

Some considerations on the relationship between migration and Kinship

Igor José de Renó Machado

Paper presented at IAUES 2014, Makuhari Messe, Shiba, Japan

This paper proposes a reflection on the connections between kinship and displacement. From a series of ethnographic examples, we deal with a flexible range of phenomena that are related to orders of kinship: all of them have something to do with displacement, even if it has occurred in a relatively distant past. We handle the everyday effects of movements in the present or the displacement of past generations. To account for this reflection, we adopt an idiosyncratic definition of kinship, which takes into account a recent discussion about its nature.

Studying this considerable variety of movements, we realized that we always see kinship as one of the most significant dimensions of relations involving migrations: the kinship that creates complex networks and complex networks that are created as kinship. In one dimension (the "given" that Eduardo Viveiros de Castro points out) or another (the constructed assigned to constructivists), kinship affects and is affected by the peoples's movement. We see a complex intertwining of movement and Kinship and intend to explore some of these overlapping and possibly provide new ideas to think anthropology of migration. A series of examples allows us a more systematic reflection on the place of kinship in migration systems, or yet the opposite: the place of migration/movements in kinship systems. At the end we came to a pertinent question that fits settle here: kinship, understood by the relatatedness (Carsten 2004) bias is itself the movement with which we deal (and therefore the opposite would also be possible)?

Much of what relates to the movement has close relation with kinship, with the orders of relations that arise as a pillar of lifestyles

marked by displacement. But beyond that entanglement that is evident in all the examples which will be discussed, what more can we say? To help answer this question, we will go through two phases: first we will deal with the discussion of kinship and its implications, and then we will connect the examples with a reflection on the connections between kinship and movements.

THE NEW KINSHIP AND ITS CRITICS

The discussion that interests us stems from reading feminist authors have made of the work of David Schneider (1984,1968). In these works, Schneider presents a fierce critique of kinship models used by anthropologists, based on a Western assumption of biology's prominence and the human reproduction taken as natural facts. Schneider came to the conclusion that what we call kinship does not exist and appear as just another illusion of our own cultural concepts.¹ These feminists, among them Marilyn Strathern and Janet Carsten, stressed the idea that kinship can also be built and is not just a reflection of biological logic. Kinship has a dimension of lived experience, produced by a large number of variables, such as commensality, exchanging names, friendship etc. This was important from the point of view of those who intended deconstruct the place of woman as mother/wife and questioning a set of gender oppressions linked to the "natural" fact of conception and physiological differences.

This Schneiderian inheritance allowed the understanding of practices not investigated before by the theory of kinship, as the production of relatives by other dimensions than just blood. These authors ended up using the perspective of Schneider to revive another debate of kinship, rather than accept the end of it, as the author wanted. Phenomena such as transnational adoption, the homoafetive marriage, polyamory, friendships, and many others pass to have a dimension

¹ About the work of Schneider see. MACHADO 2013.

relating to that we call kinship. Strathern (1992)², for example, investigated how recent discourses on development of breeding technologies interrogate the place of nature in the kinship and also in Western culture as a whole. Another notion of nature emerges in which it is not given as preexistent manifestations of human culture: it is the product of the action. This perspective leads us to rethink the relationship between nature and culture in kinship. While Schneider opened a field of investigation, he never abandoned the idea that there is a dichotomy between natural and social aspects of kinship. Other authors, like Carsten (2004), Franklin and McKinnon (2001), suggest that this dichotomy should be modified or discarded (although some critics consider that this goal has not been reached).

But since its emergence as renewal of kinship studies, the issue of relatedness has attracted a lot of criticism. More accustomed to the tradition and the biological reality of reproduction some authors have considered these studies a setback. Shapiro (2008), for example, insists on considering kinship as a set of relationships modulated by reproduction, which is the basis for the expression of other relationships. Ie, he confers an ontological privilege to relations of reproduction and its social effects. His anti-constructionism appears as a kind of "re-biologism". He uses as an example (2010:431) the fact that gay families only mirrors the "real families" (ie, reproductive). Shapiro goes further and argues for a connection between kinship and genetics, as if the "constructivist" refused the connection, ie, as if the new kinship was just that non-procreative. But we could easily demonstrate that the theorists bound to the "new kinship"³ defend the idea that not every kinship is biologically referred and not that no kinship is biologically referred.⁴ We

² STRATHERN, Marilyn. *Reproducing the future: anthropology, kinship and the new reproductive technologies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.

³ Adherents of this view speak of "new kinship", critics refer to them as "constructive".

⁴ Either criticism on the right (the biologists), as the critical on the left (deleuzian?) seem to reify this position that for the "constructivists" everything is built. Carsten, at least explicitly denies this position (2004: introduction).

could insert in this "conservative" critical current also the work of Godelier (2004), for whom the constructivist model is essentially wrong for denying the centrality of sexual procreation to kinship. For Godelier, the constructivist model will eventually dissolve the theories of kinship in an ocean of formal speeches unrelated to their reality (2004:117).

