Migrant Political Participation and Development: Re-politicizing development and re-socializing politics

Luin Goldring

SSRC Migration & Development Conference Paper No. 15

"Migration and Development:
Future Directions for Research and Policy"
28 February – 1 March 2008 | New York, NY

Social Science Research Council

One Pierrepont Plaza, 15th Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201
P: +1 212 377 2700
F: +1 212 377 2727
migration@ssrc.org

Migrant Political Participation and Development: Re-politicizing development and re-socializing politics

Luin Goldring| YorkUniversity

Introduction[1]

This discussion paper addresses research on migrant's political participation in relation to development. Research in a several social science disciplines has established that migrants from a wide range of contexts of departure in the global South remain involved in homeland affairs while living and working various countries.[2] In addition to documenting trends, this scholarship offers explanatory analyses. Two broad literatures are of current relevance to the topic. First, in migration studies, economics and anthropology there are studies of remittances (mainly economic remittances), and of the potential and/or actual role of migrant organizations and diaspora groups in development. This work tends to focus on contributions to economic development through poverty alleviation (income security through remittances) and community infrastructure improvements organized by groups of migrants. Second, in political science, sociology and migration studies, there is a rich body of work on political transnationalism. This research analyzes state policies toward emigrants, migrant participation in electoral and non-electoral politics "back home," and transformations in citizenship practices and institutions without necessarily using the language of development.

After a surge of interest by various institutional development actors (e.g. International Financial Institutions, foundations, migrant producing governments, etc.), particularly in the last five years or so, there are signs of change in the framing of the issue. Initial enthusiasm over the possibility of using remittances for development has been tempered by statements about remittances as private income, while plans for diaspora involvement in homeland development and peace-building are similarly qualified by questions about how to support positive outcomes rather than abetting

---

[1] This essay draws on an earlier presentation (Goldring, Luin. 2006. "Politics and Anti-Politics in the Developmentalization of the Diaspora." in *Fourth International Workshop in the Diaspora, Development and Conflict Programme.* Bornholm, Denmark: DIIS.), and collaborative work conducted with Patricia Landolt (Landolt, Patricia, and Luin Goldring. 2006. "Activist dialogues and the production of refugee political transnationalism: Chileans, Colombians and non-migrant civil society in Canada." in *Second International Colloquium of the International Network on Migration and Development.* Cocoyoc, Morelos, Mexico.)

[2] Most of this work is on South-North transnational connections, in spite of recognition of the importance of South-South migration.

negative ones. Whether or not this is a short term response to financial volatility, anti-immigrant movements, and security concerns, it is a good time to reflect on the state of the art, consider why interest may be dampening in some quarters, and how we might draw on broader discussions regarding development on one hand, and migrant political activism on the other, to gain insights into participation and development (together), with an eye to developing an informed research agenda.

To contribute to this research agenda, it is useful to reflect on how knowledge has been produced and why. My argument is that after an initial opening and flourishing of discussions on migrant transnationalism and development during the late 80s and early 90s that included overlapping discussion regarding development and transnational political organizing, the terms of debate began to narrow and diverge, so that work on migration and development became practically synonymous with remittances and development, while research on transnational political participation took off on an increasingly separate track. I identify and discuss two reasons for this. One is the "developmentalization of the diaspora," in which many stakeholders have gotten caught up (including academics and migrant organizations). Drawing selectively on Foucauldian approaches to development, I suggest that efforts to de-politicize development by making it a technical problem have contributed to the enchantment and potential disenchantment with migration and development.

The second has to do with contending approaches and developments within migration studies. The last 15 years or so have produced enormous advances, but there have also been tensions between narrower and broader definitions of and approaches to migrant transnationalism, and between scholars of transnational migration studies and critics. Without going into the debates, I suggest that they have contributed to the narrowing and abstraction of "the political" in research on migrant transnational engagements. This has contributed to narrowing the definition of political actors and institutions, and separating the political from the social relations in which they are embedded. My argument is that a research agenda on this topic should draw on the available research by building on efforts to broaden the terms of discussion in each of these literatures, and work to increase the overlap between scholarship on migration and development, and on migrant political participation. That is, we need to bring politics back in to transnational mobilization for development, and broaden the analysis of transnational migrant political activism by highlighting how it is embedded in broader social relations. In so doing, we can contribute to efforts to build a more global sociology and strengthen interdisciplinary transnational studies.

I. Remittance Based Development and Political Transnationalism

Reviewing Existing Research
Research on migrant's political participation in their homelands and in a set of practices called "development" has grown tremendously in the last decade, spurred by at least five processes: (1) the phenomenal growth in migrant remittances and associated changes both in research tracking remittances and services offering money transfers; (2) "on the ground" changes in the frequency, intensity and density of collective and individual migrant claimsmaking and involvement in local and national affairs "back home;" (3) federal and subnational policies in migrant producing and receiving countries that facilitate or at least do not dramatically constrain such involvement; (4) interest by International Financial Institutions (IFIs) as well as Foundations and other donors in supporting migrant participation in "development;" and (5) conceptual shifts in migration studies, particularly in transnational and diaspora studies, which have generated research on cross-border engagements and identities.

The two areas of concern, transnational political participation and migrant participation and development, have generated somewhat distinct bodies of work.

Migration and Development
Interest in the possibility of migrants contributing to development in their communities and countries of origin has generated an enormous amount of academic and policy analysis, which I do not need to review in detail. I will note that individual and collective remittances and migrant hometown associations have come to *embody* participation in development "back home" for many parties, including migrants, policy-makers, development planners, and political authorities in migrant producing and receiving contexts. High expectations surrounding remittances and, to some extent, the increasing profile of migrant associations and "diaspora groups" led Sarah Gammage (2006), Luis Guarnizo (2003), and others (Goldring 2004) to identify remittance-based development as the newest development paradigm. Concerns raised by these authors have been joined by questions regarding the effectiveness of remittances as "the new development mantra" (Kapur 2004), and unease about assumptions underlying the spread of "remittance euphoria"(De Haas 2005; Mitchell 2006; Orozco 2007). These analysts agree that remittances contribute to recipients' well-being and help reduce "transient" poverty, but they and others also warn that these funds will not address the structural causes of poverty (Orozco 2004) or contribute to human and social development (Orozco 2007).

