

ANDREW WELLINGTON  
CORDIER ESSAY

# THE ROLE OF DIASPORAS IN CONFLICT

---

Amanda Roth

*This paper seeks to examine the role of diaspora populations in the perpetuation or resolution of violent conflict in their homelands. The goal is to demonstrate the increasingly significant role diasporas play in international affairs and the importance of viewing diaspora groups as separate actors in a conflict, often with differing motivations. Diaspora groups are capable of exerting disproportionate influence over events in their countries of origin, due to disparities in economic wealth, freedom of expression, and influence on governments in their adopted homelands. Concurrently, the conflict-related priorities of such groups may differ from actors on the ground, with diaspora groups often attaching significant weight to symbolic issues of identity and principle. Therefore, diaspora groups exert significant outside influence and, in some cases, may worsen or prolong conflicts in which they become involved. However, this paper argues that shifting trends in international conflict and advances in technology have made diaspora groups a permanent and growing facet of conflict, therefore necessitating specific strategies to engage their potential for peace-building. Drawing on a range of literature and historical examples, the author examines the reasons for the growing role of diaspora groups, the factors that make their engagement in homeland conflicts unique, and their ability to improve or worsen conflict. Ultimately, it argues, the international community must acknowledge the importance of diaspora groups and actively engage them in order to maximize their capacity for creating peace.*

The manner in which nation-states, borders, identities, and conflicts are conceived of in the post-Cold War era is drastically different than the system that dominated much of the twentieth century. One of the most visible physical manifestations of increasing globalization is the movement of people across borders; approximately 232 million people live outside of their birth country, and this number does not include subsequent generations.<sup>1</sup> This migration of people is accompanied by an increased flow of ideas and communication, and one significant outcome of this is the rising influence of diaspora groups. These groups are

---

*Amanda Roth is a second year graduate student at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA), where she is studying international security policy.*

## Diasporas provide a new lens through which to look for solutions to many violent conflicts in the world today.

unique in the connections they maintain to both their homelands and the host countries in which they resettle. Diaspora groups, such as the Irish, Kurdish, and Somali diasporas, among others, have emerged at the forefront of a new discussion on the nature of international relations, and, more specifically, international conflict. A distinct change in the way conflicts begin and develop means that a new framework is needed for examining them, and diasporas provide a new lens

through which to look for solutions to many violent conflicts in the world today. Some scholars have cautioned that diaspora involvement in the affairs of the homeland, such as Jewish-American involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, risks exacerbating internal conflict. However, diaspora groups can also serve as powerful mediators and work to promote peace. This paper argues that the rising influence and importance of diaspora populations make them significant players in twenty-first century

conflicts. Rather than focusing on their ability to sustain and prolong conflict, the potential of diasporas to promote peace and serve as forces for the de-escalation of conflict must be examined and encouraged. This can be accomplished by looking at the reasons for their increased prominence, the manners in which they have aided conflict, and their prospects for helping with conflict mediation.

### DEFINING DIASPORA

The definition of diaspora varies greatly, as do the groups to which the term is applied. Increasingly, the term “diaspora” is used to encompass immigrants, displaced communities, expatriates, refugees, and others. Scholars Yossi Shain and Aharon Barth offer a common, broad definition, describing a diaspora group as “a people with a common origin who reside, more or less on a permanent basis, outside the borders of their ethnic or religious homeland.”<sup>2</sup> The term “diaspora” implies something different than the terms “immigrants” or “refugees,” indicating that members of the group in question maintain links to their country of origin; attempt to retain dual levels of identity; and preserve political, cultural, and religious interests in their homeland.<sup>3</sup> In addition, diasporas differ from a transnational relationship because they refer not only to people linking the home state with a specific host state, but also to the link between the various groups residing outside the country of origin throughout the world. The case of the Kurdish diaspora, which links people from multiple states of origin who now reside in multiple host states, illustrates this.<sup>4</sup> Originally, the word diaspora referred exclusively to the Jewish population, and this is still often seen as the archetypal example.<sup>5</sup> More

recently, however, the term has been expanded to include a multitude of ethnic groups; in fact, “recently, at least thirty ethnic groups declare themselves or are described by others as diaspora.”<sup>6</sup> Although many differences exist among diasporas—for instance, some are living outside their home state while others, such as the Kurds, are “stateless”—a number of specific characteristics make diaspora groups an important factor in current international relations. The relationship diasporas maintain to their homelands, the influence they wield in their adopted countries, and their relative economic strength, among other characteristics, contribute to their significant role in conflict promotion or prevention.

