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INTRODUCTION
Approaching Migration and Diversity in Asian Contexts

Francis L. COLLINS, LAI Ah Eng and Brenda S.A. YEOH

Migration and the human diversity that necessarily accompanies it present multifarious challenges and opportunities within the varied social and cultural landscapes of Asia. The contributions in this volume set out to interrogate some of these challenges and opportunities and to discuss emergent governance regimes, identities and practices across and within the nations, cities, neighbourhoods, communities and families of East and Southeast Asia. This simultaneously varied and integrative approach to the subject matter speaks to the wide-ranging temporal and spatial dimensions of migration and diversity in Asia. In some parts of the region, contemporary migration and diversity symbolize a historically significant rupturing of long-held self-representations of ethnically homogeneous nations and communities (such as in Japan and Korea). Elsewhere, migration as both historical memory and contemporary experience serves as a foundational basis to the imagining of a multicultural nation and community (as is the case in Malaysia and Singapore). Within such polarities of collective belonging, diversity is also negotiated on an everyday basis in the homes of multiethnic families, in the lives and identities of minorities and individuals, and in the always challenging encounters with others in social spaces such as workplaces, public spaces, restaurants and sports fields.
This introduction serves as an entry point into the themes addressed in this volume, situating the more detailed chapters that follow within extant scholarship on migration and diversity in Asia. In reviewing the current treatment of migration and diversity in Asia, it is clear that while both “migration” and “diversity” as phenomena are of increasing interest to scholars within and beyond the region, there are very few examples of scholarship that have focused on how they relate to each other. Rather, most academic work has been concerned either with increasing mobility within the region or with the already diverse social and cultural landscapes of certain parts of the region, instead of the ways in which mobility feeds into changing experiences of diversity (and vice versa), both historically and in the contemporary era. This volume, then, offers a first step in the effort to understand the increasingly important question of human mobility and its subsequent effects on population diversity in a region that is becoming ever more open and central to the processes of globalization. The chapters are primarily and necessarily empirical, with a focus on grounded understandings of migration and diversity issues. At the same time, we conclude this introductory chapter by pointing to the potential for new directions in theory building that are cognizant of the region’s contextual specificities and the rich evidence they provide.

THE STUDY OF MIGRATION IN ASIA

Migration from, to and within the Asian region is certainly not new (Castles and Miller 2008). Until the eighteenth century, Asia, particularly in China, India, and emerging empires and regional centres, was a site of tremendous economic expansion of trade and commercial ties based on overland and sea routes which facilitated the movements of traders, missionaries, adventurers and fortune-seekers. During distinct colonial periods, the mass movements of labourers and traders as well as colonial settlers, missionaries and others also played significant roles in the development of European colonies, often providing the basis for the heterogeneous societies (Kymlicka and He 2005) and significant diasporic communities (Lal, Reeves, and Rai 2006; Pan 1999) that now characterize parts of the region. Emigration out of the region was also a key characteristic of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as considerable numbers of Chinese and Japanese migrants made their way to Southeast Asia, the United States, Canada and Australia before restrictive policies came into
place. Other examples of historical migration include internal migrations within China and Manchuria in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the movement of Koreans under Japanese colonialism, mass population displacements following the partition of the Indian subcontinent (Castles and Miller 2008), and migrations within Southeast Asia and the Malay Archipelago.

While these major histories of migration certainly have their particular systems of movement and mobility, recent scholarship has tended to focus on identifying and delineating the systems of migration embedded within contemporary global processes since the 1970s (Massey et al. 1998). Writing in the late 1990s as this system was becoming increasingly coherent, Massey et al. (1998) identify four key contributing factors in their focus on the “Asia-Pacific”: shifting national origins of migrants into Japan and Australia; net-migration losses in New Zealand; the rapid economic development of some countries in the region including Hong Kong, Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia and Singapore; and the growth of refugees in Southeast Asia following the conflicts of the 1960s and 1970s. Shifting from a focus on Western receiving nations (as reflected in Massey et al.’s perspective), it is also necessary to identify large-scale labour migration (both independent and government arranged) since the 1970s from countries throughout Asia to the Middle East, a pattern that served as the leading edge of Asian migratory trends in the 1970s and which continues to the present. Overall, these factors have led to considerable increases in emigration of skilled migrants from the region into Australasia as well as North America and Europe; increased movement of migrant labour from the poorer Asian countries to the rapidly developing economies of East and Southeast Asia as well as to the Middle East; and considerable issues surrounding the presence and rights of displaced populations and undocumented migrants.

