CHAPTER 13

Drawing and Effacing Boundaries in Contemporary Media Democracy Work

Christina Dunbar-Hester

In recent years, particularly in the wake of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, a movement has emerged whose goal is to change the media system in the United States. This movement developed out of a regulatory environment favoring national broadcasting networks and corporate media consolidation, embedded practices of community media production and pirate radio, IndyMedia and the transnational "antiglobalization" movement, and the emergence of "new media" including the Internet. However, due to the heterogeneity of its constituents and the way in which it overlays other, related social justice agendas, the "media democracy movement" represents a "variegated, even chaotic field of collective action." Based on ethnographic research at sites where these constituents of the media democracy movement interact, this chapter sketches out key loci of intervention, including radical activist, "reform," and scholarly agendas.

This chapter focuses on the relational positioning of these different groups that each envision their actions to be in support of media democracy. Media activists and other kinds of advocates, including scholars, consider their work to be in service of wider, movement-level goals and a general notion of the public good; however, the various movement actors frequently find themselves experiencing difficulty collaborating with other groups who nominally share their goals for social change through critique of the media system. In examining the attempts of groups—including social scientists, media activists, and policy advocates—to collaborate, the chapter will explore resources on which actors draw: "boundary work" to establish differences between groups and an opposite impulse, which I call "boundary effacement," to reconcile them. These complementary practices of asserting difference between groups on the one hand,
and assigning coherence to their projects on the other, constitute a key dynamic of the movement for media democracy.

**The Background**

The observations in this chapter are drawn from ethnographic fieldwork mainly conducted from 2004 to 2008. That fieldwork was primarily oriented to the activities of the Philadelphia-based Prometheus Radio Project, an organization working to promote low-power FM (LPFM) community radio, both legislatively and by building new radio stations in partnership with community groups. This chapter aims to address the wider phenomena of media democracy activism and advocacy, not merely radio activism. Yet the ethnographic vignettes presented here must be understood as constitutively related to my research on radio activism; often, my observations of other groups occurred at points of interaction with the radio activists. While the points I make about the relational positioning of groups vis-à-vis one another are meant to shed light on the dynamics of media democracy activism generally, the radio activists are perhaps somewhat overrepresented in this account due to their centrality in my fieldwork. Nonetheless, the chapter is meant to offer a representative, if not exhaustive or wholly symmetrical, account of the shifting alignments and points of rupture between different constituents of the media democracy movement. This illustrates the overlapping and conflicting articulations of media democracy and media change that underpin the movement.

**Positions: Tensions and Complements**

During my fieldwork, a recurring theme was the radio activists’ awareness of disharmonies between their own understanding of politics and goals for media justice and social justice more generally and those of other groups with whom they interacted. While it was understandable that the activists would routinely disagree with groups such as the corporate broadcast lobby, an adversarial relationship with this group did not present particular difficulties for the activists as they went about their work and formulated their goals as an organization. More vexing was the fractiousness of constituents working in the terrain of media reform and media activism who desired to collaborate strategically in order to attain wider goals; disagreements between nominal allies were potentially much more frustrating. This chapter represents an opportunity to reflect on those differences, illustrating how positionality differences among constituents are negotiated in practice. An effect of this reflection is the location and interrogation of my specific position throughout the course of my own research process.
as well as more general thoughts about the consequences of ethnography and the politics of scholarly engagement.

Media activism may be a special sort of social movement, as it is characteristically embedded in other forms of activism, incorporating diverse and autonomous movements who share the goal of media reform but may also have independent concerns. Communications historian and Free Press cofounder Robert McChesney acknowledges this in his claim that “whatever your first issue of concern, media had better be your second, because without change in the media, the chances of progress in your primary area are far less likely.”

Also, media democratization efforts must be understood as split between groups who wish to use the media instrumentally to draw attention to their political efforts versus those who wish to change the media system itself. In other words, some groups hope to gain access to the media in order to have a platform for specific views, while others view structural change in the media as an end goal in itself; of course, it is difficult to fully separate structure from content because it is assumed by many that structural change will lead to content change. And of course movement actors pursue diverse tactics and ends. William Carroll and Robert Hackett distinguish between different modes of action among people working to change media systems, including: (1) influencing content and practices of mainstream media—for example, finding openings for oppositional voices, media monitoring, campaigns to change specific aspects of representation; (2) advocating reform of government policy/regulation of media in order to change the structure and policies of media themselves—for example, media reform coalitions; (3) building independent, democratic and participatory media.”

