Media Anthropology Network
European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA)
E-Seminar Series

E-Seminar 53
Negotiating Land Tenure in Transborder Media Spaces: Ayuujk People's Videomaking between Mexico and the USA

by
Dr Ingrid Kummels
Professor, Frei Universitat Berlin, Germany
Institute of Latin American Studies

Discussant
Dr Gisela Cánepa
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

29 September – 20 October 2015

Dear All,

Our 53rd E-Seminar will be opening on Tuesday the 29th, and we will be discussing the following paper:

'Negotiating Land Tenure in Transborder Media Spaces: Ayuujk People's Videomaking between Mexico and the USA', written by Prof Ingrid Kummels (Institute of Latin American Studies, Frei Universitat Berlin)

ABSTRACT
This contribution explores the production, circulation and reception of a film genre created by actors from the village of Tamazulapam del Espíritu Santo in the Sierra Mixe and its satellite communities in the USA: land dispute videos. Focusing on this film genre can provide key insights into autonomous media dynamics and their wider entanglement with an 'indigenous' village in Mexico, which has meanwhile expanded transnationally to the USA. Photography and videotaping and their use in social media have become vital fields of activity for the negotiation of land tenure in the village of origin. By opening up new media spaces in a geographical, practice-oriented and imagined sense, Ayuujk people recreate a communal way of life despite the highly restrictive immigration policies that migrants from the Mexican village face in the USA.

Our discussant will be Prof Gisela Cánepa (Departamento de Ciencias Sociales de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú)

You can find the paper online: http://www.media-anthropology.net/index.php/e-seminars

For those of you who are new to this mailing list, these sessions run for two weeks on the list and all subscribers are welcome to participate.

Really looking forward to the seminar.

Kind Regards
Veronica

Dear All,

Our 53rd E-Seminar is now open! For those of you who are new to this mailing list, these sessions run for two weeks on the list and all subscribers are welcome to participate.

The paper has been written by Prof Ingrid Kummels who is a Professor of Cultural and Social Anthropology at Institute of Latin American Studies, Frei Universitat Berlin.

(You can find more information on her research here http://www.lai.fu-berlin.de/en/homepages/kummels/index.html)

The paper is titled 'Negotiating Land Tenure in Transborder Media Spaces: Ayuujk People's Videomaking between Mexico and the USA'. For those of you who didn't have the chance to read it, you can find it online: http://www.media-anthropology.net/index.php/e-seminars

ABSTRACT

This contribution explores the production, circulation and reception of a film genre created by actors from the village of Tamazulapam del Espíritu Santo in the Sierra Mixe and its satellite communities in the USA: land dispute videos. Focusing on this film genre can provide key insights into autonomous media dynamics and their wider entanglement with an 'indigenous' village in Mexico, which has meanwhile expanded transnationally to the USA. Photography and videotaping and their use in social media have become vital fields of activity for the negotiation of land tenure in the village of origin. By opening up new media spaces in a geographical, practice-oriented and imagined sense, Ayuujk people recreate a communal way of life despite the highly restrictive immigration policies that migrants from the Mexican village face in the USA.

Our discussant Prof Gisela Cánepa will send her comments tomorrow. As always, I will give Prof Kummels the chance to reply and then will open the discussion to all. Professor Cánepa is based at the Departamento de Ciencias Sociales de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú and has published extensively on visual anthropology (You will find more information on her work here. http://www.pucp.edu.pe/gisela-Cánepa-koch/).

Really looking forward to your contributions and thoughts.

Kind Regards

Veronica

Gisela Cánepa gcanepa@pucp.edu.pe   September 30th 2015

Hi everybody.

Here I share my comments on Professor´s Kummels article

Media Anthropology Network

European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA)

E-Seminar Series
http://www.media-anthropology.net/index.php/e-seminars

3

Discussant's Comments by
Gisela Cánepa
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú
On
"Negotiating Land Tenure in Transborder Media Spaces: Ayuujk People's
Videomaking between Mexico and the USA"

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to make a few comments on this article. I am particularly excited about its findings since they derive from a series of discoveries and discussions that are highly relevant to the field of media anthropology and ethnography of the media. Ingrid Kummels' broader study deals with the uses and appropriations of audiovisual and digital technologies by indigenous communities in the context of transnational migration. On the basis of an extensive ethnographic exploration, this article examines the multiple uses and appropriations of photography, video, and social media by various members of the Ayuujk indigenous community, in particular the municipality of Tamazulapam del Espíritu Santo in the Mexican state of Oaxaca, as well as the migrant satellite communities based in the United States.

Like other indigenous groups, the Ayuujk people were beneficiaries of the Transferencia de Medios Audiovisuales a Comunidades y Organizaciones Indígenas program, introduced in 1989 in the context of the indigenismo policies of the Mexican government with regard to the country's indigenous population. For this reason, the audiovisual productions of the Ayuujk people are quickly ascribed to the category of Video Indígena and thus associated with the policies that have been imposed upon the communities. However, field research reveals a media context in which a variety of film genres, audiences, circuits and reception contexts have emerged. It also shows the audiovisual treatment of various topics, and the creation of different visual languages. Finally, it exposes the trajectories of stakeholders with regard to production, distribution, and the archiving of audiovisual material.

In this regard, the argument that runs throughout the article refers to the need to problematize the notion of Video Indígena, specifically with respect to three key issues. The first is methodological in nature. It concerns the fact that the category of Video Indígena is reductionist in the sense that it obscures the diversity and complexity of the Ayuujk media scenery, as well as the social heterogeneity that underlies it. Additionally, it fails to recognize the role that media diversity and complexity plays in the constitution of heterogeneity itself.

The genre of land dispute videos that Professor Kummels mainly discusses in her article is just one instance in which the role these productions play in shaping the Ayuujk social fabric can be observed. The videos in question are used either as evidence, as a form of argument, or as a tool for mobilization in situations of conflict over land property. More precisely, Ingrid Kummels argues that in the context of transnational migration these videos grant validity to the Ayuujk people's widely used strategy of resorting to land disputes to strengthen internal solidarity, and even extend it to the migrant communities. The land is a sensitive issue because of its

4

sentimental, symbolic and material associations for migrant communities, which further explains why land dispute videos constitute an arena of public debates in which they participate. Even from a distance migrants actively intervene and negotiate the terms of their status as members of the Tama community. In this way, the very meaning of the Ayuujk commonality is effectively redefined, contributing to the social integration of residents abroad.

