Introduction

Diasporic Return and Migration Studies

Takeyuki Tsuda

Ethnic Return Migration: A Global Phenomenon

Immigration scholars have recently become increasingly interested in diasporas—ethnic groups that have been territorially dispersed across different nations because of ethnopolitical persecution or for economic reasons and are united by a sense of attachment to and longing for their country of ethnic origin (the ethnic homeland) (e.g., see Cohen 1997; Safran 1991; Tölölyan 1996; Van Hear 1998). A number of scholars have examined how diasporas have continued to evolve through further migratory scattering, but relatively few have studied how certain diasporic peoples have also been returning to their ethnic homelands (Stefansson 2004: 6). In general, there are two types of diasporic return. The first is the return migration of first-generation diasporic peoples who move back to their homeland (country of birth) (see Gmelch 1980; Long and Oxfeld 2004; Markowitz and Stefansson 2004). The second is *ethnic* return migration, which refers to later-generation descendants of diasporic peoples who "return" to their countries of ancestral origin after living outside their ethnic homelands for generations.[1]

The contributors to this book provide a comparative ethnographic overview of most of the world's major ethnic return migrant groups. In recent decades, the total volume of ethnic return migration has increased significantly. The most prominent example is the millions of Jews in the Diaspora who have migrated to Israel since World War II. The largest group of Jewish ethnic return migrants has been from the former Soviet Union; more than 770,000 Russian Jews entered Israel between 1990 and 1999. In Western Europe, 4 million ethnic German

Table I.1 Origin states, diasporas, and ethnic return migration

Diasporic origin states	*Geographic location of diasporic peoples*	*Ethnic return migrants*
Israel	Middle East, Eastern Europe (mainly Russia), Western Europe, North America, South America (fewer)	Most from Eastern Europe, but also from other parts of the world
Germany	Eastern Europe, North America, South America	Eastern European ethnic German descendants (*Aussiedler*); a few from South America
Spain and Italy	Mainly North and South America	Predominantly Argentines of Spanish and Italian ancestry
Ireland, Sweden	United States, Western Europe	Small numbers of Irish Americans and Finland Swedes
Greece	United States, Western and Eastern Europe, Asia Minor	Ethnic Greeks from former Soviet Union, Albania, and Asia Minor; small numbers of Greek Americans
Hungary	Neighboring Eastern European countries, United States, Western Europe	Mainly ethnic Hungarian descendants from Romania
Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania, Ukraine, Latvia	Neighboring states in Eastern Europe, United States, Western Europe	Co-ethnic descendants from neighboring Eastern European countries
Russia	Surrounding countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus; North America, Western Europe	Ethnic Russian descendants from Soviet successor states in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus
Japan	Mainly North and South America	Predominantly Japanese Brazilians and Peruvians (*nikkeijin*); a few Japanese Americans
South Korea	North America, East and Central Asia, Russia, Middle East, South America (relatively few)	Mainly Korean Chinese (*chosŏnjok*); some ethnic Korean descendants from Russia, Central Asia, and the Middle East; a few Korean Americans and Korean Japanese
China	East and Southeast Asia, North America, Western Europe, Latin America (relatively few)	Mainly highly skilled ethnic Chinese descendants from Southeast Asia; a few Chinese Americans
Taiwan	China, North America	Highly skilled overseas/diasporic Chinese
Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos	East and Southeast Asia, North America, Western Europe (relatively few)	Smaller numbers of highly skilled diasporic descendants from various countries

descendants from Eastern Europe return-migrated to their ethnic homeland between 1950 and 1999.[2] Other European countries, such as Spain, Italy, Greece, Poland, and Hungary, have received much smaller populations of ethnic return migrants from Latin American and Eastern Europe. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, 2.8 million ethnic Russians living outside Russia in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus returned to their ethnic homeland between 1990 and 1998.[3] In East Asia, close to 1 million second- and third-generation Japanese and Korean descendants scattered across Latin America, Eastern Europe, and China have return-migrated to Japan and Korea since the late 1980s. China and Taiwan have also been receiving ethnic Chinese descendants from various Southeast Asian countries. There has even been limited ethnic return migration to various Southeast Asian countries. Table I.1 shows the various countries that have produced diasporas, the geographic location of these diasporic peoples, and the groups that have returned to their ethnic homelands.

