Nina Glick Schiller*

# Beyond the Nation-State and Its Units of Analysis:

# Towards a New Research Agenda for Migration Studies. Essentials of Migration Theory**

* University of Manchester, UK, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology[1]. E-mail: Nina.GlickSchiller@manchester.ac.uk

Nina Glick Schiller: Beyond the Nation-State and Its Units of Analysis: Towards a New
Research Agenda for Migration Studies. Essentials of Migration Theory, Bielefeld: COMCAD,
2007

(Working Papers – Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development; 33)

## Introduction

On a phone booth in Manchester, England – where I now live as a transmigrant – I saw an advertisement. "Send money home from closer to home" it read. It went on to announce that you can now send funds to locations around the world from any British post office. The British Post Office now competes for the lucrative business of sending migrant remittances while Spanish banks extend mortgages to migrants living in Spain who are building houses "back home" in Ecuador and elsewhere in Latin America (Escalante 2007). This facilitation of migrants' money transfers and homeland investments is echoed in the policies of powerful globe-spanning financial institutions such as the World Bank, which have proclaimed migrant remitters as the new agents of international development (Lapper 2007; Heine 2006). Researchers of development and migration, while noting the possibilities and contradictions of migrant remittances on sending and receiving localities, take for granted that migrants are both local and transnational actors (Dannecker 2007; Faist 2007; Fauser 2007; Guarnizo 2007; Khadria, 2007; Østergaard-Nielsen 2007; Raghuram 2007).

Yet politicians and the mass media in Europe and the United States focus their concern primarily on questions of "integration," seeing migrants' transnational ties as threats to "national security," attacking migrants for their supposed lack of loyalty to their new homeland. Migrants are also portrayed as threats to the nation through their effects on national economies, draining them of resources and services. Politicians, demagogic leaders, and media personalities blame migrants for national economic problems including the growing disparity between rich and poor, the shrinking of the middle class, the reduction in the quality and availability public services and education, and the rising costs of health care and housing. Calls for tightening borders and ending the influx of migrants are widespread and countries around the world are shutting their doors in the faces of people desperate to flee war, rape, and pillage. Rates of deportation are rising dramatically. Within these anti-migration discourses, little is said about either migrants' provision of vital labor, services, and skills to their new land or migrants' role in the reproduction of workforces --including their sustenance, housing, education and training --in countries around the world. These populations then provide labor used and exploited as temporary or permanent workers –from highly skilled to unskilled—in other nation-states.

What is the response of migration theorists to this set of contradictory positions on migration on the part of corporate and political interests? To date, I would argue, migration scholars have not developed a critical perspective adequate to make sense of the contradictions. They have not developed a global perspective that can place within the same analytical

framework international migration and development debates, policies and discourses, national rhetorics on migration and refugee policies, and migration scholarship. Instead, migration scholars have adopted the perspective of their respective nation-states

Much of the European and US scholarship on migration confine themselves to the questions of "how well do they fit into our society" "what are the barriers that keep them from fully joining us," or "which cultures or religions don't fit in." In these analyses, migrants' tendencies to cultural persistence and ethnic organization, attributed to either their identity politics or to a reactive ethnic response to discrimination, become the independent variable that determines the degree of fit for migrants within the context of a specific nation-state. As Michael Bommes (2005:7) has noted "assimilationists conceptualise …society as a big national collective." In the United States, migration scholars who see themselves as pro-immigration increasingly embrace what I call "born-again assimilationism" to show that migrants do indeed become part of the national fabric and contribute to it (Alba and Nee 2003: Borjas 2001; Smith 2006; Waldinger 2006). In Europe, the term used is integration, which is often differentiated from assimilation (Bommes 2005; Esser 2001; 2003; 2006). But whether the concept being deployed is integration or assimilation, most scholars of migration reflect and contribute to an approach to the nation-state that poses a nation and its migrants as fundamentally and essentially socially and culturally distinct. It is likely that future scholars will demonstrate that the revival of assimilationist theory and the "new" integrationism at the beginning of the 21st century, rather than being advance in social science, reflected the neoliberal project of restructuring of nation-states. Rescaled but not replaced in relationship to regional and global reorganizations of economic and political power, nation-states with the assistance of their migration scholars, began as they at the turn of the 20th century, to build their national identities at the expense of immigrants.

Even the scholars of transnational migration, including those who highlight migrant's roles in transnational development projects, are now concluding with reassurances that migrant transnational activities are relatively minimal or contribute to their integration into the nation-state in which they have settled (Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; R. Smith 2006). They have not provided a perspective on migration that explains why within a neo-liberal globally restructured economy, development policies look to migrant remittances to sustain impoverished communities, while at the same time the national policies of states in various regions of the world restrict migration and the movement of workers and define migrants as a fundamental challenge to the nation-states of settlement.

The purpose of this paper is investigate and critique the methodological nationalism that lies at the foundation of much of migration scholarship and to argue for its replacement with a

global power perspective on migration. By global perspective I mean an analytical framework rather than a systems theory. The analytical framework must be able to theorize the reproduction, movement, and destruction of various kinds of capital and human popula-tions across national borders and look at the construction of social relations, institutions, sys-tems of governance and modes of identification in particular localities and across space and time. Such a framework will allow us to identify contradictions and disjunctures in contempo-rary scholarship as well as forms, spaces, ideologies, and identities of resistance to oppres-sive and globe spanning relations of unequal power. The position the paper advocates reso-nates with those migration scholars who advocate institutional analyses of contemporary migration policies and discourses but goes beyond it by proposing a framework that can link contempo-rary forces of capitalist restructuring to the specific localities within which migrants live and struggle. Authors such as Andrew Geddes( 2003) have argued that rather than examining the specific backgrounds of immigrants, migration and migration policy is best understood by examining the national and EU perspectives on migration and integration. Jane Freedman (2004) adopts a similar perspective in discussing the French relationship to migration. Bom-mes (2005:3-4) argues for "a concept of modern world society, i.e. a society that is function-ally differentiated in different realms (like the economy, politics, law, science, education, health etc.) and modern organizations."

In this paper I extend this argument further, noting that the methodological nationalism of many migration scholars precludes them from accurately describing the transnational social fields of unequal power that an integral to the migrant experience. Because their scholarship is built on units of analysis that developed within nation-state building projects, few migration scholars situate national terrains and discourses within an analysis of the restructuring of the global economy, the rescaling of cities, and the rationalization of a resurgent imperialist a-genda.  The irony, of course, is that in a period during which many areas of scholarship have developed an analysis of uneven and unequal globalization, migration scholars who study globe spanning flows of people remained inured within concepts of society and culture that reflect essentialist and racialized concepts of nation.

A global power perspective on migration facilitates the description of social processes by introducing units of analysis and research paradigms that are not built on the essentialism of much of migration discourse. An alternative approach to migration studies that builds on a global power perspective would include: (1) scalar perspectives on locality; (2) transnational fields of power and (3) multiple entry points and pathways of local and transnational incorpo-ration. None of these approaches are dependent on the divide between the nation-state and migrants. In other papers, I have addressed the concept of multiple pathways of local and

transnational incorporation and examined the pathway of fundamentalist Christianity within a scalar perspective on locality (Glick Schiller (2005a; Glick Schiller, Çaglar and Guldbrandsen 2006a; b). I have also addressed the relationship between methodological nationalism and different disciplines including migration studies (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a; b). In this paper, after critiquing the methodological nationalism of migration studies historically and substantively, I further explore the concepts of transnational fields of power that restructure locality.

I want to be clear from the very beginning that by eschewing methodological nationalism and establishing a global framework for the study of migrant settlement and transnational connection, I am not saying that the nation-state is withering away. I argue that transformations in the positioning of nation-states within global fields of power affect the processes through which migrants move, settle, and maintain transnational connection. My particular interest is the contemporary restructuring of capital that is repositioning the specific localities from which migrants leave and in which they settle in relationship to global fields of power (Glick Schiller and Çaglar 2006). To understand the restructuring of globe spanning institutional arrangements including the changing role and continuing significance of states, we need a perspective that is not constrained by the borders of the nation-state.

## The Methodological Nationalism of Migration Studies: Rooted Concepts

A growing number of social theorists have argued that methodological nationalism has been central to much of western social science (Beck 2000, Beck and Sznaider 2006; Martins 1974; Smith 1983; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a, 2002b). Methodological nationalism is an ideological orientation that approaches the study of social processes and historical processes as if they were contained within the borders of individual nation-states. Nation-states are conflated with societies and the members of those states are assumed to share a common history and set of values, norms, social customs, and institutions. Some writers label this orientation the *container* theory of society to highlight that most social theorists, including Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Talcott Parsons, have contained their concept of "society" within the territorial and institutional boundaries of the nation-state (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Black 1994; Wolf 1983; Urry 2000). I find the term *methodological nationalism* more useful, however, because it reminds us that conventional "objective" social theory harbors a political position and that researchers routinely identify with the concerns and discourses of their own nation-state.

In migration studies methodological national facilitates: (1) the homogenization of national culture (2) the homogenization of migrants into ethnic groups--seen as bearers of discrete cultures –who arrive bearing cultural, class, and religious differences; and (3) the use of national statistics organized so that ethnic difference appears as an independent variable in the reporting of levels of education, health status, degrees of employment, and level of poverty. In other words as they are currently constituted, migration studies and their ethnic studies counterparts contribute to the reinvigoration of contemporary nation-state building projects (Brubaker 2004; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a; b).

