

Introduction

Racialized Mobilities

For someone from Iceland, Milan is hot in the summer. The air seems to hardly move, and the sun is high in the sky. The first days of my short work trip are filled with matters related to my research regarding migrants from Niger, where I conducted my PhD research almost twenty years ago. This time, I am accompanied by my early teenage children in an attempt to reconcile my academic and family life. The kids have been promised a trip to the Gardaland theme park as a special treat, but when we discover the rail service is on strike, our trip there seems impossible. Due to my schedule, we cannot change the date of our visit. To make matters worse, we were planning to meet relatives there, who are also traveling in northern Italy. So, we resolve to go by car and in the early morning, we visit a nearby rental car agency, only to discover that we had to book online. Feeling rather ridiculous, we step outside and reserve the car by phone. After further complications, we finally climb in our rental and are relieved to be able to keep the promise to our children.

After arriving at Gardaland, and after a joyful family reunion in the parking lot, we try out the rides and the wonders that this man-made space of entertainment has to offer. After strolling around for a while, I can relax on a nearby bench with my father in the shade. Sprinklers cool the air slightly, as we wait for the kids to return from the rollercoaster. It is all very pleasant, and I am relieved that the trip worked out, making it less stressful for me to continue with my research the next few days.

My dad and I watch the people walking by, most accompanied by children who run excitedly in front of them. He says quietly: “Do you notice how few Black people are here? Almost everyone is white.” His remark strikes me. I observe the environment around me in a completely different light. There are certainly some non-white people around, but for the most part the bodies traveling through the park are white. White faces, hands, and feet moving around this space that is Gardaland: well-dressed people buying expensive ice cream, overpriced pizzas or hotdogs. I think

about where our apartment in Milan is located and visualize the people I have seen around the neighborhood metro station Pasteur. The difference is striking. Not only is our neighborhood more diverse in terms of presence of people being defined as non-white, but it also exhibits much more economic variety.

As I start to look deeper into this ocean of white bodies that surrounds us at the park, I think of the strikingly diverse landscape of human bodies in Milan, and within it the precarious migrants from West Africa I have come to know. I remind myself at this moment of one of the luxuries of white¹ privilege; the tendency, as whiteness scholars have stressed, of white people to render their own whiteness invisible to themselves, which is itself linked to their privileged positions of power.

It is not that I have never thought about this. In fact, I have thought about it a lot. However, here I am removed from my safe space of anthropology, where I try to deconstruct and look critically at everything. Instead, I have stepped into a different realm—the everyday life of white privilege. Although I am here in Italy attempting to juggle my academic and personal life, it is clear that this privileged opportunity—to step out of the workspace—is far more readily available to privileged white scholars who do not have to encounter racism in their everyday lives (Carter 2018).

My father's comment was yet another startling reminder of the stark contrasts I have seen in the lives of people in Italy. For the duration of this research trip, I have been overwhelmed by the ubiquity and depth of these contrasts: while some people live on the street or embark on long and dangerous trips away from their families in the hope of creating a better future, others, like myself, take leisure trips just to spend their time somewhere different. We mainly encounter trivial problems, like needing to rent a car to go to Gardaland. This feeling haunts me during the research in different contexts again and again. As I sit with my father, enjoying a day with my family, I think about how Gardaland, with its high gates and admission fees, is one of many oases of whiteness. It is a space of privilege where whiteness can be enjoyed away from the more complicated arenas of racialization and class. There are no street people or beggars in Gardaland, no visible signs of desperate people from the Global South, and no evidence of the marginalized populations of Europe who have failed to “make it” in an increasingly neoliberal world.

I start this book with this reflection because it is relevant to the world of West African migrants. These individuals exist along with me in a world that criminalizes the mobility of some while celebrating the mobility of others. It is this idea with which I critically engage in this book, asking who can move in and out of Europe, and why. I focus on the mobility and immobility of differently positioned subjects through an examination of the aspirations of

men from Niger who travel to European cities, where they seek short-term economic benefits or asylum. I seek to show that Europe as such is not part of their aspirations, contrary to popular media depiction, but rather they are actively using their ability to move between different places to improve the quality of their lives and that of their loved ones back in Niger.

