9.

Mirroring the dialectic of inclusion and exclusion in ethnoheterogenesis processes

Nina Clara Tiesler

INTRODUCTION

Regarding inclusion and exclusion processes, the study of ethnic relations has been a common pursuit in Sociology and Anthropology, both in the past and in the present, especially – though not exclusively – in historical contexts marked by heightened migration. While the work of many sociologists and social-cultural anthropologists can be applied directly to social policy and welfare, this contribution is an attempt at refining the theoretical understanding of social and cultural processes through merging perspectives from both disciplines. It does so by choosing a subject matter which ranges from the micro level of individual agency and interaction to the macro level of systems and the social structure: the coming-into-being of ethnicities in the light of societal and cultural change, and as a social form of symbolic collectivity that may enhance as much as restrict individuality.

Studying the genesis and continuously shifting social forms of ethnicities is heuristically important in that it can help clarify processes of socio, cultural and political change in society at large. The specific contribution of this paper is to the research context of migrants and migrant descendants; wherein conceptual debates on self-perception, modes of belonging, group formation and collective subjectivities continue to be at the core of theoretical considerations. In conducting research among Portuguese emigrants in diverse diasporic settings on the one hand, and Portuguese Muslims of Indo-Mozambican origin on the other, we have followed different generations of people with migration experience in their family histories who share “memories of colonization and migration” (Weber). The two groupings were selected in order to be able to compare differing histories and experiences of migration and settlement, relations with other societal minorities and majorities, references to the Portuguese nation, societal positioning, and “lived” everyday cultures. Over time, different generations and migration trajectories, ethnic self-perceptions and membership roles have changed among both groupings. This paper takes the essence of the research output for exploratory analysis.¹

1 While it was possible to meet periodically with the same Muslim families from winter 1991/92, with a respective first case study carried out in 1998 (Tiesler 2000, 2005), the research collected and chosen for this work took place between 2004 and 2014 as part of diverse research projects. It included a number of case studies drawing upon a variety of qualitative and quantitative (Tiesler and Lavado 2018; Tiesler and Bergano 2012; Tiesler and Cairns 2010, 2007) and exclusively qualitative techniques (Tiesler 2008, 2009, 2012). We have conducted research on statistics and secondary data analysis, original >

The main argument is that current analytical concepts and frameworks are too limited to grasp the complex and multi-dimensional formative processes producing ethnicities.

The complex settings illustrated in the form of field notes move this preparatory work towards a new analytical concept, which I call Ethnoheterogenesis (EHG). Emphasis lies on the genesis and changes of ethnic framing and multiplicity of ethnic memberships. A common concept to describe and analyse the coming-into-being of ethnicities and ethnic change is ethnogenesis. The conceptual history of the term ethnogenesis from the late 19th century up to the present day shows manifold perspectives on – and definitions of – ethnicity and leads to insights into diverse scholarly traditions and ways of employing the concept – the latter always depending on the very specific historic (and political) research context (Tiesler 2017a, 18–31). While the linear and one-dimensional nature of most models of ethnogenesis is one source of motivation to conceptualise EHG as an alternative, another source is the analytical shortcomings and reification of subjective experience when group formations and affiliations are tautologically explained by the use of the cover-all and obliterating “identity”-category. It is essential that this preparatory work towards a new analytical framework and that EHG should open up ways to resist what Eric Hobsbawm (1996) and others have called “identity-jargon”. In close harmony with the narratives of the inquired families, analysis points out that ethnicity can neither be seen as a form of collective subjectivity nor as an unchangeable part of one’s Self – but rather as one of many membership roles that individuals take on and are ascribed within specific constellations. By conceptualising ethnic affiliation as one of many membership roles, EHG aims to add to the development of a Sociology of Membership.

Above all, the established concepts with regard to the formative processes of ethnicities do not explicitly address the dialectic of homogenisation and heterogenisation inherent in ethnogenesis and ethnic change. Therefore, I propose the concept of Ethnoheterogenesis (EHG) as an alternative model with which to analyse ethnic framing and affiliations of individuals, groupings and macro groups. The conceptual history of ethnogenesis, identity and groupism-critique and Sociology of Membership define the theoretical basis of our work,

► quantitative surveys and questionnaires, ethnographies, participant observation, biographical narratives and semi-structured one-on-one interviews. Above all, priority was given to qualitative methods, as I believe societal and migration experience cannot be captured by using only quantitative methods.

which suggests that EHG has the potential to become a useful framework for future investigations.

CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

A short sociological introduction to the term “ethnicity”, which can connect with current anthropological perspectives, reads: “To talk about human groups who define membership based on their belief in common ancestry, one can use the term ethnicity” (Bös 2010, 2). Eric R. Wolf underlines that “ideas about race, culture and peoplehood or ethnicity have long served to orient anthropology’s inquiries” (Wolf 1994, 1). As for an early conceptualisation of the term “ethnic group”, it is not only sociologists who can refer to Max Weber’s *Economy and Society* [1920]. As Weber uses categories and concepts fundamental to anthropological research, such as kinship, his definition can serve as a starting point for this contribution, which aims to merge sociological and socio-cultural anthropological perspectives:

We shall call “ethnic groups” those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of external habitus or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration; this belief must be important for the propagation of group formation; conversely, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relation exists. Ethnic membership (*Gemeinsamkeit*) differs from the kinship group precisely by being a (believed-in) membership, not a group defined by actual social action. In our sense, ethnic membership does not constitute a group; it only facilitates group formation of any kind, particularly in the political sphere. (Weber 2007 [1920], 301)

Weber also refers to “customs” and “external habitus” as pointing to what can be understood as cultural habits and daily life culture. Some anthropologists indeed emphasise the cultural nature of ethnicity.² As a commitment common in both Sociology and Socio-Cultural Anthropology, one can name the study of cultural processes and practices through which human action is individually and collectively mediated. In other words, a commitment to

2 Following Cohen (1974), one of the earliest and most influential schools of thought in this respect has been that of the former Rhodes Livingstone Institute anthropologists, notably Mitchell (1956), Epstein (1958), and Gluckman (1961), whose views were greatly affected by the special conditions existing in the industrial towns of Northern Rhodesia, now Zambia, during the 1950s.

the study of people doing things, of action and practices in specific settings of power relations, rather than the study of culture as an object. In the first edited volume on “urban ethnicity”, Cohen (1974, ix) notes that ethnicity is a ubiquitous phenomenon. This is debatable as “ethnic communities do not represent a ubiquitous form of social organisation but rather the result of a historical process related to a specific technique of social distinction”, Gabbert argues, with reference to shifting boundaries and emerging ethnic communities on Nicaragua’s Atlantic Coast (Gabbert 2011, 77). They are not a “natural” form of organisation.

