Diaspora Militancy and Homeland Security Dilemmas: Between Transnational Loyalty and State Sovereignty

Cătălin Relu Băsescu[1]

Abstract: This article examines the complex and often contentious relationship between diaspora communities exhibiting militant tendencies and the homeland security strategies of their countries of origin. It explores how transnational affiliations, ideological mobilizations, and dual loyalties challenge traditional notions of state sovereignty, internal cohesion, and national security. Building on theories of transnationalism, hybrid citizenship, and extended security frameworks, the study investigates how certain diasporas such as the Tamil, Kurdish, and Chechen communities have been perceived not only as political actors in host societies but also as security threats or insurgent supporters by their states of origin. Using a comparative case study approach, the article analyzes the dual role of these diasporas: as external pressure groups lobbying for human rights and autonomy, and simultaneously, as entities implicated in funding, legitimizing, or facilitating armed resistance. It highlights the tension between host country protections (e.g., free expression and political asylum) and homeland security interests, raising critical questions about international cooperation in surveillance, intelligence sharing, and counter-militancy measures. The study argues that diaspora militancy occupies a liminal zone in international relations, where legal norms, sovereignty claims, and diasporic agency intersect in volatile configurations. Ultimately, the article proposes a set of normative and policy recommendations for states navigating this dilemma, advocating for multi-level governance models that balance national security imperatives with democratic principles and the rights of transnational citizens.

Keywords: diaspora militancy; homeland security; transnational loyalty; state sovereignty; political activism

---

[1] Military School of Master Sergeants and Nonofficers of the Romanian Air Forces, Romania, Corresponding author: autor@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

In an era marked by the intensification of global mobility and the proliferation of transnational political identities, diaspora communities have emerged as increasingly influential actors in both domestic and international affairs. While traditionally perceived as reservoirs of cultural memory, economic remittances, and diplomatic soft power, certain diasporas have also become entangled in complex security dynamics, particularly when their political engagement intersects with ethno-nationalist militancy, secessionist ideologies, or armed resistance movements. As such, diaspora activism once confined to lobbying, cultural preservation, and remittance economies has in some cases evolved into a form of transnational militancy that directly challenges the sovereignty, legitimacy, and internal stability of the sending state.

The phenomenon of diaspora militancy raises fundamental questions about the evolving nature of state sovereignty in a globalized world where political allegiance, identity, and resistance can transcend territorial borders. States facing internal conflicts or contested authority such as Sri Lanka, Turkey, Russia, and Ethiopia often perceive parts of their diaspora as externalized threats: actors operating from the relative safety of liberal host countries but sustaining, legitimizing, or even coordinating insurgent narratives and operations abroad. At the same time, these diasporic actors frequently invoke international norms, such as human rights, minority protections, and freedom of expression as justifications for their activism, creating a normative conflict between homeland security prerogatives and liberal internationalist values.

This article situates itself at the intersection of security studies, diaspora politics, and international relations theory. It seeks to critically examine how militant diaspora networks function as both foreign policy instruments and security liabilities, often occupying a liminal space between non-state and state-affiliated political agency. Through a comparative analysis of selected cases including the Tamil diaspora's role in the Sri Lankan conflict, the Chechen diaspora's activism in European states, and the mobilization of the Kurdish diaspora in the Middle East and Western Europe the article explores the multi-layered dilemmas faced by both sending and receiving states in managing transnational political activism with potential militarized consequences.

By unpacking the strategic ambiguity of diaspora militancy, this study contributes to ongoing debates about the limits of sovereignty, the securitization of migration and

transnationalism, and the contested legitimacy of diasporic resistance. It also proposes a re-evaluation of the theoretical frameworks used to understand diasporas, not merely as civil society actors or economic contributors, but as complex political entities capable of shaping conflict dynamics and security perceptions across borders.

2. Theoretical Framework

The conceptualization of diaspora militancy necessitates a multidimensional theoretical approach that integrates elements from security studies, transnationalism, and critical international relations theory. At the heart of this framework lies the recognition that diasporas far from being passive or apolitical communities can evolve into dynamic, transborder political actors capable of influencing homeland conflicts, reconfiguring state narratives, and challenging the traditional premises of territorial sovereignty.

From a security studies perspective, the phenomenon of militant diasporas is closely linked to the process of securitization, as defined by the Copenhagen School. Securitization refers to the discursive transformation of a social or political issue into an existential threat that requires exceptional measures and policy responses. In the case of diasporas, states often frame transnational political activism as a security risk, particularly when it involves financial support for insurgent groups, online propaganda, or participation in demonstrations that question national unity. This narrative framing legitimizes surveillance, diplomatic pressure, or extraterritorial repression under the pretext of national security.