Academic critiques of the idea that migration and remittances will address or somehow significantly advance poverty reduction and development goals have been joined more recently by signs of disenchantment on the part of development and multilateral organizations. Some governments (Canadian) and quasi-governmental organizations and foundations remain interested in Diaspora involvement in development and peace-building (University for Peace 2006). However, discourse regarding migration and development appears to be shifting slightly. A declaration produced by the VII South American Conference on Migrations (VII Conference on South American Migrations 2007) notes that:

> "…remittances are private transfers generated by the migrant population which are used to improve the quality of life of the recipients, and which, therefore, should not be considered official aid for development, under any circumstances."[3]

Similarly, after developing innovative programs to support and accompany migrant organizations in the United States in 2003-04 (IAF and Ford), programs designed to capture migrant investment and leverage remittances for development (IDB 2001), and other projects aimed at strengthening capacity among migrant organizations, these programs seem to be narrowing in on improving the efficiency of remittance transfers while reducing broader claims about working with migrant organizations, capacity building, and development.

It is too early to tell whether this signals the eclipse of another development paradigm. The interesting question in my view is to understand what lies behind the widespread enchantment with remittances as a proxy for migrant participation in development.

Migrants and Transnational Political Participation
Research on migrant political involvement in national or subnational arenas has also produced a considerable body of scholarship, although curiously, it does not overlap much with work that uses the language of development. There are various ways to categorize this research (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). One could, for example, distinguish between normatively critical and celebratory approaches. Among the former, political scientists have a history of being suspicious of long-distance nationalism (Anderson 1992), although anthropologists have also raised concerns about its negative impacts (Glick

---

[3] Author's translation of: "…que las remesas son flujos financieros privados producto del trabajo de la población migrante que inciden en el mejoramiento de la calidad de vida de sus beneficiarios, y, por lo tanto, no deben ser consideradas ayuda oficial al desarrollo, bajo ningún concepto."

Schiller and Fouron 1999). Regarding the second cateory, the overly celebratory tone of some of the early work in the area of transnational studies that claimed migrants were circumventing state power was registered some time ago (Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Mahler 1998).

Another way to categorize work on migrant political transnationalism is based on research orientation, definition of and approach to transnationalism, and focus of research.[4] I will distinguish between four approaches that are informed by structural and political economy accounts of global migration, but diverge in other ways.[5] One approach analyzes the frequency and scope of transnational political *practices* and their determinants, and relies on quantitative survey research (cf. work by Alejandro Portes and his colleagues, e.g. (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003).[6] Transnational practices, political and otherwise, are defined in specific but relatively narrow terms as habitual behavior across borders in order to avoid the danger of the term "transnational" being applied too broadly. In order to operationalize this definition, research methods rely on individual-level surveys, though data analysis is contextualized with additional information. Conceptually, this work emphasizes the importance of analyzing both individual attributes and contexts of departure and reception to understand outcomes. In practice, individual level analysis takes center stage, as the context of departure is captured by aggregating people by country of origin, while contextual elements of the destination locality or country are captured by aggregating by period of arrival and location. This research has made critical contributions to transnational studies. In particular, it has addressed questions about *who* is active in transnational engagements, and offered insight into determinants (part of the *why*). At the same time, questions remain about *how*, or the specific mechanisms and processes that facilitate transnational engagements, in specific settings and over time.

A second approach is *institutional* and mainly, though not exclusively, qualitative. Here the focus is on identifying the institutional and contextual parameters that shape migrant political transnational engagement, including state policies and subnational regional and urban contexts (Itzigsohn 2000; Landolt 2007; Landolt 2008; Levitt and Dehesa 2003; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2001; Smith 2003). This category also includes comparative crossnational studies of the types of claims immigrants make (national versus

---

[4] I am limiting this discussion to research that focuses transnational engagements, and leaving out work that examines political incorporation.

[5] I am overdrawing distinctions between these approaches for purposes of discussion. There are examples of researchers that have heeded the call to study in-between transnationalism, which is consistent with working between the second and third approaches that I outline.

[6] This systematic and positivist aspect of this work contributed to making transnational approaches legitimate within migration studies.

transnational) and the level and location of political institutions to which they direct claims (Koopmans et al. 2001). This research has contributed to our comparative understanding of *how* and *why* transnational engagements take place, focusing on macro-determinants and opportunity structures.

A third approach focuses on migrant cross-border *agency*, networks and coalition politics to analyze transformations in political institutions, citizenship and civil society as institutions and arenas, as well as shifts in power relations between states and emigrants (Cheran 2007; Fox 2005; Smith and Bakker 2005; Smith 2006). Work in this area is usually qualitative and interpretive, often includes ethnography, and takes various approaches to historical depth. Though in some ways similar to the second approach, the focus is more squarely on the role of migrant agency in social change and the transformation of political institutions, rather than on the institutional parameters of migrant transnationalism. As such, it adds to our understanding of *how* transnational engagements unfold, and how institutions can be reshaped through migrant agency. This approach also highlights tensions surrounding gender, generation, class, and racial formation as these intersect with and shape power negotiations in local and translocal arenas.

A fourth approach is interpretive, sometimes historical, and examines transnational political engagements from a broader *social fields* or *social transformation* perspective (Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc 1994; Castles 2002; Castles 2003; Levitt and Glick-Schiller 2004). The focus is on understanding transnational political participation as part of broader processes of social transformation using conceptual categories that are territorially and nationally "unbound," and informed by theorizing in the areas of transnational migration, transnational studies (more broadly), and globalization. The transnational social fields approach focuses on the constitution of multi-dimensional and trans-local social fields that include migrant and non-migrant actors, where "politics" are embed in multi-level social relations. Castles' (2002) call for the development of social transformation studies as the "analysis of transnational connectedness and the way this affects national societies, local communities and individuals" is consistent with the transnational fields approach, particularly when the latter is informed by Glick Schiller's (2005) call for bringing a theory of power to transnational studies.

In this fourth approach, migrants are framed as social actors who negotiate contradictory social relations at the family and community level; as heterogenous actors whose engagements are also embedded in contradictory national and transnational class, gender and racialized hierarchies; as actors organized into political networks and organizations that contest and

negotiate power relations vis-a-vis political authorities in countries of origin and destination; and also as actors operating within global relations of inequality and geographic terrains marked by spatialized inequality (Glick Schiller 2005; Landolt and Goldring 2006; Levitt and Glick-Schiller 2004; Wong 2006).

Contributions of Existing Research

Research conducted from each of these approaches has contributed to building a rich and nuanced body of scholarship and made important contributions addressing a range of questions and conceptual issues.

- US based research confirms that a small but active share of Latin American immigrants engage in habitual transnational political practices. However, a larger share is involved on a more sporadic basis.