My insights derive from long-term research and fieldwork, developed in different projects that intersect and inform each other. In the late 1990s, I conducted ethnographic fieldwork in Niger among WoDaaBe, a group of pastoral nomads. Globalization was a topical issue at the time and gaining traction. I was far from my home in Iceland and wanted to understand what globalization meant for different people. Shortly after the completion of my research, some WoDaaBe started embarking on short visits to Europe. Expatriates and previous tourists from Europe in Niger often helped these WoDaaBe get short-term visas, meaning that the association of WoDaaBe with the exotic in European colonial imagination facilitated their mobility. At that time, it was difficult to imagine that one of the unforeseen consequences of globalization would be a fortification of European borders against those defined as undesirable outsiders. In the late 1990s, increased and less-restricted mobility seemed to be the natural outcome of globalization, one that had been celebrated and symbolized by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (Fassin 2011). Instead, what lay in wait was the gradual fortification of Europe. Precarious migrant men seeking to improve their poverty-stricken lives became, along with other West African migrants, increasingly stigmatized as some of Europe's most undesirable strangers—Black, Muslim, and male. Rhetoric suggesting that Europe was “flooded” by migrants or Muslim “others” intensified. At the same time, the mobility of privileged people in the Global North—including myself as an academic and a tourist—expanded and was hailed as a positive sign of an increasingly cosmopolitan and interconnected world.

After fieldwork in Niger, I carried out a series of short fieldwork trips to European cities that focused on precarious migrants from there. At the same time, I was engaged in research in Iceland, where one of the key focuses was on whiteness and the transformation of Icelandic people into European subjects through their engagement with coloniality. This research helped me to deepen my understanding of the wider sociopolitical relations within which Nigerien migration to Europe takes place, as well as the historically constituted relationship between Niger and Europe as a concept and an aspiration.

These small fieldwork projects, for the most part conducted in Brussels and Milan, started as an investigation into the life of WoDaaBe in Europe, but later mutated to focus on precarious men from Niger in general, as well as mobility in and out of Europe. It became clear that WoDaaBe were not

categorized as the dangerous “other,” but as a different kind of “other,” that is, exotic, exciting, and nonthreatening. Thus, some individuals benefited ironically from racist and reified processes historically characterized by European depictions of them, as they were not associated with other African “economic migrants” or negative depictions of refugees or asylum seekers.

I realized as well that my research on “whiteness” in Iceland and the mobility of “white” subjects in and out of Europe was also relevant to research on Nigerien migrants, then as a part of the larger geopolitical context. A critical and ongoing inspection of my own position as a privileged subject bridged these research perspectives. In Iceland, refugees and asylum seekers had become a part of my own environment, echoing or resisting a wider discussion on European migration. So, while I prioritize Nigerien precarious migrants in this book, my discussion seeks ultimately to draw attention to diverse actors who are differently positioned in a geopolitical context, and how their different positions shape their movement. I highlight the asymmetry in discussions about mobility, contrasting the white experts with the migrant, as well as drawing attention to the silencing of Europe’s imperial and colonial past in discussions of mobilities. How, for example, are subjects within the category of historically constituted “others” differentiated regarding class, religion, race, and their historical relationship with Europe? How are these categories created and maintained?

Recent debate about asylum seekers and refugees has intensified questions of Europe’s colonial past and, consequently, what that past means for the future (Hipfl and Gronold 2011: 29). The depiction of Europe as a constant and unified whole forced to push back against the flow of external “others” (Ponzanesi and Blaagaard 2011) draws on specific interpretations of the past where Europe is seen as consisting of clearly bounded national entities.² Despite the celebration of increased global fluidity, Europe’s borders have become more fortified through various measures, as immigrants are constantly projected as threats and increasingly subjected to intensive practices of securitization and surveillance (Balibar and Collins 2003). Further, scholarly discourses of mobility often take place in separate spheres, where discussions of economic migrants, expatriates, or tourists occur in isolation from one another (Salazar 2011).