If this criticism seems more controversial, leading to a biologizing perspective, other more nuanced criticism also flourished: Patterson (2005), for example, in the introduction of a number of the Australian Journal of Anthropology dedicated to kinship, indicates some limits. The first observation is about a gender divide between "old and new kinship", being the first one the harvest field of men and the second of women. The author criticizes a feminist point of view which tends to accentuate the non-biologist kinship as a political strategy for feminist struggle. According to the author, therefore, the new kinship is more like a feminist political arena than an intellectual movement. Remembering classic authors like Scheffer and Heritier, for whom kinship would refer exclusively to reproduction, she questions the work of feminists in the new kinship, where it is detached from reproduction. The result would be a kind of purge of reproduction facts as explanatory and we would have just cultural logics, along the lines of which native theories for reproduction would be created. Patterson also indicates that this type of ultra-politicized stance ends up denying the evidence of social facts related to reproduction and that, accordingly, it would be necessary to "exorcise the spirit of Schneider" (2005:7).

Parkin (2009) made critical observations of another order to constructivists, focusing mainly on McKinnon: to Parkin, the author deals with a kinship that appears as a result of the agency of individuals, accentuating Western notions about the limits of individuality. For him, the social embarrassment escapes the author's analysis, indicating another "schneiderian culturalism": and if the problem is not kinship, but the very idea of the individual? Constructivists would not be replacing a ghost with another? In the case, to criticize kinship, the authors use an

essentially Western notion as a universal human device (the individual). In this sense, the Viveiros de Castro (2009) criticism is more intense: in dealing with what was once considered as a given (the biological reality of consanguinity and reproduction) as something constructed, constructivists are perhaps playing a central individualism to our current conceptions, where everything must be an object of choice, as in the goods market of capitalism. The opposition between what is given and what is built is the axis of Viveiros de Castro criticism, basically because he believes that in the end, when the authors inserted the "built" in what would be the "given," constructionists continue to reinforce this distinction. For him, **"the constructivist model (is) a particularly strong version of (...) the standart model [the one where kinship refers to the data of biology], since it does no more than extend to inbreeding status built tra -tionally given the affinity in modern Western ideology of co-relatives "(2009:23).⁵**

Sahlins, in a series of articles and in a book⁶, discusses what is kinship and deals with the legacy of Schneider, his former colleague department. With strong inspiration from the South American ethnography he comes to the formula of the "commonality of being", ie the idea that kinship refers to the mutual involvement of people through established social / cultural relations. People are part of each other and therefore share a collective existence, which can be defined as kinship.

The limits of this "collective existence" are poorly exploited by Sahlins: he is very concerned with the innermost circles of kinship and

⁵ The argument of Viveiros de Castro seems, ironically, one Schneiderian criticism to the "constructivist model", since the problem is not exactly think of kinship as constructed, even on the ground of consanguinity, but the idea that any kinship is made that way. In saying that everything is built into any kinship system, they are being Eurocentric. Among native Amazonians things do not happen that way: among them, the "given" is precisely the relationship of affinity and the built is what we see as given (the reality of bodies). Obviously, he is careful to state that "given" and "constructed" are not the same in different ontological schemes. But the question then is to demonstrate that Western Kinship remains the parameter to think Kinship, even deconstructing the model criticized by Schneider. That would be, say, replicating the centrality of biology to keep the division between given and constructed as universal, after all.

⁶ SAHLINS, M. 2011a, 2011b, 2013.

theories of reproduction. Devotes, for example, an entire chapter (2013, ch. 2) to reaffirm the idea that kinship is not biology (what feminists have done since the 1980s, say). But it is undeniable that the largest part of the book deals with relationships that approximate, in the circles of commonality, from those generated by childbirth. At various times, however, Sahlins points to the other end of the commonality of being: the fact that relationships such as friendship, for example, can be taken as kinship relations. As in the following passage:

A catalogue of commonplace postnatal means of Kinship formation would thus include commensality, sharing food, reincarnation, co-residence, shared memories, working together, blood brotherhood, adoption, friendship, shared suffering, and so on. (Sahlins 2013:13)

Thus, a large "postnatal" set of relationships can be thought of as kinship, or as would Carsten, as "relatedness" (since they imply commonality of being). In an introduction to the book *Cultures of Relatedness* (2001), Carsten already indicated that when we think in the most remote relatedness, those far from biological relationships, we can fall in an analytical vacuum, because any relationships could be viewed as "kinship". Many of the criticisms of relatedness just use this argument.

But the above quote by Sahlins goes precisely to this "analytic vacuum" when enlarge considerably the scope of what would be kinship. But here we interpret this as a gain rather than as a problem. We intend, in fact, exploit this other fringe of kinship, where it can easily be confused with "social relations". What would be the theoretical gains or losses in exploring this other "border"? Our investment in kinship/relatedness here follows exactly in this direction.

