

Sven Kesserling

Mobility, Power and the Emerging New Mobilities Regimes

(doi: 10.2383/77047)

Sociologica (ISSN 1971-8853)

Fascicolo 1, gennaio-aprile 2014

Ente di afferenza:

()

Copyright © by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.

Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it>

Licenza d'uso

Questo articolo è reso disponibile con licenza CC BY NC ND. Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it/>

Mobility, Power and the Emerging New Mobilities Regimes

by Sven Kesselring

doi: 10.2383/77047

Modern everyday lives, economies and cultural practices are strongly shaped, structured but also limited by complex regimes of mobility and flow. On different scales – from the body to the global – multiple regulatory regimes are governing the ways how individuals, collectives and nation states are managing social relations over distance. Complex power settings of principles, norms and rules structure the ways how individuals stay in contact with other people, places, organizations, institutions and so forth¹. These “mobilities regimes” [Witzgall, Vogl, Kesselring 2013] are highly ambivalent phenomena: on the one side they decrease social inequalities by making mobility accessible and available for more and more people. But on the other side those who are set immobile or who don't have access to relevant technologies and infrastructures - or even don't have the necessary skills to manage complex mobilities – are often socially excluded. In this sense mobility regimes can also work as facilitators of disintegration and incoherence. They can foster mobility and strengthen equality through better chances for social participation. But mobilities regimes can also inten-

¹ This understanding of regimes is based on the definition provided by Nohlen, Schultze, Schüttemeyer [1998] and takes into account the changing socio-political conditions which are shaping mobility policies in nation states, cities and regions which can be described in terms of networks and governance processes [Hajer and Wagenaar 2003]. Further ahead a working definition based on Nohlen *et al.* [1998] is presented but it also needs to be considered that regime theory is a fairly young discipline and a seminal definition of regimes is still missing [Mossberger and Stoker 2001]. Therefore the definition of mobilities regimes that will be presented later has to be considered as work in progress.

sify social exclusion when the mobility of others enforces the immobility of some, e.g. to guarantee specific functionalities in companies and organizations [Kesselring forth.; Kesselring 2012; Sassen 2010; Cresswell 2006; Massey 1999].

To elaborate and illustrate this theoretical perspective the article relies on considerations and concepts derived from earlier empirical and theoretical research. While my former research has been focused on specific aspects of mobilities regimes such as urban mobility politics [Kesselring 2001], mobility behavior, technology use [Kesselring 2008] and mobile work [Kesselring and Vogl 2010a; 2010b], this text aims for sketching out a more general perspective on mobilities regimes, also including issues such as mobile identities, migration and planning aspects of mobility politics.

1. Global Mobilities

It is a major issue for modern societies how mobilities regimes shall develop in the future. The transition of large scale mobility and transport systems toward sustainability needs a better understanding of the nature, the power structures and the limits of mobilities regimes at work. It needs profound analyzes of the interfaces and interconnections between different mobilities regimes which are structuring the social, physical, virtual and cultural interactions across space in modern societies.

Globalization research has moved social and spatial mobilizations to the center of attention in social science and theory. From a once marginal place in social theory the question of how and why people, institutions, economies and societies travel shifted into the centre stage of sociological theorizing [Urry 2000; Bauman 2000]. Social, political, economic, and cultural developments geared toward worldwide interconnected structures of interaction; and the exchanges and constant flow of physical, social, and digital units are interpreted as an all-embracing liquefaction of spatial, social, and cultural relations [Bauman 2000; Ritzer 2010]. Authors such as David Harvey [1982; 1990], Doreen Massey, Anthony Giddens, Benno Werlen and others take this as indicators for the shrinking of the world induced by the technologically advanced acceleration of transport and communication and the speeding-up of modern lifestyles. Spaces and spheres that were once clearly separated and cut off from each other can be closely coupled through transportation and communication systems now. New ways of living apart together over distances are emerging, Skype-based long-distance relationships, new forms of organizing and structuring work, collaboration and team-work are being developed and practiced – on an increasing level

of routine, normality and self-evidence [Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2013; Doyle and Nathan 2001; Andriessen and Vartiainen 2006; Axtell and Hislop 2008]. Complex remote processes in production processes, problem solving and work-related coordination can be managed in real time and globally. The simultaneity of events and actions represents a radical change in the way space and time is experienced. It is a product of the exclusiveness of spaces dissolving and being permeated and reshaped by socio-material networks, which at the same time both enhance and restrict the mobility of people, commodities, raw materials, data, information, signs, and signals. Virtual, communicative, and media-based mobility occur simultaneously in the same place yet in different spaces. “Immediacy” [Tomlinson 2003] becomes an essential feature of contemporary cultures shaped by physical and virtual mobilities:

Now we have the phenomenon of immediacy, which, in its light, effortless, easy ubiquity, has more or less displaced both the laborious and the heroic cultural attachments of an earlier speed. And with this displacement comes a shift in cultural assumptions, expectations, attitudes and values. [*Ibidem*, 57]

The mobilizations I am describing here are by no means simply natural or inevitable developments. Rather, they are the outcome of a multitude of collective and individual decisions made in politics, economy, culture and everyday life. They are decisions affecting how mobility spaces and structures develop and what is included in or excluded from the social and spatial organization of transport and communication infrastructures. Therefore this paper is a plea for taking serious the political character of mobilities regimes. They need to be considered as fundamental instruments for structuring social interactions and contexts in general. Recent work has taken this into account and generated sophisticated analyzes of institutional (mobility) policies [Jensen 2006; 2012] and the governance of mobility infrastructures such as airports [Kloppenburger 2013; Salter 2008a; 2008b]. The aim of these works is to decode mobilities regimes as social constructions, as socio-political processes of defining how people, places and processes get connected and linked together. By producing links and relations in the global spatial economy political institutions, engineers, planners, workers and public authorities are making the social world on a daily basis. By designing transport systems, vehicles, inventing new forms of communication and interaction, developing “miniaturized mobilities” [Elliott and Urry 2010] and mobile devices for instant communication on the go stakeholders and socio-political actors are defining the future of modern globalized societies.

Ritzer therefore defines globalization as

(...) a transplanetary process or set of processes involving increasing liquidity and the growing multidirectional flows of people, objects, places and information as well

as the structures they encounter and create that are barriers to, or expedite, those flows. [Ritzer 2010, 2]

By pointing this out he emphasizes the ambivalences within these processes. He considers the emerging mobilities regimes as advancing mobility while restricting and channeling it at the same time. In accentuating this aspect, he draws attention to the fact that not everything and everyone is mobile but rather the paths and potentials for mobility are defined and regulated in a highly interconnected world. Urry [2000] has this in mind when he emphasizes that the object of mobility research is the triangle of “networks, scapes, and flows.” What he means by this is that there are socio-material structures and networks based on scapes (road-, rail-, water, and airways, cables, GPS connections, wireless connections of various kinds, etc.) in which people, commodities, raw materials, capital, signs, and information can flow. Ritzer again points out

(...) that that which is fluid never flows outside of set structures, which encapsulate, channel, contain, or even seek to inhibit it. These containers, channels, dams, and barriers function in many different ways. [Ritzer and Murphy 2002, 53 – translated from German by the authors]

What Ritzer mentions as “containers, channels, dams, and barriers” are the metaphors for the ways how modern societies are structuring and designing their mobilities. Mobility regimes materialize in form of cars, trains, ships, driving licenses, traffic regulations but also as travel regulations within companies, illegal trafficking routes for smuggling people, goods, drugs, and commodities, border controls, immigration laws, the open skies treaties, security controls on airports and in public buildings, etc.