Casting the difference between native and foreigner in ethnic cultural terms has become so common place that it requires historical scholarship to recover a consciousness of cultural difference within cities and states that was not formulated in ethnic terms. Isin Engin (2006:328) notes that in Europe there was a dramatic change in the way the disreputable urban population was depicted and distinguished from the upstanding citizen.

> [H]istorical differences through which difference itself has been constituted in theorizing the European city is important. The manner in which the difference is constituted understood and expressed show remarkable historical discontinuities. It is noteworthy to observe, for example, how, with a few decades, understanding of difference in the city shifts quite radically from the manners and habits of the working classes in the 1840s to the manner and habits of the immigrants in the 1920s. It is not that the categories 'immigrants' and 'working classes' are mutually exclusive or interchangeable but discourse in the 1920s decisively shifts to racializing and ethnicizing those who arrived in the city in a manner that was inconceivable in the 1840s.

At the beginning of this period of globalization scholars such as Fredrick Ratzell (1882) treated all movements of people across the terrain as a single phenomena linked to the distribution of resources across space. Ratzell did not distinguish between internal and international migrations because national borders were not central to his analysis of human movement. His writing reflected of the assumptions of his times, namely that the movements of people within Europe, and across the Atlantic from Europe and the Middle East to North and South America, were normal and natural. The emerging science of demography began to examine an array of factors that affect migrant flows and patterns of settlement including specificities of locality of departure and origin.

The fact that migrants came and went, maintained their home ties by sending home money to buy land, initiate businesses and support families and village projects by remittances was understood as a typical aspect of migration. Workers migrated into regions in which there was industrial development and returned home or went elsewhere when times were bad. England, Germany, Switzerland, France, the United States, Brazil, and Argentina built industrialized economies with the help of millions of labor migrants who worked in factories, fields,

mills, and mines. In general, during that era of globalization and imperial penetration, most European countries abolished the passport and visa system they had installed in the first half of the 19th century. France took the lead in eliminating such barriers to the free movement of labor in 1861. By 1914 all such documents for entry into another country had been virtually eliminated in Europe (Torpey 2000). The United States did not restrict migration from Europe and required neither passports nor visas.[1]

During the period between 1880s and World War I, the world experienced increased economic integration and flows of capital, goods, ideas, information, and people. Also, in ways similar to today, the growth of finance capital through international investment including the development of military technologies and control of natural resources affected the globe unevenly. The power of finance capital allowed the domination of certain states over the economies of others, intensified disparities of wealth and power, and forced individual and families to migrate.

During that period of unequal globalization, many states were locked in fierce competition for control of far-reaching transnational commercial networks. Colonial projects were the basis of the accumulation of nationally-based capital. The wealth of nations, as well as much of the workforce of many nations, was produced elsewhere.

This was the context within which governmental regimes increasingly deployed the concept of nation, national unity, and national economy in ways that obscured the transnational basis of their nation-state building projects. The people who lived in these states faced novel pressures to use a single national language, identify with a national history, understand their practices and beliefs as part of national culture, and be willing to sacrifice their lives for the national honor. This was a period in which national institutions including schools, railroads, militaries, banking, and postal services were being developed or refined and nation-states were being marketed and celebrated through national and international expositions.

Faced with their contradictory experience of their uneven insertion in transnational social fields of wealth and power and the growing rhetorical power of blood and nation, both inter-

---

[1] The restrictions on entry of persons from China beginning in 1882 were the precursors of efforts at broader restrictive legislation but the gate was not shut against most migration until the 1920s. The 1917 law not only continued the Chinese exclusion but kept most people from Asia from entering. Thee bulk of the restrictive legislation that followed was based on nationality until 1965 . Migrants were categorized by country of origin; tens of thousands of some nationalities were admitted while no more than 100 of other "national origins" including Greek, Bulgarian, Palestinian, and Australian. Most public discussions of migrants from the 1920s identified migrants by their "nationality," popularizing the dividing line between Americana and those identified by other national origins.

national migrants and citizens of migrant receiving states sought explanations for the rapid changes they were experiencing. Explanations and social movements that could speak to global transformations flourished including international socialism, anarchism, feminism, nationalism, scientific racism, and anti-imperialism developed (Bodnar 1985; Gabaccia and Ottanelli 2001; Potts 1990; van Holthoon and van der Linden 1988). However, state officials, politicians, and intellectuals supported nationalist ideologies that portrayed individuals as having only one country and one identity. In so doing, they contributed to the view that immigrants embodied cultural, physical, and moral differences that merited study. It was at the moment, and in conjunction with the mounting pressure to delineate national borders more firmly by closing them, that a scholarship of immigrant settlement became delineated. Within this literature, the transnational social fields of migrants and their engagement in internationalism and other forms of non-state based social movements increasingly were seen as problematic, and finally disappeared from view  Current scholarship on migrant incorporation and transnational connection continues to be shaped not only by the past approaches to migration settlement but also by the founding and current historical conjunctions in which migrant-receiving states are legitimating and privileging the national identities and discourses of these states.

By the 1920s, two related sets of discursive moves contributed to a migration scholarship that essentialized natives and foreigners and created the nation-state and its international migrants as the two units of analysis that were fundamental to migration studies. In the first place, disciplinary divides were instituted. Given the heritage of these disciplinary divides and their scholarships, it is easy to forget that not only did nation-state building and the advent of migration studies occur simultaneously but also that they were part of the same process. Historians recounted the unfolding of discreet and organic national destinies within which national, labor, and ethnic histories were each constituted as discrete fields of study. International relations became the study of formal political relationships between nation-states. Scholars of migration differentiated between populations of differing "national origin" (Schermerhorn 1949). [2] Secondly, within the specific literatures on migration—which itself became divided between demographers and geographers who studied movement between nation-

---

[2] This tradition in history continues despite a vibrant counter-narrative that can be found in the seminal work of Thistleworth (1990) and is represented in the scholarship of Bodnar (1985), Cinel (1991) Gabaccia and Ottanelli (2001), and Montgomery (1987). In main stream political science an effort to think about transnational forces was initiated by Joseph Nye (1976) and an alternative political sociology building on Marx and Lenin developed world systems theory and dependency theory. But these did little to disturb nation-state based analysis of the disciplines until the growth of the globalization literature of the 1990s.

states and sociologists who studied settlement and assimilation—several complementary but differentiated logics were deployed: a) Migration research was situated exclusively within national territories; (b) concepts of national origin were racialized as national stocks—an approach which incorporated and legitimated the "scientific racism" of migration studies; (c) assimilationist theory was developed within the hegemonic narrative of race and nation; and (d) the ethnic lens developed as national stocks came to be seen as differentiated by culture

## (a) Migration research as projects situated in national territories

Incorporating their commitment to the nation-state into their developing social science of migration at the beginning of the 20th century, scholars began to view migrants as threatening the state's national cultural and religious homogeneity. Demographers tracked, collected, and compared statistics for the population of each state, concerned with delineating the "natural" population growth through birth and death. They differentiated such changes from those brought about because people immigrated into the state from "foreign parts" or emigrated out of the state. In popularizing the "natural" growth of population within the borders of a nation-state and comparing it to growth by migration that required explanation because it was not organic to the state, these scholars helped develop and popularize the sharp division between native and foreigner and the nation-state as the unit of analysis.[3]

Meanwhile, despite detailed studies of migrants' local settlement and their transnational family ties, scholars of the city contributed to a theoretical framework that situated migrants as social problems within the terrain of nation-states. For example, William Thomas and Florian Zanecki began their 1918 book, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, which actually describes the transnational settlement strategy of four Polish families, with the following concern:

> Among the questions included in the relatively unformulated field of social science ....
> are immigration; race prejudice; cultural assimilation; the comparative mental and
> moral worth of races and nationalities; crime, alcoholism, vagabondage, and other
> forms of anti-social behavior; nationalism and internationalism, class-
> hiearchization;...the rate of individualization without social disorganization; the unre-
> flective social cohesion brought about by traditions as compared to reflective social

---

[3] Fredrich Ratzell (1897), the same German geographer whose initial approach to migration had stressed the significance of resources rather then borders, went on fifteen years after his initial theory to publish a political geography that positioned states as natural units of demographic growth.

> co-operation brought about by the rational selection of common ends and means; the introduction of new and desirable attitudes and values without recourse to the way of revolution… We are convinced of the necessity of approaching these and other social problems by isolating given societies and studying them, first, in the totality of their objective complexity, and then comparatively" (p8)

Here we can see the call to study national terrains as "societies," the concern for the social cohesions of these "societies" and the situating of immigrants as problematic elements that must be studies within the domains of this sociality. In the period between the world wars, an era of revolution, depression, and social upheaval in both Europe and the Americas, anti-immigrant legislation was bolstered by casting foreigners as threatening to national unity and colonial stability because they imported ideologies of communism, anarchism, or national liberation.

## (b) From national origins to national stocks—developing the "scientific essentialism" of migration studies

By confining the subject of study to those migrants who crossed national borders, rather than studying all human movement, migration scholars contribute to the classification of migrants by national origin. There been insufficient examination of the fact that theorization about migrant settlement globally has been shaped by the early 20th century US discourse where racial difference was used to justify a significant restriction of migration. Ironically, during that period the United States, now often referred to as the paradigmatic immigrant state, closed its doors more rapidly and more completely than most of Europe. The scientific racism that had been developing for several decades as part of a global dialogue about natural selection and states, dominated discussions of immigration in the United States. Certain nationalities were held to be so racially inferior to the "native stock" of Anglo-Americans that they should be denied entry. By the 1920s-30s, when the study of immigrant settlement in a new locality began to emerge as an important focus of the newly developing US sociology, the easy equation of nations with races had become embedded in both sociological theorization and political rhetoric (Dillingham Commission 1909-1911).[4] Each nation could be ranked in terms of its degree of civilization and desirable characteristics. This new scientifically credentialed

---

[4] The "national quotas" written into US immigration law at that time remained in place until 1965.

essentialism contributed to the efforts to define nation-states as essentially racially and culturally homogenous.

