Diasporas, Transnational Spaces and Communities

Michel Bruneau

(This article was published in R. Bauböck, Th. Faist (eds), *Diaspora and Transnationalism: concepts, theories and methods*, Amsterdam University Press, 2010, p. 35-49)

The term diaspora, long used only to describe the dispersion of the Jewish people throughout the world has, in the last thirty years, elicited unprecedented interest, attracting the attention not only of the academic world but also that of the media. In everyday language the term is now applied to all forms of migration and dispersion of a people, even where no migration is involved; this corresponds not only to the development and generalisation of international migrations throughout the world, but also to a weakening, or at least a limitation, of the role played by nation-states, at a time when globalisation has become a dominant process. I have chosen here to address the concept of diaspora from a geographical standpoint, taking into account its materiality in terms of space, place and territory.

In this chapter I shall try first to differentiate the concept of diaspora from that of others such as migration, minority, transnational community, territory of movement, and then complement the resulting definition with a typology of diasporas. My hypothesis is that the related concepts of diaspora and transnational community could be applied to different types of trans-border or transnational societies and thus help improve our understanding of the different spatial and temporal processes involved.

The concept of diaspora

A community diaspora first comes into being and then lives on thanks to whatsoever, in a given place, forges a bond between those who want to group together and maintain, from afar, relations with other groups which, although settled elsewhere, invoke a common identity. This bond can come in different forms, such as family, community, religious, socio-political, economic ties or the shared memory of a catastrophe or trauma suffered by the members of the diaspora or their forebears. A diaspora has a symbolic and "iconographic" capital that enables it to reproduce and overcome the – often considerable – obstacle of distance separating its communities (Bruneau 2004: 7-43). Members of a diaspora coalesce with their present place of settlement the whole set of micro-places (city neighbourhoods, villages…) occupied or crossed by those whom they recognise as their own. Each of these places acts as a centre in a territory where social proximities suppress spatial and temporal distances (Prévélakis, 1996). All diasporas are socio-spatial networks necessarily undergoing territorial expansion because they aggregate both places of memory and places of presence (Offner & Pumain 1996 : 163) .

Diaspora areas and territories must first be assessed in the host country, where the community bond plays the essential role; then in the country or territory of origin – a pole of attraction – via memory; and, finally, through the system of relations within the networked space that connects these different poles. It should, however, be borne in mind that the term diaspora often plays more of a metaphorical than an instrumental role. The different criteria suggested by most authors (Cohen 1997, Sheffer 2003) can be narrowed down to six essential ones focused around dispersion under pressure,

choice of destination, identity awareness, networked space, length of transnational ties and relative autonomy from host and origin societies as indicated below:

(1) The population considered has been dispersed under pressure (disaster, catastrophe, famine, abject poverty) to several places and territories beyond the immediate neighbourhood of the territory of origin.

(2) "The choice of countries and cities of destination is carried out in accordance with the structure of migratory chains which, beyond the oceans, link migrants with those already installed in the host countries, the latter thought of as conveyors towards the host society and the labour market, and guardians of the ethnic or national culture." (Dufoix 2000: 325). Such a choice may, however, also be determined by the conditions of traumatic dispersal, in which case, even though there may be far less choice, previous migratory routes can be used.

(3) The population, integrated without being assimilated into the host countries, retains a rather strong identity awareness linked to the memory of its territory and the society of origin, with its history. This implies the existence of a strong sense of community and community life. As in the case of a nation, it is an "imagined community", relying on a collective narrative that links it to a territory and to a memory (Anderson 1982). Intergenerational transmission of identities is also at work.

(4) These dispersed groups of migrants (or groups stemming from migration) preserve and develop among themselves and with the society of origin, when the latter still exists, multiple exchange relations (people, goods of various natures, information, etc.) organised through networks. In this networked space, which connects essentially non-hierarchical poles - even if some are more important than others - relations among groups dispersed over several destinations tend to be horizontal rather than vertical.

(5) These diasporic migrants have an experience of dispersion including several generations after the first migration. They have transmitted their identity from one generation to the other in the "longue durée".