In modern societies mobilities are considered as the precondition and sometimes also as the guarantee for growth, prosperity, equality, and productivity. At least public political rhetoric often considers sustainable mobility as a goal which can be reached without reducing the amount of physical movements [see critically: Urry 2013; Dennis 2013; Banister 2008]. The discussions around electric mobility i.e. often lack from a critical reflection of that it probably will be impossible to guarantee the same amount of automobility by the new engines. Instead, electric mobility can be seen as the incubator for a new mobility concept which is not even grounded on an automobile which can easily go for 1000 kilometer at one distance. Electric cars currently have a mileage of about 100 kilometers. Also with a boost in innovation and huge investments in infrastructures and smart grid energy provision it seems unlikely that electric powertrains can fully replace the combustion engines and the like. It is more likely that electric vehicles propel new mobility concepts.

At the same time, the unintended side effects of the motorization and mobilization of the past more than a hundred years (such as CO₂ emissions, climate change, urban fine dust problems, ecological devastation and social problems such as disintegration, anomy and decreasing life quality in cities and suburban regions) pose massive threats to humans and ecosystems [Dennis 2013].

The traffic volume that has evolved over the past 100 years is a source of huge problems and substantial ecological, financial, social, and cultural costs and crises. Mobility systems strongly determine the spatial and organizational structures of modern societies and make them vulnerable and depending on their functionality and stability [Urry 2004; 2010; Graham 2010]. Analyses of the automobile system and global infrastructures, such as transportation and communication technologies (airplanes/airports, container ships, freight logistics systems, telecommunication, etc.), inform us about how the centers of power are geopolitically distributed across the globe. Most transportation activities occur between the nodes of so-called world city networks [Taylor 2004]. By tracing air activity between airports, we can reconstruct a geopolitical map of the world based on such transportation data [Derudder, van Nuffel and Witlox 2009].

Cities, such as London, Paris, or New York, and their infrastructures function as “spatial fixes” [Brenner 1998] through which circulate flows of capital, labor, commodities, and waste. In order to realize this tremendous mobility potential, complex political, organizational, and cultural mobilities regimes have evolved, which allow accessing spaces, maintaining stable links between people, institutions, markets, and nation states, and regulating movements between the nodes of the global network society.

Global infrastructures of roads, intercontinental waterways, high-speed rail, air traffic, and global supply chains are linking cities, towns, and regions to the rest of the world. This creates new mobility constraints and new mobile practices. And it gives rise to constantly changing mobile forms of work and lifestyles, and triggers global chains of cause and effect that both, individuals and modern institutions and organizations force to get around with it. German sociologists Norbert Huchler and Nicole Dietrich analyze flight crews’ strategies of creating stability and a sense of embeddedness in their mobile lives. They consider this as subject-bound reactions and strategies on the body scale which ground in the embodiment and normalization of specific mobility regimes [Huchler 2013; Huchler and Dietrich 2013]. But what they strongly neglect is the fact that these forms of mobile living arrangements and social “navigations” are only possible because huge mobility systems build the socio-material backbone for the management of grant mobilities. The whole system of worldwide connected airport infrastructures, airline networks, security and mon-

itoring systems, baggage handling, global just-in-time catering and cleaning services and the social organization of mobile work (as in the case of flight crews) mutually influence and structure each other. Massive systems of expertise and control are needed to empower the airline personal for these logistics and, as Huchler [2013] describes in detail, a high level of subjectification and governmentality, of individualized discipline, self-exploitation and responsibility is needed to guarantee this level of reliability and functionality that is necessary to keep aeromobility at work and in place. This is in line with earlier research on emotional control and self-management in mobile jobs [Hochschild 2003; Poppitz 2009; Hislop 2013].

Without explicitly using the mobilities terminology Tsing [2009] identifies a historically new type of capitalism based on worldwide mobilities regimes. She speaks of “supply chain capitalism” and analyzes how social structures and inequalities outside the reach of national politics and regulation are aligned along the networks of transport and logistics infrastructures. These are used by businesses (e.g. in the textile or automobile industry) to produce more efficiently and at lower costs. Hegemonic relations between consumers, manufacturers, workers, their families and social networks are formed and consolidated along these chains; chains that at least challenge, if not evade, the influence of public policy. Bashi [2007] elaborated how the organization of work and immigration shapes specific forms of socio-geographic arrangements of social networks. She uses the metaphors of “hubs” and “spokes” what associates “aeromobilities” [Cwerner, Kesselring and Urry 2009] as a paradigmatic model of socio-geographical formation.

Misguided developments and decisions in urban planning have led to urban architectures and everyday mobility cultures that are almost completely reliant on the automobile, as evidenced by cities such as Atlanta, Houston, Riyadh, Cairo, or New Delhi. This has entrapped people in rigid, historically developed car-based mobilities regimes [Flink 1988; Wulfhorst *et al.* 2013]. The development of transportation infrastructure has not at all yielded more mobility and autonomy. Studies of automobility show that permanent reliance on the automobile can result in losing the ability to recognize and use alternative modes of transportation and mobility. The development of infrastructure geared toward the automobile (as in the case of the USA and Canada) virtually immobilizes people, especially in old age, when they no longer have access to an automobile in the way they had been accustomed to [Fisker 2011]. These people are dependent on the mobility of others. Their mobility potentials need to be constituted externally through people who are professionally or due to family and emotional relations and obligations close to them.

Following Inda and Rosaldo [2008], comprehensive analyses of globalization processes must also pay attention to the “material practices” shaping worldwide mo-

bility. With this, the authors have both physical and social phenomena in mind and emphasize the ambivalent character of mobility regimes, such as infrastructure, institutions, regulatory mechanisms, governmental strategies, and so forth – that both produce and preclude movement. The objective here is to suggest that global flows are patently structured and regulated, such that while certain objects and subjects are permitted to travel, others are not. Immobility and exclusion are thus as much a part of globalization as movement [Inda and Rosaldo 2008, 29].

In the case of corporate mobility regimes travel regulations straight forwardly define the way how people can travel and by which technical equipment they can do this. But in a business world where it is estimated “that the worldwide mobile worker population will increase from just over 1 billion in 2010 to more than 1.3 billion by 2015”², we can expect a gap between mobile and immobile workers. Nevertheless is an open questions if Bauman’s assumption is correct that all the mobile people “circulate close to the top of the global power pyramid” where “space matters little and distance is not a bother” [Bauman 2005, 3]. Considering the empirical reality in corporate mobilities regimes we need to say that the mobile personal is facing massive social costs and risks. Compared with the stationary staff they need to invest much more time and energy into the maintaining of stable social relations and also health problems play an massive role for the mobile workers [Schneider 2009].

2. Conceptual Considerations and Definition of Mobilities Regimes

Tangible structures must not be viewed solely as built environments and infrastructures made of glass, concrete, tar, steel, or fiberglass. Rather, they are at the same time solid social structures (namely mobilities regimes), which regulate movement in space and in the Weberian sense they eventually congeal into physical and physically measurable materialities. My understanding of mobilities regimes refers to a concept of regimes applied in political science, as proposed by Nohlen *et al.* [1998]. On this basis, I come to a general definition of the concept of mobilities regime. In general, a regime is a way of life, type of order, and form of governance, thus an institutionalized set of principles, norms, and rules that regulates, in a basic way, how actors operate in a given context of action [Nohlen, Schultze and Schüttemeyer 1998, 548].

Mobilities regimes hence represent specific sets of principles, norms, and rules that regulate, in a fundamental way, the movement of individuals, artifacts, capital, data, etc. in a given context of action. Generally speaking, mobilities regimes are a matter of disciplining and channeling movements and mobility by way of principles,

² See www.IDC.com.

norms, and rules. The differentiation of three levels of a mobilities regime refers to different depths of intervention in individual autonomy, with principles representing the most general form while norms pre-structure action in concrete and precise ways. Rules, on the other hand, can be viewed as a general code of conduct/behavior, which represents binding guidelines for action.