Migrants' cultural background was conflated with their religious affiliation so that individuals classified as Italian or Polish, for example, were thought of as sharing with their compatriots common cultural values in which their Catholicism played an important role. The national cultures of the migrants were understood by many during this period to be a product of different racial stocks. While men like Robert Park, William Thomas, and Louis Wirth were in no way racists, their scholarship none the less lent credence to the new "scientific racism" of the times, since they used the terms nationalities and races interchangeably in their writings (Persons 1987).

## (c) National stocks, national territories, and the development of assimilationist theory

The US discourse and its conflation of race and nationality comfortably echoed the racial distinctions drawn by colonial powers between the national cultures of the imperial mother countries and the colonized (Qinjano 2003; Balibar 1991. The language of race simultaneously justified imperial adventures abroad while contributing to the cross-class political unity of the population of the nation-states that were centers of imperialism (Horsman 1981; Takaki 1990). Projections of colonized racialized others, for example, contributed to the construction of the "British Race" (Miles 1993; Stoller 1989).[5] The scholarship that documented racial difference between nations was the product of a transnational conversation that involved European, US scholars, and Latin American intellectuals from several emerging fields including medicine, eugenics, psychiatry, anthropology, and sociology.

The popularity of the essentialism of the pre-world war II social science confronted scholars of immigrant settlement with the need to resolve the contradiction between the projection of racialized difference between native and foreigner and the mandate of assimilation. Clearly, if culture was biologically based, assimilation was not possible. Different countries that had

---

[5]. Perhaps the earliest efforts on the part of Europeans to define themselves nationally in counter-distinction to a racialized colonized "other" are found in the English colonization of Ireland (Smedley 1999; Allen 1994). The racial differences that came to be seen as separating the Irish from the English legitimated the oppression of the people of Ireland; the dynamics of oppression simultaneously created the conceptions of the Irish and the English races and fundamentally linked notions of race and nationality.

been or were experiencing large scale migrations dealt with these contradictory ideologies in somewhat different ways. In countries in Latin America, for example, which experienced large scale migration from Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, "race mixing" was advocated. The intellectuals and political leaders accepted the idea that nations were biologic ally differ-ent, that some were superior, and that assimilation was necessary. Their answer was to call for the emergence of new national races in Latin America in which the Spanish "stock" of the original colonists mixed with and improved the nature and culture of the newcomers.

Scholars in the United States, particularly those who consciously developed a new urban sociology, took a different path. Although they tended to use the language of race, they coun-tered the public rhetoric of immutable racial difference and consequent undesirability of cer-tain nationalities and argued for social and cultural assimilation as an inevitable, natural, and desirable process. However, they posited that it would be easier for some nationalities than others to become "American" (Commons 1907)[6]. Their approach reinforced the conception that national populations were uniform in their culture. Class tended to disappear as a topic of inquiry.

Those social scientists who were supportive of immigrants framed their settlement in terms of a gradual but inevitable assimilation, assessing the "progress" of their settlement in terms of the attenuation of separate migrant institutions. This analytical framework posited migrant institutions as indicators of an incomplete or inadequate integration into the mainstream so-cial and cultural life of the societies of settlement. By deploying this framework, migration scholars constructed a literature on US "nationalities" and immigrant communities that mini-mized simultaneity: the fact that pathways of social and cultural incorporation and migrant religious and cultural institutions and practices could developed together rather than in oppo-sition to each other. Meanwhile the mainstream remained unproblematized.

---

[6] For an analysis of the initial US sociological conception of assimilation see Kivisto (2004) and Persons (1987).

## (d) The Ethnic Lens[7]

Post-World War II social science, in forms ranging from Parsonian social systems theory to modernization theory, continued to legitimate and popularize the conflation of the concept of society with the nation state. This mode of analysis was encapsulated in Milton Gordon's 1964 description of *Assimilation in American Life" The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins,* a text which is currently being rediscovered and celebrated. Gordon, an American sociologist whose assimilationist model was one of the most carefully worked out and sophisticated of its day, posited for the purpose of theory building a completely homogenous host society.

Much of the assimilationist approach was apparently set aside when the national liberation struggles and the struggles of people of color for political and cultural recognition of the 1960s popularize a new identity politics. Debates, which resonate today, began between scholars such as Issacs, (1975) who argued for the inherent and inherited nature of ethnicity and those who took a constructionist position. While even the first wave assimilationists had noted that ethnic identities and institutions were often formed as part of the initial settlement process, the second wave of US migration scholars accepted this cultural pluralism as a constitutive element of the national society (Glazer and Moynihan; Glick Schiller 1977).

The pluralist, as did their assimilationist predecessors, and the multiculturalists of the 1980s, assumed that there were immigrant communities—now designated ethnic groups—and that these were the obvious unit of analysis for the study and analysis of migration and settlement.[8] In so doing, they reinforced the division between the nation-state and its others that was embedded in the historic nation-state building process. The goal of multicultural scholars has been to broaden the national narrative to include diverse histories; they have not critiqued the restraints that a nation-state building project imposes on a researchers' ability to describe and analyze important social processes. Multiculturalists' portrayal of communal homogeneity was paralleled by an assumption that the receiving nation-state also constituted

---

[7] Sections of this paper build on papers I have co-authored with Ayse Caglar. See Schiller and Caglar (2006; forthcoming).

[8] Until the 1960s the term nationality was more widely known and more precisely reflected the methodological nationalist bias of migration research. Reference to migrant groups as nationalities in contrast to indigenous culturally differentiated groups that have been designated national minorities is still part of European migration discourse. The transformation in the US migration literature of nationalities to ethnic groups was a discursive move that placed populations defined by cultural difference completely within US national space without reference to their transnational connections.

a homogeneous cultural and social unit (Kymlicka and Norman 2000). Migration scholars and those who address issues of migrant cultural diversity, whether defending or critiquing the development of ethnic institutions generally have remained within a national narrative (Takaki 1993; Vertovec 2005; Castles and Davidson 2000).

Today, the ethnic group as the primary unit of analysis with which to study and describe migration settlement, transnational migration, and diaspora remains in place. This remains true despite a voluminous historical and ethnographic literature that details the constructed nature of ethnic identities and ethnic group boundaries, detailed ethnographies of institutional processes through which ethnic categories and identities are constructed and naturalized by local and transnational actors, and copious descriptions of divisions based on class, religion, region of origin, or politics among the members of the supposedly "same" group (Barth 1969; Brubaker 2004; Çaglar 1990, 1997; Glick Schiller 1977, 1999; Glick Schiller et al. 1987a, 1987b; Gonzalez 1988; Hill 1989; Kastoryano 2002; Rath and Kloosterman 2000; Sollors 1989).

Studies of what researchers often call ethnic "communities" document divisions based on class, gender, generation, religion, region of origin, or politics among members of the "same" group. The divisions and different identities within a population assumed to share a common national origin and identity are sharp, emotionally laden, and often persistent or recurring. Many decades of research on immigrant settlement demonstrate that communities are ideologies of connection that develop only in particular times and places. Yet persistent use of the word community as synonymous with the term ethnic group compounds the problem because it contributes to defining a particular mode of settlement and identification before the research has been conducted. The possibility of assessing the actual degree of heterogeneity in migrants' identities, practices and social ties is at best made more difficult and at worst forestalled. Identities practices and social ties that migrants establish with natives and other migrants are excluded because of the unit of analysis. Even those scholars, who begin their study by critiquing the ethnic group as a unit of analysis or demonstrating the constructed nature of ethnic boundaries, present their data as the study of a population identified ethnically as Turks, Moroccans, Kurds, Haitians, Brazilians (Glick Schiller 1977; Glick Schiller et al 1987a; b; Glick Schiller and Fouron 1999; Østergaard-Nielsen 2001; Salih 2003). [9]

---

[9] Some of the scholarship on migrant youth/popular culture in gateway cities are an exception to this ethnic and diasporic research design (Caglar 1998; Sencher 2000; Soysal 2001; Nedim 2004).

The multicultural moment in the US and Britain and the fears about integration in Germany and France all have served to conflate discussions of migration processes and concerns about ethnic segregation, isolation, or ghettoization. Some scholars such as Stephen Castles (Castles and Miller 1993; Castles and Davidson 2000) moved from an initial concern with the migration process as a globally shared migrant experience to discussions of "ethnic mobilization", "ethnic politics" and "ethnic minorities." The use of ethnic groups as units of analysis is a logical but unacceptable consequence of the methodological nationalism of mainstream migration studies.

Among the deficits of confining migration studies to a study of ethnic group settlement is the loss of crucial insights about the role of the sending and receiving localities in the formulation of migrant pathways of settlement and the shaping of migrant identities. Even though many studies of migrant settlement and transnational connection are actually studies of particular localities, because the ethnic group remains the unit of analysis the data is transmogrified from a study of specific city to a study of a culture  (Mandell 1990; White: 1999; Çağlar 1995; Werbner 1990; 2002). Because of the problematic framing of the study in ethnic terms, the significance of the urban structure and its transformations in shaping migrant pathways of incorporation is disregarded, although urban restructuring is clearly a critical element of the description and analysis in both classic US studies or more recent descriptions of migrant pathways of settlement and connection based in New York, Boston, Manchester, or Berlin  ( Çaglar 1997; Gans 1965; Glazer and Moynihan 1963; Levitt 2001a; Smith 1998; Werbner 1990).

