

DIASPORA ENGAGEMENT POLICY: A NEW TYPE OF TRANSNATIONALISM

In this globalized world, millions of people live outside their country of origin. Today, almost every country has a diaspora. The past two decades have seen a significant increase in the number of states engaging members of their national communities who reside outside the state's borders. A growing body of researches conducted by numerous academic institutes has turned the attention of policymakers to the role that migrant and ethnic communities and individual migrants play in the development of countries of origin, of host countries and their influence on interstate relations. The article brings together two concepts – diaspora and transnationalism, which talk about similar categories of persons involving forms of forced and voluntary migrations, reveals similarities as well as differences between them. The paper also presents an original typology of diaspora engagement policies and provides a theoretical framework for understanding why and when states increase their engagement with populations abroad and what factors affect the implementation of diaspora engagement policies.

Keywords: diaspora, transnationalism, migrants, kin population.

Diaspora and transnationalism are part of a growing array of concepts that strive to deal with national minorities and their impact on international relations. Over the past decades, these 2 concepts have served as prominent research lenses through which to view the aftermath of international migration and the shifting of state borders across populations. Although both terms refer to cross-border processes, diaspora has been often used to denote religious or national groups living outside an (imagined) homeland, whereas transnationalism is often used both more narrowly – to refer to migrants' durable ties across countries – and, more widely, to capture not only communities, but all sorts of social formations, such as transnationally active networks, groups and organisations. Moreover, while diaspora and transnationalism are sometimes used interchangeably, the two terms reflect different intellectual genealogies. Diaspora has become a politicised notion while transnational approaches have not yet found entry into public debates to the same degree.

While diaspora is a very old concept, transnationalism is relatively new. Transnationalism has had a strong career as a concept in quite disparate fields of academic study. Probably the three most important ones are the following: first, international relations, where the concept began to be used as early as the 1970s to refer to the growing importance of non-state actors, such as multinational corporations and international NGOs, in the international arena; second, social movement studies, which were interested in political mobilisation across borders; and third, migration studies. Transnational relations were accordingly distinguished from international ones by insisting that at least one of the actors involved in the former be a non-state entity.

Diaspora is an old concept whose uses and meanings have recently undergone dramatic change. Originally, the concept referred only to the historic experience of particular groups, specifically Jews and Armenians. There has been a veritable explosion of interest in diasporas since the late 1980s. That time, in general, the literature on diaspora defined a diaspora almost exclusively by its migrant origins or the far-reaching dispersal of an ethnic community to multiple points. Diaspora was viewed as a social-political formation, created as a result of either voluntary or forced migration. At present, in academic works, as well as journalistic, nearly every migrant group is referred to as a diaspora proving that the term is under threat of concept stretching. The main concern with the definitional ambiguity of the term is the extent to which diaspora is an essential or a constructed category. One might argue that the emergence of diaspora groups could be explained by the essentialist point of view: a natural and an automatic result of migration, exile or dispersion. Others argue that diaspora is more than an essentialist form of ethnic group members. It is an elite mobilized political project, and diaspora identity is constructed, rather than a natural result of mass migration. Today, the constructivist approach to diaspora is dominant in academic discourse. More and more political researches define diaspora as a political project. Diaspora is not a natural result of mass migration and there is a difference between migrant communities and diaspora groups. Diasporas are composed of certain members of immigrant communities who maintain ties to the homeland with a strong sense of belonging, no matter whether the

homeland are an existing country, an imaginary one, or one that is to be saved. They show this sense of belonging by actively participating in their hostland's political or social spheres. They try to become involved in homeland politics, try to affect decision making in both home and host countries.

Through diaspora is an artificial and constructed phenomenon more attention is now given to the homeland state as an agent in constructing diasporas and shaping the membership of those abroad in social, economic and political spheres between homeland and host states. More and more states are constructing ties to populations abroad, and those populations are making more assertive claims for recognition of their unique status as members of cultural and political communities bridging more than one sovereign state. In the post-communist world, the liberalisation of politics and the end of Soviet domination brought renewed attention to the relationship between potential kin states and the trans-border ethnic groups created through the dissolution of multinational states and empires. And in other areas of the world, political and economic changes have encouraged states to rethink their previously informal or even exclusionary stances towards migrant populations residing abroad. While the concepts of diaspora and transnationalism are very popular in western academic researches there is a certain gap in understanding it in Ukraine. Some questions remain unresolved: why and when states increase their level of transnational engagement, who the state targets, how states create and maintain ties with those members abroad. In order to get complete picture of the role of the homeland state in shaping transnational practices we should bring the three sets of literature into dialogue with each other: the literature on diaspora, transnationalism and kin states.