The second issue regarding the critical approach to the category of Video Indígena concerns the fact that local audiovisual production is misunderstood from its perspective as simply being the result of the indigenista policies dictated by the Mexican nation state and therefore as a development that was largely influenced by external forces. This, however, downplays the dynamics and internal processes, as well as the agency of local subjects. A significant proportion of audiovisual production in Tama aims to mediate land disputes which are part of an internal dynamic and not directly related to agendas of indigenous claims. This circumstance shows how a vibrant Ayuujk media world has in fact emerged from the community's own history and internal dynamics, as well as from the phenomenon of transnational migration.

Here, it is also worth noting that the production of the land dispute videos is inscribed in a pre-existing visual tradition that originated in colonial times. So-called lienzos were canvases that contained visual representations of the geographic boundaries of properties awarded to different indigenous communities. It is precisely the connection to such a tradition which gives particular meaning and value to the appropriations that Ayuujk people have made of the new audiovisual technologies. In this regard, Ingrid Kummels has discovered that, today, photographs and videos are used in the same way that paintings were once used as evidence and cited in the context of land claims made at the Spanish courts. Photographs and videos that document and dramatize land conflicts are being produced in order to perform these same functions, although, in this case, at the level of communal politics.

The article further highlights the important role played by communal leaders as key actors in the creation, production and storage of the land dispute videos. The strategic and political use of the videos is further underscored by the fact that such audiovisual material is only circulated for local consumption because of its sensitive content. Connected to this, the third issue concerning the inadequacy of the Video Indígena category thus refers to its essentialization of the indígena as a political subject.

Such essentialization reduces the political agency of indigenous communities to an indigenista agenda that responds to the politics of identity and authenticity which place ethnicity and territory, understood in an ecological sense, at the center of political struggle. The category of indigenous video is hence further reductionist, because the invisible agendas and political leaders at the level of the Ayuujk community refer either to local or transnational boundaries.

Professor Kummels finds that these agendas and leaderships, on one the hand,

translate into local film production and aesthetics and she therefore offers an interpretation of land disputes from the perspective of the actors. On the other hand, Ayuujk producers rehearse alternative languages when they produce videos for international circuits. Although these productions have had a differentiated reception according to specific audiences, they invite us to think of the producer as a political subject in so far as he/she acts through diverse filmic proposals which are strategically handled according to the specific context of reception. The identity politics which is implied here is, accordingly, less committed to ethnic vindication than to a policy where the terms of the visual representation are being negotiated.
* * *

Finally, I would like to comment on some questions that emerge from my reading of the article and leave them open for discussion.

First, I refer to the local private photo and video collections, which Professor Kummels discovered during her field research and so effectively incorporated into her analysis. In addition to identifying the material contained in these collections as a data source, which can be subjected to formal and content analysis, she understands it as a resource for both media and political practice. It is in this sense that she discusses the key role that local leaders such as Adolfo Martínez Mireles play in gathering these collections. She also highlights the different ways in which these materials are used politically by different actors, such as when photographic material circulates through Facebook and becomes accessible even to those Ayuujk community members residing in the US.

The discussion of Adolfo Martínez Mireles' trajectory as a community leader aroused my interest. The first question it raised has to do with how media production mediates leadership and its political practice. What kind of power does the ownership over the collection grant to the community leader, even when he is not in office anymore? How is this power affected by the circulation of this material on the Internet and its appropriation by other actors?

A second concern relates to the relationship between Mexico's National Archive, which keeps the lienzo of the Tama community, and the personal audiovisual collection of someone like Adolfo Martinez Mireles. His private collection certainly implies the creation of a corpus of documents that record and legitimize land ownership at the level of local politics, while operating in parallel with the corpus of official documents held by the state. What does such a strategic move involve in terms of belonging to the national community? What tensions between autonomy and dependence in relation to the nation state are being expressed?

The last question I would like to pose relates to the author's argument regarding the crucial role that the land dispute videos play in terms of communal solidarity at a local level, and social integration at a transnational level. One might also ask, however, about the role these videos play in regard to the creation of new criteria of social differentiation and the redefinition of power relations. Since the participation of migrants in the media debate entail the discussion and negotiations of the criteria

6

themselves that will define the right to communal land, one could argue that media practices not only function as a political and ideological device through which migrants negotiate their emotional and symbolic attachment to the land, but also their right to actually and materially access it. This issue rises particularly in the context of local disputes, where the principle of "the land belongs to the tiller" is debated intensely. This could be interpreted as an example of the migrants' inclination toward a principle of individual property over that of community property.

Dra. Gisela Cánepa Koch
Profesora Principal, Departamento de Ciencias Sociales
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

Veronica Barassi v.barassi@gold.ac.uk   October 1st 2015

Dear All,

I am re-sending Prof. Gisela Cánepa comments to make sure that they have reached the list.

As always, I will give Prof Ingrid Kummel the chance to reply and then will open the discussion to all.

Looking forward to the discussion

Veronica

Ingrid Kummel kummels@zedat.fu-berlin.de   October 2nd 2015

Hello everyone,

I am grateful for this opportunity to present and discuss my paper about ethnographic research that I have just concluded. I am very much looking forward to your commentaries. I particularly wish to thank Veronica Barassi and John Postill for organizing this e-seminar and the media space it opens for discussion. Gisela Cánepa, thank you for your insightful commentaries, which have inspired me to rethink and reformulate some of the arguments of my article more carefully. I would now like to offer some of my own thoughts in response:

Reductionism of the category of Video Indígena

Professor Cánepa comments on the diverse dimensions necessary for reframing Mexico's 'indigenous' villages' media histories with regard to both the master narrative of the Mexican government program's "Transferencia de Medios Audiovisuales a Comunidades y Organizaciones Indígenas" role and the ethnic essentialization that occurs when these media are pigeonholed as part of what has become known as Video Indígena. She emphasizes that the methodological approach should take into account "the role that media diversity and complexity plays in the

constitution of heterogeneity itself." Indeed, recent research on polymedia and mediatized community building supports her argument, like the work of Hepp, Berg and Roitsch (2014), since it not only points to the differences in mediatized community building in terms of age and migrational experience, but also in terms of further orientations. In Tama's case, political projects and aims play an important role for the actors. The political aims of residents of the transnational village revolve around comunalidad or being a "good" comunero. In this vein, Ayuujk people consider grassroots self-administration and democratic practices as the basis of their autonomy vis-à-vis the Mexican state. They contest in particular the state party system. I would, furthermore, answer with regard to Gisela Cánepa's argument that mediatized communities such as the "Reunión de Tama" Facebook page demonstrate the wide range of political postures of young people from the transnational village towards the Mexican state when discussing the principles of land tenure. They assume different political stances when siding with communal land tenure or individual land ownership. Some of these stances (like individual land ownership) may in fact be more in compliance with neo-liberal policies that other young people definitely reject. Yet mediatized politics in this case takes the same form via Facebook, young people's first choice as a forum of debate.

