Transnationalisation and development(s): towards a North-South perspective
Faist, Thomas

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

Thomas Faist *

Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective

* Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development, Department of Sociology, Bielefeld University. E-mail: thomas.faist@uni-bielefeld.de

CENTER ON MIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT

2007

Abstract

The central puzzle addressed in this paper is: On the one hand we observe that public and academic debates in the newest round of the migration-development nexus address mostly one-way flows, the transfer of resources from North or West to South and East. These transfers include financial remittances, human capital, knowledge and even so-called social remittances, such as the export of democracy and human rights. The newest round of the migration-development debate, like the older ones in the 1960s and 1980s, is couched in terms of development and development cooperation. On the other hand, studies taking a transnational approach suggest that we do not see one-way traffic but two-way flows. There is the silent backwash of remittances, that is, a massive flow of resources from South to North. Examples include student tuition fees, "reverse remittances", such as families of migrants paying for their kinfolk to legalize their status. In addressing this puzzle, this paper analyses the migration-development nexus between North/West and South/East in using a transnational lens. The paper addresses three questions: First, the question is what is new and what is old about the new "mantra" of the migration-development nexus. Second, as to sustained cross-border transactions the question comes up whose transnational ties and what kind of transnational ties are good for development? Third, one of the glaring questions is why the new enthusiasm on migration and development *now*? How is it connected to changing paradigms in development thinking and the overall discursive embedding in the trinity of community & civil society, market and the state. How is it connected to changing geopolitical formations and forms of migration control after the end of the Cold War?

Preliminaries

Public debates and research on the two-way relationship between migration & development – the migration-development nexus – has increased considerably over the past years. To be more precise, it has experienced yet another climax after two previous ones, in the 1960s and 1980s. Yet there is very little systematic thought given to what is "new" around this time. I argue that the current debates around the migration & development nexus should be approached from a transnational angle, that is, looking at the emergence of a new transnational agent in development discourse – intermittently called "migrants", "diaspora", or "transnational community". Increasingly, the cross-border ties of geographically mobile persons and collectives are taken to the centre of attention. And national states[1], local governments, inter- and supranational organisations and development agencies seek to co-opt and establish ties to such agents who are engaged in sustained and continuous cross-border relationships on a personal, collective and organisational level. Also, and this is crucial for any kind of scientific endeavour, the emergence of this new type of development agent can be tackled by a decidedly transnational methodology. Only then can we hope to look at what is usually called "development" in both North *and* South. What this could mean in terms of concepts and research strategies is open for debate at our conference. In short, the starting hunch of this conference is that instead of repeating the "new mantra" (Ratha 2003) of migration and development, which is simply a retake of previous debates in familiar terms, it is useful to engage in two activities: first, to question the significance of the current debates, their economistic bias and their disjointed nature when it comes to North and South; and second, to explore opportunities for a methodologically more sophisticated approach to transnational linkages.

What are the Elements of the New Enthusiasm"?

The new enthusiasm around migration and development hinges on a number of strong claims which in turn raise serious questions. What are these claims? They can be summa-

---

[1] Instead of nation-states I use in the following two terms. I speak of *states* to indicate various levels of statehood (local, regional, national, inter- and supranational). And I use the term *national states* when referring to the ideological claim that one nation occupies one distinct territory. The latter is not often found in actually existing states with the possible exception of Iceland. The adjective national refers to the claim, not to its actual realisation.

rized in the statement that the flows of money, knowledge and universal ideas – called remittances – can have a positive effect on what is called development. Obviously, this is not a new insight and a retake of familiar debates which have been on the public and academic agendas on and off since the 1960s. The first claim is that financial remittances carry a huge potential for poverty reduction and local investment, especially since remittances very often are resistant or even counter-cyclic to economic recession. The amount of remittances transferred to developing countries flowing through officially sanctioned channels such as banks or money transfer services are estimated to have increased sharply over the past years – at $167 billion for 2005, up from about $40 billion in 1990 (IOM 2005: 270). This is at least double the sum of the OECD's annual Overseas Development Assistance (ODA). Second, despite the fact that financial remittances still stand at the core, in this new round of enthusiasm, indeed euphoria, more emphasis is placed on the transfer of human capital and social ideas & practices from North to South. Now the perception of costs and benefits have changed with shifts in ideas, from "brain drain" in the 1970s to "brain gain" in the 1990s (cf. Guarnizo, working paper). Nowadays, we supposedly find more win-win situations for mobile persons, states and others. And even newer is the concept of "social remittances", the flow of ideas and practices which are "good" and to which nobody in his or her right moral mind would object: human rights, gender equity, and democracy – to name only the most obvious ones. Third, part of the "new mantra" – it has to be repeated a lot to be believed – is the desirability of temporary labour migration because of the hope that *temporary* migrants transmit a higher percentage of their income than permanent immigrants. This view has especially been propounded by Kofi Anan's Global Commission on International Migration in its 2005 report (GCIM 2005), which was given visibility by the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2006. Overall, these three broad optimistic claims are tied to migration control. It is the hope expressed by political institutions such as the EU Commission that, on the long run, economic growth supported by financial and partly knowledge and social remittances will reduce "migration pressure" in the sending countries (EU Commission 2005).