Connecting with Glazer and Moynihan³, inter alia, and conceptualising ethnicity as a modern ideology based on renewed categories of the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research, Werz highlights that ethnicity is an enigmatic notion that can be conducive to illustrating a transformation that, during the 20th century, affected the states of consciousness of various people. Ethnic ideology or “identity-thinking” (Horkheimer’s and Adorno’s critique on “ticket-mentality”, 1969) are products of a dialectic of enlightenment and secularisation; mirroring a historical process once described by Max Horkheimer as the onward comprehension of a life world that is identical in its disenchantment (Werz 2002, 13). Indeed, ethnic ideologies (just as national ones, cp. Anderson 1991; Gellner 1993) create history. Following Gabbert, who bases his theorising on the Miskitu in Eastern Nicaragua, ethnic ideologies “take fragments from the past, string them together, construe them, and change their meaning or, if necessary, reinvent them” (Gabbert 2014, 197). In accordance with Bös, and what Cohen understands as “ubiquitous”, probably in the sense of being pervasive or omnipresent, and due to the fact that ethnicity takes a “variety of form, scope, and intensity, and of its involvement in psychic, social, and historical variables”, one can conclude that ethnicity has been defined in a variety of ways, “depending on the discipline, field experience, and interests of the investigators” (Cohen 1974, ix).

As a starting point towards a consensus, one can take the entry on “ethnicity” in the recently published second edition of the *International Encyclopaedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. The author draws upon historical aspects

3 “We are suggesting that a new word reflects a new reality and a new usage reflects a change in that reality. The new word is ‘ethnicity’, and the new usage is the steady expansion of the term ‘ethnic group’ from minority and marginal subgroups at the edges of society – groups expected to assimilate, to disappear, to continue as survivals, exotic or troublesome – to major elements of a society... [T]here is something new afoot in the world, and we may label it ‘ethnicity’” (Glazer and Moynihan 1975, 5).

regarding ethnicity and ethnic groups, and argues that the concepts have been applied to a broad spectrum of groups in history. While ethnic community building is used to foster solidarity in macro-group structures, ethnicity also legitimises social inequalities by descent. Furthermore, ethnic membership serves to fulfil individuals' need for collective belonging:

In the social sciences there is a growing consensus that ethnicity is socially constructed and historically contingent, but that many people perceive it as an important, unchangeable part of their identity. (Bös 2015, 136)

Yet, the analysis of emerging and shifting ethnic mobilisations, ascriptions and identifications uncovers societal transformations. Reflecting on the historical aspects of ethnic thinking, Randall Collins argues that:

Ethnicity is an intrinsically messy topic because the historical processes that produce it are intrinsically messy. Our analytical problems stem from the fact that ethnicity is always a distorted concept, an attempt to impose a pure category on a social reality that is not at all pure. (Collins 1999, 78; cited by Bös)

As said, the specific contribution of this paper relates to the research context of migrants and migrant descendants. Migratory contexts constitute a strategic lens for understanding “under what circumstances, among whom and in order to satisfy which needs or interests, do migrant selective identifications and dis-identifications occur” (Banton 2008, 1276). Now, as ethnicities are produced by historical processes, how can one study the emergence of ethnicities when these processes are so “messy”? One possible way is taking a historical perspective during analysis, while using abstraction from the very specific historical context in follow-up theorisation. This can be done by constant comparison – in this case, between the two groupings under analysis but also between each of them and comparable social entities of differing ethnic or non-ethnic reference and identification. Secondly, ethnicity appears as a distorted concept, as an attempt to impose a pure category on a social reality which is not at all pure. As a methodological manoeuvre to avoid this, we suggest acknowledging that the coming-into-being of ethnicities is an ongoing process that typically involves de-ethnisation as much as ethnisation, forces of both hetero- and homogenisation as well as a diversity of ethnic membership roles and multiple “ethnic options” (Waters 1990).

The third methodological challenge is due to the circumstances that suggest ethnicities are socially constructed and historical contingent, but conversely, that most people believe ethnic ascriptions and membership is unchangeable. The experiences of the two groupings under analysis underline the historical contingency in the genesis of ethnicities. More precisely, in taking both the diasporic context and that of origin into account, it highlights the fact that ethnic framing and self-articulation develop as “relational” to other minority and majority groups, as well as “situative” in specific power relations. In these processes, both societal contexts shape and undergo social and cultural change and can be described as ethnoheterogeneous (Claussen 2013). Above all, in close harmony with the narratives of the inquired families, analysis points out that ethnicity can neither be seen as a form of collective subjectivity, nor as an unchangeable part of one’s Self – but rather as one of many membership roles that individuals take up and are ascribed within specific constellations.

SHIFTING ETHNIC BOUNDARIES – NOTES FROM THE BIOGRAPHICAL NARRATIVES OF MIGRATION-EXPERIENCED FAMILIES

Néria grew up in Germany, born to Portuguese emigrant parents.⁴ Her parents left Portugal in the era of dictatorship (1926-1974). Her father had been among the first workers from Portugal registered in Stuttgart in the 1950s. During the first years abroad, Néria’s family lived in economic hardship in a working class neighbourhood, in rather ad hoc housing conditions. Portuguese had been the *lingua franca* at home, the meals were Portuguese, and during her childhood, Néria and her siblings clearly perceived themselves as Portuguese. In their social surroundings, they were seen as foreigners, guest-workers’ children, from Portugal – as far as “their country” was known by name. Originally hailing from the Alentejo, a rural southern region in Portugal, living in Germany had changed her parents’ self-perception from predominantly “alentejano” to “Portuguese”. This was different whenever the family had the opportunity to travel to Portugal for holidays and family visits. While remaining Portuguese nationals up to the present day, as well as being connected to their former neighbourhood in the Alentejo, here the local population naturally considered them as emigrants, more particularly, as Luso-Germans

4 Interviewees’ names have been changed.

(“lusó-alemães”).⁵ This concept quickly started corresponding to the family’s self-perception, at least when positioning themselves as being Portuguese.

