RECASTING DIASPORA STRATEGIES THROUGH FEMINIST CARE ETHICS

Elaine L.E. Ho, Mark Boyle & Brenda S.A. Yeoh
Forthcoming in *Geoforum* (post-print version)
August 2014

The diaspora-centred development agenda holds that migrants lead transnational lives and contribute to the material well being of their homelands both from afar and via circular migration. Concomitant with the ascendance of this agenda there has arisen a new field of public policy bearing the title 'diaspora strategies'. Diaspora strategies refer to proactive efforts by migrant-sending states to incubate, fortify, and harness transfers of resources from diaspora populations to homelands. This paper argues that diaspora strategies are problematic where they construe the diaspora-homeland relationship as an essentially pragmatic, instrumental, and utilitarian one. We suggest that a new generation of more progressive diaspora strategies might be built if these strategies are recast through feminist care ethics and calibrated so that they fortify and nurture caring relationships that serve the public good. Our call is for an approach towards state-diaspora relationships that sees diaspora-centred development as an important but corollary outcome that arises from prioritising caring relationships. To this end we introduce the term 'diaspora economies of care' to capture the derivative flow of resources between diasporas and homelands that happens when their relationship is premised on feminist care ethics. We introduce three types of diaspora economies of care, focusing on the emotional, moral, and service aspects of the diaspora-homeland relationship, and reflect upon the characteristics of each and how they might be strengthened later by foregrounding care now.

1. Introduction

Official discourses concerning emigration have oscillated, on the one hand between those bearing connotations of flight, disloyalty and exile, and on the other hand, those depicting emigration as a modern and even patriotic act (Lowell and Findlay, 2001, Nyiri, 2004; Yeoh, 2009). During the 1970s and 1980s, it was widely believed that emigration both signalled and amplified a failing development trajectory. Emigration constituted a 'brain drain' that starved the domestic labour market of talent, aggravated dependency ratios, and weakened domestic consumption. Accordingly, stemming brain drain and encouraging return migration were the preferred policy responses. From the 1990s onwards however a new discursive regime has emerged which transformed understandings of the migrant-development nexus. Today it is recognised that migrants lead transnational lives and they can contribute to their homelands[1] both from afar and

---

[1] We acknowledge the contestations associated with the idea of 'homeland' in critical diaspora studies (e.g. Brah, 1998; Anthias, 1998; Butler, 2001). Our purpose for using 'homeland' as a referent heuristically is to develop our arguments on how care may feature in the relationship between the diaspora and the countries

via circular migration. Emigration it turns out might serve as a catalyst for, rather than putting a brake on the development of migrant-sending countries.

Reflecting this discursive revolution, global development agencies[2], host countries, thought leaders, diaspora activists and migrant-sending states have begun to explore the ways in which they may engage emigrant populations more productively (see Yossi and Barth, 2003; Saxenian, 2006; Vertovec, 2007; Solimano, 2008; Faist, 2008; Dewind and Holdaway, 2008; Bakewell, 2009; Piper, 2009; Leblang, 2010). In particular, migrant-sending countries, which might have previously adopted an organic approach towards diaspora homeland relationships, now deem it necessary to redefine the state-diaspora relationship. Concomitantly, there has arisen a new field of public policy bearing the title 'diaspora strategies' (Kutzensov, 2006; Aikins and White, 2011; Boyle and Kitchin, 2011, 2013, 2014, Kitchin et al. 2013; Agunias and Newland, 2012). Diaspora strategies can be thought of as proactive efforts by migrant-sending states to birth, incubate, fortify and better leverage the transfer of resources from diaspora communities to their homelands. Through joint 'policy transfer' workshops, seminars, publications, and conferences, there exists a vibrant global dialogue as to the optimum design of diaspora strategies (i.e. the most appropriate institutions, instruments, policies, programs, and initiatives).

The diaspora-for-development agenda has enjoyed a certain celebrity status, and like many 'buzz ideas', has been permitted a somewhat pampered ascent. But a number of critical commentaries are now emerging. This paper aligns itself with these commentaries but seeks to go further. We argue that diaspora strategies, in their current form, might undermine rather than augment the contributions made by diaspora populations to the development of homelands. Diaspora strategies are prone to construe the diaspora-homeland relationship instrumentally. An alternative approach, we suggest, is to reposition diaspora strategies within a framework of feminist care ethics that prioritises and undergirds diaspora-homeland relationships built on social relations of reciprocity, trust and mutuality (Lawson, 2007; Raghuram, 2009), and which sees care as a public good (Tronto, 1993; 2013). Our argument is that diaspora strategies go awry when they begin with the wrong motives, such as to capture the resources of the diaspora for instrumental gains. The point of entry for diaspora strategies should be to support caring relationships that serve the public good. Prioritising feminist care ethics means that where diaspora strategies nurture certain forms of development these are seen as derivative outcomes of care for generating more equitable and sustainable social relations. In forwarding this argument, we do not deny the importance of economic benefits from diaspora-centred development; rather, we see the economy and care existing in a

---

that they left but continue to identify with as home, such as because of kinship ties or the desire for belonging.

[2] These include the World Bank through its 'Knowledge for Development Programme'; the International Diaspora Engagement Alliance (IdEA) established by Hilary Clinton via the Secretary of State's Office of the Global Partnership Initiative (GPI), in collaboration with the Migration Policy Institute (MPI); the joint European Union (EU) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Migrant for Development (M4D) programme; and the advocacy work undertaken by among others the MPI, Economist Magazine, MacArthur Foundation, the Inter-American Bank, and Diaspora Matters Consultancy.

symbiotic manner captured in the concept of 'diaspora economies of care' that we introduce later.

The remainder of the paper builds this conceptual argument in three stages. Firstly, we provide a critical reading of the diaspora-centred development agenda and diaspora strategising. We argue that in their current form such strategies are driven by developmental goals and privilege certain emigrants, thus potentially undermining rather than enhancing the proclivity of diaspora populations to contribute to the development of their homelands. Secondly, in recasting diaspora strategies within feminist care ethics, we propose that migrant-sending states have a duty to formulate a more progressive generation of diaspora strategies that are built upon four principles addressing how feminist care ethics can define the diaspora-homeland relationships for building more equitable and sustainable outcomes of diaspora engagement. The final section develops the concept of 'diaspora economies of care' to capture an aggregate transfer of resources between diasporas and their homelands that is premised on feminist care ethics. We set forth three types of 'diaspora economies of care' which we argue usefully redefines the notion of diaspora-centred development. These focus on the emotional, moral, and service aspects of the diaspora-homeland relationship. Our conclusion affirms the significance of feminist care ethics in the formulation of diaspora strategies and suggests future research agendas.