Against this background, we can identify a multitude of mobilities regimes at different levels of society. They range from so-called “VFR regimes” (visiting friends and relatives) where more informal and socially coded norms and rules predominate to the global mobilities regimes of international air traffic, container shipping lines, and national and international migration policies, etc. In VFR regimes mobility is regulated by class, milieu, network-specific codes of conduct and cultural norms. In corporate regimes numerous rules exist which govern the way how people travel, work while travel, stay in touch and communicate with customers and colleagues etc. and which direct the mobility of employees and membership [Kesselring forth.]. In global mobilities regimes sometime rigid legal frameworks guarantee and limit specific forms of mobility and select people and artifacts in those who are allowed to travel and those who don't. Mobility regimes such as passport regimes, immigration regimes and legislations which for instance define differences between EU and non EU members or differences between risky and non-risky travelers from specific countries determine the way how people and things are moving around the globe. This politics of mobility can be studied and analyzed in many places such as different mobility-related forms of globalization (interational labor, migration, gender issues) and the different mechanisms of governing and controlling immigration. Salter's work in Foucauldian tradition on airports and passport regimes (in the sense of mobility regimes) and other studies concerned with spatial control and surveillance strategies in the global age [Salter 2008a; 2008b; Adey 2004; Kitchin and Dodge 2009; Klop-penburg 2013] investigate the efficient policies modern societies have develied to channel flows of human bodies and artifacts.

3. Contextualizations in Time

In 1950, transport statistics recorded 25 million legal arrivals at international airports. Recent estimates indicate that the number of international arrivals has already exceeded one billion [Urry 2007, 3]. The ten busiest airports in the world, at the head of the list Atlanta, Chicago, London, Tokyo, and Los Angeles, represent 600 million passengers annually [Ritzer 2010, 16]. It is assumed that at least 360,000 passengers frequent U.S. airspace at any point in time. These figures, however, do not

necessarily mean that the number of mobile people has increased in total; what has changed dramatically is above all the distances, the ways and forms how mobility is performed, and the means of transportation used in traveling and maintaining social relationships over long distances. While use of the Internet and telecommunication has increased significantly, physical travel remains the major means of maintaining stable and intimate relationships with others.

Overall, the development of global mobilities regimes has led to changes in societies' relations to space, geographical distance, and time. Tomlinson [2003] describes the fusion and parallelization of physical and virtual mobility as a key feature of the new mobilities regimes. For mobility and transport are phenomena that are not only structurally predetermined to a high degree but also politically and socially regulated, irrespective of all of modernity's claims to freedom. The different mobilities regimes not only enhance and demand mobility, both of people and technical artifacts (cars, trains, airplanes, ships, bicycles, pedelecs, segways, etc.), they also define the limits of individual mobility and often the paths in which people are allowed and expected to exercise mobility as well.

At the moment when people move in space, different mobilities regimes intersect and structure strongly whether, when, and how travel occurs. At the same time, Internet use has increased significantly. In Germany, 76 percent of the German population accesses the Internet on a daily basis.³ Yet, as Lübke [1995] writes, communication has encouraged rather than replaced people's physical mobility. The equation therefore is this: the more people communicate, the more reasons they have to meet in person. In this vein, the Internet since its existence has led to more condensed social networks and in many of them virtual and physical spaces superimpose each other. The telecommunication technologies available worldwide intensify professional and economic relationships in particular, resulting in a continuous increase of face-to-face meetings, a growing culture of "meetingness" [Urry 2007]. A consequence is that the number of business trips have been increasing steadily rather than decreasing for years. In Germany, from 2010 to 2011 there was an increase of 7.4 percent in business trips, in total from 8.1 to 8.8 million trips annually [VDR-Verband Deutsches Reisemanagement 2013]. Face-to-face contacts are essential for community and trust. This is why it seems that the hopes attached to teleworking today face a similar fate as those once associated with the paperless office in the 1980s. Instead of substituting physical travel and commuting telework generates other forms of mobility and spatial movement. New technologies have boosted paper consumption in the business world since everything can be printed anywhere

³ See www.ard-zdf-onlinestudie.de.

anytime. A similar trend can be observed for communication technologies, such as video and Internet conferences, e-mail communication, and Internet telephony: they have resulted in closer social relationships and networks, thus giving rise to more physical travel.

Expanding telecommunication, because of its technical properties, due to which it remains unsatisfactory psychologically and in terms of group dynamics, in turn creates an additional need for immediate communication, and with the increasing number of teleconferences thus grows the number of meetings of the traditional kind, generating demand for travel [Lübbe 1995, 118].

Although this statement is 18 years old now, more recent research shows that the potential for reducing traffic through communication is far from being fully utilized. Instead, the evidence seems to confirm that communication is a driver in generating traffic [Denstadli and Gripsrud 2010].

Tomlinson considers the above mentioned “culture of immediacy” a characteristic feature of the mobile risk society. The ongoing diversification of forms of mobility give rise to changed modes of interaction that to an increasingly lesser extent are bound to a common location. Multiple mobilities, specifically social, spatial, virtual, and cultural mobilities, transform the industrial modernity into a mobile risk society where the future is strongly dependent on the question if modernity can trace a way towards the post-carbon age [Urry 2011; 2013; Jensen and Freudendal-Pedersen 2012].

Urry [2007] identifies five processes of traffic generation. In describing these, he shows that the dynamics underlying the development of mobility in modernity depend on a variety of context factors, constraints, obligations, and options that people are faced with in individualized societies with a high division of labor. He also demonstrates that nearly all basic activities in modern societies are grounded in mobility or get transformed through mobilities.

The first process is “legal, economic and familial obligations to attend a relatively formal meeting.” This refers to events such as notary appointments, weddings, funerals, etc. where physical presence is indispensable and non-negotiable. Situations of this kind involve so-called “mobility burdens”: formal expectations placed on the individual from the outside, which one can ill afford to resist and not without incurring sanctions. The second process he mentions is “social obligations to meet and to converse often involving strong expectations of presence and attention of the participants.” What is meant by this is that there exist less formal occasions that nonetheless involve strong normative expectations requiring travel to a certain location. Cases in point are a child’s high school graduation ceremony, the company Christmas party, etc. These are events where personal attendance is not

legally required but there is a high degree of social obligation and normative pressure demanding physical presence. “Such social obligations to networks of friends or family or colleagues are necessary for sustaining trust and commitment.” The third process he refers to is “obligations to be co-present with others to sign specific contracts, to work on written or visual texts, to give gifts to distant others, to devise solutions to ill-functioning objects or to devise new instruments for scientific purposes.” Especially in the context of work, there are a large number of reasons why people are required work and cooperate “elbow to elbow” and which explain why many hopes of replacing physical by virtual mobility have not materialized. Besides, there are “obligations to be in and experience a place ‘directly’ on occasions through movement within it and touch.” The paradigmatic case is journalistic research, which typically requires to be done on the spot and not by drawing on second or third hand information acquired through reading or the Internet. The last process Urry describes is “obligations to experience a ‘live’ event that happens at a specific moment and place.” If we want to experience a live concert or cheer for our favorite football team, we have no choice but to go where the action is.

The list illustrates that with regard to the reasons for travel, the various mobilities regimes overlap and mutually reinforce one another. Private and family relationships may provide motives for going from one place to another, create the desire to attend a specific event while at the same time conversing about it with friends in other places, or wake the wish to engage in touristic travel to certain cities and regions.

Today, physical mobility combines seamlessly with virtual mobility. Mobile work is the paradigmatic case as it epitomizes the disjunction of production from any specific location. Already today, but more so in the future, work can be done anywhere and everywhere: in one’s car, which becomes a mobile office, at an airport lounge, café, cafeteria, public park, and presumably even at the much-cited beach, as propagated in advertisements time and again.