Most ethnic return migration has been primarily a response to economic pressures (i.e., diasporic descendants moving from developing countries to richer ethnic homelands in the developed world). Other important factors that influence the migration are ethnic ties to ancestral homelands, a nostalgic desire to rediscover ethnic roots, and the efforts of homeland governments to actively encourage their diasporic descendants living abroad to return "home" through preferential immigration and nationality policies. The total volume of ethnic return migration is not only substantial but also generally permanent in nature. Diasporic returnees in the Middle East and Europe often migrate in order to settle permanently in their countries of ethnic origin. Although some ethnic return migrants (especially in East Asia) are sojourners who intend to remain only a few years in their ancestral homelands (as labor migrants and target earners), a number of them are prolonging their stays and settling, often with family members.

After analyzing the causes of diasporic return in Part 1, the contributors to this book focus on the ethnic and sociocultural experiences of ethnic return migrants in their ancestral homelands (Parts 2 and 3). Although many return migrants feel a nostalgic ethnic affiliation to their countries of ancestral origin, because they have been living outside their ethnic homeland for generations, they are essentially returning to a foreign country from which their ancestors came. As a result, diasporic homecomings are often ambivalent, if not negative experiences for many ethnic return migrants. Despite initial expectations that their presumed ethnic affinity with the host society (as "co-ethnics") would facilitate their social integration, they are often ethnically excluded as foreigners in their ancestral homelands

because of the alien cultural differences they have acquired while living abroad for generations (cf. Capo Zmegac 2005: 199). They are also often socioeconomically marginalized as unskilled immigrant workers and perform low-status jobs that are shunned by the host populace.

Why do the ethnic ties between diasporic return migrants and the homeland population not improve the migrants' ethnic reception or socioeconomic position in their country of ancestral origin? When migrants and hosts are ethnically related through common descent, does it produce unrealistic cultural and social expectations that are bound to be disappointed? To what extent are the negative diasporic homecomings of ethnic return migrants a product of their cultural differences and/or their low social class position as immigrant workers? How does their unexpected ethnic and socioeconomic marginalization in their ethnic homelands force them to reconsider their ethnonational identities and loyalties as well as their previous notions of home and homeland? How do we account for variations in their ethnic experiences and their levels of social integration as immigrants?

This book's comparative approach will help answer some of these fundamental questions because it examines a wide variety of ethnic return migrant groups in different countries. Some groups have been living outside their ethnic homelands for many generations (such as Jews and ethnic Germans), whereas others, such as Japanese Brazilians and Korean Chinese and Korean Americans, are only a couple of generations old. Some have retained their cultural heritage to a considerable extent, such as ethnic Hungarians in Romania and Finland Swedes in Finland, whereas others, such as Russian Jews and ethnic Germans, are quite assimilated and have lost much of their ancestral culture, despite retaining distinct ethnic identities. Although most diasporic returnees are labor migrants from poorer countries, the contributors to this book also consider the ethnic return migration of professionals and students from developed countries, because their different global positioning and higher socioeconomic status in their ethnic homelands seem to produce more positive ethnic outcomes.

The comparative framework of this book therefore allows the contributors to analyze how the differing sociocultural characteristics and national origins of ethnic return migrants influence their levels of social integration or marginalization in their ethnic homelands and subsequent transformations in their ethnonational identities. The contributors also assess how differing migration patterns, homeland immigration and nationality policies, and host society receptions affect the ethnic return migration experience.

An international and interdisciplinary group of the best scholars studying various ethnic return migrant groups from around the world was assembled for this edited volume. A highly successful two-day conference was held at the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies at the University of California at San Diego to present and discuss the submitted papers, which led to fruitful discussion, commentary, and exchange of ideas and feedback. I subsequently selected the best papers from the conference and provided extensive comments for revision to all authors. Because of the considerable amount of intellectual exchange between the chapter contributors and me (as well as among the contributors themselves), I hope that this edited volume has much greater conceptual unity than most others.

With the exception of the two chapters in Part 1 that analyze ethnic return migration policy, all contributors have conducted in-depth fieldwork among ethnic return migrants (interviews and participant observation), often in both the migrant-sending and migrant-receiving countries. Therefore, in contrast to previously published work on the topic, which has mainly relied on survey questionnaires, media reports, and statistical, governmental, and archival sources (e.g., see Münz and Ohliger 2003; Pilkington 1998; Rock and Wolff 2002), the contributors to this book examine ethnic return migrants in much greater depth through ethnographic accounts and analyses of their actual ethnic experiences. Such detailed ethnographic field data are supported by the use of these other sources in order to document broader trends and provide policy and historical context.