- US based survey research finds that migrant political involvement in homeland affairs is a gendered process that can take place alongside successful individual-level incorporation (exclusion and marginalization are not the only motivations for transnational engagement) (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003). Established men with higher levels of education tend to be most active in political (and economic) transnational practices. Research conducted using a similar approach in Canada offers different findings, namely that migrant transnationalism decreases over time and with incorporation (Hiebert and Ley 2003). However, Canadian based research using other approaches identifies a more complex relationship between incorporation and transnationalism (Goldring and Krishnamurti 2007; Satchewich and Wong 2006).

- The context of departure affects the extent and intensity of migrant organizations' involvement in politics, but the relationship is not always straight forward. Violence and limited opportunities for involvement may discourage involvement in some cases, e.g. Colombians compared to Salvadorans and Dominicans (Portes, Escobar and Walton Radford 2007), although we know it can also encourage opposition movements (Cheran 2007; Lyons 2006).

- Migrant producing states have responded to increased emigration and fiscal crises through constitutional and other legal changes, as well as uncodified rhetorical shifts, to redefine national membership, and in many cases, political rights, so as to include emigrants.

- The context of reception also shapes patterns of transnational engagement, and this may help account for divergent patterns associated with apparently similar contexts of departure—although not entirely. Here too the evidence regarding the exact relationship indicates a need for further research. Ostergaard-Nielsen (2001) found that the multicultural policies and relative inclusion of the Netherlands limited transnational political involvement while the absence of multiculturalism—in fact, strong assimilation presure combined with exclusion of non-ethnic Germans and non-citizens in Germany--was associated with higher levels of transnational involvement. A comparative study of immigrant claims-making in Germany, the UK and the Netherlands supports the finding regarding high levels of transnational claims-making in Germany, but found higher levels in the Netherlands compared to the UK, a pattern attributed to the Netherlands' relatively more open citizenship regime (Koopmans et al. 2001). Landolt's (2007) work on Salvadorans in Los Angeles and Toronto identifies different trajectories of organizing in each context of settlement. This is explained in relation to differences in the Canadian and US refugee policy, the processes of migration and the two populations, but also with respect to the relative importance of Salvadorans in these two countries to Salvadoran opposition groups and governments in El Salvador.

- Place matters for transnational engagements; transnational social fields do not homogenize place and space. Different regions and cities within migrant producing countries and contexts of settlement offer different institutional opportunities, and help to shape different forms of political transnationalism. For example, Salvadorans in Los Angeles, Washington, and Toronto display distinct patterns of engagement vis-a-vis El Salvador (Landolt 2008), as do Mexicans from different localities and states in Mexico (Goldring 2002; Smith and Bakker 2005; Smith 2003). Similarly, Mexican HTAs in Los Angeles and Chicago exhibit different patterns of consolidation and activism (Rivera-Salgado, Bada and Escala-Rabadán 2005).

- Transnational social fields are contexts in which contradictory politics take place at various levels. Some social actors can leverage resources and status through the "exit" of migration and gain "voice" and power vis-a-vis homeland politics (Kearney and Nagengast 1989; Moses 2005; Smith 2003; Smith 2006), sometimes through engagement in "ethnic" politics in the destination country (Karpathakis 1999). At the same time, these actors may experience negative racialization and other forms of social exclusion in other geographic spaces within these fields (Smith 2006). Meanwhile, other actors in the same transnational social

fields may loose power and voice, depending on tensions associated with immobility, social location (e.g. class, gender, racialization, legal status, ethnicity), place, political importance to the homeland government or opposition, etc. (Al-Ali, Black and Koser 2001; Goldring 2001; Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Landolt 2007).

Concerns
These findings have greatly advanced our knowledge of migrant political participation. At the sime time, questions remain, particularly about *why*, *how* and *when* various groups of migrants organize (beyond HTAs), how organized migrants read and respond to shifting opportunities, and how they form strategic and longer-term networks and spaces of engagement with a wide array of institutional actors. To focus the discussion for this meeting, I want to raise two concerns to contribute to a reflection about how we produce knowledge, before moving on to the research agenda:

First, approaches to the role of migration and development have narrowed the definition of development. In spite of the prominence of concepts such as human development, social development, good governance, and Sen's (2001) arguments in favour of conceptualizing development as expanding capabilities, rights and freedom, economistic approaches (with some intrusion from Basic Needs approaches) prevail in the development industry. This has helped to narrow the framing of migrants' contribution to development as participation in small infrastructure development, support for the construction of schools and clinics, "productive projects," and investment schemes.

Second, research on migrant political transnational participation has priviledged a specific set of institutional actors: (1) migrants and their organizations; (2) nation-states of exit and destination; and (3) political authorities at varous levels, and sometimes political parties, usually in countries of origin. In spite of noting the importance of non-electoral politics, the result is that this work ends up employing a narrow definition of politics (and what is political), and a similarly narrow conception of political actors and institutions. Efforts to conceptualize political alliances in transnational spaces focus on migrants (e.g. migrant civil society), and exclude non-migrants, activist campaigns, social movements and networks (unless these fit neatly into the "migrant" category). That is, by focusing on claims to membership and participation in formal political institutions, this scholarship has reinforced a narrow definition of politics; given short shrift to claims and identities associated with non-electoral and non-nationalist agendas; and excluded from the picture a broader set of political actors and interlocutors and forms of mobilization. This has been accomplished by

abstracting political participation from the broader social relations in which migrants are embedded.

How and why has this narrowing process taken place? In what follows I discuss my interpretation of why and how these discussions have been narrowed. This will inform the subsequent discussion regarding future research.

II. Containing the Terms of Discussion

The narrowing of discussion regarding migrant's participation in development is relatively recent, and closely mirrors the development industry's seizing upon remittances for development. Before that, studies in this area were recovering from a period of stagnation following an inconclusive debate regarding the effects of migration on development, and in fact, were generating interesting case studies of what Peggy Levitt described as transnational community development just over ten years ago (Levitt 1997). This research analyzed cases of migrants mobilizing to build community infrastructure and related projects in localities of origin and highlighted a recurrent tension between the power of migrant agency and mobilization on one hand, and concern about the impacts of transnational community development on social inequality at the "local," translocal, and other levels (Goldring 1992; Landolt, Autler and Baires 1999; Levitt 1997; Mines 1981; Popkin 2003; Smith 1995).

My interpretation of what was (and is) behind the subsequent narrowing of the terms of discussion is that a variety of stakeholders, including many researchers and migrant organizations, got caught up in the "developmentalization of the diaspora" and, more generally, in what Li (2007) calls "the will to improve." Why? Because of the powerful and contradictory effects of development as a discourse, project and industry. Development holds out the promise of improving very real problems, and migrant participation has the appeal of exercizing agency, empowerment, and enhancing capabilities. It also provides a legitimate label to describe what many migrant organizations were doing on their own. But problems can arise in the process of implementing and contesting different visions of development.

