

Chapter 1

Introduction – Diaspora and Transnationalism

Scapes, Scales, and Scopes

Ato Quayson and Girish Daswani

It is also a part of morality not to be at home in one's own home.

Theodor Adorno (2006)

The fierce disagreement that broke out in the late 1990s between the US Patent and Trademark Office and India over the patenting of the name “basmati” allows us a small window into the complexities of diaspora and transnationalism. RiceTec, a firm headquartered in Alvin, TX, that markets products such as Jasmati, Kasmati, and Texmati to over 20,000 supermarkets and other outlets in North America, sought a patent for a cross-breed of American long-grain rice. The patent would also have granted RiceTec the power to control basmati rice production in North America and the right to collect fees from farmers who sought to plant it. This was offensive to India, who argued that the name “basmati,” which means “fragrant one” and is grown predominantly in the Punjab region of the country, must only be applied to rice from India. They suggested that basmati rice ought to have the same status as cognac or champagne, which are protected trademark names of certain alcoholic beverages deriving from the relevant regions of France. The Indians’ scientific and commercial reasons were also supported by powerful cultural and nationalistic appeals. In response, the All India Rice Exporters Association stated in their deposition to the US Patent and Trademark Office: “You cannot build a monument anywhere and call it the Taj Mahal. There is only one Taj Mahal and that is in India” (Krieger 2005: 2–3). As Ken MacDonald shows in his discussion of the transnational circulation of cheese (CHAPTER 17), the link between cultural aura and commercial merchandizing for certain agricultural products establishes

a series of social and economic relationships across the entire spectrum of both production and consumption. It is the localization of such names that guarantees their cultural aura, and thus their niche status amongst the many other products that compete for consumer attention. In other words, there is a cultural economy to such agricultural products that relies entirely on the idea of cultural authenticity, which is folded into the product being consumed as a mark of cosmopolitan consumption.

The Taj Mahal is a labor of love and not simply a finished product of work. This example contrasts two forms of making, “work” and “labor” (Arendt 1998). For Indians, the label “basmati” represents not simply a finished market product, but a labor involving the daily life-producing activities that go into the making of home and locality. It is precisely through a labor of love, and not simply a labeling of a thing, that home and a longing for the past is created. The fact that there are also thousands of Indian grocery stores catering to the nostalgic needs of the large Indian communities across North America and elsewhere did not necessarily feature in the debate between the US Patent and Trademark Office and the All India Rice Exporters Association. Yet the cultural economy of basmati invoked in the debate may be taken as extending well beyond the immediate confines of the patent disagreement itself. Such shops have become a veritable switchboard of nostalgic exchanges between diasporic communities and the homelands from which they hail. Whether among the Indian, Ghanaian, or Trinidadian community, a visit to the local ethnic supermarket is not solely for the purchase of goods and products from the homeland. Rather, it is also significantly about the exchange of news from home, gossip about the local community, lamentations about the recalcitrance of children, and the general renewal of the sense of participating in another culture that is richer and more complex than the one that they happen to be sojourners in (Hage 1997; Mankekar 2002). It is part of the complex affective economy of diaspora, which also incorporates monuments, heirlooms, and many material objects in both the public and private spheres. At the same time, the basmati story also tells us something about the intersecting *scapes* (the links between culture and economy), *scales* (the multiple levels of farmers, shops, and people that the patent decision would have impacted, in India and North America), and *scopes* (the spatio-temporal vectors that define nation and its variant social imaginaries).

Transnationalism and diaspora are two key concepts by which to organize our understanding of nation, identity, and globalization in today’s world. They are also terms that are often used interchangeably. These two concepts tend to overlap with globalization theories in describing the conditions that give rise to new forms of migration, mobility, and mediatization. This volume shows that while there is no simple resolution to these intersections, there is a need to understand how these concepts and categories articulate with and against each other. Taken together, the concepts of diaspora and transnationalism promise a broad understanding of all the forms and implications that derive from the vast movements of populations, ideas, technologies, images, and financial networks that have come to shape the world we live in today. If the keywords that have organized the fields of diaspora

and transnational studies thus far have involved historically charged terms (i.e., nation, nationalism, ethnicity, culture, politics, economics, society, space, place, homeland, home, narrative, representation, alienation, nostalgia, and all their cognates), it is because the conditions they pertain to are so variegated that their understanding requires a multifocal, and indeed interdisciplinary, approach. The chapters in this volume address these entanglements from a variety of perspectives and will cover a wide range of topics and methodological approaches.

Conceptual Categories

Though subject to varied emphases and disciplinary investments, the contemporary concept of diaspora involves an understanding of the shifting relations between homelands and host nations from the perspective both of those who have moved, whether voluntarily or not, and of the recipient societies in which they find themselves. While diasporas emerge out of dispersals, not all dispersals lead to diasporas. For example the violent dispersals that took place in Libya and the Ivory Coast in 2011 as a consequence of the political turmoil in those two countries may not necessarily lead to the formation of diasporas, whereas the Russian invasion and subsequent occupation of Afghanistan from 1979 to 1989, which led to massive dispersals of Pashtuns and other Afghani tribes into Pakistan and surrounding areas, did coalesce into a diaspora. Indeed, the central feature of the Afghani dispersal came to intensify an ethno-political and religious ideology to be articulated in the institutional form of the Taliban, incubated and hatched in the diaspora in the late 1990s, which in its turn came to cultivate a strong affiliation with the transnational network represented by Al-Qaeda. This would satisfy criteria for what Gabriel Sheffer describes in *Diaspora Politics* as an ethno-political diaspora (Sheffer 2003).

For a diaspora to emerge out of the dispersal of a given population a number of conditions have to be met. Among other things these often include the time-depth of dispersal and settlement in other locations; the development of a myth of the homeland; the attendant diversification of responses to homeland and host nation; the evolution of class segmentation and conflict within a given diaspora alongside the concomitant evolution of an elite group of cultural and political brokers; and the ways in which contradictions among the various class segments end up reinforcing different forms of material and emotional investment in an imaginary ideal of the homeland. Sometimes a utopian impulse serves to place the quest for the homeland in the vicinity of an active nationalism, as in the classic case of Jews at the turn of the nineteenth century and Palestinians in our contemporary period, and of the Irish diaspora nationalism following from the dispersals that took place from the middle of the nineteenth century. And yet the stake in a spatial homeland is neither always stable nor indeed consonant with the interests of a given diaspora, as Hakem al-Rustom shows for the Armenians of France (CHAPTER 28). It is the utopian idealization and the work of political and cultural brokers that gives the homeland ultimate salience within diasporic consciousness, whether this ensues in a return-to-homeland

movement or not (Armstrong 1976; Brah 1996; Clifford 1997; Cohen 2008; Dufoix 2009; Sheffer 2003; Tölölyan 2000).

A diaspora, of whatever character, must not be perceived as a discrete entity but rather as being formed out of a series of contradictory convergences of peoples, ideas, and even cultural orientations. As Takeyuki Tsuda points out (CHAPTER 10), the circulations of diasporas between places of sojourn and their homelands may also come to generate different attachments to the idea of nation, either by deflating romantic notions of the national homeland and/or intensifying modes of identification with the erstwhile places of sojourn, or by conflating homeland and host nation into a new configuration of unanticipated doubled nostalgias. Following Hilary Parsons Dick on the contrapuntal lives of Mexican non-migrants (CHAPTER 24), diaspora is best understood, as Brah (1996) has noted, as the product of *diaspora space* involving a range of social and moral relationships that continually structure and restructure it. For diaspora space is inhabited not only by those who have migrated and their descendants but, equally, by those who are constructed and represented as indigenous. In other words, the concept of diaspora space (as opposed to that of diaspora) includes the entanglement of genealogies of dispersion with those of “staying put” (Brah 1996: 18).