(6) A diaspora tend to be an autonomous social formation from the host and the origin societies thanks to her numerous cultural, political, religious, professional associations. Lobbying in favour of their origin society is not uncommon among diasporas, but also resistance against instrumentalisation by the homeland.

Against this concept of a "community" diaspora (Jewish, Greek, Armenian or Chinese diasporas, for example), Christine Chivallon (2004) sets that of a "hybrid" diaspora, distinguished very clearly from any "centred model". This "hybrid" model has been defined by Anglo-American authors on the basis of the black diaspora of the Americas, using the approaches of post-modernist cultural studies. The authors, Stuart Hall and Gilroy especially, refer to the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari and to the image of the rhizome as opposed to that of the root, i.e. to a world of dissemination and interbreeding, as opposed to a world of filiation and heritage. There is no hard core of identity nor of continuity or tradition as in the community model, but a variety of formations, respecting a logic of interbreeding. This hybrid diaspora rejects all reference to the nation and to nationalist ideologies.However, albeit for a relatively

limited period of time (1919-1945), a minority of intellectuals gravitating around Marcus Garvey and Du Bois did promote a pan-African nationalist ideology.

For a diaspora to be able to live on by transmitting its identity from one generation to the next it must, as much as possible, have places for periodic gatherings of a religious, cultural or political nature, in which it can concentrate on the main elements of its "iconography". The concept of iconography, introduced in the fifties by Jean Gottmann (1952 : 219-221), shows the importance of visible and palpable symbols, such as the monasteries that the Greeks of Pontos (Black Sea region in Turkey) reconstructed in Northern Greece. Such symbols contribute towards consolidating social networks and to preserving them during the hard times of exile. The symbols which make up an iconography are akin to three main fields, religion, political past (memory), social organization : « Religion, great historical recollections, the flag, social taboos, invested and well grounded/ anchored interests are all part of what is called iconography. » (J. Gottmann, 1952 : 136). Those symbols are the object of a virtual faith which singularizes a people as different from its neighbours, who are attached to other symbols. The rooting up of national iconography in the minds of citizens is the deeper as it is transmitted to children very early by the family and the school. It unquestionably constitutes the main factor of sociopolitical partitioning in space. It is also what allows a diaspora not to become diluted into the host society and to keep its distinct identity. This concept particularly applies to « nations », or more exactly to nationalities, within great multi-ethnic empires, such as the Ottoman or Russian. Their territorial inscription is not continuous nor homogeneous unlike what is implied by the ideal territory of a contemporary European nation-state. The case appears very close to that of the diasporas, to which it can apply with equal relevance.

These 'places', where we can find the main components of the iconography, include sanctuaries (churches, synagogues, mosques), community premises (conference rooms and theatres, libraries, sports clubs) or monuments that perpetuate memory. They also include restaurants and grocery shops, newsagents and the media (newspapers, community magazines, local radio and television stations, websites). These various places may be concentrated in the same "ethnic" neighbourhood, the same locality, or be dispersed throughout a city or some bigger territory.

Since "iconography" - in the Gottmannian sense - is the material and symbolic condensation of the intricate web of linkages between the members of a community and their territory, a perfect reproduction of its elements (e.g. reconstructing the Pontic monasteries in mainland Greece) is simply not possible: territory cannot be moved from one location to another. The material aspects of social networks that depend on locations, territories, landscapes, monuments that are usually associated with rootedness, immobility and autochthoneity, have, in the course of time, become mobile. The fact that members of a diaspora create 'places of memory' in the host country gathering the icons make it possible.

By introducing the spatial and temporal dimensions of territoriality into the concept of diaspora, it can be shown how the reproduction of memory goes hand in hand with the construction of monuments and other symbolic and, sometimes, also functional places that constitute the instruments for a re-rooting in the host country.

