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Abstract

The subject of inquiry of this study is ‘gender’ within diasporic philanthropy in the discourse on migration and development. The contribution of this paper to the current literature on the migration-development-nexus (MDN) is the questioning of the major assumptions behind the migration-development discourse by challenging its notion of migrant networks as being homogeneous. As it will be shown, the latter perspective does not do justice to the hierarchies and diversities between and within networks. This is demonstrated by a gender analysis of philanthropic migrant organizations.

By analyzing the discourse surrounding diasporic philanthropy, I will argue that the MDN leaves out important features – which corroborates the hypothesis of the instrumental appliance of diasporic philanthropy within the MDN, in the interests of the North. I will demonstrate the different social and spatial articulations of diasporic philanthropy by revealing particular ways in which women and men participate in transnational communities.
1. Introduction

In recent decades international migration has intensified both in the South-North as well as South-South direction and has led to the formation of complex circuits of flows of people, information and finance. International migration has enormous implications for growth and welfare in both countries of origin and destination as well as for individual lives. Data on migrant remittances suggest that financial flows in many countries have become higher than global official development assistance (ODA) and foreign direct investment (FDI). Other forms of contributions to the home countries are recently gaining attention, such as diasporic philanthropy. This is a form of transmittal which goes beyond personal relationship (family and friends) to more encompassing contributions to the home communities or countries, often called community or collective remittances. The contributions can involve material just as much as immaterial benefits such as microfinance-projects or transfers of expertise.

The discussion around migrant remittances and diasporic philanthropy and their impact on the development of the sending country have constructed the ‘Migration-Development-Nexus’ (MDN) as a discursive field. In the High level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2006 of the United Nations and the intergovernmental Global Forum on Migration and Development in July 2007 this nexus received soaring attention and the MDN has become a new site for reasoning and action about transnational engagement as a new form of migrants’ agency, in line with the new development strategy which accords great significance to actors in civil society. (Schwenken and Ziai, 2007)

The interest in migration studies is not just about explaining migration, but to account for potential migration flows and to contribute to preventive policies - a weakness of migration research in so far as it focuses on potential rather than actual migration and its consequences. (Massey, et al., 1998: 12) This exemplifies that contemporary migration studies begun within a control paradigm whereas post-World War II studies were embedded in an assimilation paradigm: When migration patterns shifted to flows from developing to developed countries in the last quarter of the 20th century, migrants were mainly perceived as problems in need of

---

1 Accounted remittances are monies sent through bank channels and money-transfer agencies such as Western Union. Informal transfers are not accounted for and probably triple the worth of flows to developing countries. (Wong, 2006: 355) The World Bank estimates that in 2006 worldwide remittances reached US$275 billion, with US$206 billion flowing to developing countries. (Johnson, 2007: 3)
regulation. (Nyberg-Sørensen et al., 2002: 35-6) In contrast to this perception of migrants and migration, the Migration-Development Nexus tries to forge a positive view on how migration is influenced by development – and how migration impacts development. (Ammassari, 2001: 6) The established linkages assume that, “while development-oriented actions can help tackling the root causes of migratory flows, migration can, in turn, contribute positively to development, including economic growth, social empowerment and technological progress” (Migration and Development, 2006). Governments and international organizations therefore regard migration as an engine for the development in the sending countries and highlight the positive effects of migration on the economy of the home country, promoting ‘development through migration’. (Schwenken and Ziai, 2007: 1-2) Migrants are then no longer portrayed as victims, no longer dependents from the goodwill of the receiving society, but become perceived as ‘heroes’ and agents for the development of their country of origin. Diasporas – as an ‘aggregate’ of migrants – are seen as a potential for their nations’ development through a range of contributions, including: financial investment, political advocacy, and philanthropic giving.