Néria concluded her education at a technical college in Essen (Germany) and gained professional experience in the import-export business, using her language skills in German, English and Portuguese. Independently of her family, she moved to Portugal in the early 1990s, where she lives near Lisbon and continues to be successful in her professional realm. Whether in real life or on social media platforms, being in contact with people with similar socialisation experiences makes her feel most comfortable: “Communication is much easier, we always know what the other person is talking about, it doesn’t need much explanation”. This includes Portuguese emigrants and Luso-descendants in Germany in general, and Portuguese and Luso-descendant return migrants, in particular – especially those who grew up in Germany, but also returnees from other countries. She considers herself “Luso-German”, according to her conception of belongingness, her daily life cultural preferences, and her ideas of her “origins”. On Facebook, she participates in “Portuguese in Germany” and “Germans in Portugal” networks. Furthermore, she forms part of a network of Luso-descendants in Portugal and once participated in an international meeting of Luso-descendants from all over the world. In the midst of Luso-French, Luso-Canadians, Luso-Swiss, Luso-Americans, and so forth, it had been her “German-ness” in the first place, alongside a kind of “broken, kaleidoscopic Portuguese-ness”, of which she became more conscious at this event.

Aadil holds a bachelor degree in Economics from a Lisbon university, and another in Economic History from University College in London. Together with his wife and children, he moved from Lisbon to London a few years ago, where he works as a freelance journalist and activist for deprived British-Asian children and youths. He continues writing his Portuguese Blog, which is followed by Portuguese Muslim and non-Muslim visitors who are interested in leftist politics, emancipatory struggles of ethnic and religious minorities in Portugal and social/humanitarian aid projects, many of the latter being organised by the Islamic Community of Lisbon. Aadil and his wife Samira are Sunni Muslims and both their families have Indian roots. His grandmother grew up in British India; later on, she lived in Daman under Portuguese rule, where Samira’s father and his siblings were born before the family left West India to settle in Lourenço Marques (today Maputo), the capital of Mozambique,

5 “Luso” means Portuguese.

a Portuguese colony until 1974. Here, her father worked in administration and later served the Portuguese army during the colonial war, as was the case with other Muslims of Indian origin.⁶ Both Aadil and Samira, their siblings and most of their cousins were born in Mozambique, living in relatively privileged conditions, comparable to wealthy and educated Portuguese non-Muslims in higher positions. Both their parents were active in Islamic community matters and held Portuguese citizenship, as did other community members.

During a conversation with Samira's family, her grandmother once explained her definitive societal experience and respective self-perception with the words "I am British Indian", while her father prioritised "being a Portuguese Muslim". In fact, while living in India (Daman) under Portuguese rule, being a (Sunni) Muslim had been more important. But Samira's father also highlighted that his Indian origin had been a major reference, both in Mozambique and, up to the present day, in Portugal – with the exception of the early years in Lisbon during and shortly after decolonisation, when several hundred thousand people (*retornados*) returned from the colonies, in their midst, Hindus, Ismailis and Sunni Muslims of Indian origin. "Our solidarity group had been the *retornados*", he explains. "We are often called immigrants today, this despite the fact that we had been Portuguese nationals already in Mozambique. From our perspective, in fact, we were *retornados*". Samira confirms the existence of this "solidarity group", remembering her early Lisbon experiences as a child in the schoolyard. "The other Portuguese kids were picking on us. There I found myself in a corner, together with the white, Catholic *retornado* kids". Samira also considers "being a Portuguese Muslim" her strongest reference, and that this matches the self-perception of her cousins, some of whom live in Mozambique, others in Leicester (UK). Aadil explains that for those in Mozambique it also serves to set them apart from Mozambican Muslims and from non-Muslim Portuguese and Mozambicans. Those in Leicester actually meet with other Daman Sunni Muslim families who lived in Kenya under British colonial rule before settling in Leicester. For Aadil's Leicester cousins, who "became quite British", he adds chuckling to himself, the self-ascription as Portuguese Muslims was important not

6 As for the position of Sunni Muslims of mainly African origin in Mozambique under Portuguese colonial rule, see Bonate (2007). Regarding Ismaeli Muslim of Indian origin in the same context, see Khouri and Pereira Leite (2012). As for the attempts of the Portuguese colonisers to monitor and activate Mozambique's Muslim minority population shortly before and during the colonial war, see Vakil Monteiro and Machaqueiro (2011).

only in a family context stretching across at least three countries but also in their conversation with the “British Muslims” from Daman, who frequently express something like “superiority out of the simple fact that they were part of the British Empire”. For many reasons, among them being Muslim [and not Catholic or secular] but also due to his visible Indian roots, being Portuguese had always been very important to him. It is only since the couple moved to London that they have also felt affiliated to the huge South Asian population there. “One of the beautiful aspects of going to Mecca is that we simply feel like Muslims, nothing more, nothing less”, Samira says, adding with a smile: “and if anything else, there I suddenly feel quite European.” But this was stronger when she once went to the USA. Among other activities, mainly of purely touristic nature, she attended a meeting of Young Muslims there, with the organisers grouping them into the section “European Muslims”.