From the 1980s, a feminization of Asian migration became increasingly apparent, particularly to meet the growing demand in the gender-segmented markets of domestic work, entertainment and sexual services. Initially, it was mainly non-governmental organizations (NGOs) providing direct advocacy and welfare services which tracked these flows and first raised serious (and public) attention on the work and living conditions of Filipino mail-order brides in Europe (1980s); Filipino and Thai entertainers and sex workers in Japan; and Filipino, Thai and Indonesian domestic workers in Singapore, Malaysia and the Middle East (1980s and 1990s).
Some of these trends have become even clearer since the late 1990s, coupled with the increasing prevalence of female migration from the Philippines, Vietnam and Indonesia to Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia and Singapore for marriage and marriage-cum-work. The emergence of migration agents or brokers as key players in population mobility and the broader development of a “migration industry” that fills the void left by receiving states that are less than willing to make bilateral arrangements for labour supply with countries of origin is another significant aspect (Castles and Miller 2008; Xiang 2007), while another emerging trend is the mobility into, within, and out of Asia of highly skilled migrants (Yeoh and Lai 2008), students (Mok 2006) and returnees (Tsuda 2009). In contrast to these increasing trends, the Asian region has experienced a relative decline in the number of refugees at 3.4 million in 2004 compared to 5.4 million in 2000 — a fact that Castles and Miller (2008) put down to political stability and fewer internal or international conflicts — although the continued flight of the Rohingyas and other ethnic minorities from Burma reminds us that this remains an ongoing issue in Asia.

The new population movements in Asia have begun to attract significant attention from scholars at the same time that they have also become an increasingly central concern for states within the region (Asis and Piper 2008). The bulk of research on migration in Asia has been focused on labour migration as regional labour markets have gradually become more integrated and as states have become increasingly aware of their reliance on imported labour power. In 2010, Asia accounted for about one quarter or 30.7 million of the 105.5 million migrant workers globally, an increase from 25.6 per cent to 29 per cent of the global stock since 2004 (International Labour Office 2010). Labour migration in Asian countries is largely intra-regional, with large numbers of migrants originating from particular countries within the region such as the Philippines and Indonesia in Southeast Asia; India, Pakistan and Bangladesh in South Asia; and, more recently, China and Vietnam. Equally, there is a small group of newly industrialized countries within the region which dominate as the destinations of labour migrants: Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. Other nations such as Malaysia and Thailand act as both origins of considerable numbers of labour migrants while also hosting imported labour from neighbouring countries, mainly Indonesia and Burma (Asis and Piper 2008).

Labour migration in Asia primarily revolves around low-skilled workers in two highly gendered categories: low-skill (often male) workers
in industries like manufacturing and construction, and female migrants working in domestic service, entertainment or the service industry (Hewison and Young 2006). There is also important, if numerically less significant, high-skilled migration into many of the same major destination countries (Iredale 2003). Often, such workers are professionals in in-demand sectors like information technology, engineering, finance and health, and receiving countries and companies have developed policies that actively seek to attract these workers with offers of attractive packages and permanent residence. A final significant group in terms of migratory flows in the region are female marriage migrants from developing countries who have become an increasingly notable presence in Japan, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan in recent years (Piper and Roces 2003).

Recent research on the growth of labour migration systems has generally focused on either building up empirical data on the flows of migrants or on the development of policy regimes for sending or receiving migrants in various parts of the Asian region (Asis and Piper 2008). This has included considerable research into the political, economic and population influences on changing migration patterns in Asia, in particular the emergence of labour shortages in low and unskilled manufacturing areas in newly industrialized economies since the 1980s (Hugo 1998). In all of these locations, migrant workers are almost completely concentrated in sectors that are characterized by “3D” jobs that are dirty, dangerous and difficult and that attract the very minimum of wages; effectively parts of the economy that can no longer attract and retain members of the local population (Stahl 1999). Policy regimes governing the arrival and presence of migrant workers operate in a manner that further enhances their unstable position, maintaining strict restrictions through “use-and-discard” contract labour systems (Yeoh 2006) which encourage transience, discourage settlement, and provide states with the capacity to rapidly reduce their foreign labour force in times of economic downturn (Ahmed 1998).

Within this broader effort to map the flows and responses to international migration has been a particular focus on the feminization of human mobility within Asia over the last two decades (Heyzer 2007; Oishi 2005). Early scholarship in this area focused on the emergence of “mail-order-bride” phenomena with an emphasis on the systems of migration (Chun 1996; Tolentino 1996), the legal responses of sending and receiving states (Meng 1994), and the experience of women themselves (Robinson 1996; Ordoñez 1997). Other earlier research investigated female migration to work as entertainers, often involving migrants from the Philippines and
Francis L. Collins, Lai Ah Eng and Brenda S.A. Yeoh

Thailand working in the developed economies of East Asia in employment that is closely associated with the sex industry (Tyner 1997; Yea 2004), or alternatively the circulation of sex tourists in the converse direction (Truong 1983).

More recent work on the feminization of migration in the region has paid particular attention to two forms of mobility that involve women who not only cross international borders but also fulfill key roles in the making of households as domestic workers and international marriage migrants. The former involves the movement of large numbers of women from countries like the Philippines, Indonesia and Sri Lanka as early as the late 1970s to the Middle East, and more recently to Singapore, Hong Kong and Taiwan (Huang, Yeoh and Rahman 2005; Yamanaka and Piper 2005; Wong 1996). Research here has focused on negotiations of complex spaces between labouring abroad and mothering at home (Yeoh and Huang 1999), the framing of positionalities within international divisions of labour cut across by gender, class, race and nationality (Parreñas 2000), and new movements supporting the rights of domestic workers (Lyons 2005; Piper 2005).