2. Critiquing the rise of the diaspora-centred development agenda

Countries that host sizeable migrant communities have long fretted over how they ought to relate to the international migration system. Debate has centred on the extent to which it is ethical for countries in the Global North to prospect for skilled labour (e.g. nurses, doctors, and engineers) and care workers (often mothers with children) from the global South. The prognoses has been for host countries to discourage (or at least better manage) further emigration from the global South while encouraging and enabling expatriate experts to return to their homelands, even for short periods, to promote development (Faist and Fauser, 2011). For example, at the supra-national scale the United Nations' Volunteer Programme (UNVP), the International Labour Office' TOKTEN (Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals) initiative, and the International Organisation of Migration's (IOM) Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA) have each attempted to motivate diaspora members to return as volunteers.

During the 1990s when transnational migration became recognized as a means of contributing to development in migrant-sending countries, their governments started to encourage and facilitate labour migration for national development. This contributed to the burgeoning of the low-paid migrant labour export industry in the global South (Levitt and Jaworsky, 2004; Faist, 2008; Faist and Mauser, 2011). But as these migrant-sending countries realised the limitations and vulnerability of relying on remittances, they became interested in harnessing the potential of human capital and technology transfer as well (see Pellerin and Mullings, 2013). Alongside this, scholars such as Anna-Lee Saxenian (2006) started to question the brain drain thesis by arguing that emigrant scientists and entrepreneurs can still contribute to the development of their countries of origin through brain circulation. Affluent countries in the global North like Scotland and Ireland started

to pursue the resources represented by their diaspora populations; economically advanced countries in the southern hemisphere such as Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Singapore are following suit too (Kutzensov, 2006; Aikins and White, 2011; Boyle and Kitchin, 2011, 2013, 2014, Ho, 2011; Kitchin et al. 2013; Agunias and Newland, 2012).

Over the past two decades a number of migrant-sending states have given considerable attention to supporting migrant communities so that these communities can better support them. Migrant-sending states that actively harness diaspora in the service of development often prepare and are guided by a diaspora strategy. Diaspora strategies refer to policy initiatives enacted by a sending state to fortify and develop relationships with diasporic populations who share an affinity with the homeland. Policy and academic literature suggests that migrant-sending states are pioneering a range of diaspora engagement programs and we frame these thematically in three ways: as consumers, donors and economic agents. This thematic organisation allows us to propose subsequently an alternative set of diaspora strategies premised on care values, known as 'diaspora economies of care'.

First, at the heart of many diaspora strategies is a quest to build emotional bonds with diaspora populations by designing projects that recharge national pride and patriotism. Such diaspora strategies also recognise that instilling national culture promotes business opportunities, leading migrant-sending states to reach out to diaspora populations as potential consumers of products, activities or campaigns that promote national identity and belonging. Diaspora tourism[3] represents one such diaspora strategy where homelands appeal to emigrants and diasporic descendants (e.g. Basu, 2007; Kuah-Pearce, 2010) by facilitating short term visits to the homeland through easing visa schemes; providing genealogy services; supporting research, training and policy development; nurturing diaspora marketing and branding; and identifying opportunities for high value-added trade and tourism investments (Agunias and Newland 2012). Further, by sending cultural ambassadors into the diaspora, diaspora strategies seek to increase exports of ethnic and artisanal products. They enlist the support of diaspora populations embedded in marketing chains, hosting touring trade fairs, and building capacity in the area of e-commerce.

Second, diasporas also act as donors when they contribute to the welfare of their countries of origin through remittances, philanthropy and volunteerism. Remittance transfers remain an important way for diaspora populations to contribute to development. Diaspora strategies actively attempt to increase gains from remittances by lowering the cost of transfers and increasing their security; extending transfer services to communities which are 'unbanked'; facilitating collective remittances by providing migrant organizations with technical and organizational support, matching funds, marketing skills, and other business services; and encouraging more productive uses of remittances (Agunias and Newland 2012). Diaspora strategies are also actively nurturing and

---

[3] Diaspora tourism spans a broad spectrum of return visits incorporating medical tourism, business-related tourism, heritage tourism, education tourism, VIP tours, and peak experience tours (Agunias and Newland 2012).

harvesting diaspora philanthropy. They do so by promoting the philanthropic work undertaken by diaspora foundations, private and voluntary organizations (PVOs), religious organizations, corporations and alumni associations; actively soliciting gifts or bequests from potential donors; promoting or mentoring specific projects; creating conductive conditions for giving especially in relation to taxation; and investing in capacity building for non-profit organisations (e.g. Newland and Patrick, 2004; Orozco, 2006; Newland et al, 2010). Diaspora strategies may further promote volunteering schemes, especially to support vulnerable populations; provide skills that are in short supply; and assist in the administration of aid, not least following a natural or a human induced disaster (Agunias and Newland 2012).

A third way in which sending states capitalise upon diaspora populations is to leverage upon them as economic agents (labour, brokers, investors and sources of talent). For some countries, the revenue represented by low-paid migrant labour abroad provides a significant source of national income, eases domestic unemployment, and supports left-behind family members (Levitt and Jaworsky, 2004; Hoang et al, 2012). But recent diaspora strategies court as well the resources, knowledge, contacts, linguistic skills and cultural insights of highly skilled and globally networked emigrants that can be used to broker the commercial, strategic, diplomatic, and foreign policy interests. They nurture business networking platforms; channel investment opportunities into source countries; finance and guide new companies or companies aiming to globalise; and advise on national strategic direction (Kuznetsov, 2006). Some diaspora strategies seek to use the expertise of the diaspora to tackle corruption in homeland polities, fortify democracy, bolster domestic institutional capacity, and support conflict resolution (Sinatti et al, 2010). Another type of human capital mobility harnessed by diaspora strategies focuses upon encouraging the return of diaspora talent from abroad or promoting brain incubation and brain circulation[4]. Through permanent, fixed term, and circular return migration, migrants can add skills to the domestic labour market that would otherwise be absent (Vertovec 2007).

The three key ways in which diaspora strategies leverage on diasporic populations to accelerate economic growth and development in the home country casts the diaspora-homeland relationship as a mainly instrumental and pragmatic one, driven by utilitarian motives. Understood in this way diaspora strategies misapprehend the complexity of the diaspora-homeland relationship. The assumption seems to be 'let me exploit our shared heritage for my sole gain' or, 'I see you as someone who can broker my interests'. The essential logic underpinning diaspora engagement remains consistent from country to country: overseas communities have resources, moral proclivities and emotional attachments, which if harvested properly, represent the potential to accelerate economic growth and development in the home country. This instrumental approach threatens to damage the proclivity of the diaspora to care for their homelands.

---

[4] Central web portals inform diaspora populations about job opportunities, migrant-sending states host graduate and job fairs throughout the diaspora, they provide attractive packages to assist return, and they furnish one-stop shops to deal with administrative matters that can impede return (tax, visa, schooling, housing or capital transfers).