This has to be seen against the backdrop of the local cargo system which privileges the principle of seniority and face-to-face General Assemblies. Whether Internet media practices complement or they rather compete with traditional forms of comunalidad therefore remains a bone of contention in the transnational village.

The eminently political character of media archives

With regard to the interweaving of media and political practice, I found Gisela Cánepa's comment on the centrality of archives and their role in the trajectories of community leaders such as Adolfo Martínez Mireles especially illuminating. Her question about the kind of power that the collection of photographs and videos dealing with agrarian conflicts grants to the community leader, even when he is no longer in office, alludes to the political significance of archives in themselves. There is a heightened awareness in some segments of Tama's population that private archives' can serve as political instruments. These segments include teachers (teachers in Oaxaca are particularly politicized as evidenced by the movement in 2006 against the state of Oaxaca's PRI governor Ulises Ruiz and corrupt state structures), local cargo officials who have served in important offices (and who, consistent with the principle of seniority, are middle-aged or elder persons), and community leaders in the USA. A great deal of photographing, videotaping (only recently by using cell phones) is informed by this concept of an archive's political usefulness. The intensive manner in which activities like the General Assemblies and the annual change-of-office ceremony are documented audiovisually establish the political importance of these political events, whereby media practices have become constitutive of them. Photographing and videotaping ultimately result in archives which are used and circulated to varying degrees and to different circles of viewers. As Professor Cánepa rightly observes, the circulation of this material on the Internet affects the power of community leadership, which is partly based on the creation and control of private archives. Facebook pages, profiles, and personal timelines may

be understood as archives (Miller 2011). The "Reunión de Tama" Facebook page therefore also serves to document political events in an alternative way, while at the same time rivaling private collections of photographs and videos as a political tool.

The longue durée of mediatized politics

I would also like to reply to Gisela Cánepa's comments on lienzos – the canvases of the colonial period which were used for recording and claiming land property – and their relationship to Tama videos. As she succinctly writes, the videos connect "to a tradition which gives particular meaning and value to the appropriations that Ayuujk people have made of the new audiovisual technologies". This observation moves me to delve more into the functions of "evidence" (in Ayuujk language exmëtá, which translates literally into Spanish as viendo-atestiguando, "seeing-testifying") attributed mainly to individuals and projected to different media such as lienzo canvases and videos. A further function attributed to video relates to the audiovisual documentation of a migrant's donations to the village's patron saint's fiesta, which are characterized as a having the function of a "receipt". Migrants order videos, which are produced by family enterprises specialized in recording social events, to be able to trace how their financial contributions were invested and who participated in the labor and consumption directly tied to their donations. With regard to land tenure, Gisela Cánepa therefore correctly points out the direct material effects of migrants' participation in the media. As she remarks, media practices therefore "function as a political and ideological device through which migrants …. negotiate their right to actually and materially access [land]." To this I would only add that the aesthetics of photographs and videos enhance the (almost palpable) materiality of the land, its products, and it use. The material dimension Professor Cánepa refers to also has to be traced to the concrete stipulations taken in different political arenas of the transnational village with regard to land tenure. Still, the decisions taken at the face-to-face General Assemblies are seen as obligations to be met. The influence of the mediatized Facebook community on the decisions made in this face-to-face institution, however, might be considerable and deserves more attention. It is therefore a dimension that I will examine next when analyzing my research data.

Best regards to all,

Ingrid Kummels

References

Hepp, Andreas & Krotz, Friedrich (2014): Mediatized Worlds. Culture and Society in a Media Age. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Miller, Daniel (2011): Tales from Facebook. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Veronica Barassi v.barassi@gold.ac.uk   October 4th 2015

Dear All,
I am resending the email I sent on Friday, as I just realised that it may have not reached the list.

The discussion is now open to all.

We are looking forward to hearing your questions and comments.

all best
Veronica

Theresa Conner tessconner@me.com   October 6th 2015

Ingrid,

Thank you for such a wonderful dialogue, and for your research - which is rich in placing into context the relationships between media, mediatization and land tenure (and its forms of negotiation) amongst indigenous, local, diasporic and state actors.

I am particularly interested in your observations on topics that are and are not asserted by Ayuujk migrants from Tamazulapam. Specifically, the notions of plots and communal land. Is the rejection of 'plots' truly radical? In other words, from this community's perspective and its oral history, do videos function as a tool through which pre-existing cultural beliefs on land tenure are being reasserted? If so, then this moves beyond the provision of a more accurate perspective to a General Assembly.

I seek possibly a 'third' space from outside of the dichotomy you mention breaking apart. If I think about the work of Emma Perez on The Decolonial Imaginary, then this 'space' fits a cyclical (not a linear) history. The evolution and revision of land rights you describe across years is definitely relevant, but it is also linear. My question is: to what extent, if any, does your research reflect expressions of culture and identity through land - not tenure, rather as a communal doctrine that may have its basis in a cyclical notion of 'time'? Here, I think about your reference to "naaxwi'iny in Ëyuujk," or, Mother Earth.

Historiology I would argue, now means that media is an important forum of evaluation and documentation, especially where oral cultures are concerned, and for whom (as opposed to by whom), history has been written.

On mancomunidad, is Adolfo supporting the above – conquistadores notwithstanding?

More broadly from your work, in what ways do indigenous media practices challenge an historiology that previously diminished, still impacts and possibly functions to challenge or align with what Bhabha refers to as a 'dominant discourse'? It seems to me that the rejection of 'plot' and the re-placement, or re-formation of 'communal' land may represent a critical element in the cultural beliefs of the Ayuujk. Is there an indigenous word for 'plot'? Possibly not, but I wish to know.

The terms 'plot and 'communal land' are not synonymous. Taking the Ayuujk language into account, is it "rights to communal land are renegotiated in the process of mediatization and transnationalization," or something more culturally dynamic and/or intrinsic that is being asserted as well?

Similarly, the representation of what Ernestina Hernandez illustrated with greenhouse tomatoes…as you mention, video represents an auditory and visual land experience. Do you envisage this as a cultural representation of a rural indigenous experience to an urban assembly that not only has less of an informed concept of lived Ayuujk experiences, but also the very real representation of an indigenous culture of its identity to a centralized power that a community must deal with but has little day-to-day (indigenous) cultural relevance in the actual communal land setting? Is video a power broker of diasporic symbolic community action that advocates can adhere to because these experiences on video and in photos have the power and potential to change a political gaze?

As you point out, "Hence economic interest in land ownership goes hand in hand with religious feelings of belonging to the land and social recognition within the village." Is this an indigenous moral doctrine that ties and embeds land and personhood as well as social recognition?

