WestminsterResearch

http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch

The Trouble with Community: Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Transnational "Community" Micro-archives

Huc-Hepher, S. and Ma, X.

The Trouble with Community: Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Transnational "Community" Micro-archives

Saskia Huc-Hepher & Xiao Ma

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1561-6898

https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8697-3071

Abstract

In 1996, social anthropologist Gerd Baumann noted that "ethnic minorities" are often called "communities" in British public, political and media discourses. Since then, the term has become increasingly widespread, with references to the "Chinese community" or "online communities" now not only standard, but generally deemed the most "culturally sensitive" coinage. In this chapter, focusing on our experience of curating diasporic "French" and "Chinese" "community" collections within the UK Web Archive, we argue that this normalisation serves to invisibilise the underlying problematics at play, particularly in the blurry in-between space of the transnational context. Drawing on French philosophical thought, specifically that of Jean-Luc Nancy and Jacques Derrida, alongside Benedict Anderson's seminal notion of the *imagined community* and contemporary xenofeminist ideas from the international collective Laboria Cuboniks, we shall investigate the trouble with "community" in three dimensions: first, constructing community, as web curation process and principles; second, deconstructing community, as concept in the transnational archiving space; and third, reconstructing community as xenofeminist antidote to the archive's endemic trouble.

Introduction

Despite the ubiquity of the term "community" in British institutional, political and media spheres, the concept lacks critical engagement in the context of transnational web-archiving. In the mid-1990s, social anthropologist Gerd Baumann (1996) observed how "community" was regularly used in reference to "ethnic minorities", and since, its use has only grown. Designations such as the "Chinese community" or "French community", "LGBTQ community" or "online communities" are now generally regarded as "culturally sensitive" without further interrogation. In this chapter, we draw on French philosophical Nancian and Derridian thought, alongside contemporary xenofeminist theory, to explore the often overlooked practical and conceptual complexities of transnational "community" web archiving.

The chapter stems from our lived experience of constructing transnational micro-archives (Brügger, 2013), within the overarching UK Web Archive (UKWA), for two ostensibly different diasporic groups: Chinese and French. Currently, diaspora-based special collections, including ours, are categorised under "Society & Communities" in the UKWA. This classification reflects a popularised perception in the UK heritage sector that "ethnic minorities" are "ethnic communities". The idea of "community heritage" is, however, contested due to the artificial homogenisation and divisions it establishes in society, which underscore "presumed differences between the white, middle class and the 'rest'" and between "heritage experts and 'everybody else'" (Waterton & Smith, 2010, p. 5).

It is in this context that we define "transnational 'community' micro-archives" as selective collections dedicated to perceived ethnic, cultural and/or linguistic "communities", who themselves have transnational migration backgrounds and whose

online presence challenges national digital borders. But defining and delimiting transnational "community" micro-archives is troublesome. On one hand, their inclusion in the UKWA (hosted by the British Library) pushes the boundaries of the national archive and transforms it into a fundamentally transnational space. That is, by bringing culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse voices into the national framework, the diasporic micro-archives serve to destabilise the borders of the predominantly (white) Anglophone .uk digital territory typically represented in the national archive and, in so doing, contribute to its decolonisation (Huc-Hepher 2021c). On the other hand, labelling the micro-archives as "community" collections erects new borders, creating a sense of a mainstream "us" and a marginal(ised) "them". These rigid "community" parameters are inconsistent with the ambivalence and fluidity that characterise transnationalism, since transnational identities – and archives – are "not rooted in a singular place, but are forged in and through movement between places" (Ang, 2011, p. 84). The digital traces of diasporic lived experience presented in our two web collections also travel between and across borders, in what we conceptualise as a transnational "in-between space", envisioned through a metaphorically trans-inclusive lens. It is in this blurry online context, where the Chinese web artefacts rub shoulders with the French and together diversify the national UK archive, ~~that~~ our definition of "transnational 'community' web archives" comes into its own and where we explore the trouble with "community".

The idea of a Chinese or French "community" micro-archive necessarily emanates from an idea of "Chineseness" or "Frenchness", but how does Chineseness or Frenchness function as a category in the post-imperial, post-print-media, transnational web-archiving context? Is a stable "community" construct compatible with the inherent fluidity of web-curation practice in the transnational in-between space? How does

"community" as a term and concept travel across linguistic, cultural and ideological borders? And how can a deconstructive application of xenofeminist principles help us reimagine the web archive along (trans-)inclusive lines that acknowledge the "trans-ness" (Ehrig, Jung & Schaffer, 2022, p. 14) of the diasporic and the digital? These are some of the questions we grapple with in our discussion of constructing, deconstructing and reconstructing the transnational micro-archive.

Given the paradoxical scarcity of transnational web-archiving scholarship on "community"[1] and its omnipresence as a term in the UK web-preservation context, there is a pressing need to problematise "community" in both its practical and conceptual dimensions.[2] This chapter will attempt to make inroads into precisely that interrogative space. First, based on our experience of *constructing* transnational micro-archives, we discuss the practical trouble with categorisation along "community" lines. Here, we highlight the dangers of ascribing a homogenous "ethnic" and/or culturo-linguistic identity to diverse individuals and the postcolonial implications of linguistic choices. In the second section, we *deconstruct* the concept of "community", drawing on Anderson's idea of the *imagined community* (1983) and Nancy's philosophical exploration of *being-in-common* (1986).[3] Here, we focus on the boundaries of "community" and its epistemological reach in a transnational archiving environment. In section three, we turn to contemporary xenofeminist theory (Hester, 2018; Laboria Cuboniks, 2015, 2022) as a means of *reconstructing* diasporic web archiving. Here,

---

[1] See, however, Ogden & Maemura (2021) for critical analysis of the boundaries of web-based collections and Huc-Hepher & Wells (2021) for work on diasporic web-archives; Taylor & Pitman (2020) on the (in)adequacy of the "classic" nation-state/region in digital contexts; and Diminescu (2012) for a conceptualisation of "e-diaspora" as an online post-migration community (which differs from our blended offline-online understanding).

[2] Other digital projects bearing the "community" label include the Latin America UK web-archiving project (Cross-Language Dynamics: Reshaping Community) and the 2023 launch of the UK-Ireland Digital Humanities Association's "Community Interest Groups".

[3] See Luszczynska (2012) and Baker (2020) respectively for rare, combined interrogations of Derrida and Nancy, and Anderson and Nancy.

using a metaphorically trans-inclusive lens, we propose to inoculate against the binary symptoms of the *mal d'archive* or archive fever (Derrida, 1995), by optimistically foregrounding in-betweenness and constructively deconstructing the archive. Although our collections and discussion of "community" are situated in the UK context, our fundamental arguments on the trouble with oversimplistic identity-based categorisation transcend national borders and, as such, are transferable to other transnational web-archiving settings.

