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Sedentary No Longer Seems Apposite: Internal Migration in an Era of Mobilities

‘[T]he most advanced and affluent societies have now achieved a state in which the term "sedentary" no longer seems apposite for their members; almost constant change and movement have truly become a way of life. This is a highly complex, intensely interactive social system whose participants are in almost nonstop daily, weekly, or seasonal oscillation across and within spatial and social zones, indulge in a vast range of irregular temporary excursions, and frequently migrate, in the sense of formal change of residence’ (Zelinsky 1971: 247)

‘Mobility, in contemporary society, is not only an option, but also an obligation’

(Gössling and Stavrinidi 2015: 1)

Introduction: Brexit to a More Sedentary World?
As this chapter was being written, the UK public voted in a referendum (23/06/2016) to leave the European Union – what became dubbed Brexit (British exit). There were many reasons for this largely unanticipated result, and the ongoing post-mortem is likely to be lengthy, contentious and complex, but concern with the number and consequences of migrants coming to the UK through the EU’s free movement of people principle featured significantly. This concern ranged from outright racism to more diffuse worries about access to jobs, health services, housing and so on for existing UK residents.

Interwoven with the articulated anti-international migrant discourse appeared to be concerns about how life in the UK was becoming too much left to the whims of impersonal, abstract and unemotional currents. People, it seems, were left feeling no longer at home in (local) community but, through external forces of both homogenisation and differentiation, becoming existentially scattered to the four winds. They felt dis-placed in the fundamentally dislocated ‘borderless world’ associated by Shuttleworth et al. (this volume) with ‘hard’ forms of globalisation. Hence, the populist appeal of the pro-leave campaign to take ‘our’ (sic.) country back to a supposedly more certain and sedentary existence.

Support for Brexit thus fed in part from a sense that life in the UK-placed-within-the-world is simply changing too fast, it is too mobile in a whole host of different ways. Drawing on Marx and Engels’s famous terminology from 1848’s Communist Manifesto, all that is solid, known and
familiar is being dissolved and melts away. And the whipping boy - this time - for such concern was the European Union and its supposedly ‘liquid’ mobile populations. The macro-economic force that is neo-liberal global capitalism was, in contrast, seemingly let off the hook (Dolack 2016), this time at least, albeit of course itself clearly prominent within the EU project.

In spite of the high profile accorded to migration, however, Brexit may at first sight seem to have little to do with the **internal** migration focus of the present book. Yet, this is far from the case. The existential concerns expressed by many pro-Brexit voters – in this writer’s strong opinion most erroneously directed at the EU – are also expressed within internal migration. To be able to place and understand internal migration today, in other words, its relational contextualisation within an **era of mobilities** should be fore-grounded. To achieve this contextualisation, the chapter first both introduces this era, plus its relationship to migration, and reflects critically on how scholarship has traditionally, often implicitly, presented and understood migration. It then returns to consider further the present status of internal migration and its links with mobilities more generally.

**Migration in an Era of Mobilities**

**Movements, Liquidities, Flows: a *Zeitgeist?***

‘[T]here are countless mobilities, physical, imaginative and virtual, voluntary and coerced. There are increasing similarities between behaviours that are “home” and “away”...’ (Urry 2002: 161).

As noted in Chapter 1 (Champion *et al.* this volume), arguments propounded by influential books such as Castles and Miller’s (1993) *Age of Migration* and Bauman’s (2000) *Liquid Modernity* have now strongly converged with more sociological expressions such as Urry’s (2007) *Mobilities* (also Larsen *et al.* 2006) and geographical contributions such as Cresswell’s (2006) *On the Move* to suggest (well, almost) how ‘[a]ll the world seems to be on the move’ (Sheller and Urry 2006: 207; Adey 2010; Sheller 2011). Of course, people have moved residentially from place to place throughout humanity’s existence (Brettell 2013), with migration in the early ‘modern’ period for example under-appreciated (Pooley and Turnbull 1998), but the magnitude and complexity of population flows today is unparalleled. More than just people, however, flux, both experiential and metaphorical, has increasingly been argued to have displaced fixity and come to predominate within everyday life and consciousness. Its central consequence has been what Gale (2009) terms ‘de-differentiation’, including the transgressing of the categories of ‘home’ and ‘away’ that Urry
suggested above. We have seemingly thus entered – exactly when can be debated elsewhere – an era of mobilities (Halfacree 2012) for much of humanity.