Four major types of diasporas

The different diasporas are distributed unequally throughout the world at the beginning of the 21st century with, at times, a generally confirmed tendency for them to be found more especially on one or several continents. In every diaspora, culture in the

widest sense - folklore, cuisine, language, literature, cinema, music, press; community life and family bonds - plays a fundamental role. Family bonds, in fact, constitute the very fabric of the diaspora, particularly in the case of diasporas stemming from Asia and the eastern Mediterranean, with their well-known extended family characteristic; similarly, the community link is always present in and constitutive of all types of diaspora. What distinguishes diasporas, however, is the unequal density of their organisational structure, and the greater or lesser influence exerted, when it still exists, by their nation of origin. Religion, enterprise, politics and a combination of race and culture are the four major domains in which these two discriminating features manifest themselves. The combination of these criteria allows a typology of diasporas to be sketched out here (four types) and illustrated with a few examples.

1) A first set of diasporas is structured around an entrepreneurial pole; everything else is subordinated to it or plays only a secondary role: the Chinese, Indian and Lebanese diasporas are the best examples of this. Religion here does not play a structuring role, essentially because of its very diversity: Christans, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists… Nor does the nation-state of origin exercise any decisive influence, for a variety of reasons: there may be several such states instead of one homeland clearly defined (Hong Kong, Taiwan, mainland China, Southeast Asia for the Chinese); it may be deliberately disengaged and intervene only in case of extreme difficulties (India); it may be too weak and divided (Lebanon). Entrepreneurship constitutes the central element of the reproduction strategy of these diasporas, most of them emerging from a colonial context in which the ruler assigned them their various commercial and enterprise activities (Indians and the Lebanese in Africa, the Chinese in Southeast Asia).

2) Another set of diasporas is that in which religion, often associated with a particular language, is the main structuring element: this is the case of the Jewish, Greek, Armenian and Assyro-Chaldean diasporas. In these cases the religion is monotheistic, and the language of a holy script or a liturgy may itself be regarded as essential. Greek and Armenian are taught alongside religion in the diaspora schools. Synagogue and Church, each with their pronounced ethnic hue, are constitutive places for these diaspora communities and where nation-states have been formed, they have exercised an increasingly stronger influence on these diasporas. Nevertheless, even where this influence is greatest, as is the case for the Greek diaspora, whose cohesion is secured by the Orthodox Church, the diaspora has managed to preserve a relative independence. When the Holy Synod of the Athens Church (1908-1922) tried to take over control of the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States, strong resistance led to restoring the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

3) A third set of more recent diasporas is organised chiefly around a political pole. This is particularly so when the territory of origin is dominated by a foreign power, and the main aspiration of the diaspora population is the creation of a nation-state. An example of this is the Palestinian diaspora: having succeeded in setting up a real state-in-exile, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO), whose objective of establishing a nation-state next to the State of Israel has already been partially achieved by the creation of the Palestinian Authority, endowed with territories that it has administered since 1994. The Palestinian diaspora's collective memory is rooted in the historical events that mark the trauma of dispersal and occupation, especially the catastrophe (*nakba*) of 1948. This is "the core event of their imagined community, the criterion of its alterity and the main founder of the diaspora" (B. Kodmani-Darwish 1997 : 194).

4) A fourth set is organised round a racial and cultural pole. This is the case, for example, of the black diaspora, which has been shaped by several attempts at defining a shared identity. Centred around the 'negro race', what separates it from the other types is, firstly, the fact that this diaspora has no direct reference to definite societies or territories of origin.

The black diaspora is defined first and foremost by socially constructed 'race', and only subsequently by culture. Whereas the definition of race is, of course, contested and subject to various debates and interpretations, as is the very conception of African Americans as a diaspora, collective memories refer to the traumatic experiences under which this diaspora formed: the slave trade and the slave economy of the plantations. Equally, few contemporary African Americans define their identity in relation to ancestral African homelands. We can also include the European Roma in this category, as they share many of the same characteristics. One commonality with the black diaspora is a decentred community structure, not unified by the transmission of a codified tradition or by political organisation, but characterised by the non-hierarchical proliferation of community segments, that is, small groups not organised as a structured society. The logic of cultural hybridization , which implies (borrowing from the host society, comes into full play in both cases amidst highly diverse host societies, even if Roma society is characterised by high degrees of endogamy and very low rates of mixed marriages. Racial discrimination and a strong tendency towards ghettoisation are also common features, as is the great difficulty of upward social mobility to escape poverty (Cortiade, Djuric, Williams 1993).