1.1. Diasporas and Diasporic Philanthropy

Evidence suggests that fiscal remittances are generally contribution to family members, for personal consumption and individual investment. Nevertheless, some parts of remittances are also channelled for the public good, targeting mainly social infrastructure at the community level. These contributions are generally referred to as ‘diasporic philanthropy’ or also ‘diaspora philanthropy’. (Johnson, 2007: 3)

Interestingly, there is little consensus on the precise definitions of the concepts on which this paper is based, including those as central as ‘diaspora’ and ‘philanthropy’. Philanthropy cannot be taken as pre-given and self-evident: “Philanthropy is a culturally and historically specific concept, and, in the most general of terms, refers to the voluntary use of private assets (finance, real estate, know how and skills) for the benefit of specific public causes” (Anheier and Daly, 2004: 159). Philanthropy defined in a ‘mainstream’ understanding is confined to donations of foundations – of usually white, male entrepreneurs. ²

² This notion can be distilled in the article on philanthropy in the Encyclopaedia Britannica: “Starting in the late
Diasporic philanthropy is then understood in a broader concept of the term – close to the notion of volunteerism. To be fair, diaspora giving is not new: Both the migration of peoples and the tradition of ‘giving back’ to one’s country of origin are nothing new, but in the MDN these concepts receive new meanings, as they are suitable to the implicit aims and views of the MDN. This does not only influence a theoretical discourse, but the differences in the definition have significant implications for how such engagement is understood, practiced, measured, and promoted.

In the *Migration-Development-Nexus* diasporic philanthropy is represented as an underappreciated but emerging opportunity to convert private wealth to developmental capital which can be used in the country of origin and is presented as a “migrant-led initiative” (Silva, 2006: 19). Even though ‘diasporic philanthropy’ only constitutes a small share in relation to individual remittances, it is believed to have the greatest impact and potential to create equity. Successful projects of diasporic giving initiated the application in other places and on other groups which provokes inconsistencies – a common result when blueprints are applied without consideration of context and individual interests.

The prominent place occupied by diasporas in policy discourses on the MDN reflects the concern that diasporas can make important contribution to the development of their countries of origins, both through financial transfers and through the transfer of skills and knowledge acquired in host countries. In short, diasporas are regarded as financial and cultural brokers in the Migration-Development-Nexus. As developmental institutions are in a search for new supply of support, diaspora populations are viewed as an important audience and potential resource.

One of the key differences between the different forms of contributions has to do with the institutions which mediate the transfer and use of the funds. Diasporic philanthropy is often referred to as ‘collective remittances’ or ‘community remittances’, which are essentially group donations transferred by migrant organisations such as Hometown-Associations (HTA) for development projects in their home countries, mainly community focused. Even though HTAs are the most common type of migrant organisations, the contribution cannot be conceptualized as restricted to hometown occurrence, since institutional giving persists alongside per-

19th century, large personal fortunes led to the creation of private foundations that bequeathed gifts totalling millions and then billions in support of the arts, education, medical research, public policy, social services, environmental causes, and other special interests.”
sonal giving as it is also pursued through personal ties and contacts or direct gifts to organizations and institutions in the home country. (Johnson, 2007: 15)

The terms collective or community remittances then do not capture the whole range of activities and therefore reduce philanthropy to its financial dimension. This also hints to the difficulties of distinguishing remittances and diasporic philanthropy sharply, which is reflected in the almost synonymously and often contradictory use in the literature. To be for the benefit of the public is then the primary characteristic for philanthropy, be it monetary or ‘intangible’ forms of contributions which are of a private source and transferred voluntarily. (ibid: 6-8) Under this categorisation, flows comprise knowledge and skill transfers as well as the implementation of community projects which is thought to compensate for the brain drain through the emigration of skilled people and contribute to ‘brain gain’ or ‘brain circulation’. (Schwenken and Ziai, 2007: 3)

The financial connotation of the above mentioned terms are in line with the illustration of the MDN in this study: My study depicts the MDN as a discursive field which pictures development as having only one dimension: an economic one. According to this discourse, humanitarian objectives do not enhance the development of the sending country; the social dimension of development is not considered – if not as functional to economic development. In the MDN investments of the diaspora through remittances are in the centre of attention, and the State is assigned a minimum involvement.³