Yet, even a cursory glance at this new enthusiasm raises a number of obvious questions which cast doubt on this optimistic agenda, relating to three sets of questions.

First, the question is what is new and what is old about the new mantra on the migration-development nexus. Actually, after decades of research there is a consensus on the consequences of migration on development, at least among economists: whilst the economic impacts for receiving countries, mostly OECD states, are "clearly positive", for sending countries the benefits are less clear-cut and heavily contested (Delgado Wise, working paper). And most studies conclude that development in the countries of origin is not a result of mi-

gration and remittances and investments by migrants. Instead, development – or the right institutional conditions – is a prerequisite for migrants to invest and to meaningfully remit.[2] These results have been repeated over and again. Therefore, there is a dire need to historicize the discourses on the migration-development nexus (cf. de Haas, working paper).

Second, as to sustained cross-border transactions the question comes up whose transnational ties and what kind of transnational ties are good for development? Lately, terms such as "diaspora" and "transnational communities" are not only used by scholars, politicians and bureaucrats in both emigration and immigration regions. But apparently, some transnational transactions are usually seen as negative in public discourse. Just think of fundamentalist Muslims who do not want to become "like us", or think of refugee or diaspora warriors who want to establish new states by force. This is also the case for return migrants in regions such as Latin America or South Asia. For example, women return migrants may be perceived as threats to established patriarchal orders when claiming to acquire property and earn their own income (Dannecker, working paper). In short, the new enthusiasm overlooks the renegotiation of boundaries and political conflicts associated with transnational transactions, such as class, professional, ethnic and gendered hierarchies (cf. Piper, working paper). In order to do so, we need to take a closer look at the prospects of taking a transnational angle and deliberate transnational methodology.

Third, one of the glaring questions is why the new enthusiasm on migration and development *now*? How is it connected to changing paradigms in development thinking and the overall discursive embedding in the trinity of community & civil society, market and the state. How is it connected to changing geopolitical formations and forms of migration control after the end of the Cold War?

What is "old" and what is "new"? The History of Thinking on the Migration-Development Nexus

Taking a time frame of about 50 years, the fundamental claims associated with the new migration-development enthusiasm are not so new. From a simple cost-benefit point of view the

---

[2] For a rather early formulation of this point, summarizing empirical insights from the 1970s, see the contributions to *International Migration Review*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1982, Special Issue: International Migration and Development.

basic idea says that the flow of emigrants and the loss of brains are partly or wholly compensated by a reverse flow of money, ideas and knowledge.

The following three phases of the nexus can be distinguished.[3] It is interesting, yet not surprising, that the conceptualization of the nexus between migration and development mirrors the dominant economic development paradigms; economics being the leading and most conspicuous discipline in conceptualizing development.

Phase 1: Migration and Development – Remittances and Return

In phase 1 during the 1960s public policy emphasized the "labour gaps" in the North and "development" in the South. The latter was supposed to result from financial remittances, return migration and the subsequent transfer of human capital (Kindleberger 1967). This view clearly corresponded to overall economic modernization concepts and to a belief that state capacity could shape economic growth. Moreover, it was congruent with the economic textbook mantra which suggests that emigration of surplus labour from underdeveloped areas leads to a new equilibrium between capital and labour (see Lewis 1954): If labour goes North, labour scarcities in the South then create inflow of capital – and eventually economic development in the South (cf. Hamilton and Whaley 1984).

Phase 2: Underdevelopment and Migration – Poverty and Brain Drain

In phase 2 during much of the 1970s and 1980s the term development came to be replaced by "dependency" as a structural condition of the periphery dominated by a centre, and "underdevelopment" as its inevitable result. This period, in which dependency theory and later on world systems theory à la Immanuel Wallerstein criticized modernization theory (Wallerstein 1974), the nexus was partly seen the other way around in terms of assumed causality,

---

[3] Of course, aspects of migration and phenomena which after the late 1940s have been called development figured much earlier than the 1960s. In their seminal work on *The Polish Peasant* (1927) William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki talk in detail about "the role of supra-territorial organisations" (Volume 3). Thomas and Znaniecki begin their analysis with the attempts of Polish-American priests to bring together the representatives of the Polish colonies in America (*Polonia Americana*) and manage the common affairs of the American Poles, and then go on to discuss the role of Catholic, nationalist, socialist and humanitarian organisations in structuring both adaptation in the United States and what later would be called modernization in Poland. However, in explicit ways the term "development" was not connected to migration in academic and public discourses until the 1960s.

