THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE GENEVA

INSTITUT DE HAUTES ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

International History

Academic year 2018-2019

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

HI113 - Spring - 6 ECTS
Tuesdays 8.15–10

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
Tuesday 10:00–12:00

ASSISTANT

Joshua Thew
joshua.thew@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours
Monday: 14:00–16:00 and by appointment

Syllabus

Course Requirements

1. Term Paper: 50% of final grade; 4,000 words; deadline June 9, 2019 (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 26, 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: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ECmV28YZOkGQrTE6_UVThlx8Bmjlw2MfYvmGhN6Tzq4/edit#gid=0

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: 20% 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: 30% 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.

In order to integrate reading and writing exercises, every student has to write a one-page summary (ca. 400 words) of the first item on the list of required readings in one week: students with surnames A–G for week 2 (February 27), H–P for week 3, and Q–Z for week 4. These are not graded, should be submitted by email to the TA only, who will provide a brief feedback on them.

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. February 19: Introduction

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. February 26: Were Networks Everywhere?

Topic/Question:

Whereas historians of migration, until the 1970s in particular, used to study the degree to which particular (usually nationally defined) immigrant groups fitted into, or "assimilated" into, the nation-states to which they were headed, in the past decades historians have increasingly focused on the global picture, on far-reaching "networks" rather than on "push" and "pull" factors, and on migration "systems." With this change, they have also focused much less exclusively on the North Atlantic. The excerpts of the long chapter by Dirk Hoerder that we read for this session are one example of this trend. But what are the methodological and analytical implications of a global focus in migration history? Does it contribute anything interesting, or does it (as David Bell argues in his review) lead to a multitude of almost meaningless anecdotes?

Required Reading:

Barbara Lüthi, "Migration and Migration History," version 2, *Dokupedia Zeitgeschichte*, July 6, 2018: https://docupedia.de/zg/Luethi_migration_v2_en_2018

Dirk Hoerder, "Migrations and Belongings," in: *A World Connecting, 1870–1945*, ed. Emily Rosenberg (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 435–490.

David A. Bell, "This is What Happens When Historians Overuse the Idea of the Network," *The New Republic*, October 25, 2013: http://www.newrepublic.com/article/114709/world-connecting-reviewed-historians-overuse- network-metaphor

Techniques: Finding, Reading, and Writing Book Reviews

3. March 5: How Global Should Our Angle Be and What Does It Help?

Topic/Question:

This session essentially continues the discussion of the last. 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.

4. March 12: History and Reasons for Migration

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," *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 2 (2011): 339–344.

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).

5. March 19: Imperialism, Freedom vs. Servitude

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.

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).

6. March 26: Writing Term Papers

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

7. April 2: Migration and Methodological Nationalism

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. April 9: Chicago's Long Shadow

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. April 16: "Assimilation" and Social Mobility

Topic/Question:

Terms like assimilation, acculturation, integration, and social upward mobility have been, and still are, often conflated. While socioeconomic marginalization often coexists with other forms of discrimination, they need not overlap. This session thus attempts to discuss the relationship between "assimilation" and social mobility in particular, comprising a theoretical text by a famous migration scholar with an empirical study of a little known case (Uruguay) by a little known historian. What can we learn, if anything, from the example of Uruguay about grand theory and our discussion of "assimilation"?

Required Reading:

Herbert J. Gans, "Acculturation, Assimilation and Mobility," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30, no. 1 (2007): 152–164.
Michael Goebel, "*Gauchos*, *Gringos* and *Gallegos*: The Assimilation of Italian and Spanish Immigrants in the Making of Modern Uruguay 1880–1930," *Past and Present* 209 (2010): 191–229.

Source (also required):

A marriage record from Montevideo, 1930

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

José Moya, *Cousins and Strangers: Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850–1930* (Berkeley: University

of California Press, 1998).

April 23: Easter Break, No Class

10. April 30: From European "Ethnics" to Global History and Race Within the U.S.

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.
Vicki Ruiz, Nuestra América: Latino History as United States History," *The Journal of American History* 93, No. 3 (2006): 655–672.

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).

11. May 7: Migration and International Relations (taught by TA)

Topic/Question:

Though seemingly needless to say, migration takes place within a changing system of international relations. Focusing on Arabic-speaking immigrants and their descendants in North America, this session is devoted to the interrelationship between migration and the international system. How did the changing place of the Middle East, and in particular U.S.-Arab relations, impact the lives of Arabic-speaking immigrants and their descendants in America?

Required Reading:

Nathan J. Citino, *Envisioning the Arab Future: Modernization in U.S.-Arab Relations, 1945–1967* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
Alixa Naff, *Becoming American: The Early Arab Immigrant Experience* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985).

Source (also required):

Afif I. Tannous, *Village Roots and Beyond: The Memoirs of Afif I. Tannous* (Beirut: Dar Nelson, 2004).

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Sarah Gualtieri, *Between Arab and White: Race and Ethnicity in the Early Syrian American Diaspora* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).
Donna Gabaccia, *Foreign Relations: American Immigration in Global Perspective* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

12. May 14: Migration, Decolonization, and Emerging Nation-States

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: Nicola Foote and Michael Goebel (eds.), Immigration and National Identities in Latin America (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. May 21: Postcolonial Europe: The Empire Comes Home

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.

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. May 28: Contemporary Migration and Historians

Topic/Question:

In our last meeting, we will turn on its head the question that concerned us earlier in the semester. Instead of asking what history can contribute to our understanding of processes of migration more broadly, we will ask what historians have learned, or should learn, from contemporary migration. Should they, and will they, adapt the topics they look at and the questions they ask according to present-day concerns?

Required Reading:

Donna Gabaccia, "Will the Twenty-First Century Embrace Immigration History?" in: *History, Historians and the Immigration Debate*, ed. Eureka Henrich and Julian M. Simpson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 209–226.
Adam Goodman, "Nation of Migrants, Historians of Migration," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 34, no. 4 (2015): 7–16.