While I am curious about gender readings that your work draws out, I will save these for another e-mail. My larger curiosity is around Dr. Cánepa's observations on the political frameworks at stake and being presented and archived via videos and photographs, and whether or not there is an even greater (or equal) importance that these photos and videos have in challenging a written historiography with an indigenous orality that was largely excluded - possibly that which is sacred. Is there a rise in media that is rupturing the political with a re-cognition of the sacred, from/at the indigenous personhood level involving land to illustrate a more nuanced set of issues and/or topics?

Kind regards,

Tess Conner

References:

A book review on The Decolonial Imaginary, including observations on "linear narratives" - https://fortyninthparalleljournal.files.wordpress.com/2014/07/7-heidenreich-decolonial-imaginary.pdf

Bhabha on 'dominant discourse': https://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/bhabha/mimicry.html

Theresa Conner tessconner@me.com   October 6th 2015

Hello Ingrid,

11

I meant to include one more reference on indigenous cultural resurgence and the Ajuujk pueblo:

Resurgimiento cultural indígena: el pueblo Ayuujk de Santa María Tlahuitoltepec, Mixe, Oaxaca. El Bachillerato Integral Comunitario Ayuujk Polivalente - por Salinas, Núñez y García: http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=27035207

John Postill jrpostill@gmail.com   October 7th 2015

As Gisela and Tess have pointed out, this is a very rich ethnographic account. To me, it's almost an introduction to media anthropology, i.e. to media spaces, media practices, non-media-centric accounts, place-making, indigenous media, mediatisation, polymedia, remediation, mediated conflict, media change and continuity. All of these issues are touched upon and integrated into the analysis as the fluently written narrative unfolds.

So my question to Ingrid is where you think this paper may be headed theoretically in future drafts. For me, one strong candidate is media and conflict - not least because we have a media anthropology network workshop on this topic coming up in Vienna later this month!

Within media anthropology, when we think of 'indigenous' media and conflict it's usually in the context of indigenous groups clashing with white-settler states and private interests (e.g. in the work of Terence Turner among the Kayapo in Brazil). But your focus here is intra-indigenous conflict. So how does your work compare with previous work on indigenous media?

I also find a lot of media-related 'production of locality' (or place-making) potential in the paper, perhaps in relation to John Gledhill's political anthropological work also in Mexico (the political anthropology of media is still in its infancy). Are the video-making practices around land conflicts you researched (re)producing locality? If so, if what ways? In everyday popular/media usage, the word 'conflict' has obvious negative connotations but your research would seem to suggest that we may need to look more carefully, and comparatively, at the multifaceted nature of conflict -- in this case (re)mediated conflict.

Many thanks

John

Brett Frederick Dwyer Brett.Dwyer@cdu.edu.au   October 7th 2015

Yes I would like to agree with John - the paper (as much of it I have read so far) is very interesting - though I haven't finished it yet.

I am posting early to challenge John's use of "white-settler states" as though this is

12

something of an 'anthropological' category. My sense with this category - being someone who is a fifth generation descendent of so-called settlers who were white, in a land occupied by Aboriginal peoples - Australia, is that the category is a 'classical and modernist' anthropological and indeed Euro-centric conceit used to construct power relationships between others - indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. Yet the reality for many of us 'others' in Australia is that boundaries are not nearly so well defined. At what point, for instance, do I or my cohort stop thinking of ourselves as settlers? Is my friend who is married to an indigenous woman to defined by the fact he is a descendent of a white settler? In the Australian context, Aboriginality is a fluid and highly contested and yet a very real category to think with and about ourselves. I might be only 5th generation and not able to access land rights through kinship (only as private owner), but I was brought up to think of myself as belonging to the land here. Another side of this, is that there is a sense that Aboriginality has to stay defined as something which is highly distinctive - as though it does not exist, or can only exist in certain ways in the contemporary context.

I agree with John, however, that the focus is on intra-indigenous conflict - I wonder however at those excluded from analysis - such as those for instance who might challenge notions of indigeneity used to categorise them? Also where in all this is the anthropologist? Though I haven't read it all yet

Cheers

Brett

Mark Pedelty pedeltmh@umn.edu   October 8th 2015

A wonderful read, Ingrid. In addition to your argument about mediated (mediatized, etc., see attached) space, the work is rich in narrative detail. We learn a lot about the Tamazulapam del Espíritu Santo and what people are doing with media technologies and strategies.

Naturally, rather than going on about all the great things I read in this wonderful paper, which would be a very long list, I'll ask the one potentially critical question that lingered with me after I read it. It is as much a reflexive worry about my own writing as it is a question regarding yours. I view this as a disciplinary problem (maybe?)...

I have a question with narrative arc. It is a problem I am struggling with in my own writing about environmentalist musician-activists, including indigenous activists. Based on your conclusion and the tenor of the piece, it seems that the story is as follows: an indigenous group has been oppressed for centuries and is still engaged in a land dispute; now, after centuries of resistance, they have added creative use of electronic media to their resistance efforts, which is helping them to "succeed" (that word is even used). That is particularly apparent in the Conclusion, a laudatory list of creative acts leading to the point where "Ayuujk people in and from Tama even succeeded in establishing land ownership as the distinguishing characteristic of a

transnational comunero/a." I am very hopeful based on your account that you are presenting a "model of" what is happening, rather than an aspirational "model for" what you and your informants want to happen?

The recurrence of this story arc in ethnographic accounts of media makes me wonder. Is it possible, for example, that despite the ingenious use of media by our informants, that dominating forces are even more creative and sophisticated in their use of media? I would not be comfortable with the opposite, very pessimistic discourse in my last sentence either, and can't imagine an anthropologist ever getting away with writing it even if it were true, but I am not sure that the evidence always warrants the resistance-is-working-or-will-work story arc that we, self included, so often produce in our writing. Granted, your analysis is more nuanced than "resistance-is-working," but would you agree that that the general tenor of the piece is celebratory of media of your informant's media practices? Frankly, as media activists ourselves, we might need to critically explore power dynamics (e.g., what people, institutions, and systems with more power do with media) and dysfunction (e.g., how we all are part of dominant media systems to an extent few admit; third person effect). Perhaps the distance between ethnographer and informant is part of the reason for this recurring story arc? If we were writing about "us" as media activists engaged with friends (Jeff Titon's word vs. "informants") might we be less likely to be so laudatory and perhaps ask some difficult, perhaps even taboo questions about critical media practices?

See, you really got me thinking, and I learned a lot from reading your piece. Thanks for the excellent fieldwork and writing.

Regards,

Mark
(PDF attached) Clarifying Mediatization: Sorting Through a Current Debate
http://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/journals/view-Article,id=15147/

Oscar Ramos Mancilla oscar.orm@gmail.com   October 8th 2015

Hello Ingrid,

I enjoyed your text, and like Gisela, John and Tess said before, it is a rich ethnography with many details about land tenure, historical processes, and some social agents.

