazar, 2013) of tourism and migration: tourist mobility is desired and frontiers fade, while migratory movements tend to be seen as a factor of instability and potential threat and are therefore subject to closed scrutiny and constraints. Raised as almost insurmountable obstacles for poor citizens, borders are, at the same time, dissipated to citizens of the most privileged nationalities and classes, and to economic interests in which, in many cases, call into question the very sovereignty of States (Alvarez, 1995; Weber, 2009). Its selective permeability - such as a membrane that identifies, classifies, filters, and only lets go of whatever and whomever it wants - expresses deep material and symbolic asymmetries that establish hierarchies in mobilities, connections, and citizenships on a transnational scale (Anderson, 2013, Cunningham & Heyman, 2004; Kearney, 2004; Sarró & Mapril, 2011). It was possible to witness firsthand these global hierarchies in the ethnographic work field on the mobilities and configurations of intimacy between European men and Brazilian women (Sacramento, 2014). European men who go to Brazil to spend their holidays discover a

country that wants them (above all, they have capital, therefore, they are potential consumers) and opens their doors to them. On the contrary, women who interact with European men and who seek to enter Europe are confronted with an authentic strength that only at great costs allows them to pass, even if they are needed as cheap and multi-functional workforce, especially to take on traditionally feminine tasks that western women, having entered the labor market, no longer have the possibility to perform (Ambrosini, 2006; Boccagni, 2011; Ehrenreich & Hochschild, 2002).

Considered together, tourism and migration flows express the contrasts induced by the selective permeability of European borders and the general borders of the rich countries, in an ambiguous game of opening and closing that conditions the volume and composition of the different flows that intercept them. There is a clear dimension of political economy that is always important in thinking about mobility: "it is not neutral and reveals forms of power, control, monitoring and surveillance, and should be read as power and performance. [...] this power varies according to the individual or social group, according to structures of power" (Lemos, 2009, p.29). For Werbner (1999), this political reflection on mobilities fades into the metaphors of fluidity, hybridity and double consciousness[5], which considers elitist intellec-

tual artifacts dissociated from the difficulties and concerns of the migrant working classes. It is important to always keep in mind that most people are part of the "sedentary masses", so the metaphors of a moving world, as Friedman (2002) points out, are manifestly exaggerated.

3. Identity Borders and Cosmopolitanism

The relationship between Europe and migration is based on a system of qualification, classification and selection of transits, and on the coexistence of freedom of movement with restriction on mobility. In this system, some are in constant movement while many others live the motion only in their dreams, relating to the places they most desire only through the images of the media space and of their own geographical imagination (Appadurai, 1996; Salazar, 2010, 2011). Notions such as gated globe (Cunningham, 2004) for the world scenario, or gated continent (Carr, 2012) for the European context, assertively reflect the discriminatory nature of many borders. By way of discrimination, The political administrative borders of territorial delimitation (borders) also function as borders of identity (boundaries) (Fassin, 2011, pp.214-215), establishing a marked demarcation between different socio-cultural profiles, and only migrants with some economic affluence and / or social status whose ethnicity is not associated with threat stereotypes are able to move without major constraints. The ostensibly hyper-vigilant and selective Europe, functions as an authentic "factory of exclusion" (Engbersen, 2001; Linke, 2010) against a ra-

---

5   Metaphors that refer to a post-national, in-motion, cosmopolitan and ecumenical world (Bauman, 2000; Elliott & Urry, 2010; Hannerz, 1997; Inda & Rosaldo, (2002).

cialized "other" that is perceived above all as a source of identity pollution and danger:

> Europeanness is contrasted with the enemy-outsider: the anti-citizen, the fleeting figure of the terrorist, the border crosser, the non-sedentary black body. The figure of the enemy-outsider has emerged as a trope for people in motion, including migrants, immigrants, refugees, seekers of asylum and transient border-subjects, who are perceived as potential threats to "homeland" mobile security. Human figures are criminalized as icons of global instability and disorder. In Europe's imaginative geography, such frictions are articulated through the idiom of race (Linke, 2010, p.116).