SITUATIVITY AND HISTORICAL CONTINGENCY OF INCLUSION, EXCLUSION AND ETHNIC FRAMINGS

As illustrated by the field notes, different generations and migration trajectories, ethnic self-perceptions and membership roles have, over time, changed among both groupings. The first generation of Portuguese emigrants arriving in Germany, France, the USA, etc., changed a self-perception based on regional bonds to a national one; only through emigration did they “become” Portuguese. At the same time, adaptation to the new surrounding and the strong connection to Portugal which they preserved meant that in relation to (and in interaction with) the people they had left behind, they became “others”: not only “the emigrants” but more specifically the “Germans, French, Americans”. It was in the conflict between the pressure of assimilation in the host societies⁷ and the weight of the “emigrant script”⁸ that Portuguese emigrants and their offspring developed hyphenated self-perceptions of ethnic membership, such as Luso-German, Luso-American and Luso-French.

7 For Germany see Tiesler and Bergano (2012); for France see Pereira (2012); for the USA see Almeida (2010).

8 The moral obligations which constitute the emigrant script are rooted in the period from post-World War II until the 1990s, when remittances played an extremely important role in the local Portuguese rural economies; see Lubkemann (2002).

Elite Sunni Muslims of Indian origin that had been living in Mozambique before coming to Portugal in the course of decolonisation are today often framed as “Indo-Mozambican”, a concept also applied to Ismaelis and Hindus who live in Portugal (Tiesler 2008). Naturally, that was different at each stage of their migration trajectory (British India, Portuguese India, Mozambique under Portuguese rule, Portugal, and for some, the UK) and also for the different generations of the same family in each context. Members of this group represent the migration intelligence (Tiesler and Lavado 2018) and integration figures of the ethnically diverse (Sunni) Islamic communities in Portugal. Their self-perception of being Portuguese Muslims and the respective promotion of the pan-ethnic concept is of utmost importance in Islamic community life and public discourse. The concept had already emerged during colonial times in response to the colonisers’ ideology of the Portuguese Nation during the Third Empire. The first Sunni Muslim Portuguese students of Indo-Mozambican origin founded the Islamic Community of Lisbon, CIL, in 1968, and used the concept to be able to speak for all Muslims under Portuguese rule, including those in Guinea Bissau. Nowadays, the concept encompasses different ethnic groups of Muslims in Portugal and plays a key role for CIL in Islamic education. It underlines their loyalty to the Portuguese nation and the fact that they are Portuguese citizens allows them to speak for and integrate as a socially and ethnically diverse Muslim community (the most numerous group hailing from Guinea Bissau), and in Islamic education, leads to the educative formula: being a good Muslim means being a good Portuguese (Mapril 2004).

When we asked other individuals and families who belong to the grouping of Sunni Portuguese Muslims of Indo-Mozambican origin about their self-perceptions and the ways they were perceived by others in different historical and geographical contexts, we found a long row of multiple options and diverse framings (in India: Muslims; in Portuguese India: Diu-, Daman-Muslims; in Mozambique: Indian, Sunnis, Portuguese Muslims; in Portugal: *Retornados*, Indian, Portuguese Muslims; in Britain: Indian-Portuguese, Portuguese Muslims, British-Asians, and so forth). And yet, the concept of Portuguese Muslims prevails. This is interesting in at least two aspects: class and culture. The concept stresses national and religious belonging and dissolves class and cultural differences. The migration intelligence and integration figures conceptualising this are the educated middle classes who speak for a community which is diverse in terms of socio-economic backgrounds (including many

deprived families who find significant support here) and Muslim cultures to be found in the contexts of origin. African Muslims in Lisbon partly share more cultural preferences in daily life with other Afro-Portuguese (a pan-ethnic self-perception currently in fashion among younger generations), meaning those with family roots in diverse Lusophone African countries, than with Lisbon Muslims of Indian origin. The latter often socialise with other young middle class Ismaeli (Shiite) Muslims of Indo-Mozambican origin – while all of them usually socialise in broader social environments and take part in peer groups that are not ethnically marked (Tiesler and Cairns 2007). The concept dissolves class and culture inside the community *and* in reference to the Portuguese “white” non-Muslim majorities. It is due to the successful work of the integration figures that the Islamic Community of Lisbon is, in general, positively recognised by the Portuguese public and well regarded among the *classe politique*. A further study which compared young middle class Muslims with young middle class non-Muslims in fact revealed very little difference regarding their daily life cultural preferences (Tiesler and Cairns 2010).

It is generally acknowledged that homogenising forces shape the formative processes of ethnogenesis and ethnic change, as former socially and/or culturally diverse entities are becoming framed or start perceiving themselves as an allegedly homogeneous collective. The essence and exploratory analysis of the field notes suggest that this view is one-dimensional and too linear. The strength of the ethnogenesis concept, as developed to date (see Tiesler 2017a for an overview of the conceptual history), is its constructivist (and partly instrumentalist) approach, which highlights the fact that ethnicities are socially constructed and historically contingent. Its weakness lies in the fact that it cannot grasp the entanglement, the interdependency and simultaneousness, of hetero and homogenising forces. Migrants from different regions in Portugal only started perceiving themselves as Portuguese by migrating, for example, to Germany. The homogenising process of “becoming” Portuguese was part of – and only possible through – the heterogeneising process of becoming Luso-German. As for the concept of Portuguese Muslims, the same dialectic of hetero and homogenisation is in play. The latter case makes it particularly clear that ethnogenesis and ethnic change are not at all linear developments but rather multi-dimensional.

FORMATIVE PROCESSES OF (ONLY ONE KIND OF) MEMBERSHIP: A BRIEF CONCEPTUAL HISTORY OF ETHNOGENESIS

The first references to the term *ethnogenesis* are to be found in Literature Studies. A descriptive use of the concept, on the other hand, was first implemented in Latin American Studies, circa 1930s, followed by its use in Anthropology and Archaeology in different regions and scholarly traditions in the 1940s. While the term “ethnic group” had been established long before, the novelty of the notion of *ethnogenesis* was, in its explicit emphasis on the genesis, in a formative process of ethnic groups and entities, thus acknowledging, implicitly at least, that ethnic groups are not natural, given entities, but are instead the result of historical processes.