not from migration to development but from *under*development to migration (for an example, see Portes and Walton 1981). In terms of public policy, one of the central issues was not financial remittances – remember that most European countries stopped recruitment, closed their main gates and kept only side doors open for selected categories in the 1970s and 1980s – but the issue of "brain drain". In a dependency perspective underdevelopment led to the loss of highly-skilled who migrated from the periphery to the centres in the dependent world and above all into industrialized countries. This out-migration, in turn, was thought to contribute to even more underdevelopment and increased migration flows through asymmetric distribution of benefits and resources (cf. Martin 1991). Evidence for this thesis is easy to spot, also nowadays. For example, in 2005, between a third and half of the so-called developing world's science and technology personnel lived in OECD countries (Khadria, working paper). And it is almost needless to say that a differentiated view of the movement of brains indeed has proven such "brain strain hotspots" (Lowell et al. 2004), such as the health care sector in Sub-saharan Africa, while countries developing quickly along economic lines, such as Taiwan, South Korea and the People's Republic of China, could change the situation into "reverse brain drain" (Zweig 2006).

Phase 3: Migration and Co-development – The Celebration of Circulation

In phase 3, since the 1990s, the idea of what in French has been called *co-développement* best describes the public policy approaches of immigration countries to the migration-development nexus, at least those propagated by several states such as France, the Netherlands, the UK and international organisations such as the World Bank. Originally the term described local level development activities but soon came to encompass a broader migration-development strategy. The term co-development connotes a reversal of the nexus and has led us back to a more optimistic view, akin to the 1960s. International migration is supposed to fuel development in South and East – the "Global South" – this time not only via financial remittances and human capital, but knowledge flows more generally and social remittances (Maimbo and Ratha 2005): There seems to be a belief that more *circulation* of labour fosters more development by the way of remittances, hence the policy recommendation of the Global Commission to increase opportunities for short-term labour migration (GCIM 2005).

As this short sketch suggests, different directions of causality within the migration-development nexus were emphasized in the three periods mentioned.

Interestingly, none of these discourses took note of the most obvious linkage, namely the well-established economic relationship between economic development and migration, that is, that processes of Western-style industrial-economic development are usually being accompanied by emigration as a sort of inevitable by-product (Faist 2000: 160-162). Quite to the contrary, economic development, as measured in conventional terms such as growth in GDP, is likely to produce even more migrants on the short- and mid-term.

What is New? Migrants as Transnational Agents – Transnational Methodology

While in phase 1 just mentioned policymakers and analysts only could think of remittances and return migration as a way of transferring resources across borders, in the third period the landscape of alternatives has widened in an era called globalization, network society, or world society – an era of ever-increasing circulation. All of the new terms such as co-development point to the emergence of new transnational agents, that is, "diasporic" actors. Underlying this semantic change is the hunch that migrants and geographically mobile persons and those with whom they associate may be engaged in sustained and continuous cross-border practices. So the story is not simply about migration and development – but about *transnationalisation*.

Various agents have repositioned themselves locally in the global changes since the late 1980s. Both public policies and rhetoric changed. A prominent example for the transformed political semantics is the discursive and institutional changes the People's Republic of China has implemented. Discursively, the slogan to "serve the country" (*wei guo fuwu*) replaced the previous motto of "return to serve" (*huiguo fuwu*) (Cheng Xi in Nyíri 2001: 637). Such rhetoric has been complemented by public policy changes. Again, examples are easy to spot, including adaptations through mechanisms such as dual citizenship for emigrants and immigrants (Faist 2007), voting rights for absentees, tax incentives for citizens abroad, and cooptation of migrant organisations by local, regional and state governments for development cooperation. Instead of permanent return migration, temporary returns, visits and other forms of transactions have moved to the centre of attention. Thus, in recent years the notion of migrants' return as an asset of development has been complemented by the idea that even if there is no eventual return, the commitment of migrants living abroad could be tapped, not only, for example, through hometown associations but also through informal "diaspora knowledge networks" (Meyer, working paper; Barré et al. 2003), that is, networks of scientists and R&D

personnel, business networks of innovative start-ups (cf. Rauch 2001) and networks of professionals working for multinational companies (Kuznetsov 2006). States, development agencies and international organizations try to support the circulatory mobility of persons engaged. The keyword is "temporary return": Examples are UNESCO's TOKTEN or IOM's Migration and Development in Africa (MIDA) programs, which send migrants as experts back to countries of origin for short periods of time. And, of course, governments try to tap into the activities of hometown associations, although – seen only in terms of financial remittances – it is a small fraction, compared to remittances within kinship groups. A prominent example is the Mexican *tres-por-uno* (3x1) program, in which each "migradollar" sent by migrants from abroad is complemented by three dollars from various governmental levels. More recently, banks have joined the fray and announced 4x1 programs. The examples given suggest that states and organizations have started to build programs on obligations and commitments felt by migrants towards home institutions. To use Albert Hirschman's terms, soico-political loyalty is used after geographical exit to exert not economic and sometimes political voice.[4]