The concept of diaspora cannot be used to describe all types of scattered populations issued from a migration process : other types of social formations were to emerge in the postcolonial period and societies within migration fields. Concepts other than that of diaspora - like those of transnational communites and territories of movement - can be invoked; although they do share some characteristics with diasporas, they also have their own, specific features.

From migration field to transnational space: the Turkish example

An international migration field results from the "structured coupling of the places produced by the flows between the different points of the migration system" (L. Faret 2003 : 283). Such a field comprises the places of departure, route, settlement, re-settlement and even the places of return. This concept applies particularly well to Turkish migration in Central and Western Europe.

In the second half of the 20th century (1957-2000), more than three million Turks migrated to Western Europe, with two-thirds of them going to Germany (S. De Tapia, 1995 : 187). This was essentially an international labour migration, often the subject of agreements between States. Nevertheless, further analysis reveals this field to be relatively complex, because the subsequent migration of shopkeepers, carriers and various investors - not to mention social migrations such as family reunifications, second- and third-generation marriages, as well as collective solidarities - all superimpose themselves on labour migrations. In a subsequent phase, political migrations by asylum seekers - Kurds, Assyro-Chaldeans, Armenians, refugees of leftist parties, Alevis, etc. - have acquired ever increasing importance. There is, consequently, great diversity in the reasons for and causes of Turkish migration. The migration movement inside this field is intense, thanks to the road, seagoing and air network

forms of transport which the Turks themselves use and run, thanks to their own travel agencies, transport companies and communication satellites.

In the case of the Turks, the diaspora does not precede the emergence of the nation-state, but comes after it. Is it therefore a diaspora or, rather, a transnational migration field that favours the emergence of a transnational community? The Turkish nation-state is recent (1923); it has not yet completely succeeded in unifying the national identity of the different segments of society round a Sunni and Kemalist hard core. The high segmentation and internal disparities of Turkish society appear more in dispersion and migration than they do in the national territory where the minorities are not fully recognised and are hidden by an apparent national homogeneity. This society is a community composed of different socio-cultural milieux which, though they do interact, have also acquired their own organisational and social networks. The divisions are not only ethno-cultural, but also religious or ideological. The Kurds, whose migrations - owing to the repression directed against them since the 1980s - are increasingly political nowadays, find themselves increasingly distinguished from the other Turks and it is they, more than other Turkish-speaking Muslims, who come under the heading of diaspora (O. Wahlbeck, 2002).

It is therefore difficult to differentiate a diaspora from the economic and political migration of a people stemming from a socially segmented society and comprising notable differences of identity. The recent character of migration (since 1957) and the segmented type of society constitute obstacles to the recognition of a real diaspora. To take better account of these phenomena, researchers such as Steven Vertovec (1999) or Riva Kastoryano (2000) have suggested the concept of transnational community.

Transnational communities

In the 1990s a new concept emerged in academic discourse: "transnational community". Countries at the edge of the industrialised and tertiarised world of the major powers of the North (the United States, Canada, Western Europe, Japan), often former colonies or old countries of the Third World, send more and more migrants in search of employment and remittances to their families in their 'place of origin', with which they have kept strong ties. These rural, mostly unskilled, economic migrants set off from a village, a basic rural community, to which the migrants remain very attached and to which they return periodically. The family structure, more than the village community of origin, is essential in explaining the cohesion of these networks. Those from a rural community in a Latin American country or the Philippines, for instance, increasingly migrate to urban centres of various sizes in the United States, with a migration movement being established between this place of origin and the places of settlement and work. The migration territory also comprises relay places, most often a large city, which serve as hubs for a migratory route network: Dallas or Chicago for Mexicans from Ocampo, according to Laurent Faret (2003); Buenos Aires for the Bolivians from the Cochabamba region, according to Geneviève Cortes (1998). The strong association with these different places, thanks to the movement of the population of one village, where the dominant activity is migration in a variety of forms, constitutes a transnational migration territory.