³ The absence of any note on the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers (no matter if regular or irregular) and their Families in the MDN is telling, migration management in form of control is still at the forefront instead of a human development framework.
## Types of Contributions from Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Remittances</strong></th>
<th><strong>Diasporic Philanthropy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Business Investment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sender</strong></td>
<td>Mainly <strong>individuals</strong></td>
<td>Mainly <strong>collectives</strong>: organised group of migrants; families, hometown associations or other migrant/diaspora organisations</td>
<td>Individuals or collectives: Professional associations, business groups</td>
<td>Individuals, collectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recipients</strong></td>
<td>Family members, friends</td>
<td>Communities or target groups within communities</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs, companies</td>
<td>Individuals, family members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Form**         | Monetary remittances; Informal channels such as self-carry, personal couriers, the mail, in-kind remittances of goods | Monetary remittances as well as knowledge and skills transfers, time, volunteerism, projects: diasporic philanthropy | Business investments, business plans, FDI | political and human rights advocacy and technology  
transfers, social remittances: ideas, behaviours, identities, and social capital that migrants export to their home communities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mediating actors/ institutions</strong></th>
<th>Families, social networks, money transfer companies</th>
<th>Diasporic organizations, community social networks; local, state and federal governments; NGOs, foundations</th>
<th>Business links, multinational companies</th>
<th>Parties, NGOs, foundations, families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance of place of origin in destination of remittance</strong></td>
<td>Usually close relationship - remittance goes to kin in place of origin</td>
<td>Close relationship between identity and place of origin; village, ethnic, tribal loyalty</td>
<td>Business contacts in the country of origin</td>
<td>Social ties, political ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic and purpose</strong></td>
<td>Money is sent to support or help relatives and friends</td>
<td>Logic of philanthropy: money is donated to help a community or a group of needy people; to provide unavailable resources or amenities</td>
<td>Money invested to create job opportunities or enhance personal profit</td>
<td>Create awareness of situation of the country from an outside perspective, acculturation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses and function</strong></td>
<td>Consumption – food, clothing, housing, education, health, social services; Improving well-being of recipients</td>
<td>Community public works infrastructure, social services; Providing social citizenship benefits/goods/services</td>
<td>Business creation, economic development</td>
<td>Strengthen democracy, build international links, create gender equality, infusion of technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Silva, 2006*
1.2. Unpacking the social constructions of a policy frame

The intention of this research is to reveal its theoretical weaknesses by unpacking the homogenized concept of ‘migrant network’ which underpins the MDN’s notion of diasporic philanthropy, investigating the diversities of such networks and their philanthropic identities and scrutinizing the incoherence by means of a gender analysis – illustrated by the study of two organizations of Ghanaian migrants in The Netherlands with a philanthropic principle. The main question this research investigates is therefore: In which ways do gendered identities in diasporic philanthropy disprove the rhetoric of the Migration-Development-Nexus?

Different interests are shown to be on the forefront for the migrants themselves, demonstrating that the MDN consequently leaves out many aspects of the actors’ perspectives. I will demonstrate the different social and spatial articulations of diasporic philanthropy by revealing particular ways in which women and men participate in transnational communities. It will be shown that gender intersects with location, be it the place of settlement in the receiving country, the home country or community, or transnational spaces.

The analysis is inspired by Anthony Giddens’ concept of ‘Structuration’ which indicates that the migrants’ actions form and reinforce structures; at the same time they are formed by the structures provided through policies and institutional practice themselves. Therefore the latter will be investigated as deliberately and instrumentally providing the stage for the migrants’ engagement.

To bring light on the ‘diasporic voices’ the epistemological approach of this research is based on what feminist epistemologists call ‘situated knowledge’ in which the research subjects, namely Ghanaian migrants in the Netherlands who are part of organizations with a philanthropic dimension, are conceptualized as bearers of knowledge. In the discourse of the MDN these migrants are identified as ‘diasporic philanthropist’, but different interests are shown to be on the forefront for the migrants themselves, demonstrating that the MDN consequently leaves out many aspects of the actors’ perspectives.