Much of the semantics focuses on community. The two most fashionable terms are "diaspora" and "transnational communities". There is an interesting difference: "diaspora" is used frequently in the development discourse, "transnational communities" in transnationalist literature. Both terminologies refer to "communities without propinquity" (Faist 2000). Such communities are not primarily built upon geographical closeness but on a series of social and symbolic ties which connect ethnic, religious and professional diasporas. Yet the notions of diaspora and transnational community need to be unbundled and even rejected in order to get closer to a systematic analysis. Rogers Brubaker cogently observed that the "universalization of the diaspora, paradoxically, means the disappearance of the diaspora" (Brubaker 2005: 3). In recent decades there has been a telling change of meaning. First, in the "classical" meaning diaspora referred to forced migration and violent dispersal, nowadays it denotes any kind of migration, hence the talk of labour diaspora, trade diaspora, business diaspora, and refugee diasporas (Cohen 1997). Second, in the classical way diaspora implied a return to an imagined or real homeland, nowadays simply some sort of sustained ties back to the home country, and in post-modern usage even lateral ties – that is, ties not only from emigration to one immigration country but connectivity all over the globe. Third, in the old meaning diaspora referred to various forms of diaspora segregation in the immigration country, in the new meaning a sort of culturally pluralist boundary maintenance in the host country

---

[4] See Hirschman (1970) on a theory of exit and voice, mediated by loyalty.

(e.g. Gilroy 1993). While these are interesting shifts in meaning, the term diaspora – as well as transnational community – is too restrictive a term, which imagines a rather homogeneous cross-border social formation. It repeats the same mistake as much migration scholarship which assumes a rather homogenous national, ethnic or religious groupings.

Transnational social formations and a systematic transnational approach is an alternative (see working papers by Glick Schiller, Pries, and Amélina). Transnational formations – also: fields, spaces – consist of combinations of ties and their contents, positions in networks and organisations, and networks of organisations that cut across the borders of at least two national states. In other words, the term refers to sustained and continuous pluri-local transactions crossing state borders. There are various ways to conceptualize transnational social formations, which can be thought to be part of more general societal configurations. Two prominent ones are fields and spaces – the first one refers to the inner logic of social action and can be extended to systemic approaches, the second one to the spatial dimension of social life. A commonality is that they aim to overcome "methodological territorialism" (Scholte 2000: 56), that is, conflating society, state and *territory*. And they are meant to overcome also the conflation of society, state and *nation*, "methodological nationalism" (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003).

The newest wave of the migration-development nexus raises a couple of challenges to transnational approaches. Here, I want to sketch three challenges. First, we definitely need to include migrant organisations and associations (cf. Moja 2005), such as hometown associations (cf. Salzbrunn, working paper). But we also need to look at the spaces in between associations, organisations and communities. Second, we can see a disjuncture between development studies on the one hand and migrant incorporation studies on the other hand, with the former emphasizing the South, and the latter being almost exclusively concerned with integration issues in the OCED-North. And third, while there has been some discussion on remittances alleviating poverty but strengthening overall inequality in emigration region, little attention has been devoted to the public policy mechanisms which could contribute to equality and social citizenship.

(1) Methodological Rigour

Most empirical studies on transnationalisation and development from a sociological or anthropological viewpoint focus on association and organizations, a line of research which needs to be continued (e.g. Smith 2006). Such studies need to be complemented by those looking at the "spaces in between associations", that is transactions criss-crossing multiple

associations, networks forming within associations, and non-organized engagement. Methodologically, the exhortation of transnational approaches "follow the flow of persons, money, ideas and so forth" has not really been taken very seriously, contrary to most announcements. A more systematic network approach, not only in the metaphorical sense is necessary. And there are models of how to do it. Taking multi-sited fieldwork seriously – that is, simultaneous research in locations – would mean to follow financial or other transactions in tracing lateral connectivities to other immigration and emigration regions. A case at hand is the five-year study by Valentina Mazzucato and her colleagues in tracing transactions involving persons, groups and organisations in the case of networks of Ghanaian migrants located in Amsterdam back to locations in Ghana and in other regions of the world (Mazzucato et al. 2007). Such a methodological approach does not presume concepts of world society which presuppose too much unity and systemic differentiation. In sum, exploring transnational connectivities through multi-sited fieldwork enables us to look at the great variety of societal forms. In particular, it allows us to trace the combination of a high degree of local clustering with a relatively low average path distance between nodes and hubs, which are located in different states.

Networks can be built around various categorical distinctions, such as ethnicity, race, gender, schooling, professional training, political affiliation, and sexual preference. Ethnicity constitutes a particularly vexing issue in transnational studies. On the one hand a transnational approach should be able to overcome the "ethnic" bias inherent in much migration scholarship. The fallacy is to label migrants immediately by "ethnic" or "national" categories. Often scholars presuppose prematurely that categories such as Turks, Brazilians and so forth matter a lot, since they do in public discourse. On the other hand, methods should be able to trace actually existing ethnic social formations, such as networks of reciprocity, which are of great importance, for example, in informal transfer systems of financial remittances. This means to turn the issue of the importance of ethnicity into an empirical question.

