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INTRODUCTION

When discussing indigenous migration and young indigenous migrants, the question invariably arises of why we make the distinction underlining “indigenous” and not simply talk about Mexican migration to the United States in general. Why do we need to point out the specificity of this kind of migration and the social subjects involved? The reason is that they are a population segment that has been profoundly affected by the historic process of colonialism. During this period, diverse ethnic-racial categories were created in order to fix the borders of identities to ensure domination. However, we can ask ourselves what consequences this ethnic and racial differentiation has had on society and how it affects the different social groupings.

In the collective—and then nationalist—imaginary, the mestizo-indigenous dichotomy was determined to manage and create the bases for the power relations rooted in racist and ethnic classifications. Thus, the so-called “indigenous” are all those who belong (or recognize themselves as belonging) to an ancestral First People that existed prior to the Spanish Conquest; mestizos, on the other hand, would be all those social groups that have resulted from a racial mix; and “whites” are those who consider themselves the descendants of the Spaniards.

This mestizo-indigenous dichotomy undoubtedly creates limitations, considering the transformations and resignifications that social actors experience as they move to new regions to settle. However, we can ask ourselves what consequences this ethnic and racial differentiation has had on society and how it affects the different social groupings.

I should point out that all times and spaces are different, and the ways of naming things have their own dynamic. In this sense, it is not a matter of thinking that the indigenous population has been passive and simply taken on the dominant forms of social classification without filtering them. However, the indigenist integration policies imposed from the...
mid-twentieth century focused on transforming the First People’s cultures. Proof of this was the imposition of the Spanish language to integrate the population by homogenizing ethnic diversity, in accordance with the Mexican nation-state’s directives.

Other forms of cultural dispossession can be linked to territorial displacement and the destruction of sacred lands, the exploitation of natural resources, or the abandonment of the countryside as part of a national economic strategy aimed at creating a work force for industry. All of this produced social conflicts that emerged out of processes of discrimination, as mechanisms of racial and ethnic legitimacy that ensured the dominant power of certain social groups over those that had traditionally existed throughout Mexico.

Outstanding in this exercise of handling ethnic and cultural complexity is the historic post-colonial process of subordinating certain social groups through concepts like social class, the ethnic group, and race, three central items on which the relations of exploitation/domination/conflict are based.4 The use of language has been one of the most effective discriminatory devices due to its level of interiorization in the historic memory of Mexico’s indigenous population.

This is where I return to the initial question posed in this article: Why is it necessary to specify in ethnic and racial terms the kind of migration we are talking about? The case of Mexican indigenous migration to the United States makes it possible to broaden out the discussion on this issue. In the nation-state, this population group has been considered subnational and therefore their cultural and civil rights are not fully recognized.5 This has meant that they have not had regular access to a classroom education to the same extent as the mestizo population or that their incorporation into the labor market has been precarious, among other examples. That is, the Mexican nation-state’s national integration policies have generated mechanisms that have put these social groups at a disadvantage vis-à-vis what has been called the mestizo society, represented by the state.6

The literature specialized in Oaxacan indigenous migrants and their incorporation into agricultural work underlines the contradictions inherent in the following duality: agri-industry anchored in the global economy, using cutting-edge tech-
Young Oaxacans, whether Mixtec, Zapotec, or Triqui, are a group of migrants whose profound historic, cultural, and social heritage has been transmitted over generations. The indigenous nature of migrations shows signs of internalized post-colonialism among the population. This is therefore transmitted generationally, the effect of which is the subordination-domination of certain social groups. All this ideological production about otherness continues to exist among descendants of indigenous people and is manifested in different scenarios. Let us look at what Sara says about it:

I've seen lots of young people who were brought [to the United States] very young, like I was. Their parents might have spoken Spanish or not, but I feel like I was discriminated against, not only here, but also in Mexico, because I'm darker-skinned, I'm short, and I speak another language. So they [young people] suffer from the same conflict, right? Who am I? . . . I feel like the schools here [California] don't do their job. They don't in Mexico either. They don't explain why we are how we are, that it's more than just the color of your skin, right? It's something more than a culture that you aren't even familiar with because they don't teach you. So, I think that, like, that's what's needed, you know? We need talks to be able to understand the history of culture, more than anything, the history of why we're like we are, why we're here, and that it's nothing we should be ashamed of; the exact opposite: we should be proud of what we are. And I think that that's what young people need, that kind of identification and awareness of knowing. (Sara, September, 2010, Fresno, California)

For young Mixtecs, Zapotees, and Triquis, the integration process implies developing sociability strategies to be accepted because several aspects of their lives make them vulnerable, like their physical attributes (they are dark-skinned and short), their culture (the use of their native language), and their social class:

We still feel a little like outsiders, especially anyone of indigenous origin, because people always look at you sideways, even Mexicans: “Oaxacans are shorties, we’re dirty, we’re I-don’t-know-what.” But that’s not everybody. There are some people who think we’re nice and hard-working. (Carmen, no date, Madera, California)

As mentioned above, language is a fundamental factor for understanding how the colonialist structures have acted and the consequences for the descendants of indigenous. For many families, the transmission of the Mixtec language became something devoid of meaning given the ideological
demands of the Mexican nation-state, which has sought to impose a single language, Spanish, on the entire population. As Martina says,

My Dad used to tell my Mom not to teach us Mixtec because if she did, we weren’t going to speak very well and we were going to have a hard time and be discriminated against more than we are now. So we just spoke Spanish so we wouldn’t have a hard time. So, I didn’t learn it until I grew up and had children of my own because I wanted them to learn it because it makes me sad to think that I’m from Oaxaca and I don’t know how to speak the language. I feel that our not speaking it is like saying that the Spaniards won; we lost our language. So, I’m trying to learn again and so are they. (no date, Madera, California)

Migration and interaction with other socio-cultural groups has shown the descendants of Oaxacan indigenous that it is possible to remain close to their origins through defending different aspects of their culture. This is a response to the need to feel part of a world they were brought into in their childhood and where they have developed different forms for ethnic-cultural survival. The ethnic awareness that is awakened in interacting with other ethnic groups occupying the same space is part of a complex process of integration in which they resignify and reconcile memories of colonialism in the face of the new signifiers and challenges found in receiving societies.

IN THE MANNER OF AN EPILOGUE

In the early twentieth century, sociologist W. E. B. Du Bois proposed a debate about “double consciousness,” emphasizing that in the context of racialized difference, individuals are able to self-identify and situate their cultural limits vis-à-vis others.11 Franz Fanon’s approach centers on the mental nature of conflict, on psychological situations that affect the population of descendants situated in a multi-ethnic reality: the one inherited from their groups of origin and the one that the discriminatory, racist scenario reveals to them. According to post-colonial authors, these complex contexts form the subordinate subject, who has to modify his/her subjectivity vis-à-vis others, but in the framework of unequal social relations.

Walter Mignolo calls this conflict the remnants of the colonialist-modernity relationship surpassing the limitations of territorial thinking and overflowing historic memory.12 In this sense, indigenous social actors themselves name and place new values on their national historical, post-colonial heritage through new narratives, very often different from the traditional image of the Mexican indigenous, as a new configuration of their identity, to a certain extent the product of human mobility. 
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5 Naturally, this does not apply only to the indigenous population; we could say the same for parts of what is called the mestizo population. However, I am interested in focusing on the former here.


7 According to National Council for Evaluating Social Development Policy (Coneval) data, poverty levels among the indigenous population are practically twice those of the rest of the population: 55.1 percent of Mexicans who do not speak an indigenous language are poor, while 79.3 percent of the indigenous population falls into this category. Coneval, “Pobreza 2010,” http://www.coneval.gob.mx/cmsconeval/rw/pages/medicion/pobreza_2010.es.do.
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9 All names of the people quoted are pseudonyms.

10 Or, as Franz Fanon said, from the point of view of the effects on people’s mentality when subjectively fixing identities. See Black Skin White Masks (London: Pluto Press, 1986).