In parallel, transnationalism theory provides a lens through which the mobility of political identities and loyalties can be understood beyond the strict confines of nation-state borders. The globalized diaspora operates in a deterritorialized space where identity, grievance, and activism are mediated not by physical proximity to the homeland, but by symbolic and digital ties that often intensify under conditions of conflict or repression. Transnational diasporic networks mobilize around shared narratives of injustice, historical trauma, or exclusion, constructing what scholars term a "long-distance nationalism" (Anderson, 1992; Brubaker, 2005), which may be symbolic or operationally involved in resistance efforts. This dual nature of diasporas as both bridges and battlegrounds raises crucial questions for sovereignty and legitimacy in international relations. In the Westphalian order, the state exercises

exclusive control over its population and territory; however, diasporic communities blur these boundaries by functioning as semi-autonomous political spheres, sometimes protected by host state rights frameworks (e.g., freedom of speech), while engaging in activities considered subversive or treasonous by the state of origin. The emergence of digital platforms, encrypted communication tools, and global remittance channels has further weakened the ability of states to control or monitor such transnational activism. Complementary to classical security approaches, the theories of hybrid warfare and soft power are increasingly relevant in the comprehensive analysis of diaspora militancy, as they provide a suitable interpretative framework for understanding how non-state actors specifically, diasporic networks perate across a tactical spectrum that combines symbolic, political, and operational dimensions. Unlike conventional actors in armed conflict, these transnational entities function within hybrid spaces that are simultaneously humanitarian and subversive, where the rhetoric of human rights, collective memory, and victimhood is strategically interwoven with political influence, carefully crafted media campaigns, and at times informal logistical support for insurgent factions in their countries of origin.

This functional ambiguity enables diasporic actors to exercise a sophisticated form of asymmetric influence, circumventing formal diplomatic channels and acting parallel to international institutional apparatuses through indirect but highly effective means. The mobilization of narrative resources including the documentation of rights violations, the creation of solidarity networks, and access to international forums transforms these diaspora communities into agents capable of shaping global public opinion, prompting responses from international bodies, and applying pressure on homeland regimes. Their interventions often manifest in the form of petitions to the International Criminal Court, submissions to the United Nations Human Rights Council, or sustained advocacy campaigns in the European Parliament all of which constitute expressions of diasporic soft power, executed through unconventional strategies that profoundly disrupt the logic of national sovereignty and the legitimacy of contested states.

Thus, the theoretical architecture of this article positions militant diasporas as complex agents within an evolving international system in which state power, territoriality, and identity politics are constantly renegotiated. Recognizing this complexity requires moving beyond simplistic binaries patriot vs. traitor, exile vs. terrorist and engaging critically with the layered interplay between political mobilization, host state protection, and the securitization strategies of homeland

regimes.

3. Case Study: The Tamil Diaspora and the Transnationalization of Ethno-Nationalist Militancy

The Tamil diaspora constitutes one of the most prominent and extensively studied cases of transnational militancy embedded in diaspora networks. Emerging as a direct consequence of the protracted civil conflict in Sri Lanka (1983-2009), the Tamil diaspora spans across key host countries such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Norway, Germany, and Australia, where it has evolved from a refugee-based community into a politically active, institutionally structured, and ideologically mobilized transnational actor. Its trajectory offers a paradigmatic illustration of how diasporic entities can shift from humanitarian and cultural preservation roles toward strategic involvement in homeland conflict dynamics.

Throughout the civil war, large segments of the Tamil diaspora not only advocated for Tamil rights and autonomy in Sri Lanka but also became entangled in direct or indirect support for the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), a designated terrorist organization by numerous states and international institutions. This support ranged from financial contributions collected through diaspora-based charities and front organizations, to sophisticated media campaigns aimed at framing the Sri Lankan conflict within the language of genocide, human rights, and anti-colonial resistance. Moreover, the diaspora played a crucial role in lobbying Western governments and international organizations, leveraging democratic freedoms in host countries to shape foreign policy discourses around the Sri Lankan state's conduct during the war.

A defining characteristic of the Tamil diaspora's militancy was its use of soft power techniques alongside strategic mobilization, including digital advocacy, transnational protests, and engagement with legal mechanisms such as universal jurisdiction claims. Tamil organizations abroad established alternative governance structures such as the Transnational Government of Tamil Eelam (TGTE) after the LTTE's military defeat, illustrating a shift from armed struggle to institutionalized political resistance. The continued demand for Tamil Eelam by certain diaspora factions, despite the conflict's formal conclusion, underscores the long-term durability of diasporic nationalism and its potential to sustain grievances and contest the legitimacy of post-conflict national reconciliation efforts.