A transnational community is based on specific mobility know-how, "migration expertise"; the inhabitants of these places, so strongly marked by migration, have made it their essential activity. The mobility of these peasants may be based on the experience of mountain husbandry, which has always had to adapt to the seasons - whether for transhumance in certain cases or, in the case of Andean peasants, because several

distinct ecological mountain levels are concerned. Peoples with a long nomadic tradition, like the Turks or Mongols, can also be moulded more easily in these transnational spaces (S. De Tapia, 1995). A transnational community links the global to the whole range of greatly different local, networking places, without hierarchy between these different hubs. The role of the border is very much curtailed by a migrant population whose essential element of identity is knowing how to first cross the border itself, pass through the border area, and then live outside it, whilst avoiding expulsion.

These migrants come from a nation-state, where they have lived for a relatively long time, returning periodically, and then investing part of their income in their village of origin where they, or at least part of their family, do not plan to quit for good. The members of a transnational community seek to acquire the citizenship of their host country, while retaining that of their country of origin. This double affiliation is not only a question of facility, but also a chosen way of life. However, there is no uprooting from the territory and society of origin, nor trauma, as in the case of diasporas. There is no strong desire to return, because transmigrants never actually leave their place of origin, with which they retain family and community ties that are greatly simplified thanks to the growth, regularity and safety of communications.

As Nancy Foner (1997) has shown for the immigrants in New York, both today and at the turn of the 20th century, modern-day transnationalism is not altogether new but has, instead, a long history. Russian Jews and Italians maintained family, economic, political and cultural links to their home societies at the same time as they developed ties within their host land. Expecting to return home one day, they sent their savings and remittances homeward and kept up their ethnic allegiances. A transnational social space already existed but it may have been harder than now to maintain contacts across the ocean. What is new is that technological changes have made it possible for immigrants to maintain more frequent and closer contact with their home societies. International business operations in the new global economy are much more common. Telephones, faxes and videotapes allow immigrants to keep in close touch with the family members, friends and business partners they left behind in the home country. With greater US tolerance for ethnic pluralism and multiculturalism, maintaining multiple identities and loyalties is now seen as a normal feature of immigrant life. Nowadays, too, a much higher proportion of these immigrants (e. g. Indians or Chinese) come with advanced education, professional skills and sometimes substantial amounts of financial capital that facilitate these transnational connections (N. Foner 1997 : 362-369).

The concept of transnational community is also used by researchers who have studied transnational nationalism, like Riva Kastoryano (2006). According to her, Turkish transnational communities live in a four-dimensional space: that of the immigration country, the country of origin, the immigrant communities themselves, and the transnational space of the European Union. The concept of "long-distance nationalism" (Anderson, 1998) refers to the nation-state of departure, Turkey, which acts on its exiled population by way of language, religion, and dual nationality. This nation-state tries to reinforce as much as possible the loyalty of its nationals residing outside its frontiers. But the transnational networks of migrant associations can bypass the states by acting directly on transnational European institutions. We can observe the emergence of a transnational space, characterized by the dense interaction of actors belonging to different traditions (Islamist and secular Turks, Alevis, Kurds, Lazes…). It is a new space of political socialization, one of identification beyond that of national societies. The European Union (EU) has created a transnational civilian society in

which national, provincial, religious and professional networks are in competition and interact between themselves, thereby promoting the logic of supranationality.

For R. Kastoryano (2006, 90), the concept of diaspora is more aptly applied to populations scattered before the making of their nation-state like Jews, Armenians, etc., for whom nationalism refers to a mythical place, a territory to be recovered, a future state-building. This rather restricted meaning takes into account the extended history of diasporas who may have built their own nation-state after a lengthy period without a state, which is exactly the case of the Jews, Greeks, and Armenians. The nation-states emerged only in 19th or 20th century Europe, and these diasporas were already in existence a long time before that. Migrations occurred often after this state-building within the former reticular space of their diaspora. But diasporas may also have emerged from the forced exile of religious or national minorities of a nation-state after its creation (for example, Tutsis of Rwanda, Assyro-Chaldeans or Kurds of Turkey, Tamil of Sri-Lanka, Tibetans of China). Such diasporas are organized around an unsettled nation-state problem; this is not the case of transnational communities which do not contest the home or host nation-state. A transnational community is economically oriented, and its political interest is restricted to the migration policies of both its home and host country. There is, equally, another form of transnational in which cross-border migrants, using a network of acquaintances, are continually circulating between their home place and a variety of host places to sell goods; this kind of quasi-nomadism requires the use of another concept, developed below.