Yet, besides the partially elitist mobility pioneers, which Elliot and Urry [2010] call “advanced mobiles,” this fusion of physical and virtual mobility in combination with modern society’s orientation toward acceleration and mobility has an immediate impact on the lower, less privileged classes. On the one hand, the existence of global infrastructures has intensified the international division of labor, leading to people in poorer countries increasingly taking on the jobs considered less attractive in rich countries [Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2004]. Tolstokorova [2013] analyzes Ukrainian women’s mobility strategies who respond to the poor job prospects at home by

leaving their country to seek employment as housekeepers in private homes abroad. Her focus extends beyond the working and living situation of the migrant women only, to include the circumstances of the family members left behind. On the other hand, this results in developments where, for instance, lower class slum dwellers in newly industrializing countries, such as Brazil, use low-cost carriers to travel from Sao Paulo or Rio de Janeiro to visit their relatives in the northeast [Freire-Medeiros and Name 2013]. Instead of traveling more than 90 hours by bus from southern Porto Alegre to Manaus in the north of Brazil people nowadays fly by low-cost airlines. In this sense social upward mobility has a massive impact on physical travelling, comparably as it is in the BRIC states where e.g. in China rising incomes of lower classes results in rises of automobility and car ownership. Changing social norms and values therefore cause significant modifications in mobilities regimes regulation the physical travels of people.

In a qualitative study of the social costs of “corporate mobilities regimes” in Germany four dimensions have proven a sound basis for describing structural changes: the normalization, rationalization, subjectification, and the time-space compression of work-induced mobility. These dimensions also represent discourses on the social structuring of mobility that apply outside of company settings.

The normalization of mobility must be considered as a sort of overarching process which involves the rationalization, subjectification, and time-space compression of mobility practices on an individual as well as company level. People who are mobile experience more opportunities, but also come under greater pressure, to organize their movements in space efficiently and effectively. Expectations of being available at all times and able to respond immediately are not only on the rise in work-related contexts [Ducki 2010]. New technologies are changing the ways of communicating and interacting in private settings and intimate relationships. Here, too, people are increasingly expecting prompt responses and quick coordination. Companies have created powerful mobilities regimes including strong organizational capacities for mobility management to rationalize employees’ travel and communication activities. The fact that more trips are taken in shorter periods of time and, above all, over greater distances is only one side of the coin. The other side is that mobile technologies offer new opportunities for control. Subjectification in company settings, as an expression of individualization in society, results in increasingly holding the individual responsible for organizing travel efficiently. Corporate travel policies determine that each employee individually is required to economize on travel time and travel costs. This, in turn, furthers the blurring of the boundaries between private and working life as some employees begin their business trips on weekends

even though this may strongly interfere with their private and family life. Adding to this is the fact that the availability of high-speed transportation and communication technologies leads to the intensification of work, a process that we might describe as the time-space compression of work, and thus places growing pressure on the workforce.

Corporate mobilities regimes, for instance, may demand from employees, often in rigid ways, a readiness to be mobile. Mobile workers and business travelers have only a limited say in how they conduct their travel activities. Although they may indeed have some discretion (in some cases to a considerable degree) in determining when they travel, how long, and in making the specific arrangements surrounding the trip, they usually have little influence concerning whether they travel and where to. Corporate travel policies lay down, to the greatest possible extent, a binding set of rules, which may not be changed or interpreted flexibly except for good reasons. Yet, to use Ritzer's imagery [2010], the major channels (i.e. travel routes), barriers (rules prohibiting business travel for private purposes), and restrictions (rules prohibiting travel to certain countries) and the like are set and non-negotiable. It is not in the power of the individual traveler to arrange his or her own mobility; rather the mobiles invariably operate in a field of tension between autonomy and heteronomy. Hence, the autonomous, mobile subject is most notably a theme of first modernity. In the mobile risk society, we are looking at so-called "motile hybrids" who must seek to carry through with their own goals, plans, and projects often against rival attempts at exerting excessive control and direction from the outside. Referring to highly qualified professionals in multinational corporations, analyses of corporate mobility practices show that occupational mobility is by no means simply a privilege but involves new burdens as well [Millar and Salt 2008; Bozkurt 2013; Huchler 2013].

The table below lists some of the mobilities regimes found in modern societies, which allow maintaining social relationships across distances. I have distinguished them according to the macro, meso, and micro levels of social structuring to which they relate. As opposed to this heuristic, the various mobilities regimes constantly mesh with and influence one another. For this reason, the analysis of any such regime must always consider several of them from the vantage point of the specific issue or problem to be addressed.⁴

⁴ In the study of corporate mobilities regimes, all three levels had some significance since company structures in conditions of globalization cannot be explained without reference to global transportation, communication, and logistics networks and mobile work invariably has an impact on employees' social relationships.

TAB. 1. *Mobilities Regimes in Modern Societies*

Macro-level	<p><i>Global mobilities regimes</i> Global transport, GPS and telecommunication regimes (e.g. aeromobilities, global container shipping, navigation and routing, etc.) Nation state border regimes Global migration and illegal trafficking regimes etc.</p>
Meso-level	<p><i>Intra-organizational mobilities regimes</i> “Networked firm”, trans-national organizations (United Nations, Worldbank, etc.), national and trans-national professional networks, NGOs (Greenpeace, Amnesty International, etc.)</p>
Micro-level	<p><i>Subject-oriented mobilities regimes</i> VFR networks, social networks in general, families, friendship, virtual communities, etc.</p>

Source: Author’s Elaboration

Mobilities regimes, such as global networks of airports, airlines, and the supply and service networks connected to them ensure that reliable global social and economic relations can be developed. These regimes are regulated, for instance, by international, mostly binational, agreements, such as the Treaty on Open Skies regulating the liberalization of aviation. However, in addition to the fairly general provisions of such agreements, these global mobilities regimes are shaped by national policies and the specific provisions in effect at individual airports. Such national policies include legal provisions regulating the entry and exit of people, import and export of commodities, right of asylum, or the terms of use of airport facilities as such [for details, see Salter 2004; Fuller and Harley 2005; Aaltola 2005; Adey 2004; Beckmann 2004]. In her study of the case of the Indonesian airport of Jakarta Kloppenburg [2013] demonstrates how different mobility practices and policies can promote or inhibit the mobility of people and goods. In the following section, I will explore these ambivalences of modern mobility in more detail and inquire into the foundations of mobility from the perspective of modernization theory.

4. Mobility and Modernity

Modernization and mobilization are closely intertwined [Leed 1991; Berman 1982]. According to Tully [1999], in many areas of society, people are virtually “taught to be mobile.” This has resulted in the institutionalization of a “mobility imperative” in society and hence a situation in which the readiness to be mobile be-

longs to the “portfolio” of the modern capitalist individual [Boltanski and Chiapello 2005; Kaufmann and Montulet 2008]. Young people, employees, and citizens are encouraged to develop “competitive advantages” *vis-à-vis* immobile populations and all those refusing to submit to mobility demands.