Contributions to Migration Studies

Ethnic return migration shares some similarities with the return migration of first-generation emigrants to their country of birth, because both groups are returning to their homeland (a place of origin to which an individual feels personally and emotionally attached). However, return migrants are going back to their *natal* homeland (i.e., place of birth), whereas ethnic return migrants are later-generation diasporic descendants returning to their *ethnic* (or *ancestral*) homeland, where their ethnic group originated. As Markowitz and Stefansson's (2004) edited volume on return migration demonstrates, the homecomings of even first-generation return migrants are fraught with problems, and these migrants are rarely reintegrated smoothly into their natal homelands (see also Long and Oxfeld 2004). Such difficulties are compounded for ethnic return migrants, because they were born and raised abroad and are

essentially strangers in an ethnic homeland that has become a foreign country for them. In fact, their relatively poor social integration in the host society resembles that of other labor migrants because they have become immigrant minorities in their countries of ancestral origin.

Despite the relatively large number of ethnic return migrants around the world, the topic has not received much attention in migration studies. Usually referred to in the literature as ethnic affinity migration, most research has dealt with Jewish and ethnic German diasporic return (e.g., see Münz and Ohliger 2003; Remennick 2007; Rock and Wolff 2002). Although a few books have been published recently on other groups of ethnic return migrants (Louie 2004; Pilkington 1998; Roth 2002; Tsuda 2003), no general comparative analyses of this phenomenon as a distinctive type of migration have been conducted.[4] The study of ethnic return migration can therefore make a number of important contributions to the field of migration studies.

Ethnicity and Migration

Because ethnicity plays a greater role in structuring migration patterns and experiences in ethnic return migration, it provides immigration researchers with the opportunity to further explore the relationship between ethnicity and migration. Ethnicity is based on a collective consciousness of both shared racial descent and commonalities in cultural heritage that differentiate a particular social group from others. In other words, ethnicity has both a racial and a cultural component. Although some researchers consider racial identity separately from ethnic (cultural) identity (e.g., see Smith 1986), I view a consciousness of common descent and racial origins to be a part of ethnic identity (even if not all ethnic minority groups are seen as racially or phenotypically distinct from the dominant majority). This is consistent with Weber's classic definition of ethnicity as a subjective belief in common descent shared by a social group because of similarities in both cultural customs and physical appearance (Weber 1961). So what exactly is ethnic about ethnic return migration, and how is it different in this respect from other types of migration? This is a fundamental question that the contributors to this book attempt to address.

Despite its name, most ethnic return migration is not driven by the search for ethnic roots and ancestral heritage but by global economic disparities, which have caused diasporic descendants from poorer countries to return to their richer ethnic homelands. Although ethnicity by itself does not cause or initiate ethnic return migration, it channels and directs the migratory flow to specific

countries (see Chapter 1). In response to economic pressures, many diasporic descendants decide to return-migrate because of their presumed ethnic ties to their ancestral homelands and because homeland governments have generally welcomed them back through preferential immigration and nationality policies as "ethnic brethren" (see Chapters 1, 2, and 3).

Despite its mainly economic motivations, diasporic return also has serious ethnic consequences, especially in terms of the relative salience of race and culture. The transnational ethnic affiliation of diasporic descendants with their ethnic homelands is based primarily on shared *racial* descent and ancestry. However, when they return-migrate, many of them become marginalized in their ancestral homelands as ethnic minorities because of their alien *culture*, a product of their foreign upbringing. As a result, the definition of ethnicity shifts from race to culture during the migratory process, as initial ethnic inclusion on the basis of race leads to ethnic exclusion on the basis of culture. In this manner, ethnicity is highly situational in practice, and perceptions of racial and cultural commonality and difference are constantly subject to redefinition depending on particular social contexts.

Therefore, although ethnicity is not the primary motive of ethnic return migrants, nor does it improve their immigrant reception in the ancestral homeland, it remains important in structuring diasporic return migration patterns, homeland governments' immigration and nationality policies, host society perceptions, and the ethnonational identity outcomes of the migrants themselves, as shown by the various contributors to this book. In fact, the presumed ethnic affinity between migrants and their hosts may actually magnify the ethnic impact of immigration because interaction with a similar ethnic group can have a more profound effect on ethnic consciousness than contact with a completely foreign group whose characteristics have no ethnic relevance. Because both migrants and hosts anticipate that the diasporic return of co-ethnics will be less problematic than other types of immigration, the mutual ethnic and social alienation that results is all the more disorienting, forcing both migrants and hosts to fundamentally reconsider their ethnic identities. This is the "problem with similarity" that Cook-Martín and Viladrich refer to in this volume (Chapter 5).