Territories of movement

In the name of an anthropology of movement, Alain Tarrius steps from an analysis of the apparition and development of new migratory forms in Europe, studied by researchers since the eighties. Marseille is the privileged observation field of the construction of these underground international economies dealing with licit or illicit products. A world of « small migrants », « merchandise/goods conveyers », is devoted to the transportation and the trade of goods imported outside the official quotas in the European Union, of forgeries, smuggled goods, between the North African countries and France via Spain. They take advantage of spatial, economic and social closeness between South and North of the Mediterranean countries, due to the colonial and migratory past in those spaces. Localist analysis must be overcome to study those migrant societies that generate « new cosomopolitisms », now invisible or hidden, now displayed in mixity, or even cross-breeding. They result in encounters between mobile, more or less steady and enduring groups. New forms of identities then occur, founded on the capacity of multiple belonging.

"Territories of movement" (A. Tarrius, 2001) link the place where consumption goods are shipped out (for instance, in the Maghreb) to the places where they are delivered in Western Europe, within what are underground economy networks. They may seem to resemble transnational communities, in so far as they link a formerly colonised country, in which their community of origin is situated, with its previous metropolis. They are, however, actually very different. The transnational community essentially moves people who are going to "sell" their labour and send part of their wages back to their community of origin in the form of remittances. Conversely, in the territory of movement, the cross-border entrepreneurs and nomads, move with goods they loaded in their place of origin to sell in the different cities of the host country that they are familiar with. Having sometimes lived there for a lengthy period they have

been able to establish a network of acquaintances and support that can help them, the "informal notaries" of A. Tarrius (201 : 52-56).

They take commercial advantage of the wealth differential between their place of origin and their host place, circulating goods between poor and rich countries. Their expertise in moving - especially in moving goods - by crossing borders and circumventing the taxation mechanisms of the states, is as important for them as the expertise of a Mexican or Bolivian is within the migration field of a transnational community. Their host places are only points of passage or way-stations, not places of settlement and integration. The only essential place for them is that of their origin, whence they leave with their goods; they return regularly, and invest their earnings there. They never actually leave it: it is their only base. Their identity is not a diasporic one: it is a "nomadic identity" based on "partial and short-lived interbreeding" acquired in the course of the selling activity through which they socialise. In their place of origin, the link is based on family and community ties whereas, in the host and transit places, well-established local intermediaries, "informal notaries" (A. Tarrius, 2001) with diaspora experience are needed. « Those informal notaries are interlocutors who are very much valorised by regional and local, political and police authorities who actively take part in the life in emerging mosques in large Southern cities. They contribute to institutionalising uncontrolled areas, of land's ends within Schengen space, such as those identified by Italian researchers around Trieste, or Barri, Sicily, in Naples and in Milan's suburbs. » (A. Tarrius, 2001, 55). Without their intermediation nothing is possible and the smuggler cannot maintain his activity and presence on the selling places. These brokers maintain relationships with local, political and police powers, with official representatives of the migrants' home states as well as with their religious representatives, open trading and the various underground networks. They sit astride numerous borders of norms and interests.

The territories of movement and of transnational communities are produced by globalisation and result from socio-economic inequalities, which tend to increase (differences in the prices of goods and wages between countries of the North and of the South). They lock nation-states into a asymmetrical situation, one of dominating and dominated. The base in the host country, although weak in the case of territories of movement (transit place) can, on the contrary, be strong in the case of transnational communities(host place); in both cases, however, the rooting in the community of origin remains very significant and may prevail over that in the country of settlement or transit.