ETHNOGRAPHIES OF THE DISPLACEMENT

Before proceeding to the analysis, we present a series of examples of mobilities that sustain our reflection:

The first example is a family transition from the countryside to the city, in Minas Gerais, Brazil, during the twentieth century. This work⁷ addressed a branch of Rennó family. Essentially rural, the family began to divide between country and city. To summarize, we have a production of movement governed by a morality of agricultural "immobility": women (excluded from access to land by "nature of a kinship system" - it is a patrilineal and patrifocal life) and younger children (to whom was granted study instead of land, a kind of feminization of the existence of these "who came last") leave the country.

Well, the movement works here as a "misleading" ideology, which ultimately benefits those who have not moved at the expense of those who did. We treat both the mobility and immobility, thus. Who goes to the city does not receive land, which is far more appreciated in this context. The movement is literally an expulsion of the family members of land access. Earlier only women were excluded, after that also men "with studies". The movement was formally placed as equivalent to the land (leaving to study was equivalent to winning a "dowry" on land, in native speech), but in practice, given the essentially peasant's values of the family, the displacement was an excuse to concentrate the land among older sons who have not moved toward the city.

Here we see that the circulation of people leads to unexpected meanings, and the effective and recognized moral value is related to immobility. This centrifugal perspective of immobility works only for some of the sons, following an order of primogeniture up to a native account on the exhaustion of the land (in this case took place starting from the 5th child). In the next generation, however, the breakdown of favorable economic conditions to agriculture, plus the advancement of urban morals changed the positive sense of the rural immobility: the grandchildren had much more urban than rural lives, so to speak. But that's another story.

⁷ MACHADO 1998.

The second example focuses on a rural neighborhood in the south of Minas Gerais (Brazil), very close to the lands of Rennó family.⁸ Indicates, however, a contrary process, the construction of an elite in motion, as opposed to those who do not move. Here we see the moral inversion between mobility and immobility. The contrast between the two cases revolves around the value assigned to the land as opposed to the movement of persons. The result of this process was the establishment of a new social metric, another form of classification, in frank opposition to a previous system. In this context, spatially near to the first, but shifted in time (this is here the 1990s), the immobility of the farmer was associated with "lack of experience", a native concept that is fundamental in restructuring the political arena of Estação Dias

In Estação Dias, the "experience" was a native category, loaded with hierarchies and distinctions. Those who moved had more experience than those who did not move, completely reversing the moral that we saw above. They were seen as more prepared to understand the world and, in this case, they ended up having some prominence in the political arena. We are here in a setting where small-scale farming is economically suffocated, where the few economic resources that supported the neighborhood come from salaries of those who work in nearby cities. Control these resources just by moving enabled a success narrative indexed to the movement. This morality condemns the immobility and transforms those who do not move in victims and those who move on models.

The third example,⁹ which deals with international migration of Brazilians in Porto, Portugal, demonstrates how mobility qualifies places of power due to unexpected dynamics: from cultural logics gestated in the experience of immigration, Brazilians in Porto think about mobility from their conceptions of Brazilianness set in motion. Facing the Portuguese stereotyping, certain characteristics were expected of

⁸ MACHADO 2002.

⁹ MACHADO 2004, 2009.

Brazilian workers. The main characteristics were the happiness, friendliness and warmth. Believing that Brazilian atavistically harbored this series of features, the Portuguese employers were seeking by these immigrants for certain jobs. The Brazilians have gone through what I call an exoticization process. In other words, Brazilian immigrants in Porto were not only subject to the construction of stereotypical images by certain agents of power, but were also active subjects of the exoticization. Thus, in the case of Brazilians in Portugal, to adapt more efficiently to Portuguese stereotypes could confer greater power to certain people who imposed their own form of Brazilianness.

Given that power relations between immigrants passed, among other things, for control of a wide network of potential Portuguese employers, the leaders were those who, having been adapted to current images of Brazil, managed to insert themselves firmly into the labor market. Here, finally, comes the issue of movement: not immigration itself, but as the movement of those immigrants that were already in Portugal was important in the everyday life of a Brazilian community in Porto. A key element of the definition of Brazilianness, in the sense of exoticization, was the constant movement to Brazil. Spending holidays in Brazil was a kind of ritual process of Brazilianization. In other words, immigrants who could travel regularly to Brazil were seen as little more Brazilians and were in some form closer of Brazilianness stereotypical images which organized the Brazilians in Porto's processes of difference production. Well, here the movement is presented as an index of Brazilianization centrality production, which only has meaning within the symbolic universe of this Brazilian community in Porto. The movement appears as a kind of difference production.

In another case¹⁰, we also deal with the migration of Governador Valadares (MG) to other countries from the point of view of the families who stay. We demonstrate how the movement of familiar ones implies the creation of new forms of family organization, based on different

¹⁰ MACHADO 2010, 2011.

principles of relatedness. We have found that people emigrate to build the future design of their families and build new centralities in their relations. Decisions to migrate have deep relations with the nuclear families' processes of fission and fusion and its constant movement of boundaries between people from the same families. This scenario of migration indicates that the movement is seen and understood as a synonym of "family." It appears as a possible way to build a standalone household. As "family", this movement assumes forms of agency of a presence "at distance": the continued sending of remittances. It presupposes a symbolic embodiment of the absent being: totemic goods purchased by parents, husbands, boyfriends, children to their relatives who remained in Valadares. As a family, the movement also involves a risk of disintegration: the marriage may end under the threat of new relationships, betrayals and the end of sending remittances.