Moreover, not necessarily because it was the intention of the researcher but because of the way in which migration research is framed and discussed, data on an immigrant population in a particular city—"the Irish" or "Mexicans" New York City, the "Dominicans" or "Italians" in Boston, "Pakistanis" in Manchester or "Russians" in Berlin have become metonymic of a specific ethnic group in an entire nation-state. The global scalar positioning and subsequent rescaling of New York, Boston, Manchester, or Berlin, as it shapes local actors—migrant and non-migrant, is not addressed. Locality of settlement is neither problematized nor researched.

The research on migrant economic incorporation through small business ownership or employment provides a case of point in the ways in which using the ethnic group as a unit of analysis hinders the development of a global power perspective on migrant local and transnational pathways of incorporation. There is a rich and valuable literature on migrant economy, migrant business and entrepreneurialism (Bonacich and Modell 1980; Light 1972; Waldinger 1986; 1996 Wilson and Portes 1980; JEMS 2007). Having reduced the study of

the relationship of the migrant in the city to the ethnic community, researchers have debated the centrality of the ethno-cultural characteristics of the migrant groups in the analysis of their economic activity and incorporation. In the ethno-cultural characteristics perspective, researchers emphasized factors such as the historical business experience of each ethnic group settling in the city and the cultural resources they can bring to bear in their entrepreneurial activities. Such an approach has led to investigations of the compatibility of migrants' religious beliefs and practices to entrepreneurial activities, as well as their ability to organize themselves on the basis of social networks and trust relations particularly suitable for small business. The contextual and historical structuring of the city that shape the dynamics of business growth and expansion have been assessed only in terms of their contributions to the growth of ethnic enclaves, the relations between ethnic groups, or the discrimination faced by an ethnic group. The research has been circumscribed by the exclusion of the larger political economic forces that continually restructure every locality and all entrepreneurial activities within it. While many scholars have made potent critiques of the concepts of the ethnic enclave economy and ethnic businesses, they have continued to use the ethnic group and the national economy as units of analysis (Waldinger 1986, 1996).[10]

## Transnational community studies: Haunted by the spirit of methodological nationalism

Beginning in the 1990s, several bodies of literature that addressed migration attempted to shed the construct of methodological nationalism. These included transnational, diaspora, and global cities studies. Those of us who developed transnational migration research repudiated container theorists and the assimilationist biases of their migration studies (Rouse 1990; Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc 1994). Our goal was not to merely describe patterns of living across borders but to develop social theory that did not use the nation-state as the primary unit of analysis. Linda Basch, Christian Szanton Blanc and I proposed tracing transnational social fields as they were constructed within relationships of uneven power that could extend globally. We defined social field as a networks of networks without specifying a

---

[10] See a similar concern in Rath and Kloosterman (2000). Despite the relevant questions about the ownership and control in migrant business activities and the critique of the criteria used to differentiate the ethnic and the non-ethnic bases of business activity in particular places, these scholars have not developed a theory of locality. Their discussions have remained at the level of nation-states and the opportunities states provide to migrant business and entrepreneurs.

particular set of cultural practices or identities contained within them. This represented a departure from the wide-spread tendency in ethnic studies to conflate social identities with social relations. Instead we consistently separated out the social practice, which I have called *ways of being*, from identity politics. Identity politics can be thought of as *ways of becoming* (Glick Schiller 2003 :). We thought that by tracing specific transnational fields, which linked individuals to the economic, political, social, religious, and cultural institutions of more than one nation-state, we were making an analytical leap. We were moving beyond a bounded approach to social relations that conflated the nation state with society.

In an effort to conceptualize a fully developed transnational way of life, scholars spoke of "dense multiple social relations" "simultaneous incorporation," "transnational space," "transnational social formations," "transnational living" and "transnational communities" (Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc 1994; Guarnizo 1997, 2003; Faist 2000; Kearney 1991, Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004; Pries 2001; 2007; Vertovec 1999). Comparisons between a dense form of transnational connection and single purpose transnational domains became the topic of survey research that documented "the uneven distribution" of political action and economic activity within a migrant population, and strong and weak forms of transnational connection (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003: 1238; Portes, Guarnizo and Haller 2002).

At first it seemed that this new wave of research would provide a whole new perspective on migration that challenged—not the existence of nation-states but the propensity to use nation-states and national or ethnic identities as units of analysis. But methodological nationalism reasserted itself within transnational migration studies.

Transnational migration and diaspora theory has been both shaped by and reflected the contradictions of contemporary uneven globalization and its concomitant rebirths of nationalism. The first wave of transnational migration studies actually opened the way by only examining the social fields of populations identified by national origin or cultural difference. Transnational migration scholars tend to explore the ties or identifications that connect migrants to home rather than analyze broader global processes and migrant interconnections. Meanwhile, diaspora studies perpetuated the foundational essentialism of migration studies by defining their field within conceptualizations of blood and nation. Their focus was on the persistence of identity among people who shared a common ancestry (Karim 2007).[11] Some scholars reified this approach and began to talk of transnational or diasporic community, as-

---

[11] For a similar critique see Floya Anthias (1998)

suming rather than probematizing the process of building transnational identities. The term transnational community soon was understood as a gloss for a transborder linkage of people who shared national ancestry, despite the fact that initial studies that deployed the term were concerned with specific translocal ties.

Some of this initial work on specific translocal ties and hometown associations that stretched between a specific village in a homeland and a particular city of settlement had the potential to contribute to a global perspective on migration (Levitt 2001a; Smith 1998). It could have initiated new explorations of the dynamic tension between global restructuring of locality, migration flows and forms of local and transnational incorporation, and the role of migrant agency in shaping locality. Unfortunately, scholars of transnational migration developed independently of contemporary urban political geography that developed a scholarship of urban restructuring and rescaling to address the global institution of a neo-liberal agenda. Consequently most scholars of transnational migration have not responded to the challenge to examine a specific locality of departure and settlement within transborder processes and globe spanning fields of power.[12] Transnational community studies centered on questions of identity, belonging, and citizenship.

Few researchers noted the significance of locality in shaping migrants' transnational social and economic fields. Much of the richness of local studies in the transnational literature, as in the ethnic group literature, has been lost by a facile use of local data as representative of national patterns of immigrant settlement. "Dominicans" were studied in New York and Boston but the focus was on persisting Dominican identities and connections rather than on how Dominican migrants experienced and were shaped by the global repositioning of the two cities (Levitt 2001; Guarnizo 1997). Or Dominicans in New York City and Providence could be compared with Colombians in New York City and Salvadorians in Los Fangless and Washington DC (Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003) as if any urban location could serve as a proxy for settlement in the United States. Whether researchers began with the concept transnational social field, space, or community, if they situated their analysis only within a sending and receiving state and privileged ethnicity as the basis of transnational connection, they left no conceptual space for studying non-ethnic incorporation, the differential structuring of locality, or social fields of power not based on state institutions.

---

[12] Ayse Caglar's ( 2006) study of hometown association is an exception to this general trend. By examining the restructuring of a specific Turkish city in response to global flows of capital, Caglar was able to explain the situations in which hometown associations may develop and flourish.

In contrast to this general failure of transnational migration scholar to theorize locality, Michael Peter's Smith (2001) has developed a concept of transnational urbanism. However, although Smith's work builds on a careful analysis of specific transnational actors engaged in political projects in a Mexican state and in specific localities in southern California, the theoretical focus of the work is to generate a new category of urbanism. The strength of this approach is that it recognizes that localities rather than confined to their geography are built within transnational fields of power. The weakness of the concept is that the category of transnational urbanism readily becomes an ideal type, rather than an analytical tool through which to study specific localities and their various positionings as a result of regional history and global restructuring.

There has been an increasing effort to move the study of transnational migrant networks beyond the ethnic lens. Some scholars focused on transnational family ties but generally they too identified the population they were tracing in terms of ethnic or national origins (Bryceson and Vuorela 2005; Chamberlain and Leydesdorff 2004; Salih 2003). The growing study of transnational religion offers promise to move beyond the ethnic lens (Glick Schiller 2006). Christian and Muslim migrants in specific contexts of settlement develop social fields built on religious rather than ethnic concepts of identity. However to develop this analysis, researchers need to identify the actors in other than ethno-religious terms.

## Global cities literature: Speaking Global and Reinforcing the National

As is the case with transnational migration research, studies on global cities have the potential to help migration scholars step out of the essentialism and methodological nationalism of migration studies but this potential has yet to be realized. This is because rather than directing our attention to the ways in which all localities are global but in different way, scholars working described only a small set of cities as global. In the end, rather than opening a global perspective on migration, the global cities literature leads those who are not studying global cities back to a national frame of reference rather to an exploration of global processes.