The concept of cosmopolitanism is a case in point, often seen in the European imagination as facilitating European integration and embracing diversity (Baban 2013, Bhambra and Narayan 2017), while other kinds of mobilities and identities are simultaneously perceived as incompatible with the European cosmopolitan project. These “problematic” mobilities include Muslim migration to Europe from poorer parts of the world (Edmunds 2013), which tend to be discussed not as part of a burgeoning cos-

mopolitanism but instead in the context of immigration or refugee studies. Recently, the 2020 protests across Europe and the US in the aftermath of George Floyd's killing also drew attention to continued racialization and exclusion of certain populations within Europe—including citizens of Europe—and how the colonial past continues to matter in various ways.

My analysis in this book is based on two key intersecting streams of theoretical debates, which have most often been theorized separately. The first key stream consists of theoretical discussions about multicultural society and critical race studies. A “crisis of multiculturalism” has become a framing device used in public discussions in many European societies (Lentin and Titley 2011). This idea intensified thanks to increased numbers of asylum seekers and refugees which mutated into a “refugee crisis.” The idea of a “crisis of multiculturalism” is in itself based on ahistorical notions of Europe as consisting earlier of “pure” cultural spaces, as well as a complete disregard for the effect of colonialism on transnational movements. Discussions about the “refugee crisis” are also marked by these shortcomings. Here it is particularly urgent to analyze the changing landscapes of racist practices and identities, as scholars have stressed that racism is more difficult to target in the present because it is coded under different labels, such as culture and religion (Balibar 1991).

Racialization has, of course, always involved a mixture of cultural and biological features, in addition to being entangled with ideas of gender, class, and modernity (see McClintock 1995; Garner 2009). But with extreme nationalistic and populist parties gaining more currency in political debates in Western Europe, religion has become a “privileged marker of racial and absolute difference” (Fortier 2007: 110; see also Werbner 2007). In current rhetoric, religion and cultural characteristics are incorporated within discourses based on a slip between notions of culture and race (Abu El-Haj 2002). Racialized images that intersect or surface with reference to culture or religion also take on stark gendered representations, such as those revolving around the “oppressed Muslim woman” and the “male Muslim terrorist” (Abu-Lughod 2002). More recently, there has even been a merging of the image of “the terrorist” with “the Muslim” (Bhui 2016).

When the intersection of race with other categories of difference is emphasized, a more nuanced and complex picture of the persistence of racial classification can emerge, one that illustrates the way racial classifications touch on other categories and interact with them. This book utilizes this approach to draw attention to how Europe's cosmopolitan aspirations become complicated, due to their intersection with the multiple identities of particular subjects, and with Europe's colonial and imperial past.

Within discourses of migration, categories such as Muslim, immigrant, or African signal particular subjective categories that are historically nega-

tive in Europe. My research in 2013 indicated that WoDaaBe were, however, primarily seen in Europe as “exotic others,” disregarding their identities as Muslims and migrant workers. As such, they received assistance from local people in applying for Schengen visas, as well as with housing and other expenses. By comparing WoDaaBe experiences with other racialized subjects from Niger, including those who have not occupied the “exotic” category in Western writing and discourses, I ask what kind of bodies are categorized as “others” and investigate the continued relevance of “exoticness” in contemporary Europe. My discussion also asks what subject positions these migrants feel they take once in Europe, as they encounter the different manifestations of the “other” that exist in Europe today.