Significantly disseminated stigmatization and exclusion are, thus, two of the most immediate consequences of the political stances that dominate the management of migration and the functioning of European borders. This is visible, from the outset, in the more or less subtle way in which immigrant communities tend to be transformed into scapegoats of various problems, namely in the economic and security spheres (Fekete, 2004; Gorodzeisky & Semyonov, 2009; Vertovec, 2011). The representations and labels most often used to refer to immigration almost always reflect this orientation. The usual use of terminologies that generate fears (e.g. illegal) and metaphors of war (e.g. *fight, combat, defense*) promote the identity association of immigrants to danger,

disorder and criminality, which leads to suspicion (Balzacq & Carrera, 2006; Bauman, 2005; Sohoni & Sohoni, 2014). At the same time as stigmatization and social panic around immigration are encouraged, European authorities adopt repressive strategies (e.g. exacerbated border security, tightening immigration policies and increasingly restrictive admissibility criteria) which are themselves the main causes Of many of the problems (e.g. trafficking in human beings) that one wants to face and many other perverse consequences (Bommes & Sciortino, 2011; Sacramento & Ribeiro, 2011).

The generalized production of exclusions in the sphere of migration seems to be ideologically driven by identity politics subjugated to the idea of maintaining, and if possible reinforcing, the innumerable borders (e.g. political, administrative, ethnic, poverty) of a deeply unequal organized world . The primary objective is to block the constitution of ethnoscapes (Appadurai, 1996) considered as unwanted. The profusion of immigration camps and detention centers for extradition - which exist throughout the European area and in neighboring countries, the largest of which are located on the southern border, on the Mediterranean coast[6], are the most violent example of the processes of exclusion that fall on the individuals who personify the denial of the ideological dispositions of dominant identity politics.

---

6   See the Migreurop border observatory (2012), in particular its letter of the main detention centers location.

This *encampment* (Harrell-Bond, 2002) consti-tutes, in a particularly cruel and paradigmatic way, the condition of immigrant attitudes: un-placed, displaced and unclassifiable (Bourdieu, 1998); In short, "human refuse" of globaliza-tion (Bauman, 2005). Subjacent seems to be the belief that the world will only be more secure and stable if the situations that may dilute and complicate the order of borders that regulates more identities and inequalities, is eliminated or at least controlled (Amoore, 2006). At the same time, a culturalist conception of immi-grant cultures appears as a threat to a national culture imagined as unitary, homogeneous and static (Vertovec, 2011). The repressive nature of European migration policies - which are also, implicitly, Identity and cultural policies - configures a parochial tendency of closure to diversity. Openness to the world and inclusive-ness are denied, fundamental characteristics of cosmopolitanism (Schiller, Darieva & Grun-er-Domic, 2011; Skrbi & Woodward, 2007) as a humanist project of coexistence and sharing of differences in common social spaces of con-struction of borderless citizenship[7]. In addition to the exacerbated security issues, this denial tends to be justified by the argument that great-er openness would imply the complete erosion of local and national identities. It neglects the fact that cosmopolitanism is not at all a pole

of possible dichotomies and does not imply re-nunciation of identity ties at local and national scale (Beck & Grande, 2007; Delanty, 2005). In this sense, Appiah (quoted by Hannerz, 2007, p.79) speaks to us of rooted cosmopolitanism, also dubbed cosmopolitan patriotism, as a pos-sibility of a global configuration "[...] in which everyone is rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cul-tural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other, different, people". It is precisely this inclusive simultaneity of coexisting cultur-al particularities that cosmopolitanism presup-poses[8].

For this, it is essential to have effective knowledge and positive valuation of differ-ences, without dichotomous logics of recipro-cal exclusion, without ghosts or fears towards the "other", without hierarchies or processes of dissolution (or assimilation), as pointed out by Beck & Grande (2007) in defense of the imper-ative necessity of a cosmopolitan Europe:

> [...] *recognition of difference* becomes the maxim of thought, social life and practice, both internally and towards other societies. It neither orders differences hierarchical-ly nor dissolves them, but accepts them as such, indeed invests them with a positive value. Cosmopolitanism affirms what is ex-

---

7   As Kleingeld (2013) recalls, the term "cosmopolitan" derives from the Greek word "citizen of the world" (κοσμοπολίτης), so that cosmopolitanism should be considered as a concept centered on the notion of global citizenship, whether in the literal sense (political cosmopolitanism) or in the metaphorical sense (moral or cultural cosmopolitanism).

