Migration across geographic space has been an integral part of human history. It has always been an indispensable attribute of the world’s most vibrant and prolific economies. Migration creates a triangular interface between countries of origin, countries of reception and the migrant themselves. All the way through the 18\textsuperscript{th}, 19\textsuperscript{th}, and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, mass migration from Europe to Americas and Australasia enabled millions of people to escape poverty and persecution and created one of the world’s most prosperous societies. People continued to migrate in large numbers, even after the development of the nation-states and the idea of lawfully binding populations to territorial units in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The post Second World War migration of people from poor countries of the third world to the rich industrialized countries of the west has led to the creation of a changed modern-day global reality in the form of diasporas, refugees, ethnic-minorities etc.

In its simplest definition, migrancy addresses ‘the state or condition of being a migrant’ (Oxford English dictionary). Migrancy unequivocally promotes notion of movement and process rather than constancy and fixity across both space and time. Transformation in the political, economic and social environment around the world has consequently led to considerable changes in the volume and composition of international migration. Moreover, information and communication technologies in the twentieth century have reduced geographical distances and have enabled migrant population to maintain easy contacts with their homeland and among themselves. International migration is primarily an individual or family decision to settle or work in another country for both economic and non-economic reasons. However, economic factors outweigh other factors in motivating international migration. Lack of opportunities for work or education in the country of origin; demand for immigrant labour in the receiving countries; and the hope of improving the economic situation of their family through remittances together elucidate the impetus behind undergoing migration. Around 175 million people in 2000 were estimated to be living outside
their state of nationality. This figure does not include the displaced members of nationalities in the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, nor does it include illegal migrants (United Nations 2002). Emigrant remittances and foreign direct investments by diasporas can have a noteworthy impact on the home states’ economies, especially in developing countries. In recent decades, migrant diasporas such as India’s “techies” have made manifest contribution to the state of technology while also promoting global integration, economic growth, and poverty alleviation in their home countries (Beath 2006: 151).

A number of theories elucidate reasons of international migration. One justification is advanced by supply and demand of labour related to wage differentials, indicating migration from labour abundant to labour scarce countries and in a similar way reverse flow of capital. Marxist theories have explained the trend of migration to capitalist rich countries in terms of capital, which needs a reserve army of labour to enhance the competition for jobs and maintain wages at low level, as a result of discrepancy between supply and demand of labour in the receiving country (Joly 2000: 26). Massey et al. (cited in Joly 2000: 27-28) explains by relying on capital dualism on one hand (capital intensive sectors which requires highly skilled, highly paid and high status worker and labour intensive sectors which require low skilled, low paid and low status workers), and on the other hand the ambivalent belonging of migrants whose perceived status is determined from within the sending society. This entails that while the migrants connect the society of origin, they are also at the bottom rungs of wages and status with attached stigma and latent prejudices. The social dimension of migration is further dealt in the new economics of migration proposed by Massey et al. (cited in Joly 2000: 27-28) which points to the processes as the collective decision making unit. This is done by larger units than individuals with a view to diversify and maximize sources of income as an insurance against variety of risks creating a social capital. The world system theory as advanced by Wallerstein (1974) characterizes international migration as the penetration of capitalist economic relations into peripheral non-capitalist societies and its disorderly consequences resulting in migration of people. The immigrants experience differential incorporation due to class and income disparities, and also due to inferiority status ascribed to them. Education, employment, and issues of discrimination are major concerns of both migrants and policy makers in the host societies.
Migration itself is not a singular experience; it takes place under a multitude of conditions and circumstances, for different reasons—economic, political, and personal—in vastly varied contexts. The people who are now on the move are labor migrants (both documented and undocumented), highly qualified specialists, entrepreneurs, refugees and asylum seekers, or the household members of previous migrants (Brah 1996: 178). The movement of human beings across territorialized geographic, cultural and political space is deemed as a flow threatening order, security and identity. Third world immigrants are stereotyped involving their cultural and other differences which at times are treated as a challenge to a cohesive national identity. It has generated reactions and practices ranging from different forms of racism to blatant physical brutality, practices of categorization and typecasting, production of symbols, identities and other meanings (Lynn Doty 2003: 6, 15). Thus, the modern age of migration has come under the aegis of a legal framework like the founding of the United Nations and the 1951 Geneva Convention of Refugees which established a process by which persecuted individuals could seek asylum free of fear of unjustified repatriation, while the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1959 Declaration on the Rights of the Child affirmed the primacy of kinship in immigration law.

The traditional receivers’ policies now do not intend only to populate unsettled regions. The classical countries of immigrants favour highly qualified and educated immigrants for permanent migration besides allowing some unskilled under family reunion programs. Emphasis on skills in the selection of migrants has been especially strong in relation to short-term labour migration. Information Technology (IT) has created worldwide opportunities and intense competition for workers in this field. And countries such as Australia, Canada and U.S.A. have made important policy changes that resulted in significant increases in the entry of persons whose skills are considered in short supply, and those who can contribute to the development of science and technology. Highly-skilled and professional workers have become central players in the globalization process. The impact of globalization on migration policies, and the volume, direction and the composition of migrant flows, has become one of the most debated and polemic issues in migrants literature (Appleyard 2001: 14-15).
The contemporary period of globalization has led to increase in migratory trends, which makes more and more states multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-racial, multi-religious, and multi-lingual around the world. Hence, the need arises to formulate appropriate political, economic, social, legal mechanisms, to address the reality of increasing diversity, heterogeneity and hybridity so as to ensure mutual respect and to arbitrate relations across differences. Immigrants on settling in the host country face a dilemma of either opting for eventual assimilation or maintain one’s ethno-national identity. This requires many deliberated decisions with regard to migrants’ expectations of better economic and political opportunities, and the extent to which those expectations are met. Their decisions about their future are a mix of emotional and rational considerations in the host societies done on an individual as well as familial level. Thus, the emergence of international migration as a universal force of social transformation has undeniably shaped states and societies. Accordingly, it has led to the determining of diasporic identities in multicultural and ethnically diverse host societies.

The Indian diaspora is a generic term used to describe the people who have migrated from territories that are currently within the borders of Republic of India. They don’t constitute a homogenous group; rather they exhibit immense diversity and heterogeneity. They demonstrate all the cultural, linguistic and religious diversities of their homeland along with cultural persistence and adaptations abroad. Today, the technology and communication revolution has cut down barriers for people making existence in different parts of the world a reality. The purpose of the present study is to explore the lives of Indian migrants in the host societies in terms of their adaptations and cultural persistence vis-à-vis the policies and outlook of the host societies.

Multiculturalism entails both the willingness of the majority group to accept cultural difference, and the state action to secure equal rights for the minorities. The multicultural model is a combination of a set of social policies to respond to the needs of settlers, and a statement about openness of the nation to cultural diversity. This chapter will endeavor to provide a theoretical framework defining and debating diasporic identity in a multicultural society. This will include analysis of the meaning and contents of multiculturalism and focus on Australia and United States of America.
as classical countries of immigration. Dealing with Indian migration and settlement, it shall also elucidate how international migration as a part of transnational revolution shapes societies and politics around the globe, affecting both country of origin and country of destination of people on the move.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY**

Diasporic communities have existed for centuries and in many ways complicate modern notions of geographical and political boundaries. Diaspora discourse reflects a sense of being part of an ongoing transnational network that includes a homeland. It is characterized by a sense of living in one place while simultaneously remembering and/or desiring and yearning for another place. This is because of multiplicity of relations not only between diaspora communities and their homeland in a binary context but because of the ongoing, lateral relations among diaspora communities located in different sites within nation states and in different states. William Safran (1991: 83-84) defines diaspora as: ‘expatriate minority communities’-

- That are dispersed from an original ‘center’ to at least two ‘peripheral’ places;
- That maintain a ‘memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland’;
- That ‘believe they are not and perhaps cannot be fully accepted by their host country’;
- That see the ancestral home as place of eventual return, when the time is right;
- That are committed to the maintenance or restoration of this homeland;
- Whose consciousness and solidarity as a group are ‘importantly defined’ by this continuing relationship with the homeland.