As a paired term to diaspora, transnationalism on the other hand focuses on various flows and counterflows and the multi-striated connections they give rise to. Transnationalism encompasses not only the movement of people, but also of notions of citizenship, technology, forms of multinational governance, and the mechanisms of global markets. While diasporas are often understood to be a subset of transnational communities, the latter are taken to be an expansion of the overall conceptual scale of the former. As an analytical category transnational communities are understood to transcend diasporas because such communities may not be derived primarily or indeed exclusively from the forms of co-ethnic and cultural identification that are constitutive of diasporas, but rather from elective modes of identification involving class, sexuality, and even professional interest. Thus transnational communities may include the gay communities worldwide that wage daily battles across different frontiers for recognition of their rights to marriage; Buddhist communities outside of the religion’s traditional homelands of India, China, and Japan that find common ground through involvement in certain rituals, practices, and non-violent ideologies across borders; or environmentalists who routinely traverse the circuits of international forums to assert common cause for a better-managed world. All such groups come to share strongly held objectives and communal values that are nonetheless quite different from the co-ethnic identifications that are taken to define diasporas.

While several displaced persons may be included within the umbrella of diaspora (such as exiles, refugees, guest-workers, asylum-seekers, etc.) it is the term *migrant community* that is most often used interchangeably with *diaspora* in scholarly accounts. “Migrant” is also the most prominent in everyday non-scholarly and bureaucratic usages. Even though we will also be using the two terms interchangeably, it is important to note some subtle shifts in the uses of the term between

migration studies and diaspora studies over the past decade or so. These shifts become pertinent to the way that the links between diaspora and transnationalism may be conceived at the present time. As Pnina Werbner notes (CHAPTER 6), at the most formulaic level the difference between the two terms may be seen in the degree to which, within migration studies, particularly in the American scholarly literature, nation and society were taken to be coterminous, in the sense that migrants were assumed to ultimately integrate or assimilate into the country of settlement, with the nation then assumed to be the main horizon for understanding migrant relations across national borders. The social typologies of settlement and sojourn in the host nation and the problematics of citizenship were for example among the favored topics of migration studies. In an attempt to move away from what some have termed methodological nationalism (i.e., scholarly research which takes the nation-state as a “natural” container for understanding “the social and political form of the modern world” – e.g., Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002: 302), recent studies in transnationalism have taken the nation-state as merely one agent in a more complex variety of global actors. As nation and society became progressively severed as concepts, the latter, now extended across different national boundaries, began to provide a different set of analytics for the study of social formations as well as for the ethnicities and political relationships that were thought to be their constituent parts. Against the stress on borders, transnationalism examines their permeability, transcendence, or irrelevance. Werbner argues, however, against simplistic notions of “simultaneity” that the transnational social field cannot be taken as continuous and homogeneous. Instead it is “ruptured” to “create new configurations and clusterings.” Thus in Arjun Appadurai’s much cited *Modernity at Large* (1996) the standard anthropological concept of ethnicity is only taken as a starting point for elaborating the fractal social relations that connect different scapes bearing an impact on identity formation. These include the financescapes, ideoscapes, and imagescapes in his well-known nomenclature. We might also add the significance of netscapes, or the possibilities opened up by social networking and the new technologies that help us imagine forms of community across borders and the consolidation of diasporic identities connected to different spaces (Ong 2008). While nations have still remained relevant in the study of diasporas and transnationalism, they are no longer the default mode of exemplification. The elasticity of societies, their self-imaginings as transcending national boundaries, the articulation of social identities, and the long *durée* of dispersal that in certain instances goes well beyond the formation of modern nation-states as we know them today, have all provided fresh ways for thinking about migrant lives in their interconnected global frameworks. If old usages of migration implied the rubric of the nation-state, diaspora emphasizes community plus the circuits and circulations that fundamentally undergird migrant social identities across borders.

When tied to demography the concept of transnationalism, on the other hand, has grown out of the understanding that migrants do not easily substitute old homes for new ones in a straightforward way (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Blanc 1994). Instead, scholarly research on transnationalism views the lives of migrants and

those who remain behind as simultaneously connected between two or more nation-states, where homeland ties are a defining part of a transnational profile that incorporates recursive modes of nostalgia, sometimes lodged in both homelands and the nations of sojourn at once (Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt 1999). The variety of such movements, which have been variously described as transnational “circuits” (Rouse 1991, 1992), “networks” (Hannerz 1996), “social fields” (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004), “social spaces” (Faist 2000, 2011) and “chain migration” (Werbner 2002), allow for an investigation of both the broad social, economic, and cultural processes in which migrant diasporas are embedded, and the more interpersonal relationships of which they continue to be a part. The study of the transnational also includes “trans-social” spaces, where “place” at the subnational level becomes a lens through which to study intersecting social relations at different spatial levels and moments in time (Pries 2009). It is widely recognized that, just as there are different ways of studying transnationalism (e.g., from above and below, at the borders), there are also multiple ways of being transnational, since transnationalism includes a multiplicity of historical trajectories or *pathways* that affect people in different ways (Werbner 1999; Grillo 2007). These multiple phenomena are then taken to exemplify the nature and intensities of the multi-striated flows that shape the modern world. More importantly, it is also understood that migrant and diasporic networks may make an impact at different levels of society in both the host nation and the homelands from which migrants and their parents came from originally. For the implications of translocality cannot be limited to the two locations that have most framed migrants’ identities. The translocality of migrants means that their senses of themselves draw on the inflections and emphases provided by other communities of co-ethnics in other parts of the world. As Khachig Tölölyan points out in another context, “diasporas are resolutely multilocal and polycentric, in that what happens to kin communities in other areas of dispersion as well as in the homeland consistently matter to them” (2007: 651). Furthermore, as liberal multicultural policies relating to minorities within host nations are differentiated in relation to subnational groups, autochthonous communities with prior rights to land, and newly arrived immigrant/diasporic communities, they come to impact on the nature of the alliances and interrelations that such minority groups establish amongst themselves, and between them and other such entities in other national domains. This also inflects their transnationalist orientations (see especially Kymlicka 2007: 61–87).

The Study of Diasporas and Diaspora Studies

Unlike the hitherto readily recognizable sociopolitical field of area studies, which has its own hemispheric demarcations and distinctive disciplinary emphases, diasporas transcend nations, areas and regions and have arguably existed since the dawn of human history. Yet in terms of specific institutions, conferences, journals, and professional scholarship diaspora studies can only be dated confidently from

the middle of the twentieth century. There have always been differences between how diasporas represent themselves – emic uses – and how they are converted into an object of study under the rubric of diaspora studies – etic uses (Tölölyan 2007). It was only in 1965 that the historian George Shepperson made a scholarly case for viewing all peoples of African descent outside the continent as constituting a diaspora. As Brent Hayes Edwards points out (2003: 49), this crystallized the biblical resonances and figurations of Africans in the New World into a scholarly discourse explicitly in dialogue with the longstanding Jewish traditions behind the term *diaspora* itself. It also helped to expand and augment the purview of the classic diasporas, namely the Jewish, the Greek, and the Armenian. Since at least the early 1990s the term has been appropriated by and for the description of many other groups, both newer and older. Such groups have come to include the Chinese, the Indian, the Nigerian, the Caribbean, and the Somali diasporas, among many others, each of which has generated active transnational networks and internet communities as well as a steady stream of scholarly labor. With the establishment of the journal *Diasporas* by the Armenian American Khachig Tölölyan in 1991, the field progressively acquired scholarly coherence with a visible set of debates and practitioners. In 2004 the UK Arts and Humanities Research Board (now Council, hereafter AHRC) instituted for the first time the US\$12 m Diaspora, Migration and Identities Program. The program's web site asserted that its main aim was "to research, discuss and present issues related to diasporas and migration, and their past and present impact on subjectivity and identity, culture and the imagination, place and space, emotion, politics and sociality."¹ Its funding was not limited to any ethnic or cultural group but encompassed all diasporas within the United Kingdom, with a studied attempt to explore areas of overlap between the social sciences and the humanities. The presence of institutional support in the form of organizations such as the AHRC coincided also with a large range of governmental programs and policies instigated by countries in many parts of the world that sought to target and stimulate active homeland interest from their diasporas. This includes countries as varied as India, China, Zimbabwe, Trinidad & Tobago, and Brazil. As Jignai Dassa and Rani Neutill show (CHAPTER 13), the new status that the diaspora acquired for Indian policymaking was mirrored in the emergence of a new character type in Bollywood cinema of the 1990s – the non-resident Indian or NRI – constructed out of a social imaginary of liberation, sexual adventurousness, and fresh female roles shaped within diasporic urban spaces that hitherto carried a different valence in the films. And in 2005 the African Union declared its African diaspora the "sixth region" of the continent, thus putting a continental spin on what had already been evolving within the domain of national policies.²