Immigration, Transnationalism, and Ethnic Return

In addition to its ethnic aspects, the return of diasporic descendants to their ethnic homelands is different from the migratory patterns that have dominated immigration studies.[5] Because they are returning to the country from which

their ancestors came, the reverse directionality of the migrant flow introduces interesting new dynamics to previous studies of immigration.

Traditionally, immigration scholars have tended to analyze population flows as unidirectional: Migrants leave the sending society, immigrate and settle in the host society, and eventually assimilate. This perspective is also unipolar because it focuses almost exclusively on the host society by examining its reception of different immigrant groups, their social integration and socioeconomic success, and their eventual assimilation (or segmented assimilation) into the dominant host society (e.g., see Alba and Nee 1997; Gordon 1964; Portes and Rumbaut 1996; Reitz 2003). The impact of emigration on sending communities is usually neglected.

In recent decades a number of anthropologists and sociologists have argued that migration is not merely a unipolar one-way process of immigration, settlement, and assimilation confined to the receiving nation-state. Instead, they have emphasized the transnational aspects of migratory flows by focusing on their circular and ongoing nature as part of the constant global movement of peoples, commodities, and information across national borders. Instead of simply assimilating and being absorbed into singular national communities, migrants (and their descendants) retain economic, social, and political ties to their homelands, live in transnational communities that simultaneously span two or more nation-states, and develop multiple and diffuse transnational identifications that challenge nationalist loyalties and agendas (e.g., see Basch et al. 1994; Glick Schiller 1997; Pessar and Waters 2002; Portes et al. 1999; Rouse 1991; Smith and Guarnizo 1998). The analysis is bipolar, encompassing both the migrant-receiving and the migrant-sending societies, and technically requires multisite fieldwork.

Ethnic return migration points to a third migratory pattern. Not only can migrants become permanent settlers in the host society or circular transmigrants, but they (and their descendants) can also return to the homeland and stay. Although this pattern is relevant to issues raised by the previous two migration paradigms, the study of diasporic return also provides a new perspective to them. Most ethnic return migrants are marginalized as minorities in their ethnic homelands, but this has not discouraged them from settling long term in their countries of ancestral origin, where economic opportunities and living standards are better. Thus issues related to immigrant settlement and social integration and assimilation have become important not only for immigrant-receiving countries but also for the original migrant-sending coun-

try, which has now come full circle and become the host society, as the descendants of emigrants who left generations ago have now returned. Although the immigration-assimilation paradigm assumes that the social integration of coethnic descendants will be relatively smooth, it is often just as difficult and complicated as the social incorporation of immigrants who are complete foreigners. Because of initial presumptions of ethnic similarity, the sociocultural differences that emerge between migrants and their hosts in their ethnic encounter are unexpected and unsettling. Again, this is the "problem with similarity."

The study of diasporic return also contributes to the transnational perspective by emphasizing that migration is not a unidirectional phenomenon that eventually comes to an end but rather an unpredictable, ongoing process not only among first-generation migrants but also for their second- (and later-) generation descendants, who can uproot themselves and become transmigrants all over again, long after immigrant settlement and assimilation have taken place. Ethnic return migrants also live in transnational communities that link both immigrant-receiving and migrant-sending countries,[6] but unlike ordinary migrants, their cross-border ties are constructed between two homelands (the ethnic and natal homelands). Although they may therefore be seen as prime candidates for developing transnational identities based on an affiliation to multiple nation-states (homelands), diasporic return often weakens previous attachments to ethnic homelands and can strengthen parochial nationalist sentiments (see Chapters 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12).

Diasporic Studies

The concept of diaspora has been increasingly invoked to capture the qualities of migratory dispersal and dislocation and the transborder nature of migrant communities and identities. The diasporic perspective is technically multipolar (i.e., involving several nation-states), because it includes the ethnic homeland and the scattered communities of diasporic descendants in various countries.

