Diaspora as an actor of migration policy

Agnieszka Weinar

July 2008

Centre of Migration Research

Warsaw University

Banacha Street 2B

02–097 Warsaw

Poland

Tel.: +48 22 659 74 11

Fax: +48 22 822 74 05

www.migracje.uw.edu.pl

migration.cmr@uw.edu.pl

Contents

Diaspora as an actor of the migration policy

Abstract

The migration and development agendas have been only recently drawn together in the context of migration policy. It has been creating .diaspora. as one of the main actors able to respond aptly to the new challenging agenda. At the same time, the traditional concept of .migrant communities. has been assigned different ontological status. To meet the ambitious goals the diaspora is being created as a political actor and it assumes characteristics of a trans-state and trans-national community to fulfil the promise of the policy agenda. The present woorking paper is the first report on the ongoing research project, which aims at studying linkages between migration policy and diaspora engagement. The report presents outcomes of the document-based analysis of the term "diaspora" as used in various policy documents.

Diaspora jako aktor polityki migracyjnej

Streszczenie

Od niedawna polityka migracyjna zaczęła łączyć elementy polityki wobec migracji i rozwojowej. W tym nowym kontekście diaspory zaczęły odgrywać ważną rolę, jako potencjalni aktorzy polityki migracyjnej i rozwoju. Rysuje się też wyraźna różnica między pojęciem społeczności migranckich (centralnych w polityce integracyjnej) a diasporami (kluczowymi jeśli chodzi o zewnętrzny wymiar polityki migracyjnej). Obecny tekst jest raportem z pierwszej części badania poświeconego roli diaspor w polityce migracyjnej Unii Europejskiej. Przedstawia wyniki analizy tekstów kluczowych dla zrozumienia wzajemnych relacji między polityką migracyjną a polityką rozwoju.

1. Introduction

Diaspora has become a migration policy actor quite recently with the upsurge of migration policy research, which concentrates on the nexus between migration and development. The growing body of official documents of United Nation agencies, policy recommendations of International Organization for Migrations, World Bank studies on remittances, works of OECD and research of numerous academic institutes turned the attention of the policy makers to the role of migrant communities, as well as individual migrants, in the development of home countries. The main concept used in these field, namely "diaspora," has however an ambiguous meaning. At least, it is ambiguous when considered from the perspective of paradigmatic Diaspora or later definitions, mostly placed in the fields of anthropology, ethnic and cultural studies, and social sciences. To grasp this concept we need to see diaspora as a category of practice. Moreover, the perspective often applied, i.e. the practice of the given group creating itself through practices, needs to be reversed here. As Martha Finnemore (Finnemore, 1996) showed elsewhere, it is the practices of international organizations that could recreate or reshape diasporas along the lines of the definitions used in the particular policy terms.

Any policy needs clearly defined objects and targets to succeed. The policy-making calls for functional, even undertheorized, ideas. Migration policy is not an exception. The recent rise of diaspora as a policy actor within the framework of migration policy requires more clarity as to what is actually meant by this concept.

In this paper I will analyze the emerging definition of diaspora, and the indicators that help set its boundaries, in the field of policy studies. My objective is to understand how diaspora is construed as migration policy actor. I will use to this end the EU case. The migration and development agendas have been only recently drawn together in the context of the European comprehensive immigration policy, following over a decade of research and studies and policy recommendations offered by civil society, international organizations, and academia. The new components of the policy, traditionally associated with policing, deportations and borders, include a number of elements linked to the development agenda, as mobility partnerships or circular migration. However, it needs to be determined what policy actor is being sought in the context of the emerging European immigration policy, and thus how diaspora is defined.

Firstly, I will present a background for these divagations, reminding shortly the well-known definitions, and presenting the role of diaspora in the today world policy making. Secondly, I will engage in a brief analysis of exemplary documents produced by the United Nations and International Organization for Migrations,[1] explaining the different uses of terms "transnational community" and "diaspora". Then I will move to the discussion of the role diasporas have in the European comprehensive migration policy. To this end I will examine some examples of the European Community documents pertaining to the subject and analyze the difference in use of "migrant community" and "diaspora" in this context.

The material for analysis consisted of the relevant Preparatory Documents (i.e. Commission proposals and opinions – various services, initiatives by the Member States, Council common positions, legislative resolutions of the European Parliament, opinions of Committees, other

---

[1] UNDP is also a crucial agency which promotes migration and development agenda. I excluded it (as well as UNESCO) from this study for the limited scope of this paper. However, I consider introducing them on the later stages of the research.

opinions / recommendations) in the years 2000-2007, and relevant Council Conclusions.[2] I followed first quantitative analysis looking for the documents where the term "diaspora" appears. Then I conducted qualitative analysis using the interpretative approach, and thus focusing only on the documents which give a set of indicators as to what it is meant by "diaspora" as a category of practice. Supporting documents include UN resolutions on international migration and development and IOM policy recommendations. The preliminary conclusions I am presenting are by no means exhaustive, as the research is ongoing, and will be further developed.

2. Diaspora as the emerging policy actor

How to approach a "diaspora"?

It is almost a cliché now to start any divagations about diaspora with its Greek etymology.[3] This meaning of diaspora was later used to define specific groups of similarly dispersed nations, as Jews or Armenians. In these cases the definition of Diaspora, written with a capital letter, hinted at the experience of violent, not entirely voluntary, dispersion. It has been understood as a forced mass migration, when a people "is scattered as a result of a traumatic historical event."(Cohen,1995: 5). The notion of violence, traumatic collective experience has been thus an inescapable element of the definition. It stresses the sentimental and emotional links to the home country, and the strong sense of belonging. It also includes populations dispersed between two or more host countries. When discussed in this traditional sense, Diaspora refers to all the extreme cases of dispersion, e.g. Palestinians, Tamils, and Kurds. Such view does not allow for any expansion of the concept.

However, the realities change quickly and in the late 20th century the paradigmatic diasporas became a minority in the "mixed flows of people": not only traditional refugees or displaced persons, fleeing persecution and war, but also purely economic migrants, or students, all members of one ethnicity experiencing difficulties in the home country. The traditional view on diaspora as fleeing one homeland and being thus of one nationality/ethnicity has also changed, as the groups coming from the same nation-state, even if they experience trauma and violence, can be of different ethnic origins (e.g. Schnapper, 1999)

Scholars in various fields have worked against limiting the meaning of diaspora only to the paradigmatic and particular experience of few ethnic groups. Gabriel Sheffer (1986) proposed a definition of diaspora based on three criteria: the dispersed group must hold a distinctive collective identity across international locations; the group must have some form of own internal organization; the group in dispersion must keep ties with the Homeland, be it symbolic or real. What is of a change is that Sheffer sees a diaspora as having been *ethno-national* diasporas that formed as a result of "either forced or <u>voluntary</u> migration" (Sheffer, 1995: 9). Cohen follows the path of further elaboration of the concept and starts his analysis with a very broad definition, which includes people who maintained strong collective identities but "were neither active agents of colonization nor passive victims of persecution." (Cohen, 1997: 3) Cohen further

---

[2] The list of used documents can be find in the section: Secondary Sources.
[3] From Greek word "speiro" – "to sow" and the preposition "dia" – "over". In the ancient Greece the word referred to Greek colonization and maritime expansion.

indicates that it is collective identity that makes a difference and is the common denominator for the diasporas in contemporary times: "all diasporic communities ... acknowledge that 'the old country' ... always has some claim on their loyalty or emotions." (Cohen, 1997: 3) He, however, judges any overarching theory of diaspora impossible. This broad approach was criticized by Safran (1991). According to him, diasporic communities (*ethnic minority communities,* as opposed to *migrant communites*) share certain characteristics: dispersion to two or more host countries, maintain memory/vision/myth of the homeland; feel estranged from their home country; have permanent plans for return when "the time is ripe"; commitment to support of the homeland group consciousness ad solidarity are significantly defined by this relationship. (Safran, 1991)

Van Hear et al. (2004) provide broadly inclusive definition of diaspora, as "populations of migrant origin who are scattered among two or more destinations, between which there develop multifarious links involving flows and exchanges of people and resources: between the homeland and destination countries, and among destination countries." (Van Hear et al., 2004: 3) Here the most important distinction is again the link to the home country and dispersion. Elements of trauma and exile are redundant.