The analysis draws from an understanding of gender which conceives it as a construct that is reiterated and internalized through constant performative acts and is therefore understood as a verb rather than a noun. Given that all acts are motivated by implicit and explicit values it is also meaningful to consider the socio-cultural context of gender as relations and their embedded values. Negotiations of values and interests can be understood as situated performance. This research theorizes about the ways in which constructions of femininities and masculinities organize the outcomes of immigrant transnational activism which take place in a
specific policy context, constituting a multiple sets of interplay between structure and agency. It is recognized that gender intersects with other identities and locations and attention is drawn to gender as an element in network analysis with the acknowledgment that gendered identities influence the outcome of philanthropic engagements. (Järvi luoma et al, 2003: 24-25)

The focus lies on action which aims to benefit migrants’ communities of their own social origin, carried out – due to the need to set limits to this endeavour – by migrants of the first generation. This paper focuses on the collective aspect of diasporic philanthropy, on migrant networks or diasporic organization, since they are in the main focus of MDN policies in regards to philanthropy. There is little research which captures the experience of organized diasporic philanthropy. (Johnson, 2007: 4) The prevailing context is confined to an one-site study, since the analysis focuses on the migration network itself, and not on the site of the traditional ‘philanthropy-receivers’, the home communities in Ghana.

2. The Diversity of Migrant Networks

The main argument is that though conceptualization of migrant networks in the MDN as a discourse draws on Giddens’ Structuration theory, it does not take into account different layers of structuration that reflect social differentiation – which is to say that different groups of migrants have different impacts, as well as different interests. In this sense there is a hierarchy of actors, and it is misleading to assume that social networks are neutral. They are affected by multiple intersections such as class divisions, identity or gender – whereby migrant networks are steeped in power relations. The heterogeneity of migrant networks arises as they can be formed on different levels, on family or kinship relations, community based networks such as HTAs or entrepreneurial associations, as it is shown by an investigation of the organizations illustrated in the case study. These networks are culturally and politically embedded, and can therefore not be generalized. Their stance in the discourse on diasporic philanthropy within the MDN is critically examined.

Migrant networks are located in their broadest conceptualization in transnational spaces as they constitute one type of formations in these spaces, namely transnational communities. (Faist, 2006: 4). Transnational communities are then characterized by “dense and strong social and symbolic ties over time and across space to patterns of networks and circuits in two countries – based upon solidarity” (Faist, 2000: 196). As a condition for the emergence of such a community, solidarity ties need to reach beyond narrow kinship systems.
2.1. Case Study

In this paper’s context it is imperative to recognize the importance of a non-transnational but internal ‘hometown association-culture’ in Ghana – a type of social organisation which has deep roots in Ghana’s various ethnic groups. “The extension of hometown associations and networks to overseas Ghanaian migrant communities since the 1970s and 80s has been therefore a perfectly natural step, alongside the equally strong family ties maintained by Ghanaians when they travel to work and reside outside their home communities” (Crook, 2007: 7).

An official number indicates the number of Ghanaian migrants recorded in The Netherlands is around 18,000, whereby a large number is undocumented, so that the real number of migrants could be estimated as double: As Mazzucato indicates, in 2000 there were 40,000 Ghanaians in The Netherlands registering for the presidential elections in Ghana. (Mazzucato, 2005: FN 7) The ethnic group of Akan people constitutes the majority of Ghanaian immigrants. A vast majority of Ghanaian migrants in the Netherlands lives actually in Amsterdam, with a high concentration in Amsterdam South-East. (Anarfi et al. 2003: 22; Mazzucato, 2005: 3-4)

Most Ghanaians remit money, goods or services, whereby a lot do this on an individual basis, some set up an organisation or become involved in one. As my research findings show, if Ghanaians involve in organised collective remittances, they do this parallel to remitting to their immediate family. A report on migrant networks in the Netherlands revealed the presence of about 4000 migrant organisations in The Netherlands, a growing trend. Orozco (2005b: 30-3) finds that a quarter of the Ghanaians migrants engage in HTA – which in turn were all found to carry out activities in the home country. (van Beurden, 2006: 10)

2.1.1. The ‘Migration and Development’ programme of the AfroEuroFoundation

I concentrated my empirical work on two Ghanaian migrant organizations in the Netherlands. The first association, the AfroEuroFoundation was investigated through the use of interviews. The project ‘Migration and Development’ set up by AfroEuroFoundation aims to facilitate the transfer of knowledge of migrant community members with a background in business and to set up a microfinance support scheme for the informal sector in Kumasi and Kibi as pilot targets. In the eventual training of the community members of how to transfer their business
knowledge in Ghana, 40 participants took part. 20 percent of these were women. 13 people have been interviewed, including the persons who set up the programme. Of the interviewees, four were female.