In the following, I will take a closer look at the normalization of mobility as a central tendency. The concept of normalization refers strongly to social constructivist theories as represented by Berger and Luckmann [1980] and some approaches from critical discourse analysis [Foucault 1970; Link 1999]. But it also refers to theoretical and methodological approaches which analyze the relevance of routines and discursive structures in everyday life [Freudendal-Pedersen 2009; Reckwitz 2002]. Instead of talking about normalization, Beck uses the term “banal cosmopolitanism” [Beck 2006; 2008] to describe the social and cultural changes in everyday life that oftentimes go unnoticed and are difficult to grasp. What he means by this is that our consumption (and also mobility) habits are being globalized *en passant*: what is offered in the refrigerated or fruit sections of our grocery stores is comprised of items from stores of food all over the globe while, for the most part, we hardly know what parts of world the products come from. In line with this global mobility becomes a good which is far from being extraordinary or elitist anymore. International and transcontinental flights are no longer privileged to the upper middle class and beyond but increasingly available at cheap prices for people with lower incomes and also in lower positions in companies. Ritzer [2010] gives an illustration referring to the production of his book, from which the following passage is cited. He shows how the various forms of physical and virtual mobility are connected and overlap:

[...], this book is being written by an American; my editor and copy-editor are in England; the development editor is in Canada; reviewers are from four continents; the book is printed in Singapore and distributed by the publisher throughout much of the world; and you might be reading it today on a plane en route from Vladivostok to Shanghai. Further, if it follows the pattern of many of my other books, it may well be translated into Russian, Chinese, and many other languages. Amazon.com may make it one of its digital books that can be read via its wireless portable reading device, Kindle. This would make the book highly liquid since it would be possible for it to be downloaded anywhere in the world at any time. [Ritzer 2010, 3]

The “supply chain capitalism” [Tsing 2009] is obvious and virtually ubiquitous in society today. Material and immaterial “flows” play a crucial role in this context. This leads Ritzer [2010] to argue, in the same vein as Bauman and Urry, that the increasing predominance of the mobile in modernity results in radical change in once firmly institutionalized structures, thus calling for a revision of theoretical perspective. Urry [2000] uses the notion of “dwelling in mobility” to describe the

fact that “transnational connections” [Hannerz 2002] in combination with virtual and “mobile connections” have become commonplace in private life and the working world for many. E-mail exchange, mobile communication and scheduling and business trips extending beyond employees’ own regional and national context have more or less become normality in recent years [Doyle and Nathan 2001; Kellerman 2012]. At least Schneider [2008] shows that experiences with mobility and the belief that being mobile belongs to the key requirements expected from today’s personnel are widespread in the six European countries investigated. Germany even ranks as the “European champion” in terms of frequency of experienced mobility. One in five employees report of having more or less intensive experiences with business travel, moving, or commuting over long distances. Schneider *et al.*’s data are remarkable in that they reflect a development in discourse within society according to which mobility is experienced as a new normality. What I mean by this is that changes have occurred at the level of guiding ideas clearly placing greater emphasis on mobility than in the past.

Whereas the characteristic types of mobility in traditional societies and first modernity were represented by fringe groups and so-called mobility pioneers, in the post-industrial societies of second modernity the main types of mobility are to a much greater degree part of everyday life. It is no longer the poor traveler on the fringes of society, the day laborer of premodernity, or the privileged, educated bourgeois, artist, or scholar [à la Turner, Goethe, or Humboldt] in the heyday of modernity who stands for a mobile lifestyle and cosmopolitan mindset. In second modernity, they have been replaced by executives, mundane business travelers, and tourists who are the epitome of the mobile person in present-day society.

First-hand knowledge of the world is no longer the privilege of elitist groups that possess the required skills and necessary economic, social, and cultural capital to discover the world. Today, from top to bottom across all social strata experiences with mobility are being made and complex, worldwide networks of social and professional relationships are being formed. Emanating from mobility pioneers, mobility competence spreads throughout society and becomes available to a larger part of the population than had been the case in the past, because of their exclusive nature, rigid and socially static class societies of the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth century.

TAB. 2. *Mobility Concepts*

Mobility Concepts	<i>Regional Mobility</i>	<i>Territorial Mobility</i>	<i>Globalized Mobility</i>	<i>Virtualized Mobility</i>
Socialization Patterns	Movement without mobility (reaching into the 18 th century)	Nation-states as point of reference for movement (18 th /19 th century)	Movement beyond the nation-state (19 th /20 th century)	Mobility beyond the time-space-continuum (late 20 th century)
<i>Traditional societies</i> Agricultural societies	The “poor traveller” Pilgrim Conquistadores Trader			
<i>Industrial modernity</i> Industrialized societies since late 18 th century		Goethe type traveller Day laborer Commuter	Humboldt type scientist Cosmopolitan Emigrant & Immigrant	
<i>Mobile risk society</i> Post-industrial risk societies since late 20 th century			(Mass) tourist Trans-migrant Global manager	“Digital nomad” Net surfer Advanced mobiles Mobile workers

Source: Author's Elaboration

The normalization of micro, meso, and macro-scale mobilities regimes has a democratizing side effect, as it were: it gives individuals of all social strata the opportunity to develop the potential and acquire the skills for mobility. This is not to say that in mobile risk societies, everyone everywhere is constantly on the move and has access to everything. What it means is rather that social orientations, the demands on labor, and the “enactment” of individuality are undergoing change. In contrast to first modernity, the mobility imperative has become a key element in the normative settings that govern social life and cooperation in the world of work: “An apologia for change, risk and mobility replaces the high premium put on the idea of security” [Boltanski and Chiapello 2005, 89].

For this reason, changes in the late Twentieth century towards a mobile risk society must be subjected to closer scrutiny. Especially under the influence of the Internet, which has gradually become commercialized and democratized since the early 1990s and without which everyday life has become difficult to imagine, our social practices and perceptions of mobility have undergone significant change. Whereas communication and mobility were strictly separated in first modernity, various forms of physical and virtual mobility are amalgamated in second modernity. Making a phone call, writing a letter, or orienting oneself in space no longer requires us to be at a certain place. Being available while on the road, staying in touch with other people

and institutions while traveling, driving to work, or visiting a café with friends, with few exceptions, poses no problem at all. Access to the new media, at least theoretically, can provide an opportunity to stay in touch with friends and family, or also to contact the police or authorities, for people who are forced into mobility, such as refugees, certain migrant laborers, and victims of human trafficking, prostitution, or slavery. Technological developments along the lines of augmented reality and cloud computing are progressing at a breathtaking pace. Under certain circumstances, this can have a positively democratizing effect for many people by opening access to communication networks. Apart from the adverse effects of potentially ubiquitous control over the individual, open access to the means of communication can also give rise to new social constructions of security, availability, and closeness, which to a substantial degree may bring back elements of support and reliability especially to the lives of people in precarious circumstances.

The table below specifically focuses on contemporary mobility type and the so-called “advanced mobiles” [Elliott and Urry 2010] who show new social practices that break with the ideal-typological forms of first modernity. Elsewhere I have referred to these new forms of mobility and communication as “motile hybridity.” Social types emerge that command significantly more mobility potential than travelers without such technical equipment do but they are hybrid in the way that their mobility is highly controlled and also limited through these technologies, which are connected to other people and places which execute these controls (i.e. in the case of sales managers or lorry drivers, who get distributed from other people like secretaries or logistics).

Research indicates, (...), that all social ties at-a-distance depend upon multiple processes of coordination, negotiation and renegotiation with others. “Renegotiation” is especially significant in the coordination of mobile networks, as people “on the move” use new technologies to reset and reorganize times and places for meetings, events and happenings as they go about preparing to meet with others at previously agreed times. [Elliott and Urry 2010, 31]

TAB. 3. *Globalized and Virtualized Mobility*

Globalized Mobility Movement beyond the nation state (19 th /20 th century)	Virtualized Mobility Mobility beyond the time-space continuum (21 st century)
Humboldt-type scientist Cosmopolitans Emigrants and immigrants	
(Mass) tourists Trans-migrants (Global manager)	“Digital nomad” Netsurfer
Advanced Mobiles: Mobile workers, business travelers & everyday travelers/commuters	
(Ambivalences: “Here, there, and everywhere”)	

Source: Author’s Elaboration

The mass distribution of mobile devices testifies to a structural change in the organization of society, which according to Elliot and Urry [2010] can be analyzed at four levels:

1) In a world marked by the omnipresence of mobility technologies [smart phones, digital displays in subways, touch screen information systems, portable computers and communication media, invisible smart transportation systems, on-demand public rental bikes, new car-sharing systems, mobility cards as in Switzerland, etc.], strategic travel planning and communications scheduling gain significance for more and more people across all social classes and age groups. To the extent that “advanced mobilities” [Elliott and Urry 2010, 32] are not only technically feasible but also affordable, we can expect people to schedule communication and meet face-to-face more frequently. Waiting is no longer experienced as a waste of time but becomes “equipped waiting” [Lyons, Jain and Holley 2007] where people can not only be highly productive but can also experience this “idle time” as emotionally significant