In the field of the political science, the term has been used to denote political engagement of certain groups and the process of their re-denomination as such. The sphere of political practices create diasporas as an overarching cognitive frame of sometimes very diverse groups (Bruebaker, 1996: 15). The term has been already applied to "certain groups such as Greeks in Western Asia and Africa, or the Arab traders who brought Islam to South-East Asia, as well as to labour migrants." (Castles, M.J. Miller, 2003: 30) Thus, the notion of diaspora has come to denote, as Vertovec and Cohen observe, any deterritorialized or transnational group, which resides outside of its homeland and that maintains social, economic and political networks cross the borders and the globe. (Vertovec, Cohen, 1999: xvi) This broad definition opens way for functional use of the concept in the policy-related studies.

None of the above definitions discussed diasporas as primarily agents of change, actors of development/migration policy. As they mainly focus on the collective self-identification, they would be hardly operational for a policy-maker to establish the target groups of policies. Therefore, in the policy realm diaspora has gained its own status, elaborated in the many competing discourses.

Development policy actors – transnational communities or diasporas?

It is quite difficult to argue who was first to use the term "diaspora" in the relation to development agenda, especially that international migration and development have been joined together in the discourse of international organizations for well over a decade now. There is no doubt that particularly the United Nations took an effort to intensify debates on these issues. In their numerous resolutions[4], international migration was consequently linked to development agenda.

Migration and development were mentioned together in the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development adopted in Cairo[5], and its further

---

[4] e.g. resolutions 49/127 of 19 December 1994, 50/123 of 20 December 1995, 52/189 of 18 December 1997, 54/212 of 22 December 1999, 58/208 of 23 December 2003, 59/241 of 22 December 2004, 60/227 of 23 December 2005.
[5] *Report of the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, 5-13 September 1994*

implementation was set out in the annex to General Assembly resolution S-21/2 of 2 July 1999[6]. Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development and the Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development[7] provided also vague ideas of migration working for or against development. The 4th World Conference on Women, and especially its Platform for Action[8] further strengthened the message.

It must be noted however that all these documents tended to touch upon negative effects of migration on development, focusing especially on brain drain or violations of social rights of migrants. Only early 2000's brought more consciousness as to the need for a high-level debate on migration and development, where UN could play the role of a facilitator between source and destination countries, as only international cooperation could foster the migration and development agenda. Therefore, in several resolutions (in particular 57/270 B of 23 June 2003, 58/190 of 22 December 2003 and 58/208 of 23 December 2003,), it was decided to devote the 61st session (held in New York on 14 and 15 September 2006) to a high-level dialogue on international migration and development. The focus was on identifying appropriate ways and means to maximize development benefits of migration and minimize its negative impacts.

The United Nations' report preparing the high-level dialogue on migration and development states in its first paragraph that: "International migration is an intrinsic part of the development process. It is both a response to the dynamics of development and a facilitator of social and economic change."[9]

Surprisingly, contrary to the expectations, the language of the UN documents revolves around "transnational communities" as main development policy actors, not diasporas. What is the difference? Report of the Secretary General 60/871 of 18 May 2006 on international migration and development devotes several sections to the "transnational communities" and their impact on development in the home countries. The report does not provide any specific definition of the term. It is however indirectly defined through three major dimensions: relationship with the country of origin, relationship with the country of destination, and internal organization.

The report first delineates the target group by defining the links of the transnational communities and the home countries. It states that "Governments understand that **their citizens** working abroad can be development assets... ."[10] Transnational communities, that can be "development assests", are thus formed only by own citizens working abroad. But who are these citizens? What generation migrants are they? (after all, citizenship of some countries can be hold through generations without residing there). Are they citizens with a direct migrant experience? On this the documents are silent. One could thus easily include all migrants and their descendants in the wide category of transnational community, as long as they hold citizenship of the country of origin, even if they did not have migration experience.

However, in further parts, the report provides an example to the contrary: "China also has benefited from overseas **entrepreneurs of Chinese origin**, who have made large-scale

(United Nations publication, Sales No. E.95.XIII.18), chapter I, resolution 1, annex, and chapter X on international migration.

[6] section II.C on international migration

[7] *Report of the World Summit for Social Development, Copenhagen, 6-12 March 1995* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.96.IV.8), chapter I, resolution 1, annex I and II.

[8] *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4-15 September 1995* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.96.IV.13), chapter I, resolution 1, annex II.

[9] Report of Secretary General, 59/325 of 2 September 2004, p. 3

[10] Report of Secretary General, 60/871 of 18 May 2006, p. 14

investments in the country, creating jobs and expanding exports."[11] In this case the citizenship is no longer a valid condition for being a part of an active transnational community, as it is not mentioned. Ethnic origins seem to do the trick. When reasoning in purely functional terms, for the policy purposes, the link to the home country could be primarily by origins and secondly by citizenship, as the first condition allows more people to qualify. Such an approach argues with the common perception of transnational communities which should include mainly migrants of the first generation.

The same report hints at other characteristics of "transnational communities" as development policy actors, referring implicitly to their relations with the host countries: "Once **established**, transnational communities also play a role in shaping developments in the home country. ... In addition, to the extent that migrants abroad **engage in entrepreneurship**, they may foster exports of products typical of the country of origin."[12] What is added here is the notion of duration of stay. The communities are established, thus they hardly can be communities of temporary migrants. We are talking about long-term residents, engaging in entrepreneurship. This last observation implies legal status of the migrant, as undocumented migrants cannot run business easily nor are they established (generally). The legal residence is one indicator; the other is the legal employment: "For instance, the Indian software industry has benefited from **well-placed Indian workers** in the United States, who have played an important role in reducing reputation barriers to trade and generating investment in India."[13] The skills of the migrants are thus also noted as a trait of the policy agent.

The mention of the collective engagement is rather superficial: "The activities of **home-town associations** and the use of **collective remittances** have already been reviewed."[14] The reference to home-town associations implies that the transnational communities need to be organized, even under such a light form, and the individuals should be part of them to qualify as actors of development policy. However, this condition is never stated explicitly.

The main characteristics of "transnational community", as presented in the report, are vague; it is not entirely clear who counts in and who does not, who can be a policy actor and who cannot. But they revolve around a quite operational set of indicators. What counts for an actor of development policy and through what a member of a community is defined as such is the following: about its the legal status, citizenship, ethnic origins, duration of stay, employment, skills to offer, belonging to a (community) organization. They are neither mutually exclusive nor inclusive.