Development as Anti-politics and the Will to Improve
At the end of the 1980s and early 1990s, scholars began to employ Foucauldian approaches to produce trenchant critiques of development

(Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1990; Mitchell 1998).[7] Elements of this work can be drawn upon to offer insights into the rise of remittance-based development. In his analysis of development projects and policy in Lesotho, Ferguson (1990) argued that development policies operating at various levels (multilateral organizations, central governments) worked to de-politicize and reduce conflict. Far from reducing or eliminating poverty, Ferguson argued that the development industry (policies and projects) serve to increase the administrative control of the state. By increasing state control over people and resources, states—or elite sectors--were able to further their interests. One of the key mechanisms involved in the anti-politics of development was the continuous recasting of political problems and conflicts into *technical* problems.

From this perspective, development issues and problems would be presented and represented as have technical solutions, rather than being social or political problems with less manageable solutions. For example, inequality would be re-framed in terms of a lack of employment or investment, rather than a social or political problem. Unemployment might then be addressed through education and job creation programs, job-preparation training, and campaigns designed to instill certain values (work ethic). Similarly, the problem of insufficient investment might be addressed through programs and campaigns aimed at attracting large and small private investment. Neither would involve fundamental changes in economic policy or in the organization of society. Furthermore, programs and projects would be designed to address the technical problems.

Using this lens, remittances and migrant involvement in small infrastructure projects can easily be seen as becoming part of the technical solution to rural poverty, unemployment, low incomes, and insufficient infrastructure in communities with high out-migration—not to mention helping to solve problems with the balance of payments. Governments court migrants, who are expected to send money to their relatives, contribute to collective projects, and/or invest in employment- and income-generating schemes. The attraction of the remittance mantra is that it provides a set of technical problems, which can be addressed without necessarily referring to the politics of the structural causes of migration, or the politics of migrants financing public infrastructure. Working to reduce the costs of transferring money, improving financial services, banking the un-banked, and extending identifications (*matrícula* consular and drivers licenses) thus become key elements in the effort to improve efficiency in remittance transfers. Remittance-based

---

[7] Mitchell, Ferguson Escobar's work played an important role in the development of what has become known as the "post-development" approach, which includes, authors such as Sachs (1992) and Crush (1995).

development, particularly versions focusing on collective remittances, was also attractive to migrant organizations, whose leaders and members were generally happy to put on the mantle of "heroes" after being largely ignored.

This reading of development as an anti-politics machine could easily fit much of the Mexican state's outreach activities toward Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in the United States. As widely known, the Mexican government has recognized the importance of family remittances and collective remittances; developed matching funds programs for infrastructure projects; implemented strategies to attract family remittances into housing and mortgage programs, and health insurance; and funds into investment scheme—with varying success. It has also extended capacity for bureaucratic control over Mexicans in the United States through the *matrícula consular*, a consulate-issued ID that was accepted to open bank accounts.[8] For Mexican-Americans, the Mexican state has sponsored educational "roots" tours, etc. A number of analysts have written about the politics behind these programs. These efforts can be understood as part of a strategy to defuse conflict because they began in the wake of the 1998 presidential election, which many consider to have been fraudulently won by Salinas de Gortari. Prior to the election, Cuahutémoc Cárdenas campaigned in the United States, something noteworthy at that time because of its novelty.

However, a direct adoption of the anti-politics model has at least two problems. First, it does not account for the growth in the number and types of institutional actors now involved in migration, remittances and development. The state is not the only actor on the stage, nor does it control the show. Secondly, and related to the first, the anti-politics model does not do justice to what (Li 2007) describes as the "messy politics" that surround efforts to implement state governmentality and the hegemonic anti-politics of development. States may attempt to run the show, but hegemony, as Gramsci reminds us, is a contested rather than completed project.

Tania Li uses *the will to improve* to refer to practices associated with the common-sense term "development." Development practitioners, donors, local and international experts, local elites, and others often promote improvement of various sorts. The discourse of improvement may or may not be associated with concrete practices aimed at re-organizing power relations so that socio-economic transformation actually occurs. But that is not the central point.

---

[8] Translating that capacity for bureaucratic control into actual control is a separate question, which would have to be addressed at specific times and places. Early development of the matrícula database was plagued by unevenness and poor data entry. However, later on, these data were used to map the distribution of Mexicans in the U.S. by municipality of origin in Mexico. As the data improved, they were used to direct outreach and develop policies and programs.

Following Ferguson, Mitchell, and others, Li argues that it is important to study the discourse and practices surrounding the will to improve, which means drawing on Foucauldian work on governmentality to analyze discourse and power in the context of development.

However, unlike some of her colleagues, Li argues for examining the "messy politics" involved in the incomplete project of government that is part and parcel of development. Li's focus is consistent with my position that it worth adding a measure of actor oriented approaches to the version of governmentality adopted by the pioneers of post-development, and to infuse it all with an appreciation of the macro political economy. Her approach calls for an examination of contending interpretations of development, and how development projects and policies are conceived, received, responded to, re-shaped, contested, and so forth.

From this perspective, one would analyze efforts to "developmentalize" the diaspora, or render them active agents of development, through strategies that include turning remitters and remittances into part of a development anti-politics machine.[9] That is, one would examine efforts to define development as a process involving only technical solutions. However, one would also examine how migrants and their organizations have taken ownership of *the will to improve* by developing their own scripts and rationales regarding their roles in national and community development. One would also examine the interventions of other actors such as local governments, non-government organizations, unions, social movements, etc., in migrant producing areas where remittance-linked interventions are planned; a range of civil society groups in locations where migrants live and work; and gendered micro-politics surrounding remittance sending.[10] One could also make better sense of how this wider range of actors—not only migrants and migrant-producing states have jumped on the remittance bandwagon.

Abstracting the Political from the Social; Narrowing the Scope of Analysis by Limiting the Range of Legitimate Interlocutors

Early research on migrant transnationalism attempted to integrate the analysis of changing identities, political relations, economic activities, class formation, gender, and nationbuilding in the broader context of social transformation engendered by the construction of transnational social fields

[9] Hernandez and Coutin's insightful analysis of the Salvadoran state's treatment of remittances as a national resource and cost-free income is consistent with these Foucauldian approaches to development. (Hernandez, Ester, and Susan Bibler Coutin. 2006. "Remitting Subjects: Migrants, Money and States." *Economy and Society* 35:185- 208.)