## **A CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF CONFLICT AND THE INCREASED IMPORTANCE OF DIASPORAS**

Both the number and importance of diasporas have increased dramatically in the twentieth century due to a variety of factors in a changing world order. Firstly, the nature of conflict fundamentally changed over the course of the twentieth century. The vast majority of conflicts since 1989 have been intra-state rather than interstate. Between 1990 and 2007, there were only nine interstate wars, meaning that intrastate wars comprise a much larger percentage of global conflict.<sup>7</sup> Concurrent with this change have been changes in the reasons for which conflicts occur. Conflicts are now focused more on identity groups than on nation-states. These identity groups may be based on racial, ethnic, religious, or cultural divisions, but they rarely conform to nation-state boundaries. As scholar Jolle Demmers notes, these conflicts are characterized both by their political goals—which are not traditional causes of war in terms of foreign policy interests, but rather are issues such as ethnic homogeneity and self-determination—and by their ideologies, less focused on political principles such as democracy or communism, and instead looking toward identity politics, religion, or cultural differences.<sup>8</sup> The majority of recent conflicts occur in economically and politically weaker states, where governments often have less control over their territory, and the means by which they are fought have changed as well: Rather than large, conventional armies, recent conflicts are often carried out by irregular forces and militias.

All of these changes have important implications for the rise of diaspora populations. On a basic level, intrastate conflicts often pose increased danger to civilians, who are more likely to be intentional targets of violence in civil war.<sup>9</sup> Especially in protracted civil wars, this means that more people are likely to flee, creating large refugee flows and growing diaspora groups.<sup>10</sup> More importantly, this shift in the nature of conflict has opened up a new political realm for diasporas to occupy. While conflicts are frequently no longer between nations, the idea of nationalism has become in many ways de-territorialized. As Shain points out, the

“center of the nation-state ideal is the belief that people with a distinct character should possess their own territory. Thus, over time, a world consisting of independent nation-states should, by definition, obviate such phenomena as separatist movements and diasporas.”<sup>11</sup> However, in a globalized world, territory and identity are no longer irrevocably linked. Rather than the demise of nationalism that many scholars predicted with the rise of globalization, many groups are instead

## As globalization increases, so does the role of diasporas as political agents.

beginning to conceive of their nationalism in a delocalized way. Demmers argues that “we are witnessing the construction of transnational national communities.”<sup>12</sup> In this way, even as violent conflicts are moving toward smaller, intra-state affairs, the nature of the conflicts and the changing manner in which nationalism is being conceived is altering the

traditional sovereign nation-state system. The rise of transnational identities, the shift toward identity-based political conflicts, and the growing number of refugees worldwide, have combined to give diaspora groups an increasingly prominent role in international relations.

Globalization and technological change play an integral part in this process, specifically with regard to the interaction of diaspora groups with their home countries. Changes in technology, such as widespread Internet access, increases in the speed of communications, new means of travel, and an increase in the movement of ideas, have contributed to erasing traditional borders, “facilitating the development of new ideas of ‘imagined community.’”<sup>13</sup> These factors have an especially large effect on the relationship between diaspora populations and their homelands. As globalization increases, so does the role of diasporas as political agents. Advances in transportation, communication, and financial transactions allow diasporas to act internationally without going through the prescribed channels of their host states. Additionally, groups can use electronic publications, websites, and other means to organize and maintain links between diasporas in countries throughout the world. Specifically with regard to conflicts, an increase in the access to coverage of confrontations worldwide involves diaspora communities more closely in the struggles of their home states. The results of these developments are twofold. First, the ability to maintain closer links to one’s homeland can serve to limit the extent of assimilation into the host country that previously characterized immigration. Furthermore, technology that enables better communication and helps facilitate organization has strengthened the potential role of diaspora communities, both in their homelands and host countries.<sup>14</sup>