Diaspora theory is structured around three principal actors: homeland, diaspora group and host who interact in multifaceted, changing set of relationships. A theoretical approach to diaspora is multi-dimensional with many variables playing a role. The study of Indian diaspora is not a discipline by itself, but only an area of specialized study utilizing the data, concepts, methods and theories of many disciplines. Societies with considerable sections of immigrant population are social laboratories where the prominent theoretical perspectives of social science disciplines
can be tested. Diasporic sites facilitates sketching and analyzing certain key social processes like the formation of ethnic identity, the shaping of bi-lateral relations, etc.

Broadly two theoretical frameworks have been employed in the study of Indian diaspora: the socio-cultural perspective and the political economy perspective. The socio-cultural perspective drawing on conventional structural-functionalism focuses on the cultural identity and integration of diasporic communities. It addresses the issue of socio-cultural continuity and change among the diasporic communities on one hand, and the dynamics of these communities on the other. The political economy perspective focuses on the economic and political aspects of the phenomenon of Indian diaspora drawing insights from Marxist and non-Marxist socioeconomic thinking. This perspective emphasizes on the historical context of the diaspora, the mode of economy of the host country and the place of the diasporic Indians in it, and the nature of the state in the host society. While these two theoretical perspectives are different, both in their substantive interests and conceptual apparatus, they can only be complementary to each other in providing more comprehensive understanding of Indian diaspora (Jayaram 2004: 38).

The theory of acculturation has been applied in understanding the adaptations of Indian diasporic community to the values, behaviors, and practices of a new host society. Acculturation is a process involving two or more groups, with consequences for both. Generally four types of adaptation have been proposed by Berry (1980): integration (relating to both the host society and one's culture of origin); assimilation (relating to the host society and relinquishing one's culture of origin); separation (rejecting the host society and affiliating with one's culture of origin); and marginalization (not relating to either the host society or one's culture of origin). These forms of adaptation result from a bilinear/bidirectional model of acculturation (Berry), which attempts to account for biculturalism or the adherence to both native and host cultures. Assimilation when sought by the dominant group can be termed the "melting pot" (and when strongly enforced, it becomes a "pressure cooker (Bourhis et al. cited in Berry 2001: 620). For integration, when cultural diversity is an objective of the larger society as a whole, it represents the strategy of mutual accommodation now widely called "multiculturalism" (Berry 1984: 358; Berry 2001: 616-619). Evidently, the integration approach can be pursued in societies that are
unambiguously multicultural in which definite psychological preconditions are established. These preconditions are the widespread acceptance of the cultural diversity (i.e., the presence of a multicultural ideology), and of low levels of prejudice and discrimination; positive mutual attitudes among ethno-cultural groups; and a sense of attachment to, or identification with, the larger society by all individuals and groups (Berry and Kalin 1995: 302).

The process of acculturation deals with a number of spheres significant to intercultural relations (e.g., language use, food preference, parent-child relations). An analogous approach to understanding of acculturation policies draws on the idea of cultural identity. The notion of acculturation strategies is based on two underlying dimensions of own cultural preservation and involvement with other cultures. Multicultural (Berry 2001: 622), as a counterpart of acculturation process advocates that cultural diversity is good both for the society and its individual members. It is further argued that such diversity should be shared and accommodated in an equitable way. In various studies, this ideology has been assessed using a scale that loaded integration items positively and assimilation, segregation, and marginalization items negatively. Multicultural ideology has close empirical links to ethnic attitudes and prejudices but is more patently related to policy options for managing inter-group relations in culturally plural immigrant societies (Berry 2001: 620-623).

Drawing on the arguments forwarded by Berry and Safran, the present study will attempt to look at the meanings and strategies of acculturation process and the formation of Indian diasporic identity in the two settler societies under consideration. An analysis of patterns of adaptations of the Indians in the host society will be based on the socio-cultural and political economy perspective as explained earlier. A detailed examination of assimilation, integration and multiculturalism policy will be done along with review of immigration policies in the two countries. The theories propounded by others in relation to these developments will make an interesting analysis in the chapters of the present study like the works of Castles (1998), Sheffer (2003), Jupp (2001, 1991), Hugo (2003, 2006), Ueda (2005), Meyers (2004), etc.

Indian diasporic study has three kinds of writings: historical, anthropological, and diplomatic. Cross country comparisons are few. Both Australia and the United States of America share a number of important characteristics. They both started as
European settlements and are predominantly English speaking countries. They share similar political tradition of federalism and elected representative government. North America was colonized by Europe some two centuries before Australia. Both the countries have moved from being exclusionary restrictive policy to lesser racist policies and admitted substantial numbers of Asian, Latin American and African countries. However, they still employ skill criteria to restrict immigration from poor, non-European countries. The present study focuses on the changing historical role of the state: in this case the role of the state vis-à-vis immigration and multiculturalism policies. The stress on historical account helps in identifying their unique features in a comparative framework. Hence, a historical-analytical approach will be employed while comparing the two settlement societies. The study is concerned in explaining the ideology of state, multiculturalism in particular, to understand what is meant and intended by the state. The study will focuses on studying immigration policies since World War II while briefly stating pre War policies. This will enable us to look at the innate dilemmas of the immigration and multiculturalism policies. The elements of the framework of the study include a historical-comparative perspective and critical analysis of the state policies towards migrant population.

**RESEARCH QUESTION**

A series of questions can be put forward to understand the concept of multiculturalism. Such questions include why did the concept of multiculturalism arise in Australia and when it did? What were and are the foundation structures which have supported and shaped the definitions of multiculturalism that has emerged? Who have been significant definers of multiculturalism and what their definitions are? The study of multiculturalism within a framework of analyzing policies and functions of state is not restricted to a situation specific study. The theoretical framework enables to find out the inherent dilemmas in the concept of multiculturalism while understanding nature of two democratic and progressive nations. The theoretical framework will aim primarily to analyze the various ideologies of multiculturalism and assimilation which have competed for official recognition and ascendancy in the respective societies. The research attempts to address some of the above mentioned questions. To compare and contrast the two diaspora, this study proposes the following hypotheses:
• Migrants generate concerns and debates over issues of assimilation vs. multiculturalism even in nations which are classical countries of immigration like Australia and United States of America.

• Indian diaspora itself originating from a diverse and heterogeneous society has adapted and permeated many segments of host-nation's multicultural society while still retaining its Indian identity.

• Indian diaspora faces victimization in the host society despite contributing significantly to its growth and development.

• As a strategic asset linking both country of origin and country of destination, Indian diaspora plays an imminent role in international relations which cannot be ignored.

To test these hypotheses, an attempt is made at collecting relevant data based on primary and secondary sources. Also, a web survey is conducted to know the response of the Indian diasporic population with respect to these issues. The present study also aims at addressing a number of questions and issues surrounding the Indian diaspora. The following sets of questions are formulations of the major questions and issues that will be examined in the chapters:

• What legal, political, economic and social structure and practice exist or emerge to regulate migration and settlement and its impact on diasporic population.

• What are the policies adopted by the two settlement societies in responding to its increasing immigration?

• Does the Indian diaspora constitute a stable and homogenous identity or does it exhibit diversity and hybridity?

• What does it mean to be a citizen of liberal democratic society?

• Do migrants have a right to claim for citizenship?

• Can diaspora act as an asset linking both country of origin and destination?
• Is India ready to engage in open international dialogues on behalf of its diaspora?

• Do the Indians identify themselves in terms of pan-Indian identity or in terms of parochial ethnic category?

