

International History

Academic year 2020-2021

Histories of Migration: From the North Atlantic to the Global Turn

HI113 - Spring - 6 ECTS
Tuesdays 10:15am–12:00 – Room P3-506

Course Description

This seminar provides an overview over the major scholarly trends in the burgeoning field of migration history since the emergence of the Chicago School of Sociology in the 1920s. It then proceeds to test different theoretical and methodological approaches on the basis of comparative case studies, focusing on long-distance migration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, particularly in the Atlantic world and, to a lesser extent, in Asia. Students will thus learn about the history of some of the best-known countries of mass immigration, such as the United States and Argentina, but also familiarize themselves with examples of other types of migration in other world regions, such as indentured laborers in South (east) Asia and the Caribbean. The ultimate aim is twofold: First, debate the extent to which migration in the period that we study should be analyzed as a single phenomenon at all; second, learn about the reasons for and the long-term consequences of migration for our contemporary world.

> PROFESSOR

Michael Goebel
michael.goebel@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours

Wednesdays 10–12
(online only this semester; see below for details)

> ASSISTANT

Daniel Dossou
ayode.dossou@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours

Monday 14:15–16:00

Syllabus

Course Requirements

1. Term Paper: 55% of final grade; 4,000 words; deadline June 11, 2021 (by email to professor and TA)

Term papers of 4,000 words (including the footnotes, but excluding the bibliography) should deal with a clearly circumscribed historical topic and address a viable research question. Topic and question should be related to

migration history, be developed by the student, and discussed in advance with the instructor. For this purpose, students must submit (by email, to professor and TA) a 300-word abstract by April 30, which states the title, topic, question, and structure of the future paper. This serves as a basis for discussion in the office hour. Once you submitted your abstract please make an appointment here for the office hour: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ECmV28YZOkGQrTE6_UVThlx8BmjIw2MfYvmGhN6Tzq4/edit#gid=0 Then please create an online meeting (Webex, Zoom, etc.) and send an invite to michael.goebel@graduateinstitute.ch

For general reference of how to write term papers, please read the guidelines (available on Moodle) carefully. Two sessions will be devoted to academic writing. When in doubt you can also refer to this online guide for writing academic research papers: <https://writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/index.html>

2. Book Presentation and Review: 25% of final grade; 800–1,000 words; deadline Friday noon before class presentation.

From the week-by-week list below you must choose one book to present in class and write a review of it. Book reviews are standalone pieces of 800–1,000 words, which should summarize the book's content (ideally not on a chapter-by-chapter basis, but as a whole), approach, and main arguments in relation to the wider historiography of the relevant topic. They should also contain explicit praise and/or criticism. For reference, please read yourself through the book reviews of the *American Historical Review* as well as prior reviews of the book that you pick. The reviews must be submitted to all course participants by Friday noon before your presentation of the book. Feedback on the written reviews will be provided in the office hour (ideally together with discussing your abstract, if possible).

The book presentation in class should be concise (7 minutes as an absolute maximum) and refrain from summarizing the book's content once more, which through your written review will be known to all course participants before your presentation. Rather, it should relate the book's arguments to the general required reading of the session in which you present the book. Does it support or complement the arguments made in the required reading? In what way? Does it shed a different light on them or contradict them? Your presentation should thus serve as an opener of the discussion rather than as a standalone review.

3. Class Participation: 20% of final grade

Just like an orchestra, a history seminar is only as good as the individual effort of all its participants. Please come to every class equipped with a thorough reading of the assigned texts, prepared answers to the questions that you find below for each session, as well as questions of your own. Make yourself heard in class and we will all benefit as a group.

Course Structure

The seminar begins with a broad overview of the benefits and pitfalls of widening the purview of migration history beyond its classic focus on the late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century North Atlantic. Here, we will generally enquire about the usefulness of macro-perspectives in migration history, with a particular view on whether they contribute anything to the importance of networks in migration history (week 2), understandings and definitions of migration altogether (week 3), the reasons for migration (week 4), and the relationship between free and unfree migrations (week 5). This is followed by a second block (weeks 7 through 9), which deals with the legacies of old paradigms concerning the relationship between migration and the nation-state. The remaining sessions (weeks 10 through 14) have a more topical focus. In each of these weeks, we will deal with a historical topic (such as the relationship between migration and international history, migration and race, or migration and decolonization) that has come to the fore in the last decades' scholarship on the global history of migration.