The interviews focused on the ways of maintaining ties with Ghana, on the networks they identify with, on their engagement in the programme of the AfroEuroFoundation and the reasons behind it and their perception of differences in the skills, contributions or the participation of men and women in the programme.

2. 1.2 The Kwahuman Association

The derived insights of the interviews were then tested with a survey on another association, the Kwahuman Association, an ethnical association which is comparable to a Hometown-Association (HTA). It is made up by around 80 Ghanaian migrants from the Kwahu tribe who are residing in Amsterdam. Half of the members are female and half male, although my observation of two meetings found that there were more women present who also seemed to have a higher engagement in the discussions. Kwahuman is a district in Ghana, one of the 13 districts in the Eastern Region. Twelve filled questionnaires were returned to me.

It is to be pointed out that this association in particular as well as HTAs in general are serving in the first place as social organizations, assisting the lives of Ghanaians in the Netherlands by mutual help and the preservation of cultural traditions. Philanthropic activities are commonly not the main purpose of HTAs, although it is an important area of activity for many. The association under investigation has laid down in its constituency the rule to invest into a project in Ghana every two years. As highlighted in the literature on HTAs, projects are usually carried out in the education, health, and infrastructure development of the area of origin which is also the case in the Kwahuman Association.

2. 2. Comparison

The research on the AfroEuroFoundation led to the conclusion that the programme is not framed into a coherent philanthropic collective identity and that there is no ownership with the participants. Some of the participants indicated to want to help people back home, others understood the programme more as enhancing their own business or their future prospect of
self-employment, as it was indicated by one interviewee who concurred that “this programme is migrant development.” (female interviewee)

I therefore argue that the programme of the AfroEuroFoundation is initiated and embedded within the MDN in striving to improve the economic development of Ghana. Projects which are initiated from above thus do not show high sustainability if they are not based on the situated location of the migrants and in especially on their ownership.

HTA’s projects, in comparison, expressly designed to serve a defined and familiar local population, may not be looking for broader impact such as long-term economic development. Even though this approach to development might not be sustainable, the association itself is stable.

In summary, the presentation of the case studies shows that migrant networks pursuing diasporic philanthropy can have different outlines, members and interests. In the Kwahuman Association, migrants’ situated knowledge reveals that the migrants are simply acting according to norms internal to their culture which is fostered by the belonging to community organisations that reflect their common identity and ideals. Maintaining bonds to the home country and helping its development is congruent to maintaining family ties, as this sequence demonstrates:

“We are here to work, make money and help develop our country, by helping our family members first and then our communities – look at the idea – and then eventually Ghana. [...] You send a bit of money, 5, 10, 20, 100 euros, collectively it is so much money to do a lot of development in the country.” (male interviewee)

Clear goals and objectives are not enough in a competitive scene, and it is argued in the paper at hand that a strong collective identity is essential to compete in hierarchies among networks. A successful initiative for an engagement in the development of the home country must come from within diasporic organizations. Programmes should correspond to the needs of the communities, to avoid a top-down approach of migrant elitist which is also at the forefront of the criticism of development interventions designed by Western countries.

In the AfroEuroFoundation the collective identity is imposed from outside, as it is an outcome of the MDN. Despite the fact that the diaspora is supposed to be the main actor in these programmes, in reality receiving countries are pulling the strings through ‘development’ institutions, forging to build partnership with diasporas. Projects initiated from above thus do not show high sustainability if they are not based on the situated location of the migrants and in especially on their ownership. The MDN’s theoretical foundations therefore prove weak on a
closer examination and results in an instrumental utilization of diasporic philanthropy without attention to the various interests and needs of the migrants themselves.