Those who adopt the term global cities argue that a small set of cities are in significant ways unmoored from the nation-states in which they are geographically located (Sassen 2000). Global cities theorists maintain that the repositioning of cities in relationship to nation-states reflects the processes of restructuring of capitalism in the context of contemporary globalization, the mobility of labor and the dynamics of global capital flows. Global cities scholars hypothesize that the growing disjuncture between geographical and social spaces and the

changing landscape of social, economic, and cultural proximities were all outcomes of the uneven spatiality of globalization (Friedmann and Wolf 1982; Friedmann 1986; Sassen 1991; King 1991, 1996; Knox and Taylor 1995). They emphasized that global forces take particular forms in particular places and affect the dynamic configuration of specific localities, including processes of migrant settlement and transnational connection. They note the growth of an hour glass urban economy with an affluent set of businesses based on the facilitation of knowledge, fashion, culture, marketing, and financial industries and a low wage sector of non-unionized service workers and small sweat-shops. Migrants enter this paradigm as low wage; migrants are said to be attracted to and maintain the low-wage sector that is a vital component of global cities,

 The global perspective provided by global cities scholarship is vital in understanding how the migrant experience is shaped by the positioning of their localities of departure and settlement within global economic restructuring. Yet migration has generally not been studied from this perspective  Mesmerized by global cities, researchers failed to study the participation of migrants in the dynamics of other cities, whose economies, governance, and cultural life were also being affected by global reconstitution of capital.

Consequently, many researchers exploring cities that were not classified as global continue to frame their findings only within the parameters of national policies. The global forces that are restructuring all localities were ignored. Only occasionally do researchers working in cities of smaller scale examine variations in local opportunity structures as they affected migrant incorporation (Bommes and Radtke 1996). In the few cases in which the opportunity structures of different cities was examined in efforts to link different structures to different pathways of migrant incorporation, the cities compared are situated within a single nation-state (Ellis 2001).

## Migration, Development and Scalar Perspectives on Locality

As I have argued, migration scholarship's binary division of foreigner and natives, which are legitimated through the adoption of the nation-state as the unit of both study and analysis, leaves no conceptual space to address questions of the global structuring and restructuring of region and locality that serve as the nexus of migrant incorporation and transnational connection. Except of global cities theory, the insightful and powerful social theorizing of locality and scale produced by urban geographers has not entered into either migration theory or the discussions of migration and development. To note that migrant departure, settlement, and

transnational connections are shaped by the positioning of localities and regions within globally structured hierarchies of economic and political power would disrupt the homogenization of the national terrain imposed by migration theory and echoed in development discourses.

Yet there is a scholarship on the global restructuring of locality that could contribute much to efforts to understand the relationship between migration and development. Scholars of urban scale have documented that currently cities everywhere are participants in the same global trends delineated in the global cities literature ((Brenner 1998; 1999a, 1999b; 2004; Brenner et al 2003; Brenner and Theodore 2003; MacLeod and Goodwin 1999; Smith 1992; 1995; Swyngedouw 1992; 1997). All cities are global but differentially positioned in terms of globe spanning hierarchies of economic and political power. No city is delimited only by the regulatory regime and economic actions of the state in which it is based. The state itself is rescaled to play new roles by channeling flows of relatively unregulated capital and participating in the constitution of global regulatory regimes enforced by the World Trade Organization and international financial institutions. State activity is rescaled in the context of emergent neo-liberal market-oriented restructuring projects (Brenner et al. 2003; Jessop 2003). States reconcentrate their socio-economic activity to increase the competitiveness of certain cities and zones. [13]

Within global economic restructuring, theorists of urban rescaling have identified new ways that states—together with other actors—had a differentiated impact on particular localities. Scale theorists focus on the differential impacts of global processes on different localities. The scalar repositioning of localities—both urban and rural reflects their relationship to global, national and regional circuits of capital. Hierarchies and structural positioning of cities are not nested in interstate or national-regional hierarchies but are situated within and constantly repositioned with global hierarchies of power. More specifically, this scholarship highlights the various mechanisms that require all cities to compete for investments in new economies. Through the provision of state subsidies or contracts, and support for key infrastructural facilities and public services in particular zones—such as airports or research facilities—they remain as important actors in shaping the new patterns of uneven spatial devel-

---

[13] Of course the organization of state subsidies has historically differed between the European states, with their range of welfare and public interventions, and the United States, where intervention has been more indirect in the form of military and police expenditures, contracts, and urban block grants. The US does have a history of federal intervention in the form of block grants to cities, grants for research and development of research facilities, and transportation subsidies. However, much government support has been channeled through military investment.

opment. Even Asian states that continue to impose central controls find their cities rescaled within broader neo-liberal market forces.

Rather than just categorizing cities as "post-industrial" "global" or "non-global", it is vital to examine the implications of the globally restructuring of urban economies for the composition of labor forces and housing stocks, as well as for entrepreneurial strategies, infrastructure development, and tax policies. Scale theorists note that to develop and sustain their growth cities now market themselves globally in an effort to attract flows of investment and a mix of "new economy" industries and their clients and customers. "New economy: industries are ones that produce services demanded within the global economy including the very consumption of locality in the form of tourism. To attract these new industries such as computer related technologies required that the city offer a certain mix of human capital, higher education facilities, and cultural and recreational facilities. While in the age of urban development through heavy industry, cities faired differently through locational differences such as access to harbors or the provision of railroads or highways, now life style facilities capable of attracting and maintaining a highly skilled workforce became an issue. Boulder and Berlin have benefited while Liverpool and Bremen have declined within a globally restructuring of locality.

Although the scale theorists said nothing about migrant incorporation, it is evident that this perspective provides important theoretical openings with which to approach the significance of locality in migrant incorporation. The relative positioning of a city within hierarchical fields of power may well lay the ground for the life-chances and incorporation opportunities of migrants in a locally and transnationally. In order to understand the different modes and dynamics of migrant incorporation and transnational incorporation, we need to address the broader rescaling processes affecting the cities in which migrants are settling. A scalar perspective can bring into the analysis of migrant incorporation the missing spatial aspects of socio-economic power, which is exercised differently in different localities. The concept of scalar positioning introduces the missing socio-spatial parameters to the analysis of' 'locality' in migration scholarship

Migrants become part of the restructuring of the urban social fabric and the new forms of urban governance. Of course migrants' roles in each city are themselves shaped in the context of rescaling processes themselves. All the resources cities have, including their human resources—which encompasses the migrants and their skills and qualities-- acquire a new value and become assets in this competition. The "cultural diversity" of migrants is an important factor in the competitive struggle between the cities. Migrants are not only part of the new just-in-time sweat shop industries that accompany the restructuring of some cities. They provide highly skilled labor that also contributes to the human capital profile of various cities.

And they become marketable assets for the cultural industries of the cities in which they are settling (Çağlar 2005a; b; Scott 2004; Zukin 1995). The place and role of migrants in this competition might differ depending on the scalar positioning of these cities.

Drawing from the scale literature, I argue that to understand the dynamics of migrant local and transnational incorporation in different localities it is helpful to relate them to the re-scaling processes of the neoliberal regulatory systems (Peck 1998). Yet studies of development and migration tend to ignore both the specificities of localities that migrants connect through their networks of social relations and the insertion of these localities within broader structural disparities of wealth and power. Migrants who send remittances invest in social relations that are being reconfigured by the rescaling of their localities of departure and settlement. Their decisions to remit and their ability to do so are configured by the ways in which their labor, cultural and social capital, and roles as social actors contribute to the positioning of localities within unequal transnational relationships of power.

## Transnational Fields of Power

Contemporary transnational fields of power—defined as networks of networks through which capital of various kinds are organized and transmitted—are rarely studied from a global perspective that brings together corporate, military, political, and cultural institutions that span borders. For example, the discussion of neo-liberal rescaling of cities, while highlighting issues of governance as well as political economy, rarely addresses the question of globe spanning military power. On the other hand, theorists on the right and left have recently returned to the concept of imperialism and stressed the significance of warfare but often ignore the relationship between neo-liberal restructuring, migration, and the construction of images of the foreigner as enemy and terrorist (Chalmers 2004, Cooper 2003, Harvey 2003; Mann; Haas 2000; Ikenberry 2002; Reyna 2005). And migration studies, rooted in the concerns of nation-state building projects, have not only failed to address the global political economy but have also not examined its relationship to several kinds of power including that which racializes, feminizes, and subordinates regions, populations, and localities.

As a means of addressing these concerns, Ramon Grosfoguel, (2006) and Aníbal Quijano (2000) argue for an analytical framework they call the "colonial power matrix." They are developing a scholarship that analyses the role of repressive force and discursive power and speaks to the North/South divide. Grosfoguel (2006) speaks of the coloniality of power as

an "entanglement" or "intersectionality" …of multiple and heterogeneous global hierarchies ("heterarchies") of sexual, political, epistemic, economic, spiritual, linguistic and racial forms of domination and exploitation where the racial/ethnic hierarchy of the European/non-European divide transversally reconfigures all of the other global power structures.

He emphasizes that the concepts of racial and gender differences and the hierarchies they substantiate are central to the legitimization of the dominance of finance capital and its base in Northern states and institutions. The coloniality of power framework addresses the disparities of wealth and power that link together the lack of development in the global south, the root causes of migration flows, and migrants and financial institutions interests in investments in remittance flows. The framework brings together in a single analytical framework the processes of capital accumulation, restructuring of place, and nation-state building and the categorization of labor by race and gender.

However, more needs to be said about how US and European imperialist projects are simultaneously justified and obscured through a politics of fear that portrays migrants as the chief threat to national security.  I have noted that states are still important within the globe spanning economic processes that mark our contemporary world but of course not all states are equal. Unequal globalization rests on a framework of imperial states that serve as base areas for institutions that control capital, the productions of arms, and military power. These powerful states claim and obtain rights and privileges in states around the world and define the institutional limits of less powerful states. The core imperial states also are the key players in institutions that claim to be global including the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, and the United Nations Security Council.