Those who study the relationships of kin states with «stranded minorities» across the border have not, for the most part, adopted the diaspora terminology. Unlike migrant diasporas, external kin are the product of borders moving across populations. Migrant diasporas form gradually and voluntarily, are territorially dispersed and members often maintain the citizenship of their country of origin. «Accidental» diasporas, on the other hand, happen suddenly and largely against the will of their members, tend to be more territorially concentrated and often have the citizenship of only their new state of residence [3]. A kin-state refers to a state that shares ethnic, cultural or religious bonds with co-ethnics abroad, and in which the political actors within the state have a commitment to their well-being. Analyses of kin states and trans-border diasporas offer a wealth of historical and contemporary examples of the state's role in structuring ties to those abroad, which can aid in creating useful models of state-led transnationalism. The state of national origin is often a key player in shaping trans-border ethnic ties, particularly in cases where the homeland state is the politically and economically strongest actor in the triadic relationship between host state, homeland and trans-border minority. It is important to distinguish kin-state diaspora engagement policy and migrant-sent diaspora-engagement policy, since it makes a big difference whether the relation to an external homeland has come about through the movement of people across borders or of borders across people, and whether their situation in the «hostland» is one of recent arrivals and territorially dispersed immigrants or of a settled minority that has lived continuously in a particular territory over many generations. The most prominent examples of kin-state diaspora engagement policy provide Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, India. Such countries as China, Mexico, Turkey actively act as a migrant-sent countries, engaging their migrant diasporas.

Diaspora engagement policies should not necessarily be seen as part of a unitary, coordinated state strategy. Rather, they form a constellation of institutional and legislative arrangements and programmes that come into being at different times, for different reasons, and operate across different timescales at different levels within home-states. The capacity of a home-state to implement diaspora engagement policies is dependent firstly on the imagined (or discursive) existence of a cohesive transnational community, based around a common, state-centric national identity, towards which policies can be directed. Secondly, it depends on the existence of corresponding governmental apparatuses within the home-state system. In other words, it can be named as symbolic nation-building and institution building. Symbolic policies discursively attempt to produce a homogenous national diaspora, with close ties of allegiance to the home-state. They comprise of a broad range of initiatives and programmes to increase emigrants' sense of belonging to a transnational community of co-nationals, and to boost the profile of the state within this community. Home-states attempting to engage with their diasporas often make rhetorical or symbolic gestures aimed at (re)including the diaspora within national population that the state claims to represent and govern. Some home-states attempt to reinforce claims of shared national identity by establishing or supporting programmes to teach national

language and history amongst diaspora populations, and prominently observing national celebrations and cultural events within diaspora communities. Home-states often play role in shaping expatriate-targeted media, communications and public relations – partly to support these general aims of producing a homogeneous population, but also to send more specific messages aimed at mobilizing expatriates in particular ways, such as to return home, to remit money, or to help advance national interests abroad. Institution-building policies furnish the state with technologies – systems and institutions – to «govern» diaspora populations. A first step for many states is the implementation of surveillance. Monitoring efforts are typically conducted through the foreign service or the immigration bureaucracy, and aim to collect statistics on which to base strategic orientations towards emigrants. This process is often not merely a way of collecting inert data, but a way of selecting actors whom it would be profitable to deal with and forming long-term relationships with these actors. Monitoring efforts frequently stimulate greater state involvement with a wider range of emigrant associations, resulting in increased consular work – in some cases to the extent that state representatives are present at most or all emigrant association events and meetings – and expansion of budgets to cope with this increased activities. A growing number of origin states have established formal diaspora engagement institutions (diaspora institutions) of various kinds, ranging state-funded quasi-governmental organisations, to councils, committees and units within origin-state legislatures and executive bodies, to fully-functioning diaspora political departments, some with ministerial-level importance. Dedicated government offices, sometimes with ministerial level competencies, are common to almost all countries that provide diaspora engagement policy. Institution building aims to construct objective capacities to realize relations of power, and symbolic nation-building policies aim to produce a relationship of communication, the extension of rights and the extraction of obligations – or the transnationalization of citizenship – constitutes the «finalized activities», or «specific effects» of the exercise of power. Insofar as transnationalizing citizenship extends «thin membership» to the diaspora, it also extends a kind of thin sovereignty over non-residents [8]. Home-states also seek to create means of empowering these diaspora-oriented institutions with governance capabilities in the absence of territorial monopolies on violence. Discussion of diaspora engagement policies usually highlights the home-state's extraction of economic and political benefits from the diaspora. The former are extracted through investment policies, while the latter are pursued by the promotion of external expatriate lobbies.