A broad contrast in diaspora studies may be seen when we compare Robin Cohen's *Global Diasporas* (2008), Stephane Dufoix's *Diasporas* (2008) and Avtar Brah's *Cartographies of Diaspora* (1996) on the one hand and Marianne Hirsch's *The Generation of Postmemory: Visual Cultures after the Holocaust* (2012) and the work of Paul Gilroy (1993) and James Clifford (1997) on the other. Cohen and Dufoix, elaborating on the suggestive essay by William Safran (1991), set out highly productive

typologies of diasporas, while Brah's work explores the intersections of race, gender, class, sexuality, and ethnicity among South Asian diasporic communities in different parts of the world. For her part Hirsch builds upon her earlier "Post-Memories of Exile" essay from 1997, to focus on the ways in which the experiences of trauma after the Holocaust have impacted upon the field of visibility and memorialization for the children of Holocaust survivors and various others who bear witness to the violent events of the twentieth century. At the same time, Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic* (1993) and James Clifford's *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (1997) are well known as offering models for rethinking the hybridities of diaspora. However, the distinction between Cohen, Dufoix, and Brah on the one hand and Hirsch, Gilroy, and Clifford on the other may be seen as between the outlining of social typologies and the attempt to describe the intangible elements of nostalgia, memory, and desire that elude the typologies of the social sciences. In a comprehensive view, both social science and humanities approaches are imperative for understanding the full spectrum of the significations of diaspora. The arts of memory, the dialectics of place, the affective economies of dispersal, the ethnographies of nostalgia, the intersubjectivities of social identity, and the citational practices that ground senses of cultural particularity outside the homeland (such as in names, family photographs, special community journals, movies, etc.), along with social categories and identities (village of provenance, race, class, gender, generational differences, the dynamics of (in)habitation facilitated by the host nation, etc.) are all crucial for understanding diasporas. All such features are part of the sometimes strategic/instrumental but always expressive configuration of diasporicity, the salience and intensity of whose elements is also shaped by the character of historical epochs in which they are articulated (Dufoix 2008).

Dispersals and Transnationalism

The history of the term *diaspora* reveals the polysemy of the historical context from which it first emerged and the further complications that came to be attached to it in subsequent usage. "Diaspora" first appears in the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Pentateuch or Torah. According to most scholars, the first Greek translation of the Torah probably took place in third-century BCE Alexandria for the benefit of the Jews living in that city, who then spoke more Greek than Hebrew, as well as for the practical purpose of allowing the Jewish laws to be recognized and accessed by Ptolemaic law courts (Modrzejewski 1997; Cohen 2008; Dufoix 2008; Rajak 2009). The largest Jewish community outside of Jerusalem at the time, the Jews of Hellenistic Alexandria belonged to the cultural intersection of two worlds: Jewish and Greek. It is precisely this intersecting context that led Hellenized Jews to craft a Greek neologism aimed at expressing a Biblical reality devoid of Greek equivalent. The Greek noun "diaspora" was coined after the verb *diaspeirô* (from *dia*, "through" and *speirô*, "to sow"), which literally means "to disperse" or "to scatter" (hence, by extension, "to take root elsewhere"). "Diaspora" did not originally translate into, or

have the dramatic weight of, the Hebrew word *galuth* (exile, captivity), with which it later came to be associated after the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans in 70 CE and “the disappearance of a Jewish political center – especially after the failure of the Bar Kochba revolt” (135 CE) (Dufoix 2008: 55; see also Boyarin and Boyarin 2002). Rather, it is first employed in reference to God’s curse and threat of dispersal of the Jews if they do not respect his divine commandments. It is hence true to say that Jewish translators created a word that designated the potential, and not actual, dispersal of the Jewish people.

While the history of the Jewish diaspora illustrates the most extensive emic and etic reflections on diaspora, it is the dispersals dating from the early modern period that provide the horizon in which we might understand the broader transnational configurations of the world today that transcend the Jewish example. The process of imperial and colonial expansion from Europe proceeded in two main phases, which overlapped and were both tied to the formation of the global political economy. The first expansion of modernity (1492–1650 CE) was set in motion primarily by the Spanish and Portuguese monarchs in the long sixteenth century, while the second modernity (1650–1945) saw a decisive shift away from the multiple repercussions of Iberian ambition towards the interests of England, France, the Netherlands, and Germany. Each historical phase of modernity also generated its own internal and external imaginative borders. In the first modernity the expansion of Spain into the Americas coincided with their expulsion of Arabs and Jews from their lands in the name of blood purity, while a concomitant assumption of the heathen status of the natives they encountered in what later became Latin America was also maintained. The second modernity on the other hand saw the progressive construction of the uncivilized Other (Chinese, African, Caribbean, Southeast Asian) who needed to be reformed through the light of reason and colonial governmentality (Grosfoguel 2007: 94–104; also Mignolo 2000).

Scholars of colonialism and empire generally concede that the period from the sixteenth century represents the largest movement of human population in world history, with some estimates of as much as 60 million for the period. With the entire world population standing at 1.2 billion by 1850, the population dispersals from the sixteenth century onward then represent a dramatic movement of the world’s population stock. The population movements that took place in the period are however normally reported in segments; it was not until the 1905 census of the British empire that we get a detailed picture for the first time of many of these population dispersals, particularly for the English-speaking world (see Maas 2003; Christopher 2008). And it is only when we take all these population dispersals together, as opposed to piecemeal or separately, that we get a proper picture of world history from the perspective of the mobility of populations and their implications for understanding the transnational character of social relations among different regions of the world.

The reasons for and character of population dispersals contrast in different historical phases. However, from a diaspora and transnational perspective, a handy overlap may be seen between the character of largely voluntary migrations from

Europe from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, and the more instrumentalized character of population dispersals that marked first the period of transatlantic slavery from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries and then, from the high point of formal colonialism, from the mid-nineteenth century into the first half of the twentieth. As Emmanuel Akyeampong adroitly shows (CHAPTER 9), transatlantic slavery had an impact not only on the constitution of hybrid societies in the New World and Europe but also on the ways in which wage labor and regimes of factory work came to later be defined (see also Williams 1944; Baucom 2005). As Simon Gikandi argues in *Slavery and the Culture of Taste* (2011) the cultivation of modern taste in Western societies and the violence of slavery did not inhabit separate domains but were co-constitutive in the first and abiding instance. Even though population dispersal became instrumentalized as a central component of colonial governmentality, it is important to note that this process began first in Europe itself. Thus while the seventeenth century in particular was to be characterized by vast movements of populations from Europe to different parts of the world – instigated by dire demographic transitions, famine and agricultural blight, acute living and social conditions due to population explosion, and the rabid religious persecutions and zeal for renewal that marked the Reformation and Counter-Reformation of the period – these population dispersals were also managed with respect to race, class, and also law-and-order prerogatives.