The first mode is represented, for example, by Media Matters for America, a nonprofit organization that monitors media content in order to correct conservative bias and misinformation in US news and media commentary, while the radio activists’ efforts fall along the latter two lines.

As Carroll and Hackett indicate, even among groups whose primary interest is media democratization, differences emerge. Examples of this abounded during my fieldwork; both radio activists and members of other groups would at times critique the goals or worldviews of other groups or individuals, calling into question any notion of univocality within the movement. Indeed, it is with no little hesitation that I write of “a” movement; while many actors believed themselves to be part of “a” movement, it was not necessarily apparent that they were all referring to the same thing. Even the terms used by groups who are putatively members of the same movement indicate their differing goals and differing degrees of radicalization (compare “media reform” to “media justice,” for example).

Anthropologist and Philadelphia-based Media Mobilizing Project cofounder Todd Wolfson argues that Indymedia is “in its essence an anti-capitalist
resistance," whereas an advocacy group like New York–based Fairness & Accuracy In Reporting (FAIR) frames itself as a “watchdog” of mainstream media that uncovers bias and censorship. Both view change in media systems as necessary to uphold democratic ideals, but as Wolfson writes, Indymedia’s scope is incredibly wide reaching: “The indymedia movement is working, in its ideal, as the backbone of a [newly cohering, spatially distributed] class formation.” Consider the mission statement of the Philadelphia Independent Media Center: “PhillyIMC seeks to play a major role in social, economic, and environmental justice movements by creating alternatives to the profit-driven agenda of the corporate media and providing an open forum for the passionate and accurate tellings of truth.” By contrast, Free Press (a Washington, DC–based advocacy group) offers this description of itself: “Free Press is a national nonpartisan organization working to increase informed public participation in crucial media policy debates, and to generate policies that will produce a more competitive and public interest–oriented media system with a strong nonprofit and noncommercial sector.” It should be evident from these descriptions that the scope and degree of explicit engagement with other social justice struggles may vary between different strands of groups working to promote media democracy.

Anthropologists Hugh Gusterson and Faye Ginsburg have both studied how people may come to have strong beliefs about polarizing topics. While Ginsburg studied pro- and antichoice activists and Gusterson examined nuclear weapons scientists and antinuclear activists, both found that people’s deeply held beliefs were often accompanied by what Ginsburg calls “collective narrative forms for interpreting” facts or events that they encountered in their lives; this was true for people on both sides of these polarizing issues. Something I noted in the course of fieldwork was that while the activists tended to deploy these narrative forms, policy advocates did not. An example is one Philadelphia–based activist who said, “A big problem [for] a lot of activists is that the more you get involved [in social justice work], the more you see how fucked up everything is, and how you really have to change everything in order to change one thing . . . A big problem of oppressed groups and activists is that they don’t have any access to the media, and I thought that building [a radio station so that] they could have their own show[s] would be a way to help everybody that I wanted to without focusing on one thing.”

Conversely, I observed that in Washington, when I asked people how they had come to the area of telecommunications policy, they might typically reply that they had gone to law school, become a law clerk, and been assigned to research an issue in telecommunications. Compared to the grassroots activists, these members of Washington policy circles displayed a much more dispassionate and agnostic attitude toward the area in which they worked. Even a former Federal Communications Commission (FCC) commissioner who was
hailed by activists and advocates as a strong supporter of LPFM characterized her interest in promoting LPFM as derived from her obligation to correctly interpret the statute governing radio and the public interest. Rather strikingly, the activists imputed a "conversion narrative" to William Kennard, the FCC chairman who oversaw the introduction of LPFM; in telling the narrative of how LPFM became legalized, they routinely said that he became passionate about LPFM partly due to learning about the role of unlicensed community radio in combating the apartheid regime in South Africa. (Kennard is African American.) When I asked his former chief of staff whether this was true, she would not speak for him nor confirm the claim; whether or not the conversion story is true, it seems significant that the activists wish to claim Kennard as "one of them" in terms of experiencing a profound and fervent commitment to media democracy. Whether or not policy advocates privately express more passion about these issues, the activists' reliance on these "life scripts" and policy insiders' aversion to them points to a difference in style. This distinction may present obstacles to collaboration even when policy goals are similar.