What has caused the epochal shift to an era of mobilities remains a moot point and one which cannot be engaged with here. However, as this chapter will certainly imply throughout, a condition of mobility can be strongly allied to the evolution of capitalism into its present-day dominant more ‘flexible’ or neo-liberal forms. This is not to assert economic determinism but does re-emphasize how everyday life is not (re)formed either independently or at any great distance from the underlying economic domain. Clearly, any ‘mobilities paradigm’ (Sheller and Urry 2006) for examining the present day must also recognise the place of neo-liberalism and other related conditions such as globalisation as central within its explanatory framework.

Returning to migration, this clearly has a very central place within the era of mobilities, as is consistently noted by its leading scholars (e.g. Cresswell and Merriman 2011). However, by starting with mobilities – both material and, as shortly noted, immaterial – rather than with the third component of Population Geography’s classic demographic triumvirate of births, deaths and migrations (Barcus and Halfacree forthcoming), embodied human migration becomes just one element of interest to mobilities scholars. Thus, we may well note the prominence today in daily news bulletins of the subjects of the Age of Migration (Castles at al. 2014) but the scope and impact of mobilities certainly does not stop there. In fact, in part perhaps because migration is now so very prominently studied across numerous sub-disciplines (Brettell and Hollifield 2008), it can seem relatively rather neglected or certainly taken-for-granted within the mobilities canon, where more novel expressions of movement have grabbed most scholarly attention1.

Through a mobilities lens, migration needs to be emplaced first within what Pooley et al. (2005: 2) termed a ‘mobility continuum’ (Figure 1), whose time-space mapping Bell and Ward (2000) pioneered a few years earlier (Champion et al. this volume: Figure 3). Table 1 introduce five broad families of mobilities further, migration perhaps again seeming to be rather ‘lost’ within the first category, not least with its inclusion of ubiquitous everyday movements. This is a status, however, that is revisited below. Second, as Table 1 makes clear and Figure 1 hints in its final category, migration needs to be emplaced in the context of diverse material and immaterial mobilities, perhaps the most prominent of the latter being the vast flows of data flowing through the internet and other telecommunications media. It is movement or travel which can be virtual, imaginative and/or communicative (Gale 2009). The importance of this material-immaterial
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1 Not that the Mobilities journal, for example, ignores migrations!
engagement was pioneered by Urry’s (2002) concept of the ‘post-tourist’, whereby an element of the perceived de-differentiation (Gale 2009) between tourist / tourism and the everyday was the enhanced immersion in mediated images of tourist places. Subsequent physical travel may still be central to most tourist experiences but is now moulded via the immaterial as never before, not least through social media (e.g. Cohen et al. 2013; Gössling and Stavrinidi 2015).

Being mobile in diverse ways is also, moreover, not only an empirical state within the era of mobilities but also typically portrayed as a normative state of being. Living mobile lives (Elliott and Urry 2010) is a condition widely promoted and even glamorized (Cohen and Gössling 2015) through every means from the blatant seductions of advertising to a more entrenched sense that ‘contemporary societies assign high social value to the consumption of distance’ (Cohen and Gössling 2015: 1663). To be immobile is thus from this perspective to be a ‘problem’, a source of shame, embarrassment and inadequacy.

One consequence of recognising an era of mobilities in all its scope and dimensions, therefore, is the need for all us migration scholars to give greater attention to people’s residential relocations’ – still, one accepts, probably our primary academic interest – relational connections to all of the other forms of mobility. From this it immediately follows, as Champion et al. (this volume) of course acknowledged, that mobilities / the era of mobilities as a concept cannot be dismissed – or supported – simply from one element alone. It speaks for life overall – at least within the Global North and arguably for selective groups mostly even here. It is mobilities as 21st Century zeitgeist. As more practically put, ‘observations of rising mobility and declining internal rate are not necessarily incompatible’ (Champion et al. this volume: &*). However, from within this ‘mobile’ perspective, understanding of ‘migration’, too, needs further critical attention.