3. The understanding of gender in the MDN

Apart from taking networks as homogenous groups, the MDN also simplifies what happens inside a network, which is explored in the following by investigating the category ‘gender’ within diasporas. The argument is that the activities of diasporic organizations are highly gendered – which is an issue that is simply not acknowledged in the MDN, posing a danger to the perpetuation of gender inequalities through additional burdens on women.

The operationalization of the discourse is clear: since it is generally assumed that women send home a greater share of their earning in remittances (even though they typically earn less than men), women are an important source of remittances and need therefore to be enhanced and included in formal channelling and accounting of remittances.

For the Ghanaian case the concern expressed in the literature on remittances is mainly caused by the extension of the family over borders, through which the family becomes two-fold: 1) the nuclear family in the receiving country and 2) the extended family in the home country with a vast range of relatives who expect contributions.\(^4\) The importance of these family ties is highlighted by one interviewee: “If you break these ties, you break yourself.” Through compromises and sacrifices women need to negotiate their reproductive responsibilities as well as their gender roles between the two locations – social and economic burdens that may be overwhelming in the stress they place on women.

However, men also need to renegotiate gendered roles found in the Netherlands which differ from those in Ghana, due to the particular location they occupy within transnational spaces, and – to complicate the issue further – due to matrilineal family arrangements in which men are supposed to contribute rather to their matrilineal descent than to their nuclear family in the receiving country. The latter then would be the role model of large parts of the receiving society. Men as well as women deal therefore with conflicting social identities which result in

\(^4\) It is acknowledged here that the African notion of family does differ from the Western understanding of a nuclear family. The spatial limitations do not allow deepening this issue and it is referred to Oyewumi (2000).
compromises and renegotiation between men and women, resulting for instance in pooled resources.

3.1. Gender lines in Diasporic Philanthropy

Whereas the literature on the gendered patterns of remittances has recently extended, there are few accounts of gender in diasporic philanthropy and the intersections of gender and transnational locations. The findings show that both associations are gendered in their action and outcome and the gender roles found within the associations can be attributed to traditional gender roles along productive and reproductive spheres.

3.1.1. Gendered institutions

80 percent of the participants of the programme ‘Migration and Development’ are male. Furthermore, the listing of the people involved into the programme renders the gender division of the organisation itself clear: All the four speakers of the meetings, all seven community leaders involved as well as the technical assistants are male. Within the three positions of the management there is one woman to be found (with an assumable Dutch name), whereas four out of six positions for the secretary and registration are female. (AfroEuroFoundation, 2007: 10) The same observation is made in the Kwahuman Association, where on the executive board of ten elected members only two are women, and they are in positions which are fixed for women, namely the ‘Mother of the Women’ who is supposed to communicate and organise the women of the association and the ‘Miss of the Area’ who is the beauty maid for the association and represents it to the outside.

Despite the predominance of men on the executive board of both organizations, it is important to stress here that women are not to be seen as powerless within the organization. Especially in the Kwahuman Association a vivid interaction of the predominantly female present members at the observed meetings proves the point that women are engaged, but on a different level, as will be explored in the following.
3.1.2. Gender roles within the associations

Within the organisation, the division of labour takes place along traditional gender roles: Whereas the interviewees all stated not to see any difference in the participation of women and men, or any different forms of contributions, at one of the attended meetings it could be observed that the women were responsible for the catering – which is to be seen in the light of situated knowledge of internalized gender roles. The insights from the survey into the Kwahuman Association indicates pervasive gender stereotypes insofar as typical tasks carried out by women were indicated with ‘Cooking’ and ‘Catering’ – from women as well as men. Sex roles are also identified when it comes about the engagement in the programme:

“Women participate less in programmes like this, so that there is a poor gender balance. [...] African women like to restrict themselves to domestic things.” (male interviewee)