In making this case we align our thinking with recent critical commentaries arguing that an instrumental approach towards diaspora strategies reduces diaspora communities to mere agents of development, glosses over the multi-faceted relationship of diaspora populations with their homelands, and sidelines contestations. In their efforts to use diaspora as a new source of 'soft power' or 'smart power', sending states are revisiting the institutions they use to interface with expatriate communities. States manage emigration by creating brand new ministry-level diaspora institutions, establishing hybrid ministries to engage the diaspora, introducing sub-ministry or department level units, buttressing consular and embassy networks, establishing new regional or local diaspora engagement agencies, and mobilising NGOs, foundations and advisory councils (Gamlen, 2005; Ragazzi, 2014).

Larner (2007) suggests that diaspora strategies are best thought of as initiatives undertaken by neoliberalising migrant-sending states bent on building a global governmental apparatus through their emigrant populations. Using the example of the KEA network in New Zealand, she proposes that the idea of 'diaspora' is a governmental category more so than a description of an empirical population. New ways of imagining New Zealand, as a globally networked nation straddling the world's principal business centres, serves well its global ambitions and aspirations to attract inward foreign investment. As migrant-sending states revisit Westphalian assumptions and re-territorialise their nations as global networks (Larner, 2007; Ragazzi, 2009), they cultivate diaspora subjectivities that craft these subjects as neoliberal citizens prepared to put their services to the cause of the homeland.

Interrogating the new state forms and subjectivities that emerge through diaspora strategies, Ho (2011) highlights that membership and rights have been extended extraterritorially by they privilege selective emigrants. Ireland nurtures connections with elite members of the Irish diaspora through initiatives such as the Global Irish Economic Forum (GIEF) and Global Irish Network (GIN). Tropes of 'ancestry' and 'affinity' are used to sculpt, mobilize, and leverage 'ethno-preneurial' subjects useful for brokering Ireland's interactions with the global economy. But herein lies a paradox: the Irish government's overtures towards the global Irish family can be juxtaposed against its move to restrict immigrants' rights to Irish citizenship based on racialised assumptions of who can or should be considered Irish (Gray, 2012). The idea of diaspora interlocks with ideals of who belongs (or not) to the nation within its territory as well as extraterritorially.

The use of the word 'diaspora' in diaspora strategies needs to be analytically distinguished from the concept of diaspora used in critical scholarship as the former tends to venerate particular narratives of the nation while overlooking competing stories of nationhood and national community (Ho, 2011). Contested national imaginaries arising from diaspora strategies are observable in Dzenovska's (2012) portrayal of the nationalist framings tied to Latvian narratives of exile and return, compared to the Latvian state's more recent overtures towards the scientific and entrepreneur expertise of its diaspora for 'aligning' the country's economy with the requirements of European Union membership and to be considered deserving of international monetary assistance and investments

(Watkins and Agapitova, 2004). The World Latvian Economics and Innovations Forum (WLEIF) formed in 2012 embodies Latvia's quest to bring to life a projected diaspora community of scientists and business leaders (Ziedonis, *The Baltic Times*, 24 July 2013), but it indirectly devalues the worth of those who do not match the desired profile, including a significant population of unskilled Latvian youths abroad.

A shared logic underlying the various cases of diaspora strategies discussed above is an emphasis on development as a priority for national wellbeing. The development imperative driving diaspora strategies is critiqued by Pellerin and Mullings (2013) who caution against an increasing reliance on migrant populations for remittances and investments, which also shifts the risks and responsibility of driving national development to them. Commenting about the new emphasis on skilled diaspora networks in Jamaica, Mullings (2011, p. 31) further questions whether the skilled diaspora agenda for development provides 'mutually rewarding opportunities for Jamaicans abroad [who have returned] to participate in the island's development'. She cites issues such as a lack of employment opportunities that commensurate with their skills set, barriers to accessing professional networks after return, and unsatisfactory experiences that reproduce gender, race or class hierarchies.

The above critical commentaries underline not only the political economy of diaspora strategies and the development imperatives driving such state initiatives, but also draw out the new state forms produced as a result of the extraterritorial reach of the homeland to operationalise governmentality techniques. We suggest that the current diaspora strategies formulated by migrant-sending states are likely to diminish and degrade the diaspora-homeland relationship because these strategies shift the risks and responsibility of driving national development to diaspora populations; privileges certain diaspora groups deemed more deserving of care because of their socio-economic status or other axes of identity; and fails to give equal weight to the reciprocal care that should guide the diaspora-homeland relationship. In drawing diaspora populations into national development agendas, migrant-sending states invoke emotional bonds, moral obligations, and economic opportunities premised upon belonging and caring for the homeland. The convergence of these trends creates opportunity for considering how feminist care ethics can inform the design of diaspora strategies instead.

3. Recasting diaspora strategies within feminist care ethics
Pioneered in the mid-1980s by scholars such as psychologist Carol Gilligan (1982) and philosopher Nel Noddings (1984), feminist care ethics explicitly seeks to decentre established ethical frameworks, including Kantian ontology, utilitarianism, consequentialism, and virtue ethics, on the bases that these approaches to ethics are innately masculinist and western (Tong et al. 2011). Such Enlightenment ethics—masculinist by definition—search for justice based upon universal principles of Cartesian objectivity and reasoning, and advocate rational decision-making. In contrast, feminist care ethics begins with a social ontology of connection: foregrounding social relationships of mutuality and trust rather than dependence, where ethical judgements need to be made in the context of caring relationships (Lawson 2007). While questions remain over feminist exceptionalism in such perspectives, an ethics based upon care

actively courts emotion and affect when making ethical judgements. It supports immersion in the problem, permits subjectivity, and prioritises decisions that are context-attentive.

We mobilise feminist care ethics to help frame a more progressive generation of diaspora strategies. Our approach departs from existing diaspora strategies insofar as we insist that caring relationships need to work in both directions from homelands to diasporas, and from diasporas to homelands. In building our case we make four arguments, namely that 1) state-diaspora relationships are nested in wider power geometries but feminist care ethics should define the diaspora-homeland relationship; 2) migrant-sending states have an ethical imperative to support caring relationships that extend beyond the physically proximate; 3) the diaspora-homeland relationship should be underpinned by reciprocity so as not to diminish the proclivity of either party to care; 4) caring relationships informed by feminist care ethics should serve the public good, rather than partisan interests. Sending states that formulate diaspora strategies adhering to these four principles will come to see development as an important but corollary outcome of care, yet it is such forms of development that are likely to arrive at more equitable outcomes and prove sustainable.

Firstly, feminist care ethics begins with the observation that state-led interventions in diaspora-homeland relationships are nested inside complex webs of connective lines and tissues operating within and between homelands and diasporas, at myriad scales, and in a range of social, economic, cultural, and political domains. There exists a complex field of transnational connectivities and ties which result in diaspora communities becoming braided into everyday events in the homeland, and vice versa. Feminist care ethics requires that diaspora strategies are attentive to the histories and geographies of the transnational webs into which they are venturing, including the power-laden asymmetries that underpin these webs and connectivities. Existing diaspora strategies that approach diaspora-homeland relationships as opportunity (something to be leveraged) rather than as an invitation to act responsibly (something that demands an ethical response) have limited sustainability.