In discussing racialization and the so-called multicultural society, I use the phrase “precarious migrants.” While the term “precarity” is often theorized in relation to the labor market—in some cases only as referring to neoliberalism or post-Fordism changes in labor relations (see discussion in Vickers et al. 2019; Paret and Gleeson 2016: 279; Lewis et al. 2015)—I follow here Priya Deshingkar’s understanding of precarity as an “ontological stage of ‘life,’” as entangled with local histories and global conditions (2019: 2638). This means that its analytical usefulness is interlinked with how it situates inequalities as having to do with social structures and historical conditions, as well as drawing attention to “multiple forms of vulnerability” (Paret and Gleeson 2016: 280), that characterize the lives of certain migrant populations. As argued by Paret and Gleeson:

migrant existence is often precarious in multiple, and reinforcing ways, combining vulnerability to deportation and state violence, exclusion from public services and basic state protections, insecure employment and exploitation at work, insecure livelihood, and everyday discrimination or isolation. (2016: 281)

Precarity is not intrinsic to these men as individuals but rather points toward structural conditions that are produced globally, and which shape their lives. Theoretical discussion of precarity also importantly touches on agency and the ability to exert agency (Paret and Gleeson 2016: 282). Most of the men I spoke to would not see themselves as passive victims as they actively try to change and enhance their lives. My use of the term “precarious” in connection to the term “migrant” seeks to draw attention to the multiple ways of being a migrant, where some mobilities of migrant populations are made more precarious than others, while those in precarious migrant positions are not only those migrating from south to north but also those migrating within Europe or their country of origin (see discussion in Vickers et al. 2019). This means as well that not all migration from south to north is or should be seen as precarious. West Africans are welcomed into Europe

as, for example, medical doctors and football stars, which does not necessarily exclude racism and exploitation (Darby, Akindes, and Kirwin 2007; Hagopian et al. 2005; Jiwani 2008). In Brussels, people from sub-Saharan African countries come for different reasons, including to pursue lives as students, artists, and diplomats (Lo Sardo 2013: 313; Kagné and Martiniello 2001). People from Niger thus go to Europe for a longer or shorter time due to an array of reasons that this book does not cover.

The second stream of theoretical discussion informing this book focuses on mobility and immobility. As suggested earlier, discussions of multiculturalism and migration, both on the scholarly and popular level, often seem to assume that there was a prior state of immobility, which calls for an historical perspective on mobility as crucial context to any such discussion (see the criticism in Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013: 184; Salazar and Smart 2011). The use of the term “migrant” in migration studies has been criticized for its presumption that people move between two points, that is, their country of origin and a destination country (Schapendonk 2020), working from the framework of “departure-movement-arrival-integration” (Schapendonk, Bolay and Dahinden 2020: 2). The reality is far more complex, as Joris Schapendonk stresses in regard to African mobility to Europe, where “relations and notions of belonging change along pathways of movements,” with people engaging in multiple forms of mobility (2020: 4). Similarly, scholarly and popular discussions of racism also presuppose a particular kind of mobility, that is, that the mobility of precarious subjects is creating the racism directed at them. It is necessary to contrast and juxtapose different kinds of mobilities to avoid the assumption that racism is somehow the consequence of recent migration to Europe, and to recognize racism as constitutive and embedded in modernity itself (Grosfoguel 2011). Here I stress the need to place the aspiration of cosmopolitanism as a positive European virtue alongside contemporary discourses of who belongs and who is welcome in Europe, and in so doing to reflect Europe’s continued struggles with “colonialist and imperialist attitudes” (Ponzanesi and Blaagaard 2011: 4). The term “regimes of mobilities” draws attention to how the state, international regulations, and various security and surveillance mechanisms affect and shape who is mobile and in what ways, making regimes of mobility inherently interlinked with power (Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013: 189). It also draws attention to the importance of understanding mobility in relation to immobility: to ask critically whose movement is disallowed, and why? (Salazar and Smart 2011).