[10] See Wong (2006) on the gendered politics of remittances in the context of Ghanaian women in Toronto.

and broader processes of globalization (Basch, Glick-Schiller and Szanton-Blanc 1994). This was followed by efforts to systematize the study of migrant transnationalism (Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt 1999). We find ourselves now at a point where there are renewed calls for more integrative approaches that adopt a social fields approach to study ways of being and belonging in transnational social spaces (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). Added to this are calls to beware of methodological nationalism (Glick Schiller, Caglar and Guldbrandsen 2006). Despite these recent calls, research on political transnationalism in particular, because of its thematic focus on states, state institutions, electoral politics, and claims to membership in political communities, remains focused on politics toward homelands, and on a narrow range of institutional actors. The geographic orientation of political transnationalism studies might be taken as selfexplanatory or for granted. Of course it focuses on homeland involvement, that's the whole point! But there is also ample discussion of the relationship between incorporationist politics and homeland politics, usually organized around questions about whether incorporation precludes transnational political involvement. That is, the former is an independent variable in models designed to test effects on indicators of political transnationalism. However, research is pointing to the importance of understanding feedback over time between the two, and to the importance of conceptualizing them as mutually constitutive processes. While homeland engagements may be more salient initially for many organized migrants, there is evidence of feedback such that it can become difficult to arrange incorporationist and homeland claims and activities in a linear causal and temporal sequence (Rivera-Salgado, Bada and Escala-Rabadán 2005). Furthermore, restrictions on mobility caused by distance, lack of resources, or legal status can also make it difficult to start the sequence with claims made directly on homeland governments.

However, even the language of incorporationist versus homeland oriented politics speaks to a divide between here and there, a divide that a social fields and social transformation approach tries to bridge. While it is important to pay attention to differences within transnational social fields, it is also worth considering how to overcome conceptual binaries that can limit us from gaining more comprehensive perspectives. This can contribute to considering the potential multi-directionality of economic transfers (Besserer A. 2002), and social learning taking place in multiple directions.[11] In spite of considerable work on the brain drain, migration and development discourse focuses on knowledge brought back to the global South by migrants and

---

[11] The very definition of remittances builds in a directional North-South bias, as they are defined and understood as income from migrants. While the definition includes S-S flows, it generally excludes from analysis the transmission of income, other forms of support, knowledge, etc., in other directions.

members of the diaspora, rather than considering the political and other learning that im/migrants bring and contribute to social and economic development in the North. Our analysis of the pre-migration political culture of Chileans and Salvadorans in Toronto (Landolt and Goldring 2006) is a small example, but it examines political learning more dynamically, and shows how political culture and learning build on previous experiences and repertoires, and change through interaction between immigrant and non-immigrant groups, as well as among various immigrant groups, in Canada. This challenges models that focus on knowledge (and social remittances) and economic remittances going from North to South.

What is to be done?
Reviving concepts from writing on transnational community development could, in theory, address the problem of the narrowness to which the migration and development discussion has succumbed. We could look more closely at social remittances (Levitt 19), political learning, knowledge production and circulation, and argue for expanded approach to development that would include attention to messy politics, one that would pay closer attention to the politics of expanding capabilities and freedoms—to the structural changes necessary. However, the geographic orientation of development would still define the "development project" with respect to the global South.[12] Perhaps it is time to transnationalize the develoment project, or rather, bridge "development" and "community development" as practiced in North America. This would be consistent with Castles' social transformation approach, and allow for examinations of contention over definitions of development among multiple actors at various sites in transnational spaces.

III. Developing the Research Agenda
I have argued in favor of bringing the "messy politics of development" back in to the study of migration and development, and for delivering more adequately on the promises of a transnational social fields approach by infusing analyses of migrant political participation in transnational social fields with greater attention to the complex and multiple social relations, spaces and scales of migrants mobilization. I have also outlined the conceptual need to bridge between development "there" and development

---

[12] The historical roots of global inequalities are clearly rooted in colonial and post-colonial asymetries. However, it is also important to recognize that the last 70 years or so have deepened inequalities associated with colonial legacies (including with respect to First Nations within the global North and South), while also producing new topographies of inequality.

"here" as part of the project of studying transnational social transformation. In what follows, I outline suggestions for developing a research agenda that would take these points into account.

Examining the "messy politics" of development as the will to improve
Adapting Tania Li's proposal to studying the messy politics of development opens up the study of migrants' participation in development in two important ways. First, it points to considering a wide array of actors and their discursive and practical interventions in development, including contending definitions and visions of development (see next heading). Second, it brings politics, negotiation, and contention into sharp relief. Third, bringing politics back into the study of migrants in development can also push scholars to analyze more closely the politicization of development projects framed in technical terms (when and how does a paving project become political). Fourth, it can focus greater attention on interaction between various forms of migrant organizations and non-migrant organizations (e.g. HTAs, pan-ethnic and multi-ethnic coalitions, religious groups, unions, and rights groups—in various national contexts).

Calling for research on these politics also presents challenges. First, there are questions of methods and access. In order to document formal and visible as well as behind the scenes negotiations, it may be necessary to work retrospectively rather than on current issues. Furthermore, researchers have to study "up" and "down," and navigate gendered, racialized and classed spaces. Second, working closely with migrant organizations and developing long-term ties with activists draws researchers into networks of activists and makes them accountable to community members. Finding appropriate ways to frame critical comments may not always be easy.

Broader approaches to development and actors in development
Home-country development can include social justice activism with interlocutors outside the usual cast of development actors and institutions. For example our work (Landolt and Goldring 2006; Riaño-Alcalá and Goldring 2006) shows that Colombian activists in Toronto have worked with NGOs, indigenous groups, labour unions, rights groups, and faith based groups in Colombia as well as with faith-based, human rights, union and solidarity groups in Canada to advocate for and support struggles of indigenous people, unionists, and other marginalized groups in Colombia. Narrower definitions of development could exclude these initiatives and actors from what is considered part of development practice, although it is certainly consistent with Sen's approach.

Broadening the range of actors considered to be involved in the migration-development nexus can valorize the contributions of migrants who organize in ways that are not consistent with the current focus on HTAs. Landolt (2003) has argued, for example, that the Salvadoran state privileged migrants organized into home-town associations, while avoiding and marginalizing partisan organizations that included migrants by limiting their access to development funds.

Broader approaches to politics and political actors in transnational social fields
Similar to my call to bring politics back into development, I am calling for putting the political back into the social. Research on migrant political participation needs to adopt a broader approach to political engagement, one that does not abstract the political from immigrants' social relations, and can thus include various arenas of participation, organizing, and mobilization, and rest on a more expansive definition of politics.