Originality and value of the concepts of diaspora and transnational community

The value of the diaspora concept is that it shows the sedimentation, over time, often a long period of time, of communities dispersed throughout the world, which vary considerably from one diaspora to another. These diasporas are characterised by the search for a certain cultural or religious - at times even political - unity. They have been formed, during the course of time, by several waves of migration, each of which could have different or several causes at once. It is this long-term sedimentation that makes a diaspora. This is not the case either for transnational communities, which have been formed recently owing to a call for labour, or for smugglers depending on an underground economy. Each diaspora member, wherever he is, adjusts his own cultural and social unity to the local and national features, with integration characterising intergenerational trajectories: he produces "mixities" *(métissages)*. For instance, the

Greek Americans are different from those living in Canada or Australia, owing to their various migration trajectories being combined with the integration policies of these different states. The first, second or third generations in turn produce their own different types of "mixities" within each of these host countries. There are several ways to keep one's identity in exile and dispersion, as diasporas firmly rooted in their various places of settlement have taught us. They have an exceptional symbolic and "iconographic" capital that enables them to reproduce and then overcome the obstacle of the – often considerable – distance that separates their communities. This symbolic capital lives on, in particular, in shared memory.

So the relationships between diasporas and space or territories have their own specificities. Belonging to a diaspora implies being able to live simultaneously on the transnational world scale, the local scale of the community and the scale of the host or home country, thereby combining the three scales whilst privileging one or two of these. This combination differs from one individual to another, according to their position in the genealogy of generations. For instance, the first generation, those who were born and have lived in the society of origin, tend to privilege the local scale of the host country and the national scale of the home country where they lived before their migration. The second generation takes in account more often the local and national scales of the host country, where they were born and where they have lived, and, sometimes, the transnational scale; the third generation, in search of its origins, two or three of these scales.

A diaspora looks like a patchwork of families, communities and religious networks integrated in a Territory by a nation-state, within its borders. These patchworks of families, clans, villages, cities, etc., are contained inside the borders of this nation-state where circulation, exchanges with each other, is easier inside than it is outside. The nation-state creates an arbitrary limit between the networks that are inside it and those that are outside. Diasporas, however, cannot benefit from this extraordinary tool of integration. They function, as previously mentioned, as a hinge between different spaces and different geographical scales. Their networks belong to each of the host countries, and also to a trans-state diasporic network. Their global network, with its economic, cultural, social and political functions, can play the stabilizing role that nation-states cover less and less.

Through migration, diaspora members have lost their material relationship to the territory of origin, but they can still preserve their cultural or spiritual relationship, through memory. Territory or, more precisely, territoriality, in the sense of adapting oneself to a place in the host country, continues to play an essential role. Memory preserves part of territoriality, whilst the trauma of uprooting creates conditions of mobilization that can play a substantial role in integrating and unifying various family, religious or community sub-networks into a real diaspora. The construction of commemorative monuments, sanctuaries, monasteries and other symbolic (and sometimes functional) places is an essential means, for the members of a diaspora, of a re-rooting in the host country.

Unlike people of the diaspora, transmigrants and cross-border entrepreneurs or smugglers do not seek to establish a social network destined to last, a transnational social group based on the richness of a symbolic capital and a memory transmitted from one generation to the next. They seek first and foremost to build a house in their home village and climb the social ladder there, and then in their place of settlement, when such a place exists. Transmigrants are far too dependent on their community of origin and on their host country to become as independent and creative as people of the diaspora. The social group to which they belong often does not exceed the community

of origin and the network of its migrants, whereas the people of the diaspora have the feeling of belonging to a nation-in-exile, dispersed throughout the world, and bearing an ideal. But transnational communities, like the Turkish one, are sometimes the bearers of a transnational nationalism, which appears with the interactions of their different actors and tries to influence the nation-state of their origin and that of their settlement. Dual nationality and migratory circulation within the framework of a transnational region like the EU favour the emergence of new trans-border communities differing from the long-term diasporas.