Furthermore, asking questions about the gendering of migration, rather than simply the different migrations of men and women, is an emergent literature on international marriage migrations in the region. Although clearly related to earlier mail-order-bride systems, contemporary modes of international marriage migration have moved from a marginal status to a significant mode of social reproduction in Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea and Japan (Piper and Roces 2003). In the process, women from China, Vietnam, Thailand, the Philippines and other developing countries have become embedded within projects of nation building, such as population replacement due to mass ageing and lower fertility rates, that raise serious questions about diversity, cultural maintenance and integration (Kim 2007; Wang and Bélanger 2008); the role of brokerage agencies (Lu 2008); associations with trafficking (Jones and Shen 2008), and the lives of a generation of mixed-ethnicity children in previously homogeneous societies (Ishii this volume).

While much migration in Asia is taking place amongst those perceived to be low-skilled labourers or potential mothers of the next generation, there are also emerging trends of mobility amongst more skilled migrants into and within the region. Indeed, a number of Asian nations are now actively recruiting skilled professionals and are developing policies that
provide pathways to residence and even naturalization for migrants with significant financial resources or human capital (Castles and Miller 2008). These flows of migrants include professionals working in sectors long associated with skilled migration elsewhere, such as Information Technology, but also includes “foreign talent” (Yeoh 2006) in areas as diverse as sports (Goh *this volume*) and various mobilities associated with health and care-work (Connell 2008). Scholars have also identified two key state strategies within these policies. On the one hand, there is evidence that sending countries with large populations of professionals or students abroad are seeking to attract them back through incentive programmes or encouraging a sense of attachment to place and an obligation to national development (Skrentny et al. 2007). India’s recent changes to its citizenship laws offer a useful example in which “people of Indian origin” of certain nationalities could be granted visa-free travel, investment opportunities, and access to educational institutions (Dickinson and Bailey 2007). At the same time, researchers have identified a new focus by receiving countries on attracting international students as potential contributors to future skilled populations, and in particular a shift from Asian countries simply sending students abroad to the West towards new efforts to attract overseas students to China, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong (Mok 2006).

Outside of scholarship that focuses specifically on these dominant state-sanctioned forms of international mobility, three other issues have featured significantly in scholarship in and on Asia which are beyond the scope of this volume but nonetheless do warrant some brief mention here. The first is the rather tricky issue of internal migration, often not considered within key migration textbooks (Massey et al. 1998; Castles and Miller 2008) because it does not include the crossing of national borders but which may involve major dimensions of diversity and crossings of cultures. The sheer scale and intensity of internal migratory trends and the quite distinct challenges it raises for states, communities and migrants mean that this focus is beyond the scope of what can be accomplished here. There is, however, no doubting the significance of internal migration in the Asian context. Large countries like China, India and Indonesia have huge populations of internal migrants who leave rural areas in search of work in major cities and emerging agricultural and industrial regions (Liang and Ma 2004; Deshingkar 2009; Tirtosudarmo 1997). Indeed, China’s “floating population” of internal migrants at 120 million is numerically more...
significant than all international mobility in the region combined (Zhu 2006). Also, there are no doubt important inter-linkages between international and internal migration in Asia, either in terms of graduation from internal to international migration, the role of social networks and agencies across both modes, and the labour market influences that each migration appears to have on the other (Skeldon 2006). Yet, as the different contributions to this volume illustrate, despite these connections the role of borders and their management in the facilitation, limitation and regulation of mobility, particularly in Asian contexts, require specific attention as do the particular kinds of diversity that result from international movements.

A second characteristic of mobility that is significant within the Asian region and that has been the subject of some scholarly work, although beyond the purview of this volume, is the mobility, rights and experiences of undocumented and irregular migrants. The presence of this category of migrants varies considerably in the region, with numbers estimated to be approaching nearly 1 million in Thailand (Chalamwong 2004), constituting two-thirds of the total foreign workforce in the late 1990s in South Korea (Seol 2000), and negligible numbers in Singapore (Abella 2006). Scholars working in this area have focused on the causes of irregular migration (Asis 2004), its connections with documented flows, and practices of the state in seeking to control, expel or at times turn a blind eye to the presence of undocumented migrants (Ghosh 1998). There have also been efforts to focus on the rights of undocumented workers whose legal status makes them extraordinarily vulnerable, subject to potential injury or even death without recourse to the law (Piper and Uhlin 2002).

Human trafficking and people smuggling also remains a significant feature of migration within the Asian region. Although Southeast Asia and the Greater Mekong Subregion in particular are considered the epicentre of trafficking that involves both labour and sexual exploitation, there is growing evidence of a trafficking trade linking Nepal and Bangladesh as source countries with India and Pakistan as destination countries, as well as sex-trafficking into more developed Asia-Pacific countries such as Australia, Hong Kong, Japan and South Korea (Human Rights Watch 1995; International Organization for Migration 2000; Okubo and Shelley 2011). There are multiple dimensions to this phenomenon, not least the problematic overlaps between labour migration, marriage migration and forms of human trafficking (Yea 2011). There is also growing interest amongst scholars, particularly since the enactment of the UN Trafficking
Protocol in 2003 and the growing prominence of the US State Department’s annual TIP report since 2001. Unsurprisingly, given the way trafficking is represented in popular and policy discourses as victimization, much scholarship has pointed to the ways in which vulnerability is produced (Kojma 2011): in home country social relations (Yea 2005), through the work of agents and other intermediaries (Simkhada 2008), and through forms of unilateral, bilateral and multilateral government regulation (Okubo and Shelley 2011).