[Ehn and Löfgren 2010]. Mobile workers use idle time at airports and in traffic jams for contemplating or talking to their loved ones on the phone.⁵

2) Mobility technologies enable connectivity; the individual person becomes a kind of “portal” since the person itself and others gain access to other social spaces through these technologies. Parallel worlds can be combined with one another while on the move. Different worlds of meaning, codes, regimes, and norm systems are linked in complex ways. While driving, a person might participate in a meeting; in the process, he or she may constantly receive data allowing the person to navigate to the correct destination or to inform him- or herself about cultural, political, or stock market events. Activities and social relationships are *delocalized* and *decontextualized*. Navigation is by no means limited to maneuvering through topography; it also involves the ability to decide what information and which social context is relevant at a specific point in time. The city environment or Facebook? Road space or virtual space? Landline telephones our bound up with clearly defined places; cell phones, by contrast, allow autonomous movement in space. Communication occurs between people and not between places. Mobile forms of social life are distinct from stationary ones, which leads Kaufmann [2002] to discuss different models of mobility that follow from this, ranging from an areolar model of local rootedness to a fluid, rhizomatic model of societies in mobile social environments.

3) Current studies show that relationships at a distance, involving high levels of spatial mobility, are based on “multiple processes of coordination, negotiation and renegotiation with others” [Elliott and Urry 2010, 31]. As the distance between people increases, so do coordination costs [Ling 2005; Katz and Aakhus 2002; Forlano 2008; Axtell, Hislop and Whittaker 2008]. Families who see each other on a daily basis can rely on routines, traditions, and explicitly agreed-upon arrangements. This is not the case when one or more family members travel frequently. Moreover, mobility increasingly seems to characterize the everyday life of youths, also in a historical perspective [Pooley, Turnbull and Adams 2005]. Especially in the cities, family life to an increasing extent is marked by asynchronicity and the dissolution of boundaries, which also places greater burdens on the middle classes in terms of the coordination work required in order to bring together family members. Explicit arrangements

⁵ Eric Laurier’s work provides impressive evidence that trips by car can involve moments of maximum intimacy and emotional closeness. Idle time spent in traffic jams is often used to discuss problematic issues, also because the intense conversation can be interrupted at any time in this situation due to having to focus on traffic. At the Sixth Cosmopolitan Conference in Aalborg, Denmark, Laurier presented a hermeneutical analysis of car trips documented on video. He shows the emotional intensity of the conversations “on the move,” which he traces to the special transitory situation while driving. On this, see the discussion of “mobile methods” and Laurier’s other work [Büscher, Urry and Witchger 2010; Laurier 2005].

must be made to get together since at times encounters do not occur as a matter of course, nothing simply happens without planning, etc. And arrangements made can always be rescheduled. Social relationships are not constituted in face-to-face communication; instead, technology-based forms of coordination (Skype, video calls, text message dating, etc.) must be employed and proficiency in their use must be developed to create social cohesion.

4) These shifts in the social construction of reality have consequences for the social-psychological foundations of relationships and the web of everyday interactions between people. They also affect basic social categories, such as presence and absence, here and there, availability and social proximity/closeness. In this context, Elliott and Urry [2010] also discuss the social consequences of a technological unconscious that pre-structures social ties. Two examples may suffice to illustrate this: the way people move about in public spaces and what technologies of social control they accept or take for granted have changed substantially in the wake of September 11, 2001, and the attacks in Djerba (2002), Madrid (2004) and London (2005). Recent studies by Kitchin and Dodge [2009], Salter [2013] and Brabetz [2009] show that not only have security architectures changed but also social perceptions of security. What was once rejected as inappropriate surveillance is now interpreted as an adequate form of maintaining public security.

5. Conclusions

This paper presented different aspects of mobilities regimes and showed that – from the body to the globe – modern life, economies and cultural activities are shaped and governed by powerful and influential sets of principles, norms and rules concerning physical, virtual and social mobility. Mobility is omnipresent in modern societies and nearly all human activities are anyhow linked and structured with mobility. Since the formulation of the “new mobilities paradigm” approach and its research questions [Sheller and Urry 2006] questions of power and dominance, of governance and governmentality became more and more relevant and the research on these topics became more sophisticated and detailed [Bærenholdt 2013; Jensen 2011; Jensen and Richardson 2004].

Therefore this article aims for introducing into a broad research question or even more a program which brings together very different aspects of mobilities such as the rationalities of mobile subjects being part of social networks with their specific forms of family and friendship obligations which generate reasons and purposes to travel and to meet, the business life and mobile work which enormously structure

and shape the modern (mobile) lives as such. It is still surprising that the number of studies in this growing research field which are focusing on the work sphere is still relatively little. But at the same time work-related traveling is still growing while tourist mobility is stagnating or even decreasing – at least in some European societies. Corporate mobilities regimes are playing a significant if not the most important role in the way how modern lives are structured. Therefore current research is trying to reconstruct the interdependencies of different work-related mobilities (commuting, business travel, intra-firm physical mobility, household mobilities on the way to or back from work, care-taking mobilities with children, relatives and friends, and so forth). It is intended to analyze and reconstruct the mobility burdens and the benefits of the mobile workforce and in particular in lower levels of education and income. A differentiated picture of what people are actually doing and how they experience their different mobilities is still missing. This could provide the ground for some research on “mobility budgets” of individuals linked in and sometime logged on different mobilities regimes.

But this paper also wants to stimulate considerations and – in the end also – research on the grant mobilities, the aeromobilities and aqua-mobilities (such as container shipping lines, the thousands and thousands of oil tankers daily going across the oceans and feeding our carbon-driven production processes, consumption patterns and lifestyles).

Mobility, power and the spatial arrangements, the spatialities of mobility, are a key topic for contemporary research on social change and the ongoing modernization of modern societies. It is still an ongoing process that industrial societies are in transition toward mobile risk societies. Against the background of the challenges of sustainable development, peak oil and the need for a post-carbon future the micro, meso and macro-scalar dimensions and practices of power and governance need to be analyzed to provide the ground for policies of sustainability which address and also reach the different regime levels.

I would like to express my gratitude to two unknown reviewers who gave a number of valuable recommendations to improve the text. I would also like to thank the Hans Böckler foundation and the German Research Association [DFG] for funding different research projects which provided the basis for this text.

References

- Aaltola, M.
2005 "International Airport: The Hub and Spoke Pedagogy of Modern Empire." *Global Networks: A journal of transnational affairs* 2: 261-278.
- Adey, P.
2004 "Surveillance at the Airport: Surveilling Mobility/Mobilising Surveillance." *Environment and Planning A* 36(8): 1365–1380.
- Andriessen, E.J.H., Vartiainen, M., (eds.)
2006 *Mobile Virtual Work: A New Paradigm?* Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag
- Axtell, C., Hislop, D.
2008 "The Lonely Life of the Mobile Engineer?" Pp. 105-119 in *Mobility and Technology in the Workplace*, edited by D. Hislop. New York: Routledge.
- Axtell, C., Hislop, D., Whittaker, S.
2008 "Mobile Technologies in Mobile Spaces: Findings from the Context of Train Travel." *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 66 (12): 902-915.
- Bærenholdt, J.O.
2013 "Experiencing Mobility-Mobilizing Experience." Pp. 287-298 in *New Mobilities Regimes in Art and Social Sciences*, edited by S. Witzgall, G. Vogl, and S. Kesselring. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Banister, D.
2008 "The Sustainable Mobility Paradigm." *Transport Policy* 15: 73-80.
- Bashi, V.F.
2007 *Survival of the Knitted: Immigrant Social Networks in a Stratified World*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bauman, Z.
2000 *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
2005 *Liquid Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U.
2006 *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
2008 "Mobility and the Cosmopolitan Perspective." Pp. 25-36 in *Tracing Mobilities: Towards a Cosmopolitan Perspective*, edited by W. Canzler, V. Kaufmann and S. Kesselring. Aldershot, Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Beck, U., and Beck-Gernsheim E.
2013 *Distant Love*. Cambridge, Malden, MA : Polity.
- Beckmann, J.
2004 "Mobility and Safety." *Theory, Culture & Society* 21 (4-5): 81-100.
- Berger, P.L., and Luckmann, T.
1980 *Die Gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer.
- Berman, M.
1982 *All That is Solid Melts into Air. The Experience of Modernity*. London/New York: Verso.