Because of the diversity of diasporas from which ethnic return migrants originate, the contributors to this book have adopted a broad definition of diaspora that encompasses not only the migratory dispersal of ethnic groups to various countries because of ethnopolitical persecution (victim diasporas), but also dispersals resulting from economic opportunity (economic diasporas) and past colonization and imperial expansion (colonial diasporas).[7] Ironically, among all the diasporas considered in this book, only Jews, who scattered across the globe for centuries mainly in response to ethnopolitical persecution, fit the classic

definition of a victim diaspora. Other ethnic return migrants are from primarily economic diasporas (such as the Korean and Japanese diasporas). Some are also from previous colonial diasporas, such as the ethnic Germans who settled in Eastern Europe as a result of conquest and colonization since the 1000s and the ethnic Russians who migrated to surrounding countries during earlier Russian imperialist expansion and more recent Soviet expansion during the cold war. Other ethnic return migrants are from what can be called nonmigratory diasporas, which are not the product of migratory dispersal at all but of changing territorial borders. This is especially the case in Eastern Europe, where national borders were contested and shifted for centuries. When nation-states lost territory as a result of political conflicts and treaties, their peoples formerly living on their territorial fringes became a part of the "diaspora" of co-ethnics in neighboring countries (without emigration). Parts of the Hungarian, Russian, Polish, and German diasporas are examples of such nonmigratory diasporas.

In addition to this diversity in diasporic types, the age of diasporas that have produced ethnic return migration is equally varied. Few are as ancient as that of the Jews, but some are hundreds of years old, such as parts of the German and Russian diasporas. Others are of much more recent origin and are less than a few generations old, such as the Korean and Japanese diasporas. Still others are somewhere in between, such as the Spanish, Italian, Greek, and some Eastern European diasporas.

As noted at the beginning of this introduction, most studies of diasporas tend to focus on the continual dispersal of peoples from the ethnic homeland to various countries around the world. Although diasporic peoples often retain strong ties to their countries of origin, certain definitions of diaspora are based on notions of exile: a fundamental separation between diasporic peoples and their homeland, which remains a distant place of nostalgic longing to which they cannot return (Safran 1991: 91; Tölölyan 1996: 14–15; see Clifford 1994: 304). This is especially the case for victim diasporas, where the cause of territorial dispersion is ethnopolitical persecution, making a return to the homeland difficult, if not sometimes impossible. Diasporic return also seems increasingly unlikely among later-generation diasporic descendants (see Sheffer 2003: 23). In contrast to many first-generation diasporic migrants, who remain marginalized and excluded in their host countries (Levy and Weingrod 2005: 17; Tölölyan 1996: 14), their descendants have been born and raised outside the ethnic homeland and have become socioculturally integrated into the majority society to a considerable extent. In fact, some scholars simply refer to them

as ethnic groups (or ethnic minorities) and differentiate them from diasporic groups because they have become detached from their ancestral homelands (McKeown 2001: 94–97; Tölölyan 1996: 16–19).

The study of ethnic return migration serves as a corrective to this conceptualization by emphasizing not only that diasporic peoples *do* return to the homeland but also that such returns are not just limited to first-generation emigrants and exiles (see also Markowitz and Stefansson 2004). Expanding globalization not only has allowed diasporic descendants (ethnic minority groups) to reconnect with their ancestral homelands from afar but also has increased the volume of ethnic return migration, a form of diasporic "in-gathering" or the "unmaking of diasporas" (Münz and Ohliger 2003; Van Hear 1998: 6, 47–48; cf. Clifford 1994: 304). In fact, certain diasporas are now characterized by a tension between centrifugal and centripetal migratory forces. For instance, the German, Japanese, and Korean (as well as some Eastern European–based) diasporas simultaneously consist of people leaving the homeland permanently for foreign countries *and* diasporic descendants returning from abroad to settle in the ethnic homeland.

Some scholars have described diasporic returns as ethnic unmixing because an ethnic group that initially scattered to different countries to become ethnic minorities is being regrouped and reconsolidated in the ethnic homeland (see Brubaker 1998). Although most diasporic descendants are culturally assimilated in their countries of birth to a considerable extent, they continue to be seen as ethnic minorities because of their foreign ethnic origins (cf. Clifford 1994: 310–311; Safran 1991: 92–93).[8] However, when they return to their ethnic homeland, they are rarely reincorporated into the majority ethnic and ancestral populace but again find themselves becoming ethnic minorities because of their cultural differences.[9] Therefore, instead of unmixing ethnic groups, diasporic return migration is creating new ethnic minorities based on the cultural differences that have emerged among peoples previously united by shared descent but who have been living apart for generations. Ethnic return migration, therefore, does not imply a decline in either the number or the diversity of ethnic minorities around the world.

Overview of the Chapters

Part 1 of this book examines the economic, ethnic, and political causes of ethnic return migration. In Chapter 1, I discuss the causes of diasporic return by assessing the relative importance of economic push-pull forces, homeland governments' ethnic return migration and jus sanguinis nationality policies,

and the nostalgic transnational affinity that many ethnic return migrants feel for their ancestral homelands.