• How do Indians face the problems of racial construction especially as they move through institutions of higher education and workforce?

• What has been the role of the state in dealing with racism and other forms of ethnic hostility?

This study, through a comparative study of similarities and differences of the roles played by Australia and the United States in promoting its immigrant population, purports to deal with larger issues of policies of multiculturalism and assimilation in liberal democratic societies. It also explores the relations between the Indian diaspora and homeland development and how this dynamic relationship contributes to economic growth and foreign relations of the homelands. The contributions of diaspora are likely to become more prominent in India's political economy in the 21st century as the nation continues to woo its expatriates.

METHODOLOGY:

The study deals with historical, comparative and analytical approach in dealing contemporary issues concerning diasporic identity. For primary sources, the study will base itself on official reports and documents and a web survey conducted on Indian diaspora. An online survey was conducted during the course of research to ascertain the views and opinions of Indian diasporic population on the issues relevant to the present study. The questionnaire was sent to 685 people of Indian diaspora in Australia and America out which 93 chose to respond. The details of the survey are dealt in chapter six. A field trip to Australia was granted for fourteen days in 2008, where inputs from experts on migration, academicians and diasporic people themselves have helped immensely in proceeding with the study. Using an interdisciplinary research methodology that combines the use of census reports, survey data, and historical and secondary texts, the present study traces the growth of Indian
diaspora in context of global emigration from India. However, it is not possible to examine the entire range of social, political, economic, religious and cultural factors in a single study that colours the immigrant experiences. The present study will examine the immigration policies prevalent in the two countries under consideration besides looking at the multicultural fabric of the society and nation which hosts these immigrants. The study will draw extensively from secondary sources besides government reports, newspaper reports, conference papers, and academic papers etc. An attempt has been made towards getting some empirical element by conducting a web survey across the two countries.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Indian diaspora has increasingly begun to acquire a distinct global identity particularly in the last decade of the twentieth century. The Indian diaspora has attained the status of premier subject of theoretical reflections in humanities and social sciences owing to its complexity in terms of migratory patterns and diversity exhibited in host society. They exhibit all the cultural, linguistic and religious diversities of their homeland along with cultural persistence and adaptations abroad. Today, the technology of travel and communication has cut down the barriers for people to participate in social networks and cultures of past, making existence in multiple communities and multiple homelands a reality. Hence, it has kindled my interest in studying diaspora in a multicultural context.

Both Australia and the United States of America provide a good landscape for this study, being multicultural and classical countries of immigration. The present study will deal with comparative analysis of the national connotations of the term multiculturalism and its structural differences in various historical and contemporary contexts. Hence, the present study deals with Indian migration to Australia in comparison with the United States of America. There is a considerable lacuna in the knowledge of Indian migrations to Australia unlike the case of U.S.A... Some gaps are progressively being filled by the studies done by some Australians as well as some Indian researchers and academicians. Yet, a lot needs to be done. Both the settlement societies had a colonial legacy and have a considerable number of immigrants populating its geographical space. Being liberal democratic societies, both the
countries provide for tremendous scope of enquiry into issues related to the migrant population. United States has followed 'bottom up' approach to multiculturalism advanced by the erstwhile excluded ethnic 'minority' communities such as Blacks and Hispanics. Australia on the other hand, has a 'top-down' political strategy formally adopted and implemented by the state. In Australia, multiculturalism is a centre-piece of official government policy aiming at not only protecting but also promoting ethnocultural identity. Both the nations have adopted different trajectories in evolving a multicultural society (Gopal 2004: 314-316). Thus, the present study while dealing with the Indian diasporic population on a comparative framework offers an insight into lives of overseas Indians in two liberal democratic societies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent years there has been a growing academic interest in the notion of diaspora. Literature on diaspora and international migration are in abundance in such fields as history, sociology, anthropology, and geography. A number of political scientists have studied various aspects of diasporic movements. Among others, Cohen (1997), Sheffer (2003) and Safran (1991) have researched characteristics of selected diaspora groups such as the Jews, the Russians, the Chinese, and ethnic diasporas. Indeed, in a post-modern era, where scholars are deconstructing everything from gender to the nation-state, immigration history and multicultural studies are areas of burgeoning interest.

Castles and Miller's (1993, 1998, 2003), “The Age of Migration” moves away from the predominantly Anglo-American focus brought on by the race relations/ethnicity perspective and incorporates largely comparative material and sections on the Asia-Pacific, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. They differentiated migration processes as a whole, from the more specific issue of immigration, and the processes that are internal to nation-states. The authors illustrate various perspectives on migration theories which are very relevant in contemporary world covering topics like immigration and the labour market, the informal economy, global cities, highly skilled recruitment, female migration, ethnic entrepreneurship, politics of immigration, including citizenship, dual nationality, ethnic minority participation and anti-immigrant backlashes. For the authors, international migration is constant and not an aberration in human history. Population movements have
always accompanied demographic growth, technology change, political, conflict and warfare. They advocate the global character of international migration, the way it affects more and more countries and regions and its linkages with complex processes affecting the entire world.

*Global Diasporas: An Introduction* (1997) by Robin Cohen illuminates the changing meanings of diaspora and the contemporary diasporic condition. Cohen's (1997) work on global diasporas distinguished between seven different types of diaspora. This typologisation of diasporas was in part an attempt by Cohen to challenge more conventional views of diaspora. The classic diasporas, such as the Jewish, Greek or African, are considered to be characterized by collective memories of a traumatic and forced dispersal from a homeland, troubled relations with their host societies, and a sense of exile. These characteristics are often taken to define a diaspora, according to more conventional approaches. He proposed an alternative definition of a diaspora, based upon a notion of a collective link with a past migration history and a sense of co-ethnicity with others of a similar background. From this, he identified five different types of diaspora – victim, labour, trade, imperial and cultural.

Avtar Brah in 1996 brought out a book “Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities” which dealt with the notion of identity. The general driving force was to move away from essentialised view of ethnicity and culture. The author examines the concept of border, home, ethnicity, local and global and multiculturalism and shows how these are unpreventable processes of present day social relations which affects everybody. She focuses on the language of minority and its subordinating implications and makes an appeal for reasoned distinctions between desire for power and empowerment. She also reviews the history of debates and divisions between race and culture approaches which caused much damage to the ways forward in the development of respect for differences in UK during the 70s and 80s. Peter Kivisto (2002), *Multiculturalism in a Global Society*, deals with ‘the power of ethnic identity in the twenty-first century’ in the context of the ‘information age’ and the ‘network society’. The introduction examines ‘multicultural societies and globalization’, followed by a chapter which reviews ‘ethnic theory in a global age’. These provide a background to the following chapters which examine multiculturalism as it has
evolved in advanced industrial societies, specifically the United States, Canada, Australia, Britain, Germany and France.

Bhikhu Parekh's (2000), "Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory" offers critical review of political philosophers on cultural pluralism, and in his account of culture, human value, and the meaning of justice and equality in a multicultural society. Rethinking Multiculturalism is an analysis of the opportunities and challenges contemporary multiculturalism poses at the outset of the 21st century. He offers a look into intricacies of cultural diversity, of the essence and structure of culture, of the significance for, and character of, cross-cultural interaction. He cites reasons as to why cultural diversity should not simply be accepted and accommodated, but appreciated as a positive value to be cherished and fostered. He also examines lives and times of liberalism in the context of multiculturalism, migration, and cultural displacement. Parekh challenges the continuing legacy of moral monism in contemporary liberalism. Gurpreet Mahajan (2002), "The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy", examines existing multicultural alternatives and tries to reconcile cultural rights with individual freedom. The author raises the issue of group equality by examining whether different communities occupying the same social space have the same status in the public domain. She speaks of issues that are central to democracy. The author has taken up new issues and has attempted to provide a framework within which the rights of the minorities may be discussed. She has raised a whole set of important questions about heterogeneous public culture as against a homogeneous national culture, about political and civil rights of the minorities and about discriminatory state policies. The author argues that individual rights and community rights must go side by side.