Please read the topical introduction and the question for each week below and come to class prepared with an answer. In order to spread participation in our discussion, I will typically ask one student per week to offer their thoughts on these questions, so to kick-start our discussion. Some of the more topical weeks include the reading of different kinds of primary sources. This isn't much work, but hopefully helps the discussion. So, please look at these sources with the question in mind of whether they support or contradict—or how they relate to—the main argument of the required reading in that week.

1. Introduction (23 Feb, 10.15–12)

Who are we? Distribution of presentations.

Methods and Techniques:

How to prepare and deliver a good presentation. The 5–7-minute rule, brevity, and precision.

Hein de Haas, “Myths of Migration: Much of What We Think is Wrong,” March 29, 2017:
<http://heindehaas.blogspot.com/2017/03/myths-of-migration-much-of-what-we.html>

2. How Global Should Our Angle Be and What Does It Help? (2 Mar, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

The article on “global migration” by the late Adam McKeown, which you should read first, has done much to “globalize” migration history as a field. But what good does this globalization of sorts do, besides simply expanding coverage? Do we really need to know it all in order to better understand individual historical cases of migration? And, to mention a particular sub-question of today (and next week): Should internal and transnational migration be treated together, or can or should they be disentangled?

Required Reading:

Adam McKeown, “Global Migration, 1846–1940,” *Journal of World History* 15, no. 2 (2004): 155–189.
Leslie Page Moch, “Connecting Migration and World History: Demographic Patterns, Family Systems and Gender,” *International Review of Social History* 52, no. 1 (2007): 97–104.
David Feldman, “Global Movements, Internal Migration, and the Importance of Institutions,” *International Review of Social History* 52, no. 1 (2007): 105–109.
Adam McKeown, “Regionalizing World Migration,” *International Review of Social History* 52, no. 1 (2007): 134–142.

Techniques: Finding, Reading, and Writing Book Reviews

3. History and Reasons for Migration (9 Mar, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

Why do people migrate? There are of course as many answers to this question as there have been migrants in world history. Yet, starting from Douglas Massey’s survey article, in this session we will ask which scholarly models of explanation we find particularly compelling, and how they interact. More specifically, we will enquire about what history can bring to the table of scholarly debates about the reasons for migration. We will thus focus on a recent debate among historians concentrating on the argument of a so-called “mobility transition,” according to which the early nineteenth century, owing to a combination of certain factors, completely overhauled the prospects and realities of mass migration. How much water does this argument hold and, in relation to the reasons for migration more broadly, what can we learn from the discussion about it?

Required Reading:

Douglas S. Massey, “Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis,” in: *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, ed. Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind (New York: Russell Sage), 34–52.
Jan and Leo Lucassen, “The Mobility Transition Revisited, 1500–1900: What the Case of Europe Can Offer to Global History,” *Journal of Global History* 4, no. 3 (2009): 347–377.
Leslie Page Moch, “Obliterating Boundaries, Questioning Borders: A Comment on *Globalising Migration History*,” *International Review of Social History* 62, no. 3 (2017): 495–500.
Jelle van Lottum, “Some Considerations About the Link Between Economic Development and Migration,”

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Jan and Leo Lucassen (eds.), *Globalising Migration History: The Eurasian Experience (16th-21st Centuries)* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

Leslie Page Moch, *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe Since 1650* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003).

4. Imperialism, Freedom vs. Servitude (16 Mar, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

One implication of expanding the purview of late-nineteenth- early-twentieth-century migration history beyond its classic focus on the North Atlantic has been to make migration look less voluntary, more connected to the history of imperialism and of coercion. In fact, that free and unfree migrations should be treated under the same analytical rubric is one of the arguments in the second part of the Hoerder chapter (the part we didn't read). But should they? Apart from any moral question of how much the life experiences of slaves, indentured laborers, and Scandinavian settlers in Minnesota had in common, what good does it do *analytically* to treat them together? How do you assess the connection of this week's readings to the rest of the seminar?

Required Reading:

Philip A. Kuhn, *Chinese Among Others: Emigration in Modern Times* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), 107–152.

Rachel Sturman, "Indian Indentured Labor and the History of International Rights Regimes," *The American Historical Review* 119, no. 5 (2014): 1439–1465.