Constructing transnational "community" archives: process and principles

Notwithstanding the obvious demographic differences between the London French Special Collection (LFSC) and the Chinese in the UK Special Collection (CUKSC) – which later became part of the East and Southeast Asians in the UK Special Collection (ESEAUKSC) – constructing them presented common *troubles*, particularly regarding institutional/curatorial language set against individual/collective identity. Similarly, while our curatorial methods diverged, we had a shared objective to preserve the fragile digital heritage of migrant populations in collections that are both *representative* and *inclusive*.

To meet the objective of *representativeness* when constructing the LFSC, an ethnosemiotic theoretical model was applied. The approach, as previously established (Huc-Hepher, 2015), draws on Bourdieu's three-stage field analysis paradigm (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) and entails 1. contextualising the field of study (i.e. the French diaspora in London) within the field of power (e.g. governing bodies, national institutions); 2. ascertaining the relationships and capital flows (economic/cultural/social capital) between different individual/collective players in the field(s) (e.g. commercial, media, associative groups); and 3. scrutinising habitus in

relation to field (i.e. individual characteristics and practices). In practical terms, this involved collecting web artefacts corresponding to each of the three diasporic-field scales: macro (e.g. the French Embassy, French Institute and Franco-British Council), meso (e.g. Poule au Pot restaurant, Ici Londres magazine, Tamise En Scène theatre group, London Basque Society and London French Rugby Football Club) and micro (e.g. individual artists' websites, like singer-songwriter Anne B's and the visual artist Eléonore Pironneau's, alongside personal blogs, such as Food for Thoughts, Lost in London or Teatime in Wonderland).

Curating the CUKSC and ESEAUKSC was a more organic process. The initial aim was to create a "Chinese in London" micro-archive to record the diverse experiences of Londoners who acknowledge "Chinese" as part of their multiple identities and to form a bridge between their offline and online lives. The strategy was to collect UK websites created by, for or related to "Chinese people", indicated by having "Chinese" (in English or Chinese) in the website name or "About" page (or equivalent). Three months into the process, however, on a backdrop of Covid-19-related racism, multiple challenges cast doubt over this research and curation rationale. One of the main troubles concerned the creation of a seemingly natural category of "Chinese" in the UK Web Archive and its incompatibility with the complexities of "Chineseness" as an ethnic and/or racialised category in Britain. Yeh argues that "the Chinese" are perceived "not only as an ethnic other, but as a racial other" (2020, n.p.). For obvious reasons, and as violently played out in totalitarian conceptions of community in the 20th century (Nancy, 1986), it is hence highly problematic to apprehend "Chineseness" purely in terms of phenotype, just as it would Frenchness.[4] Indeed, the racialisation of Covid-19

---

[4] There is a popular misconception in the UK that London's French inhabitants are an exclusively white, wealthy elite, meaning the experiences of Black French Londoners and other minorities are overlooked.

as a "Chinese" virus (Yeh, 2020) led to a dramatic increase in racial violence against "Chinese" people. Significantly, though, the perpetrators of Covid-19-related hate crime and microaggressions targeted anyone displaying a perceived "Chinese look", irrespective of the person's national or ethnic background (Yeh, 2020). As a result, many light-skinned East and Southeast Asians (for example, people of Korean ethnicity) found themselves victims of "anti-Chinese" racism (Yeh, 2020).[5]

Similar, albeit less extreme troubles presented themselves when constructing the LFSC. The field-based principles outlined above produced a corpus whose breadth only partially met the objective of *representativeness*. That is, the LFSC blogs, though predominantly created by French women, appear to belong to a middle-classed, ostensibly white, subgroup of the wider "community" (thus perpetuating the French diaspora stereotype; Huc-Hepher, 2021a). Equivalent observations apply to many LFSC websites, despite the triadic field-based modus operandi. And while our *inclusion* ambitions were partly addressed through a participatory curation model, it was difficult to involve diaspora members beyond a self-selected subgroup who play an active role in the "community". Granted, inviting diaspora members to suggest websites for the collections avoided a troublesome top-down curation process. Nevertheless, as these crowdsourced curatorial opportunities were often shared at public outreach events in conventional and/or official "community" spaces (e.g. the French Institute), or online via platforms associated with established organisations and authorities (e.g. China Exchange,[6] the French Embassy or British Library), the genuine inclusiveness of the co-creative practices is questionable.

---

[5] Lighter skin tones are stereotypically associated with essentialist notions of "Chineseness".
[6] China Exchange is a UK-registered charity raising awareness about China, Chinese culture and London's Chinatown.

Indeed, the act of web *curation* effectively becomes one of *creation*, in the sense of fabrication, when there is a disconnect between the "community" collection and those it claims to represent (Huc-Hepher, 2015). Fieldwork with French Londoners confirmed such a discrepancy, as most did not self-identify as "members" of the "French community", perceived as an elite based in the affluent South Kensington diplomatic quarter of London (Huc-Hepher & Wells, 2021). Some even expressed a strong sentiment of *exclusion* from the group (Huc-Hepher, 2021a, 2021b).[7] Validating Smith's assertion that migrants "are still classed, raced and gendered" in the diasporic field (2005, p. 238), a French research participant from a working-class background confided how he has "always felt awkward in French establishments [in South Kensington] … where people look down on [you] a bit or speak in a slightly rude way; where you sometimes feel inferior", to the extent that he now systematically seeks to "avoid … these cultural and administrative spheres".[8] This transfer of pre-existing social structures and class-related insecurities underlines the potential conflict of "community" archiving with individual lived experience.

Likewise, the term "Chinese community" is often ascribed to the entire UK-based Chinese population from diverse backgrounds, either imposed as a hegemonic homogenising label, implying imagined commonality, or strategically self-appropriated to increase visibility and deconstruct dominant discourses from within, recalling Spivak's "strategic essentialism" (1988, 1996). "Chinese community leaders", for example, sometimes adopt self-racialised constructions of Chineseness and promote a "shared community" for socioeconomic and political gain (Christiansen, 2003). Although the term "community" is a useful one for ethnographers and memory

---

[7] For information on methodologies and participants relating to the authors' broader ethnographic research, see Huc-Hepher (2021a) and Ma (2024).

[8] All quotations from primary research data and secondary literature recorded or published in French or Chinese have been translated by the authors.

institutions, empirically it is at odds with many diasporic residents' perceptions of selfhood, as evidenced by the contested nature of the social construction of a "Chinese community" and the class-based power dynamics experienced in London's official French institutions. The term "community" was consequently avoided in the naming of both collections to challenge the assumption that "ethnic minorities" are naturally "ethnic communities" and address "the fault lines of 'community' thinking along ethnic lines alone" (Meissner & Vertovec, 2015, p. 547).