8   Even from a more pragmatic point of view, related, for example, to global risk management, this cosmopolitan existence is essential (Beck, 2011).

cluded both by hierarchical difference and by universal equality, namely, perceiving others as different and at the same time as equal. Whereas universalism and nationalism (and pre modern, essentialistic particularism) are based on the principle of 'either/or', cosmopolitanism rests on the 'both/and' principle. The foreign is not experienced and assessed as dangerous, disintegrating and fragmenting but as enriching. […] Those who integrate the perspective of others into their own lives learn more about themselves as well as about other (p.13).

Europe will hardly move in the direction of this cosmopolitanism with an approach to migration based on the merciless border selection and the strengthening of security arrangements, aiming, even upstream, to inhibit or block potential migration projects (Nieuwenhuys & Pécoud, 2007), and downstream the extradition of those persons in which, having crossed the continent's outer perimeter, are identified as illegal. Europe will hardly be able to achieve this, too, as long as thousands of migrants see citizenship suspended in detention camps; while the scenario of humanitarian and death chaos on its southern border in the Mediterranean[9] remains; and as long as the colonial legacy of "citizens and subjects" persists (Sarró

& Mapril, 2011), to frame its position vis-à-vis the other immigrant, even regarding to that one already established in their territory, of whom they need[10] and has contributed to their prosperity.

4. Final Considerations

The free movement Europe established by the Schengen agreement is a transnational political structure which is predominantly secure and selective. Invoking values such as "Freedom, Security and Justice" has been evolving customs barriers to internal flows, while intensifying control of the external perimeter of the common space and implementing digital devices for close monitoring of mobilities. In accordance with economic criteria and for security and identity reasons, a narrow selection is established between those who are welcome and those who are unwanted; between who is recognized as a (potential) citizen and who is labeled as illegal. The aim is to block mobility projects carried out by people deprived of capital and privileges and, on the other hand, have a cultural alterity in which Europe is not comfortable. Political boundaries, thus function, as factors for the strengthening of economic, ethnic and cultural boundaries, on the basis of which social exclusion and hierarchy are established. In this scenario emerge physical, symbolic and identity demarcations that

---

9   In the first half of 2015, close to 1800 immigrants died crossing the Mediterranean Sea (UNHCR, 2015). In 2014, 3072 people died and, since 2000, more than 22.400 (Brian & Laczko, 2014).

10   Therefore, for labor-deficient sectors, to better deal with the depopulation of some of their territories and to rejuvenate themselves demographically.

threaten basic human rights and compromise the community project of a cosmopolitan Europe, based on the dialogue of cultural plurality and in permanent renewal by means of the alterities that it receives. In short, a Europe that can indeed be built around fluences and confluences, averse to hierarchies and privileges, sensitive to the globally shared and paradigmatic condition of humanity of the moral and philosophical precept of the world as the place of all.

References

Alvarez, R. (1995). The Mexican-US border: the making of an anthropology of borderlands. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 24*, 447-470.

Ambrosini, M. (2006). Dentro il welfare invisibile: aiutanti domiciliari immigrate e assistenza agli anziani. *Aggiornamenti Sociali, 6*(57), 476-488.

Amoore, L. (2006). Biometric borders: governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political Geography, 25*(3), 336-351.

Anderson, B. (2013). *Us and them? The dangerous politics of immigration control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bacas, J. & Kavanagh, W. (Eds.) (2013). *Border encounters: asymmetry and proximity at Europe's frontiers*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Balzacq, T. & Carrera, S. (Eds.) (2006). *Security versus freedom? A challenge for Europe's future*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2005). *Vidas desperdiçadas*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

Beck, U. & Grande, E. (2007). *Cosmopolitan Europe*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (2011). Cosmopolitanism as imagined communities of global risk. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(10), 1346-1361.

Boccagni, P. (2011). Il retroscena del lavoro domestico. Percorsi etnografici nelle catene globali di cura. *Etnografia e Ricerca Qualitativa*, 3, 459-468.

Bommes, M. & Sciortino, G. (Ed.) (2011). *Foggy social structures: irregular migration, European labour markets and the Welfare State*. Amesterdão: Amsterdam University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). Um analista do inconsciente. Em A. Sayad, *A imigração ou os paradoxos da alteridade* (pp. 9-12). São Paulo: EDUSP.

Brian, T. & Laczko, F. (2014). *Fatal journeys: tracking lives lost during migration*. Genebra: International Organization for Migration.

Broeders, D. (2007). The new digital borders of Europe: EU databases and the surveillance of irregular migrants. *International Sociology, 22*(1), 71-92.