In our work on Latin Americans in the Toronto area, we began with questions about the relationship between incorporation and transnationalism that were framed in terms of various arenas of transnational engagement. As we continued with the fieldwork, we saw how important transnational political organizing was (and is) for many Chileans, but how much less so it has been among Colombians. We also documented a rich set of organizing activities among Salvadorans that declined. Rather than focus on differences in the scope of transnational engagements, we became interested in understanding what was behind the different patterns. That is, we became interested in identifying and explaining the constitution of different kinds of transnational social fields. This has led us to complicate our understanding of the role of violence in each of these contexts of departure, and attach greater importance to migrants' political culture, understood as cultural repertoires of strategies for political organizing.[13] This also helped us develop the notion of activist dialogues to bridge gaps between institutional approaches and migrant-focused approaches and move our work into the social fields approach.

Ongoing attention to the differential impacts of transnational political engagements in general and political participation related to development in particular

---

[13] An early suggestion from Peggy Levitt to look at literature on the sociology of culture was very useful.

Researchers have warned that migrant contributions to and participation in development can widen disparities between migrants and non-migrants, and between communities with high proportions of migrants and those with low shares. Differential opportunities for migrant political transnationalism based on class and gender have also been noted. We need additional studies that examine the politics of migrant engagement in development, or lack thereof, across various settings. Examples of work one might draw on to formulate such work include Smith and Bakker (2008), Levitt (1997; 2001), and Wong (2006).

Questions under this heading could address:
- Contending definitions and visions of development (from infrastructure to social justice)
- The comparative effects of more and less active emigrant involvement in local/regional development and political control
- Changing conceptions of "local" or community citizenship and government in the context of migration
- The relationship between activist mobilization in different geographic and institutional arenas, with attention to gendered processes
- The dynamics of political culture(s) on activist dialogues (among various im/migrant groups and racialized minorities, and between immigrants and non-immigrants)

Violence and forced migration
An emerging literature is correcting the dramatic lack of attention to the specificities of transnational engagements and migration from contexts marked by violence and repression (Al-Ali, Black and Koser 2001; Cheran 2006; Hyndman and Walton-Roberts 2000; Landolt 2007; Menjivar 2003; Nolin 2006).[14] Further research is needed into the relationship between immigration policy and entrance status on one hand, and opportunities and constraints on mobilization by refugees, asylum seekers, people living in camps, etc. on the other.

- How are asylum seekers and refugees constructed in various contexts of settlement?

---

[14] Reasons for the gap may include: the hegemony of American-based early research on transnationalism and the peculiarities of US refugee policy; less attention being paid to South-South movements more generally (which account for significant numbers of forced migration and displacement); normative assumptions about refugees and agency (if there is agency they must not be refugees); the importance of mobility in some approaches to transnational studies; and inadequate analysis of social networks among various types of refugee movements.

- How do networks of migrants originally from contexts of violence develop networks of interlocution and with what kinds of actors?
- Are those constructed as "good" or "authentic" refugees more successful in forming stable coalitions with diverse institutional actors, and does this translate into thicker transnational social spaces? If so, how does these coalitions contribute to effecting change in various locations and arenas? (e.g. International tribunals, national judiciaries; electoral politics; etc.)

Activist dialogues and political learning in transnational social fields
The ways in which newcomer groups are constructed by civil society activists at the national and local level in countries of destination affect the group's experiences of incorporation and transnational engagements (Landolt and Goldring 2006). These constructions are related to whether migrant organizations and non-migrant activist and organizations establish patterns of interlocution, and the quality and sustainability of their dialogues. We have found that Canadians welcomed Chileans coming to Canada following the military coup and constructed them as exiles leaving an oppressive regime. Canadians activists from religious, labour, inter-faith, solidarity and rights groups had a political culture that contributed to this construction, and facilitated dialogue in spite of cultural differences. We characterize them as convergent dialogues. These same Canadian activists did not develop the same kind of dialogue with Colombian activists—rather, we characterize those as divergent dialogues. Differences in the patterns of interlocution contribute to the production of different types of transnational social fields. Chilean-Canadian dialogues were characterized by relatively frequent and durable interaction between a number of Chilean organizations and a variety of Canadian civil society actors, which contributed to the political learning of both types of actors, and to specific achievements (bringing more refugees, public education about the dictatorship and Canadian mining in Chile, solidarity work with other Latin American activists, the legal case against Pinochet, long-lasting networks, Chilean participation in unions, elected office, etc.). Colombian-Canadian activist dialogues are characterized by sporadic and strategic alliances and differences regarding strategies, priorities, and agendas. While effective in achieving specific objectives, they have not led to long-term and sustained collaboration.

- US-based analysts appear to have been unprepared for the strength of marches in favour of immigrants and the undocumented. Broadening the scope of research on migrant transnational politics to include contact and coalitions with groups that have a domestic orientation would enhance our understanding of immigrant politics in general, whether or not specific actions appear to be transnational in

orientation. Analyzing the social relations in which migrants and their families are embedded may help us account better for participation in multiple arenas/orientations and understand how they are interrelated. It can also enhance analysis of how activism based on one area/identity is related to activism in others (e.g. faith-based, labour, ethnic, national, etc.). This involves placing political engagements in a broader social (c.f Polanyi) and geographic context.

- Given the anti-immigrant backlash in the US, how important are migrant and nonmigrant dialogues and coalitions in constructing responses and mobilizing opposition? How are some of the coalitions forged in the context of earlier and more recent antiimmigrant legislation faring over time?
- To what extent are Mexican civil society actors that were important in the movement for Mexican emigrant voting rights translating their involvement in emigrant politics into coalitions with those active in "immigrant" politics?
- How do activist dialogues take place across various contexts that explicitly encourage multicultural policies, and others that do not? (This would involve paying closer attention to connections among various migrant organizations and between migrant organizations and civil society and other organizations, including government settlement organizations, in Canada, Europe, the U.S., etc.)

Gender and transnational political participation
How do geographies of gender and power intersect with community development in transnational social fields? Research on political transnationalism indicates that male privilege extends to many arenas of "grassroots" transnational political organization (e.g. HTAs in the US, much Latin American political party organizing in the US, Chilean political parties in exile in Canada), but not all (e.g. the state-led Council for Mexicans Abroad, CCIME, and the National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities, NALACC). Work on community organizing among Latino immigrants highlights the significance of women's and men's activism in unions and community organizations (Zlolniski 2006). Further research is needed into whether and how gender matters, not only by pointing to the presence of male and female bodies, but rather, in terms of setting agendas and priorities, designing strategies, political negotiations, etc.