From the perspective of the Sri Lankan state, the Tamil diaspora has been persistently framed as a source of destabilization and international delegitimation, prompting various forms of extraterritorial surveillance, diplomatic pressure, and cyber-monitoring. This securitized approach has, in turn, reinforced perceptions of state repression within the diaspora, perpetuating a feedback loop of mistrust, radicalization, and symbolic confrontation. Meanwhile, host countries have navigated a complex legal and ethical terrain, balancing anti-terrorism frameworks with commitments to civil liberties and political expression.

This case illustrates the central thesis of the article: that militant diasporas operate in a transnational liminal space, challenging both the internal security paradigms of their homelands and the liberal democratic commitments of their host societies. The Tamil diaspora, in particular, exemplifies how ethnic identity, historical trauma, and digital mobilization can converge to generate enduring geopolitical friction across borders.

4. Strategic Policy Recommendations

In light of the complex dynamics revealed by the case of the Tamil diaspora and comparable transnational communities, it becomes imperative to articulate a set of coherent and multidimensional strategic recommendations aimed at reconciling national security imperatives with democratic principles and international human rights norms. These recommendations address both sending states, often grappling with diaspora-related securitization pressures, and receiving states, whose liberal legal environments may inadvertently facilitate the transnationalization of militant activism.

a) Institutionalizing Multilevel Diaspora Engagement Frameworks

States of origin must move beyond security-centric approaches that view diasporas exclusively through the lens of threat perception. Instead, institutionalized mechanisms for diaspora dialogue such as consultative councils, diaspora ombudsman structures, and formal channels for political reintegration can serve to demilitarize diaspora-homeland relations. Such frameworks should acknowledge the plurality of voices within diasporic communities and offer structured opportunities for constructive political participation without conflating dissent with insurgency.

b) Promoting International Legal Harmonization and Ethical Counter-Terrorism

Receiving states and international bodies must strive for legal harmonization regarding the regulation of diasporic political mobilization particularly in cases where activities potentially overlap with material or symbolic support for designated insurgent groups. However, such harmonization must be grounded in transparent judicial standards, the presumption of innocence, and safeguards against the instrumentalization of counter-terrorism frameworks to silence legitimate political expression. Bilateral agreements on information sharing must be accompanied by oversight mechanisms ensuring proportionality and accountability.

c) Enhancing Digital Governance and Cyber-Monitoring Capacities

Given the increasing role of digital platforms in diasporic mobilization ranging from advocacy to potential radicalization it is essential to strengthen national and international capacities in ethical cyber-monitoring and counter-narrative dissemination. Investments in AI-based digital ethnography, multilingual content analysis, and community-centered digital literacy campaigns can help states detect early signs of transnational polarization without infringing on privacy or stigmatizing entire communities. Tech companies should be engaged as partners in transparency and counter-extremism strategies, under the auspices of multilateral frameworks.

d) Fostering Normative Trust and Post-Conflict Reconciliation Mechanisms

In post-conflict contexts, diasporas must be seen as legitimate stakeholders in national reconciliation processes. The implementation of truth commissions, symbolic reparations, and inclusive historical education programs targeted at both homeland and diaspora populations can mitigate the persistence of long-distance nationalism and facilitate identity renegotiation in non-violent terms. Engaging diaspora youth in transnational peacebuilding and academic exchange initiatives may help prevent the intergenerational transmission of trauma and political extremism.

e) Establishing Independent Observatories for Diaspora–Security Intersections

A dedicated international observatory or think tank on the intersection of diaspora politics and homeland security hosted within institutions such as the UN, IOM, or regional bodies like the EU would provide vital data collection, policy evaluation, and early warning capabilities. Such a body could also facilitate policy dialogues between sending and receiving states, identify best practices, and standardize response protocols that balance security with democratic pluralism.

5. Conclusions

The analysis undertaken in this article underscores the urgent need to reconceptualize diasporic political agency within the evolving landscape of international security, sovereignty, and transnational identity. Diaspora militancy understood not merely as material support for armed groups but as a broader spectrum of political, symbolic, and digital resistance reveals the inadequacy of traditional, territorially confined frameworks for assessing national security risks in the twenty-first century.