Conceptualisation and theoretical considerations appear from the mid-1940s onwards in Latin American Studies (works by ethnologists and anthropologists) and in Soviet (Archeological) History and Ethnology. In both strands, it was used to differentiate between – and often with the intention to classify and categorise – social entities and populations along constructs of common history and cultural markers. Although the structural forces of power relations and “ethnic change” are today recognised as intrinsic to processes of *ethnogenesis*, ethnic strategising “from above” might have caused the concept itself to go out of fashion in Latin American Studies for a prolonged time period, this before getting discharged altogether by constructivist scholarly tradition (Gabbert 2011, 2014).

From the 1940s to the 1960s, most academic references to *ethnogenesis* at international level were to the Soviet theory of the subject. The decisive context here had been the National Question, with eminent Marxist historians and ethnographers partly taking on the role of motivating actors of “ethnic strategising”. While *ethnogenesis* was seen as the result of historical processes, the weakness of the Soviet concept of *ethnogenesis* lay in the assumption (or political programme) that ethnic groups were seen as rather stable, social entities that would continuously transmit their social structures from one generation to the next. It did not consider what is today commonly referred to as “ethnic change”.

“Ethnic change” was probably most visibly introduced by the “instrumentalist analyses”, as pioneered by the Manchester School Anthropologists, a perspective based on the observation of migrant workers that placed ethnic markers on highly circumstantial performances within new urban political configurations

(as opposed to positions deriving from cultural complexities of rural origin) (see Epstein 1958; Mitchell 1956). While successfully challenging the earlier fixed ideas about “tribalism,” these models had relatively little to say about the specific content of ethnic models, in particular, the affective elements that could become powerful political motivators. The instrumentalist perspective has offered quite complete explanations of the process, whereby an individual, family, or community reassigns itself from one ethnic category to another without fundamentally transforming the system at hand. Fredrik Barth (1969, 21) coined this phenomenon “ethnic osmosis”. In current use, ethnogenesis, the creation of an ethnic category, can be seen as the constructivist’s logical counterpart to the idea of “ethnic osmosis”.

In Sociology, the term only gained momentum in the 1960s, during the phase of the so-called “ethnic revival” in American Sociology, with the first paper by Lester C. Singer, entitled “Ethnogenesis and Negro-Americans Today”, published in *Social Research* (Singer 1962). Typical of sociological foci, the analysis of the relationship between the individual and social structure in formative processes of social entities is key for Singer:

The “members” of a social category are not necessarily involved in any relationship among themselves. Thus the terms “men”, “women”, “immigrants”, and “divorcees” stand for social categories. The term “social entity”, on the other hand, refers to a number of people manifesting such qualities as patterned relationships, shared values, and self-recognition. Thus a team, a gang, a community, an ethnic group, and a society all constitute recognizable social entities. (Singer 1962, 420)

For Singer, and importantly for our understanding of “ethnic groups”, the central point of the contrast between the two terms is the “presence or absence of internal structure and the accompanying cultural, or ideological, element”. He further suggests calling the formative process of ethnically defined social entities “ethnogenesis, meaning by this term the process whereby a people, that is an ethnic group, comes into existence” (Singer 1962, 423). He also reminds us that this process is only one of several kinds of group-forming processes, of which socio-genesis is the generic term.

While there are a multiplicity of causal factors at work in processes of ethnogenesis, Singer suggests specifically looking at the context of power relations, that is, “the specific character of the relationship with the other segment(s) of the population” (Singer 1962, 423-428). This relates to a

common social scientific sense, namely that internal group development and external (inter-group) relationships influence one another. In short: the characteristics of an emergent ethnic group are the consequences of factors outside themselves, as well as their response to these factors. There is a parallel to Weber's argument that highlights the difference between a kinship group and ethnic membership (as a "believed-in membership"), precisely where Singer underlines that the ancestors of the people in question do not necessarily show any kind of "ethnic group characteristics". Rather, it might only been possible to conceptualise former generations as a social category, not as a social entity. Singer connects this with the kind of process which E. K. Francis (1947) referred to:

What we have here called ethnogenesis is related to Francis' sequence at two points. It is, on the one hand, temporally prior in that ethnic groups must have formed before they could expand. On the other hand, the last stage of the sequence is ethnogenesis. Consequently, the expanded sequence should be: ethnogenesis – expansion – fission – new combination (that is, ethnogenesis). (Singer 1962, 429-430)

Although the term genesis carries the connotation of "birth" or "creation", ethnogenesis tended to be used to describe what was later called "ethnic change" or "ethnic osmosis" (Barth 1969). In introducing the ethnogenesis of African-Americans as starting *ab initio* (unlike all other inquiries up until that date in which ethnogenesis was used to conceptualise the transformation of some ethnic groups into other ethnic groups), Singer's contribution added decisively to the works of his time because traditional perspectives had nearly exclusively focused on the survival and transformation of European-derived "ethnic cultures" in the USA. It was later argued – e.g. by Fredrik Barth (1969) and Andrew Greeley (1974) – that the process whereby ethnic groups come into being had been largely ignored. Similarly, as criticised by Pierre van den Berghe (1967) as well as William Yancey, Ericksen and Juliani (1976), the emphasis on culture as an explanatory variable had tended to obscure the contribution of structural conditions to the emergence and persistence of ethnicity. During the same period, several scholars (Cohen 1969; Doornbos 1972; Hechter 1974; and slightly later Taylor 1979) suggested that while ethnicity may involve cultural referents, its development and persistence would depend on certain structural conditions. This is to say, the expectation that class or functional cleavages should become predominant over ascriptive solidarities in modern

society seemed to be unjustified in view of the persistence of these structural factors (Mayhew 1968; Bell 1975).

This is a very important point and matches with the exploratory analysis of the concept of Portuguese Muslims which dissolves class and cultural differences. Furthermore, the awareness and need to differentiate between social category and social entity, as stressed by Singer. In contrast, our ideal-typical field notes made clear that Singer's expanded sequence is too linear to grasp the formative process of either hyphenated or pan-ethnic conceptions of ethnic membership. This supports the argument that differing processes described as ethnogenesis can more tellingly be conceptualised as Ethnoheterogenesis (EHG) as this concept highlights the dialectic of hetero and homogenisation at work. However, the selected relevant sociological works introduced here underline, again, that in order to elucidate the formative process of ethnically defined social entities one needs to consider the interplay between sociocultural characteristics and social structure, as well as intergroup relations in specific settings of power.