In 1620 the English philosopher and politician Sir Francis Bacon called for a study of monsters, “of everything . . . which is new, rare, and unusual in nature” (Linebaugh and Rediker 2000: 39). Through this study landless peasants, orphans, pirates, Anabaptists, the Irish, gypsies, Africans, and other types of “vagabonds” were compared to a “hydra-headed monster” that needed to be controlled and later exploited. The British empire at the time was expanding and these “monsters” served as important sources of labor in the colonies. Thus for the British, whereas West Africa had long been considered unsuitable for a penal colony in favor of Australia, a settlement was still established in Sierra Leone for the settling of London’s black poor from 1786 to 1791. The resolution of issues of poverty in Britain through the movement of segments of its own population was not limited exclusively to the plight of the black poor but also included the dispersal of poor children to Australia, South Africa, and the Americas. As early as 1618 a hundred “vagrant” children in London were rounded up and transported to the colony of Virginia. They were set to work as indentured laborers under slave-like conditions, the policies of enforced child migration continuing piecemeal throughout the colonial period. Orphaned children ended up being sent off to the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa and the Swan River colony in Australia in 1832, and to New Brunswick and Toronto in Canada in 1833. An estimated 150,000 poor children were transferred in this way until the outbreak of World War II, with at least 80,000 of these being sent to Canada alone. Many of the children ended up in dastardly conditions of servitude.³

While some revisionist imperial historians with an eye to identifying the positive effects of empire have argued that colonial policy was often confused and unsystematic (Ferguson 2002; Darwin 2009), it remains the case that, certainly in the case

of the British, conditions were created for the transfer of large populations during the colonial period, and that these groups were dispersed between different regions of the empire. A similar phenomenon of intra-colonial dispersals were also to mark French and Dutch colonialism, while Spain and Portugal played a key role first in the dispersion of Jews in the medieval period, and subsequently in the long phase of the Atlantic slave trade. In fact, it would not be hyperbolic to suggest that colonialism relied essentially on the instrumentalization of population dispersal as a key component of governmentality. Whether with the direct establishment of administrative and bureaucratic arrangements in the conversion of what were initially trade outposts (as in much of Africa, India, and Southeast Asia), or in the context of settler colonies (as in Australia, Canada, Latin America, and, arguably, Ireland), or in the case of post-plantation economies (as in Sri Lanka, Jamaica, and Malaysia), colonial governmentality invariably involved the creation of conditions for the dispersal of populations, some of which came to coalesce into diasporas (see CHAPTER 8). And in several instances, as in the indentured labor policies that took effect from the 1830s, population dispersal was systematic and designed to meet particular economic ends. In contrast, the enforced dispersal of Jews from Eastern Europe to North and South America and Israel that took place from the late nineteenth century was tied to the spasmodic nature of nation-state formation within Europe itself. Whether with regard to Russia, Germany, Poland, or other European countries of Eastern Europe, each phase of national splintering or imperial expansion involved the isolation of Jews as anomalous citizens who were submitted to violent attack and dispersal. The political and economic vagaries of the nation-state form are also responsible for the ongoing dispersal of people from the global south to the global north in our contemporary period. From at least the postwar period, when Europe actively encouraged labor migration from its former colonies, and then magnified several fold after the economic collapse of the early 1970s, people from Third World countries have had to flee famine, wars, religious persecution, and oppressive and incoherent political systems to become sojourners in foreign lands. It is a profound irony, then, that despite the moral panic often expressed in many parts of Europe and North America today at the prospect of immigrants and asylum-seekers on their borders, the period of extensive migrations from Europe during the seventeenth century and after was marked by the same forces that have underpinned the desperate movement of populations from the global south to the global north from the latter part of the twentieth century. These include spasmodic nation-states, famine and natural disasters, inter-ethnic conflicts, and religious persecutions. If the imaginative connection between the two modernities of European expansion already noted, and between Europe and the various lands that were “discovered,” is displayed in the relentless dissemination of letters, reports, paintings, chronicles, and travel narratives penned by sailors, merchants, travelers, and colonial officials, it is also important to acknowledge that these media have not remained exclusively within the privileged purview of Europeans. As Julian Murphet shows (CHAPTER 3), once we expand our understanding of the word media to include different forms and modalities of representation that dispersed peoples have always carried along

with them, we find that the diasporas that were created out of the various processes of dispersal not only deployed similar media for the self-representation of their conditions, but also came to completely alter the terms by which these media might be understood in the first place. As a starting point to understanding the relation between media and diaspora, Murphet asks that we revise our understanding of orality and its uses. For well before Facebook people told collective stories of where they came from and where they hoped to be going. In certain instances, as with the Torah, orality coalesced into ethical dicta and recommendations for surviving the traumas of dispersal that were progressively to be written down and later disseminated via other forms of representation. In yet other instances material objects also came to be invested with the aura of the homeland and become the bearers of the arts of memory. As Rachel Mairs points out (CHAPTER 6), the more than 70 garrison diasporas that were formed following Alexander the Great's military expeditions in the fourth century BCE, which spread from Alexandria in Egypt as far as Kandahar in Afghanistan and Khujand in Tajikistan, came to carry traces of Greece through the material culture and architecture that were transposed from their homeland into the new environments. Archaeological findings in some of the garrisons in Central Asia and India suggests that they knew Greek drama, philosophy, and literature, with a Greek transcription for a fragment found in Kandahar even bearing an oblique reference to Homer.

Transnationalism and the Question of the Nation-State

If diasporas are the exemplary communities of the transnational moment (Tölölyan 1991), then when did transnationalism become understood as a separate phenomenon in the first place? Scholars have pointed to the 1910s, when "transnationalism" was used to criticize classical frameworks within international migration and to challenge a calculating and rationalist model of the migrant as *homo economicus* (Isotalo 2009: 62). Bourne (1916) first used the word "transnationalism" to refer to a state in which migrants maintain cultural ties to their home countries. He was challenging the assumptions of an American "melting pot" scenario, which assumed that new migrants had to assimilate fully into their country of residence (Ernste, Van Houtum, and Zoomers 2009). The concept fell out of use until the 1970s, when transnationalism had some cache within the domain of international relations (Nye 1976). It was only in the early 1990s that transnationalism (like diaspora) became a popular concept, extending itself across different scholarly fields and serving as a useful critique of global development theories. Going beyond the "bipolar model" (Rouse 1991), this interdisciplinary field emphasizes the ways in which migrants build transnational social fields that cut across geographic, cultural, and political borders. Examining the spatialization of the "nation" through cultural "flows" between borders and the production of transnational "hybrid" subjects proved to become an influential and exciting field that cross-cut the social sciences and humanities. Studies in transnationalism challenged the boundaries of the nation-

state and the stability of its borders and criticized policy-oriented research aiming at better managing and assimilating migrant populations.

In their attempts to move away from a simplistic model of linear migration and assimilation or integration paradigms, scholars have paid attention to the multiple ties and transnational connections that migrants maintain with their homeland (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Blanc 1994). The technologies of travel and long-distance communication have become cheaper and more easily accessible, allowing social networks and modern infrastructures to easily link nation-states over vast distances (Vertovec 2004; Wilding 2006). More recent examples of long-distance nationalism also show how migrants contribute to a national effort in their home countries, through the sending of remittances and the use of media technology (Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001). For example the financial remittances and political lobbying of overseas migrants, in Europe and North America, have contributed to the formalization of new nation-states, such as Eritrea (Bernal 2004) and Croatia (Winland 2007). Furthermore, as Anna Lindley shows (CHAPTER 18), remittances have become such a routine feature of diasporic and transnational lives that it has become an inescapable aspect of understanding such lives (see also Sirkeci, Cohen, and Ratha 2012). Another interest has been in the role of the nation-state, and the creation of new laws, to allow a more flexible or dual citizenship in order to bring political support and economic capital into these “homeland” countries from the overseas diaspora (Ong 1999; Goldring 2002; Østergaard-Nielsen 2003). India’s Person of Indian Origin law, which has been in force since 2005, grants people of Indian origin (up to four generations removed), or those married to persons of Indian origin, who are not citizens of India, an overseas citizenship of India. This law has encouraged more Indians living abroad, as well as those who have never lived in India, to “return” and invest in India’s economy – transforming what was described as a “brain drain” to a “brain circulation” (Saxenian 2006).

While much of the earlier writing on citizenship has been tied to the legal-political dimensions of the nation-state, scholarship in transnational studies has also allowed for a more complex understanding of citizenship and its cognates. Apart from its legal aspects, scholars also consider the everyday processes of subject-making and contradictory experiences involved in claims to citizenship (Ong 1996; Brown, CHAPTER 4). Citizenship is understood not simply as a legal entity but as a cultural category as well as a form of (self-)disciplinary power. Rather than being merely subjects of power, many migrants take on the responsibility of shaping the environments in which they sojourn as well as establishing the terms of the porous boundaries that govern the relationships between themselves and others. Approaching migrants as political actors helps to demonstrate how they are connected through fields of power and a web of social networks. Alongside a focus on social networks, attention is also given to how the “social world is perceived in a *placial way*,” which means that where you are matters and that a specific place or neighborhood is always already linked to other social networks elsewhere (Gielis 2009: 273–275; Brown 2005; Olwig 2007). Family relationships, occupational networks, as well as ties to civic associations and religious institutions, matter. These networks

make a difference to the migrant or transnational experience that is built around a specific location. The shift in analytical focus has also brought attention to the unequal power relationships, neoliberal restructuring, and interlinking of neighborhoods and cities on a global scale, simultaneously drawing on migration and urban studies (Sassen 1991, 2001; Smith 2001; Glick Schiller 2009; Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011; Patke, CHAPTER 23). The importance of space and place also extends to the work that has been done on labor migrants, especially female domestic workers, the (self-)disciplinary effects of their workplace, and the spatial dynamics of power in the “home-space” (Constable 2007; Parreñas 2001; Huang and Yeoh 2007; Yeoh and Hang 2010). Another growing research interest is the study of the material culture and affective realities of migrant worlds, where the senses (tastes, sights, smells, touch) and feelings, and the material practices of travel and place collide, converge, and collapse in different ways, and through which place comes to be reappropriated by people (Napolitano 2007; Basu and Coleman 2008; Miller 2008).