Finally, cutting across these two theoretical streams is my interest in “crisis” as a concept (see Loftsdóttir and Jensen 2014; Loftsdóttir, Smith, and Hipfl 2018). Crisis traversed the lives of my interlocutors in ways that became evident as my research unfolded, especially as European conversa-

tions about mobility were often framed as different kinds of crises. The “crisis of multiculturalism” became the “refugee crisis.” Muslims as a category became a “terrorist crisis.” My interlocutors’ travels from Niger’s constant social and economic crisis as one of the poorest countries in the world became a part of a humanitarian crisis due to the civil war in Libya, where they had sought new lives. Furthermore, their lives became shaped by Europe’s economic crisis and the growing sense of precarity among those living in Europe. Now as I write this book, the crisis has become linked to the global pandemic, which has affected their lives extensively.

While this book anchors its discussion in the experience of the Nigerien migrants, it also reflects on wider questions about migration in Europe in relation to racialization and different ways of othering. It asks how this space, Europe, is configured by those outside of its sphere of privilege (Herzfeld 1989, 2016: 72; Ponzanesi 2016) and what kind of transnational and historical connections become evident if the lives of precarious migrants in Europe are used as a reference point. Of particular relevance here is the intersection of racism, gender, religion, and culture in the lives of migrant men as it interacts with their position as former colonial subjects of European powers. This draws attention to past-present relations and the “after-effects of colonialism” (Ponzanesi and Colpani 2016).

Niger demonstrates the continued need for such a perspective. The ongoing political, social, and economic instability in Northern Africa has affected Niger in many ways, such as with the collapse of the tourist industry with rebellions in the country (Grégoire and Scholze 2012; Snorek 2016), and a large influx of refugees arriving from neighboring countries with Niger becoming both a hub for West African migrants in transit and a site of refugee centers (Larémont, Attir, and Mahamadou 2020; Veronese, Pepe, and Vigliarone 2019). In addition, with the end of Gaddafi’s regime in Libya, small arms and weapons became dispersed and thus more accessible in the Sahara and Sahel region, creating a situation of political uncertainty as the region has become a place of weapons, drugs, and human trafficking (Danjibo 2013: 19, 31). Niger has as well been dragged into the US-led “war on terror” (Elischer and Mueller 2018) and become an important part of the externalization of Europe’s borders (Idrissa 2019; Brachet 2016; Larémont et al. 2020), as well as shaped by other conflicts, some of which relate to the foreign exploitation of Niger’s uranium (McGregor 2007; Afifi 2011). These circumstances profoundly affect people in Niger, increasing the precarity of already precarious lives.

In this book I will occasionally refer to examples from my own intimate environment of Iceland, because my research on mobilities in Iceland informs my insights of how discourses of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers informs popular views across Europe. The example of Iceland serves as

a further illustration to elaborate what it means to be European and what means to be non-European.

Research

As the previous discussion suggests, this book scales back and forth between a larger perspective on Europe and the experiences of these precarious Nigerien men, as well as moving between different geographical sites. The research was conducted at several locations in Belgium and Italy, especially in Brussels and to some extent in Milan. Brussels is often depicted as the capital of Europe, while Milan is one of the focal points of Europe's migration crisis. In 2004, 2011, 2012, and 2016–18, I conducted ethnographic work in Belgium, as well as in northern Italy from 2016 to 2018. While brief, these persistent field trips allowed me to acquire significant insight into the migrants' lives in these localities.

In my analysis, I reference earlier research I conducted in Niger from 1996 to 1998 on mobility and globalization. My interlocutors in the research presented in this book are from different areas in Niger, and mostly aged between thirty and forty-five, though I also interviewed some younger and older individuals, as well as some individuals who were not from Niger. Most of the men I talked to were married, having left their families behind; they came from conditions of extreme poverty and had only minimal or informal education. There were also a few individuals with long formal education who had for the most part left Niger due to political prosecutions. My interviews were with Nigeriens from diverse ethnicities, including not only WoDaaBe and Tuaregs but also other ethnicities such as Hausa, Zarma, Fulani, and Toubou, and also a few individuals from neighboring West African countries. The names used in this book are pseudonyms, but in some cases I also changed the background of some of my interviewees to further mask their identities. For example, in order to protect the identity of some research participants, I sometimes treat individuals who are Tuaregs or WoDaaBe as belonging to the same ethnic group, even though this is a gross simplification as in Niger these are quite different groups in terms of history and self-identification. I chose to do this because I learned from my initial research among WoDaaBe that their limited numbers in Belgium make it difficult to hide their identity, even when pseudonyms are used. For the context where I do this, it matters that Tuaregs in Niger have historically held a similar place as WoDaaBe in the European imagination.