This approach prevails in the UN documents and has been never mixed with the notion of "diaspora". This latter term has been used only in one[15] of the official reports until the date, tackling the issue of human resources, not migration *per se*. In here, the reference to diaspora is made only in the context of the United Nations initiative, Digital Diaspora Network for Africa and the Caribbean in the North America and Europe. This initiative, promoted by the United Nations Information and Communication Technologies Task Force, was started in the late 1990s and used internet as a tool to support the growth of expatriate organizations, through "exchange of knowledge between professionals in home countries and the diasporas."[16] The term

---

[11] Ibid. p.67-68
[12] Ibid. p. 67
[13] Ibidem
[14] Ibidem.
[15] Report of the Secretary-General 60/318 of 31 August 2005 on Human resources development.
[16] Ibid. p. 17

"diaspora" is used here as the synonym of "expatriate population",[17] and no clarification of either concept is provided.

If the United Nations has been quite prudent in multiplying terminology in the official texts, other organizations have used the terms "transnational communities" or "migrant communities" and "diaspora" interchangeably and abundantly in their policy documents.[18] As Heine de Haas showed, even "migrant organization" has been used as the synonym of "diaspora". (Heine de Haas, 2006: 7) The only discussion over the actual definition and meaning of the term has been offered by the International Organization for Migrations.

IOM got interested in the issue of migration and development in the 1990s. As for the term "diaspora", it appeared prominently within the framework of the Return of Qualified Nationals (RQN) programs, in the late 1990's, and then mainly within the framework of the IOM MIDA (Migration for Development in Africa) approach. The latter was adopted by the Organization of the African Union (OUA) in 2001.

Since then, the term was used in a number of IOM papers/strategies on the subject. More and more the works within the International Dialogue on Migration (IDM), a forum launched by IOM in 2001, have been focusing on the question of diaspora contribution to development. In 2007, the forum, which is a meeting place for the States, international and non-governmental bodies, discussed in depth how migration can be mainstreamed into development policy agendas, with a specific focus on partnerships and cooperation, and the engagement of diasporas. It must be noted that thanks to this leadership in dialogue, IOM has been emerging as the international organization leading on migration policy worldwide, quite influential in policy terms and effective in its implementation.[19]

In 2006, IOM offered its contribution to the High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development. Its 5th recommendation concerned development potential of diasporas, without precising the term.

Only after IOM ran a survey[20] among the source countries to learn what impact their diasporas have on their development, the conceptual work was presented. On the basis of the results, Dina Ionescu (Ionescu, 2006) completed a report which gives some theoretical orientations as regards the definition of "diaspora". It is probably the first paper in which an international organization offered an insight of its terminology. The justification of the use is quite perplexing:

> A number of academic authors tend to use the notion of "transnational communities" to emphasize the idea of movement and exchange between home and host countries, and to attract attention to the existence of informal networks that contribute to what are often circular movements. However, the notion of "diaspora" seems to better incorporate populations that are "settled" abroad, people who became citizens of their host country

---

[17] Ibid. p. 16

[18] See for example Conclusions of Migration and Development Conference, Brussels 15-16 March 2006 (involved bodies: government of Belgium, IOM, World Bank, European Commission); Report of the Global Commission on International Migration, "Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action," October 2005, available at www.gcim.org.

[19] UNDP is another international organization actively engaged in the promotion of migration and development agenda. The use of the term "diaspora" in UNDP documents will need yet to be analyzed.

[20] "Results of the Survey on Engaging Diasporas for Development" in *Mainstreaming migration into development policy agendas*, 2006, International Migration Dialogue Series n°8, accessed online on 24 June 2008 at http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/published_docs/serial_publications/Red_Book_08.pdf

and second-born generations. **Moreover, the term "diaspora" was preferred in this paper, given the widespread use of this term at policy level**.... [21]

And

> For the purpose of this paper, a broad definition of "diasporas" is proposed as: *members of ethnic and national communities, who have left, but maintain links with, their homelands*. The term "diasporas" conveys the idea of transnational populations, living in one place, while still maintaining relations with their homelands, being both "here" and "there". We do not capitalize the first letter to avoid the confusion with the historic Jewish or Greek Diaspora, and purposely use the plural to reflect the diversity of populations that can be acknowledged as diasporas.[22]

Three observations occur immediately. Firstly, diaspora is a broader term than transnational community, as the latter includes only people with migrant experience: citizens of the host country are excluded, so are migrants' descendants. Secondly, diaspora is broadly used in policy terms and everybody seems to understand what the target group is in this context. Thirdly, a traditional characteristic of diaspora, the "triadic relationship," (Vertovec, 1999) i.e. relations between migrant communities in various destination countries and between migrant communities and their home country, is gone from the picture.

The empirical exercise ran by IOM, focusing on surveying diaspora issues, provides even more interesting insights. The IOM survey was meant to help the countries in question identify their weak points in the diaspora policy to help them improve their response. It occurred that inquired governments in general had troubles measuring diasporas, or in other words determine who counts in and who counts out. Moreover, they were unable to explain satisfactorily the difficulties in collection of data.[23] These problems are understandable if there is no homogenous definition which could be translated into a statistical toolbox. IOM and other policy makers must have realized that the more diluted the concept is, the less policy relevance it can have.

These challenges of the data collection are thus discussed by Ionescu, (Ionescu, 2006: 14) who raises quite important questions: how long a migrant should stay in the destination country to become a part of diaspora? Does s/he need to be born in her/his home country? Does the citizenship matter? What about subjective feelings of identity and belonging, can someone be forced into a diaspora? As the modern concept of diaspora "lost its dimension of irreversibility" (Ionescu, 2006: 14), IOM proposes to include in the term all types of migrants, both long-term residents and short-term migrant workers. The rationale behind is that all these groups can contribute to the development agenda. An important factor is their willingness to do so. On the second question, considering the engagement of the second or third generations in the development of the homeland, Ionescu determines that the place of birth does not condition belonging to diaspora. The issue of citizenship is also unimportant, as migrants acquire citizenship of their host country and still can contribute to development (although, as Ionescu rightly notices, their contributions are not part of the general flow of migrant workers' remittances), thus double citizens or people who renounced citizenship of their home country can still be part of diaspora. In the end of the day what really matters is identity and sense of belonging – subjective feelings that can foster contribution to the development of the homeland. These feelings are not necessarily an intrinsic element of diaspora, they can be induced by

---

[21] Ibid. p. 10
[22] Ibid. p. 13
[23] Results of the Survey..., 2006, op.cit., p. 226.

"policy of sentiment" or a legal framework facilitating identification with homeland (e.g. through economic incentives). Actually, the author argues for contextual definition of diaspora, linked to the particular situation. Such an approach could help overcome the existing problems.

Further on, the report identifies five levels of data that could help identify and describe diasporas: individual data; collective data; transnational flows; qualitative data; and gender-differentiated data. The *signified* of the diaspora that emerges from a short analysis of the proposed potential data sources is extremely broad. The data set that defines diaspora includes practically anybody, who contributes to the development of the home country. Such a migrant can be included regardless of the legal status,[24] does not need to be established in the host country, does not need to be born in the home country, does not need to have citizenship of the country of origin, does not need to be a part of any migrant association (although it helps, as collective bodies can be most easily partners for policy projects), does not need to be a part of a migrant community, should maintain economic, not necessarily political or sentimental, ties with the home country.

