

Diaspora and Foreign Policy: A Global Perspective

Dr. Nabin Kumar Khara*

Lecturer in Political Science at the P.G. Department of Political Science, Kamala Nehru Women's College, Rama Devi Women's University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha (India).

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Nabin Kumar Khara**, Lecturer in Political Science at the P.G. Department of Political Science, Kamala Nehru Women's College, Rama Devi Women's University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha (India). He can be reached through email: dr.nabinkumarkhara@gmail.com

Abstract: This article argues that foreign policy as a method adopted by countries to engage with other countries through discussions and negotiations. It helps countries to engage politically, socially, economically and militarily with each other. A key component of foreign policy is the response to the changing international positions. This article specifically focuses on the diaspora has become an integral part in the discourse of foreign policy of national states and also emerged as a powerful factor in developing relations between nation-states. The article traces the diasporas have emerged as powerful entities, since they are recognized as 'soft power' in the realm of foreign policy strategy and also as an agent or catalyst of economic development of countries of origin beside their active role in the host countries. This article also argues how can international relations theories help to better understand diasporic activities, and how can the study of diasporic international activities enrich existing international relations approaches? In this context, the article will look into the diasporic activities that can be better understood by setting their study in the theoretical space shared by constructivism and liberalism. In the modern globalized world, diaspora has emerged as a very strong lobby group influencing the policies of both the home and host country.

Keywords: Diaspora, Foreign Policy, Globalization, International Relations, Nation-States, Soft Power

1. INTRODUCTION

The term diaspora literally means "scattering" or "dispersion". Derived from Greek word dia (over, through) and speiro (to sow, to scatter), the word "diaspora" was originally used to refer to the dispersion of the Jews to the lands outside Palestine after the Babylonian captivity. Since the late twentieth century, the notion of diaspora has been used to describe any ethnic population who resides in countries other than their own historical homelands. In its references to the diasporic experiences of Jews, Armenians or Africans, diaspora conveys a negative connotation due to its association with "forced displacement, victimization, alienation, loss" (Bhargava et al. 2008). In this sense, it is accompanied with a "dream of return". In broader usage, it describes displaced people who maintain or revive their connection with their country of origin and includes a range of groups such as political refugees, alien residents, guest workers, immigrants, expellees, ethnic and racial minorities, and overseas communication (Rai 2015). Politicians, leaders, economists, policy planners etc. of overseas communities referred to the term 'diaspora' for the people who were settled outside the geographical boundary of their homeland. The term 'diaspora' has shifted its historical meaning of physically returning to the homeland to the maintenance of various kinds of linkages with the home country residing in the host country. Nevertheless, the global impacts of remittances would evolve in the monetary circle. Diaspora groups, efficient of continuing and spending in social, economic and political dimensions that comprise the earth, are of utmost importance and interest for the policy framers in home countries and host countries.

Diasporas have emerged as powerful entities since they are recognized as 'soft power' in the realm of foreign policy strategy and also as an agent or catalyst of economic development of countries of origin beside their active role in the host countries. For instance, in the economic sphere, the Chinese diaspora has been seen as a propelling force for its emergence as an economic superpower. The Chinese diaspora is one of the largest diaspora in the world. The United States, Canada and Australia now receive more migrants of Chinese origin than from anywhere else in the world. The diaspora are increasingly exerting political influence on their host countries and their countries of origin. In the

political sphere, the Jewish diaspora has a strong grip over the United States and European Union in terms of shaping their strategic relationship with Israel. Hence, diaspora being transnational communities have become important non-state actors as well as deciding factors in international political and economic relations (Mahalingam 2013).

The power of diaspora to influence the foreign policy of both the home and host countries, builds their identity on a global platform. It creates a global space where that interconnection can be established. It has challenged the dynamics of international politics. It can be argued that substantial outcomes can be expected by giving the diaspora its due importance not only as a relative social or historical event, but as a potential resource which needs to be considered in the structures of polity in the present-day eroding and uncertain modern nation-state system and the international society, which is relentlessly organized, disorganized, and reorganized. Diaspora provides an alternative to the geographical state for the complex and conflicting relations between cultural identity and political institutions. The success and development of the diaspora is reflected in the hostland. Diasporic communities are distinct in their nature and play a vital role in fostering relations among cultures in the present times.