The 2005 National Conference for Media Reform (NCMR), sponsored by Free Press, provided a useful site to examine the internal politics of media democracy work. During and after the conference, the second of its kind, groups on the more radical-activist end of the spectrum voiced a number of critiques. First, a major concern for Indymedia participants was that the conference venue provided no dedicated space for media production and was not Wi-Fi enabled. This not only presented a practical obstacle to people who expected to report and blog from the conference but also represented to many a symbolic fissure between their goals and those of the conference organizers (perceived by many as a moderate, Beltway, "reform" group without grassroots engagement). After the conference, some participants posted their objections online: "NCMR suckiness/concerns included: lack of any focus on Indymedia & access to answers to questions people had about Indymedia; banging of heads between Indymedia & Free Press—because Indymedia is subversive and Free Press is reform-oriented . . . lack of an open media lab; framing of actionable items (in caucuses) as 'how can you amplify Free Press's message'; . . . lack of discussion about how capitalism is intertwined with the issues of the NCMR; and the lack of centering of media justice issues at the conference." Another attendee registered a somewhat complementary viewpoint but drew different conclusions, in that she was less bothered by what she perceived as the differences between Indymedia's and Free Press's goals for engagement:

It's interesting to see the continued tension between the small professionalized media reform ngo's [nongovernmental organizations] and participatory social movements like indymedia. On some level i agree with what
commenter] said, “I refuse to get upset with the reform conversations because it was a reform conference.” She’s right, it’s a reformist conference by reform-minded organizations with fundamentally reformist goals. That’s ok, they don’t want to tear down the system. It’s good that indymedia and other radicals are engaging and participating in that process while acknowledging that it’s a process lead by free press and the other NGOs.21

Though these participants were to greater and lesser degrees dismissive of Free Press (and other “NGOs”), they agreed that the concerns of Indymedia were fundamentally different from those of “media reformers” who were perceived as more institutionalized and less radicalized. And Indymedia itself is not immune from radical critique. One person who had been active in Indymedia commented to me that “Let 1000 flowers bloom’ is not a fucking politics—this is totally naïve!”22 by which he meant that more structured efforts were needed to put media production into the hands of people without power; he was extremely critical of the race and class backgrounds of the people he saw having self-organized to form Independent Media Centers (IMCs), at least in the United States.

Interestingly, not everyone was attuned to the critiques of the NCMR emanating from more radical groups. In 2005–6, Free Press handed over responsibility to administer a database and other program areas it had been planning about media research to the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) in New York City. That fall I met with an administrator at the SSRC, who was generally concerned about fractiousness between the media advocacy and activist groups with whom he was going to be working and their potential inability to collaborate with academics to produce research. He, however, viewed the NCMR as a success and was dismayed when he learned how unsatisfactory some of the Indymedia and radical groups had found it. He was explicitly worried about the potential for infighting between groups to present difficulties for the SSRC, which hoped to provide a clearinghouse for useful research but not mediate between the concerns of different groups.23 The SSRC initiated a grant-giving program area (“Necessary Knowledge for a Democratic Public Sphere: Bridging Media Research, Media Reform, and Media Justice,” funded by the Ford Foundation), providing grants to advocacy groups and academics working in collaboration to produce policy-relevant research.24 In spite of its concerns, the SSRC was indeed interested in facilitating specific types of relationships between groups and fostering the production of academically rigorous research that was of specific use to advocates.25

At the NCMR, some participants opted out of scheduled conference events to hold a small rally decrying the fact that Democracy Now!, a news program featuring Amy Goodman, was not broadcast in St. Louis. Wandering away from
the conference site of a downtown hotel, the activists set up a protest with banners and signs near a highway off-ramp. Concerned that drivers were flying by without noticing the protest, one Prometheus organizer spontaneously decided to get their attention by writing “Democracy Now!” across her belly with a marker and flashing her bare breasts and stomach at the cars. Whether or not this worked to capture the attention of the passers-by, her action seemed on some level a protest against the tone of the conference itself; she seemed to translate some of her frustration at the conference into an oppositional and “improper” bodily response. (Democracy Now! staff, including Goodman, looked on, and I do not know whether or how they reacted internally to this addition to their rally.) Of course, this mode of expression would certainly be off-limits if, for example, a congressional meeting about LPFM were to go badly. This indicates that maintaining decorum at NCPR was not her highest priority and, in fact, this breach in her composure may have served to mark a boundary between herself and the “media reformers.”