The notion of "class" brings us to that of "classification" and the trouble with naming/metadata. From its roots in biological compartmentalising and hierarchising, classifying information has been a process of *differentiation* and, thus, implicitly of discriminating and othering. Institutionally, however, it is deemed essential due to the link between descriptive metadata and "value", for "[o]nly rarely is unlabelled or insufficiently labelled material of any use" (Cain, 2023, n.p.). According to this rationale, our web artefacts need labelling to be of "use", but such naming is not trouble-free (Huc-Hepher, 2015). Assigning titles and organising web objects, and by extension individuals, into ordered categories, reproduces the (b)orders, classes and socially constructed taxonomies (and racialisations) that exist offline, or worse, introduces ones that were not there at the outset. To avoid relying on abstract systems of class(ification), which reflect the researcher-researched power relationship, Bourdieu foregrounds practices as meaningful entry points into understanding social and cultural distinctions (Bourdieu, 1994; Reed-Danahay, 2020). Similarly, Anderson (1983) refers to style, materialised through a common language, as fundamental to the building of "imagined communities" as nations. This praxis-, style- and language-centred construct is effective theoretically and useful from a curatorial perspective, as it contributes to the three-stage approach outlined above and ensures migrants' everyday online lives are

recorded in the archive (Huc-Hepher, 2015). However, it is more problematic when organising and hence "making sense" and "use" of the archived diasporic web material. For how can troublesome divisions be avoided when classifying information, even according to a logic of practice or (generic, discursive, etc.) style?

In our desire to bring order and discoverability to the large-scale messiness of reborn-digital data (Brügger, 2016; Kitchin, 2014; Ogden & Maemura, 2021), we inevitably cause a tension between *inclusivity* and *navigability*. By *including* them in a community-based category, we *exclude* them from others. How can an inclusive curatorial strategy which rejects the othering associated with migration through negative UK media discourse and a politically "hostile environment" (Mazzara, 2019) be reconciled with an institutional framework grounded in utilitarian classificatory and navigational division? Take, for example, the founding principle of creating and naming a corpus of "French" or "Chinese" community web artefacts. While the preservation intentions are laudable, the implications are manifold. Should common language be the key defining feature of "community" identity, as initially suggested by Anderson (1983)? In such a framework, a London-French corpus would include web artefacts belonging to North and Sub-Saharan African "communities", as well as those from North American, West Indian or Polynesian webospheres, connected through a shared language and imperial legacy alone (Fanon, 1952[2015]).[9] Should, then, the corpus instead acknowledge the "fluidity of community boundaries and […] the challenge, and arguably futility, of attempting to assign specific habits and practices to a single heritage or community", including language (Wells, 2022, p. 57)?

---

[9] At the time of France's colonial empire, known as the *Communauté française*, the French language was imposed to erase cultural/ethnic/racial differences in the name of a collective "French" identity. Such linguistic "white-washing" is evidently at odds with the inclusive aspirations of the LFSC.

In practical and conceptual terms, the community micro-archive and its naming and cataloguing processes suffer from the tension at the heart of the archive itself. Derived from the Greek word *arkhḗ*, which simultaneously designates a hospitable home for authored (hi)stories *and* the authority of the memory institution bringing order and sense to material, the archive is, at its very core, troubled by its fundamental ambiguity (Derrida, 1995). Its hospitable function performs an openness to the Other, the *xenos*, as prescribed by xenofeminist principles, particularly in the case of multilingual diasporic collections. Yet, its naming and classifying conventions inevitably instate unwelcome/unwelcoming perimeters around categories, and around and between "communities". By ordering material into *types*, the risk of introducing stereotypes is never too distant, and so the discriminatory spiral of othering is perpetuated. Likewise, when constructing "community" collections and boxing material into "user-friendly", navigable compartments, the archive's authority takes precedence over its hospitality. And this is only accentuated in the case of multilingual collections within the predominantly Anglophone context of the UK Web Archive.

In the case of the CUKSC, we note several terminological/linguistic troubles connected to bringing classified order. According to the 2021 Census, only 0.7% of the overall population self-identified as "Chinese" in England and Wales (ONS, 2022). However, this single umbrella term encompasses a (growing) population who are ethnically, linguistically and culturally diverse, with complex migration trajectories and sociocultural influences from a range of geographical locales, including Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, mainland China, India and the Caribbean. The complexities of "Chineseness" (Wu, 1991) begin with the English word "Chinese" itself, which not only fails to communicate certain meanings but gives rise to misinterpretation (*ibid.*). A variety of terms are used in Chinese languages to reflect

racial, ethnic, cultural and national nuances. In Mandarin, for example, these include *Zhonghua minzu* 中华民族, *Hanren* 汉人, *Tangren* 唐人, *Huaren* 华人, *Huaqiao* 华侨 and *Zhongguoren* 中国人 (Wu, 1991; Lee, 2022). The meaning and use of each term is socially, historically, and politically specific.[10] In the UK, however, all these terms are typically translated as "Chinese", which flattens the subtleties of people's identities and complex migration trajectories.

As a direct response to Covid-19-related "anti-Chinese" racial violence (Yeh, 2021), the years following the start of the pandemic witnessed a stark increase in the number of UK websites using the term "East and Southeast Asian (ESEA)" in their names (e.g. Britain's East and South East Asian Network). This form of self-identification, although not entirely new, was borne of political mobilisation (*ibid.*), online and offline, and as a means of individual and collective healing. Online workshops and events were organised by new ESEA anti-racism and advocacy groups (in which the authors participated). Rather than privileging the "Chinese" experience, the term "East and Southeast Asian" was deployed as a tool to foster solidarity and combat racial inequalities. In a constructively destructive move, therefore, which, as xenofeminist ideals dictate, "seizes alienation as an impetus to generate new worlds" (Laboria Cuboniks 2015, p. 0x01), a fast-growing ESEA political identity (Yeh, 2021) was challenging the depoliticised "Chinese community" label. Actively engaging in this *collective* category-making in our web archiving practice therefore became essential to our commitment to anti-racism, particularly in a post-BLM (Black Lives Matter) context. Documenting the rise of this "East and Southeast Asian" identity online also became a new imperative. From August 2021, the curation process therefore

---

[10] This brief discussion serves only as a starting point to unpack the complex meanings of the term "Chinese".

switched from being one focused on a self-professed "Chinese" population only, to one geared towards the collection and preservation of websites reflecting the bottom-up, pan-ethnic development of an ESEA (political) entity.

Bringing this section to a close, it is important to stress how these contemporary web-classificatory barriers to inclusion and language-based metadata ramifications echo colonial power imbalances of the past. In the 17th century, Indigenous American languages were shoe-horned into the rigid and limited European alphabet of the colonisers for the sake of documentation and preservation (Dodds Pennock, 2023). Today, for the same reasons, overlapping, translingual, transnational and disorderly web data produced by diasporas finds itself ordered into the similarly confining categories and labels of the archiving authority. To agentively avoid reproducing imperial hegemonies of the past, it is therefore necessary to address these practical troubles when constructing "community" collections today. In the next section, we delve deeper into the complexities of "community" curation by deconstructing the concept of "community" itself.