2. DIASPORA AND FOREIGN POLICY: A CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Diasporas have evolved as an influential power since they are considered as soft power in the domain of foreign policy strategy and also a source of economic development of home countries along with their active role in the development of host countries. Diaspora has also been conceptualized in the context of the 'return' of diaspora to their homeland. The return here may not be the physical return of the diaspora. The 'return' can be conceptualized in terms of the social, cultural, spiritual, economic, political and intellectual connection of the diaspora with their homeland as well as the diaspora's contribution to the socio-economic development and intellectual capital of the home country. Diaspora is proved to be one of the major agents but they specifically observe the conflict situations for availing political opportunities persisting due to the structures of international relations. They can play the role of both peace-makers and peace-breakers in the conflict. Diaspora tends to contribute to the peace processes and renders active support, economic and political, from host as well as home countries. They have participated and contributed to various conflicts existing in every part of the world.

Diaspora is also a very significant source of soft power. Diaspora can also become a facilitator of bilateral relationship between their homeland and country of residence. Diaspora works for the development of both the home and host country. Diasporas are people who would want to explore the meaning of the hyphen, but perhaps not press the hyphen too far for fear that this would lead to massive communal schizophrenia (Mishra 2007: 01). It's the hyphen that defines diaspora's identity as well as their role as agents of growth of both the home and host country. Generally, diaspora is a part of the imagined group in the hostland. Diaspora as a lobby group influences the foreign policy of their hostland towards their home country. Diasporic lobbying, of course, is a form of lobbying across the borders and does not consume the subfield because not all transnational lobbying is diasporic (Laguette 2006). Foreign policy is a framework of engagement of a country with other countries of the world for political, economic, socio-cultural, security, peace, progress etc. purposes. Every government of a country frames its foreign policy. Diplomacy is a significant tool in carrying out foreign policy. In the present era of multilateralism, use of 'soft power' has emerged as a significant instrument in influencing foreign policy. Diaspora has become a 'soft power' influencing and smoothening the foreign relation of the home and host country.

Diaspora has become an important subject in the discourse of foreign policy of national states and also plays a crucial role in strengthening bilateral relations between nation-states. The potential of the diaspora has gained growing international recognition, both in political and academic circles as well as among diaspora members themselves. Foreign policy is no longer the sole domain of the diplomatic corps; rather the diaspora community organizations and members play an important role in promoting stronger, deeper, more effective bilateral collaboration with their countries of origin. Partnerships that build on existing linkages to nations of origin and draw on the talents, creativity, resources, and networks of diaspora communities are a vital part of the foreign policy process (Rai 2015). Diasporic involvements denote an engrossing ground for evaluating these structures provided that the emergence of governments pursuing their diaspora is basically connected with the modernist approach of development and nationalism, which are at times interpreted by the scheme of neoliberalism.

The last decade witnessed the emergence of various definitions and commonalities, propounded by various social scientists, Walker Connor (1986) defines diaspora as “that segment of a people living outside the homeland” (Connor 1986). Similarly, scholars like William Safran (1991) tried to build a definition based on the idea of trauma, exile and nostalgia. To Safran a definition based on the memories of one diasporic community (the Jewish experience) and thus, turning it into a paradigm, could be less fruitful than one could imagine. Based on the study of the Jewish historical experience, Safran tried to set the criteria in order to build a typology, according to which a community could be, or not, categorized as such (Safran 1991). It is here that new approaches that explore through a more ethnographic approach that point to different routes of not only to the variety of the histories, but also to the wider politico-economic conditions that instigate transnational movements and also, the epistemological framework that tries to comprehend the latter with the re-launching of the term diasporas (Clifford 1994). Diasporas also often relate to ethnic commonalities and kinship solidarity as common identity that is essential to distinguish diasporic communities from mere transnational or international groupings (Anthias 1998).