Secondly, literature on feminist care ethics often draws a distinction (explicitly and by implication) between 'humanitarian care' (calibrated by justice ethics) and 'intimate care' (calibrated by care ethics) (Barnett, 2005, p. 9). Humanitarian care refers to care motivated by a sense that injustice has been inflicted upon an abstract other and is predicated upon impartial and rational judgement. Intimate care in contrast refers to care motivated by personal relationships and is best characterised as embodied, emotive, partial, and partisan care. Whilst both types of care are assumed to be at work in the care afforded to proximate others, humanitarian care is often taken to dominate the care afforded to distant others (Robinson, 1999). Certainly arguments on feminist care ethics are most often contained within a nation-state framework and focus predominantly on relationships between the state and the population it governs concerning rights allocation, resource distribution, support provision and public participation (Clement, 1998; Sevenhuijsen, 1998). This has led at times to the notion that caring from a distance is

principally disembodied, cool and detached care. Whilst virtuous and essential, humanitarian care tends to be overly abstract and insufficiently personal.

But this paper aligns itself with recent research which challenges this assumption and follows others in arguing that intimate care can indeed serve as a potent progenitor of the care people afford to distant others (Robinson 1999, Raghuram, 2009, Silk, 2004 Lawson 2007). Citing Held (1993), Robinson (1999, p. 44) argues that 'an ethics of care might have dimensions beyond the family and domestic society'. Likewise the research agenda set out by Doreen Massey's (2004) on geographies of responsibility calls for more attention to be given to 'caring from a distance', which arises from the power geometries of relational space. For Massey, as globalisation bridges physical and social distances, an ethics of care that is relational and promotes trust and responsibility is even more necessary than before. Meanwhile Lawson (2007) also argues that feminist care ethics can be extended spatially beyond the physically proximate. The language of care is increasingly being adopted by a variety of individuals, groups and institutions to advance causes drawn around 'imagining a relationship with distant others' (Raghuram, 2009, p. 26; also see Silk, 2004). A range of debates applying feminist care ethics in a global context are surfacing and address topics such as international climate change, humanitarian disasters, ethical consumption, corporate social responsibility, the prosecution of rogue political and military leaders accused of crimes against humanity, global poverty and social justice, and transnational labour migration especially with respect to the global industry of care work. We contend that the proclivity to care for proximate others at a distance (as opposed to distant others) can serve as a potent progenitor of diaspora-homeland ties.

Recognising that care can underpin diaspora-homeland relationships leads to our third claim: that diaspora strategies ought to be formulated out of responsibility than opportunity. In her seminal book, *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care,* Tronto (1993) argues that it is women, the poor or ethnic minorities that carry out the care work necessary for societies to function. Polities functioning upon market principles further redistribute and reallocate care burdens to social groups who already carry more than their share, allowing the privileged to pass on responsibilities and to practise what Tronto (2013) refers to as 'privileged irresponsibility' (the ability of elites to exploit the proclivity of others to care thus excusing or relieving themselves of obligations which ought to fall on them). Tronto argues that valorising feminist care ethics in political practice and its relevance in public life means it is the duty of the state to attend to caring relationships both directly and indirectly. In her next book, *Caring Democracy* (2013), Tronto furthers her case by arguing that democratic systems are in crises precisely because liberal democracies and market economies hand out 'charity passes' (charitable assistance) and 'bootstrap passes' (help to kin) as an alternative to providing structural and systematic supports to care providers. She calls for a new rapprochement between politics and care so that carers feel that the state is aligned and in solidarity with the caring they provide. Care should not provide the state with an opportunity to abrogate on its responsibilities; instead care should be registered, rewarded and supported by the state.

Informed by Tronto's insistence that political systems and care work be reconciled, we argue that diaspora strategies premised upon feminist care ethics should be pursued because migrant-sending states have a duty to register the caring work being done by diaspora populations for homelands and homelands for diasporas. If either seeks to capture communities simply to extract resources they may damage the diaspora-homeland relationship, perhaps irrevocably, thus diminishing the proclivity to care. In contrast, when migrant-sending states and diaspora communities prioritise, respect, cherish and protect the proclivity to care, they will take responsibility for rebuilding and reinvigorating relationships between diasporas and homeland. Diaspora strategies led by feminist care ethics will seek to build diaspora strategies that align markets and polities so that they respect and do justice to the care work undertaken by migrant communities. But the care work undertaken by diasporas and homeland does not always result in outcomes that are just and care is not always treated as a public good, which leads us to our next point.

Many ethicists now recognise the importance of bringing into conversation justice and care perspectives when arbitrating the virtues and vices of particular actions. Both can be put to productive usage, sometimes even with respect to a single problem. But Barnett Barnett (2011; 2012) seeks to go further by arguing that it is necessary to move beyond normative frameworks of dualist thinking. Whilst advocates of humanitarian care turn to concepts of justice to validate particular actions and proponents of intimate care turn to feminist care ethics, Barnett (2011, p. 4) proposes that normative judgements be calibrated through situated and embodied reasoning, or 'practical reason'. He suggests there exists a modest, non-foundational ethics that is determined by practical reason as the basis for reaching normative decisions. Extrapolating these deliberations to the present task of recasting diaspora strategies within feminist care ethics leads to the realisation that one of the limitations accompanying arguments of intimate care and caring at a distance has been an uncritical valorisation of partisan care. A number of pathologies are inherent within diaspora strategies that produce outcomes exclusively attentive to the care work migrants do for their families and immediate communities. Our fourth principle then is to press for diaspora strategies that generate care outcomes serving as a public good.

4. Diaspora economies of care
With these arguments in mind, we introduce the concept of 'diaspora economies of care' to capture how feminist care ethics may frame the movement of resources between diaspora and homelands. We name this 'diaspora economies of care' so as to destabilise binary framings of economy and care; economy and care have a symbiotic relationship in diaspora strategies premised on feminist care ethics. We argue that diaspora strategies motivated by feminist care ethics and which seek to nurture caring relationships to serve the public good will produce an accompanying flow of resources between homelands and diasporas that can be directed towards building more sustainable and equitable social relations within the homeland as well as with the diaspora.

Below we revisit the tendency of diaspora strategies to objectify diasporic communities as consumers, donors, and economic agents. We offer an alternative conceptualisation of

diaspora strategies calibrated by care by drawing out three potential diaspora economies of care: *an emotional economy, a moral economy, and a service economy.* We view each of these diaspora economies of care as driven by a different kind of proclivity to care. By foregrounding potential caring relationships that can be cultivated in such diaspora economies of care, we counter-balance policy approaches that reduce diaspora-homeland relationships to economic development goals (see critical perspectives by Larner, 2007; Ho, 2011; Mullings, 2011). We also bear in mind critiques about the potential partisan outcomes of care, signalling that care should serve as a public good. Caring relationships under diaspora economies of care refract resources so that they circulate in ways that may not occur should a straightforward capitalist logic prevail. What would diaspora strategies calibrated by feminist care ethics look like?