In the face of intense global economic, political, social, and cultural interconnections, growing inequality and continuing racialized and gendered hierarchies, the popularization of the notion of the migrant as the outsider rehabilitates earlier myths that nation -states contain homogenous cultures shared by native populations. Once again the migrant is constructed to reinforce and validate the nationalism that continues to socialize individuals to identify with their nation-state. Once again a discourse of the world is as divided into autonomous nation-states is becoming hegemonic.

## Conclusions

A global perspective on migration to provide an analytical lens that can allow us to think beyond the re-imposition of nationalist interests is both necessary for scholars of migration and development to analyze and speak to the contemporary contradictions that we confront. Migration studies are at a crucial juncture. We can follow the pattern of the past, let our research be shaped by the public mood and the political moment, and revive old binaries, fears, and categories. Or we can engage in research that clarifies this moment by developing new frameworks for analysis. In short, we need a new scholarship that can build on our understanding of global processes, and highlight them so that we can actually document how migrants live their lives as constitutive actors in multiple social settings. This scholarship will reconstitute migration theory so that it explains current observations and facilitates new ones. To do this we need units of analysis that do not obscure the presence as well as internal contradictions of imperial globe-spanning power, its inability to provide consistent development, and its dependence on migrant labor.

This paper has explored the way in which much of migration research, because it is founded upon the dichotomy of the nation-state and it's others, depicts migrant difference as threatening to the stability and unity of a fixed national ethos. The native-foreigner divide is so fundamental to the entire enterprise of migration research that its conceptual underpinnings are rarely confronted. Yet the concept of migrants as the other of the nation state reflects the particular and peculiar political optic of both past and contemporary processes of nation-state building. It is part and parcel of the intellectual orientation of methodological nationalism.

When, delimitated by their methodological nationalism, migration theorists confine their units of analysis to the nation-state and the migrant, they are unable to track structures and processes of unequal capital flow that influence the experience of people who reside in particular localities. Migration scholars often fail to look at relationships of migrants and natives that are not framed by concepts of cultural or ancestral difference. Furthermore they ignore the way in which local institutions that incorporate residents of states in a variety of ways are configured by power hierarchies that interpenetrate into states and regions. To counter the effects of methodological nationalism on migration research, I have suggest that scholars and citizens develop a global power-imbricated perspective for migration studies in order to access units of analysis that take migration research beyond the nation/migrant divide.

Migration theorists must acknowledge the systemic structuring of power by imperial power states and the financial and military institutions they control. And we need a global theory of unequal power to analyze the contradictions that have led the World Bank and the global

lending institutions and many migrant sending states to celebrate migrant remittances as fundamental to the economy of migrant sending states, at the very moment of anti-immigrant fence building and gate-shutting. Development discussions that celebrate migrants as global actors contributing to the schools, markets, and industries of home localities through remittance flows and home town associations complement and reinforce methodological nationalism. They do this by sustaining and revitalizing older ideologies of modernization with the migrant rather than the nation-state as the force for independent national development. Development discussions that do not address transnational fields of unequal power serve to obfuscate rather than promote analysis. Many states dominated by imperial power and its new regulatory architecture are struggling because a sizeable proportion of their gross national product is channeled into debt service, leaving migrants to sustain the national economy through their contributions. Migrants provide exploitable labor, whether unskilled or highly skilled. Their exploitation is facilitated by their vulnerability, a product of governance regimes that define migrants as foreign and racially, culturally, and religiously inferior and therefore not entitled to the protection of full citizenship rights. Reacting to forms of exclusion, increases migrants' incentives to invest in their transnational networks and homeland ties. Meanwhile remittances and the flow of migrant capital across borders contribute to the profitability of banks and other financial institutions (Guarnizo 2003).

In arguing that current migration theory has an internal politics, I am arguing for an explication of political positions within social theory, not for a notion of a value-free social science. A global perspective on imperial power can also facilitate our ability as socially engaged scholars to theorize the contradictions of imperial dilemmas and find ways in which they can contribute to progressive social transformation. The increasing rejection in Latin America of the Washington Consensus, the rising opposition in the US to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan and the planned war in Iran, the rejection of new war plans by public opinion in Europe, provide openings for movements that allow us to critique the global system of imperial power. But we can only do this if we set aside born-again assimilationism and other forms of integrationist theory that posit migrants as disruptive of national communities. It is necessary for migrants and native of countries around the world who find their lives diminished by unequal globalization to understand what the problem is and is not. It is not putative hordes of illegal aliens or migrants transnational connections that are threatening the majority of people in the imperial core countries. Most people would prefer to stay home and most people do stay home. We need a scholarship that can links subjective feelings of despair and unmet life aspirations as well as localize quests for identity and community to the global fragility of contemporary capitalism, its rescaling of cities and states, and its dependence on war and plunder.

The future of migration studies should be based on learning from the past but not repeating it. We need research that responds to popular fears but is not shaped by them. Migration needs to build on the global perspective that has been emerging from various disciplines and theorists. This perspective (1) critiques all forms of methodological nationalism (2) puts aside the nation state and ethnic groups as a the primary units of analysis, while understanding them to be potent forms of identification; (3) links war, development, and displacement to global processes of capital accumulation; (4) highlights the need for immigrant and refugee polities that end the separation between our problems and theirs; and (5) identifies migrants as a legitimate and necessary actor of movements for progressive social transformation. We need to study and popularize the concept that migration, as well as development processes are part of global forces experienced by people who move and who do not move. This means migration scholars must enter into the public debate about social cohesion by identifying the forces of globalization that are restructuring lives of migrants and non-migrants alike and speaking to common struggle of most of the people of the world for social and economic justice and equality.

## References

Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee 2003 Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Allen, Theodore 1994 The Invention of the White Race: Racial Oppression and. Social Control, New York: Verso.

Anthias, Floya 1998 "Evaluating 'Diaspora': Beyond Ethnicity" Sociology 32: 557-580

Barth, Fredrick 1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference. Boston: Little Brown.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Blanc 1994 Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects. Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorrialized Nation-States. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Balibar, Etienne 1991 In Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities. New York: Verso.

Beck, Ulrich 2000 "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity, "British Journal of Sociology, 51(1):79–105.

Beck, Ulrich and N. Sznaider, N. 2006 'Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences.' British Journal of Sociology 57, no. 1 (2006), pp. 1-24.

Bodnar, John 1985 The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America Bloomington, IN: Indianana University Press

Bommes, Michael, and Frank-Olaf Radtke 1996 "Migration into Big Cities and Small Towns- An Uneven Process with Limited Need for Multiculturalism," Innovation: The European Journal of Social Sciences, 9(1):75–86.

Bommes, Michael 2003. Der Mythos des transnationalen Raumes. Oder: Worin besteht die Herausforderung des Transnationalismus für die Migrationsforschung? In: Thränhardt, Dietrich; Hunger, Uwe, eds. Migration im Spannungsfeld von Globalisierung und Nationalstaat. Leviathan Sonderheft No. 22. Wiesbaden, 90-116.

Bommes, Michael 2005 Transnationalism or Assimilation? sowi-online e.V., Bielefeld http://www.sowi-onlinejournal.de/20051/transnationalism_assimilation_bommes.htm Veröffentlichungsdatum: 30.12.2005

Bonacich, Edna and John Modell 1980 The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Borjas, George J. 2001 Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bourne, Randolph 1916 "Trans-National America" in The Atlantic Monthly, 118 (July), pp. 86-97, Boston, The Atlantic Monthly Group

Brenner, Neil 1999a "Beyond State-Centrism? Space, Territoriality and Geographical Scale in Globalization Studies," Theory and Society, 28(1):39–78.

Brenner, Neil 1999b "Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-Scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union," Urban Studies, 36(3):431–451.

Brenner, Neil 2004 New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brenner, Neil, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon MacLeod 2003 "Introduction: State Space in Question." In State/Space: A Reader. Eds. Neil Brenner, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon MacLeod. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. Pp. 1-27.

Brenner, Neil and Theodore, Nik 2002 "From the 'New Localism' to the Spaces of Neoliberalism," Antipode, 33(3): 341-347.

Bretell, Caroline 2003 "Bringing the City Back: Cities as Contexts for Immigrant Incorporation." In American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigration. Ed. Nancy Foner. Sante Fe: School of American Research Press. Pp. 163-195.

Brubaker, Rogers 2004 Ethnicity without Groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryceson Deborah Fahy, and Ulla Vuorela eds. 2005 The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global Networks Oxford: Berg

Çağlar, Ayse 1990 "Das Kultur-Konzept als Zwangsjacke in Studien zur Arbeitsmigration," Zeitschrift für Türkeistudien, 1:93-105.

Çağlar, Ayse

   1995 "German Turks in Berlin: Social Exclusion and Strategies for Social Mobility," New Community, 21(3):309–323.

1997 "Hyphenated Identities and the Limits of 'Culture': Some Methodological Queries." In The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity, Community. Eds. Pnina Werbner and Tariq Madood. Zed Publications. Pp.169-186.

1998 Popular Culture, Marginality and Institutional Incorporation: German-Turkish Rap Cultural Dynamics.1998; 10: 243-261

2005a "Mediascapes, Advertisement Industries: Turkish Immigrants in Europe and the European Union," New German Critique, 92:39–62.