The issue of vulnerable populations and exploitation through migration points to another prominent issue: the limited rights of most migrants in Asia (Piper 2004; Yeoh 2006) and the emergence of national and transnational human rights movements in Asia, and in particular NGOs’ advocacy work on migrant rights (Piper and Uhlin 2002). This has been a particular feature of debates in Northeast Asia where NGO movements have been successful in achieving important concessions (Lim 2003). Such movements also play an important role in incorporating even temporary migrants into local political contexts (Tsuda 2006) but also more generally contribute to new vibrant forms of democratic multiculturalism (Shipper 2008). Looking to the future, these debates have also raised important questions about the citizenship and residence status of temporary migrants, especially in countries where migrant workers now form an indispensable part of the economy (Kim 2009). The recent (2009) setup of a human rights mechanism among ASEAN countries suggests the new potential to address similar “rights” issues faced by undocumented and other vulnerable migrants is also emerging in Southeast Asia.

As this summary suggests, there is now a considerable amount of research on migration within the Asian region that reveals increasing and diversifying levels of mobility and an increasing attention paid to the phenomenon by the region’s states. It is also clear that the bulk of this work has tended to focus on analysing what Massey et al. (1998) identified in the late 1990s as the emerging “migration system” within the region. However, as Asis and Piper (2008, p. 427) have identified in their recent overview of labour migration in Asia, this focus on gathering “information for practical purposes” and a tendency to operate as a “running commentary of a phenomenon in progress” has limited the extent to which studies of migration have been able to engage with conceptual questions or with the wider diversity of migration-related issues that have been common elsewhere. Indeed, there has been much less study of the formation of
transnational communities in Asia, the identities of migrants abroad or the interaction that migrants have with local populations. These are important questions for a more mature state of migration research in the region. They also raise significant issues for understanding the complex issues that are now emerging as migration becomes a more permanent feature of lives in Asia. Not least amongst these issues are the new forms of social and cultural diversity that are emerging as the presence of migrants becomes a central feature of everyday lives throughout Asia.

THE STUDY OF DIVERSITY IN ASIA

While the literature on international migration in Asia is clearly well established and increasingly varied, equivalent scholarly inquiry into emergent diversity is much less apparent. Moreover, where the former has largely focused on contemporary mobility associated with work and marriage, scholarship on diversity in Asia has tended to approach this issue as a historically constituted reality. As such, the focus has been mainly on those countries where diversity is a foundational part of nation-building or on other contexts where internal or cross-border minorities have been a significant presence (Hefner 2001; Goh et al. 2009; Kumar and Siddique 2008; Kymlicka and He 2005). In this regard, more attention has been paid to issues within South and Southeast Asia where diversity and the presence of minorities have long prevailed and much less so in Northeast Asia where diversity, if recognized at all, is seen as a temporary rupture of long-established homogeneity.

In Western European contexts such as the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Denmark and Holland (Madood and Werbner 1997) and “immigration countries” such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand (Pearson 2001), the concerns and debates on diversity variously focus around the discourses and practices of “multiculturalism”, “integration”, “rights and responsibilities”, “social cohesion”, “social inclusion”, “cosmopolitanism” and “unity in diversity” and, in the post-September 11 environment, much attention has been paid to Muslim minorities. In contrast, there has been relatively little attention given to the growing diversity in Asia in contemporary times. While debates are also emerging over diversity issues in some Asian settings, there has not been a similar level of attention given to the processes, meanings and significances embedded in these issues as compared to the prominence evident in European contexts; neither
has there been sufficient attempts to understand diversity issues within the contexts of highly distinct and varied postcolonial histories, cultures, geographies, and political economies specific to Asia. Rather, questions of diversity in Asia have been addressed within the larger corpus of work on the history of migration in colonial societies and the processes and tensions within nation-building, particularly in the context of the heterogeneous societies of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore.