Some things that I found relevant in the text:

It includes details about agrarian disputes, the communal tenure and the limits of plots. Mexican agrarian studies agree that every "núcleo agrario" has particular historical processes, but your work adds the current negotiations linked to transnational migration and photography and video uses. These elements also push to rethink about how the local is connected with other global flows, not like

something imagined bur rather observable in specific relations with a material basis.

Another interesting aspect is the continuity in the ways of transmitting territory meanings (for instance, being a "comunero/a"), and local knowledge like "usos y costumbres" (ways of being and doing community).

When reading the text, it grabbed my attention the strategies of the migrant people, due to the need of being in two places at a time, and I linked that to my work with indigenous youth, since they also try to keep up with their towns of origin when they go somewhere else to study or work, and they do so in/with social media. Materials are produced which circulate among young people and also other people from those indigenous communities, and they start to configure extensions of social spaces across audiovisual representations.

I would have liked to read more about social media uses, and your observations about the "Reunión de Tama" Facebook profile, or others, in the community building process.

Regards,

Oscar

Brett Frederick Dwyer Brett.Dwyer@cdu.edu.au   October 9th 2015

I enjoyed reading this paper. On a personal level I like to see evidence of field work, commitment to the field and how material was collected - context etc., in a paper and this comes through. The participants here, however, are not just those that made/participated or were the subject of the film but also those who judged it - the anthropologists who commented for instance. I'd like to know more about why the anthropologist felt the judging panel had missed the point. Why was that 'assumption' necessary in the context of the whole narrative.

I only have two issues really: the question of working with an' illegal' group of people in the United States. What does this mean? Does it mean they should not be there and are living covertly? Is it a tacitly accepted thing? Did you have to clear that ethically with any institution? How did the local people in the U.S. feel about you working there with illegals? Are the illegals jeopardized by your research?

I am only asking because I sit on an ethics committee our National Statement (Australia) has stipulations about following the law or engaging in illegal activity; harm to subjects? The use of media to strengthen a sense of belonging to an 'origin' place while economically taking advantage of another place (illegally) could be construed as an unethical practice.

The question I have is were you able to interview all the people who were subject of the films. If so were they ok with the release/publication of the film. Also as a record keeping device were all parties agreeable to the storage of the film?

15

Many thanks for an enjoyable and insightful paper.

Brett F. Dwyer

Ingrid Kummels kummels@zedat.fu-berlin.de   October 10th 2015

Hello everyone,

Many thanks to Theresa Conner, John Postill, Brett Frederick Dwyer, Mark Pedelty and Oscar Ramos Mancilla for their comments! You have caused a veritable "rainfall of ideas" – as brainstorming is referred to in Spanish – and it is a very thought-provoking as well as a demanding task to respond to at least some of your very insightful remarks. I'll try to do so by taking them in a somewhat different order:

The theoretical implications of video-making practices, land conflicts and the (re)production of locality

John asks where my paper will lead in the future in terms of its theoretical approach, particularly in the light of an incipient political anthropology of media. I agree with him that a further advance of political anthropology's insights in view of recent developments such as socializing and politically participating via Internet is necessary (Postill 2011). Without focusing on mediatization, but with regard to the study of violence in Mexico in a historical perspective, John Gledhill (2012) rightly emphasizes that the idea of 'community' must be unpacked in order to avoid running the risk of reifying 'community', which nevertheless remains an important rhetorical device in social reality. My conviction is that a media anthropological perspective precisely allows for better discerning the social and political processes underlying plural forms of sociality, which, in the case of transnational Tama, currently consists of a mass mediatized politics of 'community'-building and localization. For the moment, I have privileged an inductive method, through which I sought to identify actual social groups such as the participants in the "Reunión de Tama" Facebook page, creators of audiovisual archives, and others. At the same time, I remain interested in tracing continuities with regard to political uses of media for (re)producing locality in Mesoamerican 'indigenous' villages in the colonial past (Gruzinski 2001; Amith 2005), such as with regard to connections between the use of colonial lienzo canvases and modern digital videos used for claiming land.

My paper focuses on intra-indigenous conflict because it is central to actors' efforts to maintain a web of sociality in face of Mexico's neoliberal regime and the USA's restrictive policies towards migration. While previous work on indigenous media occasionally mentions inter-village conflict lines, it typically fails to consider either its role as an initial incentive for photographing and video-making locally or as a key factor in the process of transnational community-building (for example Wortham 2013). My approach differs from earlier work in that I do not view the conflicts to have been "inherited" from pre-colonial or colonial times, but rather as repeatedly remediated "modern" phenomena. One reason previous studies omit this approach

16

lies in the obvious negative connotations of 'conflict'. However, instead of understanding conflict and violence as being solely destructive, I indeed recognize them as basic features of human coexistence (Eckert 2004). Besides, the actors in my case study also conceive and engage in agrarian struggles as a way of provoking a dialogue with the opposing party. Furthermore, when mediating conflict they activate senses of belonging that counteract social fragmentation. This condition has been imposed on them by economic constraints that have spurred their migration and is the consequence of a marginalized and disenfranchised status they experience in the USA, which denies them recognition as citizens and socio-political participation.

Decolonializing categories of space, time and indigeneity

Theresa's remarks concern moving beyond the dichotomies that might be implied in my characterization of the perspectives of migrants and non-migrants debating on the "Reunión de Tama" Facebook page or between the views of participants in this mediatized community and those of the village's face-to-face Asamblea General. In reference to 'community' and comunalidad as a political rhetoric, however, the actors do express dichotomic stances, as for example when they draw a distinction between a plot of land (in Ayuujk: käm) and communal land (in Ayuujk: komunääx; which hints at this concept having less ancestry, since komun seems to derive from the Spanish word comunal). Concepts of space and time, moreover, are also conceived and expressed in lineal and vertical ways, despite the fact that there are continuities in the way they are situationally tied (albeit not uniformly) to the Mesoamerican calendar as well with its cyclical disposition. In accordance with their different political orientations, therefore, actors may adopt and reinterpret (or according to Bhabha: mimic) 'colonial discourses' or decide to rely on 'their own knowledges'. Although I agree with Bhabha that something new emerges that goes beyond the ruptures created by these processes of appropriation, I feel uneasy with his celebratory appraisal of them. Similar to conflict and violence, in my view these processes basically evolve from human coexistence and the movements of people, practices and ideas and are not per se laudable.