Far from being passive or peripheral actors, certain diasporas have demonstrated their capacity to shape conflict trajectories, reframe political narratives, and exert asymmetric influence on both homeland regimes and global governance structures. As illustrated by the Tamil case, diaspora communities can simultaneously embody collective trauma, legitimate grievance, and complex political agency, thereby operating in a liminal space where transnational loyalty often collides with homeland security prerogatives and host-state democratic commitments. The securitization of diasporic activism by sending states, while at times grounded in valid concerns, risks exacerbating alienation, reinforcing radicalization cycles, and undermining long-term reconciliation. Meanwhile, host states are challenged to maintain a delicate balance between protecting civil liberties and preventing the exploitation of their open societies for the advancement of extraterritorial conflicts.

Ultimately, diaspora militancy reveals a deep tension between the normative ideals of global liberalism freedom of expression, political self-determination, and post-national citizenship and the resilient logic of state sovereignty and territorial control. Navigating this tension requires a multidimensional strategy that includes legal harmonization, ethical cybersecurity, inclusive political frameworks, and dialogical engagement with diaspora constituencies.

By situating militant diasporas within the broader architecture of international relations and hybrid security, this article contributes to a critical rethinking of how non-state transnational actors can be simultaneously regulated, engaged, and recognized as integral participants in the negotiation of global order.

References

Adamson, F. B., & Han, E. (2024). Diasporic geopolitics, rising powers, and the future of international order. *Review of International Studies*, 50(3), 476–493. Retrieved from

https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/review-of-international-studies/article/diasporic-geopolitics-rising-powers-and-the-future-of-international-order/A8D62FDBC6195729138E90662B6C824D.

Aiken, S. J., & Cheran, R. (2023, June 15). *The Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora and its transnational networks post-9/11: Challenges and opportunities for Canadian policy*. Queen's University Legal Research Paper. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=4467869.

Brubaker, R. (2006). The "diaspora" diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 1-19.

Burgess, J., & Leitz, R. L. (2023). Diasporas and transportation of homeland conflicts: Inter-group dynamics and host-country responses. *Diaspora*, 22(4). Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17449057.2023.2199598.

Dragomir F.-L. (2025f). Thinking Traps: How High-Performance Information Systems Correct Cognitive Biases in Decision-Making. *New Trends in Psychology*, 7(1), 99-108. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/NTP/article/view/3257.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2017a). The modelling of decisional problems. Bulletin of" Carol I" National Defence University, 1, 72-75. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=548376.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025a). Algorithmic Transparency in Information Systems: A Legal Necessity for the Protection of Fundamental Rights. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Juridica*, 21(1), 126-136. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/AUDJ/article/view/3298.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025b). How information systems are reshaping national security strategies. *Romanian Military Thinking*, 1(1), 202-213. Retrieved from https://gmr.mapn.ro/webroot/fileslib/upload/files/arhiva%20GMR/2025/1/DRAGOMIR-2.pdf.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025c). Integrating artificial intelligence into operational research – New horizons for national security. *Romanian Military Thinking*, 1(1), 174-187. Retrieved from https://gmr.mapn.ro/webroot/fileslib/upload/files/arhiva%20GMR/2025/1/DRAGOMIR-1.pdf.

Dragomir, F.-L., & Alexandrescu, G. (2017b). Applications of artificial intelligence in decision-making process. *Bulletin of "Carol I" National Defence University*, 4(2), 56-61. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=547684.

Dragomir, F.-L., & Alexandrescu, G. (2017c). The axiomatic character of decision. *Bulletin of "Carol I" National Defence University*, 6(1). Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=548274.

Dragomir, F.-L., Alexandrescu, G., & Postolache, F. (2018). Tools for Hierarchical Security Modeling. In *The 14th International Scientific Conference "Strategies XXI"*, 4, 34-38. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/TOOLS-FOR-HIERARCHICAL-SECURITY-MODELING-Dragomir-Alexandrescu/85a94ac164082be2ca3f5d13318b6321ad4c5562.

Dragomir-Constantin, F.-L. (2025d). Information System for Macroprudential Policies. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Œconomica*, 21(1), 48-57. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/AUDOE/article/view/3254.

Dragomir-Constantin, F.-L. (2025e). Thinking Patterns in Decision-Making in Information Systems. *New Trends in Psychology*, 7(1), 89-98. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/NTP/article/view/3255.

Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2024). Security governance practices beyond the sending state: Transnational political activism and homeland security. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 7(4). Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/jogss/article/7/4/ogac023/6783083.

Tikuisis, P. (2024). Hybrid actorness and diaspora soft power: Understanding unconventional influence in transnational spaces. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 21(1). Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/fpa/article/21/1/orae031/7913346.