Under-researched are also linkages between informal networks and formal organisations. Sometimes, for example, village associations celebrating cultural practices from the "homeland" change function: In the case of Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia there are "old linkages, new networks". Village associations (*shetuan*) also function as an arena for businesspersons planning to invest in certain parts of China (Liu 1998). While Overseas Chinese entrepreneurs' foremost considerations in deciding on China investment are profitability and economic opportunities available, it is in village associations that ties based on place of origin, kinship and dialect become useful as a foundation of establishing personal relationships (*guanxi*). Cultural affinities can facilitate effective personal and business relationships, and so

do play an important part in directing a substantial amount of investment and charitable money to the People's Republic of China (*qiaoxiang*).

(2) Incorporation and Development

So far, incorporation and development studies are disjointed, even in transnational studies. Studies either take the perspective of the country or region, in which immigrants live, and deal from a transnational angle with issues of incorporation into labour markets, housing, education and cultural pluralism, but also social security, state security, wage differentials, and so forth. Or studies deal with the effects of transnational ties on home countries, villages, formations from which migrants originate, such as demographic dynamics, remittance flows, and cultural impacts and often involving an analysis of transnational flows. The former studies, preoccupied with effects on immigration regions, have entered into a dialogue with assimilation and multiculturalism perspectives, and the latter, focusing on emigration regions, with development studies. Yet the two areas are awkward dance partners. For example, studies have found in the case of immigrants from Mexico, the Dominican Republic and Colombia in the USA that transnational immigrant organizations' members are older, better-established, and possess above-average levels of education (Portes et al. 2007). This could be interpreted, depending on one's conceptual predisposition, as transnationalism and assimilation not being opposites, or as a strong transnational orientation indicating a specific path of incorporation.

However, if not carried onwards, such discussions miss the essence of a transnational approach, which is not only relevant for viewing incorporation in national terms. This is clearly visible in two-way flows. From an integrated North-South perspective one has to look not only at remittances but also at potential "reverse remittances." There are indeed empirical findings of "reverse remittances" or two way flows: They can be important especially at the beginning stages of migration of persons or groups, for example to help (undocumented) migrants to get papers and thus to legalize their stay.[5]

---

[5] In a systems-perspective two-way flows also have to be seen in a long-term historical perspective covering several centuries. There was a co-constitution of what we nowadays call North and South. From early colonialism onwards many resources flowed from South to North – flows of information, knowledge, economic resources were also critical for regions such as Europe; the most obvious linkage being migration from colonies or former colonies to centres. In turn, such flows helped to create the very transnational remittance flows from North to South we are looking at nowadays.

It is questionable whether terms such as immigrant integration or incorporation are able to capture how two-way flows shape associational life in between emigration and immigration regions (cf. Fauser, working paper; Ostergaard-Nielsen, working paper). They are valid perspectives, of course, centring on regions of destination and origin. Nonetheless, the in-between transactions constitute social facts *sui generis*. Yet we have not yet found an appropriate terminology to deal with these social facts. Simply rejecting methodological nationalism is not enough.

(3) Public Policy, Networks and Inequality

Many studies look positively at remittances – financial, knowledge and social – because they may reduce poverty or even eradicate it and contribute to economic growth (see Mundt, working paper; Zoomers, working paper). However, there is almost no discussion of the mechanisms of how this may work – it is almost as if an "invisible hand" would transform remittances into poverty reduction and economic growth. Needless to say, this is a very myopic view of the public policy relevance of remittances. If tying transnational migration to global social inequality, then remittances must be examined in their relevance for social policy. Seen in this way, they do not constitute explicit social policies, of course, but they form a basis for fostering social solidarity among citizens. This thought is not as farfetched as it may seem at first sight. Comparative historians of welfare states tell us that "late industrializers" in the sense of Alexander Gershenkron, such as the Nordic countries and East Asia (Wong 2006), developed more universal social policies than "early industrializers" such as the United Kingdom. Yet, in the recent past targeted in contrast to universal social policies were the foundation of policies which international organisations favoured in the case of developing countries. Such policies failed miserably, in particular structural adjustment policies and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). Therefore, the crucial policy question is how to fit remittances into universal social policies. How can remittances be factored into what a recent publication by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UN-RISD) calls "developmental welfare"? Social policy and social rights are not something that might merely evolve after a certain level of development has been reached. Rather "social policy is a key instrument for economic and social development" (UNRISD 2007: 2). Since there is no simple remittance-development-nexus, we need to look at policies which can forge social solidarity and are thus based on social citizenship. All great theorists of societal membership – from Aristotle, Cicero, J.S. Mill, Hannah Arendt, T.H. Marshall – have agreed that in order to participate fully in public life, persons need to be in a certain socio-economic and political position – in Marshall's tradition we may call it social citizenship; more recently

the term "capabilities" has been introduced by Amartya Sen to capture the same thought (Marshall 1973, Sen 1999).