First, *emotional diaspora economies of care* arise when resources flow between diaspora populations and their homelands on the bases of a shared interest in preserving and narrating the story of the nation. Diaspora tourism is a means through which homelands build up emotional ties with diaspora populations while earning revenue from their consumption practices at tourism sites or of cultural commodities bearing the stamp of the nation (e.g. Basu, 2007). However, diaspora tourism, or what Newland and Taylor (2010) term the 'nostalgia trade' could challenge the diaspora-homeland connection by commodifying the diaspora-homeland relationship. Ireland's annual event for diaspora tourism known as *The Gathering*, faced such controversy when a prominent Irish celebrity denounced it as a crass marketing 'scam' to extract revenue from the diaspora, rather than nurturing a 'connection' (*The Journal.ie*, 6 November 2012).

Although these observations by a public figure are by no means representative of the Irish diaspora, this incident signals that mutually enriching emotional diaspora economies of care are likelier to emerge when the diaspora feels they treated as more than consumers of a national brand. Armenia runs a 'birthright' program where short-term internships or community service placements are offered to young diaspora professionals, enabling them to cultivate leadership skills while instilling shared identity and cultural ambassadorship values amongst them. Upon returning to their countries of habitual residency, they are enrolled in alumni or networking programs (Newland and Taylor, 2010). Such an approach allows for the flow of emotional resources from the diaspora to the homeland, as well as creating an experience where diaspora populations find that their ongoing relationship with the homeland is treated with respect, integrity and authenticity.

Another type of diaspora strategy that capitalises on emotional ties is the large-scale celebrations staged by migrant-sending states either in the homeland or in countries where a critical mass of overseas nationals can be found. Examples are the *Pravadi Bharatiya Divas* conference (India), St. Patrick's Day festivities (Ireland) and Singapore Day celebrations (Singapore), but there are many others. Such events tend to showcase universalising narratives of nationhood and national belonging. Mani and Varadarajan (2005, p. 51) underline the 'expansive spatial temporal idea of India' mooted at India's *Pravadi Bharatiya Divas* celebrations, which simultaneously inscribes geographical, religious and class invisibilities within the Indian diaspora (also see Raj, this issue). For example, Thandi (2014) reports that within the Indian diaspora are the Punjabs whose

relationship with the Indian state and the prevailing Hindu majority population in India remains troubled by a history of political repression and anti-Sikh violence. He argues that appealing to a sense of identity or patriotism to serve the nation is insufficient in this context. A caring orientation that underpins diaspora strategies promoting national identity and belonging would reflexively recognise and attend to competing representations of the interlocking relationship between nation and diaspora. Enabling a dialogue amongst the different diaspora groups that claim stakeholdership in the story of the nation implies a preparedness to listen and respond (Barnes, 2012, p. 161), even if those views fall outside the norms of how the national story is commonly portrayed. Cultivating emotional rootedness amongst diaspora populations also means calibrating the balance between belonging/identity, rights and responsibilities (Ho, 2009) through meaningful debate of the care values on which the social compact of citizenship is based (Sevenhuijsen, 1998). The latter overlaps with the moral and service diaspora economies of care, which we turn to next.

The second alternative approach focuses on *moral diaspora economies of care* where diaspora populations and homelands stand in solidarity, supporting the welfare of one another. Moral diaspora economies of care arise when both diaspora populations and homelands realise that they are embedded in networks and relationships of care, and they collaborate to create an elevated sense of interdependence and social solidarity. Contemporary diaspora strategies count on diaspora populations to contribute to development projects on account of their ties to the community and homeland. Critical studies of diaspora strategies suggest that the responsibility for development has been outsourced to diasporas (e.g. Mullings, 2011), and neoliberal discourses and practices are depoliticised into a set of development interventions (Kothari, 2005 cited in Mullings, 2011:419) that advance a narrow set of interests. Recalibrated by feminist care ethics, moral diaspora economies of care emerge when diaspora populations are viewed as partners in purposeful development projects, not only for economic development but also to advancing social agendas. A unique example of diaspora strategies informed by interdependency and social solidarity is found in Delano's (2014) study of the cooperation between Mexico and Latin American consulates in the United States to provide health, labour rights and educational services to Latin American migrants collectively. Recognising that they have greater collective bargaining power in the host country context, these governments promote common agendas to care for their diaspora populations. Not only do diaspora populations receive care from homelands that may otherwise have limited resources, a derivative outcome of such moral diaspora economies of care is stronger regional solidarity and bilateral relations. By prioritising care relationships, political and social agendas are realised as well.

It is care for the well-being of families, the community or co-nationals that prompts diaspora populations to respond to diaspora strategies eliciting their remittances and philanthropic donations, even if it is at the expense of a better quality of life for themselves abroad (e.g. Nyberg-Sorensen et al, 2002; Parreñas, 2005). Hence, embedded within moral economies of care is the right of diaspora populations to demand accountability from governments for how their remittances and donations are used. Under feminist care ethics, the leadership in homeland organisations would recognise they are

embedded in a web of interdependency not only with the national population that they serve, but also diaspora populations. On the one hand, the resources entrusted to them should be directed to projects improving the social welfare of those cared for by diaspora populations. Newland and Taylor (2010) who highlight how, through an NGO founded by Moroccan migrants, public-private investment and civil society engagement together delivered electricity access to migrants' home villages, and improved roads and water services, thus raising the quality of life in those localities. However, this example also signals the partisan nature of care as other social groups and spaces disconnected from diaspora populations fall further behind. Thus, on the other hand, it is also the responsibility of the leaders to rise above parochial interests and ensure the needs of other social groups disconnected from diaspora populations are being met in an equitable manner. This allows the outcomes of caring relationships to serve as a public good rather than meeting partisan needs, or restricted to crude metrics of deservingness and undeservingness (see Barnes, 2012). Such discretionary redistribution decisions can be operationalised effectively only if co-nationals and diaspora populations believe the national leadership is competent and acts in carefully responsible ways that deserves trust (Tronto, 1993; 2013; Sevenhuijsen, 1996). Crafted with the above feminist care ethics in mind, the social compact of citizenship discussed under the emotional diaspora economies of care also becomes more closely intertwined with the moral diaspora economies of care presented herewith.