According to Khachig Tölölyan (1991) the term ‘diaspora that once described Jewish, Greek, and Armenian dispersion now shares meanings with a larger semantic domain that includes words like immigrant, expatriate, refugee, guest-worker, exile community, overseas community, ethnic community’(Tölölyan 1991). In recent years, the notion of diaspora has developed into a central theme of academic and policy discussion. Encyclopedia of diasporas gives a very broad and liberal definition of diaspora as a people dispersed by whatever cause to more than one location. Thus people dispersed to different lands may harbor thoughts of return, may not fully assimilate to their host countries, and may maintain relationships with other countries in the diaspora (Rai 2015). On the one hand, diaspora has been proved to be an asset and on the other, it has been observed as a prospective basis for generating conflict in the host country. Diaspora is seen as an asset because of the contribution it makes in terms of their economic, social and cultural spheres to both, the country of origin and destination.

Similarly Robin Cohen (2008) emphasized the necessity to consider both forced dispersal and voluntary migrations in the study of diaspora. Cohen proposes a typology in which he classifies diaspora as: victim diaspora, labor and imperial diaspora, trade diaspora, cultural diaspora, and global-deterritorialized diaspora. Not suggesting a perfect match between a particular ethnic group and a specific type of diaspora, Cohen identifies the Jewish, Palestinian, Irish, African and Armenian diaspora as victim diaspora. He represents the British as an imperial diaspora and the Indian as a labor diaspora. Chinese and Lebanese are classified as trade diaspora. Caribbean’s in his typology are characterized as a cultural diaspora. Cohen describes today’s global migrants as considered to be a part of a diaspora. In our globalized and interconnected world, trade, labor and economic needs are powerful driving forces behind transnational migration and the formation of diasporic groups. Lately, the growing importance of diasporic groups in international politics has re-examined the patterns of influence as well as the role of diaspora in policy-making, trade, and circulation of ideas (Cohen 2008).

Breuning takes the notion from Neustadt and May focuses on how a comparative understanding of history is useful. He argues that foreign policy comparatively and systematically has the potential to yield knowledge that is far more helpful than merely knowing historical facts: a systematic understanding of foreign policy events as alike or different can help decision makers to fashion appropriate responses. Moreover, understanding the peculiarities of the personalities of specific leaders can facilitate more useful and productive diplomacy (Breuning 2007: 17). The end of foreign policy is directed towards identifying the behaviour of the nations involved in international dealings. It takes the study of various political meetings, policies and amendments of several states who come on a usual forum and agree for working towards developmental policies. Foreign policy consideration is an important aspect in the upholding of the affairs of nation-states. Foreign policies are regularly determined through the complex nexus of certain events. It can look for reasons for changing aspects of international relations and its impingement on the position of foreign policy.

The study of the foreign policy helps in understanding how nation-states build their activities and how they direct activities towards another nation-body politic and how they manage the international state of personal business. The foreign policy of a country tries to define the nature of a supposed system of power in international politics and is motivated mainly towards the goal of honoring and developing a

state-state control as well as the declaration for the better sort of issues on the international policies. Therefore, the nation-states design and formulate the foreign policies that are directed towards the achievement of mutual goals. And in the making of foreign policy, a number of aspects have to be considered to ensure its effectiveness. Foreign policy concerning human rights must be partly a policy for improving this machinery (Luard 1981: 22). Foreign policy is an amalgamation of several means and events, and various actors play important roles in foreign policy making. Foreign policy analysis is an analytical process, which examines several actors of the state, non-state actors and sub-state bodies. It is actor-centric and driven by the clashes of national interests. The prospect and enhancement of foreign policy analysis are of great worth in international relation studies.

Foreign policy can be defined as a process that occurs concurrently across four levels i.e. the strategic, the contextual, the organizational and the operational. It is not in uniformity with other common forms of foreign policy those enclosed by a set of systematic processes. A country's foreign policy goals can be attained by engaging various tools ranging from diplomatic, socio-cultural and economic to military. Foreign policy, by definition, operates in spaces constructed by states (Chong 2007: 38). Foreign policy is frequently impacted by various variables, including historical relations of a country with other countries, geographical positioning, economic attainment, political clout, cultural influence, and military strength. The foreign policy of a country is basically directed towards the protection and promotion of political, economic and military interests as well as creating a dignified position in the world. As Abraham points out:

Foreign policy, understood as a core state boundary-making exercise, seeks to create and privilege, on the one hand, the reassurances of home, with all its attendant pleasures of security, comfort, and the absence of threat, even as, on the other hand, it demonizes the zone lying outside the domestic space as the representation of all that is to be feared and kept away. The spatial boundary that foreign policy seeks to institute and maintain is also a moral boundary, a hierarchical, even eschatological, ordering and separation of good and evil (Abraham 2014: 34, 35).