In sum, there is, first, an interesting nexus between remittances, social policy and development with remittances constituting a sort of intervening variable because they are an expression of diffuse solidarity and generalized reciprocity upon which any kind of social policy has to be built. Second, only by integrating transnational migrants into policy circuits on various governance levels can such potentials be realized. Therefore, the uncritical celebration of diasporas and transnational communities in isolation from other agents by both neo-liberal and transnationalist-cum-communitarian views may be seriously misguided. At the very least, we need to analyse the social policy potential inherent in transnational with respect to state agencies on various levels, non-governmental organisations and economic organisations such as firms.

Why Now? Structural Factors Shaping the New Enthusiasm

The last broad issue I would like to touch upon today is why the migration-development nexus and migrants as new transnational agents of development have been introduced now and how it fits into the changing paradigms and concepts of thinking on development. Three topics need to be considered: first, the discursive constitution of the relationships between state vs. civil society & community and market vs. civil society; second, geopolitical changes since the end of the Cold War; and third, migration control as an implicit factor driving circulatory migration.

(1) Changing Concepts of Development: Statehood, Market and Transnational Civil Society & Community

The criticism of the "civil religion" of development from the 1980s onwards has called into question the idea of a homogeneous third world, the idea of progress (Rist 1996), and most important for our question, state-civil society & community relations (Schuurman 2000). The changing conceptualizations of state, civil society & community and market over the past 50

15

years in the development debate may signal a transnationalisation of these terms. This can be usefully illustrated in the relationship between, first, state and civil society & community, and second, market and civil society & community.[6] Crucially, development thinking has moved from a focus on the national state to more emphasis on local government and international institutions. Therefore, we have to broaden our concepts and speak not simply of the state but of statehood on various levels. Moreover, as the enthusiasm on diasporas and transnational communities indicates, civil society has also to be conceptualized as transnational civil society (cf. Raghuram, working paper).

a) *Statehood and Civil Society*: While in modernization theory we found a strong belief in the crucial role of the national state[7], this belief was called into question after the 1960s and 1970s, when international development organisations focused more on "market" as a principle and as diffuse notions such as community and of civil society moved to be the lodestars of development. The epitome of the market was the by now dated "Washington Consensus" while community and civil society – often used interchangeably – entered discussions in the context of strategies such as basic needs. It has been in this context that migrants were introduced in the 1990s as a civil society or community actor, either as individuals remitting funds or as migrant associations in the form of "diaspora" of "transnational communities". It is therefore no coincidence that organised groups such as hometown associations in Mexico, returnee associations in Jamaica, or charitable foundations in Egypt have gained importance in discourse and policy making. In short, over the decades, the central role of the national state has become de-emphasised in favour not only of the market but also of civil society and community. Equally noteworthy is the now often made distinction between the central and local state. In the face of decentralization and attendant slogans such as ownership and stakeholdership, local governments, along with civil society and community, assumed a greater role. The migration-development nexus proved to be no exception. In immigration states such as France vis-à-vis West African states the aforementioned idea of co-development in phase 3 of the migration-development nexus sees migrants as their own development agents regarding sending countries: Migrants and their diasporas alleviate poverty and help to solve conflicts, especially if local governments work with diaspora groups and deliver better results. Examples can be found in France and Spain.[8] In general, the focus on

---

[6] Here I use the terms civil society and community interchangeably since I refer to their diffuse usage in public discourses.

[7] See phase 1 of the migration-development nexus above.

[8] It is often forgotten that the idea of local government is decidedly western; one of the conceptual foundations is

local governments and diasporas has come to be especially relevant in cases where national states in Third World countries have failed to establish territorial domination, rule of law, institutionalize democracy and start a "sustained" economic development. Hope is invested in non-governmental organisations and local government in a synergetic collaboration with diasporas.

b) *Market and Transnational Civil Society*: Not only have statehood-civil society relations changed but also the linkage between market and civil society. Communities or civil society are becoming more and more a complement to liberal economic approaches in the era of the post-Washington consensus. Two elements abound: liberal economic thought on the one hand, and participatory approaches, on the other hand. Liberal economic thought would suggest that migrants are their own best development agents. A recent UK House of Commons report touting diasporas as development agents approvingly cites John Kenneth Galbraith. He described migration as "the oldest action against poverty" (Galbraith 1962). A second element is usually to be found as well, participatory and grassroots approaches. In this way "voice" in combination with "exit" and continued "loyalty", that is, commitment of transnational migrants to regions of origin is compatible with the "market citizen", who, by the way, is not necessarily a political citizen. Participatory approaches, as expressed, for example, by reports of the United Nations Development Organisation,[9] focus on collective remittances. Not surprisingly, migrants' collectives in all forms, hometown associations, diaspora knowledge networks, businesspersons' networks and even religious congregations (see Tonah, working paper) are now sought after by governments seeking to establish – as usual – their own interest groups. Obviously, the study of transnational civil society is not to be restricted to non-governmental organisations (cf. Ballard, working paper).