Chapters 2 and 3 provide a comparative analysis of the preferential immigration and nationality policies of homeland governments that have enabled their ethnic descendants to return from abroad. In Chapter 2, John Skrentny, Stephanie Chan, Jon E. Fox, and Denis Kim argue that, whereas ethnic return migration policies remain strong in Asia, they have weakened in Western Europe. In Asia such policies are used for instrumental economic purposes, but in Europe they are justified on the basis of ethnic affinity or the protection of historically persecuted co-ethnics abroad, even if they are sometimes economically quite costly.

Chapter 3, by Christian Joppke and Zeev Rosenhek, is a case study comparing ethnic return migration policies in Israel and Germany. Israeli policy, which enables the return migration of all Jews in the Diaspora, has remained resilient in the face of emerging domestic political opposition because the return migration has been critical to the development of the nation-state. In contrast, German ethnic return migration policy was restricted to ethnic Germans in Eastern Europe vulnerable to persecution after World War II and has now lost much of its original historical rationale. It has been peripheral to the country's nation-state building and is now in decline. In this manner, the current geopolitical position of these two countries and the historical rationales for their ethnic return migration policies account for their divergent outcomes.

Part 2 of this book focuses on ethnic return migration in Europe. In Chapter 4 Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels examines the changing status of *Aussiedler* (ethnic German descent returnees from Eastern Europe) in Germany. Although *Aussiedler* were once openly welcomed as ethnic brethren, the German government now restricts their immigration because the decline of ethnic German persecution in Eastern Europe has undermined the raison d'être of their return migration and they have experienced serious social integration problems as unwelcome outsiders in Germany. This has caused *Aussiedler* to be seen as and treated like ordinary immigrants instead of returning German ethnics.

Chapter 5, by David Cook-Martín and Anahí Viladrich, deals with the recent ethnic return migration of Argentines of Spanish descent to Spain. Despite the numerous benefits of their presumed ethnic affinity with the host society, they are disadvantaged on the labor market because as dual nationals with Spanish citizenship, they share native Spanish work orientations and expectations and are less willing than other immigrants to perform the unskilled, low-wage jobs they are offered. In turn, their local Spanish hosts (and employers) are disil-

lusioned by the Argentines' apparently poor work ethic and come to see them as ill-suited for immigrant jobs. Cook-Martín and Viladrich conclude that ethnic return migrants who are granted citizenship expect the same rights and privileges as native workers, ironically hindering their labor market integration despite their cultural affinity with the host populace.

In Chapter 6 Charlotta Hedberg analyzes the ethnic return migration of the Swedish-speaking minority (Finland Swedes) from Finland to Sweden. Although they are a relatively privileged minority in Finland, they still experience some segregation and intolerance. They return-migrate to Sweden because of the cultural and linguistic affinity they feel for an accessible, neighboring ethnic homeland, not for purely economic reasons. Despite the ease of their social integration in Sweden, Finland Swedes are culturally distinguishable because of their Swedish dialect and feel somewhat socially excluded, causing their ethnic affinity with Sweden to initially decline and producing a greater national attachment to Finland. Over time, however, they tend to assimilate into Swedish society and retain their Finland Swede identities mainly in private.

In Chapter 7 Jon E. Fox examines the return migration of ethnic Hungarian descendants from Romania to Hungary. Over the past 15 years, Hungary has promoted a discourse of a broader, deterritorialized ethnic nation that includes Hungarian descendants in neighboring countries and has attempted to develop transborder political, cultural, and economic links with its co-ethnics abroad. However, ethnic Hungarians from Romania who have return-migrated to Hungary are economically marginalized and socially denigrated as unskilled "Romanian" labor migrants, despite their shared ethnicity with the host society. Instead of reunifying Hungarian descendants across national borders, as imagined by Hungarian political elites, ethnic return migration has reproduced national disunity and difference between ethnic Hungarians from Romania and those in Hungary.

Israel is included in this section despite its geographic location in the Middle East because it represents the largest and most important case of ethnic return migration.[10] According to Larissa Remennick (Chapter 8), because Jewish diasporic returnees are critical to Israel's ongoing nation building, they face greater expectations of national loyalty and assimilation than other ethnic return migrants. Although Russian Jews from the former Soviet Union return-migrate with considerable human capital, they have lost their Jewish linguistic and cultural background and have suffered a decline in occupational status in Israel. As a result, most experience significant social and economic marginalization and

their cultural consumption remains mainly Russian. In general, there is more social integration in public and more separatism in their private lives, indicating that the immigrant community simultaneously manifests both tendencies.