During the colonial era, the heterogeneity of populations, mostly arising from labour recruitment and migration systems, did not escape the notice of scholars and colonial administrators. This gave rise to important conceptualizing work such as the plural society thesis of Furnivall (1967) which became the dominant theoretical framework for studying colonial and heterogeneous societies. Studies on specific immigrant populations, such as the Chinese in Southeast Asia (Purcell 1965), as well as anthropological studies of specific cultural/ethnic groups also made important contributions to understanding diversity and the constitution of racial/ethnic categorizations under colonial administration in Malaya and Singapore. With the imminence and then achievement of independence, concern shifted to building viable and cohesive nation-states out of these heterogeneous societies, and scholarship from the 1950s onwards primarily focused on migration histories, demographics, citizenship and identities of settlers and minorities (Wang 1988, 1989; Yen 1986; Sandhu 1969; Arasaratnam 1979; Sandhu and Mani 1993). This included accounts of political movements in which immigrants played pivotal roles, such as the Chinese in the anti-colonial Communist movement in Malaya, and the political and cultural issues of post-colonial nation-building (Emerson 1960; Bell 1976; Bell and Freeman 1974; Horowitz 1985). Many from the first and second generations of local scholars focused on specific communities or aspects within the nation-building project and processes specific to new nation-states, such as communalism and political accommodation in Malaysia (Ratnam 1965; Muzaffar 1974). More focused studies also engaged with the potentially divisive issues of language, culture and religion in Singapore and Malaysia (Tham 1971; Chiew 1983; Chan 1984; Puru Shotam 1989), the effects of race-based colonial policies on immigrant as well as indigenous populations in Malaysia (Lim 1977; Shamsul A. B. 1986) and the role of immigrants in nation-building (Suryadinata 1997).

Nation-state building continues to dominate research and writing in the postcolonial societies of Southeast Asia, in part because their relatively
new nation-state building projects are still works-in-progress. Thus, where issues of ethnicity, language, culture and religion first emerged as potentially divisive in the newly independent nation-state, as was the case in Malaysia, they have now re-emerged to hinder projects of nation-building, ethnic integration and social cohesion in ways that are influenced by a complex interplay of policy and social forces (Mandal 2001; Shamsul 2001; Lim, Gomes, and Raham 2009). In the Malaysian case, those from second and subsequent generations of Chinese and Indian descent who are full-fledged citizens are still viewed as immigrants by some Malays who consider themselves indigenous and bumiputra (sons of the soil), and minority issues on language, culture and religion remain hotly contested. In the context of recent Islamization among Malays and growing religiosity among others, issues of religious practice and conversion in particular have become controversial and divisive among Malaysia’s diverse and overlapping ethnic and religious populations (Mohamad 2009, Whiting 2008).

In Singapore, the CMIO (Chinese, Malay, Indian and Others) model of multiculturalism that continues the racial categories employed by British colonial administrators was first laid as a foundation for the newly independent nation-state in the 1960s (Benjamin 1976). To this day it continues to be under scrutiny and contestation for its underlying assumptions about the fixedness of ethnic culture and its perpetuation of differentiation and separation by ethnicity (Siddique 1989; Chua and Kwok 2001). Also, language issues around the use of English (inherited from the British), Singlish (a local version of English influenced by various Chinese dialects, Malay and Indian) and Mandarin (dominant language of the Chinese majority population and new Chinese immigrants) continue to be debated in terms of their relative cultural and economic values. The arrival of recent immigrants adds yet another layer of complexity and challenge to CMIO multiculturalism, such as the (mis)fit of immigrants into the CMIO schema, the “rightful” place and use of English by immigrants, and local-immigrant interaction and integration issues (Yeoh 2005). What is of significance here is that always underlying nation-building are issues pertaining to social and cultural diversity and the challenges of negotiating them, however diversity and multiculturalism may be defined within national and local contexts.

Where recent research has started to address questions of diversity in Asia, it has often looked at applicability of Western approaches to
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multiculturalism within Asian contexts. Kymlicka (2005), for example, notes that the particularities of cultural diversity in Asia, where long-established minority groups are equal citizens and/or key contributors to the nation-state even as they desire neither independence nor assimilation, means that Western models of integration or minority rights are not easily applied. Yet, at the same time, the absence of large-scale debates about minority rights and integration that follow European models does not mean that diversity is not a key dynamic in the region. On the contrary, research has found that diversity is often viewed as a part of everyday life in countries like Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore (Hefner 2001; Lai 1995; Gomes, Kaartinen, and Kortteinen 2007; Goh et al. 2009; Wise and Velayutham 2009). This is not to suggest that conflict around differences in ethnicity, culture, language and religion do not take place; they certainly do, as research around experiences of racism and issues of cosmopolitanism in places like Singapore make clear (Gomez 2010; Ong and Yeoh this volume; Velayutham 2009). It is to point out that the negotiation of such differences is often treated as part and parcel of community and everyday life (Lai 1995; Lai this volume).

A less notable presence within the study of diversity in Asia has been the impact of more recent migratory waves on the cultural constitution of communities and nations. Certainly, some of the forms of migration discussed in the previous section raise important questions about diversity — particularly the question of new transnational marriages in changing the ethnic/cultural make-up of both present and future generations of families. Yet, even here, there appears to be little effort to connect debates around the processes of migration with the emergence of new forms of diversity, but rather a more descriptive focus on policy responses. In the case of labour migrants, the assumed transience of these subjects in state policy and rhetoric has meant that little discussion of diversity has emerged.

Clearly, contemporary forms of migration do present significant challenges for scholarly understandings of diversity in the region. In some cases, this needs to be understood within the contexts of already pluralistic societies, such as Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, where new forms of migration are both extending and expanding the diversity of populations. Some of these societies have also historically encountered conflicts and tensions between ethnic groups, but this means they have also accumulated accommodation and integration experiences, efforts and processes that present contexts and possibilities for newer migrants to
find openings in the fabric of communities. In other cases, contemporary forms of migration are occurring in relatively homogeneous societies such as Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, and diversity poses a new challenge to policy-makers, the public and immigrants themselves. In general, for members of host societies, the tremendous speed and scale of immigration and the variety of immigrants’ backgrounds pose adjustment problems of perception and acceptance of immigrants and of changes to their existing social orders, cultures and identities.