The intra-indigenous character of the conflicts in my case study, to which both John and Brett specifically point, is illustrative of the dichotomic categorization taking place in social life. Until the 1980s, women were internally categorized as 'others' in terms of land, since family property was passed exclusively to the sons. Brett asks whether I have excluded anyone from my analysis and he is right to refer to those – in this case this applies to women – who challenge notions of indigeneity (here in reference to being a comunero or comunera) once used to categorize them. In my paper I only mention briefly that women, even if they had been born and raised in Tama, were formerly denied a right to the land and thus discouraged to connect to their home town. It is therefore important to stress how women themselves specifically changed this situation by advancing socially as a result of migration. By earning their own money and gaining recognition, women attained equal rights to land inheritance within Tama only a few decades ago. Consequently, Facebook users such as "Meetsk Neex" (in Ayuujk: "little girl") now passionately engage in

17

discussions about the use of land.

Avoiding celebratory media anthropological narratives and the question of advocacy

I sympathize with Mark, who is worried about the recurrence of laudatory narrative arcs in ethnographic accounts of the media, which highlight the resistance to colonialism and neo-colonialism, and the current creative uses of electronic media which help the actors to "succeed" in their resistance efforts. Indeed, such celebratory narratives are highly problematic, which is why I have attempted to avoid, already at the methodological level, pigeonholing the media practices I have researched. This includes "Video Indígena," a field which in general is celebrated as originating from the endeavor of collectively organized teams making documentaries with the sole intent of giving a unified voice to the local needs and demands of indigenous collectives. I precisely engaged in a field which I felt had been omitted to date because it is unsettling and messy in order to problematize former essentializations: the field of intravillage/intra-indigenous land conflicts. These struggles as well as the energy and time invested in them are not only unsettling for me because of their violent and destructive dimensions, but are also perceived as disturbing by the actors themselves. I will strive to make these ambivalent perceptions of the conflicts more explicit in the future, as well as the particular focus of my advocacy. These struggles are indeed multi-layered and have positive aspects for those participating in them as well. I tried to mainly trace these positive dimensions which, in general, scholars are less willing to concede to land conflicts through the negotiations and mediatizations taking place via Facebook, video-making and the creation of private audiovisual archives. I remain personally conflicted about my research subjects' engagement in land conflicts/agrarian struggles, particularly when judging their engagement according to norms and values which inform my media activism and advocacy. My use of the verb "to succeed" in the sentence "Ayuujk people in and from Tama even succeeded in establishing land ownership as the distinguishing characteristic of a transnational comunero/a" therefore refers to the particular dimension of their endeavors of community-building (similar to those Oscar refers to in his comment), which I do in fact laud and support. Ultimately, efforts on this level (being a transnational comunero/a) center on overcoming the restrictive, unjust and hypocritical border and immigration policies of the United States towards its neighbors south of the border.

I am afraid I still left a lot of interesting questions unanswered.

Best regards to all,

Ingrid

References

Amith, Jonathan (2005): Place Making and Place Breaking: Migration and the Development Cycle of Community in Colonial Mexico. In: American Ethnologist 32

(1):159–179.

Eckert, Julia (2004): Anthropologie der Konflikte: Georg Elwerts konflikttheoretische Thesen in der Diskussion. Bielefeld: transcript.

Gledhill John (2012): Violence and Reconstitution in Mexican Indigenous Communities. In: Pansters, Wil G. (ed.). Violence, Coercion, and State-Making in Twentieth-Century Mexico. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 233-251.

Gruzinski, Serge (2001): Images at War. Mexico from Columbus to Blade Runner (1492-2019). Durham: Duke University Press.

Postill, John (2010): Localizing the Internet. An Anthropological Account. London: Berghahn.

Wortham, Erica Cusi (2013): Indigenous Media in Mexico. Culture, Community, and the State. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mark Pedelty pedeltmh@umn.edu   October 11th 2015

Thanks, Ingrid. Very thoughtful and enlightening response.

Mark

Kerstin Andersson tinni.andersson@telia.com   October 12th 2015

Dear Ingrid and the list!

Thanks for a very interesting paper, which I enjoyed reading! I have a couple of questions entering from the point of view of migration, mobility and new media.

First; Initially, I was on my way to ask you about your approach. Then I read your recent comments, declaring an inductive method, I understand it a bit better. I simply thought that your discussions very much focused on mapping down different aspects of interconnection between diaspora groups and people in the home community, as remittances, commissioned videos, discussions on social media on land disputes, retirements homes, the help group that was organised etc. However, there are very little discussions on the implications of those actions, practices and imaginaries in in the different groups/ sites. I would have loved to hear more about effects, changes and implications for identity, society and community.

Second: You introduce the notion "media space", taking stand from Appadurai's notion of "mediascapes". I would like to know a bit more about your thoughts and standpoints on other concept used to discuss the interconnection between transnationalism, migration, space and media/ new media. The area is quite well-discussed, and is illustrated in concepts as e.g. transnational space, transnational social field, virtual space, bridgespace, diasporic spaces (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2003, Purkayastha 2005, Adams and Ghose, 2003, Horst 2006, Nedelcu 2012 and

19

others). For example, Levitt and Glick Schiller's classical notion of the transnational field is quite illuminating: "a set of multiple interlocking networks of social relationships through which ideas, practices, and resources are exchanged, organized, and transformed…. (transnational fields) are domains of interaction where individuals who do not move themselves maintain social relations across borders through various forms of communication" (2003: 7). Others describe the internet as an intermediary transnational social space and so on. It would be quite nice to get some more knowledge about similarities / distinctions between you concept of media space and other notions.

Third: A personal reflection, reading your text, the notion "visual" stood out as something extra and intriguing for me. You start with "audio visual", later on you introduces the notion of "visual war", you include the importance of older visual expression and intriguing comments from informants on it. Have you reflected on elaborating or giving this notion a more extensive space in the text?

Finally: A brief question on your choice of the concept of mediatization and not mediation. I'm simply curious about the differences between your notion of re-mediatization and Bolter and Grusin's. (1999) concept of "re-mediation"?

Thanks for a very nice paper and all the best!

Kerstin B Andersson

Veronica Barassi v.barassi@gold.ac.uk   October 14th 2015

Dear Ingrid and All,

Given the active participation on the seminar we are going to extend it for another week. The seminar will now close on Tuesday the 20th at 00:00 GMT.

All best
Veronica

Ingrid Kummels kummels@zedat.fu-berlin.de   October 15th 2015

Hello Kerstin, Brett and all other members,

Thank you so much for your thoughtful comments, which I would now like to respond to.

I'll start with Kerstin, who has pointed to how much work has already been done in the transnational social field, beginning with Basch, Glick-Schiller and Szanton Blanc's "Nations Unbound" from 1994, I would add. This book already contains illuminating descriptions of migrants' actions as embedded in networks of a transnational social field. In particular, scholarship on the diaspora between Mexico and the US, starting with Roger Rouse's "Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism" (1991), has paved the way for insights on the simultaneous participation in ways of

life on both sides of the border. Indeed, why should we not rely on existing key concepts – such as Thirdspaces (Soja) or mediascapes (Appadurai) – that have already proven to be quite helpful when charting the interconnections between transnationalism, migration, space and media/ new media?