## AN OVERVIEW OF DIASPORAS IN CONFLICT

However, the change in borders and the force of globalization do not mean that diasporas are merely a transnational extension of the citizens still residing in the homeland. Because of the distance between homelands and diasporas, the discourses of nationality and struggle are inherently divergent, even if they are in concurrence on a number of points.<sup>15</sup> Precisely because of the factors that distinguish the diaspora from the homeland, diasporas interact with the population in their countries of origin in very specific ways, which will be discussed below. These distinct interests and traits are especially poignant in the manner in which a diaspora participates in the conflicts of its homeland. Before investigating the potential for diasporas to either fuel or mitigate conflicts in their home states, it is necessary to look at the specific investments of a diaspora population in a given conflict.

Diasporas have a particular role to play in conflicts that occur in their countries of origin. Much has been written about this role and its potential for either "peace-making" or "peace-wrecking," to use the terminology of scholars Hazel Smith and Paul Staes. However, as Smith points out, based on a number of country-specific case studies, "it is hard to find...an example of a diaspora in conflict that has been a thorough-going peace-wrecker. All arguably want peace—the major question is, on what terms."<sup>16</sup> Therefore, the first question to ask is this: In what way do diasporas interact differently with conflicts than the population remaining in the homeland? For one, they frequently become involved in confrontations that involve intangible issues such as identity, beliefs, and cultural norms, rather than more concrete issues such as resource sharing or territory. These are frequently "zero-sum" conflicts, which make them more difficult to resolve.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the technological progress discussed earlier that allows populations abroad to stay in close contact with the affairs of their homelands—the Internet, television, and telephone—also means that the way diasporas experience conflicts today is different. They remain physically removed from the direct suffering of those at home, but are now emotionally and psychologically much more involved. Some social scientists have argued that this removal provides them with a lack of responsibility and accountability that greatly affects the way they participate in conflict.<sup>18</sup> The diaspora becomes involved in the issues of its homeland for a variety of reasons, such as emotional or nostalgic attachment, concern for family members and friends who remain in the country, or a desire to eventually return. Interest in the outcome of violence at home is often even stronger when the diaspora was formed as a result of forced migration due to conflict.<sup>19</sup> Combined with the often differing perspective of the diaspora, these motivations may lead to divergence between the diaspora community and the government of their homeland. For instance, in his case study of the Armenian diaspora in the aftermath of Armenian

independence, Shain argues that factions of the diaspora played a key role in prompting the resignation of then-president Levon Ter-Petrossian. The diaspora viewed Ter-Petrossian as too forgiving in his negotiations with Turkey, an opinion that Shain argues differed from the larger Armenian population, which was more likely to view the negotiations as necessary for the new country's survival. In this case, the emotional opposition of the diaspora to negotiations with Turkey differed from the more pragmatic views of the homeland.<sup>20</sup>

Diasporas have a particularly strong, and in some cases disproportionate, hand in the conflicts they choose to get involved in for a number of reasons. First, they often have significant economic wealth, especially in comparison to the populations in their home countries. Remittances sent back to the homeland are remarkable; in 2013, developing countries received \$404 billion in remittances according to the World Bank.<sup>21</sup> Remittances can be an especially powerful economic force in countries experiencing conflict, where traditional economic sectors have been damaged. In Somalia, for example, annual remittance flows are the largest source of revenue, estimated at \$1.2 billion per year. This exceeds revenue flows from foreign direct investment, livestock trade (Somalia's largest commercial trade), and foreign aid.<sup>22</sup> Secondly, the identity groups that are frequently the ones involved in the conflict of the homeland lack formal representation. Without a lobby in the United Nations (UN) or in regional international bodies, the ability of groups such as the Sikhs in India or the Karen in Myanmar to get their voices heard outside their borders is limited.<sup>23</sup> Here, a diaspora can lobby its host government to bring the conflict to the fore internationally. Combined with the fact that, often, diaspora groups enjoy freedom of expression not available to them in their countries of origin, they can have an extremely large effect in their host countries—this is the case, for instance, with the Kurdish diaspora, which played a significant role during the Iraq War in 2003, in part because of its ability to assert itself outside Iraq in ways that the Kurds within the country were otherwise unable to do.<sup>24</sup>