**APPROACHING MIGRATION AND DIVERSITY IN ASIA**

This volume takes as its object of enquiry the intersection between processes of migration and experiences of diversity in Asia. Our geographical focus is in East and Southeast Asia, parts of Asia that are presently subject to considerable international migratory flows. This also means that there are important gaps that have not been addressed here, most notably the internal and international migration systems of China and South Asia, as well as the cross-border flows that characterize central Asian nations. Nevertheless, the chapters here represent an initial effort to draw together these debates around migration and diversity that have largely remained independent in scholarly literature in Asia but that are intricately intertwined not only in the lives of migrants but also in the goals of policy and discourses in the public domain. Indeed, unlike Western European, North American and Australasian contexts where notions of integration and assimilation draw these issues together — our review of scholarship in and on Asia has illustrated a tendency to focus on the distinct role of recent migration as a solution to labour shortages and changing family arrangements, and diversity as an already existing feature of some national polities or non-existent in others. In this regard, research on migration and diversity in Asia remains either under-theorized or overly reliant on conceptual frameworks developed in other empirical contexts (Parreñas 2010). Indeed, as Asis and Piper (2008, p. 425) aptly put it: “what is lacking is theory building”, particularly in terms of the contextual specificities of Asia. While we do not endeavour to provide an overarching conceptual approach to studying migration and diversity in Asia within this introduction, not least because of the range and differences in experiences in the region, we do seek here to highlight some key issues within Asia that suggest the need for thinking differently about processes of migration and their relationship with diversity.
At the core of a more relevant approach to studying migration and diversity in Asian contexts is the pressing need to delineate and differentiate territorial configurations of Asia and the West. Indeed, Asian migratory systems and diversity experiences are markedly different from both the European model of supposedly homogeneous and insular states, and the North American and Australasian settler colonies which, whilst founded on migration, appear locked into models of multiculturalism that privilege the European/White/Caucasian subject as the core of the nation. Southeast Asia (and indeed Asia more broadly) fits uncomfortably within these models. In Southeast Asian nations, migratory processes and the diversification of populations neither marked the establishment of a nation-state in spite of indigenous populations (à la the white settler colonies), nor have they only occurred subsequent to consolidation of national territories and imaginaries (as in the mode of Western Europe). Instead, migration can be understood as foundational to the formation of the nation-state in Southeast Asia (particularly in Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore), taking place both prior to and during the colonial period and then becoming entrenched in a post-colonial moment of independence and nation-state formation based on an already existing plurality.

Even in East Asia, where narratives of long-standing homogeneity have often been even more forceful than those in Western Europe, we need to understand contemporary approaches to migration and responses to diversity in Japan (Nagy this volume), South Korea (Kim this volume) and Taiwan (Hsia this volume) through the particularities of nation-state building and regional geopolitics. Korea’s obsession with its own ethnic homogeneity, for example, would appear to be based in part at least on experiences of and resistance to Japanese colonialism, even as this homogeneity shrouds the historical presence of non-Koreans within the nation-state (Kim this volume) and historically entrenched modes of incorporating diversity in pre-colonial eras (Han 2007). As both Hsia and Nagy illustrate in their respective chapters, migratory movements and diverse populations are also not absent in the territorial configurations of the Japanese and Taiwanese nation-states but, unlike Southeast Asian states, diversity has often been denied through articulations of homogenisation that desire coherence between racial and national communities (see also Wang 1997).

Contemporary patterns of migration and approaches to citizenship outlined by Asis and Batistella in their chapter clearly build upon historical experiences of migration, constructions of nationhood, and already existing
(or denials of) diversity. At the same time, they also suggest further fertile terrain for reconceptualizing migration and diversity in ways that build up from contextual specificities in and across Asia. Clearly, central amongst these specificities is the prevalence of migratory regimes that enforce transience on contemporary populations of labour migrants, particularly those considered unskilled and undesirable (Collins 2011). Each of the major receiving states within Asia (Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan) is stringent in its maintenance of this distinction between temporary residents and permanent citizens, creating a context where encounters across this form of diversity are structurally problematic (Ong and Yeoh this volume). At the same time, however, each of these states has sought to incorporate other migrant subjects in different ways. Marriage migration is another common trend across these states. This is an arena where the migration of women leads into the very homes of the nation and the making of families and the next generation. As both Hsia (this volume) and Ishii (this volume) illustrate, the migration of women for marriage and an emerging generation of children with multi-ethnic identities serve as incipient diversities that problematize state-centred cultural and citizenship models and present opportunities for new sorts of connections between groups.