In my view, however, they do gloss over an important aspect. To put it briefly: What if migration does not lead to transnationalism? That is, concepts like Thirdspace and mediascape may motivate us to presuppose that this is always an outcome of mobility, while causing us to overlook the cases in which shared representations and imaginations do not actually emerge (or are not allowed to due to power inequalities, as Mark has stressed). I am more concerned with fleshing out the creative work that actors necessarily invest in such an outcome and have therefore privileged both an actor- and practice-centered approach. My own interest in "media spaces" began with what I felt was a shortcoming of Appadurai's concept of the mediascape, which emphasizes the extension of a landscape of images and the processes of their dissemination, and less their local anchoring (Kummels ed. 2012). As I wrote in the paper, "the concept of 'media spaces' gives greater emphasis to the spaces that actors have extended beyond their marginal position in terms of geography, practice and imagination, and highlights the interstices and interrelations between these fields." That is, I use the concept with a view to discerning actors' appropriation and modification of ideas and practices circulating globally in response to local conjunctures, as well as their "bottom-up" influences. One example of this is how actors have created novel media genres such as the land dispute drama and land ownership has become the distinguishing characteristic of a transnational comunero/a (as highlighted in my paper). I did not refer to a further important aspect of my choice of "media spaces" in the paper, which encouraged me to retain and develop it further: I discovered its consistency with Ayuujk vernacular theories. In particular, Ayuujk media makers conceive of their expertise and creativity to overcome physical borders and social hierarchies as a widened scope for action and as "opening spaces", as a "sacred space," or a "convivial space." As part of their discursive practices, they use Spanish terms to convey these notions to a wider non-Ayuujk audience.

I would now like to respond to Kerstin's view that there was a relative lack of discussion in my paper on the implications of those actions, practices, and imaginaries in the different groups/sites. To be sure, there is little discussion of implications that could be generalized at the level of identity, society and community, and it is indeed important to elaborate on the plural forms of sociality that arise from current media practices in this transnational community. Nevertheless, in the paper I do delve into discursive practices and media uses at the local sites that simultaneously contain such implications at the level of identity, society and community. I adopt Jesús Martín-Barbero's (1987) view that media production and consumption are intertwined and cannot be separated. He interpreted these "mediations" as equally sites of production and reception. Thus, "viewers" are in fact also "producers" who actively contribute to generating the meanings of media products through their own culturally defined sensory perception. For this reason, actions and results with regard to identity, society, and community can actually be

clearly identified and are decisive in the micro-practices I describe. When "Meetsk Nëëx," who lives in the USA, manifests this Ayuujk identity via a Facebook Page that negotiates land tenure, it has an implication at the level of identity, society, and community – the implication of acting as and being a transnational comunera, of transnationalizing the community with regard to land ownership in the home town.

Kerstin, thank you for the reference to Bolter and Grusin's (1999) concept of "re-mediation," which I will follow up on.

Brett's questions, finally, relate to the basic issue of conducting research with Ayuujk migrants as an 'illegal' – or rather illegalized – group of people living and working in the United States. Nicholas De Genova (2004, 2005), in particular, has extensively studied the subject of how to avoid being complicit as a scholar in the naturalization of Mexican migrants' "illegality" as an allegedly "mere fact of life." First of all, their illegal status as a "presumably transparent consequence of unauthorized border crossing" (De Genova 2004:161) is actually constructed by the US nation state. As a researcher, I have therefore taken pains to emphasize this production of "illegality" through my methodological approach and form of anthropological representation. Even if "illegality" is tacitly accepted in a city like Los Angeles, undocumented migrants live with a constant awareness of their vulnerability. I tried to learn as much as possible about what this means for my research subjects in this particular context, first contacting and interviewing local experts on the subject of undocumented migrants' socio-political condition. This situational approach, as well as taking rigorous precautions to protect privacy, seems essential for minimizing the research subjects' further vulnerability. At the same time, as a result of the exchange with persons to whom I maintain close ties with, I am able to bear witness to their efforts to overcome this paradoxical policy. The USA relies heavily on illegalized migrant labor and even collects regular taxes from migrants, while persistently denying them the status of residents and/or citizens.

Best regards to everyone,

Ingrid

References

De Genova, Nicholas (2004): The Legal Production of Mexican/Migrant "Illegality". In: Latino Studies 2: 160-185.

De Genova, Nicholas (2005): Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago. Durham: Duke University Press.

Martín-Barbero, Jesús (1987): De los medios a las mediaciones. México D.F.: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.

Kerstin Andersson tinni.andersson@telia.com   October 18th 2015

Dear Ingrid and the list

Since the deadline has been extended, I will take the opportunity to give some further brief comments.

- The concept media space;

Early discussions on transnationalism integrated transnational activities and also the importance of communication (see e.g. Portes et al. 1999). The concept transnational field was introduced by Levitt and Glick Schiller in 2004. It has provoked some discussions. Around 2005 the transnational paradigm was extended, including the "2nd wave of transnationalism" and the more fluid concept of "mobility". And, (the important point in my statement), during the last ten years it has appeared a quite extensive body of research on transnationalism, migration, mobility, diaspora and its relationship to new media and social media, its use and implications in host and home societies and beyond, with focus on individuals and groups, and covering several different topics, e.g family, identity, politics and so on. Appadurai's ideas are discussed in some of those studies. The references that I gave in my earlier comments includes scholars that suggests different notions to grasp the configurations that appear in the intersection of transnationalism, migration, mobility and new media and social media, e.g virtual space, bridge space etc. I simply think that those discussions might be of interest for you paper and I will include proper references to them. The list is in no way exclusive.

- "Meetsk Nëëx"

Thanks for elaborating on it. This is exactly the type of discussions that I would have loved to find more of in your paper. However, it's your paper and this is my personal preferences…

Thanks again for a very nice paper!