In looking at the entire universe of potential diaspora members for any given country, it becomes clear that many states cannot so easily be classified as either «ethnic kin state» or «migrant-sending state». Many states have current or historical relationships with populations in other countries for various reasons, including the redrawing of international boundaries, sporadic and voluntary dispersal and state-sponsored emigration. Some states that are usually thought of primarily as emigration states have had the potential to act as protectors of members of the national community who reside on territory that was once part of the national homeland. And many kin states also have substantial economic and political migrant populations. Some states have policies that extend to both cross-border minorities and migrant communities, but most have chosen to target only one or the other for specific purposes. The targeting reflects what the homeland state wants from its engagement with certain diaspora populations, as well as the feasibility of integrating external communities without risking tensions with other states. Shifts towards increased diaspora engagement are driven in large part by the interests and perceptions of homeland state political elites. These motives can be grouped into three main sets of interests and 'resources' represented by diasporas: the extraction of material resources for economic gain, the creation or maintenance of domestic and international political legitimacy and the utilisation of those abroad as a culturo-linguistic resource to be used in defining the boundaries of national identity. Diaspora communities are often sources of important material resources through remittances they send back to the homeland state, in the form of diaspora-led investment or by offering the homeland state expanding markets for its exports, cultural output and even a temporary labour pool. Most migrant-sending countries, like the Philippines, Turkey and many Latin American, Middle Eastern and South-Eastern European countries, rely heavily on the emigrant diaspora working in richer economies to contribute to the country's GDP. Diaspora engagement also plays an important role in political legitimation, both domestically and geopolitically. Reaching out to those abroad and establishing cross-border ties can be a way for governments and political parties to redefine the bases of their legitimacy at times of economic or political crisis, or when the sovereignty of the state is being weakened by external

forces. Maintaining the loyalty of emigrants to their home country, and thereby securing access to those communities and their resources, can be a vital «part of the process of nation-building and maintaining elite dominance at home» [1]. Populations abroad are also strategically important because of their culturo-linguistic function, particularly their role in state-building, national identity construction and cultural reproduction. The diaspora can serve prominently in the construction of national myths, which are used to legitimise nationalist political agendas and the modes of inclusion and exclusion that designate who will have access to political power and the resources of the state. External populations are often incorporated into narratives identifying forces that threaten the survival of the cultural or linguistic nation, broadly defined as extending beyond existing state borders. The continued existence of a group beyond the border that maintains its cultural identity and connections to the homeland by resisting assimilationist pressures offers a defence against fears of cultural dilution and a source of national pride. One of the main triggers for utilising the diaspora to bolster state legitimacy is political liberalisation through institutional or regime change, which subjects control over the state-diaspora relationship to more intense political contestation. The diaspora resources become prizes to be captured within the context of domestic political competition. Reframing a discourse of the nation and national identity that invokes those beyond the border can provide a unique source of legitimacy for some new political actors. They can position themselves as «nationalising elites» or as saviours of the nation who can now right the wrongs of the past [4]. Post-communist Hungary, Mexico, El Salvador, Haiti and the Dominican Republic have seen electoral campaigns spill over into diaspora communities, with party elites hoping to capture the endorsement of diaspora leaders and their formal and informal organisational networks, as well as to control the discourse of national interests and priorities by embracing the diaspora. External actors and the actions of the state in which diasporas reside can also cause shifts in the opportunity for elites to engage those abroad. If the degree of access to, and availability of, diaspora resources becomes constrained, then the homeland state is likely to increase its level of engagement. For example, if homeland state elites see that new integrationist or assimilationist policies are being put into place by host states, they may respond by trying to «pull» the diaspora back to the homeland through transnational connections and feelings of loyalty.