Part 3 moves to East Asia, which has received both large numbers of ethnic return migrants from developing countries and also smaller populations from developed nations. In Chapter 9, I argue that the divergent ethnic homecomings of Japanese Americans and Japanese Brazilians in Japan are mainly a product of the different positions that Brazil and the United States occupy in the global hierarchy of nations. Because of the lower position of Brazil in the international economic and political order, Japanese Brazilians have negative ethnic experiences as they toil as unskilled migrant laborers in Japan and develop defensive, nationalist identities in response to ethnic degradation in their ancestral homeland. Meanwhile, many of their Japanese American counterparts from the United States migrate to their ethnic homeland as part of the global educational and professional elite, are accorded the appropriate respect of nationals at the top of the international order, and emerge from their migratory experiences with a stronger transnational and cosmopolitan connection to their ethnic homeland.

Chapter 10 is about Japanese Peruvians in Japan. Ayumi Takenaka notes that, although Japanese Brazilians strengthened their Brazilian nationalist identities in response to their ethnic marginalization in Japan, many Japanese Peruvians in Japan have been more ambivalent about their nationalist Peruvian identities and instead have strengthened their ethnic identities as *nikkei* (peoples of Japanese descent from abroad). Because of their greater cultural and racial differences, Peruvian immigrants are lower in the Japanese ethnic hierarchy than Brazilian immigrants and have fewer employment opportunities. In addition, Japanese Peruvians distance themselves from illegal non-Japanese-descent Peruvians as more privileged Japanese-descent *nikkei*. Therefore internal divisions within the Peruvian immigrant community are another reason they remain reluctant to identify nationally as Peruvians.

In Chapter 11, Changzoo Song discusses the causes of the ethnic return migration of Korean Chinese (*chosŏnjok*, also spelled *joseonjok*) to South Korea. Because of the nostalgic images of their ethnic homeland they had developed in China, Korean Chinese are disappointed by their ethnic and socioeconomic marginalization in South Korea; they face legal and employment discrimination and are forced to perform harsh, degrading immigrant jobs. On the host society side, South Korean elites, who view Korean Chinese as people who

have maintained Korean cultural traditions, are disillusioned that their ethnic brethren from China have an insufficient work ethnic, have become too culturally Chinese, and are no longer loyal to South Korea. The alienation of Korean Chinese in their ethnic homeland causes them to recognize that they are more Chinese than Korean and to redefine China and not Korea as their homeland.

In Chapter 12, Nadia Y. Kim looks at Korean Americans in South Korea. Because Korean Americans continue to be racialized as nonwhite foreigners in the United States, they have developed a romanticized view of South Korea as the ethnic homeland where they truly belong as racial insiders. However, when they return-migrate to Korea, they are not ethnically accepted as authentic Koreans, despite their shared racial descent, because they are seen and treated as overly Americanized cultural foreigners. Because of such disillusioning experiences, Korean Americans develop some negative attitudes about South Korea and lose their previous emotional affiliation with their ethnic homeland, which no longer feels like a "home." This causes them to strengthen their identities as Americans and to redefine themselves as more at home in the United States.

In the Conclusion, I draw from the case study chapters to address some of the main concerns of the book. These include the reasons for the ethnic and socioeconomic marginalization of ethnic return migrants in their ancestral homelands and how the difficulties inherent in diasporic homecomings have forced homeland governments to reconsider their ethnic return migration policies and their conceptions of citizenship and national belonging based on shared bloodline. Finally, I discuss how the negative homecomings of ethnic return migrants have transformed their ethnonational consciousness and their understandings of home and homeland.

Notes

1. Although ethnic return migration is often referred to as ethnic affinity migration or ethnic migration in the literature, these terms will generally not be used in this book because of their greater ambiguity.

2. In addition, between 1945 and 1949, 12 million ethnic Germans were expelled from Eastern Europe after World War II and resettled in West and East Germany (and Austria).

3. A number of these returnees are first-generation Russians who emigrated during Soviet expansion during the cold war. The proportion that are later-generation ethnic Russian descendants is not clear.

4. Christian Joppke's book, *Selecting by Origin: Ethnic Migration in the Liberal State* (2005), is broader in geographic scope but focuses exclusively on the impact of ethnic preferences on immigration policy and is thus not specifically about ethnic return migrants.