The implementation of foreign policy requires a fragile equilibrium in the ability at the national level to match and combine tools effectively, along with the capacity to engage in joint activities where it is right or essential. The overall management of foreign policy does not lead certainly as to effective implementation. The implementation of foreign policy and the better making of foreign policy demands decisions, choices, and the matching of the commitments. Foreign policy implementation takes place through the natural processes of political leaders that may be in a position that is inter-governmental and trans-governmental in the surroundings. Diplomacy is at present only a small part of what goes on through the implementation of foreign policy. Foreign policy is conducted in an environment of multiple linkages between home and abroad in the forms of NGOs, MNCs, academics, political leaders, interventions of several foreign governments, as well as intense media scrutiny (Chong 2007: 05).

Moreover, many tactical manoeuvres or inconvenient aspects of foreign policy are often simply not officially acknowledged, for instance, party-to-party relations which may be at cross purposes with state-to-state relations (Batt et al. 2005: 176). Flexibility of official behavior and reasons is mainly evident in foreign policy, with certainly the most notable example being the Hitler-Stalin pact. Theoretical approach of foreign policy suggests that a nation asks to look for making certain likely decisions for the principle of an activity. In the study of international politics foreign policy analysis, add a dynamic attitude to the study. Foreign policy making is a propelling power, which directs people towards more good goals for the benefit of the world at large and for flexible impacts. Foreign policy is an important part in the building of nation-states and affects its political, economic and developmental policies. The study of foreign policy helps to understand the nation-state. A country's foreign policy is determined under the influence of many intellectual policy-makers. In today's modernized world, it is a powerful tool and is quite diversified in terms of its strategic elements, political implications and economic contents. Palmer and Morgan argue that states create their foreign policy portfolios to achieve the things that they want, given existing constraints (Palmer and Morgan 2006: 03).

In sum, the identities of specific leaders can facilitate more useful and dynamic finesse. The best minds of the foreign policy changes of a nation-state are often laid up in the complex link of various publications. The world away from the boundaries has a deep impact over the opportunities used for a foreign policy achievement. Foreign policy decisions and behaviors are shaped by the leaders and

their natures, observations and inspirations. Individual decision-makers in every country have affected almost the way in which their nation-state structures the foreign policy. The decision-making in foreign policy involves the choice of personalities, people, and federations to mark the changes a country faces in its engagements at the international stage. It has gained a significant role in the field of international relations. Leaders not only interpret the situation in which they find themselves but often manipulate it, framing elements of the domestic and international environments to their audiences, drawing attention, involving new actors, instigating issue linkage (Grove 2007: 02). The leaders become the sole determinant of foreign policy making. The dictatorial leaders or heads of the states shape foreign policies, which revolve around their personal likings and dislikings and whims and fancies. One example as Chong points out is the dictatorship of Pinochet in Chile. As Chong says, "The prime historical context is the 1973 military coup d'état and the ensuing praetorian regime that endured till 1990, as well as its human rights legacy till 2000" (Chong 2007: 144). Through the military coup in 1973, Pinochet captured power in Chile. As a dictator, he shaped the foreign policy of Chile as per his personal likings and whims. During his period, there was the terrible violation of human rights. The decision-making approaches towards foreign policy analysis have been carried out by the unitary rational actor theory, which is used in international environments.