Furthermore, there are a few relevant alternative concepts applicable to or enhancing ethnogenesis and ethnic change, namely ethnic osmosis (Barth 1969), ethno(re)genesis, ethnocultural drift and ethnic strategising (Thomson 2011). The question is whether or not EHG might serve as an umbrella category for these concepts.

ETHNOHETEROGENESIS: APPROACHING THE DIALECTICS OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION WITHIN A SOCIOLOGY OF MEMBERSHIP

The conceptual history of the term ethnogenesis provides an essential part of the theoretical framework for this endeavour. The second important aspect for such a framework derives from a key problem dealt with in researching migrants and sociocultural change in society at large – this less so in the field and more in relation to academic discourse: the (ab-)use of the identity category, and loose talk of “identities” and consequent lack of analytical insight. As mentioned above, it is no coincidence that our conceptual considerations and theorising are oriented by “traditional”, critical, sociological and anthropological craft. “Traditional” in this context means before the identity-jargon became established.

There is indeed a complement to the instrumentalist, constructivist and other perspectives on ethnicity. Matching our purpose, a significant parallel line of argument addresses the nature of ethnic situations rather than the nature of “ethnic identity”. Essential to all of these perspectives is the insight that ethnicity, as a phenomenon, is fundamentally an attribute of pluralistic situations, especially “the asymmetric incorporation of structurally dissimilar groupings into a single political economy” (Comaroff 1987, 307; cp. also Thomson 2011). As the subtitle of Barth’s 1969 landmark volume states, we are considering “the social organization of cultural differences.” The research at the basis of this theoretical endeavour took an actors’ perspective and employed anthropological as well as sociological methods in the field. While acknowledging the importance of the emancipatory struggle of ethnically defined minorities, the analysis, however, does not perpetuate the political language of identity politics.

The problem of the commonly loose talk of identities is that it neither explains the socio-cultural heterogeneous premises for the homogenising genesis of ethnicities nor its heterogeneous outcomes. In doing so it enhances the structuring of allegedly homogenous macro groups along ethnic boundaries⁹ – in terms of “cultural”, “national”, “hybrid”, “multiple”, “pan-”, “hyphenated” and so forth “identities”. Instead, and as with a growing number of recent theoretical works (Banton 2011) in the “post-identity era” (Hank, Enrique and Laraña 1994), it refers back to sociological and anthropological craft and concepts that were in use before the 1960s; a time when the words “identity” and “ethnicity” took off together for a vast career of semantic broadening in academic discourse.

An analytical framework called Ethnoheterogenesis resists tautological explanations such as “ethnic identities emerge from cultural identities and challenge or are being pressured by national identities as such causing collective minority identities and hybrid and multiple personal identities”. It suggests rediscovering and recuperating self-perception, membership, affiliations, ascriptions, ethnic framing, representations, mobilisation, social entities,

9 Ethnoheterogenesis, as proposed here, shares many grounds with the theories of ethnic boundaries (Barth 1969) and ethnic boundary making (Wimmer 2008), especially regarding the dynamic nature and situativity. It goes beyond these theories by employing a transnational perspective and in highlighting not only the diversity inside such boundaries, but also the heterogenising power impacting in inter and intragroup dynamics during formative processes that are often interpreted as homogeneous in their results (Tiesler 2017a).

reflexive ethnisation and de-ethnisation, collective subjectivity, collective identification, identity-thinking and politics, from the unrecognisable condition into which they melt within the “verbal container” (Claussen) of “identities”. Here, they melt from subjective belief and needs for collective action, with the objective consequence of structuring macro groups in society and re-enforcing social inequalities along ethnically defined boundaries. By conceptualising ethnic affiliation as one of many membership roles, this contribution adds to the development of a Sociology of Membership.

The alternative concept I am proposing is called Ethnoheterogenesis (EHG) in order to highlight the hetero and homogenising forces and their inherent entanglement in these formative social entity processes. This insight is based on several case studies among two groupings: Portuguese emigrants and their offspring in diverse diasporic settings and Portuguese Muslim families with triple migration trajectories. But the dialectic of hetero and homogenisation in of ethnic framing and membership processes does not seem to be specific to these two particular cases. Numerous examples of empirical material derived from research on race and ethnic relations, on hyphenated and pan-ethnic self-perceptions, point to this logic. This is why I believe that EHG has the potential to become an analytical framework of heuristic value for future investigations in this field. As an alternative to the reifying identity-jargon, the EHG concept suggests perceiving individuals and their subjective experiences, preferences and unique webs of group affiliations (Simmel 1992 [1908]) as non-identical with others despite possible common ethnic affiliation and ascriptions to macro groups. Above all, as an analytical framework, EHG considers ethnic membership as *one among many* membership roles.

Who belongs here, and who does not? A Sociology of Membership observes and analyses the developmental contexts, impact and consequences of this question. The answer to the question targets different aspects, frames, modes and conditions of membership and is constantly negotiated by diverse social formations, such as national states, political parties, firms, sport clubs, families, or ethnic groupings. Such negotiations are defined by – and are shaping – power relations. While ethnic claims and identity politics are found among both societal majorities and minorities, the term ethnic group (as well as national group) is commonly used to describe a societal minority. It is not exclusive but indeed essential that a Sociology of Membership acknowledges that minorities in any society, however defined, are not homogenous units. Individuals and group(-ings) within a minority may differ in their reaction to

subordination, type of leadership, ideology, degree of allegiance to their group, to other members or to the larger society, the ultimate goals of the group, etc. Consequently a minority (and by inference the contextual majority/ies as well) will generally not be a wholly united group – groups and individuals will favour various modes of action in response to majority constraints.