## **THE PERPETUATION AND WORSENING OF CONFLICT**

Numerous scholars have argued that in part because of these specific interests and abilities, diaspora populations invariably prolong and worsen the conflicts in which they become involved. Scholars Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler even claim that the presence of an active diaspora is a significant factor in predicting whether violence in a country suffering from a civil war will reoccur, and that diasporas nearly always delay the peace process after a conflict has been resolved.<sup>25</sup> As mentioned above, because diasporas are removed from the physical violence of the situation, they experience it differently than their counterparts in the homeland. Those who emphasize the negative role of diasporas in conflict cite this disparate



experience as one of the primary problems. Although some scholars have proposed that nationalism has become de-territorialized, it is possible that because diasporas are not experiencing the danger and insecurity at home, diaspora groups may tend to romanticize and idealize their homeland, and cling to an idea of territoriality.<sup>26</sup> Here, territory provides an example of how the distance between a diaspora group and the home state can cause diasporas to oppose policies that would improve security at home, because from abroad they perceive the policy as damaging what they have come to view as their identity. For instance, in 2000, the Jewish-American diaspora and former Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak clashed over then-U.S. President Bill Clinton's proposed peace plan, which outlined shared Israeli-Palestinian sovereignty over the Temple Mount. Reportedly, members of the Jewish-American diaspora protested that this compromise threatened "to undermine the Jewish identity of American Jews and tear away at the already delicate fabric of their relationship with Israel."<sup>27</sup> The diaspora protested the decision because it harmed their symbolic identity, while some Jews in Israel argued that the diaspora's detachment was causing them to value this identity over the security of the Israeli people.<sup>28</sup> In a 2001 interview with *Anglo File*, rabbi and activist David Clayman noted, "I don't make light of Jerusalem or the Temple Mount, but it's nice to live in [the United States] and to know that the Temple Mount is in our hands. But what is really to see up there? Mosques. And for what price?"<sup>29</sup> While this is an oversimplification of a complex issue, it demonstrates the manner in which the diaspora's conception of identity can cause it to break with the interests of the homeland, and potentially worsen the conflict that already exists there.

There are numerous cases where remittances from diaspora populations abroad have been used to purchase arms, fund terrorist groups, and otherwise prolong the military component of the conflict.

Just as the diaspora's symbolic conception of the homeland can lead to the worsening of conflict, so too can its economic power. There are numerous cases where remittances from diaspora populations have been used to purchase arms, fund terrorist groups, and otherwise prolong the military component of a conflict. These cases include the Sri Lankan Tamils, the Kurds, the Armenians, and others. In the conflict in Northern Ireland, millions of dollars of funding for the Irish Republican Army came from Irish-American organizations throughout the United States.<sup>30</sup> There is even evidence that guns used in shootings came from the Boston Police Department by way of the diaspora community.<sup>31</sup> There are also examples



where members of the diaspora returned home specifically to participate in the fighting, such as in Bosnia, where “weekend fighters” returned from Germany to fight.<sup>32</sup> This type of support, coupled with the influence the diaspora wields both in the homeland and in the host state, have led numerous scholars to caution that the presence of large populations outside the home state may worsen a conflict. Terrence Lyons of George Mason University cautions that “diasporas often support militants engaged in homeland conflicts and tend to frame conflicts in uncompromising and categorical ways that in turn influence the political strategies of parties back home.”<sup>33</sup> Because of their removal from the conflict, and their immunity from the direct losses of citizens at home, it is argued, the presence of a large and influential diaspora group inevitably plays a role in worsening the conflict in which they become involved.

## THE POTENTIAL FOR MEDIATION

Although there are numerous examples where the participation of groups outside the homeland has exacerbated the conflict occurring in the state of origin, diasporas are a permanent and growing feature of the international system. Therefore, to view them as irrevocably negative forces is shortsighted and potentially harmful. As analysts Reinhard Lohrmann and Stefano Guerra point out, to paint migration as solely a security threat is to risk “unwittingly facilitating the scientization of xenophobic and racist discourses.”<sup>34</sup> Diasporas offer enormous possibility as outside mediators to internal strife in their homelands. Furthermore, there are a number of examples of diasporas having a distinctly positive influence, such as the Irish-American diaspora’s eventual role in the Northern Ireland peace agreement, or the Somali diaspora’s valuable financial contributions toward rebuilding. Most importantly, among these positive examples, there are a number of patterns that can be seen, offering a hopeful narrative for the manner in which diasporas can be actively involved in future conflict resolution.