Deconstructing "community" in the transnational web-archiving space

Neal & Walters argue that community is "an incomplete process through which people construct and create identities, and bond themselves to others, whether geographically, virtually or imaginatively" (2008, p. 237). In other words, a community is built not found, and identities within these communities are shaped by a range of factors, from age, gender, sexuality and profession, to culture, ethnicity, race, immigration status, socioeconomic status, etc. It is thus highly problematic to assume that "ethnic, cultural or national minorities" are naturally "ethnic, cultural or national communities". "Minorities" and "communities" are not synonymous. People who recognise migration

as part of their personal or family history might participate in community-building, but it is not necessarily related to cultural, national, ethnic or racial identity. There is no such entity as "the white community in the UK"; neither is there a "Chinese community in the UK" nor a homogenous "French community". Community is an ongoing process, not a stable entity. It is also, as Anderson (1983) argues, a creative work of the *imagination*, rather than an experiential fact. Just as it is impossible for every member of a nation to know every other member (*ibid*.), so it is impossible for every member of the Chinese or French diaspora in London or the UK to have a tangible connection with each other. Consequently, a Chinese or French "community" is an "imagined community" (Anderson, 1983, p. 65), which is not to say "there is no such thing as community" in a neoliberal, Thatcherian sense. [11] Rather, a collective sense of belonging is materialised textually through *communication*, through a common vernacular shared previously via print media (Anderson, 1983) and today chiefly on digital/social media.

This conceptualisation of community as a process constructed through communication, as opposed to an essentialist fact, resonates with the notion of community that French philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy spent a lifetime developing. For Nancy (1986), community does not involve an essential state of being, nor does it imply a split or contradiction between the individual and the collective, reminiscent of neoliberal political agendas, since community is only made possible through the *relationship* between the self and others, referred to as a "relational ontology" (James, 2020, p. 16). One's existence, rather than being confirmed by Descartes' dualistic (mind/body) thought-based model ("I think, therefore I am"), is, according to Nancy,

---

[11] Conservative prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, (in)famously declared: "[t]here is no such thing as society" (Thatcher, 1987, p. 30), underlining *individual* rather than *State* economic responsibility.

realised through *communication* at a more fundamental level: I express myself therefore I am. It is impossible for an individual to state "I am born" or "I am dead", as both extremes of existence are reliant on other people's articulation of one's presence in, and absence from, the world (Nancy, 1986, p. 68). Existence is, therefore, necessarily a common state, what Nancy terms "l'être-en-commun" (1986, p. 99), or being-in-common. The "in" is crucial here, as it places the emphasis on the in-between space, rather than on the idea of commonality in the sense of sameness. So, combining Anderson's imagined community through materialised communication and Nancy's notion of expression as the essence of existence, we see how our diaspora-based web collections realise a community presence through the expressive materiality of the web artefacts and how their shared (re)presentation in the transnational web archive constructs a sense of common cohesion. However, this common (re)presentation is distinct from the acknowledgement of a commonality of experience or identity.

Indeed, accepting that existence is conditional on a dynamic between oneself and others does not signify that the self is a common being, for "there is no common being, no common substance, essence or identity" (Nancy, 1986, p. 224): it is the existence of self *with* others that is the essence of our being, rather than a likeness *to* others that is our essence. In this sense, we form communion through our communication with others and not through a common set of (biological or cultural) characteristics, which, as Nancy is acutely aware, can lead to dangerous totalitarian conceptions of community at both ends of the political spectrum. If communication is essential to "being-in-common", then sharing a common language, as Anderson asserts but Nancy curiously overlooks in *La communauté désœuvrée* (1986), seems fundamental. Nonetheless, as discussed above, regarding both the French and Chinese diasporas, language muddies the waters of the being-in-common concept due to its postcolonial and transnational

undercurrents, not to mention many 2nd and 3rd generations not speaking the language of the "homeland". Does this, in turn, prevent them from "community" belonging?

One trouble with "community", then, is its insistence on a shared language, together with the tension between its simultaneous conceptual liquidity (as process and multiplicity) and fixity (as stable and universal). Moreover, this liquidity seeps into the conceptualisation and production of the archive itself. As Brügger asserts,

in contrast to the digitisation of a stable newspaper [the medium considered crucial to the construction of the "imagined community" in Anderson's paradigm], the Web that is to be archived is (potentially) in a state of flux and constant updates and changes. (2021, p. 219)

Unlike the "print-capitalism [of newspapers, which] gave a new fixity to language [and] created language-of-power" (Anderson, 1983, pp. 44-45), our diasporic web collections provide a counternarrative to the official media representations of migrant minorities and do so in an intrinsically heterogenous, messy and fragmented fashion. Missing links, multiple versions and intertextual contradictions are steadily becoming the norm rather than the exception. In this sense, our collections in the UK Web Archive provide an archontic home (Derrida, 1995, p. 12), a protective refuge for the diasporic web artefacts, but in a way that reflects the liquidity of the transnational experience and distinguishes itself from the concept of "community" as a hermetic whole. Rather than "community collections", we are effectively dealing with "[l]iquid homes" (Cohen 2018, p. 241, citing Bauman) and recognising the potential for multiple and changing identities within the singular conception of "community", as well as the dis-placed nature of the migrant experience and the fragmented reality of web archives.

If we accept, therefore, that a "community collection" transcends a single homogenous classification of Chineseness or Frenchness and comprises manifold identities, themselves "always plural and in process" (Brah, 2018, p. 238), its fluid in-betweenness is patent. In the transnational context of the London-French experience, the concept of "community" is also trapped between two rigid culturo-ideological frames, leading to a fundamental tension between the opposing understandings of "community" and "communauté", despite their lexical proximity. In Britain, the term "community" typically has positive, inclusive connotations in the public space. Now regularly used in the plural form by contemporary politicians as a substitute for *society*, "community" is defined by the NHS/ONS as "a very general term referring to the people living in a locality or to the locality itself" (Datadictionary, 2023, n.p.). This location-based definition fails to acknowledge the additional semantic reach of the term in English, namely, "people who are considered as a unit because of their common interests, social group, or nationality" (Cambridge Dictionary, 2023). In France, while the first dictionary definition of "communauté" aligns with the second aspect described above, i.e. a "social group whose members live together, or have common goods or interests" (Le Robert, 2023), there is a key difference between the English and French definitions. In addition to there being an absence of geographical (and national) meaning in the latter, there is a religious aspect not included in the former: "Group of religious people living together" (Le Robert 2023).

This addition is not innocuous, as it points to the underlying trouble with the idea of community in the French public consciousness. Being a vehemently secular State since 1905, France apprehends communities as being contrary to the Republic's universal ideals. As a religiously rooted construct, intertwined with sectarian notions of identity, "communauté" is consequently seen as a threat to the ultimate overarching

"imagined community", namely the nation-state, or what Laborde refers to as "le communautarisme national" (2016, cited in Kiwan, 2020, p. 4). Further, having been weaponised in French political and media discourses as a critique of both "racialised individuals … unwilling to integrate" (Wolfreys, 2018, p. 131) and of the so-called "Islamo-gauchiste", "woke" academic elite (Kiwan & Wolfreys, 2023), the notion of "communauté" has become highly charged and inextricably linked to "communautarisme" (communitarianism), itself regularly serving as "a metaphor used by 'respectable racism'" to oppose US/UK pro-diversity ideologies (Wolfreys, 2018, p. 100).