The third type of alternative diaspora strategies, *service diaspora economies of care*, results when diaspora populations and their homeland reciprocally place themselves in the service of one another. Here, when migrant workers, brokers, investors and talent in the diaspora put in their labour, financial resources, knowledge, contacts, and influence it is not merely for self-benefit but to generate caring outcomes as a public good. Equally migrant-sending states would be mindful of their responsibility to provide diplomatic protection and services abroad to serve the needs of their diaspora populations. But it also means widening the web of relations to include corollary sites of care such as coming alongside families, communities, civil society and the private sector to strengthen care relationships in the homeland. In short, not only should care be reciprocal, it can be multi-stranded and complementary. Diaspora strategies informed by feminist case ethics will value the contributions, or service, rendered by less-skilled migrant labour towards the homeland alongside those of brokers, investors and talent. Such reciprocity captured in the dynamics of care builds the sustainability of service diaspora economies of care as migrant workers, brokers, investors and talent feel that their ongoing relationship with the homeland is valued emotionally and respected. Inasmuch as migrant-sending states couch diaspora strategies in emotional discourses of homeland and belonging, market-driven logics penetrate diaspora strategies as when targeting high net worth entrepreneurs, brokers of global networks and talent (Gandhi, 2002; Xiang, 2005; Newland, 2010; Brinkerhoff, 2012). But the effectiveness of material incentives in attracting and retaining their service to the homeland has been questioned (e.g. Welch and Zhang, 2008; Zweig and Wang, 2013). For example, despite initiatives by the Malaysian state to entice the repatriation of highly skilled nationals abroad, overseas Chinese-Malaysians are torn between returning to serve in the development of their homeland and enduring systemic discrimination as an ethnic minority under the country's *bumiputra* policy (privileging

the Malay majority) (Koh in press). As discussed under emotional diaspora economies of care, counter-narratives of nationhood deserve inclusion in the national dialogue, and even more so in a spirit of independency, if those diaspora populations are called to serve the nation.

Service diaspora economies of care develop when diaspora populations and migrant-sending states learn to harness the resources of migrant workers, brokers, investors and talent from the diaspora while simultaneously recognising and even enhancing the interests of those who put their labour, financial and human capital resources to the service of the homeland. Even those supportive of the state's diaspora strategising project may feel over time that their interests have been disregarded by the homeland or other members of the diaspora whose interests they served, thus depleting their goodwill and leading to withdrawal (Seguin et al, 2006). The feminist care ethics practised in service diaspora economies of care entails reciprocal relations whereby beneficiaries, such as of the expertise shared by brokers, investors and talent or those supported by migrant labour abroad, recognise they are in turn responsible for ensuring others in the interconnected web of relations, including those who have cared for them, may feel cared for and are nurtured. Countering critics who construe responsibility and reciprocity as a duty of obligation, Tronto (1993; 2013) and Barnes (2012) argue that obligation is embedded in a set of formal practices whereas responsibility and reciprocity, and we would add service, are ensconced in cultural practices arising out of responsiveness to the dynamics of care. Caring requires people to consider to whom they are related and how they are related (i.e. belonging/identity) in order to make discerning decisions that weigh up personal needs and wants (i.e. rights) against serving wider social solidarity goals (i.e. responsibility). In these ways, emotional and moral diaspora economies of care are implicated in service diaspora economies of care too. Indeed the three diaspora economies of care discussed here build upon one another in that without the emotional bonds, people would not stand in solidarity with one another, nor are they likely to channel their labour, financial and human capital resources into improving the welfare of the homeland.

5. Conclusion
This paper argues that in formulating diaspora strategies, migrant-sending states might usefully reflect upon the meaning, responsibilities, and implications of working within frameworks set by feminist care ethics. We submit that feminist care ethics provides the bases for a new generation of more progressive diaspora strategies to be built. To this end, we have offered a conceptual framework to guide practice. The three types of diaspora economies of care proposed each draw out a different proclivity to care, crucially in both directions between diaspora populations and homelands. Emotional diaspora economies of care focus on the flow of resources arising from emotional connections between homelands and diaspora which is often framed as belonging and identity but is also calibrated against rights and responsibilities. Moral diaspora economies of care are attentive to feminist care ethics concerning interdependency and social solidarity. Under such moral diaspora economies of care, diaspora strategies would advance not only economic goals but also social justice and political accountability, bearing in view the interdependency between the state, the national population and diaspora populations. Service diaspora economies of care result when diaspora

populations and migrant-sending states recognise the care work performed by migrant labour, investors, brokers and talent, and are conscientious about supporting them in a spirit of reciprocal care. Although presented separately, these three diaspora economies of care inform one another in practice and bear the potential to be mutually enriching, or debilitating in situations where feminist care ethics are abused.

Our approach has a number of distinctive benefits: a) it recognises that transfers of resources between diaspora and homelands are derivative or incidental outcomes of caring relationships; b) it reframes diaspora strategies as responsibility more so than an opportunity for migrant-sending states; c) it focuses not only on economic linkages but also diaspora economies which emerge from caring relationships in the social, cultural, and political spheres; d) it privileges reciprocity and relationality over dependency and extraction; e) it is attentive to the webs of connective lines and tissues operating at a myriad sites and scales (individual, family, firms, NGOs, interest groups, state etc.) as opposed to relying on overly structured, overly managed, state-led endeavours; and f) it emphasises long term sustainability over short term gain.

Conceptually, recasting diaspora strategies within care frameworks sets out new research agendas as well. First, our approach speaks to Massey's (2004) wider call for greater understanding of geographies of responsibilities. Lawson (2007), building on Massey, argues that feminist care ethics can be extended spatially beyond the physically proximate. Ramdas (in press) also argues for thinking about care and responsibility not just in relation to those that are biologically proximate but also to those with whom we share common histories and intimacies that connect across multiple spatio-temporalities (also see Raghuram et al, 2009). We note that not enough is known yet about who benefits most from different kinds of diaspora strategies, or the where, why, when, and how aspects of diaspora strategies. For feminist care ethics to extend beyond the proximate, we need to understand better how diaspora strategies impact development agendas in socially and spatially variable ways.

Second, advocates of feminist care ethics situate their arguments on liberal, pluralistic & democratic principles. However, diaspora strategies may be implemented by migrant-sending countries where governance styles depart from such political traditions, especially in postcolonial contexts that experienced violent political transitions, heavy-handed governance and uneven development in the aftermath of decolonisation. In certain cultural contexts, care may be misconstrued and used to legitimise paternalism instead (Tronto, 1993). Thus another potential research agenda is to consider how postcolonial scholarship may inform the recasting of diaspora strategies within care ethics. Alongside this, many care ethicists now recognise the importance of bringing care perspectives into conversation with justice perspectives when arbitrating the virtues and vices of particular actions. Both can be put to productive usage, even with respect to a single problem, but what is needed is a clearer set of normative deliberations bridging care and justice perspectives, as well as signalling how these can be operationalised.