Kerstin

References

Horst, H. A. (2006) The Blessings And Burdens Of Communication: Cell Phones In Jamaican Transnational Social Fields Global Networks 6, 2 143–159

Levitt, P. and Schiller, N. G. (2004), Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society. International Migration Review, 38: 1002–1039

Mitra, A. (2006) Towards Finding A Cybernetic Safe Place: Illustrations From People Of Indian Origin New Media & Society Vol 8(2):251–268

Nedelcu, M. (2012) Migrants' New Transnational Habitus: Rethinking Migration Through a Cosmopolitan Lens in the Digital Age, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 38:9, 1339-1356

Portes, A. Guarnizo, L. E. Landolt, P. (1999): The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22:2, 217-237

Portes, A. (1999) Conclusion: Towards a New World - The Origins and Effects of Transnational Activities, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22:2, 463-477

Purkayastha, B (2009) Another world of experience? Transnational contexts and the experiences of South Asian Americans, South Asian Diaspora, 1:1, 85-99

Skop, E. Adams, P. C. (2009) Creating And Inhabiting Virtual Places: Indian Immigrants In Cyberspace National Identities Vol. 11, No. 2, June, 127-147

Ingrid Kummels kummels@zedat.fu-berlin.de   October 20th 2015

Hello Kerstin and all other members,

First, I would like to thank everyone again for their commentaries. I will revise this version of my paper/chapter of my book soon and it will no doubt profit from your insightful suggestions and criticisms, especially those concerning its theoretical approach with an emphasis either on a political anthropology of media or on media transnationalism, its research ethics as well as the issues of decolonializing research concepts and of devising a non-celebratory ethnographic narrative.

Kerstin, your recommendations on the most recent scholarship on media transnationalism, which covers topics like family, identity and identity politics, are much appreciated. Although I am aware of some of the related literature, you have caused me to reflect more on why I do not wholeheartedly adopt or put an emphasis on mediascapes and/or the modified notions of "configurations that appear in the intersection of transnationalism, migration, mobility and new media" your refer to. Similar to Mirca Madianou and Daniel Miller (2012), I believe that a further advance of theoretical insights is best achieved by paying equal attention to both a theory of media as well as to the social relationship itself which is being mediated/mediatized like in transnational Tama's case the social relationship to land. Because of the specific historical and political dimensions of colonialization with which the Ayuujk people have had to cope with, my book in general pays special attention to actors' ongoing creative work in bridging structures of inequality in the field of audiovisual media – this is something that according to transnationalism's theoretical framework could be conceptualized as "media transnationalism from below", but in my opinion it also requires tracing local media practices in a longue durée leading back to the periods before modern nation states came into existence. It is for this reason, too, that I have privileged the concept of media spaces, which incorporates vernacular theories that conceive of the processes of Ayuujk media makers and their audiences as displaying historical continuities (as well as disruptions) and from a decolonializing perspective as opening up new media spaces both in a geographical, practice-oriented, and imagined sense.

At the same time, I acknowledge that it is important to explain my position against the backdrop of existing media transnationalism approaches. And, I will certainly elaborate more on the implications of micro-practices for identity, society, and community when revising this chapter.

I very much look forward to having future discussions with all of you on related topics in media anthropology!

Best regards to all,

Ingrid

Reference: Madianou, Mirca/Miller, Daniel (2012): Migration and New Media. Transnational Families and Polymedia.

Theresa Conner tessconner@me.com   October 20th 2015

Hello Ingrid,

Thank you again for such a wonderful paper and thought provoking dialogue. On the portions of your reply that refer to "the specific historical and political dimensions of colonialization with which the Ayuujk people have had to cope with," "tracing local media practices in a longue durée leading back to the periods before modern nation states came into existence." - I would argue that the importance of these dimensions to pre-bordered nation states include ongoing scholarship that challenges what has been, and continues to be a normative approach to placing agents and agencies in the contexts of current nation state borders. Mira Madianou and Roza Tsagarousianou (2002 and 2004) have raised the problematics of this approach in their works on digital diasporas.

On the topic that Brett raised of research ethics and "illegals," and your reply on the methodology that you took forth to incorporate an acute sensitivity to the "vulnerabilities" with which undocumented peoples live…more than being an ethical element to the research, these vulnerabilities are experiences by documented and undocumented communities that share family, issue (land tenure), and other ties. Our efforts to 'avoid complicity' in any outcome of a person's socio-political status must first (as you pointed out), account for that which I would define as having been the long-term, institutionalized exclusion (not only from 'citizenship' but from basic healthcare, education, etc.), of migrant workers in the US. This exclusion is also based in state-sanctioned economic exploitation. One of the early US efforts to evaluate the conditions of migrant seasonal farmworkers (and I am not placing all migrants into this category), is a program that former US President Carter took forward - CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act). A portion of CETA included sociologists and researchers who went to every state to record the living conditions of migrants and their families, interview family members on their access to (or lack of access to) basic education, healthcare and occupational hazards, record wages, and compile data from research instruments (that were each about 3 inches in height and included photographs), in order to offer vocational training other than farming as a

way to bring undocumented workers into a more competitive economic position, offer education and healthcare services to mobile/migrant communities, and begin to decrease community vulnerabilities that were rooted in an institutionalized movement of peoples that farm owners and manufacturing companies had not only relied upon but created, for decades. If we seek rigor in our research methods then our focus is less on 'legal' status and more on the implications of vulnerabilities that have been and continue to be sanctioned by the US nation-state. Maybe I digress. But I find today's notions of who gets to be a 'legal' citizen of the US to be preposterous where many undocumented people are concerned, and I place what seems to be a risky association between these notions, research ethics and socio-political outcomes of research participants into question. Whenever we (in the US) experience angst, the quick route to resolve our angst (social, political, economic), is to point to that which "the other" is somehow 'taking' from us. We raise these narratives the most around who is and who is not 'an American', and the fact is that legal citizens contend with being categorized as 'the other' as well.

We must always be vigilant about the undertaking of research and the methods that we employ to protect vulnerable sources of data and experiences.

By acknowledging that communities, not just individuals, remain highly vulnerable to decreased forms of socio-political recognition, we bring needed balance to possibly an under-explored aspect of the negotiations that you set forth. I am suggesting that there may be less 'space' between both nation-state border and community negotiations of land tenure, and that this space of a more shared vulnerability - which you begin to capture, that is at the root of a question on methodology and ethics.

Tsagarousianou, Roza. 'Rethinking the Concept of Diaspora: Mobility, Connectivity and Communication in a Globalised World', *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, 1:1 (2004) pp. 52–65

Fazal and Tsagarousianou (2002). Diasporic Communication: Transnational Cultural Practices and Communicative Spaces at http://javnost-thepublic.org/article/2002/1/1/

Best,
Tess

Veronica Barassi v.barassi@gold.ac.uk   October 21st 2015

Dear All,

I wish to thank everyone for the thought-provoking discussions of the last three weeks.

I especially want to thank Prof Ingrid Kummels for her paper and Prof Gisela Cánepa for her insightful comments.

The discussion is now closed. We will let you know when the transcripts will be available on our website.

All best
Veronica

Ingrid Kummels kummels@zedat.fu-berlin.de   October 21st 2015
Dear Tess,

Thanks for your thoughts on vulnerabilities, community and interconnected space which are illuminating!

Best regards

Ingrid

<p style="text-align:center">E-Seminar Closed</p>