Accustomed though we are to seeing many parts of today’s urban world as multicultural and accommodating the interactions of variant migrant ethnicities, it must be remembered that certain periods in history have also provided important exemplars of cultural mixing. From the manuscript fragments lodged in the Cairo Geniza, S.D. Gotein’s magisterial *A Mediterranean Society* (1967–1993) provides us with a complex picture of the multiple ways in which Jews and Arabs interacted in Mediterranean medieval society, and the truly global reach of these interactions. More recently, Natalie Rothman’s *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects Between Venice and Istanbul* (2011) displays a similarly variegated picture. The book is set mainly in the Venice of the 1550s–1670s and focuses on the cultural mediation performed by various actors, including the famed dragomans (translators), Venetian commercial brokers, traders, converts, and a host of other personages. *Brokering Empire* is literally teeming with cultural ethnicities and social functions: Jews, Armenians, Ottoman ambassadors, and Arabs, along with a plethora of Venetian commercial and political elites. As she adroitly shows, the composite households of commercial brokers acted as switchboards of interchange between “locals” and “foreigners” and thus provided a theater for the ongoing recalibration of these categories. From a diaspora and transnational studies perspective, the central attraction of the book lies in Rothman’s modeling of the idea of mediation, circulation, and the structuring and rupturing of ethno-cultural boundaries across trans-imperial locations. And, as Edhem Eldem shows (CHAPTER 12), the terms of cosmopolitanism in Istanbul of the mid-nineteenth century was to take account of a shift in linguistic registers among the elite, from the Italian that had been dominant throughout the Mediterranean basin to the French that was gradually coming to dominance in newspapers and other media of cultural dissemination alongside the equally strong Ottoman discourse that had been bequeathed to the city after several centuries of the empire. As he shows, religious and ethnic communities – Arabs, Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, Russians, Syriacs, and Nestorians – were all part of the complex milieu that defined Istanbul’s cosmopolitanism well into the

twentieth century and which, if we take his earlier work (Eldem 2011) on the heritage of Ottoman archaeology, alongside Rothman's and those of various others, shows that both Istanbul and Venice have historically been highly intercultural locations.

While we are urged to look beyond a purely "ethnic lens" (Glick Schiller, Çağlar, and Guldbrandsen 2006), and not to overlook the "non-national or even a-national cultural patterns" (Wilding 2007: 345), the nation-state remains an important player that continues to impact the field of transnational studies. The ongoing importance of nation-states in shaping the daily lives of its citizens and residents means that people are influenced by transnationalism whether they travel or not, as Avtar Brah (1996) has pointed out. By default of belonging to or residing in a nation-state that is itself constituted by the circulation of populations across borders, whether in Europe, Africa, South Asia, or Latin America, one is already connected transnationally in inclusive and exclusive, positive and negative ways. "Home" can be looked upon as an exotic place where various kinds of foreign Others arrive from the outside. These outsiders await designation (visa student, contract labor, guest-worker, foreign talent), and such acts of naming determine how they are received, their length of residence, social status, and access to economic and state resources. The category of "migrant" also commonly applies to second/third generations, even if they are citizens; consider Germany, where Turkish people cannot get German citizenship; and Israel, where despite the large number of Arab Israeli citizens, it has been very difficult for other non-Jews, say from Africa or South America, to gain citizenship in the country. In this way the transnational becomes personal and the personal is always political. While migrant groups are often invited to help build a country's economy, many are also described as a danger and a threat, especially in times of socioeconomic instability. If the nation is defined as a symbolic community that shares state borders, nationalism becomes "the political utilization of the symbol nation through discourse and political activity, as well as the sentiment that draws people into responding to this symbol's use" (Verdery 1996: 227).

Popular sentiments linked to a sense of nationalism created along the lines of "common blood," "dominant race," or "people of the soil" are often used to create fear and hostility against outsiders who are seen to be "swarming" into the country and changing its moral fabric. In many countries, from Singapore to the United Kingdom, from the Netherlands to Nigeria, and from the USA to Argentina, migration has become a common topic of conversation. In many of these conversations, which include political speeches, newspapers and magazine articles, and online blogs, migrants are described as an invading force, unable to integrate fully into the resident society. Migrants become perfect scapegoats for national distress, which is perceived as resulting from exogenous forces; by projecting the blame onto the Other the national Self is preserved. While earlier policies of segregation (for example to "import labor and not people" in Germany or to "remain white and monocultural" in Australia) have generally been abandoned in favor of a policy of multiculturalism (Castles 2007: 31; Kymlicka 2007), this policy also serves in some countries as a form of moral compartmentalization built on the ideology of

tolerance. However, as history teaches us, tolerance can easily turn into intolerance, and hospitality into hostility (Derrida 2000; Adorno 2006: 103).

Between October 2010 and February 2011 the leaders of three prosperous European countries lamented what they described as the failure of multiculturalism. German chancellor Angela Merkel, Nicolas Sarkozy, then president of France, and UK prime minister David Cameron publicly stated that they no longer believed different cultural communities could comfortably coexist in their countries side by side. They described this idea of multiculturalism as being in conflict with the dominant values of their respective countries (Angela Merkel called it Germany's Christian values). Instead, they argued, every migrant culture should work hard to integrate and assimilate within the dominant culture of their resident country. Their opinions, while potentially far-reaching, were mainly directed at the Muslim community and its potential links with a "homegrown Islamic terrorism." However, this political rhetoric is not exclusively used for a single group. The "Latino Other" in the USA, for example, is also described as people who are "unable or unwilling to integrate into the social and cultural life . . . they seal themselves off from the larger society, reproducing cultural beliefs and behaviors antithetical to a modern life" (Chavez 2008: 177). Ironically, a shared ideology of humanitarianism collectively expressed through attention to human rights does not always preclude a society or nation-state from hostility to immigrants (Fassin 2005; Isatalo 2009). Especially after 9/11, the migrant Other, along with the refugee and asylum-seeker, has often come to be seen as a threat to national security. Such forms of political scapegoating conveniently feed back into a call for increasing homeland securitization against the threats of immigration. However, much of the fear that nationals feel toward immigrants may itself be a by-product of the incoherent internal transformations of capitalism, which are ideologically masked in the discourse of the nation-state. As Glick Schiller (2009: 31) aptly puts it:

It is not putative hordes of illegal aliens or migrants' transnational connections that are threatening the majority of people in the imperial core countries. Rather . . . anti-immigrant rage and subjective feelings of despair, the precariousness of life, and life's unmet aspirations reflect and speak to the global fragility and exploitative character of contemporary capitalism, its restructuring of economies, labor regimes, and states, and its dependence on war and plunder.

Nostalgia, Moral Imagination, and Ethics

The term nostalgia, which is derived from the Greek *nostos* ("to return home") and *algos* ("pain"), was originally intended to refer to a medical condition and physical ailment. Coined in the seventeenth century by a Swiss medical student, Johannes Hofer, nostalgia was used to describe the pathological homesickness of Swiss soldiers serving outside the fatherland who were pining for their mountain landscapes (1934: 45). It was in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the advent

of Freudian psychoanalysis, that nostalgia became seen as a process interior to the self and, by the end of the nineteenth century, nostalgia came to refer to a longing for a specific place and time that had since been lost (Wernick, cited in Wilson 2005: 23; Boym 2002).