Broeders, D. (2009). Tracing, identifying and sorting: the role of EU migration data-

bases in the internal control on irregular migrants. Em H. Fassmann, M. Haller & D. Lane (Eds.), *Migration and mobility in Europe: trends, patterns and control* (pp. 249-271). Cheltenham e Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Carr, M. (2012). *Fortress Europe: dispatches from a gated continent*. Nova Iorque: The New Press.

Cunningham, H. (2004). Nations rebound?: crossing borders in a gated globe. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, *11*(3), 329-350.

Cunningham, H. & Heyman, J. (2004). Introduction: mobilities and enclosures at borders. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 11*(3), 289-302.

Delanty, G. (2005). The idea of a cosmopolitan Europe: on the cultural significance of Europeanization. *International Review of Sociology, 15*(3), 405-421.

Ehrenreich, B. & Hochschild, A. (Eds.) (2002). *Global woman: nannies, maids, and sex workers in the new economy*. Nova Iorque: Metropolitan Books.

Elliott, A. & Urry, J. (2010). *Mobile lives*. Londres: Routledge.

Engbersen, G. (2001). The unanticipated consequences of panopticon Europe. Residence strategies of illegal immigrants. Em V. Guiraudon & C. Joppke (Eds.), *Controlling a new migration world* (pp. 222-246). Londres: Routledge.

Fassin, D. (2011). Policing borders, producing boundaries. The governmentality of immigration in dark times. *Annual Revue of Anthropology*, 40, 213-226.

Fekete, L. (2004). Anti-Muslim racism and the European security state. *Race & Class*, *46*(1), 3-29.

Friedman, J. (2002). From roots to routes. Tropes for trippers. *Anthropological Theory*, *2*(1), 21-36.

Giorgi, A. (2010). Immigration control, post-fordism, and less eligibility: a materialist critique of the criminalization of immigration across Europe. *Punishment & Society, 12*(2), 147-167.

Gorodzeisky, A. & Semyonov, M. (2009). Terms of exclusion: public views towards admission and allocation of rights to immigrants in European countries. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 32*(3), 401-423.

Guild, E., Carrera, S. & Balzacq, T. (2008). The changing dynamics of security in an enlarged European Union. *CEPS Research Paper*, 12, Bruxelas: CEPS.

Hannerz, U. (1997). Fluxos, fronteiras, híbridos: palavras-chave da antropologia transnacional. *Mana, 3*(1), 7-39.

Hannerz, U. (2007). Cosmopolitanism. Em D. Nugent & J. Vincent (Eds.), *A companion to the anthropology of politics* (pp. 69-85). Oxford: Blackwell.

Harrell-Bond, B. (2002). Can humanitarian work with refugees be humane? *Human Rights Quarterly, 24*(1), 51-85.

Houtum, H. & Pijpers, R. (2007). The European Union as a gated community: the two-faced border and immigration regime of the EU. *Antipode, 39*(2), 291-309.

Inda, J. & Rosaldo, R. (2002). Introduction: a world in motion. Em J. Inda & R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The anthropology of globalization: a reader* (pp. 1-34). Oxford: Blackwell.

Karyotis, G. (2007). European migration policy in the aftermath of September 11. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 20*(1), 1-17.

Kearney, M. (2004). The classifying and value-filtering missions of borders. *Anthropological Theory, 4*(2), 131-156.

Kleingeld, P. (2013). Cosmopolitanism. Em H. LaFollette, J. Deigh & S. Stroud (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of ethics* (pp. 1134-1144). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lechevalier, A. & Wielgohs, J. (Eds.) (2013). *Borders and border regions in Europe: changes, challenges and chances.* Bielefeld: Transcript.

Leerkes, A. & Broeders, D. (2010). A case of mixed motives? Formal and informal functions of administrative immigration detention. *British Journal of Criminology, 50*(5), 830-850.

Lemos, A. (2009). Cultura da mobilidade. *Revista Famecos*, 40, 28-35.

Linke, U. (2010). Fortress Europe: globalization, militarization and the policing of interior borderlands. *Topia-Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 23-24, 100-120.

Maas, W. (2005). Freedom of movement within 'Fortress Europe'. Em E. Zureik & M. Salter (Eds.), *Global surveillance and policing: borders, security, identity* (pp.233-246). Devon: Willan Publishing.

Migreurop (2012). The principal spaces of detention [online]. Disponível em: <http://www. migreurop.org/IMG/pdf/Carte_Atlas_Migreurop_8012013_Version_anglaise_version_web.pdf> (acesso em 15/04/2015).