Source (also required):

"The National Archives | Exhibitions & Learning Online | Black Presence | India." Accessed February 11, 2019. <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/blackhistory/india/forced.htm>.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Sunil Amrith, *Migration and Diaspora in Modern Asia* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Andrew Arsan, *Interlopers of Empire: The Lebanese Diaspora in Colonial French West Africa* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Kathleen López, *Chinese Cubans: A Transnational History* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

5. Migration, Cities, and Transport (23 Mar, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

This session combines two commonplaces of migration history that may deserve further scrutiny. The first of these is that in a broad variety of settings since the nineteenth century migrants have disproportionately headed to cities rather than to rural areas. Why is that and what can it tell us? The second issue is almost a truism: Except where people walk, migration requires means of transport. So, what changes of migration history is reconceptualized as transport history or as mobility studies? And what is the relationship between the urban propensity of migration and the history of transport? Since the first of the two required readings was written by the tutor and is still unpublished, it can also serve as a basis of discussion for the following week's class on writing techniques.

Required Reading:

Michael Goebel, "Immigrant Cities Since the Late Nineteenth Century," in *The Cambridge History of Global Migrations*, vol. 2, ed. Marcelo J. Borges and Madeline Y. Hsu (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

Colin Pooley, *Mobility, Migration and Transport: Historical Perspectives* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 21–50.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Valeska Huber, *Channeling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1869–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

No class for one week

Easter Break

6. Essay Writing Class (13 Apr, 10.15–12)

To be taught together with HI 130, format to be announced.

Please read carefully the guidelines and come prepared to discuss specific matters that in your eyes arise from these guidelines.

7. Migration and Methodological Nationalism (13 Apr, 12.15–2pm)

Topic/Question:

The assumption that the nation-state is the naturally unit of analysis was written into the professionalization of history as an academic discipline, but it has also underpinned migration history (as well as the sociology of migration) more specifically. In fact, the assumption has been so strong that instances of migration that do not cross-national boundaries are typically either not classified as "migration" at all, or else bracketed as "internal migration" and disconnected from the broader field of migration studies, the bulk of which concentrates on transnational migration. Our question for today will thus be: Has it been only the nation-state that has made migrations visible as such?

Required Reading:

Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology," *International Migration Review* 37, no. 3 (2003): 576–610.

Rogers Brubaker, "Migration, Membership and the Modern Nation-State: Internal and External Dimensions of the Politics of Belonging," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 41, no. 1 (2010): 61–78.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Andreas Fahrmeir, *Citizenship: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Concept* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).

John Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

8. Chicago's Long Shadow (27 Apr, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

For a long time, the history and sociology of migration was shaped and overshadowed by the concepts, approaches, and tools developed by the Chicago School of Sociology. From the 1970s onward, however, the term "assimilation,"

often used by Chicago School scholars, became increasingly discredited. It was discarded partly because of its normative overtones (i.e. the notion that immigrants *should* “assimilate”), partly because of seemingly growing empirical evidence that the entire idea of the melting pot did not capture a reality of ongoing exclusion (e.g. Glazer and Moynihan). On the basis of some historical writing about “assimilation” from the 1960s (conveyed through the book presentations, which this week should exceptionally consider these books as historical sources of how sociologists in the 1960s viewed issues of immigration and race), we will ask whether there is anything redeemable in the concept of “assimilation,” as argued by Alba, Nee, and Brubaker.

Required Reading:

Richard Alba and Victor Nee, *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1–16.

Rogers Brubaker, “The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and Its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, no. 4 (2001): 531–548.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Patrick Moynihan and Nathan Glazer, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1964).

Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964).

9. Migration and Gender I (27 Apr, 6.15–8pm)

Topic/Question:

Throughout history, migrations have been profoundly gendered. Men and women have not always migrated in equal proportions, to the same destinations, for the same purposes, or with the same consequences. Gender norms at the place of destination may be different from those in the place of origin. Families may be torn apart in the process, or built anew. But given that gender nestles everywhere in migration processes, is there a systematic way to relate the two? And what do changing gender compositions in various migration streams tell us about this relationship?

Required Reading:

Suzanne M. Sinke, “Gender and Migration: Historical Perspectives,” *International Migration Review* 40, no. 1 (2006): 82–103.

Katharine M. Donato et.al., “Variations in the Gender Compositions of Immigrant Populations: How They Matter,” *International Migration Review* 45, no. 3 (2011): 495–526.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Leisy Abrego, *Sacrificing Families: Navigating Laws, Labor, and Love Across Borders* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2014).

Joanna Dreby, *Everyday Illegal: When Policies Undermine Immigrant Families* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015).

10. Migration and Gender II (11 May, 10.15–10)

Topic/Question:

This second session devoted to the relationship between migration and gender delves into slightly more specific examples: The first text concerns the pair’s links to the history of labor and of protest. The second enquires specifically the effects of mass male emigration from turn-of-the-century Sicily, with the ensuing results on sex ratios, family and gender norms in sending areas. In light of these examples, however, our overarching question will remain similar to that of the previous week: Is there a systematic way in which our understanding of migration changes if we consider gender.