*Multiculturalism citizenship: A Liberal theory of Minority Rights* by Will Kymlicka (1995) reflects that the increasing multicultural fabric of modern societies has given rise to many new issues and conflicts, as ethnic and national minorities demand recognition and support for their cultural identity. The book represents a new conception of the rights and status of minority cultures. It argues that certain "collective rights" of minority cultures are consistent with liberal democratic principles and that standard liberal objection to such rights can be answered. However, the author emphasizes that no single formula can be applied to all groups,
and that the needs and aspirations of immigrants are very different from those of indigenous people and national minorities. He addresses issues such as language rights, group representation, religious education, federalism and secessionism issues central to an understanding of multicultural policies.

Waters and Ueda’s (2007), “The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration since 1965” is divided into two categories of entries. The first section is devoted to twenty thematic essays, while the remaining thirty-one chapters constitute case studies of particular immigrant groups. In specifying case studies for inclusion, the editors had to deal with two interrelated realities. First, some immigrant groups are considerably larger than others. Second, some groups have received considerably more scholarly attention than others. The thematic essays offer a portrait of those topics that have remained persistent over time in immigration research, while reflecting both changes in perspective and the introduction of new concepts and focuses of attention. The essays are devoted to such themes as the economy, politics, media, religion, language, education, gender and family, and intermarriage.

Indian Diaspora constitutes a unique and important force in world culture. Overseas East Indian emigration dates back to as early as the seven century and has continued to the present. While, some migrated against their will, others migrated on their own initiative merely to take advantage of the opportunities that presented themselves in the host societies. ‘Diaspora: Yesterday today and Tomorrow’ edited by Jagat K. Motwani, Gosain published in 1993 brings about global implications of Indian diaspora and pattern of emigration. Madhulika S. Khandewal’s book, Becoming American, Being Indian: An Immigrant Community in New York City offers an informative insight to the growing literature emerging from the US about Indian immigrants and their settlement trajectories. Sandhya Shukla’s (2003) “India abroad: diasporic cultures of post war America and England”, concerns itself with analyzing the development of the Indian diaspora in the United States and England from 1947, the beginning of the postcolonial era, to the present. In particular, running through the book is the thread of diaspora as a concept and a set of social formations having imagination at its core. Shukla considers how the Indian diaspora has become a contact zone for various formations of identity and discourses of nation. The Indian diaspora is interpreted as simultaneously global and local. Shukla’s main premise is
that no one modality can explain how nation and nationality are constructed abroad, no one genre can fully express diasporic life. The book also charts out the economic, sociological and racial dimensions at play in the creation of “little Indias” through out the 20th century, contrasting the higher positions of educated Indians “brain drained” in the 1960s by the US government to the situation of earlier working class migrants to the UK. She also documents the generational shifts occurring in the representations, imaginings, practices and experiences of Indian diasporic citizens of Britain and America as well as creative changes brought about by the younger generations’ involvement in the form of popular culture such as music and cinema.

Thus, Sheffer (1986), Safran (1991), and Clifford (1994) as we shall analyze in the following section, have considered the phenomena of diaspora in considerable depth and proposed several encompassing definitions. Although they are not identical, the important characteristics are history of dispersal, myths/memories of the homeland, alienation in the host country, desire for eventual return, ongoing support of the homeland, and a collective identity. The following sections will deal with conceptualizing and defining diaspora and multiculturalism.

THEORETICAL DEBATE ON DIASPORA AND MULTICULTURALISM

CONCEPTUALISING DIASPORA

The disintegration of Soviet Union and the speedy globalization facilitated increased migration and the creation of new diaspora communities across the world. The complexity of diaspora phenomenon is manifested in relation to their host societies, homelands, and other societal and political actors and agencies. Both host and homeland societies and governments have mostly demonstrated rejection and indifferent attitudes toward these diasporic entities. However, over the last few decades, members of diaspora community have increased conspicuously moving beyond their successful and failed attempts at assimilation, integration or acculturation. They clearly exhibit a confident and assertive identity of their community. Diasporans positive cultural and economic contribution to host societies, making investments and transferring remittances to homeland cannot be ignored. Gradually, more and more host societies and homelands are recognizing diasporans’
self-confidence and contributions to their societies. The social, cultural, political and economic issues raised by them have to some extent altered the dominant hostile attitude toward them. Increasingly, dominant groups in the host country are displaying a more tolerant behaviour towards inclusion of diaspora in the pluralist or multicultural framework.

Diaspora theory is linked to theoretical discourse on transnationalism and globalization. Töloolyan (1991: 4-5) states that “Diasporas are the exemplary communities of the transnational moment and the term that once described Jewish, Greek and Armenian dispersion now shares meaning with the larger semantic domain that include words like expatriate, immigrant, refugee, guest-worker, exile community, overseas community, ethnic community”. Transnational communities characterize conditions in which international movers are connected by social and symbolic ties over time and across space to patterns of networks and circuits in two countries – based upon solidarity beyond narrow kinship systems. Diasporas represent a particular type of transnational community. Diasporas can only be called transnational communities, if the members also develop some significant social and symbolic ties to the receiving country (Faist 2000: 197). Diasporism focuses on the widely recognized cultural, social, political and economic importance of the migrant community. Today no regional, national, international developments and politics can ignore them.

The origin of the term “diaspora” is believed to have first appeared in the Greek translation of the book Deuteronomy in the Old Testament, with reference to the situation of the Jewish people. The word has its origin in Greek word -diasperien, in which -dia means ‘across’ and -Sperien means to ‘Sow or Scatter Seeds’. Literally, the term refers to dispersion i.e. “the word embodies a notion of center, a locus, a home from where dispersion occurs”. He argues that diasporas do not refer to temporary or casual sojourns. Paradoxically, diasporic journeys are essentially about settling down, about putting roots ‘elsewhere’. The question is not about ‘who travels but when, how, and under what circumstances’ (Brah Avtar 2003: 616). It can be understood as identification of displaced communities of people who have been dislocated from their native homeland through the movement of migration, immigration or exile.
Another historical mention can be made of the Black African diaspora in the sixteenth century, which started with slave trade being transported to ‘New World’ comprising parts of North America, South America, and Caribbean. Generally, this word relates chiefly to the Jewish exile existence in clogged, ghetto-like communities that have persisted outside the Holy Land. Oxford English dictionary defined the term as “the dispersion of Jews among the Gentile nations” and as “all those Jews who live outside the biblical land of Israel.” It also signifies as “the situation of people living outside their traditional homeland.” In Hebrew, the term is generally galut, which initially referred to the settling of scattered colonies of Jews outside Palestine after the Babylonian exile and has assumed a more general connotation of people settled away from their ancestral homelands. The word pezura is also used in a similar sense (Shuval 2000: 42). So closely, indeed, had ‘diaspora’ become associated with this unpropitious Jewish tradition that the origins of the word have virtually been lost. For the Greeks, the expression was used to describe the colonization of Asia Minor and The Mediterranean in the Archaic period (800-600 BC).

However, the term “diaspora” has a wider connotation than merely referring to the Jewish exile. The term diaspora refers today not only to such classic groups as Jews, Greeks and Armenians, but to much “wider categories which reflect processes of politically motivated uprooting and moving of populations, voluntary migration, global communications and transport”. Sheffer further (2003: 9-10) posits that an ethno-national diaspora is a social-political formation, created as a result of either voluntary or forced migration, whose members regard themselves as of the same ethno national origin and who permanently reside as minorities in one or several host countries. Members of such entities maintain regular or occasional contacts with what they regard as their homelands and with individuals and groups of the same background residing in other host countries. But to maintain a common identity, diasporans identify as such, showing solidarity with their group and their entire nation, and they organize and are active in the cultural, social, economic and political spheres. Among their various activities, members of such diaspora establish trans-state networks that reflect complex relationships among the diasporas, their host countries, their homelands, and international actors.

