Embraced by new tentacles of the globalization process and the high-tech revolution, the states of the Caribbean are undergoing massive transformations in the conduct of everyday politics. This transformation is generated by a number of internal and external pressures that are both transnational and global in nature. Two such border-crossing practices will be identified and examined in this chapter to show their implosion into the states of the Caribbean and how they are reshaping their political identities: the transnational posture of local units (grassroots organizations and government agencies) and the diaspora’s transnational maintenance of relations with the homeland (long-distance participation in local politics).

In this chapter, state-diaspora relations are reproblematicized in order to show how these are engendered through the process of immigration, diasporization, and transnational politics. To achieve our analytical goal of examining these issues and providing a frame of reference to understand the theoretical ramifications for the study of international relations (IR), this chapter first redefines and operationalizes the concepts of diaspora and transnationality and reconceptualizes state-diaspora relations by mapping identifiable models. Second, it examines a specific set of transnational connections with a focus on diaspora-grassroots relations. And third, taking stock of the widespread influence of the globalization process, it formulates an alternative way of framing the problem of the relations between states and diasporas.

This chapter analyzes five models of state-diaspora relations—the reincorporation model, the ethnic model, the economic model, the model of political opposition, and the transnational model—in the context of the history of Haitian immigration to the United States. It argues that these relations have contributed to a repositioning and reshaping of
both the diaspora and the state. The multilayered dynamics and criss-crossing networks of these transnational processes will be examined in terms of the extraterritorial expansion of political constituencies and the rise of transnational grassroots organizations in an effort to show how international migration in particular and globalization in general have reshaped our notions of national territories and social identities.\(^2\)

**Issues for Analytical Observation**

The Caribbean states did not develop consistent policies vis-à-vis their diasporas during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.\(^3\) The evolution of such policies depended on political circumstances at home or in the country of residence of the diaspora. There are several factors that influence these state-diaspora transnational relations: the size or importance of the diaspora, the extent to which the diaspora is creating a potentially embarrassing situation because of “illegals” or “undocumented immigrants” in the country of adoption, and whether the diaspora constitutes itself as the supporter of the homeland government or its foe—a government in exile, a liberation movement, or a movement of political resistance.\(^4\) One may argue that state policies vis-à-vis the diaspora depend on the predicaments in which both entities find themselves.\(^5\)

The state-diaspora problematic revolves around the resolution of three sets of issues and can be framed as an object of analytical investigation. These issues pertain to state transformation and the new political culture it generates, diaspora integration and its influence on the homeland, and the transnational nature of state-diaspora relationships. These variables are interlocked in the process that shapes their identities. Since they are not separated from each other, I will not engage here in a study of their impact on each other. Rather, I will concentrate on interactional processes that generate these transformations.

The first set of issues that I want to raise takes into consideration the reasons why a state gets involved with its diaspora beyond the mere question of emigration.\(^6\) A state is involved in extraterritorial units to the extent that it sees a positive return for its population, whether in real or symbolic terms. How would a state benefit from such an engagement, since the population is living beyond its territorial borders? Why should a state intervene in a polity over which it has no control or jurisdiction? Why should a state allow another state to intervene inside its territorial borders? What would be the extent of that intervention for the sending state and the diaspora? What does the receiving state gain from a