Required Reading:

Donna Gabaccia and Franca Iacovetta, “Women, Work, and Protest: An International Research Agenda,” *Labour/Le Travail* 42 (1998): 161–181.

Linda Reeder, “Conflict Across the Atlantic: Women, Family and Mass Male Migration in Sicily, 1880–1920,” *International Review of Social History* 46, no. 3 (2001): 371–391.

Source (also required):

A marriage record from Montevideo, 1930

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Francesca Falk, *Gender Innovation and Migration in Switzerland* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

Donna R. Gabaccia, *From the Other Side: Women, Gender, and Immigrant Life in the U.S., 1820–1990* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1994).

11. From European “Ethnics” to Global History and Race Within the U.S. (11 May, 12.15–2pm)

Topic/Question:

As our session on the Chicago School revealed, historical scholarly discussions of immigration in the U.S. focused primarily on European newcomers who in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had crossed the Atlantic. Today, this is radically different, of course, with 1965 most commonly designated as a watershed between the “old” and the “new” migration. It is often argued, or simply assumed, that the historical mass immigration of Europeans took place in a context radically different from today’s. In particular, the salience of race as an identity marker, so this argument goes, forbids any diachronic comparison. Our question in this session will be how analytically useful such a categorical distinction is. Can the “old” immigration teach us anything about the “new”?

Required Reading:

Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 3–13.

Richard Alba and Victor Nee, *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 124–166.

Source (also required):

Samples of U.S. census questions

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Ira Berlin, *The Making of African America: The Four Great Migrations* (New York: Viking, 2010).

Clara E. Rodríguez, *Changing Race: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 2000).

12. Migration, Decolonization, and Emerging Nation-States (taught by TA, 17 May, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

Harking back to our earlier session about the interrelationship between migration and the nation-state, in this week we will more specifically focus on historical migrations out of, and into, regions that are themselves in a process of transition from empire to nation-state—here the Bay of Bengal and the Caribbean. Did migration spur or delay such transitions? And how were migrants and their descendants affected by such transitions?

Required Reading:

Sunil Amrith, "Reconstructing the 'Plural Society': Asian Migration Between Empire and Nation, 1940–1948," *Past and Present* 210, suppl. 6 (2011): 237–257.

Lara Putnam, "Migrants, Nations, and Empires in Transition: Native Claims in the Greater Caribbean," in *Immigration and National Identities in Latin America*, ed. Nicola Foote and Michael Goebel (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2014), 31–66.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Lara Putnam, *Radical Moves: Caribbean Migrants and the Politics of Race in the Jazz Age* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

Tim Harper, *The End of Empire and the Making of Malaya* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

13. Postcolonial Europe I (25 May, 10.15–12)

Topic/Question:

As is well known, the postwar decades saw Western Europe transformed from a continent of emigration to one of immigration. In Britain and France most famously, immigration arose alongside decolonization of their former empires. With a comparative view to the earlier session about post-1965 migration to the United States, in this week we will ask how imperial history shaped the expectations and experiences of postcolonial migrants to Western Europe. How indispensable is this history to understanding postwar migration to Europe?

Required Reading:

Richard Alba and Nancy Foner, *Strangers No More: Immigration and the Challenges of Integration in North America and Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 1–18.

Kennetta Hammond Perry, *London Is the Place for Me: Black Britons, Citizenship, and the Politics of Belonging* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 48–88.

Source (also required):

Lord Kitchener, "London is the Place for Me": <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dGt21q1AjuI>

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Anthony M. Messina, *The Logics and Politics of Post-WWII Migration to Western Europe* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Minayo Nasiali, *Native to the Republic: Empire, Social Citizenship, and Everyday Life in Marseille Since 1945* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2016).

14. Postcolonial Europe II (25 May, 6.15–8pm)

Topic/Question:

Following on from the previous session, this one still concerns migration into Europe in the wake of decolonization, but instead asks how these migrations impacted Europe. Did they fundamentally alter how Europeans conceptualized their own various nations? How did the changing interpretations differ between various West European cases?

Required Reading:

Elizabeth Buettner, *Europe After Empire: Decolonization, Society, and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 322–414.

Christoph Kalter, "Building Nations After Empire: Post-Imperial Migrations to Portugal in a Western European Context," *Contemporary European History* (forthcoming).

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Rita Chin, *The Crisis of Multiculturalism in Europe: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017).