While diasporas may not feel the direct physical effects of a conflict in their home state, they are not completely free from repercussions, as scholars who have observed their potential to worsen conflict have argued. Rather, because of the links diaspora groups maintain to their homelands, resolving a conflict there has important effects for them economically and socially, both as a matter of self-image, as well as a matter of the way in which they are viewed in their host society, making it in their interest for peace to be achieved as quickly as possible.<sup>35</sup> For instance, after September 11th, the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora took steps to distance itself from the activities of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam in order to avoid being viewed as supporting terrorist activity abroad.<sup>36</sup> In cases of conflict, the vested interest that diasporas possess can be viewed as increasing their

impetus to work toward peace in their homelands. In many ways, diasporas may act similarly to interest or lobby groups during conflict resolution, but they have more knowledge of and investment in their homelands.<sup>37</sup> Due to their unique relationship to the conflict, diaspora groups may be more invested and more readily received as mediators than traditional third-party actors.

Especially in the case of poorer, less-developed countries, where conflict occurs more often today, legitimacy is of vital importance in the resolution of conflict. Here, in particular, the diaspora can assert important leverage on regime behavior. For instance, "If the homeland country and the regime suffer politically from lack of legitimacy, the governments then need outside support to survive, and the support they seek usually comes from the diaspora."<sup>38</sup> In the case of Northern Ireland, the diaspora, once seen as a major contributor to the violence, played an integral role in lobbying the U.S. government, eventually involving then-president Bill Clinton, who appointed former Senator George Mitchell to oversee the implementation of the pivotal Good Friday Agreement.<sup>39</sup> The influence of Irish-Americans in lobbying the U.S. government and involving a third party to help bring the conflict to a resolution is a well-documented example of the way diasporas can use their leverage to facilitate the peace process.

As professor Jacob Bercovitch points out, frequently, "the termination of a conflict requires an audience beyond the geographical boundaries of the conflict arena to be addressed."<sup>40</sup> As demonstrated in the case of Northern Ireland, this arena is one of the most important potential areas for diaspora populations to play an integral role in the settlement of the conflict. While critics argue that diasporas can expand conflict by involving outside parties and turning an intra-state conflict into an interstate one, this position can be utilized in the opposite way as well. Groups can lobby their host country governments and international organizations at every stage of conflict; by forcing the international community to address a conflict either in the prevention stage or during the conflict itself, a diaspora can stop or prevent violence in its homeland. In addition, diasporas can promote the ideals of multiculturalism and liberal social values that they have gleaned from their host states and export them to the homeland, representing another opportunity to advance positive change in their home states.<sup>41</sup>

Due to their unique relationship to the conflict, diaspora groups may be more invested and more readily received as mediators than traditional third-party actors.

Furthermore, diaspora populations can establish formal and informal channels to discuss resolution of conflicts. Diasporas have an important hand in framing conflict issues, and this influence can be used to facilitate the peace process.<sup>42</sup> In Sudan, for example, diaspora groups supported a number of private radio stations to mobilize support for peacebuilding following a period of conflict in the early 2000s.<sup>43</sup> One arena in which this can be especially influential is in addressing human rights concerns and violations committed in wartime. Because of a combination of the lack of governmental legitimacy in the home state and the larger freedom of expression often granted in the host country, diaspora groups may be better suited for this position than anyone in the homeland.

The economic role that has so often been cited as a contributor to conflict is actually a manner in which diaspora groups may be able to help resolve a conflict. In this vein, groups outside the homeland can contribute economically to factions that may feel deprived of resources, possibly making these parties unwilling to engage in conflict for fear of losing these remittances.<sup>44</sup> In the post-conflict stage, the role of remittances may be even larger. After violence, much of the infrastructure of the homeland is in need of extreme repairs, and the money sent by the diaspora can help to alleviate the economic stress that is so often a contributor to the reemergence of conflict. For instance, in Somaliland, a semi-autonomous region in northern Somalia, remittances have been crucial to the rebuilding process. Members of the diaspora, who are often wealthier than those who remained in the country during the conflict, contributed by paying the salaries of critical workers, such as police officers, teachers, judges, and clerics, as well as by partnering with local companies and foreign aid organizations to finance infrastructure repair.<sup>45</sup> This example shows the economic potential of the diaspora to contribute to rebuilding the homeland, especially when organizational mechanisms are put into place by the home state to facilitate the process.