Re-specifying Migration
The era of mobilities may raise the existential significance of migration from occasional life course disruption to a more regular part of an everyday cultural texture of normative flux but this perspective does not leave the concept of migration, even repositioned within the continuum of mobilities, itself untouched and thus as conventionally delineated. Our concept of migration, too, feels the force of the de-differentiating wave that articulates mobilities’ ‘liquefation of social forms’ (Gale 2009: 132) that include socially constructed cognitive objects (Halfacree 2001).
Initially put, as in a recent textbook, migration is ‘the movement of people to live in a different place’ (Holdsworth et al. 2013: 96). It is a ‘permanent change in residence’, as in most censuses deemed to have occurred when one’s ‘usual address’ has changed within the last one or five years (Bell et al. this volume). Nonetheless, as Holdsworth et al. (2013: 98) also noted, careful consideration of these definitions immediately raises a host of questions over the precise meaning and significance given to terms such as ‘different place’, ‘live in’, ‘permanent’ and ‘usual address’. Such terms do not escape the attention of the mobilities critique.

In particular, mobility scholarship’s rejection of an assumption of a sedentarist norm causes also a questioning of the component terms of migration as conventionally understood. Now widely recognized (e.g. Cresswell 2006; Gustafson 2014) and reinforced by philosophical reflections on human dwelling (e.g. Heidegger 1971), ‘sedentarism’ expresses the idea that being still, bounded and ‘authentic’ through being-in-place is a foundational feature of human life. In consequence, mobility is regarded with suspicion. It is at root ‘inauthentic’, even potentially deviant, inherently disruptive of normal settled states of affairs (Cresswell 2006). Thus, people ‘live’ ‘permanently’ at a single ‘usual address’ unless residential relocation impels them to a ‘different place’ where a (re-)building of sedentarist roots automatically begins again.

Rejection of an assumption of sedentarism – as opposed to recognizing it as an achievement to be worked at – also rejects the certainty that one can always recognise a single ‘usual address’. It likewise throws into the air the notion that migrations are ‘permanent’. Indeed, as most people move residence many times in their lives, how can anyone ever really conclusively declare a move to be permanent? Furthermore, with this implied fuzzier sense of both place and time, the certainty of both ‘living in’ somewhere and the boundedness of ‘different places’ become equally uncertain. In short, the mobilities paradigm works to undermine the predominant significance of the empirical fact of residential relocation from Point A to Point B.

Yet this critique and reappraisal can be taken further still to challenge the taxonomic delineations that surround and regulate migration scholarship (Halfacree 2001). First, attention can be paid to the enduring distinction (as in the present book) between internal migration and international migration (King 2002). Whilst the act of crossing a national boundary – defining a migration as ‘international’ – is very likely to be highly significant for a migration and its experience - ‘state borders matter’ (Shuttleworth et al. this volume: &*), certainly in these ‘age of migration’ and Brexit times of hard borders being resurrected across Europe – its core and primary importance is not necessarily true a priori. Favell (2008a: 270, emphasis added), for example, has argued how the ‘defining’ role of state boundaries can be overemphasized since ‘the world is not
only one of nation-state units’. For example, for lifestyle migrants (discussed below), whether internal or international, their urban-to-rural relocation may well be more significant to their everyday lives than the international relocations of Favell’s (2008b) economically elite Eurostars in Eurocities.

Second, within just internal migration, too, what is seen as migration is often itself separated from short-distance residential mobility. This can also be problematic if also assumed to be a hard divide (Coulter et al. 2016). As Shuttleworth et al. (this volume: &*) noted, research has suggested that there is often ‘no obvious or easily defined cut off between local and long distance migration’, whilst Bell et al. (this volume) found from their extensive work through the IMAGE project how declines or rises in internal migration were frequently apparent at all scales.