Commenting on Prometheus’s status in the terrain of work to promote media democracy, the same activist said, “Big nonprofits should be asking existing community media [outlets] working on getting media reform issues out [in] to their communities [to help them], not [addressing] a generic American public that doesn’t exist . . . The movement for a democratic media should not be run out of DC. Nonprofit policy groups only have ground to stand on because of the success of groups at the grassroots level.”

In fact, Prometheus organizers are quite thoughtful about the issue of their position in the spectrum of groups working on media democracy, making an effort to reflect on their goals and situate their organization accordingly. Another Prometheus activist said, “Radicalism is not extreme sports, to me. I’m working to advance goals within liberal reforms that are consonant with a more radical vision. I have radical ideals, but I’m also a pragmatist.” This issue of positioning can feel like a balancing act for Prometheus at times, as their organization seeks to display radical activist ideals and maintain credibility with radical and grassroots groups, while working within an increasingly bureaucratic nonprofit organizational framework, as well as within the legal and bureaucratic framework governing LPFM. Additionally, they are not immune from criticism from more radicalized elements of the microradio activism community, as some microradio proponents (such as Stephen Dunifer) deride efforts to incorporate low-power radio into a legal, regulated context. The same Prometheus activist who said that “radicalism is not extreme sports” wryly proclaimed that “Dunifer is a great anarchist and a terrible businessman.” He doubtless admires anarchism more and respects people for adherence to ideals. Yet in order to accomplish practical goals, he was willing to compromise some of his most extreme beliefs; in fact, he felt that there was a greater good at stake and that working
toward practical and attainable goals was the best use of his effort. In my observation, Prometheus seemed to navigate these differences by adopting a fairly tolerant stance toward groups with different views than their own—they not only work with nonpartisan reform groups but have forged alliances with conservative Christians on the issue of LPFM legislation—and through frequent reflection on their own goals and position. Still, much boundary work occurred in the organization in order to demarcate Prometheus from other groups with whom they work, mainly "Beltway" nonprofits and policy groups. (I do not mean to suggest that all of these instances of boundary drawing are reflectively self-conscious; indeed, they are often spontaneous and unmeditated means of managing anxiety about organizational change and maturation.)

The Case of Scholars

Another group with whom media activists may tenuously ally is academics. Throughout my fieldwork, a current of tension familiar to ethnographers over how to "give back" to one's "subjects" in exchange for providing access led me to consider how the projects of academics and activists differ and overlap. Of course, the question of whether and how to pursue advocacy and involvement in the issues one studies has been a concern of social science for decades. Some scholars choose to elide their own presence in studying activism and approach their subject as nonparticipants, though perhaps sympathetic ones,30 or as former activist-participants whose role as scholars overlaps very little with activists or other actors they study.31 Others, such as anthropologist Kim Fortun, find themselves contributing actively to activist efforts by using their skills as writers to aid people they are also studying, supplying mobilization efforts with written accounts that are clearly not written for a scholarly purpose.32

In my scholarship on media activism, I have not maintained a "symmetrical" approach;33 I have systematically elevated the status of the radio activists by giving them the most voice and their claims the most analytical attention in my publications. I also do not claim to have affected a "neutral" stance with regard to the controversy over whether consolidated, for-profit media is harmful to democratic discourse or whether a robust independent media system is preferable. That said, the research I conduct does not directly aim to address this problem, nor offer prescriptive, "upstream" conclusions that would bear on it, which has perhaps had consequences in terms of my relationship with activists.34

Once I began my most intensive fieldwork period, which included volunteering in the Prometheus office, we discussed ways that I could make myself useful. Some of my first tasks were to read and organize news files and produce an issue of Prometheus's newsletter. Later, though, the activists became
interested in meshing my skills with their needs, and I wound up volunteering as an “academic liaison”—I surveyed communications literature for work on LPFM, gave Prometheus database and library access through my academic affiliation, corresponded with academics writing on LPFM, helped draft and distribute calls for academic research desired by Prometheus, and occasionally met with scholars on Prometheus’s behalf. This represented a compromise in which my resources and expertise could be put to some productive use but without tying my research project to the production of knowledge that would directly benefit Prometheus.