## **WHAT CONCLUSIONS CAN BE DRAWN?**

Diaspora groups are not homogenous; they differ from each other in terms of their history, circumstances, and the ways in which they manifest themselves. However, they share a number of qualities, and, as demonstrated, they can be forces for peace and resolution in as many ways as they can promote conflict. Furthermore, they show no signs of lessening in importance or influence—in fact, all evidence points toward the contrary. Therefore, it is of vital importance to look at the commonalities in the way they advance the cause of peace in order to reframe the discussion of their role in international relations to focus on their potential for positive contributions. Of all lessons to be learned, one stands out primarily: Diasporas must be recognized as independent and influential actors

in peace processes. As Denise Natali, senior fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies, summarizes in her findings on the Kurdish diaspora and its role in the conflict in Iraq since 1998, "Diasporic communities linked to legitimized leaders and organizations are more likely to pursue strategies based on negotiation than are diasporas delegitimized in the international arena."<sup>46</sup> This legitimization comes in a number of forms: First, the international community must recognize the legitimacy and importance of diaspora groups in general. Secondly, the host government must acknowledge and support the diaspora community. Because diasporas tend to promote the rhetoric and values of their host country, especially when living in a liberal, democratic state, the support of the host government is critical to diasporas viewing themselves as part of the peace process. As the case of Northern Ireland illustrates, even diasporas that originally fueled violence and conflict can be incorporated as important partners for third-party actors in the resolution stage. Lastly, legitimacy must come from the homeland government itself. If the government in the host state recognizes the potential of the diaspora to promote its cause abroad and to contribute to resolution at home, and therefore includes it as a legitimate actor, the diaspora is more likely to see and act on its responsibility to work toward peace at home. This recognition can be manifested both in rhetoric and action; the homeland government may reserve governmental powers or representation for the diaspora, consult it when making important decisions during and after conflict, and petition it to advance the homeland interests in the host countries.

**Legitimacy must come  
from the homeland  
government itself.**

In conclusion, the way that both state and non-state actors engage in conflict today has changed drastically. The definitions of intra-state, interstate, and non-state have become blurred, as has the distinction between nations and international populations. Diasporas are an important manifestation of this change, which require a new understanding and framework for mediating conflict. By focusing on the potential for diasporas to aid in peace and reconciliation processes in the new international system, important and lasting conclusions can be drawn. In a world order that no longer conforms to a conventional realist image, diasporas have an important and long-term role to play, and ignoring the positive possibilities associated with this role is both rash and potentially harmful. 

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> "Migration and Human Rights," Office of the High Commission for Human Rights, <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Migration/Pages/MigrationAndHumanRightsIndex.aspx>.