The return of the absent one, or the absent ones, implies new challenges, now the adventure of re-structuring relations that necessarily happened at a distance. On some occasions this is not possible, resulting in an end of those dreams that led to the movement, and others result in serious maladjustments between members of a family now physically joined. The movement implies family as dream and future model in the departure and as a reordering of relations in return. Sometimes it works satisfactorily, sometimes great dramas happen. It should be noted here that the movement implies very different meanings from the other three examples.

The Stabelini's work¹¹ advances in the analysis of this scenario in Valadares with an ethnography of the architecture of migrant families. He demonstrates how the built houses(or under construction) relate to the family's centrality project, corresponding to an archeology of migration processes. Unfinished houses signify the failure of the project, sumptuous homes in poor neighborhoods indicates success, while a new style of more discreet houses corresponds to the adaptation of familiar

¹¹ Stabelini 2013.

architecture to economic crises of this century. By analyzing the projects of the houses and the processes of construction, Stabelini shows us how the movement is embedded in the urban landscape precisely in the shape of these properties.

Alexandra Almeida, on the other hand, has produced an ethnography¹² of the emigrant family in the Gonzaga town, which belongs to the same region of Governador Valadares. The small town of Gonzaga allowed Almeida an analysis of the female point of view on emigration, where female immobility is the perfect contrast of male mobility¹³: the monitoring of woman's life even stronger than that we see in Valadares, the need for a moral attitude approved in the small town, the defense of the honor of the husband and the risks of social isolation if they deviate from that path of moral rectitude in the Gonzaga's perspective. This perspective implies abandonment of social life, constant subjection to the husband's family, total dedication to the children and the coordination of the house construction itself. Almeida demonstrates how this situation implies a constant stress and, in a way, in a veiled oppression to women who remain waiting for their husbands in Valadares. She also shows how the return of the husband and the reorganization of family life are much harder than one might imagine, often involving more subordination of woman than during the period of absence itself.

The Japanese examples demonstrate a diversity in the relation between movement and kinship: Kubota¹⁴ brings an unexpected dimension of family reorganizations in Campo Grande (MS). When immigrating to Japan, the descendants of Japanese and Okinawans leave relatives in Brazil and, as the volume of exits has been intense over the

¹² Almeida 2010.

¹³ It is worth noting that these ethnographies in Valadares and Gonzaga have focused on families divided by immigration, mostly of couples who live at a distance. Such cases are more common, yet many persons migrate unmarried (men and women) and even married women migrate, leaving husbands in Brazil. The analysis here refers to the first case.

¹⁴ Kubota 2014.

last 20 years, those who remained have built other networks relations, marked by physical proximity and neighborhood and less by consanguineous relationships. With so many relatives outside the country, new networks of kinship are created among the remaining (descendants), who experience a new family experience. Like a puzzle where the pieces are rearranged to make another drawing, the displacements in Campo Grande lead to a multiplicity of kinship: the original kinships, added to new kinship among those who remained.

Lourenção¹⁵, in turn, analyzes the space of the Kendo dojo training as a House in the Lévi-Strauss sense: the constitution of a moral person embodied in the person of the master, turned himself a member of the dojo, which usually takes the name of its creator (and therefore takes its kinship). Lourenção indicates how the coexistence in the dojo can lead to what he calls "devir samuraíco" or a process of construction of Japaneseness molded in martial arts and the moral linked to it. This process reaches descendants and non-descendants also: the centrality of Japaneseness has more to do with the moral practices than with blood. The dojo thus becomes a key entry to an Japanese kinship unrelated to blood, but shaped in the moral correctness and intense involvement of students with the art mediated by the master.

Hatugai¹⁶ explores another process of Japaneseness, this time in the city of Araraquara, at São Paulo estate, Brazil. In the NIPO association, the relevant question is the domain of Japanese cuisine art, concentrated in the hands of old ladies: this domain is an art of Japanization because eating the proper food makes people more or less Japanese. The association operates, however, with a consanguineous logic: you must be the son/daughter of Japanese (descendants) to be effectively Japanese, but the domain of culinary arts is the most efficient mechanism to approach those who do not carry the blood or, on the other hand, is the path to the redemption of a lost Japaneseness, when they want to

¹⁵ Lourenção 2009.

¹⁶ Hatugai 2013.

reconnect descendants with a Japanese life in the association. Hatugai shows us the relationship being created on the tables and association events between cuts of veggies and memory devices.