Third, even the distinction between (internal) migration and more everyday mobility (such as commuting for work or travelling to shops) is not to be assumed as paramount. This point, of course, has already been suggested above when the era of mobilities was sketched out. Its significance will shortly be illustrated further. Instead, therefore, overall it can sometimes be more useful for researchers to examine migration according to themes cross-cutting both internal / international and migration / mobility divides, such as lifestyle migrations / mobilities (Cohen et al. 2015; see Barcus and Halfacree forthcoming) than simply to work within pre-ordained categories. The era of mobilities does indeed seem to suggest here how these social forms are more liquid than we have tended to acknowledge.

Internal Migration within an Era of Mobilities
Every Day, not Everyday
Recognizing the provisional status of ‘internal migration’ as a concept from the previous section, attention will now be paid to how such mobility is entangled with the residential demands placed on people by the neo-liberal globalised capitalist world of the 21st Century. In simple terms, internal migration’s presence and absence is to be presented as both expressing neo-liberal globalisation and as resisting such global logics.

First, though, it is important to return to the status of internal migration overall within an era of mobilities. From the preceding discussion it might be concluded that it acts as a relatively minor member of the mobilities cast, certainly not its star player. This needs qualifying. On the one hand, internal migration represents an every day component within the general cacophony of mobile rhythms of lives that write and reproduce the era of mobilities. On the other hand, such migrations are rarely everyday (Schillmeier 2011) for those involved. Explained in greater detail,
on the one hand, internal migration is an every day mobility, in that almost everyone migrates during their life, most of us many times. As a form of mobility, as has been argued, it is not so clearly distinguishable or as unique as Population Geographers have perhaps tended to imply. And yet, on the other hand, internal migration is not everyday, in that both the significance of a residential relocation and its post-relocation consequential playing out can have profound life course consequences (Fielding 1992; Halfacree and Rivera 2012). In other words, whilst arguing for internal migration to be understood relationally within its mobilities context, it is still generally a bit more existentially significant an action than strolling to the shops for a newspaper...

**Neo-liberal Expressions**

Returning to internal migration’s 21st Century context, contemporary neo-liberal capitalism’s central demand, simply put, is predominantly for a fluid or flexible workforce, where ‘flexibility’ is understood in at least three ways. First, it needs to be flexible in terms of what jobs / tasks can be performed. Workers develop a portfolio of skills / experiences rather than pursue one career, whether defined by job or occupation, except for a small number of senior experts. Second, the workforce must be spatially flexible, willing to move almost at the drop of a hat to access the latest work opportunity. Crucially, this is a spatial flexibility at a variety of scales, from the intra-urban to the international. Third, flexibility is demanded of the life course priorities of the workers, such that existential needs for ties to people, places or practices should not impede the other two areas of flexibility.

From the preceding backdrop, therefore, one might immediately expect internal migration to be enhanced in these neo-liberal times. Indeed, this is implied by the frequent association made between neo-liberalism and mobilities. However, this interpretation is wholly inadequate. It would be to present workers in the kind of atomised ways that bedevil early neo-classical migration theories, for example (Barcus and Halfacree forthcoming). In short, whilst neo-liberal capitalism might desire and prompt enhanced internal migration with one hand, with many of its other hands it can hold back such migration. This is best appreciated in terms of the many ways that (internal) migration is both suppressed but also displaced by and thus dispersed amongst other categories within the mobilities continuum.

First, the process of moving house is of course frequently certainly not as straightforward as the estate agency and removal businesses, for example, would have us believe. Leaflets posted through the door promising a no-hassle house sale certainly cover only part of the relocation network story (Halfacree 2012)! Moving house can consequently be held back for many reasons.
It is widely recognised as stressful (e.g. Mann and Seager 2007) and disruptive (Fielding 1992). It is also usually very costly in terms of time and money. On top of these considerations must also be layered the often notable (as in the UK) geography of housing costs – both rented and owned – which are widely noted with preventing movement from less- to more-expensive places (e.g. Cameron and Muellbauer 1998; Rabe and Taylor 2010).