Nostalgia is now commonly associated with rupture from, and the desire to one day return to, a place called home. It is also associated with the mourning for the impossibility of return, at least to a home as one remembers it. Avtar Brah (1996) has pointed out that the diasporic nostalgia for home is equally a site for diaspora identity politics. As she explains, this “homing” desire is not necessarily the same as wanting to return to a physical place, since, as we noted earlier, not all diasporas sustain an ideology of return (p. 180). Her distinction between “homing desire” and “desire for homeland” is a suggestive one as the desire of returning home does not reflect the more complex reality of the nostalgic desire for homeland. Elaborating on the work of Ghassan Hage (1997) and others, Michelle Obeid (CHAPTER 21) draws a fascinating picture of a displaced Palestinian family now resident in London and how they attempt to create a sense of home and homeliness away from the Occupied Territories. The family’s café business produces a reconfiguration of the boundary between public and private, since the large upstairs room of their house is used as the café’s parlor, which is also serviced by the same kitchen used by the household itself. The duality of this café’s parlor space means that it comes to underwrite two seemingly distinctive affective fields, that of providing the household with a communal space for congregation and the breaking of bread, and a space in which stories of the vagaries of being a Palestinian and Arab in London are constantly rehearsed as clients meet regularly in the café to exchange tales from their various homelands. For the youngest generation of grandchildren who have known no other scene of familial congregation, the parlor performs the function of generating affective proliferation and of structuring the intimate secrecy of domestic spaces in a manner similar to that described by Gaston Bachelard in *The Poetics of Space* (1958). And yet the “Gazāwi” family’s labored construction of a sense of home through their café business does not entirely obliterate the fact that they are a displaced family facing injunctions against return to their homeland because of Israel’s policies of security containment in the Occupied Territories following political events there in 1997. As Daniel Barber points out in *On Diaspora: Christianity, Religion, and Secularity* (2011: 54–61), one of the defining features of diaspora is the dialectical relation between integrity and discontinuity, spatialized as a form of deterritorialization.⁴ The particular theoretical model he deploys, which is both highly focused and yet also depends on insights from theology, philosophy, Christianity, structuralism, and ethics, does not allow him to talk about the affectivity involved in this pairing of integrity and discontinuity. But once we begin to look more closely at the grounds for bringing the two terms together we come to find that affectivity is central to both integrity and discontinuity and their mutual implication in diaspora. If integrity is not a pre-given condition of being (lodged perhaps in the authenticity of homeland culture, for example) but rather unfolds as a restless (re-)production of an account of one’s self (Butler 2005), then it is in the necessity

for establishing the inter-particularities of everyday life, in, say, gaining competence in the language and culture of the host society whilst also mastering the arts of memory of one's own culture, that establishes for the diaspora an oscillatory relationship between integrity and discontinuity. This oscillatory movement is never supposed to be fully resolved in favor of one or the other pole but only creatively contained as defining a realm of open possibility. Nostalgia may then be seen as both future-oriented and utopian (in a secular as well as in a religious register), even as it is tied to an ineluctable sense of things past.

If the moral imagination is also an important component of both diaspora and transnationalism it is because it helps produce a narrative of possibilities, hopes, and social roles of appropriate conduct as well as models for action that are made meaningful by allowing individuals to take on the active narrative positions of migrant, victim, hero, survivor, community builder, transnational actor, and so on. The moral imagination, however, is not without constraints or limits, and is always refracted through various discourses and by the politics of place or the several places that are knitted together for a given diaspora. Nation-states, regions, cities, and neighborhoods continue to provide a spatial and legal framework for how different diasporic groups self-identify and are allowed to organize themselves, and these spatial constraints also act as dialectical determinants of a moral imagination. At the same time the moral imagination also includes projects of self-fashioning that take into account the ethical lives of people as they participate in remaking themselves as members of a virtue-community intersecting with other communities within the same location and further afield. It is at the conjuncture of the crossing of borders, along with the pressures of shaping a coherent understanding of the Self within a diaspora far from the homeland, that ethical deliberation and action become important considerations to the study of diasporas and their transnational realities. While diasporas evoke a future time that foregrounds ritual practice and performance which is in tension with, yet also participates in, the creation of a distant homeland in the present, transnationalism points to an irony and tension between the personal and group ambitions to transcend geographical, social, and economic boundaries and the political and cultural barriers and boundary-making processes that accompany such movement and mobility.

Working alongside a moral imagination, ethics is not simply a matter of following rules and conforming to, or transgressing, social norms. It is through radical ethical positioning also that one becomes less concerned with *what* the boundaries of home are, and more interested in seeking answers to the more unsettling *why* questions concerning the reasons for the continuity of alienation, persecution, and suffering for one's own group and those of others. Jewish tradition installs this ethical concern as a central aspect of the rituals of the Pesach feast. It is a matter of reflection, when the means (the journey) and not the ends (the results) of life's decision-making processes become important considerations to an imagination of home and its relation to discontinuity and Otherness. Within this framework ethics draws attention to the moral judgments people must make regarding their dreams, aspirations, desires, fears, and vague ideas in deciding how to live a good life, and

how to deal with incommensurable cultural values made visible between the homeland and the spaces of sojourn.

Salman Rushdie reflects on the nuance of migrant ethical imagination in his *Imaginary Homelands* thus (1991: 124–125):

The effect of mass migrations has been the creation of radically new types of human being: people who root themselves in ideas rather than places, in memories as much as in material things; people who have been obliged to define themselves – because they are so defined by others – by their otherness; people in whose deepest selves strange fusions occur, unprecedented unions between what they were and where they find themselves. The migrant suspects reality: having experienced several ways of being, he understands their illusory nature. To see things plainly, you have to cross a frontier.

In these remarks Rushdie is clearly privileging the experience of displacement, suggesting that it creates an inherent epistemological payout that allows the diasporic to see the world in a fuller and more complex manner. But this diasporic privilege has to be countered by the more sober understanding proffered by Theodor Adorno (2006). Adorno connects home, alienation, and morality most poignantly in the telling aphorism from *Minima Moralia* (published in 1951) that forms the epigraph to our chapter: “It is also a part of morality not to be at home in one’s own home.” The point being made here is that alienation has a performative effect in generating an orientation toward homeliness that incorporates a necessary skepticism toward normalization. At a more profound level, this link between home, alienation, and morality also suggests the foundation for a new social contract. For if it is also a part of morality *not* to be at home *in one’s own home*, then one does not need to be an immigrant to experience the creative restlessness produced by not being at home. We can readily see how a philosophical critic of the Enlightenment who himself suffered exile and witnessed persecution could produce such a fertile aphorism. Recall that the subtitle to *Minima Moralia* is “Reflections on a Damaged Life.” In Adorno’s usage the aphorism forces us to tarry with the particular, which at the same time is being idiosyncratically connected to a critique of the totality of social relations that are undergirded by capital and that thus produce the conditions for a damaged life in the first instance. To tarry with the particular yet couple this with the unpredictable and subtle links to a social totality may also be taken as a methodological necessity for the study of diaspora and transnationalism. For each detail in these two fertile and intersecting fields is a threshold of fresh interpretative possibilities that allows us to sense the complex layerings of what is past, passing, and still to come.