In his *Theory of Social Categories*, Michael Banton (2011) is on a par with Steve Fenton (2003) and Rogers Brubaker (2006) in his critique of “groupism”. As a starting point, Banton confirms that it has been conventional to conceive of ethnogenesis as a process by which a set of individuals come to conceive of themselves as a people. For the development of EHG as an analytical framework his following point is of major importance: instead of understanding ethnogenesis as a formative process of “a people [...] it would be more accurate to speak of ethnoacclivity and ethnodeclivity as processes by which the significance attributed to ethnic identification rises and declines. From a sociological standpoint it is as important to account for the absence of ethnic identification as for its presence” (Banton 2011, 193).

Every person can acknowledge one or more ethnic or national origins. As Steve Fenton (2003, 68) has observed, “the problem ... is not the word ‘ethnic’ but the word ‘group’”. Brubaker (2006, 8) has similarly criticised “groupism”, by which he means “the tendency to take discrete, bounded groups as basic constituents of social life, chief protagonists of social conflicts and fundamental units of social analysis”. Banton concludes:

The conceptual problem is even greater when the recognition of ethnic origin is generalized by reference to ethnicity as if this were an independent factor that influences the behaviour of humans in many regions of the world. Some of these difficulties may be eased if the focus is moved from the concept of a group to that of a category (Banton 2011, 194).

This confirms what we have already learnt from Singer’s work, the first sociological paper on ethnogenesis (Singer 1962), namely to speak of ethnically defined groupings as social entities. Additional to these insights, there is a different line of sociological inquiry regarding ethnogenesis which can add to the development of our framework.

A model that grasps the simultaneousness and interdependency of ethno-cultural changes among both migrant populations and the society they are part of was presented by Andrew Greeley (1974), an American sociologist and Roman Catholic priest, with empirical reference to the USA context: a two-dimensional

model of ethnogenesis. By conceptualising socio-cultural change in society at large as ethnogenesis, Greeley's model went beyond the analysis of group affiliations but remained under-theorised despite its heuristic potential. As with other models of socio-cultural change, and concepts regarding ethnicities, Greeley's model does not explicitly address the dialectic of homogenisation and heterogenisation in the process of ethnogenesis. It is for future research to verify if Ethnoheterogenesis can also be employed as a framework to analyse socio-cultural change in society at large. The notion of "ethnoheterogeneous societies" as coined by Detlev Claussen (2013) points to this potential.

In this paper, I have proposed the concept of Ethnoheterogenesis (EHG) as an alternative model to analyse the ethnic framing and affiliations of individuals, groupings and macro groups. Potentially, EHG can further develop a) as an umbrella category for ongoing formative processes of ethnogenesis and ethnic change, including ethnocultural drifts and ethnic strategising, and b) to grasp the process of socio-cultural change in societies marked by migration which we describe as ethnoheterogeneous.

NINA CLARA TIESLER

Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa
and Institute of Sociology, Leibniz University of Hannover, Germany

Av. Prof. Aníbal Bettencourt 9 — 1600-036 Lisboa, Portugal

ninaclara.tiesler@ics.ulisboa.pt

orcid.org/0000-0002-3712-5929

§ REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA, O. T. 2010. *O Peso do Hífen. Ensaios sobre a Experiência Luso-americana*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.
- ANDERSON, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- BANTON, M. 2008. "The sociology of ethnic relations". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31 (7): 1267-1285. DOI: 10.1080/01419870701710922.
- BANTON, M. 2011. "A theory of social categories". *Sociology*, 45 (2): 187-201.
- BARTH, F. 1969. "Introduction". In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, ed. F. Barth. Bergen-Oslo: Universitets Forlage, 9-38.
- BELL, D. 1975. "Ethnicity and social change". In *Ethnicity. Theory and Experience*, eds. N. Glazer and D. P. Moynihan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 141-174.

- BÖS, M. 2010. "Race and ethnicity: the history of two concepts in American Sociology". Paper presented at "Sociology of Citizenship: 105th American Sociological Association Annual Meeting", Section on History of Sociology, Atlanta (August 2010).
- BÖS, M. 2015. "Ethnicity and ethnic groups: historical aspects". In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, vol. 8, ed. James D. Wright. Oxford: Elsevier, 136-141.
- BONATE, L. 2007. "Roots of diversity in Mozambican Islam". *Lusotopie*, 14 (1): 129-149.
- BRUBAKER, R. 2006. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- CLAUSSEN, D. 2013. "Im Zeitalter Globaler Gleichzeitigkeit. Kritische Theorie der Gegenwart, Vortrag zur Eröffnung der Konferenz, Kritische Theorie. Eine Erinnerung an die Zukunft", Humboldt Universität, Berlin am 29. November 2013.
- COHEN, A. 1969. *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- COHEN, A. 1974. "Introduction: the lesson of ethnicity". In *Urban Ethnicity*, ed. A. Cohen. London: Tavistock Publications, ix-xxiv.
- COLLINS, R. 1999. "Balkanization or Americanization: a geopolitical theory of ethnic change". In *Macrohistory: Essays in the Sociology of the Long Run*, ed. R. Collins. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 70-109.
- COMAROFF, J. 1987. "Of totemism and ethnicity: consciousness, practice and the signs of inequality". *Ethnos* 52 (3-4): 301-323. DOI: 10.1080/00141844.1987.9981348.
- DOORNBOS, M. 1972. "Some conceptual problems concerning ethnicity in integration analysis". *Civilization*, 22: 263-283.
- EPSTEIN, A. L. 1958. *Politics in an Urban African Community*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- FENTON, S. 2003. *Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- FRANCIS, E. K. 1947. "The nature of an ethnic group". *American Journal of Sociology*, 52: 393-400.
- GABBERT, W. 2011. "Shifting boundaries, emerging communities – Ethnicity and ethnogenesis on Nicaragua's Atlantic coast". In *Ethnicity, Citizenship and Belonging: Practices, Theory and Spatial Dimensions*, eds. S. Albiez et al., Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 65-91.
- GABBERT, W. 2014. "Ethnicity and social change – Miskitu ethno-genesis in Eastern Nicaragua". In *New World Colors: Ethnicity, Belonging and Difference in the Americas*, ed. J. Raab. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 193-208.
- GELLNER, E. 1993. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- GLAZER, N., D. P. Moynihan, eds. 1975. *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- GLUCKMAN, M. 1961. "Anthropological problems arising from the African Industrial Revolution". In *Social Change in Modern Africa*, ed. A. Southal. London: Oxford University Press.
- GREEELEY, A. 1974. *Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance*. New York: Wiley.
- HANK, J. R., G. Enrique and J. Laraña, eds. 1994. *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- HECHTER, M. 1974. "The political economy of ethnic change". *American Journal of Sociology*, 79: 1151-78.
- HOBBSBAWM, E. 1996. "Identity politics and the left". *New Left Review*, 1 (217): 38-47.