- <sup>2</sup> Yossi Shain and Aharon Barth, "Diasporas and International Relations Theory," *International Organization* 57, no. 3 (2003): 452, quoted in "Diasporas as Peacemakers: Third Party Mediation in Homeland Conflicts," Bahar Baser and Ashok Swain, *International Journal of World Peace* 25, no. 3 (September 2008): 8.
- <sup>3</sup> Jacob Bercovitch, "A neglected relationship: Diasporas and conflict resolution," *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?*, ed. Hazel Smith and Paul Stares (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 19.
- <sup>4</sup> Denise Natali, "Kurdish intervention in the Iraq War," *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?*, ed. Hazel Smith and Paul Stares (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 198.
- <sup>5</sup> Yossi Shain, *Kinship and Diasporas in International Affairs* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2007) 1.
- <sup>6</sup> Baser and Swain, 8.
- <sup>7</sup> See Joseph M. Grieco, G. John Ikenberry, and Michael Mastanduno, *Introduction to International Relations: Enduring Questions and Contemporary Perspectives* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 142; Steven R. David, "On Civil War," *The American Interest* 2, no. 4 (1 March 2011), <http://www.the-american-interest.com/2007/03/01/on-civil-war/>.
- <sup>8</sup> Demmers, 87.
- <sup>9</sup> Stathis N. Kalyvas, "The Logic of Violence in Civil War" (paper, Yale University, New Haven: 2000), 2.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 25–26.
- <sup>11</sup> Shain, 9.
- <sup>12</sup> Demmers, 93.
- <sup>13</sup> Bercovitch, 20.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>15</sup> Shain, 103.
- <sup>16</sup> Hazel Smith, "Diasporas in international conflict," *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?*, ed. Hazel Smith and Paul Stares, (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 10.
- <sup>17</sup> Bercovitch, 24.
- <sup>18</sup> Demmers, 95.
- <sup>19</sup> Baser and Swain, 14.
- <sup>20</sup> Yossi Shain, "The Role of Diasporas in Conflict Perpetuation or Resolution," *SAIS Review* 22, no. 2 (2002). 130–131.
- <sup>21</sup> "Remittances to Developing Countries to Stay Robust This Year, despite Increased Deportations of Migrant Workers, Says WB," World Bank, 11 April 2014, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2014/04/11/remittances-developing-countries-deportations-migrant-workers-wb>.
- <sup>22</sup> Laura Hammond, *Family Ties: Remittances and Livelihoods Support in Puntland and Somaliland* (report, Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization: 2013), 23.
- <sup>23</sup> Demmers, 87.
- <sup>24</sup> Natali, 196.
- <sup>25</sup> Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler, "Greed and grievance in civil war," *Oxford Economic Papers* 56, no. 4 (October 2004), 575,589.
- <sup>26</sup> Terrence Lyons, "Conflict-generated diasporas and transnational politics in Ethiopia," *Conflict, Security and Development* 7, no. 4 (November 2007), 532.
- <sup>27</sup> Shain (2007), 106.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

- <sup>29</sup> Charlotte Halle, "Advocate, Rabbi, Peacenik, Host: 'Jerusalem Will Miss David Clayman,'" *Haaretz*, 23 May 23 2003, <http://www.haaretz.com/advocate-rabbi-peacenik-host-jerusalem-will-miss-david-clayman-1.9266>.
- <sup>30</sup> Shain (2007), 115.
- <sup>31</sup> Bercovitch, 31.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Lyons, 545.
- <sup>34</sup> Richard Lohrmann and Stefano Guerra, "Migrants, Refugees, and Insecurity in International Relations," *Of Fears and Foes: Security and Insecurity in an Evolving Global Political Economy*, ed. Jose V. Cipurut (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 145.
- <sup>35</sup> Bercovitch, 21.
- <sup>36</sup> C. Christine Fair, "The Sri Lankan Tamil Diaspora: Sustaining Conflict and Pushing for Peace," *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?*, ed. Hazel Smith and Paul Stares, (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 185.
- <sup>37</sup> Baser and Swain, 19.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid., 21.
- <sup>39</sup> The Good Friday Agreement, ratified in 1998, ended a three-decade long sectarian conflict in Northern Ireland, known as the Troubles. For more information on the agreement and the peace process, see [http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/events/good\\_friday\\_agreement](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/events/good_friday_agreement). Terrence Lyons, "Engaging Diasporas to Promote Conflict Resolution: Transforming Hawks into Doves" (working paper, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA: April 2004), 18, <http://tamilnation.co/conflictresolution/lyons.pdf>.
- <sup>40</sup> Bercovitch, 32.
- <sup>41</sup> Shain (2007), 109.
- <sup>42</sup> Lyons (2004), 12.
- <sup>43</sup> Baser and Swain, 12.
- <sup>44</sup> Bercovitch, 30.
- <sup>45</sup> Mary Harper, *Getting Somalia Wrong?: Faith, War and Hope in a Shattered State* (London: Zed Books, 2012), 128; Nauja Kleist, "Agents of Development and Change: The Somali Diaspora at Work" *Africa's Finances: the Contribution of Remittances*, eds. Raj Bardouille, Margaret Grieco, and Muna Ndulo, (Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008). 103.
- <sup>46</sup> Natali, 196.