(2) Geopolitical Changes: Diaspora's New Role

Tocqueville who sees the local level as the cradle and the center of democracy.

[9] The Human Development Report of 1991 put it this way: "the basic objective of human development is to enlarge people's choices to make development more democratic and participatory. These choices should include access to income and employment opportunities, education and health, and a clean and safe physical environment. Each individual should also have the opportunity to participate fully in community decisions and to enjoy human, economic and political freedoms." (UNDP 2002: 1)

The political opportunity structure of voice after geographical exit changed dramatically after the end of the Cold War.[10] In the 1960s lobbying activities of diasporas mainly took the form of protests against the domestic policies of governments in the homelands (Armstrong 1976). It was Cold War rivalries that largely dictated the effectiveness of the diaspora campaigns against the government in the homeland (Shain and Barth 2003). Nowadays, although national liberation diasporas still ongoing (Kurds, Tamils, Palestinians and so forth), the activities have become more varied; diasporas, for example, have portrayed themselves as carriers of democratization. And even in the context of armed conflict and civil wars diasporas have assumed a more visible role. Violent conflicts made some countries to collapse totally, making them ungovernable, such as countries located in the Great Lakes, the Horn of Africa and Afghanistan. In these cases the activities of immigration countries and development organisations have focused on conflict mediation in addition to armed intervention (von Carlowitz 2004).

(3) The Coupling of Migration Control and Development Aid

Paradoxically, restrictive migration policies may be conducive to financial remittances and transnational kinship groups. Contemporary international borders are much more akin to sieves than to medieval brick walls. Their principal function is to protect the integrity of the socio-economic, demographic and cultural integrity of the population which lies behind them. One important measure is to filter unacceptable or illegitimate migrants and welcoming those which increase the competitiveness of the economy. To paraphrase Ari Zolberg, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water are implicitly "wanted but not welcome" (Zolberg 1986). By contrast, those regarded as highly skilled migrants who transmit knowledge and foreign investments are not only wanted but also quite welcome. The migration-development link is usually mentioned in its function to reduce the propensities for migration to Europe. Coupled with such controls are policies making development aid to states in the European periphery conditional upon their willingness to control undocumented migration (Faist and Ette 2007). In other words, emigration countries need to show their willingness to control illegal migration to immigration countries in order to get development aid. A good example for such conditionality is Morocco, which partly depends on the EU for financial contributions. Yet these poli-

---

[10] Of crucial importance have been slowly evolving systems changes, for example, in the People's Republic of China since 1978. It has led to a re-orientation of the relations to her diaspora in order to attract foreign investment and to induce knowledge transfer, mostly by the Overseas Chinese.

cies, provided they are half-way effective, may produce unintended consequences. For example, the implicit migration policy logic of remittance and development discussions is that migrants should keep migrating, in a rather restrictive migration control configuration that sets migrants up to remit: Family members are left behind. This is so because restrictive immigration policy towards some categories of mobiles, especially towards illegal ones, produces ruptured transnational families. Then remittances may become even more relevant! Seen from a functional point of view, the public policies that differ towards undocumented migrants and the highly-skilled, restrictive in the former and welcoming in the latter case, are important for sustaining the same kind of effect, namely the circulation of persons and other resources.

Conclusion

To sum up, my introductory reflections represent a very preliminary overview of the issues we shall discuss at this conference. Occlusions and silences abound. For example, I have barely mentioned the role of armed conflicts, civil wars and peace-building on political change. Also, I have not even touched on different notions of development to be found among different categories of agents. Not only development experts are mobile and researchers who study migration and development – and looking around in this arena, obviously quite a few distinguished scholars belong to this circle – but also migrants themselves. And, perhaps most important of all, I have not yet introduced what one could call the symbolically highly charged numbers' game, which characterizes development cooperation. For example, we may ask: What is the significance of repeating the statement that financial remittances are x-times higher than the sums allotted to official development aid (ODA) – considering the fact that ODA is not really regarded as really successful in overcoming social problems such as poverty? Does the repetition signal the continuation of a logic which cannot be repeated in the case of ODA, for all the obvious and known problems discussed for decades? Why would the mechanisms underlying "development" change all of a sudden if we substituted bearers of hope such as political elites or women with migrants?

References

Armstrong, James A. 1976: "Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas." *American Political Science Review* 2: 393-408

Barré, Philippe, Victor Hernandez, Jean-Baptiste Meyer, and Dominique Vinck, eds. 2003. *Diasporas scientifiques. Expertise collégiale. Institut de Recherche sur le Développement.* Paris: Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

Brubaker, Rogers. 2005: "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, 1: 1-19

Cohen, Robin. 1997: *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press

European Commission, 2005: *Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations*. COM (2005) 390 final of 1 September 2005. Brussels

Faist, Thomas, ed. 2007. *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*. Avebury, UK: Ashgate.