As the concept of diaspora comes to be extensively used, there is inevitable dilution, change and expansion of the meaning of the term. Gerard Chaliand and Jean-Pierre Rageau (1997: xii-xix), point to the need to distinguish between diasporas and indigenous or immigrant minorities. They include under the rubric of diaspora that share the following attributes:
A collective forced dispersion of a religious or ethnic group, precipitated by a disaster, often of a political nature;

A role played by collective memory, which transmits both the historical causes of the dispersion and a specific cultural heritage (broadly understood);

The will to survive as a minority by transmitting a heritage;

The persistence of an “externally oriented” collective identity after the lapse of several generations of residence in “host” country.

Robin Cohen (1996: 512-513) attempts to arrange diasporas under different logical subtypes: (1) victim diasporas (such as Armenians and Africans); (2) trade diasporas (Chinese and Lebanese); (3) cultural diasporas (Caribbean); and (4) “labor” and “imperial” diasporas (Indians, and British). Cohen further (1996: 515) proposes a consolidated list of the ‘Common features’ of a diaspora, drawing on the classical tradition, on Safarn’s insights, on his modifications to his list and on his own views. He calls this list one of ‘common features’, to indicate that no one diaspora will manifest all features:

- Dispersal from an original homeland, often traumatically, to two or more foreign regions.
- Alternatively, the expansion from a homeland in search of work, in pursuit of trade or to further colonial ambitions.
- A collective memory and myth about the homeland, including its location, history and achievements.
- An idealization of the putative ancestral home and a collective commitment to its maintenance, restoration, safety and prosperity, even to its creation.
- The development of a return movement which gains collective approbation.
- A strong ethnic group consciousness sustained over a long time and based on a sense of distinctiveness, a common history and the belief in a common fate.
 ➢ A troubled relationship with host societies, suggesting a lack of acceptance at the least or the possibility that another calamity might befall the group.

 ➢ A sense of empathy and solidarity with co-ethnic members in other countries of settlement.

 ➢ The possibility of a distinctive yet creative and enriching life in host countries with a tolerance for pluralism.

 Diasporas defined as dispersed people are ubiquitous but not all immigrant populations in present day States can be described as diasporas. Gabriel Sheffer (2003:83) describes diasporas as ‘ethno national communities and its members as at home abroad’. He summarizes the most significant common characteristics of historical diasporas and modern diasporas as follows:

 All diasporas have been created as a result of voluntary or imposed migration; in most cases, decisions to join or establish diasporic entities have been made only after migrants have settled in their host countries; diasporans generally have been determined to maintain their ethnic identities and have been capable of doing so, those identities have been important bases for promoting solidarity within diasporic entities of the same national origin; most diasporas have established intricate support organizations in their host countries; they have been involved not only in economic activities in their host countries but also in significant cultural and political exchanges with their homelands and other diasporic entities of the same national origin; they have maintained contacts with their homelands and other dispersed segments of the same nation; in some cases, blatant hostility and discrimination have forced individuals and groups to join and establish ethno-national diaspora organizations.¹

 Steven Vertovec (1997: 277,279,289), argues that there are at least three discernible meanings of the concept “diaspora”. They refer to diaspora as social form, diaspora as type of consciousness, and diaspora as mode of cultural production. Diaspora as social form is characterized by a triadic relationship among (a) globally dispersed yet collectively self-identified ethnic groups, (b) the territorial states and context where such group resides, and (c) the homeland states and contexts where they or their forbearers came. Diaspora consciousness is marked by a dual or

¹ The classical diasporas were a phenomenon produced by a premodern type of political order. Classical diaspora people are endogamous, residentially and socially segregated, and confined to specific occupations and professions. They are oriented to their fellow ethnics for trade and marriage relations and are, in that sense, part of a diaspora network. Whatever the extent of their success in financial terms, as traders, moneylenders, artisans, or scholars, their legal position remains fragile and precarious. They are part of a particularistic world in which they have no rights and are easy scapegoats in times of crisis. Diaspora cultures reflect this particularistic world; they do not aim at incorporating others or being incorporated by others.
paradoxical nature. It is constituted negatively by experiences of discrimination and exclusion, and positively by identification with a historical heritage or with contemporary world culture or political forces. Diaspora as a mode of cultural production is usually seen in context of globalization.

There are wide variation among the diasporas owing to their unique historical experience, socio-cultural milieu and political-economic situations of homeland and host nations. Nonetheless, some common attributes based on observation can be figured out. For instance, William Safran (1991: 83; 1999: 260) argues that the term “diaspora” is used to cover all sorts of expatriate ethnic communities that can somehow be identified as ethnic, racial or religious categoric groups and even indigenous minorities that are not related to any external point of origin or “center”.

Hence, diaspora focuses on associations and flows, cultural bonds, ties to homeland, transnational organization and networks linking people together across geographical boundaries and dispersion. James Clifford (1994: 306) however, argues that one should be wary of constructing a working definition of a term like diaspora by recourse to an ‘ideal type’, with the consequences that groups becomes identified as more or less diasporic having only two, or three, or four of basic six features (as identified by Safran); Also, at different times in their history, societies may wax and wane in diasporism depending on changing possibilities - obstacles, openings, antagonisms and connection in their host countries and transnationally.

Diasporic subjects are marked by hybridity and heterogeneity i.e. cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and national, and are defined by traversal of the boundaries demarcating nation and diaspora. Contemporary use of the term moves beyond the notion of homeland, national or ethnic identity, and geographical location to conceptualization of diaspora in terms of hybridity and heterogeneity. Thus, diasporic studies have emerged as an important field of study in literature, anthropology, sociology, film studies, queer theory, area studies, ethnic studies etc. Two reasons have been mentioned for studying and theorizing diaspora. First, diaspora forces to rethink the rubrics of nation and nationalism, while refiguring the relation of citizen and nation-states; second, diaspora presents innumerable facets of globalization and transnationalism. In all its contexts, nonetheless, the concept of diaspora remains
challenging, for it raises multifarious questions about the meanings of a number of correlated terms, such as nationality, ethnicity and migrancy.

Thus, the diasporas share features that generates unique structural, organizational, and behavioral parallels among them which is lined by their sense of belonging to same ethnic nation. Anderson (1991) regards nations and nationalism as modern cultural artifacts which began to appear toward the end of eighteenth century. He defined nation as an "imagined political community" as members of nation who never knew, met or heard most of fellow beings yet, all share a common image of community and a desire to maintain it. Anderson (1992) and others have referred to the formation and persistence of ethno-national diasporas as "long distance nationalism". The discourse on nation state and its authority plays an important role in dealing with diaspora studies. It challenges the hegemony of modern nation states because of the feelings they engender toward groups and places located outside the borders of a given nation state. Diaspora communities make it clear that identity with as political or geographical entity does not need to be binary but can involve loyalty to more than one such entity. Diaspora discourse articulates "both roots and routes to construct what Gilroy (cited in Clifford 1994: 308) describes as ‘alternate public spheres’, forms of community consciousness and solidarity that maintain identification outside the national time/space in order to live inside, with a difference" (Clifford 1994: 307-312). Thus, notions of assimilation and loyalty are challenged by diaspora which, in addition to relating to their host nation state, relate simultaneously to people located in other nation states (Shuval 2000: 45).