Boltanski, L., and Chiapello, E.

2005 *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Bozkurt, Ö.

2013 *Beyond Privilege: Conceptualizing Mobilities Inside Multinational Corporations*. Pp. 89-98 in *New Mobilities Regimes in Art and Social Sciences*, edited by S. Witzgall, G. Vogl, and S. Kesselring. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Brabetz, M.

2009 *Kontrolle des Unkontrollierbaren: Neue Risiken und ihre Bewältigung im transnationalen Flughafensicherheitsregime*. Saarbrücken: VDM-Verlag.

Brenner, N.

1998 "Between Fixity and Motion: Accumulation, Territorial Organization and the Historical Geography of Spatial Scales." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16: 459-481.

Büscher, M., Urry, J., Witchger, K.

2010 *Mobile Methods*. Abingdon Oxon New York, NY: Routledge.

Cresswell, T.

2006 *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. New York: Routledge.

Cwerner, S., Kesselring, S., Urry, J. (eds.)

2009 *Aeromobilities*. London, New York: Routledge.

Dennis, K.

2013 "Mobility Futures. Moving on and Breaking Through on an Empty Tank." Pp.331-354 in *New Mobilities Regimes: The Analytical Power of the Social Sciences and Arts*, edited by S. Witzgall, G. Vogl and S. Kesselring. Burlington VT: Ashgate.

Denstadli, J. M., and Gripsrud, M.

2010 "Face-to-face by Travel or Picture: The Relationship between Travelling and Video Communication in Business Settings." Pp. 217-238 in *International Business Travel in the Global Economy*, edited by J.V. Beaverstock, B. Derudder, J. Faulconbridge, and F. Witlox. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

Derudder, B., van Nuffel, N., Witlox, F.

2009 "Connecting the World: Analyzing Global City Networks through Airline Flows." Pp. 76-95 in *Aeromobilities*, edited by S. Cwerner, S. Kesselring, and J. Urry. London, New York: Routledge.

Doyle, J., Nathan, M.

2001 *Wherever Next? Work in a Mobile World*. London: The Work Foundation.

Ducki, A.

2010 *Arbeitsbedingte Mobilität und Gesundheit. Überall dabei – Nirgendwo daheim*. Pp. 61-70 in *Fehlzeiten-Report 2009*, edited by B. Badura, H. Schröder, J. Klose and K. Macco. Heidelberg: Springer.

Ehn, B., Löfgren, O.

2010 *The Secret World of Doing Nothing*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ehrenreich, B., Hochschild, A.R.

2004 *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York, NY: Metropolitan/Owl Book.

- Elliott, A., Urry, J.
2010 *Mobile Lives: Self, Excess and Nature*. New York, NY/London: Routledge.
- Fisker, C.E.
2011 *End of the Road? Loss of [Auto]mobility among Seniors and Their Altered Mobilities and Networks: A Case Study of a Car-centred Canadian City and a Danish City*. Aalborg: Aalborg University.
- Flink, J.J.
1988 *The Automobile Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Forlano, L.
2008 "Working on the Move: the Social and Digital Ecologies of Mobile Work Places." Pp.28-42 in *Mobility and Technology in the Workplace*, edited by D. Hislop. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Foucault M.
1970 *The Order of Things: an Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Tavistock (or. ed. 1966).
- Freire-Medeiros, B., Name, L.
2013 "Flying for the Very First Time: Mobilities, Social Class and Environmental Concerns in a Rio de Janeiro Favela." *Mobilities* 8(2): 167-184.
- Freudendal-Pedersen, M.
2009 *Mobility in Daily Life: Between Freedom and Unfreedom*. Farnham, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Fuller, G., Harley, R.
2005 "SYD: The City as Airport." *SCAN-Journal of Media Arts Culture* 2(1). Available at http://scan.net.au/scan/journal/display.php?journal_id=46
- Graham, S. (ed.)
2010 *Disrupted Cities: When Infrastructure Fails*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hajer, M. Wagenaar, H.
2003 "Introduction." Pp.1-30 in *Deliberative Policy Analysis. Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, edited by M.A. Hajer and H. Wagenaar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hannerz, U.
2002 *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, D.
1982 *The Limits to Capital*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
1990 *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hislop, D.
2013 "Driving, Communicating and Working: Understanding the Work-related Communication Behaviours of Business Travellers on Work-related Car Journeys." *Mobilities* 8(2): 220-237.

Hochschild, A.R.

2003 *The Managed Heart; with a New Afterword: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of CA Press.

Huchler, N.

2013 "Piloten als Flexibilitätsponierer. Was wir von Piloten für die flexibilisierte Arbeitswelt lernen können." *Personalführung. Fachmagazin für Personalverantwortliche* Heft 11, 46 Jg.: 42-50.

Huchler, N., Dietrich, N.

2013 "Aeromobility Regimes in Commercial Aviation: the Mobile Work and Life Arrangements of Flight Crews." Pp. 73-88 in *New Mobilities Regimes in Art and Social Sciences*, edited by S. Witzgall, G. Vogl, and S. Kesselring. Aldershot: Ashgate

Inda, J.X., Rosaldo, R.

2008 "Tracking Global Flows." Pp.3-46 in *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, edited by J.X. Inda and R. Rosaldo. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jensen, A.

2006 *Governing with Rationalities of Mobility: A Study of Institution Building and Governmentality in European Transport Policy: Department for Environmental, Social and Spatial Change*. Roskilde: Roskilde University, Ph.D. Thesis.

2011 "Mobility, Space and Power. On the Multiplicities of Seeing Mobility." *Mobilities* 6(2): 255-271.

2012 "The Power of Urban Mobility: Shaping experiences, Emotions and Selves on the Bicycle." In *Tracing the New Mobilities Regime*, edited by S. Kesselring, G. Vogl, S. Witzgall. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Jensen, O.B., Freudendal-Pedersen, M.

2012 "Utopias of Mobilities." Pp. 197-218 in *Utopia: Social Theory and the Future*, edited by M.H. Jacobsen and K. Tester. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Jensen, O.B., Richardson, T.

2004 *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Katz, J.E., Aakhus, M.A.

2002 *Perpetual Contact: Mobile Communication, Private Talk, Public Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaufmann, V.

2002 *Re-Thinking Mobility. Contemporary Sociology*. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate.

Kaufmann, V., Montulet, B.

2008 "Between Social and Spatial Mobilities: The Issue of Social Fluidity." Pp. 37-56 in *Tracing Mobilities: Towards a Cosmopolitan Perspective*, edited by W. Canzler, V. Kaufmann, and S. Kesselring. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Kellerman, A.

2012 *Daily Spatial Mobilities. Physical and Virtual*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Kesselring, S.

2001 *Mobile Politik: Ein soziologischer Blick auf Verkehrspolitik in München*. Berlin: edition sigma. University Diss-München.