Any norm of undertaking internal migration for employment reasons is thus frequently impractical or even impossible to enact (see also Coulter 2013). Instead of internal migration, therefore, other forms of mobility may be adopted to compensate the need for geographical employment flexibility (Bonifazi et al. this volume). Internal migration thus becomes displaced into other mobility forms. The most obvious example is the rise of long-distance commuting (e.g. Green et al. 1999), facilitated of course by developments in transport mobilities, but these compensatory forms of mobility can be extended to such unstable and temporary living arrangements as couch or ‘sofa surfing’ (e.g. Schwartz 2013).

Second, the stress and ability to move house is not the only block on internal migration in an era of mobilities. A fluidity in the character of jobs undertaken – flexible jobs, zero-hours contracts, employment precarity – can undermine the incentive to migrate if the job in question is consequently seen as very insecure or unrewarding. Whilst the idea of economic calculation within the migration decision-making process has been widely critiqued, a perhaps more qualitative sense of ‘is it worth it?’ undoubtedly informs this process. When a job is certainly not ‘for life’, then what is the (rational) point of making a ‘permanent’ (sic.) move? How potential migrants engage with risk and uncertainty (Williams and Baláž 2012) is clearly of central significance here.

Third, fluidity can be extended still further to note the mobility consequences of the breakdown of the former predominant norm of a family having one predominant income earner or breadwinner. The growth of the ‘dual-career household’ (e.g. Green 1997), for example, has meant that to find suitable jobs accessible through commuting from a single ‘usual address’ can be extremely challenging. Hence, the rise of ‘dual-location households’ (e.g. Green et al. 1999), ‘commuter marriages’ (e.g. van der Klis and Mulder 2008) and the ‘living-apart-together’ (LAT) relationship (e.g. Levin 2004), all displacing a potential internal (or international) migration. The practice of such households is, in turn – as with long-distance commuting - facilitated by the development of transport mobilities, for example. Furthermore, they demonstrate the de-
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2 As suggested by Shuttleworth et al. (this volume), this issue may be less pertinent in countries with greater socio-economic equality such as Sweden.
differentiating force of mobilities. LAT, for example, expresses ‘neither a new family form... nor... a simple reaction to constraints’ (Duncan *et al.* 2013: 337) but new flexible articulations of inter-personal relationships.

**Resisting Neo-liberalism and De-differentiation**

‘[Mobilities research] emphasizes the relation of such mobilities to associated immobilities and moorings, including their ethical dimension; and it encompasses both the embodied practice of movement and the representations, ideologies and meanings attached to both movement and stillness’ (Sheller 2011: 1).

In the era of mobilities, internal migration is not only at first sight normatively promoted in response to demands for economic flexibility but then in contextual practice undermined by other aspects of neo-liberalism and either blocked or displaced into other mobilities. In addition, negative existential consequences of the contemporary mobilities experience (Cohen and Gössling 2015) can prompt migration and non-migration as critical responses.

Resisting de-differentiating mobilities can, at first sight rather paradoxically, go on to prompt other forms of internal migration, thereby somewhat ironically re-inscribing a positive association between mobilities and internal migration. In particular, whilst a strong individualism as well as (allied) neo-liberalism may stimulate the mobilities condition (Bauman 2007), this can also promote more social- or community-seeking responses, as with many of Duncan *et al.*’s (2013) LATs envisaging future co-habitation. Two further responses will shortly be considered but, as Sheller (2011) acknowledged above, it is important to state that focusing simply on movement forms only part of the scope of the mobilities paradigm.