The definition of diaspora in the policy context is delineated thus by several indicators, similar to the ones present in the UN discussion of transnational communities, i.e. legal status, citizenship, duration of stay, ethnic origin, but also subjective feelings of belonging that can influence the decision to contribute. It is important that both approaches define actors of development policy as individuals – the notion of collective identity is less important, a community member acts on voluntary basis, following his/her own values. Both see these individuals as linked no longer by traumatic experience or symbolic ties, but by a pure and positive readiness to act in economic terms.

This functional view on diasporas is probably the most clear definition of the concept: diaspora is made of all individuals, who have migration history, either themselves or in earlier generations, and who can contribute to the development of the country of origin. In other words, people who do or can deliver. When keeping this broad definition in mind, the uses and misuses of the term in the policy-related documents loose their relevance.

The policy recommendations are thus no longer limited to **help** diaspora contribute but to **make them want** to contribute. In the constructivist optic, this inducement of practices can have strong influence on group self-identification if applied in real life policies, especially if supported by financial incentives.

The top-down approach to diasporas as migration and development actors, as presented in the discussed cases, has had an impact on such real life policies. Powerful actors, such as the European Union, have changed significantly their optic as to incorporate the development dimension in their migration policies. Naturally, diaspora as the main actor of such policies has been also inherited.

---

[24] It is proposed e.g. to include in the measurement numbers of migrants registered by the means of instruments such as the Mexican *Matricula Consular*, which, among others, allows undocumented migrants in the US to obtain a Mexican ID.

3. European Comprehensive Migration Policy

European Union does not have a unified common migration policy. However, in the union of 27, there are some areas of migration that have been harmonized quite successfully, following the changes brought by the Amsterdam Treaty and the Hague Programme.[25] The several areas included in the Title IV of the Amsterdam Treaty, most prominently asylum and immigration create the basis for the community competence for harmonization in some domains. Cooperation in the field of asylum and immigration was explicitly described in the articles 62 and 63 of the Treaty. Further on, in 1999 the Tampere European Council agreed on the elements that should build up the EU immigration policy. These include a common asylum policy, fair treatment for third country nationals, management of migratory flows (legal and illegal), and partnerships with countries of origin. These priorities were also included in the detailed five year programme on the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice.

European comprehensive migration policy has several dimensions: border management, fight against illegal migration, asylum policy, integration and legal migration, and cooperation with third countries. Out of which especially the last two are of importance for this paper, as they focus on important extent on migrant and ethnic communities and involve them as European policy actors. It must be underlined that these two areas reflect internal and external dimensions of the policy.

Legal migration and integration

Admission of categories of foreigners other than refugees and asylum seekers has been quite a weak point of European migration policy, for a simple reason – the core decisions concerning the area crucial for migration management, e.g. labour markets, lie in the sole competence of the Member States. Any attempts to harmonize access of migrant workers have been received by the Member States with understandable reserve. In 2001, the Commission's proposal for a Directive on the conditions of admission and stay of third country workers[26] was discussed and turned down. The next attempt to establish some degree of harmonization in this area was a Green Paper on an EU approach to managing economic migration.[27]The results of this consultation were presented in the Policy Plan on Legal Migration, adopted in December 2005,[28] which lists the actions and legislative initiatives intended by the Commission to build European legal migration policy. The Commission promised there to propose new directives[29] addressing the conditions of entry and residence of certain categories of immigrants (highly skilled and seasonal workers, intra-corporate transferees and remunerated trainees), as well as one framework directive defining the basic rights of all immigrant workers admitted in the EU. As far as other categories of migrants, the objective of uniformization of admission rules regards only

---

[25] **The Hague Programme**: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union, Official Journal, 2005/c 53/01.
[26] **Proposal for a Council directive** on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purpose of paid employment and self-employed economic activities, COM (2001) 386 final, Official Journal C 332 E, 27/11/2001 P. 0248 - 0256.
[27] **Green Paper** on an EU Approach to Managing Economic Migration, COM (2004) 0811 final.
[28] **Communication** from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Policy plan on legal migration, COM (2005) 669 final.
[29] In 2007 Commission in fact proposed 3 out of 5 promised directives: the framework directive, directive on highly skilled, (the directives on seasonal workers and intracorporate transferees to follow).

researchers[30] and students of all levels.[31] Harmonized legal admission is however on aspect of this policy which does not involve migrant and ethnic communities. Integration of the admitted person, on the other hand, calls for more cooperation.

Integration of admitted immigrants, except for refugees, even if not really obviously anchored in the Treaty or in the Hague Programme, has been the flagship of the more consolidated European response to immigration. The areas where directives where issued include family reunification,[32] and rights of long-term residents.[33] Moreover, the legislation concerning equal treatment has also been high on the agenda.[34] On 19 November 2004, at the initiative of the Dutch Presidency, the EU Council adopted a set of Common Basic Principles on Integration. Harmonization in integration of immigrants across the Member States is nevertheless quite an ambitious objective. The Common Agenda for Integration enumerates specific measures that should help achieve it.[35] A number of practical tools, as the network of National Contact Points on Integration or yearly Handbook on Integration, promote a consolidated agenda in this field, and the Integration Fund provides financial support for the implementing actions.

So who is the target group of the EU integration policy? Common Agenda for Integration addresses in many of its proposals the members of migrant communities, i.e. people with direct migrant experience. Ethnic communities, composed of EU nationals of ethnic background, are not included in this optic. The most important feature of the EU approach is thus a distinction between a migrant and non-migrant. The dividing line is defined by the legal status of an individual in the host country. Consequently, within this framework, the migrants are defined as migrants without EU citizenship. In this context, migrant community is not exactly an ethnic community, it is narrower. Integration of EU nationals of immigrant origin is quite obviously not a question of immigration policy but social policy. The target group of integration policies are thus third country nationals, usually long-term residents of the EU.

The individual is always the most important subject of these regulations. As it is stated in the first Common Basic Principle on Integration: "Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States."[36] The focus is on

---

[30] **Council Directive** 2005/71/EC on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research, Official Journal L 289, 3/11/2005 p. 0015. **Recommendation** 2005/761/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 September 2005 to facilitate the issue by the Member States of uniform short-stay visas for researchers from third countries travelling within the Community for the purpose of carrying out scientific research, Official Journal L 289, 3/11/2005 , p. 0023 - 0025. **Council recommendation** 2005/762/EC of 12 October 2005 to facilitate the admission of third-country nationals to carry out scientific research in the European Community, Official Journal L 289, 3/11/2005, p. 0026.

[31] **Council Directive** 2004/114/EC of 13 December 2004 on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service Official journal L 375, 23/12/2004, p. 0012-0018.

[32] **Council Directive** 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification, Official Journal L 251, 03/10/2003 p. 0012 – 0018

[33] **Council Directive** 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents, Official Journal L 016, 23/01/2004, p.   0044 – 0053

[34] **Council Directive** 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, Official Journal L 303, 02/12/2000 p. 0016 – 0022. Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, Official Journal L 180, 19/07/2000 p. 0022 – 0026.

[35] **Communication** from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee, A Common Agenda for Integration - Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union, COM (2005) 389.

[36] **JHA Council Conclusions**, 19 November 2004, 14615/04, p. 17

individual rights and individual effort to integrate. Migrant community as a collective unit is not presented as the principal addressee of the policy. The recent Report on Integration[37] enumerates the successful programs on integration run in the Member States. The immigrant communities are explicitly mentioned only twice.[38] However, they are inexplicitly indicated as partners many times, e.g. in the relation to initiatives concerning religious communities.