- 2008 "The Mobile Risk Society." Pp. 77–102 in *Tracing Mobilities: Towards a Cosmopolitan Perspective*, edited by W. Canzler, V. Kaufmann, and S. Kesselring. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate.
- 2012 "Betriebliche Mobilitätsregime. Zur sozialen Strukturierung mobiler Arbeit." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 41 (2): 83–100.
- Forth. "Corporate Mobilities Regimes. Mobility, Power and the Socio-geographical Structurations of Mobile Work." *Mobilities*. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rmob20/current>.
- Kesselring, S., Vogl G.
- 2010a "'...Travelling, where the Opponents are': Business Travel and the Social Impacts of the New Mobilities Regimes." Pp. 145–162 in *Business Travel in the Global Economy*, edited by J. Beaverstock, B. Derudder, J. Faulconbridge, F. Witlox, and J.V. Beaverstock. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.
- 2010b *Betriebliche Mobilitätsregime: Die sozialen Kosten mobiler Arbeit*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.
- Kitchin, R., Dodge, M.
- 2009 "Airport Code/Spaces." Pp.96–114 in *Aeromobilities*, edited by S. Cwerner, S. Kesselring and J. Urry. London, New York N.Y.: Routledge.
- Kloppenburger, S.
- 2013 "Mobility Regimes and Air Travel. Examples from an Indonesian Airport." In *New Mobilities Regimes: The Analytical Power of the Social Sciences and Arts*, edited by S. Witzgall, G. Vogl and S. Kesselring. Burlington VT: Ashgate.
- Laurier, E.L.
- 2005 "Doing Office Work on the Motorway." Pp. 262-277 in *Automobilities*, edited by M. Featherstone, N.J. Thrift, and J. Urry. London, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Leed, E.J.
- 1991 *The Mind of the Traveler: From Gilgamesh to Global Tourism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ling, R.
- 2005 *The Mobile Connection: The Cell Phone's Impact on Society*. Amsterdam: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Link, J.
- 1999 "Wie kommen 'Normalitäten' zustande? Zwischenbilanz der Dortmunder DFG-Forschungsgruppe 'Leben in Kurvenlandschaften - Flexibler Normalismus.'" Pp.46-48 in UniReport. Forschungsberichte aus der Universität Dortmund, H. 29.
- Lübbe, H.
- 1995 "Mobilität und Kommunikation in der Zivilisatorischen Evolution." *Spektrum der Wissenschaft*, Dossier 2: 112-119.
- Lyons, G., Jain, J., Holley, D.
- 2007 "The Use of Travel Time by Rail Passengers in Great Britain." *Transportation Research Part A*, 41 (1): 107-120.
- Massey, D.B.
- 1999 *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space Time: Hettner Lecture 1998*. Heidelberg: Department of Geography.

Millar, J., Salt, J.

2008 "Portfolios of Mobility: the Movement of Expertise in Transnational Corporations in Two Sectors — Aerospace and Extractive Industries." *Global Networks* 8 (1): 25-50.

Mossberger, K., and Stoker, G.

2001 "The Evolution of Urban Regime Theory. The Challenge of Conceptualization." *Urban Affairs Review* 36(6): 810–835.

Nohlen, D., Schultze, R.O., and Schüttemeyer, S.S.

1998 *Lexikon der Politik: Politische Begriffe*. Munich: Beck.

Pooley, C.G., Turnbull, J., and Adams, M.

2005 *A Mobile Century? Changes in Everyday Mobility in Britain in the Twentieth Century*. Aldershot, Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Poppitz, A.

2009 "Work and Ride'. Mobiles Arbeiten im Zwischen[zeit]raum Bahnfahrt." Pp.236–252 in *Mobilität als Tätigkeit: Individuelle Expansion - alltägliche Logistik - kulturelle Kapazität*, edited by M. Dick. Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.

Reckwitz, A.

2002 "Toward a Theory of Social Practices." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(2): 243-263.

Ritzer, G.

2010 *Globalization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ritzer, G., and Murphy, J.

2002 "Festes in einer Welt des Flusses. Die Beständigkeit der Moderne in einer Zunehmend Postmodernen Welt." Pp.51-80 in *Zygmunt Bauman. Soziologie Zwischen Postmoderne und Ethik*, edited by M. Junge and T. Kron. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Salter, M.B.

2004 "And Yet It Moves. Mapping the Global Mobility Regime." Pp.177-90 in *Global regulation: Managing Crises after the Imperial Turn*, edited by K. van der Pijl, L. Assassi and D. Wigan. Houndmills Basingstoke Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

2008a "The Global Airport. Managing Space, Speed, and Security." Pp.1-28 in *Politics at the Airport*, edited by M.B. Salter. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

2008b (ed.) *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

2013 "Tracing the Financial-Security Apparatus." *Political Geography* 32: 52-60.

Sassen, S.

2010 *Globalization and Its Discontents (Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money)*. New York NY: The New Press.

Schneider, N.F. (ed.)

2008 *Relevance and Diversity of Job-Related Spatial Mobility in Six European Countries*. Opladen: Budrich.

2009 (ed.) *Mobile Living Across Europe II: Causes and Consequences of Job-Related Spatial Mobility in Cross-National Comparison*. Leverkusen: Budrich Barbara.

Sheller, M., and Urry, J.,

2006 "The New Mobilities Paradigm." *Environment and Planning A* 38 (2): 207-226.

Taylor, P.J.

2004 *World City Network: A Global Urban Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Tolstokorova, A.

- 2013 "One-way ticket? International Labor Mobility of Ukrainian Women." Pp. 99-108 In *New Mobilities Regimes in Art and Social Sciences*, edited by S. Witzgall, G. Vogl, and S. Kesselring. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Tomlinson, J.

- 2003 "Culture, Modernity and Immediacy." Pp. 49-66 in *Global America?: The Cultural Consequences of Globalization*, edited by U. Beck, N. Sznajder, and R. Winter. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Tsing, A.

- 2009 "Supply Chains and the Human Condition." *Rethinking Marxism* 21 (2): 148-176.

Tully, C. (ed.)

- 1999 *Erziehung zur Mobilität. Jugendliche in der Automobilen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Urry, J.

- 2000 *Sociology beyond Societies. Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London: Sage.
2004 "The 'System' of Automobility." *Theory, Culture & Society* 21 (4-5): 25-39.
2007 *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
2010 "Mobile Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 61, Issue Supplement s1: 347-366.
2011 *Climate Change and Society*. Cambridge: Polity.
2013 *Societies Beyond Oil*. London: Zed

Witzgall, S., Vogl, G., Kesselring, S. (eds.)

- 2013 *New Mobilities Regimes: The Analytical Power of the Social Sciences and Arts*. Burlington VT: Ashgate.

Wulforth, G., Kenworthy, J., Kesselring, S., Kuhnimhof, T., Lanzendorf, M., Priester, R.

- 2013 "Mobility Cultures in Megacities." Results from a Global Study. Paper presented as poster on *World Conference in Transport Research*, Rio de Janeiro, 15.07.2013

Mobility, Power and the Emerging New Mobilities Regimes

Abstract: This paper presents various aspects of mobilities regimes. It shows that – from the body to the globe – modern life, economies and cultural activities are shaped and governed by powerful and influential sets of principles, norms and rules concerning physical, virtual and social mobility. Since the formulation of the “new mobilities paradigm” approach questions of power and governance become increasingly relevant in theory and empirical research. The author presents four analytical dimensions helping to understand the power structures in mobilities: the normalization of mobility is discussed as an overarching process which involves the rationalization, subjectification, and time-space compression of modern mobilities. The paper argues for a research agenda that critically investigates the micro-, meso and macro-scalar dimensions of mobilities regimes in order to provide the ground for new policies of sustainable mobility.

Keywords: *New Mobilities Regimes, Mobile Risk Society, Normalization, Power, Reflexive Modernization.*

Sven Kesselring is professor in mobility, governance and planning at Aalborg University, Denmark and member of the Innovationsmanufaktur GmbH in Munich, Germany. He holds a doctoral degree and a PhD in sociology. Sven is the spokesman of the international Cosmobilities Network (www.cosmobilities.net). From 1999 to 2006 he was member of the reflexive modernisation research centre in Munich. Recent publications: Witzgall, S., Vogl, G. and Kesselring, S. (eds.). *New Mobilities Regimes*. Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2013.