Faist, Thomas. 2000. *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Faist, Thomas, and Andreas Ette, eds. 2007. *Between Autonomy and the European Union: The Europeanization of National Immigration Policies*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Galbraith, John Kenneth. 1962. *Economic Development in Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Gilroy, Paul, 1993: *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso

GCIM (Global Commission on International Migration). 2005. *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action. Report of the Global Commission on International Migration.* Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration.

Hamilton, Bob, and John Whaley, 1984. "Efficiency and Distributional Implications of Global Restrictions on Labour Mobility." *Journal of Development Economics* 14: 61-75.

Hirschman, Albert. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Harvard, MA: Harvard University Press.

IOM (International Organization of Migration), 2005. *World Migration: Costs and Benefits of International Migration*. Geneva: IOM

Kindleberger, Charles P. 1967. *Europe's Postwar Growth: the Role of Labour Supply*. Cambridg: Harvard University Press

Kuznetsov, Yevgeny, ed. 2006. *Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills: How Countries Can Draw on Their Talent Abroad*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Lewis, Arthur, W. 1954. *Theory of Economic Growth*. London: Unwin

Liu, Hong. 1998. "Old Linkages, New Networks: The Globalization of Overseas Chinese Voluntary Associations and Its Implications." *The China Quarterly*, no. 155: 582-609.

Lowell, Lindsay B., Allan Findlay, and Emma Stewart, 2004. "Brain Strain. Optimising highly skilled migration from developing countries." *Asylum and Migration* Working Paper 3, Institute for Public Policy Research, London, UK

Maimbo, Samuel Munzele and Dilip Ratha (eds.), 2005. *Remittances: Development Impact and Future Prospects*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

Marshall, T.H. 1973 [1950]. *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Martin, Philip L. 1991. *The Unfinished Story: Turkish Labor Migration in Western Europe, with Special Reference to the Federal Republic of Germany*. Geneva: International Labour Organization (ILO)

Moja, Jose C. 2005. "Immigrants and Associations: A Global and Historical Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31, 5: 833-864

Muzzucato, Valentina, 2007. *The Role of Transnational Networks and Legal Status in Securing a Living: Ghanaian Migrants in the Netherlands*. Working Paper No. 43, ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford, Oxford

Nyíri, Pál, 2001. Expatriating is patriotic? The discourse on "new migrants" in the People's Republic of China and identity construction among recent migrants from the PRC, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27, 4: 635-654

Portes, Alejandro, and Walton, John. 1981. *Labor, Class, and the International System.* New York: Academic Press.

Portes, Alejandro, Cristina Escobar, and Alexandria Walton Radford. 2007. "Immigrant Transnational Organizations and Development: A Comparative Study." International Migration Review 41, 1: 242-281

Ratha, Dilip 2003. "Workers' Remittances: An Important and Stable Source of External Development Finance." *Global Development Finance 2003*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Rauch, James E. 2001. "Business and Social Networks in International Trade." *Journal of Economic Literature* 34: 1177-1204.

Rist, Gilbert 1996. *Le développement, histoire d'une croyance occidentale*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Schuurman, Frans J. 2000. "Paradigms lost, paradigms regained? Development studies in the twenty-first century" *Third World Quarterly* 21, 1: 7-20

Sen, Amartya K., 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Knopf

Shain, Yossi, and Aharon Barth. 2003. "Diasporas and International Relations Theory." *International Organization* 57, no. 3: 449-479.

Smith, Robert C. 2006. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Thomas, William I., and Florian Znaniecki. 1927 [1918-1921]. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 5 Vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf

UNDP (United Nations Development Program). 2002. *Human Development Report 2001: Making New Technologies Work for Human Development*. New York: UNDP

UNRISD (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development). 2007. "Transformative Social Policy. Lessons from UNRISD Research". Research and Policy Briefs, no. 5/2007. http://www.unrisd.org/UNRISD/website/document.nsf/ab82a6805797760f80256b4f005da1ab /c77a2891bc2fd07fc12572130020b2ac/$FILE/RPB5e.pdf (accessed 28 May 2007)

von Carlowitz, Leopold. 2004. „Migranten als Garanten? Über die Schwierigkeiten beim Rechtsstaatsexport in Nachkriegsgesellschaften." *HSFK Standpunkte* no. 6/2004. Frankfurt: Hessische Stiftung für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World System: capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press

Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick-Schiller, 2003. Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology. *International Migration Review* 37: 576-610

Wong, Joseph. 2006. *Healthy Democracies: Welfare Politics in Taiwan and South Korea*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Zolberg, Aristide R., 1987: 'Wanted but Not Welcome': Alien Labor in Western Development, in William Alonso (ed.), *Population in an Interacting World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 36-73

Zweig, David. 2006. „Learning to compete: China's efforts to encourage a "reverse brain drain." Pp. 187-215 in: *Competing for Global Talent*, ed. Christiane Kuptsch and Pang Eng Fong (eds.). International Labour Organization (ILO).