Organization of the Book

Each chapter in this volume was included on the basis of being able to combine general theories of diaspora and transnationalism with specific examples and case

studies. The book's sectional divisions must be seen as overlapping and mutually reinforcing, rather than distinct and exclusive. For example, despite the fact that they happen to appear in different Parts and that they focus on different case studies, there is much in common between the chapters by Emmanuel Akyeampong (CHAPTER 9) and Ann Reed (CHAPTER 31); or Pnina Werbner (CHAPTER 6) and Takeyuki Tsuda (CHAPTER 10); or Seán McLoughlin (CHAPTER 7), Meena Sharify-Funk and Timm Lau (CHAPTER 29), and Paul Christopher Johnson (CHAPTER 30); or Ayona Datta (CHAPTER 5) and Rajeev Patke (CHAPTER 23); or Garret Brown (CHAPTER 4) and Hakem al-Rustom (CHAPTER 28) – to take just a few examples of thematic clustering. It is thus important for teaching purposes to read as many of the chapters as possible and to see the variety of ways in which they might be fruitfully paired for students. Part I, *Transnationalism and Diaspora Through the Disciplines*, provides models for discussing diaspora and transnationalism from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. The aim is to identify a small cluster of themes from each discipline and to see how these are transformed in the context of the two key terms. The list of disciplines in this section is meant to be suggestive rather than exhaustive, and we hope that further work will be done to identify the ways in which other disciplines and interdisciplinary models such as international relations, public health, law, and public policy will provide further insights about the salience of conceptual categories such as diaspora and transnationalism. Girish Daswani (CHAPTER 2) examines the ways in which anthropology has been historically invested in questions concerning transnationalism and diaspora, as well as how these two terms converge and their respective limits within the discipline. Julian Muphet (CHAPTER 3) offers an outline of the relationship between media studies and diaspora and how different forms of media interact with one another in diaspora. Garrett W. Brown (CHAPTER 4) discusses some of the more relevant debates about what constitutes a “political community,” analyzing the primary overlaps between the study of diaspora and transnationalism and contemporary themes in the discipline of political science. From the perspective of media studies, Ayona Datta (CHAPTER 5) is interested in the role of cities in the making of migrant identities and the importance of shifting our scale of inquiry from the transnational to the urban. Drawing on migration studies and from an anthropological perspective, Pnina Werbner (CHAPTER 6) emphasizes the multivalence of diasporic notions of home and belonging and the limits of “simultaneity,” as expressed by migrants in their transnational social relations. Seán McLoughlin (CHAPTER 7) looks at why religion is sometimes a problematic and understudied category and goes on to present an overview of how it has been studied in relation to diaspora and transnationalism. In addition to the chapters already discussed above, Ato Quayson (CHAPTER 8) points to the importance of diaspora for understanding the main conditions of production and reception that fall under the rubric of postcolonialism.

The chapters in Part II, *Backgrounds and Perspectives*, provide broad overviews of the processes of migratory flows and counterflows and the character of the historical interculturalism that has had an impact on different parts of today's world.

Akyeampong's discussion of slavery and indentured labor (CHAPTER 9) is complemented by Tsuda's lively discussion (CHAPTER 10) of the many patterns by which homeland return may be traced and the variety of configurations that the simultaneous attachments to lands of sojourn and to homelands produce for such migrants. The chapters by Ray on interracial sex in the making and dissolution of the British empire (CHAPTER 11) and by Eldem on Istanbul's cosmopolitanism (CHAPTER 12) both return to earlier historical periods to trace the character of intercultural formations and the implications that might be drawn from these for understanding cosmopolitanism. Part III, *The Aesthetics of Transnationalism and Diaspora*, attends to a number of creative cultural vectors that have become central to understandings of the two terms. As Desai and Neutill (CHAPTER 13), Garritano (CHAPTER 14), and Kabir (CHAPTER 15) show, from Bollywood to Nollywood and salsa, diasporic communities have established highly productive creative dialogues at the intersection of materiality, the new social media, and the dynamics of creative embodiment in a transnational world. Part IV, *Overviews and Case Studies*, is our longest section and offers a cornucopia of case studies and examples drawn from a variety of regions and diasporic/transnational groups. For example, technology (Sreekumar, CHAPTER 32; Tettey, CHAPTER 20), specific historical, ethno-cultural, political, and social discourses (Obeid, CHAPTER 21; Cummings, CHAPTER 22; Mairs, CHAPTER 26; al-Rustom, CHAPTER 28; and Reed, CHAPTER 31), the complex inter-relays of leisure, material culture, and the commercialization of body parts (MacDonald, CHAPTER 17; Moniruzzam, CHAPTER 27) and the new transnational economic nexus represented by the increase in remittances worldwide (Lindley, CHAPTER 18), make this section a rich and ready resource for teaching and further research. It is our hope that the chapters in this volume will individually and collectively be taken as a gift offering to the study of diaspora and transnationalism for students, researchers, and policymakers alike and that it will stimulate further insight, research, and discussion in the years to come.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to Evan Snyder, the very able and patient research assistant on this project, and to Janey Fisher, our magnificent copy editor.

Notes

- 1 See the website of the Diaspora, Migration, and Identities Program, at <http://www.diasporas.ac.uk/>, accessed January 30, 2013.
- 2 The process to make the diasporas the "sixth region" started in May 2003 when President Wade of Senegal moved for its adoption at the first Extraordinary Meeting of the Assembly of Heads of State in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The Council of Ministers then made a declaration at its ordinary meeting in May in 2005 in Addis Ababa and the first African

Union Diaspora Ministerial Conference was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, from November 16 to 18, 2007. The most significant development was the decision to amend the Constitutive Act of the African Union (AU) to include Article 3(q), which “invites and encourages the full participation of the African Diaspora as an important part of our Continent, in the building of the African Union.” I am grateful to my colleague Thomas Tieku at the University of Toronto for pointing me to the relevant sections of the AU documents regarding the declaration.

- 3 For a further discussion of the founding of Sierra Leone and of the dispersal of children, see Ato Quayson (2012: 8–10); also “Child immigration,” National Maritime Archives and Library information sheet 9, National Museums Liverpool, at www.diduknow.info/emigrants/media/child_emigration.rtf, accessed January 30, 2013; Bean and Melville (1989); Bagnell (2001).
- 4 Barber’s argument is much more complex than can be conveyed here. But the argument with respect to terms such as immanence, Christian declaration, apocalyptic rupture, and the discontinuity of signification is so suggestive in its interdisciplinary effervescence as to provide a really stimulating model for thinking about diaspora as a philosophical concept as opposed to just a sociological one.

References

- Adorno, T. 2006. *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*, trans. E.F.N. Jephcott. London: Verso. (First published 1951.)
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Arendt, H. 1998. *The Human Condition*, 2nd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (First published 1958.)
- Armstrong, J. 1976. “Mobilized and proletarian diasporas.” *American Political Science Review*, 70: 393–408.
- Bachelard, G. 1994. *The Poetics of Space*. New York: Beacon Books.
- Bagnell, K. 2001. *The Little Immigrants: The Orphans Who Came to Canada*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Barber, D.C. 2011. *On Diaspora: Christianity, Religion, and Secularity*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., and Blanc, C.S. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and De-Territorialized Nation-States*. London: Gordon Breach.
- Basu, P. and Coleman, S. 2008. “Introduction: Migrant worlds, material cultures.” *Mobilities*, 3(3): 313–330.
- Baucom, I. 2005. *Specters of the Atlantic: Finance Capital, Slavery, and the Philosophy of History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bean, P. and Melville, J. 1989. *Lost Children of the Empire*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bernal, V. 2004. “Eritrea goes global: Reflections on nationalism in a transnational era.” *Cultural Anthropology*, 19(1): 3–25.
- Bourne, R. 1916. “Trans-national America.” *Atlantic Monthly*, 118: 86–97.
- Boyarin, J. and Boyarin, D. 2002. *Powers of Diaspora: Two Essays on the Relevance of Jewish Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boym, S. 2001. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.