2005b Migrants, Cultural Industries and Scale: Essen—Mardin. Unpublished MS, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Central European University.

2006 "Hometown Associations and Grassroots Transnationalism," Global Networks, 6(1):1- 22.

Castles, Steven, and Mark J. Miller 2003 The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World. Third Edition: Revised and Updated. New York: Guilford Press.

Castles, Stephen and Alastair Davidson 2000 Citizenship and Migration. Globalization and the Politics of Belonging. Palgrave

Chamberlain, Mary and Selma Leydesdorff

1991 The National Integration of Italian Return Migration, 1870-1929. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2004 "Transnational Families: Memories and Narratives" Global Networks 4 (3), 227–241.

Commons John R. 1907 Races and Immigrants in America. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dannecker, Petra 2007 "The Re-ordering of Political, Cultural and Social Spaces Through Transnational Labour Migration "Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1

de Haas, Hein 2007 "Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective" Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1

Delgado Wise, Raúl 2007 "The Migration and Development mantra in Mexico: Toward a New Analytical Approach" Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1

Dillingham Commission 1909-1911 Dillingham Commission Reports. http://library.stanford.edu/depts/dlp/ebrary/dillingham/body.shtml

Ellis, Mark "2001 A Tale of Five Cities? Trends in Immigrant and Native-Born Wages." In Strangers at the Gates: New Immigrants in Urban America. Ed. Roger Waldinger. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 117–158.

Engin, Isin 2006 "Theorizing the Europeann City" in Contempoprary European Social Theory Gerard Delanty ed. pp 323-332 London; Routledge

Esser, Hartmut

> 2003: Ist das Konzept der Assimilation überholt?, Geographische Revue, 5(Summer): 5-22.

> 2001 Kulturelle Pluralisierung und strukturelle Assimilation: das Problem der ethnischen Schichtung, Swiss Political Science Review7( Summer): 95-130.

> 2006 "Migration, Language And Integration" AKI Research Review 4 Arbeitsstelle Interkulturelle Konflikteund gesellschaftliche Integration (AKI) Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB)

Escalante, Ana 2007 Building Futures Financial Times August 29 Accessed September 27 2007. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/1bf0b258-55d3-11dc-b971-0000779fd2ac.html

Faist, Thomas 2000 Transstaatliche Raeume. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Fauser, Margit 2007 The Local Politics of Transnational Development Cooperation: on the Interaction between Migrant Organizations and Local Authorities in Spanish Cities Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1.

Freedman, Jane 2004 Immigration and Insecurity in France London: Ashgate

Friedmann, Jonathan

    1986 "The World City Hypotheses," Development and Change, 17(1):69-84.

    1995 "Where We Stand: A Decade of World City Research." In World Cities in a
    World System. Eds. P.L. Knox and P.J. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge University
    Press.

Friedmann, Jonathan and Goetz Wolf 1982 "World City Formation: An Agenda for Research
and Action," International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 6(2): 309-339

Gabaccia, Donna And Fraser M. Ottanelli 2001 Italian Workers of the World: Labor Migration
and the formation of Multiethnic States Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Gans, Hubert 1965 The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans
New York:The Free Press of Glencoe

Geddes, Andrew and Michael Bommes 2000 eds. Immigration and Welfare: Challenging the
Borders of the Welfare State London: Routledge.

Glick Schiller, Nina

    1977 "Ethnic Groups Are Made Not Born." In Ethnic Encounters: Identities and
    Contexts. Eds. George Hicks and Philip Leis. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press. Pp
    23–35.

    1999 "Transmigrants and Nation-States: Something Old and Something New in the
    U.S. Immigrant Experience." In The Handbook of International Migration: The
    American Experience. Eds. Charles Hirshman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind,
    New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 94–119.

    2003 "The Centrality of Ethnography in the Study of Transnational Migration: Seeing
    the Wetland Instead of the Swamp." In American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the
    New Immigration. Ed. Nancy Foner. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
    Pp. 99–128.

    2005a "Transnational Social Fields and Imperialism: Bring a Theory of Power to
    Transnational Studies. "Anthropological Theory 5(4):439–461.

2005b "Transnationality." In A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics. Eds. David Nugent and Joan Vincent. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Pp. 448–467.

2006 "Introduction: What Does Transnational Studies Have to Offer to the Study of Localized Conflict and Protest?" Focaal—European Journal of Anthropology, 47:3–17.

Glick Schiller, Nina and Georges Fouron 1999 "Terrains of Blood and Nation: Haitian Transnational Social Fields," Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22:(2):340-366

Glick Schiller, Nina, Josh DeWind, Mare Lucie Brutus, Carolle Charles, Georges Fouron, and Luis Thomas

1987a "All in the Same Boat? Unity and Diversity Among Haitian Immigrants." In Caribbean Life in New York City. Eds. Constance R. Sutton and Elsa M. Chaney. Staten Island, NY: Center for Migration Studies. Pp. 167-184.

1987b "Exile, Ethnic, Refugee: The Changing Organizational Identities of Haitian Immigrants," Migration World, 15(1): 7-11.

Glick Schiller, Nina, Ayse Çaglar and Thaddeus C. Guldbrandsen

2006a Jenseits Der Ethnischen Gruppe Als Object Des Wissens: Lokalität Und Inkorporationmuster Von Migranten. In Die Macht Des Lokalen In Einer Welt Ohn Grenzen. Ed. Helmuth Berking. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag

2006b "Beyond the Ethnic Lens: Locality, Globality, and Born-Again Incorporation." American Ethnologist 33(4): 612-633.

Glazer, Nathaniel and Daniel Moynihan 1963 Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gonzalez, Nancie L. 1988 Sojourners of the Caribbean: Ethnogenesis and Ethnohistory of the Garifuna. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Gordon, Milton 1964 Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins New York: Oxford University Press.

Grosfoguel, Ramón, and Ana M. Cervantes-Rodríguez. 2002 The Modern/Colonial/Capitalist World-System in the Twentieth Century: Global Processes, Antisystemic Movements, and the Geopolitics of Knowledge. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press,

Guarnizo, Luis

> 2007 "The Migration-Development Nexus and the Post-Cold War World Order" Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1.

> 2003 The Economics of Transnational Living International Migration Rview 37:3 666-699.

> 1997 The Rise of a Transnational Social Formation and the Mirage of Return Migration Among Dominican Transmigrants. Idenetities: Global Studies in Culture and Power 4(2):181-233

Guarnizo, Luis, Alejandro Portes, and William Haller 2003 Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants American Journal of Sociology, 108:1211–1248

Harvey, David 2003 The New Imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heckmann, Frederik 2003 "From Ethnic Nation to Universalistic Immigrant Integration: Germany". In The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies, National Differences and Trends of Convergence. Frederik Heckmann and Dominique Schnapper, eds. Pp. 45–78. Stuttgart: Lucius und Lucius.

Hill, Jonathan 1989 "Introduction: Indigenous Peoples and Nation-States," Latin American Anthropology Review, 1(2):34–35.

van Holthoon, Frits and Marcel van der Linden 1988 Internationalism in the Labour Movement, 1830-1940. Leiden: E. J. Brill. University Press.

Horsman, Reginald 1981 Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Huntington, Samuel 2000 Reconsidering Immigration: Is Mexico a Special Case? San Diego: Center for Immigration Studies. http://www.cis.org/articles/2000/back1100.html

Issacs, Harold 1975 . Idols of the Tribe. New York: Harper & Row.

Jessop, Bob 2003 The Crisis of the National Spatio-Temporal Fix and the Ecological Dominance of Globalizing Capitalism published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster

University at http//www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Jessop-Crisis-of-the- National-Spatio-Temporal-Fix.pdf

Joppke, Christian and Ewa Morawska 2002 Toward Assimilation and Citizenship:Immigrants in Liberal Nations. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave

Karim, Karim H. 2007 Nation and diaspora: Rethinking multiculturalism in a transnational context International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics (2):3 267-282.

Kearney, Michael 1991 Borders and Boundaries of State and Self at the End of Empire. Journal of Historical Sociology 4 (1), 52–74

Khadria, Binod 2007 "Adversary Analysis and Optimizing the Macro-economic Stakes of Trans-national Divide in Migration for Development" Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1.

Kymlicka, Will and W. Norman 2000 Citizenship in Culturally Diverse Societies: Issues, Contexts, Concepts 2000

Kastoryano, Riva 2002 Negotiating Identities. States and Immigrants in France and Germany. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

King, Anthony ed.

> 1991 Global Cities: Post-Imperialism and the Internationalization of London London: Routledge.

> 1996 Representing the City: Ethnicity, Capital and Culture in the 21st Century. London: Macmillan.

Peter Kivisto

> 2004 "What is the Canonical Theory of Assimilation?" Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 40 (2): 149 - 163

> 2005 Incorporating Diversity: Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Age. aradigm Publishers: Boulder, CO.

Knox, P.L. and P.J. Taylor eds. 1995 World Cities in a World System. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lapper, Richard 2007 The Tale of Globalisation's Exiles Financial Times August 27 2007. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/11c878de-54bf-11dc-890c-0000779fd2ac.html Accessed September 15 2007

Lefebvre, Henri 1991 [1974] The Production of Space. Oxford, UK und Malden, MA.

Levitt, Peggy and Nina Glick Schiller 2004 "Transnational Perspectives on Migration: Conceptualizing Simultaneity" International Migration Review, 38 (145): 595-629.

Levitt, Peggy

>   2001a The Transnational Villagers. Berkeley: University of California Press.