First, one consequence of numerous mobilities developments, from improved transportation allowing longer distances to be travelled regularly to social media and the internet prompting ever-distant social links, is the potential for social worlds to be ever more geographically scattered. In particular, the most significant and valued social links to immediate family and close friends are often no longer tied down to local, regional or even national scales (Larsen *et al.* 2007). Social media and other communications mobilities are, moreover, not sufficient to keep these links flourishing. Embodied propinquity is still needed, expressed by enhanced Visiting Friends and Relatives (VFR) travel. Janta *et al.* (2014) associates this type of mobility, both internal and international, with five types of practice. It is about maintaining social relationships but it also expresses care provision (e.g. to elderly parents), affirming or even discovering place-based roots and identities, asserting territorial rights (e.g. for voting), and...
pursuing leisure and tourism activities. All but the last of these express a critical response to mobilities’ de-differentiating liquefactions and neo-liberalism’s abstraction of the individual.

Second, ‘decreasing time for co-present social life at home and locally’ (Cohen and Gössling 2015: 1672) or the ability to entangle oneself in more locally place-based community is a further existential experience consequent from enhanced mobilities. This emerges, for example, from the need for the aforementioned extensive VFR mobilities, from the extensive time-space demands of hyper-mobile business travel, or from a more general flexible precarious economic existence. The resulting social or communitarian cost of mobilities can be manifested in many ways. It comes through in a rising ‘desire for connectedness’ (Gössling and Stavrinidi 2015: 2), a rootedness that, as Cooke (2011, 2013, this volume) observes for the US, is not just driven by material priorities.

Desire for (re-)connection is expressed particularly strongly through the imaginative geographical lure of ‘a place in the country’ (Halfacree 2008). This refutes liquid modernity’s treatment of space as ‘ceasing to count for much at all’ (Gale 2009: 132) by emphasizing rurality’s status as a source for articulating a critical form of place consumption. Specifically, as metaphorical ‘bolt-holes’, ‘castles’ or ‘life-rafts’, consuming rural places through residence can express ‘critical responses to mainstream everyday life’ (Halfacree 2010: 250). The mobilities associated with such forms of rural consumption range from those linked to accessing rural leisure and living within second homes (e.g. Halfacree 2012) to more permanent counterurban relocations in search of an assumed sedentary rural *gemeinschaft* existence (e.g. Halfacree 2008; Halfacree and Rivera 2012). Thus, Cognard (2014: 216) could depict even relatively poor urban residents relocating to rural upland areas of France as being motivated in part by the lure of ‘a place that is reassuring in its permanence in these uncertain times’. The burgeoning lifestyle migration literature (e.g. Benson and Osbaldiston 2014) illustrates these pro-rural quests extremely well. Even the amenity migration literature is now recognising how the appeal of many rural places is often about their supposed promise of the ‘slow life’ and ‘stillness’ as much as their recreational offer (Moss 2014).

Together, both some aspects of VFR and community-seeking pro-rural mobilities illustrate how many forms of what Cohen *et al.* (2015) more broadly term ‘lifestyle mobilities’ may be facilitated by Table 1’s five families of contemporary mobilities but nonetheless express a critical narrative on the overall ‘liquid’ condition. It is a narrative with which internal migration is deeply enmeshed. However, critique may also be expressed through non-migration, through efforts to try to stay put and dwell within relatively established and secure locally emplaced moorings. In other words, the presence of non-migration must not be seen solely in terms of constraints
preventing relocation – although these are very widespread, as noted above (e.g. Cooke 2013; Coulter 2013) – but as an expression of asserting more ‘rooted’ social forms of dwelling. Hence, Bonifazi et al. (this volume) show Italy’s more ‘familial’ society’s mobilities experience promoting varied forms of commuting more than internal migration.

**Conclusion: Beyond Mobility Saturation**

‘[I]t is more difficult to fix an effective upper limit to human mobility, even if the phenomenon is obviously finite. Is there a point beyond which mobility becomes counterproductive economically and socially or even psychologically and physiologically? ... When and how will mobility saturation be reached?’ (Zelinsky 1971: 247-8)

It is clear that internal migration has a central place within any present-day era of mobilities and will continue to do so. However, it is simply too one-dimensional to suggest or expect to see any clear positive relationship between the two – mobilities and internal. The whole basis of any mobilities era or zeitgeist is that the whole is greater than the sum of its individual parts... and ‘mobilities’ is much more than internal migration or even migration in total. Indeed, the brief sketch given in this chapter has shown an overall ambiguous relationship between mobilities and internal migration, with the former sometimes encouraging and facilitating but at other times discouraging and preventing the latter. At the same time, both internal migration and non-migration may be seen as attempts to resist and counter the fluid logics of the era of mobilities. Certainly, there is no clear or singular relationship between mobile times and moving house, as Table 2’s summary of the discussion in the last section and the diversity of internal migration experiences illustrated in this book attests. Mobility today may well be an obligation but quite how individuals and families fulfil this is very variable indeed.