Clearly, this policy targets internal actions, and thus it does not deal with migrants as purely transnational individuals. There is no clear interest in diasporic potential, thus the home country loyalties are not in the picture. The focus is on the cultural and racial distinctiveness which may precondition the inclusion in the host society. Only the link between an individual or his family and the destination country is of importance. Of course, where it exists, the community in which a migrant functions can become an important interlocutor of integration policy. Such an approach has its own rationale. As studies have shown (e.g. Grillo, Mazzucato, 2008) transnational individuals are involved in a complex matrix of reciprocity of transnational practices. On the policy level, perceived as the practice of the State, integration cannot become an inter-state or trans-state exercise, because it could undermine the very grounds of integration. Treating migrants as culturally distinctive individuals, as masters of their own variation/interpretation of the culture of origin can facilitate integration.

However this philosophy might see a change. In the recent conclusions, the Council invited the Commission and the National Contact Points on Integration to: "... consider approaches to integration that **involve the society as a whole**," and to focus *inter alia* on naturalisation systems, management of immigration-related diversity in society, and the impact of integration policies on social alienation and radicalization. All these issues go beyond the definition of an immigrant as the first generation non-citizen, as they concern also EU nationals.

On the other hand, this most internal dimension was tackled by several Communications focusing on development, and thus, external cooperation. In its section on integration policy, Communication on Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration that "(I)t is also important to recognise the link between members of the diaspora and their country of origin."[39] Similarly, also the Communication on Migration and Development[40] states that: "Integration of migrants is much more than just a part of a diaspora mobilisation policy; it is one of the central pillars of EU immigration policy … This policy, by allowing migrants to feel that their cultural identity is recognized and valued, should encourage them to remain committed to their country of origin and those they have left behind."[41] The division between the two dimensions is however kept, as the text sends the reader to the Communication on Common Agenda for Integration.

---

[37] **Communication** from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration COM(2007) 512.

[38] Ibid, p.17

[39] **Communication** from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration - First follow-up to Hampton Court, COM(2005) 0621, p. 7

[40] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations COM(2005) 390;

[41] Ibid., p. 24

External dimension of the EU migration policy

Involving migration issues in the relations with third countries was proposed by the Commission in 2002[42] and reiterated by the Council Conclusions of May 2003.[43] However the more developed approach was proposed only in the Commission's Communication of November 2005[44] and the European Council Conclusions of December 2005. There, the British Presidency put forward the idea of a new policy line, the Global Approach to Migration, which was defined as "a balanced, global and coherent approach, covering policies to combat illegal immigration and, in cooperation with third countries, harnessing the benefits of legal migration."[45] The Council also noted that the EU's "commitment to support the development efforts of countries of origin and transit is part of a long-term process to respond to the opportunities and challenges of migration". The Global Approach to Migration, developed more concretely since 2006, aims to formulate comprehensive and coherent policies that address a broad range of migration-related issues, bringing together justice and home affairs, development and external relations in an effort to enhance dialogue and cooperation on migration with third countries. In the first stage it related only to Africa and the Mediterranean; since 2007, the Council, under German Presidency, in its Conclusions of July 2007 extended this policy approach to the East and South-East regions of Europe.

The Global Approach encompasses three following dimensions: cooperation with third countries (of transit and origin) in migration management, support for fight with illegal migration (trafficking and smuggling) and migration and development[46]. Creation of a triple win situation, were the host country gains through labour, home country gains through co-development, and the migrant gains through support for individual initiatives, has become a mantra of the EU-level documents for several years now.[47] The focus on the development agenda as the major innovation added to the traditional restrictive approach has been further pursued in a Communication from May 2007 "On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries."[48]

Prior to 2002, in the EU documents, the term „diaspora" was used in the Country Strategy Papers or in specific country reports, primarily on economic subjects. There, diaspora was mentioned as

---

[42] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with third countries, COM(2002) 703

[43] **Council Conclusions** on migration and development, 19 May 2003.

[44] **Communication** from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration - First follow-up to Hampton Court, COM(2005) 0621.

[45] European **Council Conclusions** December 2005, p. 3

[46] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Council on the Global Approach to Migration, and **Communication** from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy, COM(2006)0735.

[47] see e.g. **Commission Communications:** Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with third countries - COM(2002); Policy Coherence for Development - Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals - COM(2005) 134; Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations COM(2005) 390;

[48] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries, COM(2007)0248.

a source of revenues and important factor stabilizing local and regional growth.[49] However, the nexus with the development agenda brought the notion of diaspora to the European comprehensive migration policy. Diaspora became an important policy actor, and its representation shifted from a mere mention to actual offer of involvement.

In December 2002, the Communication "Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with third countries"[50] showed the shade of interest of the European policy makers in diasporas, after a decade of debates in other international fora.

The Communication discusses the ways in which the cooperation and dialogue on migration can be introduced to the relations with third countries. Diaspora is introduced as a possible element of dialogue and cooperation, especially in the context of development. No real definition of diaspora is given, but there is an attempt to precise the subject. First of all, diaspora is an active network: "In order to really make the step into outward migration one needs contacts for practical advice and support. Usually the practical aspects of migration are **facilitated** by family contacts or the wider network of the migrant diaspora."[51] Such a network can play a positive role in lowering the risks of migration, by offering the safety net, but it also can be degenerated, as "(i)ncreasingly this type of support is provided on a relatively low risk and highly profitable commercial basis by criminal organisations involved in human smuggling."[52] The network theory is directly translated into the core understanding of diaspora. It is no longer a compact community, it is a set of dispersed individuals linked to each other by the network of facilitators.

Who are these individuals? The Communication mentions briefly only the issue of legal status. As it is said in the context of co-development: "(a) migrant can also provide positive inputs in the local development of his or her country of origin, **without regaining permanent residence**."[53] The migrant thus is the migrant who is no longer a permanent resident in his or her country of origin. It does not say if he or she is a citizen, but since the verb "regaining" is used, the diaspora includes apparently only the 1st generation. There is no mention of the status in the country of destination, the diaspora is characterized only vis-à-vis the home country. It is especially visible in the parts, where diaspora is seen as a development driving force, of a primary interest to the home countries: "Governments of migrant sending countries such as Tunisia, Senegal and Nigeria have set up active policies to intensify contacts with their diasporas and to involve them in the national development process, both in economic and political terms."[54]

However, diaspora is also seen as being of interest to the receiving countries and international organizations, which set up special co-development schemes that are addressed to diaspora members. The characteristics vis-à-vis the receiving country are limited only to the eligibility for such schemes. In other words, diaspora is any eligible collective body or individual.

---

[49] e.g. **Report** from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – European Agency for Reconstruction. Annual Report 2000, COM(2001); **Report** from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the Implementation of Macro-Financial Assistance to Third Countries in 2001, Com(2002) 352.
[50] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with third countries, COM(2002) 703
[51] Ibid., p. 11.
[52] Ibidem
[53] Ibid., p. 16
[54] ibidem

Diaspora is also seen in the terms of space, when terms as "academics in diaspora"[55] are used. Such a notion recalls the ancient Greek idea of diaspora as geographical dispersion, without the emotional and sentimental burden. It is actually a synonym of "abroad", with the hint at variety of places the migrants might come from.

The emerging characteristic of diaspora is thus a network of migrants with various legal links to the home country, who are able to form a body eligible for projects. Their link to the home country is purely economic and utilitarian – again, the famous triadic relationship is gone from the definition.