And even though I was essentially given free rein in my research as far as the activists were concerned, they occasionally displayed a playful, reactive stance to my presence, sometimes introducing me as “our anthropologist,” calling themselves my “lab rats,” and, on one occasion, indicating that they were undertaking a particular project (a workshop to clean and repair two 1970s-era radio transmitters) in order to provide me with something to study (even though I had not asked them to do this). This provided me with a reminder of the issue raised by Pam Scott and her coauthors in which the presence of the researcher has the potential to actively change what she is studying. I would not take at face value the activists’ claim that they held the workshop purely for my benefit, of course, but they were aware that I was interested in the pedagogical dynamics of this workshop and the interactions around technical artifacts. Additionally, it is worth considering that the presence of an outsider interested in studying their organization was perhaps another indication to the activists that their organization was maturing or undergoing change. I do not believe that my presence in any way enhanced or legitimated the activists’ standing in contexts such as policy advocacy, but having an academic accompany them in these situations could have had the effect of framing their interactions and experiences with other groups as observable, causing a turn toward awareness of being objectified, analyzed, or formalized, not only for the activists, but also for the people with whom they interacted.

The radio activists desired research that would help them advance their goals. Before I began my project, Prometheus had already solicited scholarly research; during my fieldwork, they became even keener to find people to conduct research that could help them make the case that LPFM provided the benefits that they hoped for and believed in. At the five-year anniversary of LPFM (in 2005), the activists had begun to feel pressured to “prove” its merits in order to secure and, hopefully, improve its standing; they were especially nervous that existing metrics for the impact of (commercial) radio stations were inadequate to demonstrate the benefits of LPFM. Prometheus distributed a document that read,
Scholars! Have You Had Enough Of Morose Meta-Mediated Musings? Do you envy the impact that conservative scholars have over the national media policy debate? Are you ready to kick some ass? Then Prometheus needs you! . . . We're media activists, and we know how to make a difference. We've changed federal policy on community radio, and had a big impact in the media ownership debate. Problem is, none of us has more than a BA. We barely know Adorno from A Door Knob. So often we don't know what we're talking about. None of us even has a library card to a decent public or university library.36

Here the Prometheus activists mark a boundary between themselves and academics. Obviously, they do know Adorno from A Door Knob, but they are pointing to the need for academic production and credentialing of knowledge, which differs from the expertise they claim. The Adorno-A Door Knob quote also raises the issue of markers of identity between activists and other groups with whom they interact. The activists were occasionally very funny, and, I argue, sometimes used a tone of irreverence (as in the Democracy Now! incident) to reinforce an outsider identity vis-à-vis academic, policy and advocacy, or lobbying groups, for whom such outward displays of humor would be less appropriate or likely.

In addition to identity displays, another point of dissonance in terms of activist-academic collaboration is timing. As sociologist Günter Getzinger states, "A crucial problem of transdisciplinary projects is the different 'timing' of decision-oriented systems ('practice' [policy, activism]) and knowledge-oriented systems ('science' [social science; the academy])."37 Activist solicitation of scholarly assistance was often to aid in time-sensitive policy discussions, whereas the duration of an academic project is often much longer. When I searched for published research on microradio in 2004–2005, the articles I found took up the topic of 1990s microbroadcasting; the most current of them ended with the introduction of LPFM. For the activists, who sought up-to-date work on the impact of LPFM to use in making policy requests or in issuing comments on legislation, academic research ran the risk of being "stale" by the time it was published, often taking years to go through the academic publication cycle. The activists did attempt to scale their needs to the possibilities presented by academic schedules: "You have students that need projects and internships. Instead of having them write another comparative content analysis of Madonna vs. Britney Spears, why not focus your classes on real problems for community radio? Your research might make it into an official FCC rulemaking, and make a real difference!"38 Here Prometheus suggests to professors that a semester might be a unit of time that is mutually copacetic, trying to dovetail an academic calendar with an activist research need.
Seeta Peña Gangadharan has discussed what she calls the "knowledge production practices" of media activism. She approaches this topic rather literally, taking documents and reports produced by reform- and social justice-oriented organizations as her object of study. Printed documents, or what Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar theorize as "inscription devices," are a very important output of academic and scientific labor (and, as Gangadharan notes, reform and activist labor as well). Documents provide, perhaps, a ready point of comparison between academic and activist or reform projects. From my perspective, it is important to recognize that media activists' knowledge production practices extend to technological practice and political organizing, which may not easily lend themselves to direct comparison with knowledge products such as written reports.