Kebbe¹⁷ in his ethnography of Brazilians in Japan (the descendants of Japanese immigrants in Brazil) relates the displacements with the reorganization of the family structure. If Kubota shows us what happens here in Brazil, Kebbe offers us a long description of the restructuring of descendants' families in Japan, when they face the intense routine of work. Kebbe comes to the conclusion that families are structured in the distance, with the flow of care and affection operating on both sides of the Atlantic. What appears as messed up to Japanese NGOs and various authorities is seen by Kebbe as a specific kinship dynamic, which involves changing places, successive marriages, arrangements of care among family and even changing names.

Finally, Ngomane¹⁸ presents an interesting study on young Mozambican students in the city of Belo Horizonte (Minas Gerais, Brazil). The ethnography presents a true kinship system articulated among young people, with exogamous characteristics, groups of siblings, commercial exchanges in various orders and many parties. The daily life is characterized by the slow transformation of friends into brothers, with implications for affective relations, which should not happen within the group. The dynamic comes to prescribe that women should date Mozambicans in other Brazilian cities, and that men should date other African or Brazilian, but never Mozambican friends. The displacement of these students produces a kinship system that works in Belo Horizonte regardless the entry and exit of new members, in a constant flow.

KINSHIP and DISPLACEMENTS

¹⁷ Kebbe 2008.

¹⁸ Ngomane 2010.

This set of ethnographies constitutes the substratum of our reflection on the relationship between kinship and displacements. We see, first, that mobility have several different densities: the practice of kendo is hardly comparable to international migration from Gonzaga, and this one is also from a different order than local movements between farm and town and between small towns of Minas Gerais. At the same time, the holiday's movement of Brazilian immigrants in Portugal is different in intensity of migration of Brazilians decasségus in Japan.

With different densities, they all have in common the fact that the displacement, be the way it is, took effect on people's lives and, more than that, produced infinitesimal differences: *diferencialities*. In previous work we advocate the use of the concept of "*diferencialities*" to refer to situations usually linked to the concept of identity. The differentiality avoids any a priori definition of the group and only exists when shared collectively by a group of people on a permanent coexistence (we're far apart therefore from the idea of identity or imagined community). Therefore we use the perspectives of Ingold (2007) on "sharing experiences" to think about the difference. Obviously the difference does not depend on the movement, but it is also evident that movement acts as a booster of new tangles from which new lines are launched in space and time. The movement in all examples operates as a catalyst for differences.

Since the diffusionist studies of the late nineteenth century, however, it was already evident. So evident that some have to debit on the account of movement all human process of "evolution". Rivers (1914) explains the changes in Melanesian from logically imagined migrations, for example. This great theoretical field, fallen into disuse in the mid-twentieth century, presupposed the movement as the motor of history. Even taking a temporal leap forward in the Levi-Strauss' (1976) celebrated "Race and History", we see that mobility (forced or not) is one component of the production of the "optimal" diversity that social life should imply – below which we would necessarily see fission processes

(internal differentiation) or the importation of differences (migration). Fact also highlighted by Sahlins (1997a, 1997b) in his analysis of the Polynesian migration to the U.S., in the texts concerning the validity of the concept of culture.

The displacements imply transformations in kinship structures in many different ways. We quickly saw some of these transformations. In the case of valadarenses' migration the movement itself responds to the imperatives of the kinship orders: they move to produce the relationship itself. At the same time, the movement implies changes in relations between members of a family: temporary forms are created, which may even completely change their own early relationships.

The movement is a result of kinship but at the same time transforms it. Stabelini demonstrates in his work (2013) how the physical home itself, housing built by immigrants, is the result of determinations born in and through kinship. The house needs to be divided, to demonstrate the ability of the family to compose your space so as not to scramble social and private spaces. Homes need divisions, floors, separations and clearly private and public areas. Homes must also be homes-economic-units in many cases: the family business is on the first floor of the house. I.e., the house is an autonomous and self-sufficient home, metaphor of the family they want to build.

The transformation of the houses also implies a social transformation of the orders of kinship, from the large detached houses of the 1980s to the narrow twinned houses of the 2010s. The horizons for autonomy are changing, as well as the rules and practices associated with kinship. But the autonomy of the nano-houses remains intact, even if the relationships within the house are different. Remains the same interest for autonomy, but now less ostentatious and more involved with economic sustainability centered in the rent of the other terraced houses (when they managed to build more than one).

As in the example of Almeida (2011), we have an intertwining between movement and family formation. The mobility presupposes

immobility and vice versa. People move to build a property (house), to build an economic structure that supports immobility. Continued mobility (the comings and goings of some) is seen as a failure and as an inability to remain motionless. And the imobility, in this case, is the family permanently united under one roof.

In Gonzaga it is even more noticeable the relationship between movement and family (kinship). The dilemmas of the cases where the movement caused the breakup of marriages projects makes clear the difficult place that gender relations delegate to women. Unlike what we saw in Valadares, here the margin is very small and the restructuring of the family when her husband returns generally means a reversion to a family model where women have a subordinate role, generating conflicts and dissatisfactions so well illustrated in the text of Alexandra Almeida.