In the Council Conclusions on migration and development adopted on 19 May 2003 diaspora is not even mentioned, and the authors talked only about trans-national community as the development partner. But in September 2005 Communication on migration and development[56] diaspora is fully present and finally defined for the European policy use.

It becomes clear instantly that to define the term "diaspora", and thus the scope of its possible actions, is not the Commission's objective. The definition figures only in a footnote (17). As it is explained:

> For the purposes of this Communication, we use a broad definition of the diaspora. The diaspora from a given country therefore includes not only the nationals from that country living abroad, but also migrants who, living abroad, have acquired the citizenship of their country of residence (often losing their original citizenship in the process) and migrants' children born abroad, whatever their citizenship, as long as they retain some form of commitment to and/or interest in their country of origin or that of their parents. In some extreme cases, such as the Chinese diaspora, people **may still feel part** of a country's diaspora even though their family has been living in another country for several generations."[57]

This definition is indeed a broad one. It clearly goes hand in hand with the ideas presented by Ionescu. It focuses merely on the question of the birth place and nationality (however underlines the importance of some individual emotional link to the homeland), it does not discuss the questions of legal status, employment, skills, duration of stay or belonging to an organization. These can be deduced from the further text, where the functional aspects of diaspora are discussed.

The first characteristic special to the diaspora is that it is seen as a transnational community, "linking countries of origin and countries of residence, diasporas can make an important contribution to the development of their home countries."[58] The transnational character of the diaspora guarantees the success of development initiatives: "Temporary return, and more generally circular migration, can also allow migrants or diaspora members who have succeeded in business activities in the EU to set up additional business activities – either directly connected or not to their main activity in the EU – in their country of origin..."[59]

---

[55] ibid., p.24

[56] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations COM(2005) 390;

[57] ibid., p. 23

[58] ibid., p. 22

[59] ibid. P. 29

Second observation concerns migrants – they are not the same as diaspora members. They belong to a narrower group: " …brain circulation … can be defined … as the possibility for developing countries to draw on the skills, know-how and other forms of experience gained by **their migrants – <u>whether they have returned or not</u> – and members of their <u>diaspora abroad</u>**." As illustrated by the quote, migrants might be more prone to return than diaspora members, hence the difference. Still, it is not entirely clear if the migrants are truly considered to be something different than diaspora members, since according to the broad definition, provided in the beginning, they should be included. This ambivalence persists in several parts of the text. It seems that the distinction was introduced so as to group people with migration history (members of migrant communities) under one label and the people of ethnic background (members of ethnic communities) under the other. This division might simply recall the internal and external dimension of the EU migration policy, although members of ethnic communities in this view should have some emotional link to the homeland. Not all of them still have it, and thus not all of them form a part of diaspora. From further reading it seems that actually both such involved migrants and diaspora members could make a part of diaspora as policy actor.

The third characteristic concerns thus the legal status. As the Commission proposes, among its initiatives, to help "developing countries **map their diasporas** and **build links** with them,"[60] and then to "consider supporting efforts to set up **databases** where members of diasporas interested in contributing to home countries' development **can register** on a voluntary basis,"[61] it is quite clear, it refers mainly to those legally staying and working. Data collection usually concerns counts not estimations. Interestingly enough, there is no discussion of how to define diaspora to be able to gather the relevant data, or even from where the data can be gathered. When discussing migration profiles, a proposed data-gathering tool, which are described in the Annex 8, the Communication does not pose any question to this end either.

The legal status and even resident status, as an indicator of belonging to diaspora, is further stressed when the Commission promises to "look at how to ensure that the residence rights in the EU of diaspora members who decide to engage in such activities are not affected by temporary returns to countries of origin."[62]

Fourth trait of diaspora is the organizational side. The constant use of the term "member of diaspora" suggests some sort of organizational structure within diaspora, or at least some collective identity, juxtaposes individual and atomized migrants against the diasporic community. Moreover, in its proposals for action, the Commission "invites those Member States that do not already do so to identify and engage diaspora organisations which could be **suitable and representative interlocutors in development policy** and/or **possible initiators** of development projects in countries of origin."[63] Here diaspora equals ethnic or migrant organization. It cannot be any organization, it must be qualified to be a partner in the development policy of its country. Thus, it should be trustworthy and well-established, for the partnership in projects usually means managing EU funding.

Transnational character of diaspora is revealed in other parts of the text. Firstly, when it comes to funding, Commission promised to support sustainable development projects "with a preference

---

[60] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations COM(2005) 390;
[61] ibid., p. 6
[62] ibid., p. 8
[63] ibid., p. 6

for projects in third countries involving diasporas **in two or more Member States**."[64] Secondly, Commission also encourages "steps by the organisations representing diasporas involved in the development of countries of origin to set up a mechanism that could ensure appropriate **representation of their interests at EU level**, in particular as far as policies of interest to these countries are concerned."[65]

In the first case, the traditional triadic relationship is echoed (or even its re-creation required), and the transnational character of "a preferred" diaspora is stressed. In the second case, diaspora organizations should thus become not only economically but also politically engaged in the development strategy of the third country. This political engagement is truly transnational in substance – it involves country of origin, EU country of destination and EU level. Again, the members of such a diaspora need to be recognized in the EU legal system to be able to get through to the EU level – they might be only EU citizens or long-term residents, thus not temporary or circular migrants.

Now, what can the diaspora do for its country? The Communication leaves a broad leeway for the "each diaspora member"[66] underlining the voluntary character of contributions. This implies that a diaspora member should really feel some connection to the homeland. What type of the connection, it is not precised. A substantial part of the text is devoted to financial remittances, associated with first generation (i.e. migrants), but also to transfer of skills and productive investment, domain of second and third generation. In this context, the authors promote the idea of temporary return of qualified diaspora members.

The image of diaspora as presented in the Communication is thus is narrowed down to the functional indicators. It also has specific characteristics which define it as an actor of the European migration policy. A member of diaspora can be anybody (although the division between migrants and diaspora members is not clear) legally residing and working in the EU Member State, belonging to a recognized and well established diaspora organization or having access to such. Diaspora has thus a collective dimension. Diaspora has a purely transnational character, as it can reach out not only to the home country but also to other diasporic organizations in other Member States. This understanding of diaspora leaves aside individual migrants who do not want make part or keep contact with any ethnic/migrant organization or who are illegal. Of interest are mainly these diaspora members who can engage in business activities in the home country (use of remittances) or offer skills for development.

Such view suggests the most important function of diaspora, its economic but also its political power, not necessarily merely in the home country but also in the host country and on the EU level. Such a view on diaspora was repeated in Commission communications discussing migration and development ever since.[67] On the implementation side, e.g. in the relations with

---

[64] ibid., p. 8
[65] ibidem
[66] **Communication** from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations COM(2005) 390, p. 23
[67] e.g. **Communications** from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration - First follow-up to Hampton Court, COM(2005) 0621; The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy, COM(2006)0735; On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries, COM(2007)0248; Policy Coherence for Development COM(2007) 545;

Africa, Commission involved substantial funding to support *inter alia* diasporas as agents of development[68] within the framework of AENEAS program and EDF resources.

The Commission's definition is relatively less broad than the one presented by IOM or UN, but still the utilitarian delineations prevail.

4. Conclusions

In this paper I tried to delineate the current use of the term "diaspora" in its most common public vest – development and migration agenda. This discourse shapes the understanding of the term of policy-makers and average citizens. I examined the major documents produced by the UN, IOM and European Communities to understand what is meant when the word appears in the policy documents. Diaspora is here a category of practice that can re-shape the existing self-identification of the interested groups.