Lastly, important questions need to be asked about what role can *migrant-receiving states* play for recasting diaspora strategies through feminist care ethics? The rise of the migrant

labour care industry means that migrant-receiving states are also beneficiaries of global care chains (Yeates, 2005; Hoang et al, 2012), even if this means migrant workers are abdicating their caring responsibilities in the homeland. New scholarship is emerging on how migrant-receiving countries are intervening in diaspora strategies by faciliating diaspora-homeland engagement[5] amongst immigrant groups in their countries (Sinnati and Horst, 2014). For some, this signals how migrant-receiving countries are practising reciprocal care for the benefits they derive from migrant labour, but it raises other difficult questions as well. We suggest that the diaspora engagement by migrant-receiving states presents an opportunity to explore in a new context critiques of development by postcolonial scholars (e.g. Raghuram et al, 2011; Noxolo et al, 2012), such as concerning whether responsibility is being passed on by the global North to third parties or if host countries are formulating diaspora engagement to use the knowledge, contacts, linguistic skills, and cultural insights of their immigrant populations for serving their own economic, diplomatic and foreign policy agendas and/or to substitute for care work they ought to be doing.

Our paper sets out a framework for recasting diaspora strategies within care frameworks, as an intellectual endeavour in response to critiques of diaspora engagement and to guide practice on how feminist care ethics may be operationalised in an international context. Through this discussion, we propose that diaspora strategies calibrated by feminist care ethics are more likely to create sustainable diaspora economies of care over the longue durée. But ongoing critical academic engagement with diaspora strategies, as we suggest above, is also compatible with a spirit of feminist care ethics that is cognisant of context-specificity and responsive towards changing environments, while still seeking to advance caring relationships in a reflexive manner.

---

[5] Examples are the World Bank Knowledge for Development (K4D) Programme (2007-2013), the European-commissioned United Nations Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI) (2008-2012), and the US-based International diaspora Engagement Alliance (IdEAR) (ongoing).

References
Aikins, K., White, N., 2011. Global Diaspora Strategies ToolKit. Ireland Funds, Dublin.
Agunias, R., Newland, K., 2012. Developing a Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development. Migration Policy Institute, Washington D. C.
Anthias, F., 1998. Evaluating diaspora: beyond ethnicity?. Sociology 31 (4), 557-80.
Bakewell, O., 2009. Migration, diasporas, and development: some critical perspectives. Jahrbucher f. Nationalokonomie u Statistik 229, 787-802.
Barnes, M., 2012. Care in Everyday Life: An Ethic of Care in Practice. Policy Press, Bristol.
Barnett, C., 2005. 'Who cares'? In: Cloke, P., Crang, P., Goodwin, M. (Eds.) Introducing Human Geographies (2nd Edition). Arnold, London, pp. 588-601.
Barnett, C., 2011. Geography and ethics: placing life in the space of reasons. Progress in Human Geography 36 (3), 379-388.
Barnett, C., 2012. Situating the geographies of injustice in democratic theory. Geoforum 43 (4), 677-686.
Basu, P., 2007. Highland Homecomings: Genealogy and Heritage Tourism in the Scottish Diaspora. Routledge, London and New York.
Boyle, M., Kitchin, R., 2011. A Diaspora Strategy for Canada? Enriching Debate Through Heightening Awareness of International Practice. Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada, Vancouver.
Boyle M and Kitchin R (2013) 'Diaspora and development: In search of a new generation of diaspora strategies' in Kuznetsov Y (ed) Diaspora and Institutional change in countries of origin (Penn State University Press, Penns.) 280-309.
Boyle M and Kitchin R (2014) 'Diaspora centred development; Current practice, critical commentaries and research priorities' in Sahoo S and Pattanaik P K (eds.) Diaspora and Development: Perspectives, issues and practices (Springer, New Delhi) 11-30
Brah, A., 1998. Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities. Routledge, London and New York.
Brinkerhoff, J. M., 2012. Creating an enabling environment for diasporas' participation in homeland development: enabling diaspora contributions. International Migration 50 (1), 75-95.
Butler, K. D., 2001. Defining diaspora: refining a discourse. Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies 10 (2), 189-219.
Clement, G., 1998. Care, Autonomy and Justice. Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
Delano, A., 2014. The diffusion of diaspora engagement policies: A Latin American agenda. Political Geography 41, 90-100.
Dewind J., Holdaway, J. (Eds.), 2008. *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration* International Organization for Migration, Geneva.
Dzenovska, D., 2013. The great departure: rethinking national(ist) common sense. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 39 (2), 209-218.
Faist, T., 2008. Migrants as transnational development agents: an inquiry into the newest round of the migration-development nexus. Population, Space and Place 14, 21-42.
Faist, T., Fauser, M., 2011. The migration-development nexus: toward a transnational perspective. In: Faist, T., Fauser, M., Kivisto, P. (Eds.) The Migration Development

Nexus: A Transnational Perspective. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, Basingstoke, pp. 1-28.

Gamlen, A., 2008. The emigration state and the modern geopolitical imagination. Political Geography 27 (8), 840-856.

Gandhi, A., 2002. The Indian diaspora in global advocacy. Global Networks 2 (4): 357-62.

Gilligan C., 1982. In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Gray, B., 2012. 'Generation emigration': the politics of (trans)national social reproduction in twenty-first-century Ireland. Irish Studies Review 21 (1), 20-36.

Held, V., 1993. Feminist Morality: Transforming Culture, Society, and Politics. Women in Culture and Society. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Ho, E. L. E., 2009. Constituting citizenship through the emotions: Singaporean transmigrants in London. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 99 (4), 788-804.

Ho, E. L. E., 2011. "Claiming" the diaspora: sending state strategies, elite mobility and the spatialities of citizenship. Progress in Human Geography 35 (6), 757-772.

Hoang, L.A., Yeoh, B.S.A., Wattie, A.M., 2012. Transnational labour migration and the politics of care in the Southeast Asian family. Geoforum 43, 733–740.

IDEA, 2007. Voting from abroad: the international IDEA handbook. <www.idea.int/publications/voting_from_abroad/> (accessed 04.09.13)

Kitchin R, Boyle M, and Ancien D (2013) 'Ireland's Diaspora strategy: the quiet strategy of obligation and opportunity' in Gilmartin M and White A (eds) *Ireland and Migration* (Manchester University Press, Manchester) 105-137.

Koh, S.Y., (in press) State-led talent return migration programme and the doubly-neglected 'Malaysian diaspora': Whose diaspora, what citizenship, whose development?. Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography.

Kuah-Pearce, K. E., 2011. Rebuilding the Ancestral Village: Singaporeans in China. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

Kuznetsov, Y. (Ed.), 2006. Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills – How Countries Can Draw on Their Talent Abroad. World Bank Institute, Washington, D. C.

Larner, W., 2007. Expatriate experts and globalizing governmentalities: the New Zealand diaspora strategy. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 32 (3), 331-345.

Lawson, V., 2007. Geographies of care and responsibility. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 97 (1), 1-11.

Leblang, D., 2010. Familiarity breeds investment: diaspora networks and international investment. American Political Science Review 104 (3), 584-600.

Levitt, P. and Jaworsky, B.M. 2007. "Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends." Annual Review of Sociology 33 (1), 129–56.