3. DIASPORA STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International politics speaks of political boundaries which is an important idea of neorealism. Even the classification of countries on various bases is normal in the contemporary world. International relations theories have used the modernist theory and theoretical pluralism in international politics. Foreign policy and its strategies are related to the concept of control. It makes the relation between other countries' peace, coalition, diplomatic relations, implementation of nuclear status, political support etc. The democratic foreign policy talks about the value of democracy and the non-democratic foreign policy inter-relates the most collective strategy ability in the inexpert democratic foreign policy making. The emphasis on democratization as a tenet of foreign policy had, however, generally been on liberation and not on control (Pierce 2003: 205). The study of diaspora nowadays constitutes a growing intellectual industry, increasing recognition of the importance of diaspora in international affairs. The theorization of diaspora in international relation theories like realism, liberal institutionalism, constructivism and post-colonialism pay attention to the potential of diaspora in its theoretical tenets (Rai 2015).

International politics and diasporic politics are systems which run on the concept of the proto-political. Diasporic politics is interdependent on a number of political factors. It has developed a political arena in which the factors of both the hostland and the homeland are involved. Diasporic politics is like a double-edged sword which though mingles the diaspora into the society; but also works as a divisive element which breaks the community in nationalistic aspects. Political engagement of the diaspora increases the ethnic and transnational slant of the community. Diasporic politics has its individual interest in hostland and homeland politics. However, the diaspora has actively engaged itself in politics among the states. In international relations, the homeland inscribes the diaspora in its economic planning because of the remittance factor, a source of extra national income to be sustained (Laguerre 2006: 02). A vital role is played by the diaspora in promoting and maintaining socio-economic relations. It is an active mediator between the politics of the hostland and the homeland. One of the major factors affecting the integration of the diaspora with the host country is politics.

International diaspora is studied broadly in various disciplines like anthropology, geography, and sociology and so on but in the domain of international relation it is an underestimated area. The first theory to be considered is realism. Of all the theories which have been considered, realism has no space for international diaspora. To talk about realism, there is no singular definition of the same. However there are common attributes in all definitions. Propounded by Hobbes, Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz there are some core assumptions of realism, i.e., state is a unitary actor in an anarchical world. The obsession with state centrism and anarchy leaves no space for the diasporic community as an actor. In fact as states subsume unitary identity, the domestic abroad gets neglected as a component of the state which can exert influence even after remaining outside the boundary of the state (Das 2014).

In 2003, Yossi Shain and Aharon Barth's article "Diasporas and International Relations Theory" argued that diaspora given their importance, and their status as a permanent feature in the imperfect

nation-state system; now receive growing attention from decision-makers around the world. According to Shain and Barth diasporic activities can be understood by setting their study in the theoretical space shared by constructivism and liberalism. These two theories provide scope for theorization of the international diaspora. Liberal institutionalism and realism share many of their assumptions. Both theories believe in an anarchical system where the state has to survive, but liberalism acknowledges domestic influence internationally. Thus international diaspora are such actors who can link both domestic and international politics (Shain and Barth 2003).

Diaspora have a unique status, they are geographically outside the state, but identity-wish perceived by them, the homeland, or others as inside the people attach great importance to kinship identity. Constructivism seeks to account for actors' identities, motives, and preferences, while liberalism deals with explaining their actions once the preferences are settled. Diaspora is among the most prominent actors that link international and domestic spheres of politics. Their identity based motivation should therefore be an integral part of the constructivist effort to explain the construction of national identities. Furthermore, diasporic activities and influence in the homeland, despite their international location, expand the meaning of the term 'domestic politics to include not only politics inside the state but also inside the people. However, there is no mention of international diaspora in complex interdependence (Shain and Barth 2003). The collective identity of diaspora is defined by this persistent relationship with its homeland. Thus, diaspora has an important role to play in both the home and host country. As Antwi-Boateng observes:

The diaspora is bound to have more impact in homeland politics if it is in a stronger position in its relationship with the homeland. This strength relationship is measured in terms of how much the homeland needs diaspora resources for investment, or how much political support the diaspora can mobilize from the host country for homeland benefit (Antwi-Boateng 2011: 10).