Diaspora discourse reflects a sense of being part of an ongoing transnational network that includes dispersed people who retain a sense of their uniqueness and an interest in their homeland. Diaspora is a "social construct founded on feeling, consciousness, memory, mythology, history, meaningful narratives, group identity, longings, dreams, allegorical and virtual elements, all of which play a role in establishing a diaspora reality. At a given moment in time, the sense of connection to a homeland must be strong enough to resist forgetting, assimilating or distancing” (Shuval, 2000:43). Tökölyan (2007: 649), points to salient features of diasporic community. First, a diaspora that is born of catastrophe inflicted on the collective suffers trauma and usually becomes a community to which the work of memory,
commemoration, and mourning is central, shaping much of its cultural production and political commitment. Second, all diasporic communities are also ethnic communities, but not all ethnic communities are diasporic; to put it another way, when strictly defined, diasporas are a specific subset of ethnic minorities. The defining characteristics of diasporas are, first, a culture and a collective identity that preserves elements of the homeland’s language, or religious, social, and cultural practice, either intact or, as time passes, in mixed, bicultural forms; the best known subset of biculturalism is denoted by the term hybridity. By contrast, ethnic groups at best exhibit a diluted form of biculturalism. A third salient characteristic of diasporas, especially those dispersed by catastrophic destruction in the homeland, is a rhetoric of restoration and return that, in practice, takes the form of a sustained and organized commitment to maintaining relations with kin communities elsewhere, and with the homeland, to which diasporans either return literally or, more commonly, “re-turn” without actual repatriation: that is, they turn again and again toward the homeland through travel, remittances, cultural exchange, and political lobbying and by various contingent efforts to maintain other links with the homeland. Fourth, the accommodating redefinition of diaspora as dispersion raises conceptual problems. After several generations, the descendants of the first generation of emigrants cease to be a “segment” of the homeland’s population in any meaningful sense; to claim that they continue to be such a segment only because they share an (increasingly mixed) gene pool incurs a certain danger of biologism, which lingers in most easygoing definitions of diaspora.

One complexity encountered by authors who use the term “diaspora” is that they are employing a term with a recognized historical connotation that surfaced in an previous historical situation in an entirely different historical settings. It is assumed that later settings have some resemblance to these earlier historical situations. “In the publications of French political geographers, who were among the first to popularize the term, we find already this ambivalent use of the word “diaspora,” for instance in the Atlas of Diasporas by Ge´rard Chaliand and Jean-Pierre Rageau. A second problem is the tendency to confuse the phenomenon under analysis with its (supposed) causes and/or consequences. It seems an obvious analytical fault that is, however, not uncommon in the social sciences and has also, for instance, obscured discussions of ghettos and minorities” (Amersfoort 2004:360-361).
The theoretical debates revolving around diaspora essentially deals with various approaches dealing with ethnicity and ethnic diasporism. The first approach is referred to as "primordialist" or "given" or "essentialist" explanation for the roots of identity that contribute to the persistence of ethnicity and ethnic diasporism. In short, this approach focuses on biological factors, physical markers such as skin, color and facial contours, and cultural attributes such as common history, revered myths and legends, language, food, costumes and folklore in creating and preserving identities of ethnic nations and minorities. Instrumentalists argue that affiliations into ethnic groups, including diasporas, and maintenance of that collective identity are useful for achieving practical individual and group goals. In between the two approaches mentioned above are the "psychological" approach and the "ethno-symbolic and mythical" approach. The authors argue that the identities of the members of such groups have their bases in subjective psychological factors or in strong attachment to symbols and myths. They also argue that some of these groups have ancient roots. The fourth approach that is the "constructionist" approach, which originally was intended to explain modern nationalism and has been more recently applied to ethnicity and ethno-national diasporas. The advocates of this approach assume that nations essentially are modern social constructs, artifacts created by "cultural engineers" and elite who invent traditions in order to organize newly enfranchised masses into new status systems and communities (Sheffer 2003: 18-19). Diaspora has inherent links with the ethnic theory based on assumption that people seek a shared identity from commonality of history, language (in some cases religion) and past achievements. When a group finds itself in a context of exclusion, limited opportunities for advancement, political domination or social or political discrimination, a diaspora culture helps maintain a sense of community and belonging to a more rewarding and welcoming social entity. This is accomplished by selectively preserving and recovering traditions so that they create or maintain identification with far reaching historic, cultural and political processes giving a sense of attachment elsewhere, in a different time accompanied by hopes or visions of renewal (Shuval 2000: 44).

The postmodern approach deals with an individual's interpretation of the diaspora phenomenon and is not based on the subjective reality or collective definition. Thus, it may even refer to a diasporic identity claim made by a member of
dominant ethnic or religious majority who feels discriminated. Diaspora discourse is widely appropriated. It deals with issues pertaining to events like decolonization, increased immigration, globalization encouraging multi-locale attachments and dwellings. However, diasporic discourse will be modified from time to time as it deals with a very mobile, dynamic and heterogeneous population.

Diasporicity manifests itself in relations of differences. The diasporic community construes of itself as connected to but distinct from population of the host society. It also identifies itself as powerfully linked to, but in some ways different from, the people in the homeland as well. In the countries of settlement, “either such difference is sustained by persecution and the rejection of assimilation by the majority among whom the diasporic community settles or, when assimilation is permitted, even encouraged, the diasporic community chooses to do cultural and political work in order to sustain crucial kinds of difference”. The current discourse of diaspora studies is characterized, by some disagreement and divergent uses of its key concepts, such as diaspora and dispersion, ethnic and diasporic, transnational and global, mobility and sedentariness, network and node, local and global etc. (Tolólyan 2007: 650,654).

Migrants challenge assumptions of territoriality while crossing borders, participating in home-country politics, influencing the foreign policy-making of host and home states. They develop alternative diaspora political identities which transcend existing borders. Voting, standing for election, campaign contributions and other support for contending political parties are various ways in which diaspora exhibits its influence. Indians in America have regularly funded for elections and created its own lobby of influence. The communication networks and increased mobility that make homeland political participation possible can also facilitate the development of more ambivalent transnational identities among migrants. These act as alternatives both to complete assimilation to the host society and to the retention of homeland political identity that is often expressed in support of nationalist movements in the homeland (Koslowski 2005: 9, 14, 22).

The three reasons: human capital advancement, remittances, and the political lobbying of receiving country governments, connect sending country with their citizens abroad. The host state fears that diasporas may transplant fierce ethno-
national and religious conflicts or that migrants may be influenced by a foreign government to act against the national interest. The homeland may accuse the overseas population who demands participation in political process at home and be accused of imposing their interests from the outside without sharing any responsibility for the outcome. The two elements immediately relevant for transnational political practices and membership are external voting rights and dual citizenship. Dual citizenship appears to be formal recognition of transnational membership. In receiving states dual nationality is often interpreted as the legal expression of hyphenated identities, such as Mexican-American, in which the first part signifies an ethnic and the second part a political membership (Baubock 2003: 712-716).

Increase in diasporan community and their organizations have contributed to their greater social and political assertiveness and influence which have often led to rising of various questions regarding social and political difficulties that they can create for hosts. Globalization and emergence of cultural and political pluralism have led to influx of migrants and the subsequent growth of new diasporas. There is a range of push and pull factors like internal social, political, religious rivalries and conflicts and easy access, weak regimes that facilitate chain migrations. The present study also needs to examine the recent attitudinal changes towards incipient diasporas both in host countries and homelands. Thus, as witnessed in the above discussion, both the conceptual study of diaspora, and substantive studies of particular diasporas, revolve around space and place, mobility and locatedness, the nation and transnationality. Research within this field also raises questions about the nature of mobility, migration and other movements over transnational and diasporic space, and the ways in which migrant and the other mobilities are embodied, embedded and grounded.