Beyond the religious/secular dissonance in the concept of *communauté*, the difference in the terms' semantic reach in English and French therefore results from the nations' diametrically opposed immigration paradigms: a multicultural model versus an assimilationist one. Thus, while ostensibly equivalent terms, the respective positive and negative connotations of "community" and "*communauté*" embody the transcultural and translingual tensions within the Franco-British transnational space to which the LFSC corresponds. The in-betweenness of the "community" concept is also applicable to the British-Chinese context, with multiple equivalents existing in Chinese languages. Originally referred to as "*jiben shehui* 基本社会" (basic/fundamental society) and "*defang shehui* 地方社会" (local society) in the early 20th century based on translations of the English "community", by the 1930s, "*shequ* 社区" was coined to blend the earlier terms (Ding, 2020). *Shequ* is still commonly used in China, but its meaning has evolved. While *shequ* tends to focus on locality, other terms describe "community" in different contexts and discourses, including *wangluo shequn* 网络社群 (online community), *ouzhou gongtongti* 欧洲共同体 (European Community) or *guoji shehui* 国际社会 (international community). These examples again highlight

the fluidity of "community" across the transnational space-time, but only scratch the surface of its conceptual complexities and elasticity in the Sinitic context. Furthermore, being based solely on Mandarin within China's borders, they neglect variations brought by differing uses and perceptions of "community" in Sinitic-language societies and cultures outside China (e.g. Singapore). In the UK, "Chinese community" translations include *shequ, shequn* and *shehui*, reflecting the multifarious interpretations of the "Chinese community" construct and loss of nuance in the Anglophone web preservation setting.

The conceptual tensions and inequivalences discussed in this section illustrate the ideological trouble with "community" in relation to the LFSC and CUKSC, and emphasise the significance of the in-between space in transnational web archiving, a point to which we return in the final section. With these complex community conceptualisations in mind, we need to ask what our so-called "community" web collections are for? Are they principally repositories for documenting "communities", or sites for documenting and preserving the multiple and intrinsically fluid processes and interpretations of community-building in the transnational space? As described in the previous section, grassroots groups are actively contributing to Chinese and/or ESEA identity category-making in the digital space. Likewise, although most French field-research participants unequivocally oppose the "community" label (Huc-Hepher, 2021a), having been conditioned by France's *communitarian* political and media discourses, the "common-unity" of their digital communicative practices (Huc-Hepher & Wells, 2021) testifies to the existence of a collective identity which belies their words. Moreover, through the materiality of the web artefacts and their common semiotic affordances, this collective identity, though plural and liquid, is given lasting solidity within the overarching national archive, rendering them fossils of the future,

connected through their co-location in the collections. This confirms Nancy's contention that history-making and community-making are interdependent, with the "history of a single person … never becoming historic until it belongs to the community" (1986, p. 253). As researchers and curators of these diverse diasporas, archiving their web artefacts thus serves to cement their collective presence and allows us to map contested processes of category- and identity-making, and better understand negotiations of borders and belongings. We are nevertheless aware that mapping, being built on the colonial "basis of a totalizing classification" (Anderson, 1983, p. 173), brings complex and controversial troubles of its own.

Deconstructing the term "community" in this section has raised important conceptual questions for the broader field of transnational web archiving. In the next and final section, we turn to the future. In the spirit of optimism highlighted by Ogden & Maemura (2021, p. 19), this chapter constitutes "a prompt to explore the space between the 'future promise' of web archives and the contemporary challenges they invoke for researcher use". Having looked back on the diasporic-web-collection construction process and looked inwards to deconstruct the very concept of community, it is now time to look forward and explore potential ways to relieve the "community web archive" of its chronic troubles through active, xenofeminist reconstruction work.

Reconstructing transnational "community" archives: a xenofeminist cure for the trouble?

From Derrida's original deconstructionist questioning of established oppositions and Nancy's "singular plural existence … [as] problem, ambivalence" (James, 2020, p. 21), through Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990), Donna Haraway's *Staying with Trouble* (2016) and Alison Phipps's *The trouble with mainstream feminism* (2020), to this

chapter, challenging established binaries and embracing in-betweenness through the prism of *trouble* has constituted a leitmotif in these different currents of philosophical and feminist thought. The focus of this chapter has been on the *trouble* with "community", as practice, term and concept. Such trouble is only intensified in the transnational web-archiving space, where terms and their underlying (political) ideologies come adrift in a disconcerting in-between space, floating amidst pre- and post-migration cultural frameworks. Equally disorientating is the in-betweenness of the web archive itself, embodying single-collective, online-offline, past-future, public-private binaries in one entity (Huc-Hepher, 2021c). Indeed, playing on the ambivalence of *trouble* in French (the noun meaning *problem/disorder* and the adjective, *blurry*), Derrida, in a Freudian challenge, posits that the archive's innate ambiguity is its "trouble" (1995, p. 141). And this blurry, generically trans identity (*genre* covering discursive/textual genre and gender in French) is seen to be at the root of the archive's conceptual and material malaise (Huc-Hepher, 2021c). In this section, we explore how a xenofeminist (XF) framework, which welcomes deliquescent ambiguity, can be applied to the dualistic troubles of *trans*-national community web archiving.

Although XF writing does not explicitly refer to "trouble", there are implicit allusions, such as the intertextual nod to Derrida's *Mal d'archive* (1995) in the contention that it is against political "maladies that XF inoculates" (Laboria Cuboniks 2015, p. 0x09). XF is also a self-proclaimed trans-inclusive, technomaterialist "politics for alienation" (*ibid*.), which aligns with the gender-que(e)rying theory of Butler (1990), the post-gender cyborg feminism of Haraway (1990) and the post-#MeToo feminism of Phipps (2020). Phipps challenges "borders of class and nationality [because they] are at one with the borders of gender" and contends that "[b]inary gender is a colonial and capitalist project" (*op.cit*, p. 156). Being closely linked to

cyberfeminism from the outset, the Laboria Cuboniks xenofeminist collective reassert their openness to liquid genders and identities in their 2022 publication, confirming XF's "commitment to *transfeminisim*" and rejection of "*categorical identities* in favour of a feminism based on always *malleable states* and *processes – transits* and *transformations*" (n.p.; our italics).