Nieuwenhuys, C. & Pécoud, A. (2007). Human trafficking, information campaigns, and strategies of migration control. *American Behavioral Scientist, 50*(12), 1674-1695.

Ribeiro, M., Baptista, A., Ribeiro, F. B. & Sacramento, O. (2007). *UHSA: a experiência portuguesa da instalação temporária de imigrantes.* Lisboa: SEF.

Rumford, C. (2007). Does Europe have cosmopolitan borders? *Globalizations, 4*(3), 327-339.

Sacramento, O. & Ribeiro, F. B. (2009). Procurando entrar na fortaleza da terra prometida: translocalização da intimidade e mobilidade migratória feminina do Nordeste brasileiro para a Europa (pp. 1209-1217). Em *Proceedings of the X Congresso Luso-Afro-Brasileiro de Ciências Sociais.* Braga: Universidade do Minho.

Sacramento, O. & Ribeiro, M. (2011). Vidas embargadas: a institucionalização temporária de estrangeiros *ilegais* em Portugal no contexto das actuais políticas de imigração. Em P. Silva, O. Sacramento &

J. Portela (Eds.), *Etnografia e intervenção social: por uma praxis reflexiva* (pp. 141-172). Lisboa: Colibri.

Sacramento, O. (2014). *Atlântico passional: mobilidades e configurações transnacionais de intimidade euro-brasileiras*. Lisboa: ISCTE-IUL (tese de doutoramento).

Sacramento, O. (2015). Schengen e a obsessão securitária: cidadania selectiva, exclusão social e a ironia do controlo. International Conference *Schengen: people, borders and mobility*. Lisboa: Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas – UNL, 15-16 de Junho.

Salazar, N. (2010). Tanzanian migration imaginaries [online]. University of Oxford, International Migration Institute (pp. 1-29). Disponível em: <http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/ publications/wp-20-10> (acesso em 13-07-2015).

Salazar, N. (2011). The power of imagination in transnational mobilities. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 18*(6), 576-598.

Sarró, R. & Mapril, J. (2011). 'Cidadãos e súbditos': imigração, cidadania e o legado colonial na Europa contemporânea. *Revista Migrações*, 8, 27-34.

Saux, M. (2007). Immigration and terrorism: a constructed connection. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, *13*(1-2), 57-72.

Schiller, N., Darieva, T. & Gruner-Domic, S. (2011). Defining cosmopolitan sociabil-ity in a transnational age. An introduction. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(3), 399-418.

Schiller, N. & Salazar, N. (2013). Regimes of mobility across the globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 39*(2), 183-200.

Skey, M. (2012). We need to talk about cosmopolitanism: the challenge of studying openness towards other people. *Cultural Sociology, 6*(4), 471-487.

Skrbiš, Z. & Woodward, I. (2007). The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness. *The Sociological Review*, *55*(4), 730-747.

Sohoni, D. & Sohoni, T. (2014). Perceptions of immigrant criminality: crime and social boundaries. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *55*(1), 49-71.

Turnbull, S. (2015). 'Stuck in the middle': waiting and uncertainty in immigration detention [online]. *Time & Society*, online before print, 1-19. Disponível em: <http://tas.sagepub.com/content/ early/2015/09/08/0961463X15604518.full.pdf> (acesso em 7/12/2015).

UNHCR (2015). Mediterranean crisis 2015 at six months: refugee and migrant numbers highest on record [online]. Disponível em: <http://www.unhcr.org/5592b9b36.html> (acesso em 13/07/2015).

UE (s.d). Europa sem fronteiras: o Espaço Schengen [online]. Disponível em: <http://ec.europa.eu/ dgs/home-af-

fairs/e-library/docs/schengen_bro-chure/schengen_brochure_dr3111126_pt.pdf> (acesso em 18/07/2015).

Vertovec, S. (2011). The cultural politics of nation and migration. *Annual Revue of Anthropology*, 40, 241-256.

Weber, S. (2009). D'un rideau de fer à l'autre: Schengen et la discrimination dans l'accès à la mobilité migratoire. *Géocarrefour, 84*(3), 163-171.

Werbner, P. (1999). Global pathways. Working class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds. *Social Anthropology, 7*(1), 17-35.

Zaiotti, R. (2011). *Cultures of border control: Schengen and the evolution of European frontiers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.