As stated earlier, the discussion in this book is also informed by debates about migration and refugees in Iceland, where I live and where I originated. Initially, I debated whether Iceland was relevant to this book, but soon saw

that referring to migration and other transnational movement in Iceland informed and enriched my research on West African migrants, in particular concerning the transnational character of certain practices and ideas. Additionally, as a part of Europe and of the Global North, Iceland draws from and contributes to larger discourses about migration, asylum seekers, and refugees.

The research is shaped by my academic upbringing in anthropology, where ethnography has not only been a key research method but a source of theoretical inspiration and way of communicating research results. Within anthropology, discussions of *what* ethnography is, have continued to be a fruitful way of thinking about research methods and how to engage with the present. Researching mobility has revealed new methodological challenges, including questions about how to analyze a planet in “flux” (Salazar, Elliot, and Norum 2017: 3). Multi-sited ethnography has become particularly important in this regard (see discussion in Salazar et al. 2017: 10; Xiang 2013: 283). My approach can be defined both as multi-sited and multi-scalar. In regard to migration, scholars have stressed the need to focus on migrant experiences as well as actions in regard to policy making, where “how social phenomena, such as transnational migration, are constituted through actions at different scales” (Xiang 2013: 284; see also Fortier 2006).

While these perspectives are important there is a long tradition within anthropology of conducting research among objects and people “on the move” (Salazar et al. 2017: 5) and to emphasize a holistic perspective, where different spheres of society are not only seen in conjunction with each other, but where the analysis scales between more localized experiences and larger political and historical context. Thus, for a long time, anthropologists have dealt with the complication of, what Xiang phrases, “small observable details and big generalizable critiques” (Xiang 2013: 283).

My methodology for capturing mobility can be understood as a combination of multi-sited and multi-scalar participant observation and interviews. I scale back and forth from a wider historical perspective where Europe is a central concern toward the experiences of individual Nigeriens in Europe. Part of understanding the broader power structures and historical inequalities that shape the lives of these men are my occasional insertions of Icelandic debates and concerns as a small country in Europe. I see this approach as providing deeper insight into how mobility is racialized as well as bringing the interconnected lives of those racialized in different ways more sharply into perspective.

In trying to capture this story that I want to tell, I am inspired by anthropologist Anna L. Tsing’s (2011) observation that ethnography constitutes a methodology that pulls in salient bits and pieces here and there,

using the term “patchwork ethnographic fieldwork.” As Günel, Varma, and Watanabe (2020) point out, the term seeks to capture these irregularities of fieldwork as well as how “home” and “field” are no longer separate entities but intersect in various ways. For my own fieldwork, patchwork ethnography also involves trying to patch together different commitments to the people I worked with, to my workplace, and importantly also to family members. When looking back, these were not simply disruptions to the research but also sources of insight.

Organization

Throughout this book, I jump between different locations and different moments in the research in an attempt to capture interlinked spaces and lives. Furthermore, by placing different kinds of migrants, that is, the less and more privileged, side by side, the racialization of mobility becomes more clearly visible.