- HORKHEIMER, M., T. W. Adorno. 1969 [1944]. *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag.
- KHOURI, N., J. Pereira Leite. 2012. *Os Ismailis de Moçambique: Vida Económica no Tempo Colonial*. Paris: Ed. Colibri.
- LUBKEMANN, S. C. 2002. "The moral economy of Portuguese postcolonial return". *Diaspora* 11 (2): 189-213.
- MAPRIL, J. 2014. "Aren't you looking for citizenship in the wrong place? Islamic education, secular subjectivities and the Portuguese Muslim". *Religion and Society: Advances in Research*, 5: 65-82.
- MAYHEW, L. 1968. "Ascription in modern societies". *Sociological Inquiry*, 38: 105-20.
- MITCHEL, J. C. 1956. *The Kalela Dance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- PEREIRA, V. 2012. "Os futebolistas invisíveis: os portugueses em França e o futebol". *Etnográfica* 16 (1): 97-115.
- SIMMEL, G. 1992[1908]. Die Kreuzung sozialer Kreise, in: ders., Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung (GS Bd. 11), Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, S. 456-511.
- SINGER, L. 1962. "Ethnogenesis and Negro-Americans today". *Social Research*, 29 (4): 419-432.
- TAYLOR, R. L. 1979. "Black ethnicity and the persistence of ethnogenesis". *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (6): 1401-1423.
- THOMSON, S. 2011. "Revisiting 'Mandingization' in coastal Gambia and Casamance (Senegal): Four Approaches to Ethnic Change". *African Studies Review*, 54 (2): 95-121.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2000. "Muçulmanos na margem: a nova presença Islâmica em Portugal". *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas*, 34: 117-144.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2005. "Novidades do terreno. Muçulmanos na Europa e o caso Português". *Análise Social*, 173, XXXIX (3.º): 827-849.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2008. "No bad news from the European margin: the new Islamic presence in Portugal". Reprint in A. Rippin, ed., *World Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. New York, London: Routledge, 189-216.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2009. "Muslim transnationalism and diaspora in Europe: migrant experience and theoretical reflection". In *Transnationalism. Diasporas and the Advent of a New (dis) order*, eds. E. Ben-Rafael and Y. Sternberg. Leiden: Brill, 417-440.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2012. "Diasbola: futebol e emigração Portuguesa". *Etnográfica*, XVI (1): 77-96.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2017a. *Ethnoheterogenesis. The Dialectics of Hetero – and Homogenization in Processes of Ethnic Framing and Membership*, ISH – Arbeitspapier des Instituts für Soziologie der Leibniz Universität Hannover 02-2017.
- TIESLER, N. C. 2017b. "Ethnoheterogenese: (De-)Ethnisierung, Diversifizierung und multiple Mitgliedschaftsrollen in modernen Migrationsgesellschaften". *Berliner Debatte Initial* 28 (4): 108-121.
- TIESLER, N. C., N. Alves Bergano. 2012. "Ligações culturais entre portugueses na Alemanha: o futebol e a gastronomia como espaços sociais para convívios internacionais". *Etnográfica*, XVI (1): 117-142.
- TIESLER, N. C., D. Cairns. 2007. "Representing Islam and Lisbon youth: Portuguese Muslims of Indian-Mozambican origin". *Lusotopie*, XIV (1): 223-238.
- TIESLER, N. C., D. Cairns. 2010. "Across difference? Portuguese Muslim youth as Portuguese youth". In *Youth on the Move? European Youth and Geographical Mobility*, ed. D. Cairns. Berlin: vs-Verlag, 134-145.

- TIESLER, N. C., S. Lavado. 2018. "Muslim migration intelligence and individual attitudes towards Muslims in Portugal". In *Muslims at the Margins of Europe*, eds. T. Martikainnan, J. Mapril, and A. Khan. Leiden: Brill.
- VAKIL, A., F. A. Monteiro and M. A. Machaqueiro. 2011. *Moçambique: Memória Falada do Islão e da Guerra*. Lisbon: Almedina Coleção.
- VAN DEN BERGHE, P. 1967. *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Wiley.
- WATERS, M. C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- WEBER, M. 1968 [1920]. *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich. New York: Bedminst.
- WEBER, M. 2007 [1920]. "The origin of common ethnic beliefs: the language and cult community". In *Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity*, ed. S. Kalberg. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 299-304.
- WERZ, M. 2002. "Ethnizität als moderne Ideologie. Ein gesellschaftlicher Begriff in geographischem Kontext". *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für Deutsche Geschichte*, 30: 13-22.
- WIMMER, A. 2008. "Ethnische Grenzziehungen in der Immigrationgesellschaft. Jenseits des Herder'schen Commonsense". *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Heft 48: 57-80.
- WOLF, E. 1994. "Perilous ideas: race, culture, people". *Current Anthropology*, 35 (1). DOI: 10.1086/204231.
- YANCEY, W., E. Erickson and R. Juliani. 1976. "Emergent ethnicity: a review and reformulation". *American Sociological Review*, 41: 391-403.

CITE THIS CHAPTER AS:

TIESLER, N. C. 2018. "Mirroring the dialectic of inclusion and exclusion in ethnoheterogenesis processes". In *Changing Societies: Legacies and Challenges*. Vol. 1. *Ambiguous Inclusions: Inside Out, Inside In*, eds. S. Aboim, P. Granjo, A. Ramos. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 195-217.
<https://doi.org/10.31447/ics9789726715030.09>