Constructivism is another theory which can be utilized to understand the activities of the international diaspora. To familiarize with this theory, constructivism holds that if structures shape the behavior of social and political actors, then normative and material structures are also as important as material structure. The understanding of non-material structure's influence on actors' identity is important as interests are related to identity. However, according to constructivism structure and agent are mutually constituted. Normative and ideational structures can influence identity and interest but they are also dependent on the knowledgeable practice of the actors. Thus it appears that constructivism offers space to theoretical conceptualization of international diaspora as the same is concerned with identity and interest. Constructivism helps to understand the identity based activities of the international diaspora (Shain and Barth 2003).

Most observers have defined diaspora variously in terms of legal status, memory of the homeland, physical distance from it, the nature of relations with it, and/or a collective consciousness of being different from the majority due to differences in origin. Being able to trace that origin to a location outside the country of residence, however, is not equivalent to being in diaspora for, as was pointed out above, if one goes back far enough, most people have ancestors who had come from somewhere else. Diasporic identity may be understood as an existential condition made possible by the myth or the existence of an abandoned homeland, belonging to which feels normal. For some groups in exile the strength of the diaspora may be the story of repatriation identified in the literature, while other groups may find the main strength in the transcending of borders challenging the nation-state. Here, it has been argued that for people living in exile diaspora is a central form of community allowing them to claim their rights in the transnational space in ways that challenge the doctrine of cultural homogeneity on which the nation-state is founded.

4. DIASPORA AND FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Diaspora is a concept that can help us to understand relationships and formations of community better as it arises from a situation where people move and simultaneously belong to multiple places. Diasporic communities consist of people having a history of migration and of being scattered in various locations throughout the world. At the same time, they are united by ethnic, national, religious, linguistic, territorial, local, regional and/or cultural affinities, crossing the borders established by the nation-states. Diasporic groups across the world act as a soft power in building, influencing and strengthening the mutual relationship between the home and host country. Diaspora originates from the subjectivity of the impacts of globalization and transnational migration, but also

gets integrated with the histories of colonialism and imperialism. Diaspora is not a result of socio-historical and disciplinary concepts, but evolves from intensive subjective operations of racial memory, distress for losses which could not be expressed and desires, which are based on the possibility. It is organized in the structure of grief and the pleasures of uncertain mystery of connection. Diaspora must be separated from transnationalism, not just because the crossing of domestic boundaries importantly defines the subjectivity of the diaspora but also because being a diaspora is to be represented by loss. Transnationalism can be defined as a process that comprises trans-border engagements between two or more nation-states, a social domain that links the migrant communities through the exchange of communication technology, goods, finance, and people.

Diaspora can play a strengthening role in foreign policy. The diaspora has gained growing international recognition, both in political and academic circles as well as among diaspora members themselves. Foreign policy is no longer the sole domain of the diplomatic corps; rather the diaspora community organizations and members play an important role in promoting stronger, deeper, more effective bilateral collaboration with their countries of origin. Partnerships that build on existing linkages to nations of origin and draw on the talents, creativity, resources, and networks of diaspora communities are a vital part of the foreign policy process. The diasporic community also influences the internal conflict of the homeland both in negative and positive ways. They may provide assistance and support to any faction to continue fighting. They can play the role of peace-makers as well (Rai 2015). Moreover, diaspora groups have been inventing new ideas in the homeland. The homeland has been endowed by diaspora abroad for economic and political actions in their host country. Diaspora has emerged as key actors in the often precarious politics of their homeland.

The role of diasporas in global politics, particularly as political and social actors who transcend territorial boundaries, is a subject that has drawn intense scholarly scrutiny in recent times (Varadarajan 2010: 06). Irrespective of the vigorous voices of diaspora organizations and their impact on international politics, the role of diaspora in international relations has been ignored or understated. In classical realism and neorealism, where the international system is state dominated, diaspora is not considered as important political actors. The role of diaspora has been criticized for supporting war efforts in the homeland, financially or otherwise; ‘promoting extremism and holding uncompromising political views’. However the role of diaspora is not only negative in the context of internal unrest in the homeland. They can also act as peace-makers in a conflicting situation. Diasporic communities can create a lobby to influence the government to settle internal disputes. They can also approach international organizations for that purpose. They may provide assistance in the post-conflict reconstruction process (Rai 2015). Diaspora provides surveillance to the homeland government.