Nonetheless, even when the products of academic labor in some ways resemble activists' knowledge products, the academics' work may still fail to translate to nonacademic projects in significant ways. At the 2008 annual academic professional society meeting of the International Communication Association (ICA) held in Montréal, Canada, ICA hosted a preconference meeting with the SSRC on the topic of "Bridging the Scholar-Activist Divide." At the meeting, participants discussed experiences collaborating across these communities of practice. People who worked in nonacademic roles raised the difficulty of understanding academic writing, even going so far as to suggest that it was hard to trust whether engagement of academics with activist-advocacy topics was conducted in sympathy with them because it seemed impossible to determine from the academic products.

Looking at the situation from the vantage point of scholars, Michael Delli Carpini, a senior scholar who has tried to promote academic work on media reform topics as dean of the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, stated:

I would say that "allies" is too strong, because I don't think we've figured out good ways to work together, but I think kind of kindred spirits, would [include] everything from local groups with a national impact like Prometheus, to some of the Washington-based groups . . . My own personal perspective is that . . . scholars and community activists don't always use the same language and aren't always clear with each other . . . And expectations usually get built that are really, really hard to fulfill, that include the idea that academia can provide data and research that would be useful, that the pace of life for activists and academics doesn't allow to happen very easily.

In spite of his acknowledgment that obstacles to collaboration are real, Delli Carpini formed, with scholars at other universities, a loose federation called COMPASS—a rough acronym for Consortium on Media and Policy Studies—in
The goals of COMPASS include placing graduate students in internships and other positions in Washington and potentially developing curricula that would include a public interest focus, likely at the graduate level. However, its goals remain largely inchoate. Delli Carpini reflected at some length on difficulties reconciling differing agendas:

I think that seeing each other's goals as complementary and overlapping, that can be worked out. I think that mainly requires more interaction, more honest, open, civil interactions, where you're in kind of a trusting space where you can talk freely about what you can bring to this... I fervently believe, from years of doing this, that the basic critique of media reformers is right. [And] I believe... that [getting] information out, with the imprimatur of good research... could play a very powerful role in bringing about reform. And I think that's the underlying premise of why I think that scholars should be involved in this. And that's not scholars as citizens, you know I can get involved in all kinds of things in my personal life, and be an activist on the side, but I'm talking about what I bring as a scholar, what the field can bring as scholars.

Like the radio activists, Delli Carpini invokes a boundary between scholarly projects and those of activists, and also like the radio activists, he focuses on ways that those projects could be brought in line with one another even while cognizant of difference.

Conclusions, Reflections

In this chapter, I have outlined how activists, scholars, and, to a lesser degree, reformers approach media change, each with their own priorities and strategies. I have also attempted to demonstrate how members of these groups may either enroll or mark distance between themselves and members of other groups, sometimes simultaneously. In essence, both activists and scholars are concerned with both marking difference and effacing boundaries in order to advance what they feel are the most meaningful, constitutive aspects of work to change the media system. Even while they recognize, and indeed highlight, distinctions between their goals and work styles, each of the groups I have discussed also strives to overcome these differences at times, in order to foster, if not collaboration, at least a sense of common cause or common way of seeing.

I want to point out that the insistence on "making a real difference," however it is defined, underscores the similarity in activist and academic projects around media democracy. Like activists, academics occupy a mediating position, making knowledge claims and mobilizing them across networks. As anthropologist Dominic Boyer suggests, a sense of critical agency pervades the work of intellectuals; elsewhere I have suggested that this concept may be useful in
understanding activism as well. Normative intervention does not necessarily flow from critical agency, but they are closely related, as an impulse to intervene is predicated on criticality, as well as the not-insignificant belief that social change is possible. Thus even out of the "variegated, even chaotic field of collective action" complementarity may emerge. Differences matter (even greatly), but efforts to strategically efface boundaries between groups may also yield productive alignments and unforeseen transformations.
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