Governments have enacted immigration policy to serve their economic self-interests. Immigration policy is a government endeavor to regulate and manage the admission of immigrants into the country, and determine the terms under which people can inhabit there permanently, or take political asylum. A country’s immigration policy comprises of social, economic, housing and spatial policies. Most countries leave geographic dispersal and employment to market forces. There are two approaches in terms of socio-cultural policies on immigrant absorption. One is ‘melting pot approach’ , under which immigrants from all countries undergo a process
of assimilation in the destination country. This conception argues that social assimilation is vital for constructing a fresh social foundation for the country which will also promote economic advancements. The second approach is multiculturalism which promotes preservation of immigrants’ ethno cultural identity and formation of a multicultural nation. The first approach was applicable to United States immigration policy, whereas the second is adopted by Australia. The waves of immigration have changed the socio-cultural structure in Australia. The radical changes in the ethnic makeup of immigration to Australia forced policy makers to switch from melting-pot to multiculturalism (Gorter et al. 1998: 187-188). Countries have enacted stringent immigration policies owing to the North-South divide. It is asserted that people migrate because they opt for a destination society for cultural, religious or political reasons. The test in this international migration system is to comprehend interest of sources and destination countries in addition to defending the rights of migrants. The following section will center around theoretical debate on multiculturalism.

MULTICULTURALISM DEBATES

The endorsement of multiculturalism has not been well received uniformly throughout the world. Some nations feel that their unity is threatened by demands for cultural equality from minority groups. In the United States of America, the civil rights movement facilitated the understanding that all American citizens have freedom and opportunity to build a base for themselves on the basis of their own cultural traditions. In other parts of the world, the expulsion of Asians from East Africa and the exodus from Vietnam of the boat people, as they became known, who were largely members of the ethnic Chinese minority raised significant issues. It led to a debate about the rights of ethnic minorities and the position of their culture within the country in which they had settled for generations.

Multiculturalism means different things in different context. In Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom, the term is intertwined with questions of racialized differences. Australia having adopted the guiding principle of multiculturalism since 1970s has faced both approval and rejection on one hand and new challenges on the other. Multiculturalism has been developed as a concept by nations and other aspirants who try to represent themselves as homogeneous in spite
of their heterogeneity. The politics of representation, the specificities of legislation, public policies and their often arbitrary implementation are major concerns encircling issues of assimilation and integration.

Analysis and understanding of multiculturalism must be contextual, and we should not try to understand one within the framework of the other. Multiculturalism and its challenges outline the experiences of the majority societies and nations in the twenty-first century. It is imperative to note that multiculturalism is not just about celebrating diversity but the challenges that such variations present to society also need to be faced at the level of national politics and state management. Multiculturalism purports to deal with minorities and thus implies a relation with majority, but how these two categories are defined and wielded in relation to each other is highly contested and further complicated by differences in articulation between advanced capitalist countries and the so-called Third World; between 'settler societies' and, for example, the European Union (Gunew 2004: 16). Stuart Hall (2000: 209) argues that the term ‘multicultural’:

...describes the social characteristics and problems of governance posed by any society in which different cultural communities live together and attempt to build a common life while retaining some of their ‘original’ identity. It is the strategies and policies adopted to govern and manage the problems of diversity and multiplicity which multicultural societies throw up.

The term also describes the ways in which societies (from local to national policy levels) deal with their differences. Of particular interest and importance are the ways in which these differences are politically managed and governed—from the question of immigration procedures and controls, through to employment and housing opportunities, social justice and education. For scholars such as Taylor (cited in Nye 2007: 113-114) recognition, and in particular the ‘politics of recognition’, is a central issue for the practical implementation of multicultural policy. That is, there must be engagement between groups and individuals, across the cultures, religions and values that separate them, and that engagement must be based on knowledge of each other, tolerance and mutual respect for the differences, along with acknowledgement of some common ground to which all belong (Nye 2007: 113-114).
John Rex (1995: 32) has pointed out that many young people from immigrant groups are "forming syncratic links with members of both immigrant communities and the indigenous society". He added that there may well be some members of immigrant communities who wish to move away from their traditional culture and to work with or in both indigenous and ethnic organizations. This is not merely a case of “living between two cultures” and breaking down under the strain; some individuals have chosen to “belong to different social groups and different cultural systems simultaneously and are used to the fact of multiple identities.... It is a normal part of social and political life” (Rex 1995: 32-34).

In his theory of the accommodation of national and ethnic differences, Kymlicka (1995: 27-33) argues for three forms of group-differentiated rights: 1) self-government rights; 2) polyethnic rights; and 3) special representation rights. Immigrant groups, however, cannot claim self-government rights, but can enjoy ‘polyethnic rights’, which are group-specific measures ‘intended to help ethnic groups and religious minorities express their cultural particularity and pride without it hampering their success in the economic and political institutions of the dominant society’.

Bhikhu Parekh (2000: 336) enlists a variety of contributing factors resulting in multiculturalism. According to him, human beings are culturally embedded in the sense that they grow up and live within a culturally derived system of meaning and significance, and place considerable value on their cultural identity. Also, different cultures represent different system of meaning and vision of good life. This understandably leads us to infer that people have understanding of one’s own culture aided by consciousness of other cultures. Forwarding his views further Parekh states that every culture is internally plural and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. This in views of Parekh is an indicator of plural, fluid and open identity. Thus, to Parekh multiculturalism means the creative interplay of three important and complementary insights namely the cultural embeddings of human beings, the incapability and desirability of cultural plurality, and the plural and multicultural institution of each culture. But multiculturalism should not be confused with plurality. “Plurality suggests the presence of many but doesn’t stipulate anything about nature of many. The concept of multiculturalism
endorses the idea of difference and heterogeneity that is embodied in the concept of diversity” (Mahajan 1999: 56-58)

Multiculturalism as a phenomenon is widely acknowledged and debated. It is also the official policy in many countries like Australia and Canada owing to protests from some of the ineffaceable immigrant groups to the bilingual or bicultural polices adopted. Multiculturalism deals with a number of interrelated themes like the need to have a stable identity, recognition, difference, cultural affinity, assimilation, integration etc. In other words, multiculturalism plainly refers to existence of cultures with diversity which is expressed as values, ways of life and is appreciated, treasured and preserved. Cultural, religious pluralism and pluralism of values and association is an entrenched certainty in almost all societies. Multiculturalism encompasses citizens who are proud of their culture and see that culture being endorsed by the state. It is imperative for this study to discuss distinction between state multiculturalism, dealing with the management of diversity, and critical multiculturalism used by minorities as leverage to argue for participation, grounded in their differences, in the public sphere. In assimilative inclusion, the qualities that define foreign and different do not change but such people permitted to discard these qualities in their public lives. In a multicultural community, incorporation is not celebrated as inclusion but as the achievement of diversity. Thus, after reviewing the discussions and debates, we can conclude that multiculturalism is time-honored with both appreciations as mechanism to deal with pluralism, as well as is severely criticized as one undermining social cohesion and threatening national identity. The following section will briefly introduce the evolution of the Indian diaspora tracing it from the earliest times.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE INDIAN DIASPORA

Indian diaspora does not represent a homogenous group rather it reflects diversity of the homeland. It does not necessarily imply, despite its earliest and widespread use in English for Jews dispersed from Palestine/Israel, any kind of exile, willful or not, or even mere expatriation, with a consequent profound attachment to the former or lost place of residence. Rather, it refers to all those people from India who had ever emigrated to other areas around the world (Perry 2002: 83). A number of reasons motivate Indians to migrate like money, career enhancement, opportunities and facilities in their field of specialization, circumvention of social strictures, and family
enhancement. The choice to migrate has been voluntary and is not forced out by political considerations.

S. L. Sharma (2004: 49-51) argues that overseas Indians tend to take a Pan-Indian identity, while dealing with others. However, while interacting among themselves their regional, linguistic or religious identities takes precedence. The relative numerical strength in the host country helps in formation of their identities. Wherever Indians form a substantial group, they are viewed as Indians having a distinctive identity. In the countries where their number is small and the ethnic groups of other nationalities are also present they tend to be bracketed with the other Asians. He also identifies three modes of adaptations followed by Indian immigrants:

I. Assimilation

II. Cultural preservation with economic integration.

III. Ethnic politicization for power cultivation

The author also points to the factors which are likely to impinge on the mode of adaptation of an immigrant community which he groups in six sets:

➢ Background conditions and characteristics of immigrants.