The discussion on the role played by the international diaspora as an actor in international relation dynamics enables them to show that they can play a dominant role in the policy-making process of both the host and homeland. Globalization and liberalization of the global economic system coupled with the rapid advancement of transport and communication technologies that have reduced time and space have in turn intensified their socio-economic, political and cultural ties very strongly with their origin countries. Globalization is examined in its guise as the world-wide flow of cultural objects, images and meanings resulting in a variegated process of realization, back-and-forth transferences, mutual influences, new contestations, negotiations and constant transformations (Vertovec 1999). Hence, not only have diasporas attained due importance at the international level, but also in the domestic political and economic affairs of home countries than ever before. Eventually, they have emerged as an ‘inevitable link’ between their home and hostlands along with major political and economic implications for both sides (Rai 2015).

In short, globalization has a homogenizing impact on all cultures, so that the homeland and hostland cultures are no longer as distinct as before. But globalization has also led to the decline of the ‘absolutist’ approach to membership in the political community, one that separates political from ethno-cultural identity and makes room for the recognition of diversities and accommodates to the continued existence of diaspora communities. The growing interest in the concept of diaspora has also been related to contemporary processes of globalization and the challenges they pose to the ideologies and institutions of the nation-state. In the wake of globalization there is an increase of people’s mobility across national boundaries and awareness of belonging to transnational communities. Since globalization tends to aggravate the economic exploitation of the unskilled, poor, and powerless, it may accentuate diasporization insofar as many immigrant societies fall into these categories.

Conversely, the diaspora identity of new immigrants may fail to develop if they are in contact with well-assimilated co-ethnics who had immigrated several generations earlier. Moreover, globalization contributes to secularization and to the development of a transnational mass culture; the one would leave less room for religious diversity or for religion as a marker of collective identity, and the other, for cultural diversity.

5. CONCLUSION

Now, in this era of globalization where distance is diminishing, contacts are ever increasing the role international diaspora has increased many folds in the international system. International migration has shown tremendous increase in the last few decades and therefore, their role in political, economic, cultural and other aspects of international relations is growing. Diaspora is a productive as well as counter-productive (Rai 2015). Diaspora has engaged itself with the home country while being the citizen of the country of settlement. Diaspora has been maintaining financial and political networks in the homeland and hostland. In the last few decades, diaspora has become a vital element for the making of foreign policy. This paradigm shift has led to engaging with the diaspora. Foreign policy is the political interaction among the states which is complex and dynamic where that a state involves pursuing relations with other state and non-state actors outside the scope of its own jurisdiction. Foreign policy is a dynamic and comprehensive design based on knowledge and experience for fostering relations of government with other countries.

To conclude, foreign policy in the modern world has become more and more complex because of its strategic elements, political implications and huge economic content. Foreign policy is not a zero sum game. Its positive quality enhances its skill to evolve multi-dimensional affairs. Foreign policy is an instrument of engagement; an engagement with neighbors, engagement with world powers, engagement with as many countries of the world as possible, engagement for political reasons, engagement for economic reasons, engagement for security reasons, engagement for peace and development, and now it has been shaped up as an engagement for energy concerns. Foreign policy leads and guides the state to achieve national objectives while not compromising on national interest and maintaining an edge over other nation-states. Therefore, the existence of foreign policy is ensured till the prevalence of sovereign states in the international sphere. Diaspora has become a very significant subject in the discourse of foreign policy of nation-states and it also plays a crucial role in strengthening bilateral relations between nation-states.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to all those who have contributed in the successful completion of this research work. My heartfelt thanks to my M.Phil./Ph.D. Supervisor and Mentor, Dr. Siba Sankar Mohanty, Centre for Diaspora Studies, Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar (India) for guiding my study. Finally, I wish to thank my parents for their support and encouragement throughout my research article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, Itty (2014), *How India Became Territorial: Foreign Policy, Diaspora, Geopolitics*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [2] Anthias, Floya (1998), "Evaluating Diaspora: Beyond Ethnicity?" *Sociology*, 32 (3): 557- 580, London: Sage Publications, [Online: web] Accessed 11 March 2019, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038598032003009>.
- [3] Antwi-Boateng, Osman (Fall, 2011), "The Political Participation of the U.S.-Based Liberian Diaspora and Its Implication for Peace Building", *Africa Today*, 58 (1): 3-26, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, [Online: web] Accessed 07 April 2019, URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/africatoday.58.1.3>.
- [4] Batt, Judy et al. (2005), "Foreign Policy Ideology", in Gerald Segal et al. *Openness and Foreign Policy Reform in Communist States*, London: Routledge. This is an e-book.
- [5] Bhargava, Kant et al. (2008), "Building Bridges: A Case Study on The Role of the Indian Diaspora in Canada", [Online: web] Accessed 15 May 2019, URL: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265245184>.
- [6] Breuning, Marijke (2007), *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [7] Chong, Alan (2007), *Foreign Policy in Global Information Space Actualizing Soft Power*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [8] Clifford, James (1994), "Diasporas", *Cultural Anthropology*, 9 (3): 302-338, Wiley: American Anthropological Association, [Online: web] Accessed 23 June 2019, URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/656365>.