On the scholarly ground, the paradigm of Diaspora as a nation in exile went through several transformations, leaving us with a set of ambiguous characteristics, as dispersion of a group of one national or ethnic origin between two or more places, maintaining developed network over all destinations, symbolic or real links to the home country, emotional identification with the home country, organized. The common complain of academics and researchers is that the definition is too dilutes to present a sound conceptual value.

On the other hand, the actual use of the term "diaspora" in the policy context is based on several indicators that help distinguish diasporas from other communities and promote them as policy agents. These include legal status, citizenship, belonging to an organization, duration of stay, identification, skills, employment status. Each migrant or descendant is thus graded against these indicators and his or her utility is judged.

Some international organizations tend to apply a very broad version of the definition, being as inclusive as possible, keeping in general only three important conditions: ethnic/national origin, capability to contribute and readiness to contribute. The most important is the economic dimension of diaspora – the ties to the homeland cannot be symbolic anymore, or purely political, they need to be first of all beneficial for the country of origin, in the second place – to the diaspora members themselves. This "economics-ation" of diaspora may seem harsh, as the central values of cultural identity, symbolic belonging, sentimental ties etc are not accentuated.

European migration policy also defines diaspora through these lenses, although here the definition is more exclusive. Apart from origins, capability and readiness to contribute, the belonging to diaspora organizations is required. On this basis the European policy makers can define their target group and provide support for its activities. It is quite important though that diaspora is welcome as the European migration policy actor only in its external dimension, in the context of cooperation with third countries. The internal dimension has been still reserved for migrant communities only, although the gradual shift might occur.

The table below represents the main dilemmas.

---

[68] **Communications** from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy, COM(2006)0735

Tab. 1. Development policy actor as defined by UN, IOM and EC.

INDICATORS	UN	IOM	EC
Legal status	Relevant (residence of the host country)	irrelevant	Relevant (residence of the host country)
Citizenship	Unclear (if relevant, it is of the country of origin)	irrelevant	irrelevant
Ethnic/national origins	relevant	relevant	relevant
Duration of stay in the host country	temporary migrants excluded	all included	temporary migrants excluded
Legal employment	relevant	irrelevant	relevant
Skills to offer	relevant	relevant	relevant
Funds to offer	relevant	relevant	relevant
Membership in a organization	Unclear	irrelevant	relevant for funding
Subjective feeling of belonging	Unclear	relevant	irrelevant
Transnational characteristics	'triadic relationship' irrelevant	'triadic relationship' irrelevant	'triadic relationship' relevant for funding

Still it is not entirely clear who will be the final user and implementing actor of the policy. The rooted and established diasporas have very often nothing in common with the newly arrived migrants, and the subsequent waves of migration create their distinct and closed communities. Apparently, the idea for migration and development agenda is to overcome these differences, to have a less diverse set of interlocutors on the other side, joined by a common goal. It is probable that in the result of the process we will be faced by proliferation of more or less standardized organizations competing for the financial support, as it is already the case in several other policy areas (cfr. Finnemore, 1996)

The support for diaspora within the boundaries delineated by the presented indicators will influence directly the self-identification of diasporas and their members. The incentive to organize can have positive impact on many migrant communities, which to the date do not perceive themselves as diasporas and have weak internal structure. This is the case especially of the quite recent migrants from the extremely weak or very new multinational states, who do not necessarily see themselves as members of the national community associated with their home country. This case is well represented by the Moldovans, who are exceptionally reluctant to see themselves as uniform diaspora because of the different ethnic identification (Moldovan, Russian, Romanian), and thus who often choose to subscribe to some other ethnic organization. (Schwartz, 2007). It remains to be seen how the availability of the funding and importance given

to the role of diaspora can change this particular group and other similar ones according to the discursive elements present in the policies.

References

Bruebaker R. (1996). *Nationalism reframed: nationhood and national question in the New Europe*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press

Castles S., M.J. Miller (2003). *The Age of Migration*, New York, London: The Guilford Press

Cohen R. (1995). Rethinking "Babylon": iconoclastic conceptions of the diasporic experience. *New Community* 21: 5-18, p. 5.

Cohen R. (1997). *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration - First follow-up to Hampton Court, COM(2005) 0621;

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Policy Coherence for Development - Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals - COM(2005) 134

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy, COM(2006)0735;

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries, COM(2007)0248;

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Policy Coherence for Development COM(2007) 545;

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy, COM(2006)0735

Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration COM(2007) 512.

Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Policy plan on legal migration, COM (2005) 669 final.

Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee: A Common Agenda for Integration - Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union, COM (2005) 389.

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy, COM(2006)0735

Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations COM(2005) 390

Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with third countries, COM(2002) 703.

Conclusions of Migration and Development Conference, Brussels 15-16 March 2006 (involved bodies: government of Belgium, IOM, World Bank, European Commission);

Council Conclusions on migration and development, 19 May 2003.

Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, Official Journal L 180, 19/07/2000 p. 0022 – 0026.

Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, Official Journal L 303, 02/12/2000 p. 0016 – 0022.

Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents, Official Journal L 016, 23/01/2004, p. 0044 – 0053

Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification, Official Journal L 251, 03/10/2003 p. 0012 – 0018

Council Directive 2004/114/EC of 13 December 2004 on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service Official journal L 375, 23/12/2004, p. 0012-0018.

Council Directive 2005/71/EC on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research, Official Journal L 289, 3/11/2005 p. 0015.

Council recommendation 2005/762/EC of 12 October 2005 to facilitate the admission of third-country nationals to carry out scientific research in the European Community, Official Journal L 289, 3/11/2005, p. 0026.

de Haas Hein (2006). "Engaging Diasporas. How governments and development agencies can support diaspora involvement in the development of origin countries," University of Oxford International Migration Institute, James Martin 21st Century School, accessed on 30/01/2008 at www.imi.ox.ac.uk;

European Council Conclusions December 2005

Finnemore M. (1996). National Interests in International Society. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Green Paper on an EU Approach to Managing Economic Migration, COM (2004) 0811

Grillo R., V. Mazzucato (2008). "African <> Europe: A double engagement." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34 (2): 175-198

IOM, (2006). "Results of the Survey on Engaging Diasporas for Development" in *Mainstreaming migration into development policy agendas*, International Migration Dialogue Series n°8, accessed on 30/01/2008 at www.iom.int

Ionescu D. (2006). *Engaging Diasporas as Development Partners for Home and Destination Countries: Challenges for Policymakers*, IOM Migration Research Series, No 26, IOM, Geneva.

JHA Council Conclusions, 19 November 2004, 14615/04

Proposal for a Council directive on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purpose of paid employment and self-employed economic activities, COM (2001) 386 final, Official Journal C 332 E, 27/11/2001 P. 0248 - 0256.

Recommendation 2005/761/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 September 2005 to facilitate the issue by the Member States of uniform short-stay visas for researchers from third countries travelling within the Community for the purpose of carrying out scientific research, Official Journal L 289, 3/11/2005 , p. 0023 - 0025.

Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – European Agency for Reconstruction. Annual Report 2000, COM(2001)

Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the Implementation of Macro-Financial Assistance to Third Countries in 2001, Com(2002) 352

Report of Secretary General, 59/325 of 2 September 2004

Report of Secretary General, 60/871 of 18 May 2006

Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, *4-15 September 1995* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.96.IV.13), chapter I, resolution 1, annex II.