In Gonzaga, the family presupposes the movement and immobility, and presupposes the immobility linked to women subordination with a structure of male control. Mobility, in turn, appears as a moment of freedom (monitored) of the wife, a fact that will then generate the post-return conflicts. From our point of view, when we think of the relationship between kinship/relatedness and migration we see that this gonzaguenze differentiability generates an interweaving between displacement and family, between gender-based roles and mobility/immobility.

In Gonzaga, the family presupposes the movement and immobility, and presupposes the immobility linked to women's subordination with a structure of male control. Mobility, in turn, appears as a moment of freedom (monitored) of the wife, a fact that will then generate the post-return conflicts. From our point of view, when we think of the relationship between kinship/relatedness and migration we see that this gonzaguenze differentiability generates an interweaving between displacement and family, between gender-based roles and mobility/immobility.

Another interesting case, which relates mobility, immobility and kinship, is the first of the examples in which the family who is divided between country and city, do it from a logic of immobility and expulsion of women and young children from access to land. We have seen that mobility is part of a logic of kinship linked to peasant morality, with strong valuation of the land. In this logic, mobility is just a way to keep the functional immobility of those who remains in the land. The movement is a constitution's accessory of the family's relationship with land that is concentrated in the hands of some (older) sons by successive advances of inheritance, for it to be not divided.

Here those that move are excluded from kinship, for which urban life appears as an alternative to expulsion. Here kinship and displacement are inextricably linked, even if it is for making of displacement a mechanism for maintaining a family exclusionary order. We have also seen how this order is reversed in a very close locality, but at a later time: people who move end up taking over the political arena of the rural neighborhood where they live.

This transition leads to the "revenge" of the displaced, where what was exclusion becomes part of a discourse of empowerment (while it discriminates farmers "that do not move"). Here we see the pendulum of displacement operating, from reason for exclusion to the building element of a small elite.

These examples above converge diferencialities and kinship, and relate these processes to displacement. In the Japanese cases mentioned here we also see relationships between displacement and kinship, but it is now necessary to point out some distinctions. Two of the cases (Hatugai 2014 and Lourenção 2012) deal with the effects of Japanese displacement to Brazil throughout the twentieth century. They are not cases of movement itself, but are effects and densities resulting from the choices of their ancestors. The kinship at the dojo and at the Nipo Association in Araraquara raise important issues to think about.

These examples above converge differentialities and kinship, and they relate these processes with displacements. In the Japanese cases mentioned here we also see relationships between displacement and kinship, but it is now necessary to point out some distinctions. Two of the cases (Hatugai 2014 and Lourenção 2012) deal with the effects of Japanese displacement to Brazil throughout the twentieth century. They are not cases of movement itself, but are effects and densities resulting from the choices of their ancestors. The kinship at the dojo and at the Nipo Association in Araraquara raises important issues to think about.

Firstly, the case of the association is the obvious example of a "kinship's fringe". Here the relationship between the members of the Association constitutes a relatedness/kinship that should be seen as a threshold-kinship. The old ladies' alimentary practices are indexes of Japaneseness according to local logic. In a way, the association is a distributor of substantive assignments of Japaneseness through the food, mainly.

The coexistence in the association and the everyday learning of the culinary arts produce a systematic relationship between the people attending the environment, marking a relationality that implies mutuality of being, to think as Sahlins. This coexistence can even approach non descendants to this Japanese differentiality at the association, suggesting a possibility of reproducing a Japanese family even if the women are not descendent.

The case of Kendo, analyzed by Lourenção points to other fringes of kinship, those that are created from the experience in the dojos. The practice of kendo relates people and dojo, itself a derivation of kinship well analyzed by the notion of House, representing an original founder and his private House. Incoming students somehow step into the original House and start to have specific roles and relationships related to this practice. Here's an interesting limit for reflect on the relationship between kinship and differentiality, since that belong to the same dojo does not automatically make practitioners 'relatives', or people who share

commonalities of Being. But they are part, at the same time, of the same dojo-House and gradually tend to have intertwined lives, if they continue practicing.

So we would have a limit case where there isn't an exactly overlapping of differentiability and kinship but, at the same time, there is a trend of gradual overlap. Here time operates as a producer of kinship. Thus, with the involvement with the arts of the spirit (Ki) and a progressive Japanization by this way, these practitioners will also produce mutuality of Being, intertwining descendants and non descendants with the Dojo-House.

The case described by Kubota, in turn, points to a process of kinship remodeling from "leftovers" of people who remained motionless while relatives were leaving to Japan. Those who remained end up joining themselves in initial patchworks of different families, which gradually become de facto families, sharing everyday living, holidays, sufferings etc. This reassembly among those who did not move in turn is challenged by new displacements, allowing us to see how the movement implies transformations and rearrangements on the orders of relatedness, operating with varying densities.