5. This section was inspired by the comments of an anonymous reviewer.

6. Because ethnic return migration is also transnational, research on the topic should ideally involve the type of multisite fieldwork that most contributors to this volume have conducted.

7. This basic typology is used by Robin Cohen (1997: ch. 2).

8. In rare cases, diasporic descendants are part of the "majority" ethnic group (e.g., Argentines of Spanish and Italian descent who were considered part of the European-descent "white" majority in Argentina).

9. The only exception is ethnic return migrants who have maintained their cultural heritage and language for generations and are not ethnically and socioeconomically marginalized in the homeland. The only examples in this book are the Finland Swedes who return to Sweden and possibly a limited number of Spanish Argentines in Spain. Ethnic Russian descent return migrants in Russia may also have similar experiences.

10. Initially, a chapter on Palestinian ethnic return migration was to be included as part of a section on the Middle East.

References Cited

Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *International Migration Review* 31:826–874.

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

Brubaker, Rogers. 1998. "Migrations of Ethnic Unmixing in the 'New Europe.'" *International Migration Review* 32(4):1047–1065.

Capo Zmegac, Jasna. 2005. "Ethnically Privileged Migrants in Their New Homeland." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 18(2):199–215.

Clifford, James. 1994. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology* 9(3):302–338.

Cohen, Robin. 1997. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Glick Schiller, Nina. 1997. "The Situation of Transnational Studies." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 4(2):155–166.

Gmelch, George. 1980. "Return Migration." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 9:135–159.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Joppke, Christian. 2005. *Selecting by Origin: Ethnic Migration in the Liberal State.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Levy, André, and Alex Weingrod. 2005. *Homelands and Diasporas: Holy Lands and Other Places.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Long, Lynellyn D., and Ellen Oxfeld, eds. 2004. *Coming Home? Refugees, Migrants, and Those Who Stayed Behind.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Louie, Andrea. 2004. *Chineseness Across Borders: Renegotiating Chinese Identities in China and the United States.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Markowitz, Fran, and Anders Stefansson, eds. 2004. *Homecomings: Unsettling Paths of Return.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

McKeown, Adam. 2001. *Chinese Migrant Networks and Cultural Change: Peru, Chicago, Hawaii, 1900–1936.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Münz, Rainer, and Rainer Ohliger, eds. 2003. *Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel, and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective.* London: Frank Cass.

Pilkington, Hilary. 1998. *Migration, Displacement, and Identity in Post-Soviet Russia.* London: Routledge.

Portes, Alejandro, Luis Guarnizo, and Patricia Landolt. 1999. "Introduction: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2):217–237.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America: A Portrait.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reitz, Jeffrey, ed. 2003. *Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants.* Center for Comparative Immigration Studies Anthology Series. La Jolla: University of California at San Diego.

Remennick, Larissa. 2007. *Russian Jews on Three Continents: Identity, Integration, and Conflict.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Rock, David, and Stefan Wolff, eds. 2002. *Coming Home to Germany? The Integration of Ethnic Germans from Central and Eastern Europe in the Federal Republic.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Roth, Joshua. 2002. *Brokered Homeland: Japanese Brazilian Migrants in Japan.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rouse, Roger. 1991. "Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 1(1):8–23.

Safran, William. 1991. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 1(1):83–99.

Sheffer, Gabriel. 2003. "From Diasporas to Migrants, from Migrants to Diasporas." In *Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel, and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective*, Rainer Münz and Rainer Ohliger, eds. London: Frank Cass, 21–55.

Smith, M. G. 1986. "Pluralism, Race, and Ethnicity in Selected African Countries." In *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, John Rex and David Mason, eds. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 187–225.

Smith, Michael Peter, and Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, eds. 1998. *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Stefansson, Anders H. 2004. "Homecomings to the Future: From Diasporic Mythographies to Social Projects of Return." In *Homecomings: Unsettling Paths of Return*, Fran Markowitz and Anders Stefansson, eds. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2–20.

Tölölyan, Khachig. 1996. "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 5(1):3–36.

Tsuda, Takeyuki. 2003. *Strangers in the Ethnic Homeland: Japanese Brazilian Return Migration in Transnational Perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Van Hear, Nicholas. 1998. *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal, and Regrouping of Migrant Communities*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Weber, Max. 1961. "Ethnic Groups." In *Theories of Society*, Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils, Kaspar Naegele, and Jesse Pitts, eds. New York: Free Press, 305–309.