- Why and how do women achieve positions of authority in some HTAs, and does it matter in terms of process and outcomes?
- Do other forms of migrant organizing (Caribbean school alumni associations)

- How do socially expected duration (SED), political culture (experience in social movements or parties), policies affecting the geographic location of family members, and social exclusion in contexts of origin and arrival contribute to women and men's decisions about participation in (1) homeland oriented organizing and (2) community organizations, unions, local churches and other spaces in contexts of settlement..

The challenge of critiques of methodological nationalism

Questions have been raised by Glick Schiller and others about the limitations of taking nationality as an unquestioned point of departure for categorizing groups in migration studies (Glick Schiller, Caglar and Guldbrandsen 2006; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003). Among other things, these critics argue that we need to investigate identity construction more critically. In our own work, we have found that indigenous Latin Americans from various countries organized with each other and with Indigenous Canadians, and not with co-nationals, with whom they felt no social or other connections. While not discarding the importance of national identities in the process of migration and immigrant mobilization, further research can address multiple and shifting bases for organizing across borders by paying attention to identities that are not contained by national labels (Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral 2000). Studies of religious transnational engagement (Levitt 2007; Menjivar 1999) can complement work on ethnic and racialized identities.

Studying the backlash

Most research on migrant political participation across borders leaves suspends attention regarding the significance of borders and immobility. The current anti-backlash and Huntington-style efforts to re-define the national "we" in narrower terms calls for those studying political transnationalism and transnational community development to examine these issues more closely.
- How does the hardening of borders affect different forms of political participation in various transnational social fields?

IV. Closing

The study of migrant participation in development and transnational politics has employed various approaches and generated a significant body of interesting and nuanced research. However, many questions remain. A forward-looking research agenda can be developed based on the concerns and questions outlined here, and the questions identified in the SSRC document that went out to participants. Perhaps mechanisms can also be found to

consult with activists about the research agenda as well, not in a token way to ensure participation, but in a meaningful way based on the experiences of researchers and activists who are trying to build bridges (e.g. NALACC and the International Network on Migration and Development, RIMD).

REFERENCES

Al-Ali, Nadje, Richard Black, and Khalid Koser. 2001. "Refugees and Transnationalism: The Experience of Bosnians and Eritreans in Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27:615-634.

Anderson, Benedict. 1992. "The New World Disorder." *New Left Review* I/193:3-13.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnationl Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Langhorn, Pennsylvania: Gordon and Breach.

Besserer A., Federico. 2002. "Contesting Community: Cultural Struggles of a Mixtec Transnational Community." in *Anthropology*. Stanford, California: Stanford University.

Castles, Stephen. 2002. "Studying Social Transformation." *International Political Science Review* 22:13-32.

—. 2003. "Towards a Sociology of Forced Migration and Social Transformation." *Sociology* 37:13-34.

Cheran, R. 2006. "Multiple homes and parallel civil societies: refugee diasporas and transnationalism." *Refuge* 23:3-7.

—. 2007. "Transnationalism, Development and Social Capital: Tamil Community Networks in Canada." Pp. 129-144 in *Organizing the Transnational: Labour, Politics and Social Change*, edited by Luin Goldring and Sailaja Krishnamurti. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

De Haas, Hein. 2005. "International migration, remittances and development: myths and facts." *Third World Quarterly* 26:1269-1284.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ferguson, James. 1990. *The anti-politics machine: "Development," depoliticization, and bereaucratic power in Lesotho*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Jonathan. 2005. "Mapping Mexican Migrant Civil Society." in *Mexican Migrant Civic and Political Participation*. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Gammage, Sarah. 2006. "Exporting People and Recruiting Remittances, a Development Strategy for El Salvador?" *Latin American Perspectives* 33:75-100.

Glick Schiller, Nina. 2005. "Transnational Social Fields and Imperialism: Bringing a Theory of Power to Transnational Studies." *Anthropological Theory* 5:439-461.

Glick Schiller, Nina , Ayse Caglar, and Thaddeus C. Guldbrandsen. 2006. "Beyond the ethnic lens: locality, globality, and born-again incorporation." *American Ethnologist* 33:612(22).

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Georges Fouron. 1999. "Terrains of Blood and Nation: Haitian Transnational Social Fields." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:340-366.

Goldring, Luin. 1992. "La Migración Mexico-EUA y la Transnacionalización del Espacio Político y Social: Perspectivas Desde el México Rural." *Estudios Sociológicos* X:315-340.

—. 2001. "The Gender and Geography of Citizenship in Mexico-U.S. Transnational Spaces." *Identities* 7:501-537.

—. 2002. "The Mexican State and Transmigrant Organizations: Negotiating the Boundaries of Membership and Participation in the Mexican Nation." *Latin American Research Review* 37:55-99.

—. 2004. "Individual and Collective Remittances to Mexico: A Multi-dimensional Typology of Remittances." *Development and Change* 35:799-840.

—. 2006. "Politics and Anti-Politics in the Developmentalization of the Diaspora." In *Fourth International Workshop in the Diaspora, Development and Conflict Programme*. Bornholm, Denmark: DIIS.

Goldring, Luin, and Sailaja Krishnamurti (Eds.). 2007. *Organizing the Transnational: Labour, Politics and Social Change*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Guarnizo, Luis E. 2003. "The Economics of Transnational Living." *International Migration Review* 37:666-699.

Guarnizo, Luis E., and Michael Peter Smith. 1998. "The Locations of Transnationalism." Pp. 3-34 in *Transnationalism from Below*, edited by Michael Peter Smith and Luis E. Guarnizo. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo, Alejandro Portes, and William Haller. 2003. "Assimilation and transnationalism: determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:1211-1248.

Hernandez, Ester, and Susan Bibler Coutin. 2006. "Remitting Subjects: Migrants, Money and States." *Economy and Society* 35:185-208.

Hiebert, Daniel, and David Ley. 2003. "Characteristics of Immigrant Transnationalism in Vancouver." in *Working Paper # 03-15*. Vancouver: Vancouver Center of Excellence, Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis.

Hyndman, Jennifer, and Margaret Walton-Roberts. 2000. "Interrogating borders: A transnational approach to refugee research in Vancouver." *The Canadian Geographer* 44:244-58.

IDB. 2001. "Can remittances help to fuel development?" in *IDB America*. Washington: Inter-American Development Bank.

Itzigsohn, José. 2000. "Immigration and the Boundaries of Citizenship: The Institutions of Immigrants' Political Transnationalism." *International Migration Review*. 34:1126-1154.

Itzigsohn, José, and Carlos Dore-Cabral. 2000. "Competing identities? Race, ethnicity and panethnicity among Dominicans in the United States." *Sociological Forum* 15:225-247.