Lowell, L. L., Findlay, A., 2001. Migration of highly skilled persons from developing countries: impact and policy responses. International Labour Office International Migration Papers 44.

Mani, B., Varadarajan, L., 2005. 'The largest gathering of the global Indian family': neoliberalism, nationalism, and diaspora at Pravasi Bharatiya Divas. Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies 14 (1), 45-74.

Massey, D., 2004. Geographies of responsibility. Geografiska Annaler Series B 86 (1), 5-18.

Meyer, J. (2011) A sociology of diaspora knowledge networks. In: Faist, T., Fauser, M., Kivisto, P. (Eds.) The Migration Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, Basingstoke, pp. 159-181.

Mullings, B., 2011. Diaspora strategies, skilled migrants and human capital enhancement in Jamaica. Global Networks 11 (1), 24-42.

Newland, K., 2010. Voice After Exist: Diaspora Advocacy. Migration Policy Institute, Washington, D. C.

Newland, K., Patrick, E., 2004. Beyond remittances: the role of diaspora in poverty reduction in their countries of origin, a scoping study by the Migration Policy Institute for the Department of International Development. Migration Policy Institute, Washington D. C.

Newland, K., Taylor, C., 2010. Heritage Tourism and Nostalgia Trade: A Diaspora Niche in the Development Landscape. Migration Policy Institute, Washington D. C.

Newland, K., Terrazas, A., Munster, R., 2010. Diaspora philanthropy: private giving and public policy. Migration Policy Institute, Washington D. C.

Noddings, N., 1984. Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Noxolo, P., Raghuram, P., Madge, C., 2012. Unsettling responsibility: postcolonial interventions. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 37 (3), 418-429.

Nyberg-Sorensen, N., Van Hear, N., Engberg-Pedersen, P., 2002. The migration-development nexus: evidence and policy options state-of-the-art overview. International Migration 40 (5), 3-47.

Nyiri, P., 2004. Expatriating is patriotic? The discourse on 'new migrants' in the People's Republic of China and the identity construction among recent migrants from the PRC. In: Yeoh, B. S. A., Willis, K. (Eds.) State/Nation/Transnation. Routledge, London, pp. 120-143.

Orozco, M., 2006. Diasporas, philanthropy and hometown associations: the Central American experience. <http://publications.iadb.org/handle/11319/3498?locale-attribute=en> (accessed 05.05.14)

Parrenas, R., 2005. Long distance intimacy: Class, gender and intergenerational relations between mothers and children in Filipino transnational families. Global Networks 5 (4), 317-336.

Pellerin, H., Mullings, B., 2013. The "diaspora option", migration and the changing political economy of development. Review of International Political Economy 20, 89–120.

Piper, N., 2009. Rethinking the Migration-Development Nexus Bringing marginalized visions and actors to the fore. Population, Space and Place, 15, 93–20.

Ragazzi, F., 2009. Governing diasporas. International Political Sociology 3 (4), 378-397.

Raghuram, P., 2009. Caring about 'brain drain' migration in a postcolonial world. Geoforum 40 (1), 25-33.

Raghuram, P., Madge, C., Noxolo, P., 2009. Rethinking responsibility and care for a postcolonial world. Geoforum 40 (1), 5-13.

Ramdas, K. (in press). Is blood thicker than water? Single Indian Singaporean women and the geographies of 'being' family. Gender, Place and Culture.

Robinson, F., 1999. Globalizing care: Ethics, Feminist Theory, and International Relations. Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.

Seguin, B., State, L., Singer, P.A., Daar, A.S., 2006. Scientific diasporas as an option for brain drain: re-circulating knowledge for development. International Journal of Biotechnology 8, 78–90.

Saxenian, A., 2006. The New Argonauts: Regional Advantage in a Global Economy. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Sevenhuijsen, S., 1998. Citizenship and the Ethics of Care. Routledge, London and New York.

Silk, J., 2004. Caring at a distance: gift theory, aid chains and social movements. Social & Cultural Geography 5 (2), 229-251.

Sinatti, G., Horst, C., 2014. Migrants as agents of development: Diaspora engagement discourse and practice in Europe. Ethnicities, doi:10.1177/1468796814530120

Sinatti, G., Ezzati, R., Guglielmo, M, Horst, C., Mezzetti, P., Pikklalainen, P., Saggiomo, V. Warnecke, A., 2010. Diasporas partners in conflict resolution and peacebuilding. <http://www.diaspora-centre.org/DOCS/DIASPEACE_Delivera.pdf> (accessed 12.05.14)

Solimano, A. (Ed.), 2008. The International Mobility of Talent Types, Causes, and Development Impact. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Thandi, S.S., 2014. The Punjab paradox: understanding the failures of Diaspora engagement. Diaspora Studies 7, 42–55.

The Journal.ie, 'Gabriel Byrne slams The Gathering, calls it "a scam"', 6th November 2012. <http://www.thejournal.ie/gabriel-byrne-slams-the-gathering-calls-it-a-scam-662823-Nov2012/> (accessed 14 May 2014)

Tong, R., Nancy, W., 2011. Feminist ethics. In: Zalta, E. N. (Ed.) The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/feminism-ethics/> (accessed 7 April 2014)

Tronto, J. C., 1993. Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care. Routledge, New York.

Tronto, J. C., 2013. Caring Democracy: Markets, Equality, and Justice. New York University Press, New York.

Vertovec, S., 2007. Circular migration: the way forward in global policy. International Migration Institute Working Paper.

Watkins, A., Agapitova, N., 2004. Creating a 21st century national innovation system for a 21st century Latvian economy. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3457.

Welch, A. R., Zhang, Z., 2008. Higher education and global talent flows: brain drain, overseas Chinese intellectuals, and diasporic knowledge networks. Higher Education Policy 21 (4), 519-537.

World Economic Forum, 2013. Global Competitiveness Report 2013/14. World Economic Forum, Switzerland.

Xiang, B., 2005. Promoting knowledge exchange through diaspora networks (the case of People's Republic of China). A report written for the Asian Development Bank. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.118.7305&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed 12.05.14)

Vertovec, S., 2007. Circular Migration: The Way Forward in Global Policy. International Migration Institute, Oxford.

Yeates, N., 2005. Global care chains: a critical introduction. Global Migration Perspectives 44 (2) < http://www.refworld.org/docid/435f85a84.htm> (accessed 12.05.14)

Yeoh, B. S. A., 2009. Emigration. In: Kitchin, R., Thrift, N. (Eds.) International Encyclopedia of Human Geography: Volume 3. Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 434-439.

Yossi, S., Barth, A., 2003. Diasporas and international relations theory. International Organization 57 (3), 449-479.

Ziedonis, D. 'Look past borders for growth, say Latvia's business leaders', *The Baltic Times*, 24 July 2014.

Zweig, D., Wang, H., 2013. Can China bring back the best? The Communist Party organizes China's search for talent. The China Quarterly, 215, 590–615.