>   2001b Transnational migration: taking stock and future directions Global Networks 1 (3), 195–216

Light, Ivan (1972) Ethnic Enterprise in America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mandell, Ruth 1990 "Shifting Centres and Emergent Identities: Turkey and Germany in the Lives of Turkish Gastarbeiter." In Muslim Travellers: Pilgrimage, Migration, and the Religious Imagination. Eds. D.F. Eickelman and J. Piscatori. London: Routledge. Pp. 153-171. Martins, Herminio 1974 "Time and Theory in Sociology." In Approaches to Sociology. An Introduction to Major Trends in British Sociology. Ed. John Rex. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Pp. 248-294.

Montgomery, David 1987 The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge,

Miles, Robert 1993 Racism after "Race Relations". New York: Routledge.

Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva

>   2001 "Transnational political practices and the receiving state: Turks and Kurds in Germany and the Netherlands," Global Networks, 1(3):261-82

>   2007 " Perceptions and Practices of Codevelopment in Catalunya "Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1.

Persons, Stow Ethnic Studies at Chicago 1987 1905-45. . Urbana: University of Illinois Press

Potts, Lydia , 1990 The World Labour Market: A History of Migration London: Zed Books

Pries, Ludger

      2001 "The Disruption of Social and Geographic Space: Mexican-US Migration and the Emergence of Transnational Social Spaces," International Sociology, 16 (1): 55-74.

      2007 "Transnationalism: Trendy Catch-all or Specific Research Programme" Paper delivered at 'Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective' Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1,

Nye, Joseph S., Jr. 1976 "Independence and Interdependence" Foreign Policy 22 (Spring): 130-161.

Peck, Jamie 1998 "Geographies of Governance: TECs and the Neo-liberalisation of 'Local interests'," Space & Polity, 2 (1): 5–31.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut 2006 Immigrant America: A Portrait, 3rd edition (revised and updated). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Quijano, Anibal 2003 Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America International Sociology.2000; 15: 215-232

Rath, Jan, and Robert Kloosterman 2000 "Outsiders' Business: A Critical Review of Research on Immigrant Entrepreneurship," International Migration Review, 34(3):657–681.

Ratzell, Friedrich.

      1882. Anthropogeographie. Stuttgart: J. Engelhorn.

      1897. Politische Geographie. Munich: R. Oldenbourg

Sackmann, Rosemarie, Bernhard Peters, and Thomas Faist, eds. (2003) Identity and Integration: Migrants in Western Europe. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Raghuram, Parvati 2007 "Which Migration, What Development: Unsettling the Edifice of Migration and Development "Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1.

Rouse, Roger

1990 "Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism." Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies 1.1: 8-22.

1992 "Making Sense of Settlement: Class Transformation, Cultural Struggle and Transnationalism among Mexican Migrants to the United States", in Glick Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch and Cristina Blanc-Szanton (eds.), Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered, 25–52. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Sassen, Saskia

1991 The Global City : New York, London, Tokyo. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

2000 Cities in a World Economy. 2nd. edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Salih, Ruba 2003 Gender in Transnationalism: Home, Longing and Belonging Among Moroccan Migrant Women. New York: Routledge.

Salzbrunn, Monika 2007 "Localising Transnationalism: Researching Political and Cultural Events in a Context of Migration" Paper delivered at Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld University, May 31 and June 1,

Schermerhorn, R.A. 1949 These Our People: Minorities in American Culture. Boston : D.C. Heath and Company

Scott, Allen. 2004 "Cultural-Products Industries and Urban Economic Development," Urban Affairs Review, 39(4): 460-490.

Smedley, Audrey 1999 Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview, 2nd ed. (Boulder CO: University of Colorado Press

Smith, Anthony 1983 "Nationalism and Social Theory," British Journal of Sociology, 34:19-38.

Smith, Michael Peter 2001 Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, Michael Peter and Luis Guarnizo, 1998 (eds), Transnationalism From Below, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, pp.196-238.

Smith, Neil 1995 "Remaking Scale: Competition and Cooperation in Pre-National and Post-National Europe." In Competitive European Peripheries. Eds. Heikki Eskelinen and Folke Snickars. Berlin: Springer Verlag. Pp 59–74.

Smith, Robert

2006 "Black Mexicans, Nerds and Cosmopolitans: Key Cases for Assimilation Theory". Paper delivered at Segundo Coloquɪo Internacɪonal Sobre Mɪgracɪón Y Desarrollo: Migración, transnacionalismo y transformación social Cocoyoc, Morelos, México, October 26- 28.

1998, 'Transnational localities: community, technology and the politics of membership within the context of Mexico and US migration', in M. P. Smith and L.E. Guarnizo, 1998, (eds), Transnationalism From Below, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, pp.196-238.

Sollors,Werner ed. 1989 The Invention of Ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Soysal, Levent 2001 "Diversity of Experience, Experience of Diversity: Turkish Migrant Youth Culture in Berlin," Cultural Dynamics, 13(1):5–28.

Stoller, Ann Laura 1989 "Making Empire Respectable: Race and Sexual Morality in Twentieth-Century Colonial Cultures," American Ethnologist 16: 26-51

Swyngedouw, Erik

1992 "The Mammon Quest: "Glocalisation," Interspatial Competition and the Monetary Order: The Construction of New Scales." In Cities and Regions in the NewEurope. Eds. Mick Dunford and Grigoris Kafkalas. London: Belhaven Press. Pp. 39–68.

1997 "Neither Global nor Local: "Glocalization" and the Politics of Scale." In Spaces of Globalization. Ed. Kevin R. Cox. New York: Guilford Press. Pp. 137-166.

Takaki, Ronald

1990 Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th Century America. Oxford: Oxford University Press

1993 A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America Boston: Little, Brown,

Thistlewaite, Frank 1964 " Migration from Europe Overseas in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries In Population Movements in Modern European History ed. H. Moller New York: Macmillan Company,

Thomas, William and Florian Zanecki [1918] The Polish peasant in Europe and America, University of. Chicago Press, Chicago,

Torpey, John 2000 The Invention of the Passport. Surveillance, Citizenship and the State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Urry, John 2000 The Global Media and Cosmopolitanism. Paper presented at: Transnational America Conference, Bavarian American Academy, Munich, June 2000. Electronic document, http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc056ju.html, accessed September 20, 2003.

Vertovec, Steven

> 1999 " Conceiving and researching transnationalism" Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22(2): 447-462.

> 2005 Opinion: Super-Diversity Revealed. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4266102.stm,

>  accessed October 10, 2005.

Waldinger, Roger

> 1996 "Ethnicity and opportunity in the plural city. In Ethnic Los Angeles Roger Waldinger, and M Bozorgmehr, Eds. New York: Russell Sage Found. pp. 445-70

> 1986 "Immigrant Enterprise: A Critique and Reformulation," Theory and Society,15: 249-285.

> 2006 "Immigration Reform: Too Hot To Handle" New Labor Forum, 15 (2):21 – 29.

Waldinger, Roger and David Fitzgerald 2004 "Transnationalism in Question" American Journal of Sociology, 109 :1177–1195

Wolf, Eric 1982 Europe and the People Without HistoryBerkeley: University of California

Press

Werbner, Pnina

1990 Imagined Diasporas among Manchester Muslims: The Public Performance of Pakistani Transnational Identity Politics. Oxford: James Currey.

2002 The Migration Process: Captial, Gifts, and Offerings Among Overseas Pakistanis. Oxford:Berg

White, Jenny. 1999 "Turks in the new Germany," American Anthropologist, 99 (44): 754-767.

Wilson, Kenneth and Alejandro Portes 1980 "Immigrant Enclaves: An Analysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami," The American Journal of Sociology 86 (2) 295-319.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller

2002a "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences," Global Networks, 2(4):301–34.

2002b "Methodological Nationalism and the Study of Migration," Archives of European Sociology, XLIII 2:217–240.

Zukin, Sharon 1995 The Cultures of Cities. Oxford: Blackwell

The most common unit of analysis will be a migration corridor (usually a country of origin and a country of destination). Â 1. Agree on goals and unit of the analysis 2. Set up an analytical framework consistent with these goals 3. Identify the actors to be involved and avenues for participation 4. Describe the main dimensions of the evaluation 5. Select indicators (key variables, proxies, etc.) for each dimension 6. Gathering data on indicators - measuring or selecting secondary data 7. Weighting and. Â The HDI is essentially cross-sectional, although its existence over many years now allows some longitudinal analysis. The politicisation of migration research and its significance for migration studies. 3. Migration and Social Transformation. Â Strong proponents of globalisation regard the nation-state as obsolete â€" to be replaced by the power of markets and consumer choice (Ohmae 1995). This view is linked to the neo-liberal principles of a â€˜small stateâ€™, privatisation of utilities and services, economic deregulation and the opening of markets (especially those of developing countries) to global competition. Â The politicisation of migration has ambivalent consequences for migration research. The governmental and inter-governmental activities generate a great need for data-collection, analysis and research. develop a global agenda for research on migration, climate change and the environment. Experts at this workshop all recommended that a systematic review of existing research should be conducted prior to launching any major new studies. In particular, it was felt that such an assessment could help to frame the future research agenda by highlighting gaps in current knowledge, outline conceptual issues and highlight policy challenges. This book and the themes which have been selected are the result of the recommendations from the Munich workshop. Â A â€˜re-discoveredâ€™ issue The movement of people as a result of changes in the environment is not a new phenomenon. People have been moving in response to changes in their environment, often seasonally, for centuries.