In the Kwahuman association, this division along essentialized sex roles are clear-cut, since the ‘Mother of the Women’ arranges the duties such as cooking and shopping for parties with the ladies, whereas the ‘Men’s’ leader’ organizes the men for typical male tasks such as carrying of heavy stuff for events. These findings are supported by literature on the gendered nature of HTAs in general. (Goldring, 2001: 59)

Women are therefore confined to take over reproductive responsibilities:

“Men have been always hunters and women are domestic carers. When it comes to caring about a programme, caring about a community, I wouldn’t give it to a man, I would give it to a woman. When you give a woman a seed, she will sow and then go and reap. When you give a man a seed he will sow small and the rest he will go and take it to other women to eat and he forgets about his children. Would a woman do that? I don’t think a woman would just leave her family.” (male interviewee)

3.1.3. Diasporic Philanthropy as a male dominated scene

These observations endorse diasporic philanthropy as a male dominated scene which has also consequences on the result of the activities: According to Buchy (2005) “gender blind organisations deliver gender-biased services” which she asserts in her essay of that same title. It has to be asked what this means for the philanthropy pursued by the networks at hand.
In this regard, the target of the project has to be investigated: The target of market women in the AfroEuroFoundation is favoured by most of the participants, since they think that women in Ghana invest their profits into the family whereas a man “even having his own wife, will still think of taking other girlfriends” (female interviewee) and the training of women would also have a greater impact on society as “the woman will teach her child, her brother, her boyfriend how to do it” (male interviewee).

Due to this target group, all participants favoured the involvement of women as trainers, since they can relate better with women and “[w]omen have a very soft way of transmitting. They become better teachers in everything” (male interviewee). But despite wishful thinking, 80 percent of the participants of the programme are male.

3.1.4. Gender solidarity: women, men help their ethnic counterparts

It is then found that the engagement in the network does depend on a certain collective identity or construction of loyalty and solidarity which operates along different lines: Whereas women identify along gender lines, men identify along their ethnic or national identity, indicating a gendered ethnicity.

“I feel more Ghanaian, but over there in Ghana, when you go there, I go to my geographical area. Over here, we are all Ghanaians so we are doing things in common. But of course, Sunday I meet my church people and then we meet with the Okyeman group. […] In general I feel more Ghanaian, but when you come down, the family and friends are coming from the same area.” (male interviewee)

As the interviews revealed, women are also engaging outside of the two associations for the capacity building of women and children in the Netherlands. This supports the hypothesis that women identify themselves better with other women. This would be also supported by the evidence that more women than expected are participating in a business oriented programme, which could be related to the fact that the programme is actually targeting women. According to one female interviewee the focus should be on “the most deprived women, market women, illiterate women, Muslim women who are sitting home and don’t know how to get out and do something.” In additional emphasis on this finding, the ‘Mother of the Women’ of the Kwahuman Association plans to leave the executive board to invest more time into her own organisation, a foundation for children in which the children of the migrants are taught Ghanaian culture.
In contrast, men engaged in the AfroEuroFoundation indicated to group in their ‘concrete’ collective identities more in associations based on ethnicity, which leads to the presumption that the gendered identity of men is rather articulated by ethnicity or nationality, i.e. with the country in a broader sense. Philanthropy in the Kwahuman Associations is mainly initiated by a male dominated executive board and so subsequently shows the expected characteristics.

3.1.5. The location of engagement

In this regards another point has to be made: Whereas men engage more transnationally, women not only solidarize along gender lines, but also concentrate in the first place on the facilitation of the internal community, i.e. the migrant community in The Netherlands. This explains the fact that more women engage in activities in The Netherlands than in philanthropic activities. This is also supported by the results of the survey on the Kwahuman Association, in which all the women indicated that they think it is more important to engage for the betterment of the people and their situation in the Netherlands, whereas most men indicated that they consider it more important to engage for the people in Ghana.

Philanthropy then intersects with gender in as much as men engage in transnational networks for the good of their home country, whereas women engage at the other pole of transnationalism – in the receiving society. If philanthropy is restricted to the former it has therefore a strictly male notion, but if diasporic philanthropy is extended to every location within the transnational network, women pursue diasporic philanthropy by engaging for the good of the migrants in the receiving society.