It is, for me, this relationship to places and territories which enables us to distinguish between diasporism and transnationalism. Diaspora implies a very strong anchoring in the host country and sometimes, when the home country is lost or is not accessible (Greeks of Asia Minor, Armenians, Tibetans), a clear-cut break with it. This is compensated, in the host country, by the creation of territorial markers, places of memory, favoured by an « iconography » fixing the link with the home country. That gives some kind of autonomy from host and origin societies to the diasporic social formation compared to the transnational community. In transnational spaces and territories of mobility, this break no longer exists, nor is there the need to be re-rooted elsewhere, on the host territory. A specific family has two parallel lives in two or more nation-states: the home country is dominated and the host countries, where the family has migrated, are dominant. In the autochtonous model, the fact of having« always been there » on which the nation-state is based, means that identity is constructed in close connection with place over a greater or lesser period of time. On the contrary, in a diaspora, identity pre-exists place and tries to re-create it, to remodel it, in order to reproduce itself. Individuals or communities in diaspora live in places that they have not themselves laid out and that are suffused with other identities. So they will try to set up their very own place, one that is redolent of their home place within the bosom of which their identity, that of their kinfolk, of their ancestors, has been formed. De-territorialization goes with or is followed by re-territorialization.

Bibliographic references

Anderson B. (1982), *Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London : Verso.

Anderson B. (1998), 'Long Distance Nationalism' in *The spectre of comparisons : nationalism, Southeast Asia and the world*. London : Verso.

Berthomière W., Chivallon Ch. (eds.) (2006), *Les diasporas dans le monde contemporain*. Paris : Karthala-MSHA.

Bruneau M. (2004), *Diasporas et espaces transnationaux*. Paris : Anthropos-Economica.

Chivallon C. (2004), *La diaspora noire des Amériques. Expériences et théories à partir de la Caraïbe*. Paris : CNRS-Éditions.

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

Cortes G. (1998), 'Migrations, systèmes de mobilité, espaces de vie: à la recherche de modèles', *L'Espace Géographique*, 3 : 265-275.

Cortiade M., Djuric R., Williams P. (1993), *Terres d'asile, terre d'exil: l'Europe tsigane*, numéro spécial d'*Ethnies,* 15 (8).

De Tapia S. (1995), 'L'émigration turque: circulation migratoire et diaspora', in Bruneau M. (ed.), *Diasporas*, 174-188 Paris : RECLUS-La Documentation Française.

Dufoix S. (2000), 'Note de lecture: La structuration de l'expérience collective à l'étranger', *Cahiers d'études sur la Méditerranée Orientale et le Monde Turco-Iranien*, 30 : 319-332.

Dufoix S. (2003), *Les diasporas*, Paris : Que sais-je ?, PUF.

Faret L. (2003), *Les territoires de la mobilité, Migration et communautés transnationales entre le Mexique et les États-Unis*, Paris : CNRS-Éditions.

Foner N. (1997), 'What's new about transnationalism ? New York immigrants today and at the turn of the century', *Diaspora, A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 6 (3) : 355-375.

Gottmann J. (1952), *La politique des Etats et leur géographie*, Paris : Armand Colin.

Kastoryano R. (2000), 'Immigration, communautés transnationales et citoyenneté', *Revue Internationale des Sciences Sociales*, 165 : 353-359.

Kastoryano R. (2006), 'Le nationalisme transnational turc ou la redéfinition du nationalisme par les Turcs de l'extérieur', in Berthomière W., Chivallon Ch. (eds.), *Les diasporas dans le monde contemporain*, 87-105. Paris : Karthala-MSHA.

Kodmani-Darwish, B. (1997), *La diaspora palestinienne*. Paris : PUF.

Offner J.-M., Pumain D. (ed.) (1996), *Réseaux et Territoires.* Montpellier : éditions de l'aube.

Prévélakis G. (ed.) (1996), *Les réseaux des diasporas*. Paris/Nicosie : L'Harmattan-KYKEM.

Sheffer G. (2003), *Diaspora Politics : at Home Abroad*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Tarrius A. (2001), 'Au-delà des États-nations: des sociétés de migrants'*, Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 17 (2) : 37-61.

Vertovec S. (1999), 'Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22 (2) : 447-462.

Wahlbeck O. (2002), 'The concept of diaspora as an analytical tool in the study of refugee communities', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 28 (2) : 221-238.