The above quotation shows how XF addresses several of the troubles discussed in this chapter: classificatory trouble when constructing "community" collections; the transits and transformations affecting understandings of "community" in transnational web-archiving spaces; deconstructionist recognition of the relevance and malleability of in-betweenness; and the processual nature of identity and archival construction. In view of XF's pledge to dismantle binaries and celebrate fluid identities, its embracing of contemporary technologies to achieve change and its core tenet to be welcoming of difference (Laboria Cuboniks, 2015, 2022), XF is a theoretical toolkit apt for the reconstruction of diasporic "community" web archiving. We contend that applying XF to transnational web archiving allows for the productive problematisation of "community" and transcends the dichotomies outlined above. XF provides a means to reconstruct web-archiving discourse/practice, avoiding postcolonial and "patri-archaic" notions of categorisation and differentiation, through its "construction of non-oppressive norms and hegemonies … so important now as technologies develop at an ever-accelerating rate" (Laboria Cuboniks, 2022, n.p.). To ensure that our transnational micro-archives counter persistent hegemonies, beyond their mere presence in the Anglophone national patri-archive (Derrida, 1995), which alone contributes to a positive translingual and transcultural queering (Huc-Hepher, 2021c), it is essential that web curators actively work against them and are attentive to the "inequalities of gender,

race, and class" coded into our digital worlds, without which "these blind spots will continue to determine our future" (Laboria Cuboniks, 2022, n.p).

When reconstructing "community" web-archiving practice, we therefore need a form of "xeno-hospitality" (Hester, 2018, p. 64) that simultaneously recognises and resists the reproduction of a colonial order through the naming and framing of digital diasporic culture, or what Tony Bennett (2009, p. 102) proposes as the "Museum-Field-Colony" triad. One way to mitigate an implicitly neo-colonial paradigm is to embed diasporic web-archiving in a wider ethnographic project and embrace co-creative, rather than appropriative, methods (Phipps, 2019). This transforms the process from a patronising "armchair" collecting model (Bennett, 2009) to one component of an ethnographic whole, grounded in reflexivity. Furthermore, "insider" researchers-cum-web-curators are equipped with the culturo-linguistic knowhow to cut through semiotic barriers to understanding, which guards against the warped (re)presentation of collective digital identity and future blind spots highlighted in xenofeminist thought (for what is considered of historic value for the collecting institution may not align with the priorities or lived experience of the diaspora). Importantly, therefore, this reconstructed framework defends "the immanent real of open community as the real itself" (James, 2020, p. 26) – a realness that recognises the messiness of everyday practice and blurriness of "community", while rejecting imperial logic founded on principles of ownership and division.

Indeed, geared towards the future as well as the past, "archiving produces as much as it records" (Derrida, 1995, p. 34; Appadurai, 2019). Archival inclusions, omissions and classifications are all building blocks for future memory, determining the discourse, filling or introducing gaps in knowledge and understanding. As such, to pave the way for the fullest record and most faithful narrative possible, a reconstructed transnational

web-archiving model must explore the breadth and depth of the diasporic webosphere. To minimise present curatorial bias and future skewing of the past, it must actively seek out transnational spaces hidden beneath unexpected top-level domains and ensure that institutional logics of class(ification) do not serve to divide and exclude, but are purposefully fluid, overlapping, potentially unintelligible (for the linguistically lacking), and consistently inclusive of the entities (re)presented. Brah contends that diasporas are "sites of hope and new beginnings. They are contested cultural and political terrains where individual and collective memories collide, reassemble and reconfigure" (2018, p. 237). The same can – or should – be said of diasporic micro-archives. With a moral obligation to the future as well as the past, "community" curators must resist the "[b]iological racialization" carved into collecting institutions' traditional "territorially and racially defined galleries [and classification systems] (the Black African Hall, the White African Gallery, the European Gallery …)" (Bennett, 2009, p. 106-7), or what Haraway terms the "Teddy Bear Patriarchy" (Haraway, 1984, p. 21). We need an archiving practice that transcends these neo-colonial divisions and agentively incorporates the heterogeneity of "the textual traces" of culture (Bennett, 2009, p. 104). A reconstructed transnational archival praxis must revel in the spaces *between* the contours of biology and in the fluidity of identity. It should produce – albeit a cliché – a unity borne of plurality, or in Baker's (2020, p. 225) construal of Nancy, one that acknowledges "that we are all singular human beings, with a matrix of differences in common".

In its non-binary attitude to difference, which recalls Derrida's deconstructive aspirations and "openness to alterity" (Luszczynska, 2012, p. 3), xenofeminism provides a pathway from Bennett's historic Museum-Field-Colony model to a dynamic Community-Archive-Community one. It is a model where the diaspora co-construct the

micro-archive on the basis of their own insights and knowledge, and the archive lays the foundations for a complete picture of the diasporic presence, in all its slimy (VNS Matrix, 1991, cited in Laboria Cuboniks, 2022) and contradictory heterogeneity, for the benefit of future generations.

Let us espouse the xenofeminist force that recognises how we "are thrown into this world of flesh, carved up by gender [and race] and skewed by power" (Laboria Cuboniks, 2022, n.p.) and resist these predestined inequities by reconstructing "community" micro-archiving according to XF's inclusive and gender/genre-abolitionist principles. The effectiveness of applying such an XF theoretical framework to the LFSC has been previously demonstrated (Huc-Hepher, 2021c), but, as yet, other transnational micro-archives have not been exposed to an XF lens. So, regarding the CUKSC and ESEAUKSC, xenofeminist reconstruction work could involve renaming the collections as "Becoming (British) Chinese in the UK" and "ESEA political mobilisation and community-building" respectively. This would highlight the dynamism of group-making and contextual contingencies of community-building. Web artefacts in both collections could be tagged in several collections to acknowledge their multiple belongings and dismantle classificatory borders. When analysing ESEAUKSC web artefacts, researchers could use "issue-mapping", i.e. identifying and analysing the issues (e.g., hate crimes) triggering the term "ESEA" online, to critically examine the "ESEA" construct (Wark *et al*., 2022). This approach would enable researchers to switch their focus from the identity category to the complex process of identity-category-making.

Embracing the "Questioning paradigm" of archival thought, which acknowledges themes of diversity and representation and understands the communicative function of archives (Ridener, 2009, p. 151), we therefore propose a reconstruction of the

"community" micro-archive along the following metaphorically trans-inclusive xenofeminist lines. National archiving institutions should support efforts to involve researchers or subject-specialists in transnational selective web archiving. Their culturo-linguistic expertise and sensibilities will help to 1) empathetically decode the translingual web objects identified and avoid cultural *faux pas*; 2) support inclusive classification methods; and 3) actively engage grassroots (social) networks in the curation process, including groups/individuals not explicitly geared towards "community" work (e.g. religious, sports, etc.). Moreover, involving humanities' researchers in web-curation activities and incorporating web archiving in an overarching (ethnographic) research project has significant symbiotic value. Knowledge of the offline diasporic spaces provides leads for the identification of collectable web artefacts, and searching for web artefacts in the transnational webosphere introduces new offline spaces worthy of attention in the field. True to xenofeminist principles, this dynamic archiving-research process is welcoming of the "entanglements of locations (both on and off-line) that mutually co-constitute one another" (Laboria Cuboniks, 2022, n.p.), and is concurrently immersive and productive. It deepens the researcher's experiential knowledge of the population and provides a lasting digital record of their physical presence. Beyond the exploratory benefits of the archiving process and consultative stability and framing affordances of the micro-archive as product (Ogden & Maemura, 2021), memory institutions also benefit from the symbiosis. Researcher dissemination, academic repurposing (e.g., in the classroom) and public-engagement activities bring new audiences to, and uses of, web archive(s), as well as bringing new, transdisciplinary theorisation and methodologies.