- [9] Cohen, Robin (2008), *Global Diasporas: An introduction*, London: Routledge.
- [10] Connor, Walker (1986), "The Impact of Homelands upon Diasporas", in Gabriel Sheffer (ed.) *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- [11] Das, Linamee (2014), "Theoretical Conceptualization of International Diaspora", *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 4 (5): 1-8, [Online: web] Accessed 07 July 2019, URL: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.637.6318&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- [12] Grove, Andrea K. (2007), *Political Leadership in Foreign Policy Manipulating Support across Borders*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [13] Laguerre, Michel S. (2006), *Diaspora, Politics, and Globalization*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [14] Luard, Evan (1981), *Human Rights and Foreign Policy*, New York: Pergamon Press.
- [15] Mahalingam, M. (October 21, 2013), "India's Diaspora Policy and Foreign Policy: An Overview", [Online: web] Accessed 20 August 2019, URL: <http://grfdt.com/PublicationDetails.aspx?Type=Articles&TabId=30>.
- [16] Mishra, Vijay (2007), *the Literature of the Indian Diaspora: Theorizing the Diasporic Imaginary*, London: Routledge.
- [17] Palmer, Glenn and T. Clifton Morgan (2006), *A Theory of Foreign Policy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [18] Pierce, Anne R. (2003), *Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman Mission and Power in American Foreign Policy*, London: Praeger.
- [19] Rai, Sarita (2015), *the Role of Indian Diaspora in India-Myanmar Relations*, M.Phil. Dissertation, Gangtok: Sikkim University.
- [20] Safran, William (1991), "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return" *Diaspora*, 1 (1): 83-93. Quoted in Judith T. Shuval (2011), "Diaspora Migration Definitional Ambiguities and a Theoretical Paradigm", in Ajaya Kumar Sahoo and Brij Maharaj (eds.) *Sociology of Diaspora: A Reader*, Vol. I, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
- [21] Shain, Yossi and Aharon Barth (2003), "Diasporas and International Relations Theory", *International Organization Foundation*, 57 (3): 449-479, New York: Cambridge University Press, [Online: web] Accessed 23 September 2019, URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3594834>.
- [22] Tölölyan, Khachig (1991), "The Nation-State and Its Others: In Lieu of a Preface", *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1 (1): 3-7, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, [Online: web] Accessed 27 October 2019, URL: <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/diaspora.pdf>.
- [23] Varadarajan, Latha (2010), *the Domestic Abroad Diasporas in International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- [24] Vertovec, Steven (1999), "Three Meanings of 'Diaspora', Exemplified among South Asian Religions", 7 (2): 1-37, Oxfordshire: University of Oxford, [Online: web] Accessed 24 November 2019, URL: <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/diaspora.pdf>.

Citation: Dr. Nabin Kumar Khara. "Diaspora and Foreign Policy: A Global Perspective" *International Journal of Political Science (IJPS)*, vol 6, no.4, 2020, pp. 12-20. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20431/2454-9452.0604002>.

Copyright: © 2020 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.