➢ Their demographic, generational and organizational status in the country of immigration.

➢ Their economic performance and power position in the host country.

➢ Response of host community, culture and religion,

➢ Level of development and manpower needs of the host society.

➢ State policy in respect of immigrants.

Migration of people from India to different parts of the world is not a new phenomenon. Indian emigration has been taking place for centuries but India witnessed massive movements of people from India to other parts of the world as in 19th and 20th century. More than 5000 years ago, saints and seers moved in different
directions. The impact of these visits is reflected in the existence of “Angkor Vat” in Cambodia, the temples in Bali Province, and the 7 horse driven chariot of Arjuna and Lord Krishna in front of the presidential palace in Jakarta, which symbolizes rich cultural heritage of India. Emperor Ashoka sent his son and daughter to spread the gospel of Buddhism and they achieved success not only in Sri Lanka and South-East Asian countries but also in Tibet, China and Japan. This was the first phase of migration from India though not in big numbers but competent persons who spread the message of Indian culture to the world.

Second wave of migration comprised of traders who traded far and wide and went up to Italy and France. They followed the famous silk route but never tried to colonize. The third phase of migration from India was during the British period. Slavery was abolished by the British parliament in 1830 and the white colonial masters wanted some alternative labour force to replace the black slave contingent working in sugar plantations not only in Mauritius and South Africa but also in Fiji and the Caribbean countries. A new system of labour contract known as the indenture system was introduced by the white plantation owners under which the worker was on contract of 5 to 10 years on a very meagre salary. The first batch of indentured labour went to Mauritius in 1834 and ever since it continued till 1917 when the indenture system was abolished because of organized protest from the Indian political leadership. Besides migration to the gulf countries, there has been a sudden increase in the migration of Indian professionals to the western countries resulting in ‘Brain Drain’ at the cost of Indian economic development (Baleshwar Agarwal 2001: 3-4). The European imperialist policy and the abolition of slavery in British, French and Dutch colonies respectively in 1834, 1846 and 1873 created the need for large supplies of labour, making Indian and China the obvious alternative sources of labour. Thus unskilled labourers and small-scale entrepreneurs constituted the two streams of emigrants to the colonies. Indian labour emigration under the indenture system first started in 1834 to Mauritius, Uganda and Nigeria.

According to R. K. Jain (1993: 2-3), the emigration from India began in 1830s to the colonies of Mauritius and Caribbean where they coexisted with other ethnic groups under one political state. But they maintained a sense of being a diaspora from India. He talks of three broad patterns of this migration in terms of history and
political economy: (a) Emigration of nineteenth century (b) Twentieth century migration to industrially developed countries (c) Recent migrations to West Asia.

Indians cling to their norms of endogamy, marital stability and family solidarity, kin orientation, religion and mother tongue. They are always nostalgic about Indian food. They adhere to traditional cultures ostensibly in terms of celebrating festivals and functions, building of temples and gurudwaras. The core feature that defines the Indian diaspora in its collective imagining of India- of emotions, links, traditions, feelings and attachments that together continue to nourish a psychological appeal among successive generations of emigrants for the ‘mother’ country (Gurharpal Singh 2003: 4).

Amartya Sen (2005: 73-74) argues that the Indian diasporic population sees no contradiction between being loyal citizens of the country in which they are settled and where they are politically and socially integrated and still retain a sense of affiliation and companionship with India and Indians. The Indian diaspora takes pride in the culture and tradition of their original homeland. However, there has been systemic effort to encourage NRIs of Hindu background to identify themselves, not primarily as ‘Indians’ but as ‘Hindus’. The campaign has worked effectively over parts of the diaspora, and the Sangh Parivar receives large remittances from Indians overseas. Yet many expatriate Indians find difficult to identify themselves in such divisive terms and are worried about the brutalities associated with the extremist wing of the Hindutva movement. Diasporic Indians are called by a host of names including ‘desis’, ‘NRIs’ (Non-Resident Indians), ‘PIOs’ (Persons of Indian Origin), ‘OBIs’ (Overseas-Born Indians) and a plethora of other acronyms and nicknames. The diaspora plays an ever-greater role in Indian politics, whether internally or on the world stage (Bose 2008: 113).

Thus, as evident from the above discussion, the earlier migrants who formed the basis of an Indian diaspora mainly involved ‘cheap’ manual (unskilled) workers, who had left India in large numbers to meet the global demand for indentured labour that arose in the plantations, mainly in south-east Asia and the Pacific, immediately after the British abolished slavery in 1834 – leading to what is sometimes also called the ‘brawn drain’. The ‘brain drain’ - a quality exodus of India’s cream of highly skilled professionals - comprising doctors, engineers, scientists, teachers, architects,
entrepreneurs, and more recently the IT workers, and nurses on the other hand, appeared a century-and-a-quarter later. The paradigm shift in the perception about professional migrants leaving India, has taken place in phases though - from the 'brain drain' of the 1960s and 1970s to the 'brain bank' of the 1980s and 1990s, and subsequently to 'brain gain' in the twenty-first century( Khadria 2007: 5-6). India since 2003, has been organizing Pravasi Bharatiya Divas in recognition and appreciation of constructive economic, political and philanthropic role-played by people of Indian origin all over the world. The emergence of international migration as a global force entails theories of systemic transformation of societies. Novel forms of interdependence, transnational society and bilateral and regional co-operation are transforming lives of millions of people and are inextricably weaving together the facts of state and societies. Thus, the diaspora constitutes a strategic asset to both the country of origin and destination.

The emergence of international migration as a global force entails theories of systemic transformation of societies. Novel forms of interdependence, transnational society and bilateral and regional co-operation are transforming lives of millions of people and are inextricably weaving together the facts of state and societies. Indian migration to Australia is very recent compared to Indian migration to other parts of the world like USA, UK. The following chapters build on one another in a sequential progression, each addresses a part of the overarching questions raised in the present study. The second chapter of this study “Multiculturalism and immigration policies in Australia” endeavours to analyze the immigration policies prevalent in Australia while making a brief account of history of migratory patterns of Indian diaspora to Australia. The following chapter deals with similar issues prevalent in the United States.

The third chapter ‘Immigration policies of the United States of America’ examines the American immigration policies regulating the population inflow and their impact on Indian diaspora. This will also examine the diversities of Indian diasporic communities in U.S.A. Chapter four “Indian diasporic identity in Australia and United States of America” will evaluate as to how and to what extent Indian diaspora has made an impact on Australia and United States of America while seeking its own identity in a new home. An impact of migration on their society, culture,
labour market, urban infrastructure is dealt on a comparative framework. The present study will also highlight the role of Indian State in addressing problems of its diaspora and promoting them. Analysis of Indian diaspora as a strategic asset is dealt in the fifth chapter titled “Indian state and its diaspora”. Chapter six will be based on empirical findings with the support of a web survey conducted on Indian diaspora in these two countries of settlement. It will deal with the issues relevant to the present study on a comparative framework based on the responses of the diasporic population in Australia and America. A comparison of empirical findings of the Indian diaspora in the two countries is made to study the differences and similarities in the responses of diaspora. Explanations will be developed to account for activities of Indian diaspora from historical, cultural, economic, institutional, and geopolitical perspectives. The concluding chapter will make observations based on the present study in a comparative framework. Hence, the study of Indian migrants to Australia and United States of America needs to be understood in its totality as a complex system of social interactions with a wide range of institutional structures and informal networks in both sending and receiving countries and also at an international level.