Kapur, Davesh. 2004. "Remittances: The New Development Mantra?" in *G-24 Discussion Paper Series. Research papers for the Intergovernmental Group of Twenty-Four on International Monetary Affairs*. New York and Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Karpathakis, Anna. 1999. "Home Society Politics and Immigrant Political Incorporation: The Case of Greek Immigrans in New York City." *International Migration Review* 33:55-78.

Kearney, Michael, and Carole Nagengast. 1989. "Anthropological Perspectives on Transnational Communities in Rural California." Davis, California: California Institute for Rural Studies.

Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Jacqueline Costa-lascoux, and Marie-Antoinette Hily. 2001. "How national citizenship shapes transnationalism. A comparative analysis of migrant claims-making in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands." *Débats contemporains [Current debates]* 17:63-100.

Landolt, Patricia. 2003. "Building Communities in Transnational Social Fields: The Case of Salvadoran Refugees, Migrants and Returnees." *Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos* 17:627-650.

—. 2007. "The Institutional Landscapes of Salvadoran Refugee Migration: Transnational and Local Views from Los Angeles and Toronto." Pp. 191-205 in *Organizing the Transnational: Labour, Politics and Social Change*, edited by Luin Goldring and Sailaja Krishnamurti. Vancouver: UBC Press.

—. 2008. "The Transnational Geographies of Immigrant Politics: Insights from a Comparative Study of Migrant Grassroots Oranizing." *The Sociological Quarterly* 49:53-77.

Landolt, Patricia, Lilian Autler, and Sonia Baires. 1999. "From Hermano Lejano to Hermano Mayor: The dialectics of Salvadoran transnationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:290-315.

Landolt, Patricia, and Luin Goldring. 2006. "Activist dialogues and the production of refugee political transnationalism: Chileans, Colombians and non-migrant civil society in Canada." in *Second International Colloquium of the International Network on Migration and Development*. Cocoyoc, Morelos, Mexico.

Levitt, Peggy. 1998. "Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion." *International Migration Review* 32:926-948.

—. 1997. "Transnationalizing Community Development: The Case of Migration Between Boston and the Dominican Republic." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 26:509-526.

—. 2001. *The transnational villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

—. 2007. *God Needs No Passport*. New York: The New Press.

Levitt, Peggy, and Rafael de la Dehesa. 2003. "Transnational Migration and the Redefinition of the State: Variations and Explanations." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26:587-611.

Levitt, Peggy, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2004. "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society." *International Migration Review* 38:1002-39.

Levitt, Peggy, and Nadya B. Jaworsky. 2007. "Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:129-156.

Li, Tania Murray. 2007. *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development and the Practice of Politics*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Lyons, Terence. 2006. "Conflict-Generated Diasporas and Peacebuilding: A Conceptual Overview and Ethiopian Case Study." in *University for Peace Expert Forum on Capacity Building for Peace and Development: Roles of Diasporas*. Toronto.

Mahler, Sarah. 1998. "Theoretical and Empirical Contributions Toward a Research Agenda for Transnationalism." Pp. 64-100 in *Transnationalism from Below*, edited by Michael Peter Smith and Luis E. Guarnizo. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Menjivar, Cecilia. 1999. "Religious Institutions and Transnationalism: A Case Study of Catholic and Evangelical Salvadoran Immigrants." *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 12:589-612.

—. 2003. "Living In two worlds? Guatemalan-origin children in the United States and emerging transnationalism." *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*:531-552.

Mines, Richard. 1981. *Developing a community tradition of migration to the United States: a field study in rural Zacatecas, Mexico, and California settlement areas*. La Jolla, Calif.: Program in United States-Mexican Studies University of California San Diego.

Mitchell, Susanna. 2006. "Migration and the remittance euphoria: Development or dependency?" Pp. 33. London, UK: New Economics Foundation.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1998. *Colonizing Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Moses, Jonathon. 2005. "Exit, vote and sovereignty: migration, states and globalization." *Review of International Political Economy* 12:53-77.

Nolin, Catherine. 2006. *Transnational ruptures: gender and forced migration*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Orozco, Amaia. 2007. "Gender, Remittances and Development." in *Migration and Development*. Santo Domingo: INSTRAW.

Orozco, Manuel. 2004. "Remittances to Latin America and the Caribbean: Issues and Perspectives on Development." Washington, D.C.: Organization of American States.

Ostergaard-Nielsen, Eva. 2001. "Transnational Political Practices and the Receiving State: Turks and Kurds in Germany and the Netherlands." *Global Networks* 1:261-282.

Popkin, Eric. 2003. "Transnational Migration and Development in Postwar Peripheral States: An Examination of Guatemalan and Salvadoran State Linkages with their Migrant Populations in Los Angeles." *Current Sociology* 51:347-374.

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

Portes, Alejandro, Luis E. Guarnizo, and Patricia Landolt. 1999. "The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:217-237.

Riaño-Alcalá, Pilar, and Luin Goldring. 2006. "A Colombian Diaspora? Characteristics, tensions and challenges in transnational engagements." in *Expert forum on Capacity Building for Peace and Development: Roles of Diaspora.* Toronto.

Rivera-Salgado, Gaspar, Xóchitl Bada, and Luis Escala-Rabadán. 2005. "Mexican Migrant Civic and Political Participation in the U.S.: The Case of Hometown Associations in Los Angeles and Chicago." in *Mexican Migrant Social and Civic Participation in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Satchewich, Victor, and Lloyd Wong (Eds.). 2006. *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Sen, Amartya K. 2001. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Michael P., and Matt Bakker. 2005. "The Transnational Politics of the Tomato King: Meaning and Impact." *Global Networks* 5:129-146.

—. 2008. *Citizenship across borders: the political transnationalism of el migrante*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Smith, Robert C. 1995. "Los Ausentes Siempre Presentes: The imagining, making and politics of a transnational community between Ticuani, Puebla, Mexico and New York City." Dissertation. New York: Columbia University.

—. 2003. "Migrant membership as an instituted process: Transnationalization, the state and the extra-territorial conduct of Mexican politics." *International Migration Review* 37:297-343.

—. 2006. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

University for Peace. 2006. "High Level Expert Forum on 'Capacity Building for Peace and Development: Roles of Diaspora'." Toronto: University for Peace.

VII Conference on South American Migrations. 2007. "Declaración de Caracas." Caracas, Venezuela: International Organization for Migration.

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, Madeleine. 2006. "The Gendered Politics of Remittances in Ghanaian Transnational Families." *Economic Geography* 82:355-381.

Zlolniski, Christian. 2006. *Janitors, Street Vendors, and Activists: The Lives of Mexican Immigrants in Silicon Valley*. Berkeley: University of California.