- Brah, A. 1996. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, J.N. 2005. *Dropping Anchor, Setting Sail: Geographies of Race in Black Liverpool*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Butler, J. 2005. *Giving an Account of One's Self*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Castles, S. 2007. "The factors that make and unmake migration policies." In A. Portes and J. DeWind (eds) *Rethinking Migration: New Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*, pp. 29–61. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Chavez, L.R. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Christopher, A.J. 2008. "The quest for a census of the British Empire, 1840–1940." *Journal of Historical Geography*, 34(2): 268–285.
- Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, R. 2008. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge. (First published 1996.)
- Constable, N. 2007. *Maid to Order in Hong Kong: Stories of Filipina Workers*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Darwin, J. 2009. *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World System, 1830–1970*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, J. 2000. "Hospitality," trans. Barry Stocker and Forbes Morlock. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 5(3): 3–18. (First published Paris, 1997.)
- Dufoix, S. 2008. *Diasporas*, trans. William Rodamor. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edwards, B.H. 2003. *The Practice of Diaspora: Literature, Translation, and the Rise of Black Internationalism*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Eldem, E. 2011. "From blissful indifference to anguished concern: Ottoman perceptions of antiquities, 1799–1869." In Z. Bahrani, Z. Çelik, and E. Eldem (eds) *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753–1914*, pp. 281–330. Istanbul: SALT/Garanti Kültür.
- Ernste, H., Van Houtum, H., and Zoomers, A. 2009. "Trans-world: Debating the place and borders of places in the age of transnationalism." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie*, 100(5): 577–586.
- Faist, T. 2000. "Transnationalization in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23: 189–222.
- Faist, T. 2011. "Transnationalization and development: Toward an alternative agenda." *Social Analysis*, 53(3): 38–59.
- Fassin, D. 2005. "Compassion and repression: the moral economy of immigration policies in France." *Cultural Anthropology* 20(3): 362–387.
- Fassin, D. 2011. "Policing borders, producing boundaries: the governmentality of immigration in dark times." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40: 213–226.
- Ferguson, N. 2002. *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and the Lessons for Global Power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gielis, R. 2009. "A global sense of migrant places: Towards a place perspective in the study of migrant transnationalism." *Global Networks*, 9(2): 271–287.
- Gikandi, S. 2011. *Slavery and the Culture of Taste*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gilroy, P. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glick Schiller, N. 2009. "A global perspective on migration and development." *Social Analysis*, 53(3): 14–37.

- Glick Schiller, N. and Çağlar, A. 2011. "Migrants and cities." In N. Glick Schiller and A. Çağlar (eds) *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Glick Schiller, N. and Fouron, G.E. 2001. *Georges Woke Up Laughing: Long-Distance Nationalism and the Search for Home*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Glick Schiller, N., Çağlar, A., and Guldbrandsen, T.C. 2006. "Beyond the ethnic lens: Locality, globality, and born-again incorporation." *American Ethnologist*, 33(4): 612–633.
- Goldring, L. 2002. "The Mexican state and transmigrant organizations: Negotiating the boundaries of membership and participation." *Latin American Research Review*, 37: 55–99.
- Gotein, S.D. 1967–1993. *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Grillo, R. 2007. "Betwixt and between: Trajectories and projects of transmigration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(2): 199–217.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2007. "World-system analysis and postcolonial studies: a call for a dialogue from the "coloniality of power" approach." In R. Krishnaswamy and J.C. Hawley (eds) *The Post-Colonial and the Global*, pp. 94–104. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hage, G. 1997. "At home in the entrails of the West: Multiculturalism, ethnic food and migrant home-building." In H. Grace, G. Hage, L. Johnson, et al. (eds) *Home/World: Space, Community and Marginality in Sydney's West*, pp. 99–153. Annandale: Pluto Press.
- Hannerz, U. 1996. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.
- Hirsch, M. 2012. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hofer, J. 1934. "Medical dissertation on nostalgia," trans. C.K. Anspach. *Bulletin of The Institute of the History of Medicine*, 2(6): 376–391. (First published 1688.)
- Huang, S. and Yeoh, B.S.A. 2007. "Emotional labour and transnational domestic work: the moving geographies of 'maid abuse' in Singapore." *Mobilities*, 2(2): 195–217.
- Isotalo, R. 2009. "Policing the transnational: On implications for migrants, refugees, and scholarship." *Social Analysis*, 53(3): 60–84.
- Krieger, J. 2005. *Globalization and State Power: Who Wins When America Rules?* London: Pearson Longman.
- Kymlicka, W. 2007. "The forms of liberal multiculturalism." In *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*, pp. 61–85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levitt, P. and Glick Schiller, N. 2004. "Conceptualizing simultaneity: a transnational social field perspective on society." *International Migration Review*, 38: 1002–1039.
- Linebaugh, P. and Rediker, M. 2000. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. London: Verso.
- Maas, W. 2003. "Population and demographics." In M.E. Page (ed.) *Colonialism: An International Social, Cultural, and Political Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, p. 479–481. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Mankekar, P. 2002. "'India shopping': Indian grocery stores and transnational configurations of belonging." *Ethnos*, 67(1): 75–98.
- Mignolo, W. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Essays on the Coloniality of Power, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Miller, D. 2008. "Migration, material culture and tragedy: Four moments in Caribbean migration." *Mobilities* 3(3): 397–413.

- Modrzejewski, J.M. 1997. *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Napolitano, V. 2007. "Of migrant revelations and anthropological awakenings." *Social Anthropology*, 15(1): 71–87.
- Nye, J.S. Jr. 1976. "Independence and interdependence." *Foreign Policy*, 22: 130–161.
- Olwig, K.F. 2007. *Caribbean Journeys: An Ethnography of Migration and Home in Three Family Networks*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ong, A. 1996. "Cultural citizenship as subject-making: Immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the United States." *Cultural Anthropology*, 37(5): 737–762.
- Ong, A. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ong, A. 2008. "Cyberpublics and diaspora politics among transnational Chinese." In J.X. Inda and R. Rosaldo (eds) *The Anthropology of Globalization*, pp. 167–183. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E.K. 2003. "The politics of migrant's transnational political practices." *International Migration Review*, 37: 760–786.
- Parreñas, R.S. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Portes, A, Guarnizo, L.E., and Landolt, P. 1999. "The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22: 217–298.
- Pries, L. 2009. "Transnationalisation and the challenge of differentiated concepts of space." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie*, 100(5): 587–597.
- Quayson, A. 2012. "Introduction: Postcolonial literature in a changing historical frame." In A. Quayson (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Postcolonial Literature*, Volume 1, pp. 1–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rajak, T. 2009. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rothman, N. 2011. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects Between Venice and Istanbul*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rouse, R. 1991. "Mexican migration and the social space of postmodernism." *Diaspora*, 1: 8–23.
- Rouse, R. 1992. "Making sense of settlement: Class transformation, cultural struggle and transnationalism among Mexican migrants in the United States." In N. Glick Schiller, L. Basch, and C.S. Blanc (eds) *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration*, pp. 25–52. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Rushdie, S. 1991. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism, 1981–1991*. London: Granta.
- Safran, W. 1991. "Diasporas in modern societies: Myths of homeland and return." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1): 83–99.
- Sassen, S. 1999. *Guests and Aliens*. New York: New Press.
- Sassen, S. 2001. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Saxenian, A. 2006. *The New Argonauts: Regional Advantage in a Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Serkeci, I., Cohen, J.H., and Ratha, D. (eds) 2012. *Migration and Remittances During the Global Financial Crisis and Beyond*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.
- Sheffer, G. 2003. *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, M.P. 2001. *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tölölyan, K. 1991. "Rethinking diaspora(s): Stateless power in the transnational moment." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 5(1): 3–36.

- Tölölyan, K. 2000. "Elites and institutions in the Armenian transnation." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 9(1): 107–136.
- Tölölyan, K. 2007. "The contemporary discourse of diaspora studies." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 27(3): 647–655.
- Verdery, K. 1996. "Transnationalism, nationalism, citizenship, and property: Eastern Europe since 1989." *American Ethnologist*, 25(2): 291–306.
- Vertovec, S. 2004. "Migration and other modes of transnationalism: Towards conceptual cross-fertilization." *International Migration Review*, 38: 970–1001.
- Werbner, P. 1999. "Global pathways: Working class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds." *Social Anthropology*, 7(1): 17–35.
- Werbner, P. 2002. *The Migration Process: Capital, Gifts and Offerings Among Manchester Pakistanis*. Oxford: Berg.
- Wilding, R. 2006. "'Virtual' intimacies? Families communicating across transnational contexts." *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 6(2): 125–142.
- Wilding, R. 2007. "Transnational ethnographies and anthropological imaginings of migrancy." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(2): 331–348.
- Williams, E. 1944. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilson, J.L. 2005. *Nostalgia: Sanctuary of Meaning*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- Wimmer, A. and Glick Schiller, N. 2002. "Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation building, migration, and the social sciences." *Global Networks*, 2(4): 301–334.
- Winland, D.N. 2007. *We Are Now a Nation: Croats Between "Home" and "Homeland"*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Yeoh, B. and Huang, S. 2010. "Transnational domestic workers and the negotiation of mobility and work practices in Singapore's home-spaces." *Mobilities*, 5(2): 219–236.