*Table 2 about here*

The chapter started with the UK’s Brexit referendum and how the result expressed in part a desire to step from a mobilities existence associated with the European Union and inscribe a neo-sedentarist existence. From an era of mobilities perspective, however, the actual result is likely to be a case of out of the shelter of the EU frying pan into the full force of the neo-liberal fire. With the loss of the social safeguards and spatial boundedness that the EU (imperfectly) provided, to compete economically in a globalised mobilities world, for example, may require the UK to step-up its labour flexibilities within a global as compared to a more regional marketplace that consequently enhances the sense of existential angst that in part shaped the Brexit vote. The
most spatially and socio-economically marginal communities who most vigorously called for leaving the EU, in particular, are likely to become still more abstracted and ‘de-differentiated’ from the global pool of ‘flexible labour’. Whether a result is more internal migration is doubtful since, as shown above, this practice can be demanding of resources – monetary and otherwise – these communities typically lack. And sadly, any option of seeking and building a rewarding place-based community existence is also likely to be very limited indeed. Seeking to drop-out is, in short, likely to fail, as any mass strategy at least, in any era of mobilities.

Overall, to conclude, Zelinsky was extremely perceptive nearly half a century ago with his assertion that the idea of humans being sedentary was no longer satisfactory. How we dwell today implicates countless forms of mobility, of which internal migration continues to play a major part. Yet, the present era of mobilities also highlights the limits of the mobile nomadic life, not least how it is prevented for many and also resisted for its consequences, sometimes in ways such as the Brexit referendum that may ultimately be strongly counterproductive. Indeed, to dwell in an existentially satisfying manner requires much more effort in terms of producing both settlement and mobility practices, including those of internal migration, which fit any 21st Century popular bill.
Table 1: Five Families of Contemporary Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Work, leisure, family, safety: from everyday mobility through internal migration to international migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>Raw and finished goods to producers, retailers, consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaterial</td>
<td>Imaginations</td>
<td>Other places via written word, photographs, film and TV, memories, conversations, dreams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaterial</td>
<td>Virtual worlds</td>
<td>Internet exploration of places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material and/or</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Letters, cards, phone calls, emails, texts, online conversations (e.g. Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: substantially adapted from Gale 2009: 133; Larsen et al. 2006: 4)
Table 2: Internal Migration and Neo-liberal Mobilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-liberal Consequences: Mobilities</th>
<th>Internal Migration +</th>
<th>Internal Migration -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexible work and workers - precarity</td>
<td>• Displacement to other mobilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Normative ‘nomadic’ identities</td>
<td>• Generalised conditions – no point to moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monetary costs, geographically highly variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberal Resistances: Community</td>
<td>• Enhanced importance of VFR</td>
<td>• Staying put – building place-based communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Second home consumption</td>
<td>• Dropping-out – Brexit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pro-rural lifestyles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 1: The Mobility Continuum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday movement</td>
<td>• Home, Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily short-distance trips</td>
<td>• School, Work, Shopping, Family, Social activities, Leisure, Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular longer trips</td>
<td>• Business, Family, Social, Leisure, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical mobility between two homes</td>
<td>• Long-distance weekly commuting, Students, Children between parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday away from home</td>
<td>• Various distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residential moves</td>
<td>• Same community, Short distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-distance migration</td>
<td>• Same country, Various distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International migration</td>
<td>• Various distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual mobility</td>
<td>• Almost limitless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: based on Pooley et al. 2005: Figure 1.1)
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