In order to shape these relations, states extend their sovereignty and redefine the boundaries of citizenship and membership to include targeted members of populations abroad through institutionalized packages of engagement policies. All states have available a similar toolkit of policies they can choose from in shaping relations with populations abroad. Homeland states can:

- (1) seek to change host state policies through diplomatic advocacy or treaty protections;
- (2) fund diaspora community organisations and the creation of educational, cultural, political and entrepreneurial institutions;
- (3) offer full or limited forms of political citizenship, such as voting rights, special forms of representation, dual citizenship or dual nationality;
- (4) offer full or limited forms of social citizenship through welfare state and labour market access and direct subsidies to diaspora members; or
- (5) extend the benefits of cultural and symbolic membership through rhetorical inclusion, ethnic identity cards and trans-border cultural exchanges.

The most powerful – and controversial – of these policies is the expansion of citizenship through dual nationality legislation, giving those abroad preferential access to entry and the state's political community. Kin states use «ethnizenship» for those who do not reside in the country granting the status as a form of symbolic membership and nation-building. States may allow for multiple citizenship or preferential naturalisation for ethnic kin as a form of minority protection, providing an «exit option» for national minorities facing discrimination and assimilation. In migrant-sending states, external citizenship is meant to create a relationship of rights and obligations with emigrant non-residents in order to tie potentially reluctant or increasingly distant (in time and space) populations abroad to the state or origin.

Not only in public debates but also in academic analysis, the terms diaspora and transnationalism have fuzzy boundaries and often overlap. While the term 'diaspora' always refers to a community or group and has been heavily used in history and literary studies, concepts such as transnationalism – and transnational spaces, fields and formations – refer to processes that transcend international borders and therefore appear to describe more abstract phenomena in a social science language. The term diaspora is

now applied to all forms of migration and dispersion of a people, even where no migration is involved. Due to the dominant constructivist approach diasporas are constructed bodies and the state of origin plays a key role in this process. Diaspora engagement policy can be regarded as a type of transnationalism that comes from the state – «transnationalism from above». Analyzing diaspora engagement policy four sets of arguments can be made. First, while states often utilise a rhetoric of engaging the «global nation», their policies target specific populations abroad, depending on what these populations can offer the homeland state. Depending on the type of population that is engaged states can be classified as either «ethnic kin state» or «migrant-sending state». Second, states increase their engagement with specific external populations because it serves a specific political and strategic purpose. Third, diasporas represent a set of unique cultural, material and political resources, which homeland state elites come to recognise and seek to capture. States expand the boundaries of citizenship and membership in order to co-opt and control access to diaspora resources. Finally, this new engagement involves the expansion of the political community. The development of diaspora policies is often a contested process, which can lead to a backlash against diaspora engagement and a disconnect between rhetoric and the substance of policies.

Використана література:

1. Adamson F. Constructing the diaspora: diaspora identity politics and transnational social movements / F. Adamson // *Politics from afar. Transnational diasporas and networks* / T. Lyons, P. Mandaville. – London: Hurts & Company, 2012. – С.25 - 45.
2. Bauböck R. Cold constellations and hot identities: Political theory questions about transnationalism and diaspora / R. Bauböck // *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods* / R. Bauböck, T. Faist. – Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010. – С.295 – 323.
3. Brubaker R. Accidental Diasporas and External "Homelands" in Central and Eastern Europe: Past and Present [Електронний ресурс] / R. Brubaker. – Vienna: IHS Political Science Series, 2000. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/brubaker/Publications/19_Accidental_Diasporas.pdf
4. Brubaker R. National minorities, nationalizing states, and external national homelands [Електронний ресурс] / R. Brubaker // *IHS Reihe Politikwissenschaft*. – 1993. – № 11. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.458.3988&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
5. Bruneau M. Diasporas, transnational space and communities / M. Bruneau // *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods* / R. Bauböck, T. Faist. – Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010. – С.295 – 323.
6. Faist T. Diaspora and transnationalism: what kind of dance partners? / T. Faist // *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods* / R. Bauböck, T. Faist. – Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010. – С. 9 – 35.
7. Gamlen A. Creating and destroying diaspora strategies [Електронний ресурс] / A. Gamlen // *International Migration Institute Working Papers*. – 2011. – No. 31. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://www.migration.ox.ac.uk/odp/pdfs/WP31%20Creating%20and%20Destroying%20Diaspora%20Strategies.pdf>
8. Gamlen A. Diaspora engagement policies: What are they, and what kinds of states use them? [Електронний ресурс] / A. Gamlen // *COMPAS Working Paper*. – 2006. – No. 32. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: http://essays.ssrc.org/remittances_anthology/wp-content/uploads/2009/08/Topic_19_Gamlen.pdf
9. Ionescu D. Engaging Diasporas as Development Partners for Home and Destination Countries: Challenges for Policymakers / D. Ionescu // *IOM Research Series*. – 2006. – No. 26 – 86 с.
10. Popovski V., Turner N. Blood across borders: The role of the kin-state in minority protection / V. Popovski, N. Turner // *Blood and borders. The responsibility to protect and the problem of the kin-state* / W. Kemp, V. Popovski, R. Thakur. – Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2010. – С. 231 – 240.
11. Schiller G. N., Basch L., Blanc C.S. Transnationalism: a new analytic framework for understanding migration / G. N. Schiller, L. Basch, C.S. Blanc // *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. – 1992. – Vol. 645, No. 1 – P. 1 - 24.
12. Swain A., Baser B. Stateless diaspora groups and their repertoires of nationalist activism

in host countries [Електронний ресурс] / A. Swain, B. Baser // Journal of international relations. – 2010. – Vol. 8, No.1. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/14820/Baser_Swain_StatelessDiaspora36-59.pdf?sequence=2

13. Udrea A. Kin-state responsibility, reparations, and extraterritorial citizenship: a comparative analysis of Romania's and Hungary's legislation on kin minorities. / Ed. Agarin T., Karolewski I.P. – London: Rowman and Littlefield International, 2015. – С. 23 – 43.

Волкова Я. О. Політика залучення діаспори: новий тип транснаціоналізму

У сучасному глобалізованому світі мільйони людей живуть за межами країни свого походження. Сьогодні майже кожна держава має свою діаспору. За останні два десятиліття кількість держав, які проводять політику залучення своєї національної спільноти за кордоном, істотно збільшилася. Зростаюча кількість досліджень, проведених численними академічними інститутами, звертає увагу політиків на роль, яку відіграють мігрантські і етнічні спільноти, а також окремі мігранти в розвитку країн походження, приймаючих країн та їх впливу на міждержавні відносини. У даній статті поєднані дві концепції - діаспора і транснаціоналізм, які мають справу з однією і тією ж категорією осіб, пов'язаних з примусовою та добровільною міграцією, розкриваються подібності, а також відмінності між ними. У статті також представлена оригінальна типологія політики залучення діаспори і викладена теоретична основа для розуміння того, чому і коли держави посилюють свою взаємодію з населенням за кордоном і які чинники впливають на здійснення політики залучення діаспори.

Ключові слова: діаспора, транснаціоналізм, мігранти, споріднене населення.

Волкова Я.А. Политика привлечения диаспоры: новый тип транснационализма

В современном глобализованном мире миллионы людей живут за пределами страны своего происхождения. Сегодня почти каждое государство имеет свою диаспору. За последние два десятилетия число государств, которые проводят политику задействования своего национального сообщества за рубежом, существенно увеличилось. Растущее количество исследований, проведенных многочисленными академическими институтами, обращает внимание политиков на роль, которую играют мигрантские и этнические сообщества, а также отдельные мигранты в развитии стран происхождения, принимающих стран и их влияния на межгосударственные отношения. В данной статье соединены две концепции - диаспора и транснационализм, которые имеют дело с одной и той же категорией лиц, связанных с принудительной и добровольной миграцией, раскрываются сходства, а также различия между ними. В статье также представлена оригинальная типология политики задействования диаспоры и изложена теоретическая основа для понимания того, почему и когда государства усиливают свое взаимодействие с населением за рубежом и какие факторы влияют на осуществление политики взаимодействия диаспоры.

Ключевые слова: диаспора, транснационализм, мигранты, родственное население.