Report of the Global Commission on International Migration, "Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action," October 2005, accessed on 30/01/2008 at www.gcim.org.

Report of the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, 5-13 September 1994 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.95.XIII.18), chapter I, resolution 1, annex, and chapter X on international migration.

Report of the Secretary-General 60/318 of 31 August 2005 on Human resources development.

Report of the World Summit for Social Development, Copenhagen, 6-12 March 1995 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.96.IV.8), chapter I, resolution 1, annex I and II.

Safran W. (1991). "Diasporas in modern societies: myths of homeland and return", *Diaspora,* 1(1): 83-99.

Schnapper D. (1999). "From the Nation-State to the Transnational World: On the Meaning and Usefulness of Diaspora as a Concept", *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 8 (3): 225-254.

Schwartz R. (2007). "Exploring the Link between Moldovan Communities Abroad (MCA) and Moldova", Chisinau: IOM, accessed 31/01/2008 at http://www.iom.md/materials/diaspora_and_ocv_final_report_eng.pdf

Sheffer G. (1986). "A new field of study: Modern diasporas in international politics." In G. Sheffer (Ed.), *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*, 1-15. London: Croom Helm.

Sheffer G. (1995). "The Emergence of New Ethno-National Diasporas", *Migration,* Vol. 28: 5-28

The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union, Official Journal, 2005/c 53/01.

UN Resolution 49/127 of 19 December 1994,

UN Resolution 50/123 of 20 December 1995,

UN Resolution 52/189 of 18 December 1997,

UN Resolution 54/212 of 22 December 1999,

UN Resolution 58/208 of 23 December 2003, 59/241 of 22 December 2004,

UN Resolution 60/227 of 23 December 2005.

Van Hear N. F. Pieke, S. Vertovec (2004). *The contribution of UK-based diasporas to development and poverty reduction.* A report by the ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford for DfID, the Department for International Development

Vertovec S. (1999). "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 22:2.

Vertovec S. R. Cohen, eds. (1999). *Migration, Diasporas and Transnationalism.* London: Edward Elger Publishing Limited UK

Secondary sources

1. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the future of relations between the European Union and the Republic of Cape Verde [SEC(2007) 1415] (COM/2007/0641 final)

2. Commission staff working document - Accompanying document to the Proposal for a Council Directive on the conditions of entry and residence of third country nationals for the purpose of highly qualified employment - Impact assessment {COM(2007) 637 final} {SEC(2007) 1382} (SEC/2007/1403 final)

3. Commission Working Paper - EU Report on Policy Coherence for Development {SEC(2007)1202} (COM/2007/0545 final)

4. Commission Staff Working Paper - Accompanying the Commission Working Paper - EU Report on Policy Coherence for Development {COM(2007)545 final} (SEC/2007/1202 final)

5. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries (COM/2007/0248 final)

6. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - A European Programme for Action to tackle the critical shortage of health workers in developing countries (2007–2013) (COM/2006/0870 final)

7. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy (COM/2006/0735 final)

8. Commission staff Working Document accompanying the Communication "Governance in the European Consensus on Development: towards a harmonized approach within the European Union" {COM(2006) 421 final} {SEC(2006) 1021} {SEC(2006) 1022} (SEC/2006/1020)

9. Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – A Common Agenda for Integration - Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals. *OJ C 206, 29.8.2006, p. 27–39 (ES, CS, DA, DE, ET, EL, EN, FR, IT, LV, LT, HU, NL, PL, PT, SK, SL, FI, SV)* J**OC_2006_206_R_0027_01**

10. Communication from the Commission to the Council - Contribution to the EU Position for the United Nations' High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (COM/2006/0409 final)

11. Commission staff working document - Annex to the Communication de la Commission au Conseil et au Parlement européen - Renforcer la liberté, la sécurité et la justice dans l'Union européenne - Rapport sur la mise en œuvre du programme de La Haye pour l'année 2005 {COM(2006) 333 final} (SEC/2006/0814)

12. European Parliament resolution on the links between legal and illegal migration and integration of migrants (2004/2137(INI)) *OJ C 124E , 25.5.2006, p. 535–542 (ES, CS, DA, DE, ET, EL, EN, FR, IT, LV, LT, HU, MT, NL, PL, PT, SK, SL, FI, SV)*

13. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Increasing the impact of EU aid : a common framework for drafting country strategy papers and joint multiannual programming (COM/2006/0088 final)

14. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee - An EU-Caribbean partnership for growth, stability and development {SEC(2006) 268} (COM/2006/0086 final)

15. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - EU strategy for action on the crisis in human resources for health in developing countries (COM/2005/0642 final)

16. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration - First follow-up to Hampton Court (COM/2005/0621 final)

17. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions - Migration and Development : some concrete orientations (COM/2005/0390 final)

18. Communication from the Commission to the Council on the monitoring and evaluation mechanism of the third countries in the field of the fight against illegal immigration (COM/2005/0352 final)

19. Commission staff working document - Annex to the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "Annual report 2005 on the European community's development policy and the implementation of external assistance in 2004" {COM(2005) 292 final } (SEC/2005/0892 final)

20. Commission staff working document - EU Report on Millennium Development Goals 2000 – 2004 - EU contribution to the review of the MDGs at the UN 2005 High Level Event {COM(2005)132 final} (SEC/2005/456 final)

21. Commission staff working paper - Annex to "European Neighbourhood Policy" - Country Report – Lebanon{COM(2005) 72 final} (SEC/2005/0289)

22. Report from the Commission to the budgetary authority on guarantees covered by the general budget situation at 31 December 2003 {SEC(2004) 922} (COM/2004/0491 final)

23. Communication from the Commission - Opinion on Croatia's Application for Membership of the European Union (COM/2004/0257 final)

24. Joint Parliamentary Assembly of the Partnership Agreement concluded between the members of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, of the one part, and the European Community and its Member States, of the other part - RESOLUTION on

children's rights and child soldiers in particular *Official Journal C 026 , 29/01/2004 P. 0017 - 0026*

25. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with Third Countries - I. Migration and development - II. Report on the effectiveness of financial resources available at community level for repatriation of immigrants and rejected asylum seekers, for management of external borders and for asylum and migration projects in third countries (COM/2002/0703 final)

26. Preliminary draft supplementary and amending budget No 4 to the budget for 2002 - Statement of revenue and expenditure by section - Section III – Commission (SEC/2002/0851 final)

27. Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Macro-Financial Assistance to third countries in 2001 (COM/2002/0352 final)

28. Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of macro-financial assistance to third countries in 2001 (COM/2002/0352 final/2)

29. Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - European Agency for Reconstruction - Annual Report 2000 - According to Article 4.14 of Council Regulation (EC) 2667/2000 (COM/2001/0446 final)

30. Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on "Development of human resources in the Western Balkans" *Official Journal C 193 , 10/07/2001 P. 0099 - 0116*

31. Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on the "Proposal for a Council Decision adopting a Multiannual Community programme to stimulate the development and use of European digital content on the global networks and to promote the linguistic diversity in the Information Society" *OJ C 116, 20.4.2001, p. 30–36 (ES, DA, DE, EL, EN, FR, IT, NL, PT, FI, SV)*

32. Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on the "Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions — Principles and guidelines for the Community's audiovisual policy in the digital age" *OJ C 14, 16.1.2001, p. 114–119 (ES, DA, DE, EL, EN, FR, IT, NL, PT, FI, SV)*

33. European Council Conclusions 2000-2007