3.1.6 The public – private divide philanthropy

The intersection of gender and philanthropy is congruent with the boundaries between the public and the private: Whereas transnational engagement is performed in the public sphere – where it often functions as rehabilitation of the loss of status through economic downward mobility in the receiving country – the female engagement in capacity building organizations in the Netherlands does take place in the private sphere, in which the nature of the reproductive, the caring work of women is located. The public-private divide is at the core of gender biases as it conceptualizes the public as constituted by the self as rational male being in the
productive sphere which generates culture and the private as the sphere of the ‘other’, i.e. women who perpetuate nature in the reproductive sphere. (Roy, 2001: 115)

The women’s engagement in the ‘private’ location is crucial for the migrant networks in the receiving society and serves as a cushion for a male public engagement. Women’s transnational engagement is insofar ‘invisible’ as it persists in the private sphere, remaining ‘familial’. The low recognition of the caring activities of women becomes even more significant through the distinction by the MDN, ascribing weight to transnational activities which serve the economic development of the sending country, which addresses mainly male migrants, as this study shows, and leaves women’s engagement disregarded.

By pushing for more transnational engagement, the MDN then puts women in a situation where they have to make up the leeway. Their gender roles prescribe them care responsibilities in forms of remittances for a twofold transnational family and in form of care for the community in the receiving society – therefore on three different locations. Besides adding to migrants’ burdens in general, the MDN discourse on philanthropy adds additional expectations on women in particular.

A sequence in a meeting attended with the AfroEuroFoundation illustrates this connection: The only woman present interrogated the genderedness of the undertaking and her provocative question addressed towards a male fellow hit the nerve of the problem:

“If your wife would want to come to this meeting, would you stay at home and take care of the kids?” (female interviewee)

On a more general note, once the discourse transcends on the ground, it could increase the expectations on the receiving end, by increasing the already existing family obligations. As one of the female interviewees pointed out for the situation in Ghana:

“The problem we have sometimes with petty trader in the market is how to deal with business and family. This relates to the extended family that we have in Ghana. Family member may come all the way from their village, and ask: ‘Please try to give me the money.’ What do you do? To sympathise with the person you have to give the money. But if this continues it is going to collapse the business.” (female interviewee)

If this problem is already persisting at the community level, the expectations on migrants at the receiving end might increase enormously due to the location which they take on within transnational networks – a location that is associated with wealth and quick success in the minds of the left behinds. If the MDN succeeds to turn private affairs to public ones, migrants
become bereft of their agency and get indulged in continuous obligation – rendering the dexterity of the discourse apparent.

4. Concluding remarks

[Women’s practice of philanthropy can and should be interpreted in broader terms, as community engagement, in line with their gendered roles in the reproductive sphere – which are typically undervalued. The intersection of gender and location is reflecting the multiple burdens of women – to supply the wants of the family members left behind, the (nuclear) family in the receiving country and to contribute to transnational communities.

I therefore postulate a wider definition of diasporic philanthropy in the MDN which also includes women’s “invisible” engagement. But since the MDN does not take into account different social locations and interests of migrants which lead to the formation of particular migrant networks, it is far from doing justice to the diverse gender patterns of diasporic philanthropy. Women are included in the MDN to the extent that they are found to pursue valid remitting practices – which reveals the simplistic understanding of gender in the MDN. An enhancement of diasporic giving as envisioned within the MDN does then mainly target male migrants – and has therefore incalculable consequences in perpetuating traditional gender roles.

Thus I argue for caution to include diasporic philanthropy as part of the discourse on the MDN, since the efficiency of networks follows its own rules and diasporic organizations are not responsible for functions which rightfully belong to states. Characteristics of migrant networks such as part-time and voluntary work demonstrate that ‘development co-operations’ sought with migrants overtax the migrants’ capacities – as they already face a variety of risks, especially in the migration process, or as irregular migrants. Orozco subsumes these concerns: “Donors, governments and non-profit organizations must not attempt to change the behaviour of these associations by pushing them into development activities. The associations are an expression of meaningful contacts with the country of origin […]” (Orozco, 2003: 43-4).
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