To challenge the borders that "community" categories erect, collecting institutions should encourage the cross-collection tagging described above. This would perform

both Nancean being-*in*-common and inclusive XF objectives. They must endeavour to provide curator tools in multiple languages and facilitate naming/metadata protocols that recognise diasporic fluidity and plurality. Memory institutions should also consider referring to diaspora/ic, as opposed to "community" or even "transnational", since the notion of transnationalism is based on one of nationalism. Identification with an imagined national space, an "imagined homeland" (Rushdie, 2018) or an "imagined community" is often at odds with individual belongings and powerful regional, or translocal selfhoods (Gielis, 2009; Huc-Hepher, 2021; Huc-Hepher & Lyczba, 2024). In view of this blurry, unstable transness, web curators should move towards a "'deterritorialized diaspora'" (Cohen, 2018, p. 242; Taylor & Pitman, 2020) that transcends geographical, phenotypical, cultural and linguistic divides. According to Laboria Cuboniks (2022, n.p.), "[b]iology ceases to be destiny only insofar as we are free to control our biology and refuse to let it merely be a means by which we, ourselves, are controlled by others". Web curators and archives should, then, defy the binary hegemonies embedded in conventional preservation practices and embrace a post-biological, post-taxonomic, translanguaging and transcultural order.

Concluding thoughts: towards trans-unity

Drawing on Nancy's and Derrida's philosophy, alongside Laboria Cuboniks' contemporary xenofeminist thought, in this chapter we have examined the trouble with "community" in three dimensions. First, we addressed constructing community, as web curation/archiving process and principles. Second, we deconstructed community as a concept in the transnational archiving space. Third, we explored how community could be reconstructed as a xenofeminist antidote to the archive's endemic trouble. The chapter has shown that the transnational web archive is a liquid space, where the fluid

seeping of identities and blurring of meanings across linguistic, cultural and national borders are only troublesome when attempting to contain them in hermetically bordered "community" categories. If we accept Nancy's contention that community is necessarily diverse and that, like (online) communication, it is "without limits and the being in common communicates itself to the infinity of singularities" (1986, p. 167), we can contribute to a positive rethinking of the diasporic web collection along permeable "open community" lines (James, 2020).

In keeping with both the conception of community developed by Nancy and that of space developed by Massey, the transnational *community* web-archiving *space*, is, therefore, in "the sphere of possibility … of coexisting heterogeneity" (Massey, 2005, p. 9). It is an in-between space (hyper)linked through a common-unity of online semiotic and linguistic practices, yet fundamentally plural. This liminal space where the self ends and the other begins, and where nations merge in diasporic lived experience, should not be apprehended as a divisive borderland. Rather, it is a deterritorialised "contact zone" (Pratt, 1991), blurring the boundaries between pre- and post-migration places and between the physical places migrants inhabit and the digital worlds they create. It is a post-taxonomical space that permeates beyond transnationalism and beyond community to a moist and fertile "transunity".

References

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.

Ang, I. (2011). Unsettling the national: Heritage and diaspora. In H. Anheier & Y. R. Isar (Eds.), *Heritage, Memory and Identity* (pp. 82-94). Sage.

Appadurai, A. (2019). Traumatic Exit, Identity Narratives, and the Ethics of Hospitality [Electronic version]. *Television & New Media*, *20*(6), 558-565.

Baker, E. (2020). From 'Imagined' to 'Inoperative' Communities: The Un-working of National and Latin American Identities in Contemporary Fiction. In C. Davies & R. O'Bryen (Eds.) *Transnational Spanish Studies* (pp. 213-226). Liverpool University Press.

Baumann, G. (1996). *Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-Ethnic London*. Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, T. (2009). MUSEUM, FIELD, COLONY [Electronic version]. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, *2*(1-2), 99-116.

Bernal, V. (2018). Nations, Migration, and the world wide web of politics. In K. Stierstorfer & J. Wilson (Eds.) *The Routledge Diaspora Studies Reader* (pp. 257-64). Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Raisons pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action*. Editions du Seuil.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1992). *Réponses. Pour une anthropologie réflexive*. Editions du Seuil.

Brah, A. (2018). Cartographies of diaspora. In K. Stierstorfer & J. Wilson (Eds.) *The Routledge Diaspora Studies Reader* (pp. 235-8). Routledge.

Brinkerhoff, J. (2009). *Digital Diasporas: Identity and Transnational Engagement*. Cambridge University Press.

Brügger, N. (2013). Web historiography and Internet Studies: Challenges and perspectives [Electronic version]. *New Media & Society*, *15*(5), 752-764.

Brügger, N. (2016). Digital humanities in the 21st century: digital materials as a driving force. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, *10*(2), n.p.

Brügger, N. (2021). The Need for Research Infrastructures for the Study of Web Archives. In D. Gomes *et al*. (Eds.) The Past Web: Exploring Web Archives (pp. 217-24). Springer.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.

Cain, A. J. (2023). Taxonomy. *Encyclopaedia Britannica.* Retrieved February 27, 2024, from

https://web.archive.org/web/20240307212609/https://www.britannica.com/science/taxonomy/Nomenclature

Cambridge Dictionary (2023) Community. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from

https://web.archive.org/web/20240307214020/https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/community

Christiansen, F. (2003). *Chinatown, Europe: An Exploration of Overseas Chinese Identity in the 1990s*. Routledge Curzon.

Cohen (2018). Solid, ductile and liquid: changing notions of homeland and home in diaspora studies. In K. Stierstorfer & J. Wilson (Eds.), *The Routledge Diaspora Studies Reader* (pp. 239-43). Routledge.

Datadictionary (2023). NHS Data Model and Dictionary – Community. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from

https://web.archive.org/web/20240307214126/https://www.datadictionary.nhs.uk/nhs_business_definitions/community.html

Diminescu, D. (2012). Introduction: Digital methods for the exploration, analysis and mapping of e-diasporas [Electronic version]. *Social Science Information*, *51*(4), 451-458.

Ding, Y.Z. 丁元竹 (2020*) Zhongwen shequ de youlai yu fazhan jiqi qishi* 中文 "社区"的由来与发展及其启示 (The Origin, Development and Inspiration of the Chinese

Concept of "Community"). *Minzu yanjiu* 民族研究 *(Ethno-National Studies), 4*, 20-29.

Derrida, J. (1995). *Mal d'archive. Une impression freudienne*. Editions Galilée.

Dodds Pennock, C. (2023). *On Savage Shores: How Indigenous Americans Discovered Europe*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Ehrig, S., Jung, B. C., & Schaffer, G. (2022). *Exploring the Transnational Neighbourhood: Perspectives on Community-Building, Identity and Belonging*. Leuven University Press.