The other side of Kubota's coin is the example of Kebbe (2014), which chronicles in detail the transformation processes of families orders and organizations that want give an account of family of Brazilians in Japan (predominantly descendants, but also non related to these descendants), simultaneously in many different areas. These rearrangements are so affected by the mobility as by immobility, because those who live the experience together need to reshape their roles and situations within a set of pre-existing relationships, so that they continue to exist in some way. These other "families" are the product of the displacement and the willingness to remain connected, even if the migration experience produces new families (as we have seen in some instances) both for those departing and for those who remain. Here time and displacement produce substantive changes.

The other side of Kubota's coin is the example of Kebbe (2014), which chronicles in detail the transformation processes of orders of families and organizations that want give an account of family of Brazilians in Japan (predominantly descendants, but also those non related to these descendants), simultaneously in many different areas. These rearrangements are so affected by the mobility as by immobility, because those who live the experience together need to reshape their roles and situations within a set of pre-existing relationships, so that they continue to exist in some way. These other "families" are the product of the displacement and the willingness to remain connected, even if the migration experience produces new families (as we have seen in some instances) both for those departing and for those who remain. Here time and displacement produce substantive changes.

We still have more two interesting examples, properly related to kinship produced by displacement. The cases of Brazilians in Porto (MACHADO 2009) and Mozambican students in Belo Horizonte (Ngomane 2010) are quite illustrative of what we call "fringes of kinship." Brazilians in Oporto built socialities extremely elaborate and lived their lives according to rules, morals and ideas that they created from the experience of immigration in Portugal. They lived in collective households that were authentic (relational) families, through which goods, symbols and weddings circulated. They built kinships and each group sought a centrality in their relationship, similar to that we saw in Valadares, but only without blood connections (except those that have slowly been created). In the city of Oporto are the migration, prejudice experience and everyday life that produced relatives, relatedness.

In another book we carefully explored these relatednesses.¹⁹ Here we explore only one dimension of those Brazilians' mobility that, surprisingly, has nothing to do with the migration itself. The most important displacements for these Brazilians were holiday trips to Brazil, in order to build Brazilianness rituals in Port. These rituals made perfect

¹⁹ MACHADO 2009.

sense in the lives of Brazilians and had deep relationship with the Portuguese stereotypes and with the integration of immigrants into the labor market. And these were related to migrant differentiability built in that context, at that particular moment.

From the point of view of the relationship between migration and kinship, we can see that these Brazilians constituted a whole system of life that was a great kinship, which involved most of the dimensions of the lives of these immigrants. Similarly, Mozambican students forged for their lives in Brazil a system of kinship: dwelling places, systematic and friendly relations, movement of goods, exogamy and camaraderie. Interestingly, in the case of the students analyzed by Ngomane is that the kinship system exists as an institution that continues beyond the life of students in Belo Horizonte: new students arrive, old students depart and the system continues to regulate the Mozambican/African sociability in Belo Horizonte.

The dynamics of the kinship reaches the sophistication of constitute a exogamy system that leads to preferential affective relationships with Mozambicans (for women) or Brazilian (for men) and is exemplary of what we call fringes of kinship and diferencialities: it organizes the experience of Mozambicans from beginning to end of their stay in Brazil.

FINAL REMARKS

We saw a large set of examples that enables us to evaluate various relationships between kinship and migration. It was first necessary, however, to establish that we have a broad conception of kinship, as advocated by Sahlins in recent work, and as crafted by Carsten from the concept of relationalities in several works.

In our research context we have used the concept of relatedness/kinship in a consciously broad perspective, leading to a meaning that is concerned with the limits of Sahlins' ontology: in our view, relatedness/kinship relations mean any orders that create

"mutuality of being", regardless of whether or not related to human reproductive systems. Thus, living in an association of Japanese descendants can create mutuality of being, and we can see it as relatedness, as kinship. We can appeal to weavers' metaphors of Ingold (2007) to indicate that the intertwining paths that people go through together may be enough to create relatednesses. This leads us away from the "old kinship" and perhaps of any kinship.

We have considered as kinship since the relations obviously related to reproduction of nuclear families in Gonzaga, Governador Valadares up to relations between Mozambican students in Belo Horizonte, or between practitioners of the same Kendo dojo. Having demonstrated this intentionally broad definition and displayed how it appears in different contexts, what could we finally tell about kinship and migration?

We have considered as kinship since the relations obviously related to reproduction of nuclear families in Gonzaga, Governador Valadares up to relations between Mozambican students in Belo Horizonte, or between practitioners of the same Kendo dojo. Having demonstrated this intentionally broad definition and also demonstrated how it appears in different contexts, what could we finally tell about kinship and migration?

Very simply, we demonstrate that the displacements are like catalysts for changes in family relationships, but we also saw that the movement itself may be an effect of the determinations of kinship. And we saw that in either situation, the displacement may put into question the relationships of kinship, or because it is difficult to return to a traditional model (as we saw in Gonzaga), or because migration itself is seen as a risk.

Movements intervene in kinship; they create new kinships, challenge existing kinship, while it may be part of an inclusive system of kinship which implies movement. And even those systems which require movement can be challenged by the imponderables of displacement. At the same time, we saw no example in which displacement was not deeply

related with kinship: whether as a starting point, whether as a point of arrival, or as both simultaneously. The displacements are generated by kinship in some cases and in others result in new kinship structures. The movement is always related, somehow, to kinship.