These varied moments of nation-state formation and consolidation through migration appear then as fundamental to ensuing experiences of diversity, constituting an ideological denial or acceptance of difference that sets the parameters for how diversity is played out in the always complex processes of nation-building. Hence the “separate but equal” and “unequal” models of multiculturalism espoused in Singapore and Malaysia respectively, the acceptance of Chinese diasporic presence in Thailand, the “unity in diversity” of Indonesia, but also the ongoing ideological homogenization of South Korea and Japan, and the ethnically-centred nationalism of Taiwan. Contemporary migration policies and approaches to diversity are necessarily developed in relation to these already existing cultural dynamics. At the same time, however, it is also clear that there is considerable feedback between evolving policy approaches, emerging migratory processes and the changing aspirations of the state and those of its populace. Hence, the multicultural framework and arithmetic of Singapore is gradually being problematized and modified by the arrival of new populations who do not fit easily into existing categories (Ong and Yeoh this volume; Goh this volume). In East Asia too, the rigorous
adherence to homogeneity is being broken down as nations face the challenge of incorporating marriage migrants and their children who are literally reconstituting what it means to be Taiwanese, Japanese and Korean (Hsia this volume; Ishii this volume; Kim this volume). Such examples do not suggest that the state is relinquishing its grip on migration, diversity and their implications for nation-building; quite the opposite, they illustrate the fluid and evolving nature of policy approaches particularly in an era of accelerated population mobility in Asia.

Policies and responses to diversity also cannot simply be read through a singular nation-state centred narrative. Rather, closer analysis of differential incorporation of migrant subjects, the active advocacy by civil society groups and alternative modes of incorporation at lower levels of the state also play a role in structuring the inclusion of migrant-subjects and nascent engagements with diversity. In South Korea, for example, the state has not completely excluded all migrant subjects, but rather is engaged in a selective incorporation of some migrants over time, most notably marriage migrants, mixed-race Koreans and also, to a lesser degree, a historically resident ethnic Chinese population (Kim this volume) and ethnic Korean migrants from China (Kim 2008). In doing so, the state has also selectively drawn upon rhetorics of multiculturalism and discourses of human rights to relocate the social and cultural borders of the nation, charting a course towards a new, more diverse, but still exclusionary national imaginary. Civil society groups are clearly an important part of shifts towards new spaces for migrants in South Korea (Lim 2003), and also in Japan (Shipper 2008) and Taiwan (Hsia this volume). In contexts like Taiwan where citizenship is often locked into associations with ethnicity and the nation-state, advocates for expanded migrant rights provide examples of how exclusionary citizenship regimes can be transformed into more inclusive models (Hsia this volume) through the introduction of new radical modes of citizenship that problematize the exclusion of some migrants. In other contexts, local governments contribute to different modes of incorporation which, while not presenting a direct challenge to the nation-state, do render certain spaces more open to difference. Adachi and Shinjuku urban wards in Tokyo offer a useful example, having developed policies of “multicultural coexistence” to “secure the rights of all residents” in a context where, at the national level, there are systemic legal, cultural and linguistic barriers to inclusion (Nagy this volume). However, as Nagy’s analysis illustrates, these policies are not simply imported rhetorical approaches to diversity but draw on
the historical and contemporary specificities of each area to construct new more diverse urban communities within a national framework that still espouses homogeneity.

Existing alongside and sometimes superseding or countering these policy approaches is also an assemblage of practices for and experiences of negotiating diversity that are grounded in long-standing local processes which reflect evolving modes of accommodation within many Asian contexts. These are apparent in and through sites like the *kopitiam* that are historically grounded manifestations of everyday practices of living together through diversity (Lai *this volume*) or the emergence of new cultural spaces that bring together new migrants and older residents (Song *this volume*). These readings do not suggest that the everyday negotiation of diversity is always easy or without conflict. Indeed, Ong and Yeoh’s (*this volume*) discussion of (un)cosmopolitan behaviour and attitudes of Singaporeans towards transient male migrant workers, and even the somewhat problematic incorporation of foreign sporting talent outlined by Goh (*this volume*), illustrate some of the very real difficulties that emerge around changing diversities. In particular, they illustrate the disjuncture between the “opening up” of the nation brought about by state policy and the friction that materializes around different practices, spaces and identities in everyday life. At the same time, these frictions do not foreclose all possibilities for contact and flexibility between groups. Certain sites, like the food and community spaces of the *kopitiam* in Singapore discussed by Lai (*this volume*) or the new *halal* eateries of Itaewon in Seoul discussed by Song (*this volume*), suggest that there are already resources for diversity in many Asian contexts that can be scaled up to achieve a broader, more inclusive and civil negotiation of difference. These examples highlight that in contexts where migration and diversity have been *foundational* to the formation of larger communities and nations (as in Southeast Asia) or where new diversity is accompanied by more worldly outlooks (as in South Korea), individuals and groups have developed the capacities required to engage with “others” they live amongst. Indeed, the *kopitiam* is but one of several public and everyday sites of encounter within a larger multicultural public housing setting in the Singapore context in which 85 per cent of the population live (Lai 1995; Lai 2011). There is a departure in this case, then, from the sorts of disinterested “tolerance” and objectified exotization that have been viewed by some scholars as the crux of Western multiculturalism (Mitchell 1993; Žižek 1997). There are also, however,
potential synergies here with emerging research on everyday encounters and the negotiation of diversity in specific local contexts that seeks to respond to both conservative and progressive critiques of multiculturalism (Amin 2002; Sandercock 2003; Wise and Velayutham 2009).