Fanon, F. (1956 [2015]) *Peau noire, masques blancs*. Editions Points.

Gielis, R. (2009). A Global Sense of Migrant Places: Towards a Place Perspective in the Study of Migrant Transnationalism. *Global Networks*, *9*(2), 271-287.

Gilroy, P. (2004). *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1984). Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908-1936 [Electronic version]. *Social Text*, *11*, 20-64.

Haraway, D. (1990). *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature.* Routledge.

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Hester, H. (2018). *Xenofeminism*. Polity.

Hine, C. (2015). Ethnography for the Internet. Bloomsbury.

Huc-Hepher, S. (2015). Big Web data, small focus: An ethnosemiotic approach to culturally themed selective Web archiving [Electronic version]. Big Data & Society, 2(2), 1-15.

Huc-Hepher, S. (2021a). *French London: A blended ethnography of a migrant city*. Manchester University Press.

Huc-Hepher, S. (2021b). Navigating the London-French Transnational Space: The Losses and Gains of Language as Embodied and Embedded Symbolic Capital [Electronic version]. *Languages*, *6*(1), 57.

Huc-Hepher, S. (2021c). Queering the web archive: A xenofeminist approach to gender, function, language and culture in the London French Special Collection [Electronic version]. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*, *8*, 298.

Huc-Hepher, S. & Lyczba, F. (2024) "Sorry, I'm French": Frenchness as Uneasy Resource in the Construction of Home, Identity and Belonging among French Students in London. In C. Wang & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Negotiating Identities, Language and Migration in Global London: Bridging Borders, Creating Spaces* (pp. 52-77). Multilingual Matters.

Huc-Hepher, S. & Wells, N. (2021). Exploring Online Diasporas: London's French and Latin American Communities in the UK Web Archive. In D. Gomes *et al*. (Eds.) The Past Web: Exploring Web Archives (pp. 189-201). Springer

James, I. (2020). On Open Community: Nancy, Laruelle, and the Un-Determination of the Real. In C. Bax & G.-J. van der Heiden (Eds.) *Continental Perspectives on Community: Human Coexistence from Unity to Plurality* (pp. 15-28). Routledge.

Kitchin, R. (2014). The Data Revolution. Sage.

Kiwan, N. (2020). Secularism, Islam and Public Intellectuals in Contemporary France. Manchester University Press.

Laborde, C. (2016). Elle a perdu son âme. *Libération*, 22 November. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from https://www.liberation.fr/debats/2016/11/22/elle-a-perdu-son-ame_1530196/

Laboria Cuboniks (2015). Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from

https://web.archive.org/web/20240307215604/https://laboriacuboniks.net/manifesto/xenofeminism-a-politics-for-alienation/

Laboria Cuboniks (2022). New Vectors from Xenofeminism. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from https://web.archive.org/web/20240307215621/https://lab.cccb.org/en/new-vectors-from-xenofeminism/

Le Robert (2023). Communauté. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from

https://web.archive.org/web/20240307215647/https://dictionnaire.lerobert.com/definition/communaute

Lee, G. (2022). What is Chinese (online). Irish Institute for Chinese Studies, University College of Dublin. Thursday 7 April 2022. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bzq4X9vAtkU

Luszczynska, A. M. (2012). *The Ethics of Community: Nancy, Derrida, Morrison and Menendez.* Bloomsbury.

Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. Sage.

Mazzara, F. (2019). *Reframing Migration: Lampedusa, Border Spectacle and the Aesthetics of Subversion*. Peter Lang.

Ma, X. (2024). Contesting Everyday (food) Heritage in London's Chinatown. In C. Wang and T. Lamb (Eds.), *Negotiating Identities, Language and Migration in Global London: Bridging Borders, Creating Spaces* (pp. 235-262). Multilingual Matters.

Meissner, F. and Vertovec, S. (2015). Comparing super-diversity [Electronic version]. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *38*(4): 541-555.

Nancy, J.-L. (1986). *La Communauté désœuvrée*. Christian Bourgois Editeur.

Neal, S. and Walters, S. (2008). Rural be/longing and rural social organisations: conviviality and community-making in the English countryside. *Sociology*, *42*(2), 279-297.

Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2022). ONS website, statistical bulletin, Ethnic group, England and Wales: Census 2021.

Ogden J, Maemura E (2021). 'Go fish': Conceptualising the challenges of engaging national web archives for digitial research [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Digital Humanities*, 1-21.

Phipps, A. (2019). *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate.* Multilingual Matters.

Phipps, A. (2020). *Me, not you: The trouble with mainstream feminism*. Manchester University Press.

Pratt, M. (1991). Arts of the Contact Zone [Electronic version]. *Profession*, 33-40.

Reed-Danahay, D. (2020). *Bourdieu & Social Space: Mobilities, Trajectories, Emplacements*. Berghahn.

Ridener, J. (2009) *From Polders to postmodernism: a concise history of archival theory*. Litwin Books.

Rushdie, S. (2018). Imaginary Homelanads. In K. Stierstorfer & J. Wilson (Eds.), *The Routledge Diaspora Studies Reader* (pp. 227-229). Routledge

Smith, M. P. (2005). Transnational Urbanism Revisited [Electronic version]. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *31*(2), 235-244.

Spivak, G. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak?. In L. Grossberg & C. Nelson (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 66-111). Macmillan.

Spivak, G. (1996). Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography? In D. Landry and G. MacLean (Eds.), *The Spivak Reader* (pp. 203-37). Routledge.

Taylor, C. & Pitman, T. (2020). Digital Culture and Post-regional Latin Americanism. In C. Davies and R. O'Bryen (Eds.), *Transnational Spanish Studies* (pp. 195-211). Liverpool University Press.

Wark *et al*. (2022). East and Southeast Asians: Documenting a Category in the Making. The Public Data Lab. Retrieved 27 February, 2024, from https://web.archive.org/web/20240307215759/https://publicdatalab.org/projects/esea/

Wells, N. (2022). Networking and Representing the Transnational Neighbourhood Online: The Linguistic Landscapes of Latin Americans in London's Seven Sisters. In S. Ehrig, B. C. Jung, & G. Schaffer (Eds.), *Exploring the Transnational Neighbourhood: Perspectives on Community-Building, Identity and Belonging* (pp. 115-136). Leuven University Press.

Waterton, E. & Smith, L. (2010). The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *16*(1-2), 4-15.

Wolfreys, J. (2018). *Republic of Islamophobia: The Rise of Respectable Racism in France.* C. Hurst & Co.

Wu, D. Y. (1991). The Construction of Chinese and Non-Chinese Identities [Electronic version]. *Daedalus, 120*(2), 159-179.

Yeh, D. (2020). Covid-19, Anti-Asian Racial Violence, and The Borders of Chineseness [Electronic version]. *British Journal of Chinese Studies*, *10*, n.p.

Yeh, D. (2021). Becoming British East Asian and Southeast Asian [Electronic version]. *British Journal of Chinese Studies, 11,* 53-70.