We saw different densities of this relationship in several examples, since the effects of it after generations, up to the very definition of movement as kinship. This great range of connections allows us to assert, finally, that the movement is always something of kinship. The movement corresponds to production and/or reproduction of kinship.

Bibliography

ALMEIDA, Alexandra Cristina Gomes de. Uma etnografia de Gonzaga/MG após o caso Jean Charles. 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Antropologia Social) - Universidade Federal de São Carlos.

CARSTEN, J. 2000 Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship (edited). Cambridge University Press.

CARSTEN, J. After Kinship Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2004.

CARSTEN, J. After Kinship op. cit.

FRANKLIN, Sarah e MCKINNON, Susan. (orgs.) Relative values: reconfiguring kinship studies. Durham & London, Duke University Press, 2001.

GODELIER, Maurice. Métamorphoses de la parenté. Paris, Fayard, 2004.

HATUGAI, E. R. A medida das coisas. Etnografia de uma japonesidade. 01. ed. Saarbrücken: Novas Edições Acadêmicas, 2013. 200p.

INGOLD, Tim. Lines: a brief history. London: Routledge, 2007. 188

KEBBE, Victor Hugo. Famílias transnacionais entre Brasil e Japão. 2008. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Sociais) - Universidade Federal de São Carlos.

KUBOTA, Nádia Fujiko Luna. Novas (re)configurações familiares e relações de parentesco entre filhos de dekassegus . Texto de qualificação de doutorado. UFSCar, 2014.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. “Raça e História” in Antropologia Estrutural II Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1976, capítulo XVIII, pp 328-366.

LOURENCAO, G. V. Kendo: Devir samuraico, mitológicas e ritológicas nipônicas. Adentrando a Casa Japonesa .. R@U : Revista de Antropologia Social dos Alunos do PPGAS-UFSCAR, v. 1, p. 64-93, 2009.

MACHADO, I. J. R. . Cárcere Público: Processos de exotização entre brasileiros no Porto. 1. ed. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2009. v. 1. 256p .

MACHADO, I. J. R. . História Familiar e Jogos de Diferença: trabalho, antecipação de herança e gênero. Temáticas (UNICAMP), Campinas, v. 11/12, p. 167-194, 1998.

MACHADO, I. J. R. . Lugar ampliado, espaço e poder. Campos (UFPR), Curitiba, Paraná, v. 02, p. 101-116, 2002.

MACHADO, I. J. R. Cárcere Público: Processos de exotização entre brasileiros no Porto. 1. ed. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2009. v. 1. 256p. MACHADO, I. J. R. . Brazilian Immigration and the Reconstruction of Racial Hierarchies of the Portuguese Empire. Vibrant (Florianópolis), Florianópolis, v. 1, n.jan-jun, p. 1-22, 2004

MACHADO, I. J. R. Reordenações da Casa no contexto migratório de Governador Valadares, Brasil.. Etnográfica (Lisboa), v. 14, p. 5-26, 2010; e MACHADO, I. J. R. Kinship and Differentialities: Alternatives to Identity and to Ethnic Frontiers in The Study of Migrations. Vibrant (Florianópolis), v. 8, p. 220-235, 2011.

PATTERSON, Mary. Introduction: reclaiming paradigms lost. Ast. J. Anthropol 16, abril 2005.

RIVERS, W.H.R. The history of Melanesian society. Volume II. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press. 1914.

SAHLINS, M. What kinship is (part one). JRAY 17 (N.S.), 2-19, 2011. SAHLINS, M. What kinship is (part two). JRAY (N.S) 17, 227-249, 2011.

SAHLINS, M. What Kinship is. And is not. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

SAHLINS, Marshall. “O ‘pessimismo sentimental’ e a experiência etnográfica: Por que a cultura não é um objeto em via de extinção”, Partes I e II. In: Mana 3 (1), Abril de 1997, pp. 41-73, e Mana 3 (2), Outubro de 1997, pp. 103-150.

SCHNEIDER, D. 1984, A Critique of the Study of Kinship. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. SCHNEIDER, David. American Kinship: a cultural account. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

SHAPIRO, W. (2010), Kinship and beyond: the genealogical model reconsidered – Edited by Sandra Bamford & James Leach. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 16: 431–432.

SHAPIRO, Warren. What human Kinship is primarily about: toward a critique of the new kinship studies. Social Anthropology. 16, 2,137-153, 2008.

STABELINI, Fábio. Estrutura e ausência: produção do parentesco na casa emigrante.. 2013. Dissertação (Mestrado em Antropologia Social) - Universidade Federal de São Carlos.

STRATHERN, Marilyn. Reproducing the future: anthropology, kinship and the new reproductive technologies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Ngomane, Y. Estudantes moçambicanos em Belo Horizonte: uma discussão sobre a construção identitária e de redes de sociabilidade. 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Antropologia Social).