These multiple modes of negotiating, including and advocating for different forms of diversity in Asian contexts raise important questions about the relationship between national diversity policy and the daily experience of difference. They suggest, for example, that even as the state retains a hegemonic control on ideologies and imaginaries of diversity within national territories, these are neither all encompassing nor completely impregnable to popular participation. At the same time, they also point to distinct departures from modes of understanding migration and managing diversity in Western contexts where a focus on rights and recognition within the nation or the promotion of diversity has often superseded any efforts to deal with the complexities of everyday living in diverse contexts. Whilst foundational and nascent engagements with diversity in these Asian contexts are by no means unproblematic, they do suggest different possibilities for reformulating and rethinking the politics of diversity more broadly. Indeed, at a time when existing modes of multiculturalism are being questioned in the West (Grillo 2007), these examples of negotiating diversity in Asia, as shared circumstance, present insights that might contribute to new efforts to rethink approaches to migration and diversity across different territories both within and beyond Asia (Amin 2002; Sandercock 2003; Wise and Velayutham 2009).

The different evolving approaches to migration and diversity in the various Asian contexts discussed in this volume also raise significant questions about the identities of migrants and the position of future generations in society. In part, the challenge of identity formation for newer migrants and communities is one that already characterizes settlement processes historically in parts of Asia, involving the transition from sojourner to settler and their necessary political socialization into citizenship of a new nation-state of first generation immigrants (Wang 1989; Sandhu and Mani 1993) and also of local-born second and subsequent generation members who are full-fledged citizens. The identities of first generation immigrants do shift during these processes, from close associations with distant homelands to identities that, while still community-based, are grounded more in the politics, practices and experiences of the new country and less with pre-migration affiliations. In this respect, identity formation
needs to be understood relationally, particularly in an era of heightened global mobilities and communications. This would mean taking into account both dynamics internal to particular migrant subjects and their connections and disconnections with other parts of society and broader diasporic networks that extend beyond both homeland and hostland (Lorenzana this volume). Identity formation is always a fraught process then, reliant not simply on ethnic affiliations but also refracted through representations of gender and class as communities themselves evolve and become increasingly involved in the necessarily stratified social life of settlement. For the second generation, particularly those whose parents come from different backgrounds, such complexities are likely to be even more prominent as they negotiate identities through hierarchies of ethnicity, class and gender that always threaten to position them at the margins of society (Ishii this volume). Nonetheless, looking to the future, it is also the next generation, whether of one or mixed heritage, whose experiences of diversity position them as the vanguard of as yet unscripted engagements with and negotiations of diversity. They may not be the hybrid creolized subjects so valorized in the study of postcolonialism, but as young people who have grown up amongst or between different groups, they offer considerable insight and hope for Asian futures characterized by both diversity and opportunity.

This volume brings together these different debates and issues through a range of chapters that focus on the dynamic relationship between migratory processes and social and cultural diversity in East and Southeast Asian contexts. The contributors come from a range of humanities and social science disciplines including anthropology (Lai; Song), communication studies (Lorenzana), literary and cultural studies (Goh), geography (Ong and Yeoh), international studies (Nagy), and sociology (Asis and Battistella; Hsia; Ishii; Kim). Correspondingly, the volume also incorporates diverse research methods including grounded ethnographic studies (Lai; Song), more structured qualitative interviews and observations (Ong and Yeoh; Ishii), media (Goh; Lorenzana) and policy analysis (Asis and Battistella; Kim; Nagy) and action research (Hsia). This diversity of perspectives and approaches is important because it provides a more encompassing account of the different and complex dimensions of migration and diversity in the Asian region and the ways in which it articulates itself through politics and policies, media representations and everyday life.

Beyond this Introduction, the volume is divided into three sections. The first section addresses Migration, Multiculturalism and Governance in
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Asia. It begins with an broad region-wide overview of these issues in the chapter by Asis and Battistella before we turn to investigate the specificities of four nations within the region — South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Japan — focusing in particular on contemporary migratory flows and state techniques of governing the movement and incorporation of migrant subjects in them. The second section focuses on more detailed case studies of settlement and the emergent identities of diverse populations over generations. Here authors address more specifically the lives of second and third generation migrants and the children of mixed marriages, highlighting issues of belonging, encounter and circulation which emerge as part of the dynamics through which identities are formed and plural conditions are negotiated. The third and final section focuses on practices and draws our attention to the everyday negotiation of difference and diversity through sites like the multicultural Singaporean kopitiam, new ethnic restaurants in Seoul and the increasingly “foreign talent”-filled sports fields of Singapore. In charting various trajectories in contexts and levels that range from nation to region, city, community, family and individual, these contributions illustrate the multifarious experiences of and responses to migratory flows and diversity taking place within Asia. In doing so, the authors also remind us that the outcomes of these processes are always in the making, tenuous in some circumstances but also always an arena open to new progressive developments built upon lives increasingly marked by mobility and difference.
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