The first chapters of the book, in Part I “Making Precarious Migrants,” focus for the most part on individual stories of migration, while acknowledging the context of a wider recent discussion of migration. Chapter 1, “Living in Divided Europe: The Theme Park and the Street,” begins with a brief insight into the lives of precarious Nigeriens in northern Italy, who generally see themselves in transition. The chapter focuses on the global inequalities of mobility and how borders work toward a racialized classification of people into “beings” and “nonbeings.” The chapter also demonstrates how similar stories of migration can be seen across the Global North, wherein racism and dehumanization become almost mundane in their repetition across different spaces. Chapter 2, “‘Enough of Refugees’: Depiction of Precarious Migrants in Europe,” provides a wider context of discussion of migrants in the European contexts, especially in relation to asylum seekers and refugees in 2015. In Chapter 3, “Into the Heart of Europe: Migrants in Brussels and Beyond,” the discussion moves from the borders of Europe and more abstract discussion of migration toward Brussels, where we are introduced to precarious Nigerien migrants living in the city. The concept of Europe is the subject of Chapter 4, “Global Citizens and the Backstage,” where the discussion scales toward a different wider context by examining and aligning their particular mobilities within the broader spectrum of mobility in general in Belgium, but also more widely in questioning what are desirable and undesirable mobile subjects. In Chapter 5, “Multicultural Europe: Invasions against European Values?” the focus is on the positionality of these Nigerien migrants within discussions of multiculturalism in

Europe, where I draw attention to how precarious migrants in Europe are familiar with and engage with media discussions of migrants as criminals or dangerous others.

Part II “Entangled Histories” is composed of Chapters 6, 7, and 8, which anchor the subject matter into the history of colonialism. Chapter 6, “This Is All in the Past Now: Niger and a Global World,” starts with a brief discussion of Niger’s history as a shared history with Europe, as well as its current embedment in global politics. Modernity takes on a particular form in Niger, which cannot be separated from wider global context nor its shared history with Europe. In Chapter 7, “Nostalgic Colonialism: Different kinds of Otherness,” I scale down to the experience of particular types of migrants from Niger, who arrive with a visa into the Schengen area. The chapters show how new and not-so-new meanings of exotic otherness can become an important commercialized resource and where particular kind of “strangers” are welcomed in Europe, even during times of intense fortification at its borders. In Chapter 8, “Spaces of Innocence: Belgium’s Colonial History and Beyond” the gaze moves toward Belgium’s colonial history, and how across Europe colonial legacies are very much ignored. The chapter also reminds us of movements against the present glorification of this brutal past.

Chapter 9 and the Conclusion in Part III, “Europe’s Past and Future,” focus more deeply on what the preceding discussion means in term of future anticipation of migrants and others living in Europe. Chapter 9, “The Heart of Darkness: EUrope as a Concept” draws attention to the concept of Europe, as well as these men’s desire for a “livable” life, and their struggle to reconcile Europe’s association with humanitarianism with the harsh response to the migration crisis. The last chapter, “Welcome to the Future: Dismaland and Anxieties in Europe” focuses on crisis and migration in relation to future anticipation. I juxtapose the migrants’ stories with broader narratives of loss in Europe, including the loss of a particular vision of the future, and draw attention to how such narratives are used to mobilize hate groups and anti-migration sentiments.

Taken together, I aim with these chapters to draw attention to how people live within the same shared discourse, even while being positioned differently within it; elucidating the mobility of racialized images and ideas, and how they translate into practice; and how the discourses that take place in wider Europe and which shape the lives of these Nigerien migrants, are expressed in different locations. Spaces across Europe, such as Gardaland, are endowed with racial meanings, reflecting structural and historical relationships that tell a larger story of colonialism and enduring discriminations.

NOTES

1. In line with critical research on race and racism, “white” and “Black” are used here as social classifications. Recently, anti-racist mobilizations have called for capitalizing “Black,” partly to recognize the persistent salience of racism (Weeber 2020). There have been debates regarding whether or not “white” should be capitalized as well, as it constitutes a social construct just as the term “Black” does. The uneasiness of capitalizing “white” derives from fears of reifying whiteness and giving legitimacy to white supremacy (Weeber 2020; Daniszewski 2020). I decided not to capitalize it in this volume, although I remain conflicted about whether that is the best decision.
2. This interpretation selectively “forgets” Islam as a part of Europe’s history, where it is discursively constructed as an external force (Özyürek 2005).