

# Migration History in World History

Multidisciplinary Approaches

*Edited by*

Jan Lucassen, Leo Lucassen and Patrick Manning



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2010

## CONTENTS

Foreword .....	vii
About the authors .....	ix

### PART I

#### HISTORICAL APPROACHES

Migration History: Multidisciplinary Approaches .....	3
<i>Jan Lucassen, Leo Lucassen and Patrick Manning</i>	

### PART II

#### BIOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Population Genetics and the Migration of Modern Humans ( <i>Homo Sapiens</i> ) .....	39
<i>Peter de Knijff</i>	
A Brief Introduction to a Geochemical Method Used in Assessing Migration in Biological Anthropology .....	59
<i>Shomarka Keita</i>	

### PART III

#### LINGUISTIC APPROACHES

Prehistoric Migration and Colonisation Processes in Oceania: A View from Historical Linguistics and Archaeology .....	77
<i>Andrew Pawley</i>	
Linguistic Testimony and Migration Histories .....	113
<i>Christopher Ehret</i>	

## MIGRATION HISTORY: MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES

Jan Lucassen, Leo Lucassen and Patrick Manning

Migration is the talk of the town. It is difficult to read a newspaper without stumbling upon the ubiquitous phenomenon of human geographical mobility, its consequences and the reactions it provokes: boat refugees from Africa, dead bodies washed up on Mediterranean shores, Chinese peasants in Shanghai and other booming towns, Filipino servants and nannies in Rome and Dubai, Mexicans illegally crossing the border of the United States, Polish and Romanian workers all over Western Europe and Chinese mainland brides in Taiwan, to mention just a few examples.<sup>1</sup> On the whole, the current situation is seen as resulting from unique political upheavals (the fall of the Iron Curtain, the wars in Iraq and Sudan, etc.). Others point to the process of globalisation, which is regarded as unprecedented and characterised by increasing cultural, social, political and economic global interaction and interpenetration since the 1980s or so.<sup>2</sup> Contemporary predictions about migration and its effects have often been proved wrong, largely due to an insufficient understanding of the past. Think of the forecasts at the beginning of the 1990s that 25 million Russians would leave the Soviet Union and of a massive stream of labour migrants from other Eastern European countries after the fall of the Iron Curtain.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, such a-historical interpretations are not particularly helpful in understanding the nature of the migration experience. Quite the reverse, recent studies show, for example, that the current global migration is more diverse, but that its scale is strikingly similar to a century ago,<sup>4</sup> whereas more long ranging observations show that migration has been a structural aspect of human life since the very beginnings.<sup>5</sup> So far, however, the work by

<sup>1</sup> Piper and Roces 2003; Palriwala and Uberoi 2005; Lu 2008.

<sup>2</sup> Held et al. 1999; Sassen 2006. For different periodizations, see Strikwerda 1999; O'Rourke and Williamson 2002 and Manning 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Thränhardt 1996.

<sup>4</sup> Gozzini 2006.

<sup>5</sup> Hoerder 2002 and Manning 2005.

migration historians has not really influenced the current debate.<sup>6</sup> As a result, the discussions on the problems caused by global migration do not profit from the long-term insight developed within the field of migration history.

#### WHY DO MIGRATION STUDIES MATTER?

Optimism or pessimism has often dominated the public discourse in an irrational way. Scholars, policy makers and the media alike tend to ignore relevant historical analogies and interpret current developments as unprecedented. For example, in January 2007, Bernard Lewis, the world-renowned Middle Eastern and Islamic scholar, voiced his belief that Europe would become Islamic by the end of the century and that Muslims are on the verge of taking over this part of the world, fueling fears that migrants from Muslim countries are a sort of fifth column and that they will remain an alien body and a threat to Western values.<sup>7</sup> Others predict that the internal migration of 345 million people within China in the next 25 years will destabilize or even disrupt society.

Such moral panic is nothing new. The economic historian William Cunningham prophesied in 1897 that the (then) recent Russian Jewish immigrants to London—in contrast to earlier waves of migrants to the UK—would be unfit for assimilation, as were Southern Europeans in the eyes of many American commentators and politicians circa 1900.<sup>8</sup> Similar developments in the 19th century are the widespread concerns about Catholic Irish immigrants in Protestant England and the United States, whose massive presence would wreck society and who, in the eyes of the majority, could never assimilate because their religion was at odds with democracy and individualism. Or in the words of Aristide Zolberg:

The confrontation between a sanctimonious mid-19th-century Anglo-American Protestantism and a demonized Roman Catholicism strikingly evokes the late twentieth century construct of a “clash of civilizations”

<sup>6</sup> With the notable exception of the work by the historian Klaus Bade, who has been very influential, especially in the German speaking world, in linking historical knowledge on the last two centuries to the political debate on migration and integration: Bade 1995; Bade 2000 and Bade 2003.

<sup>7</sup> Interviews with Bernhard Lewis in *Die Welt* (July 28, 2004) and *The Jerusalem Post* (January 29, 2007). See also Tibi 2002; Very different opinions were voiced by: Roy 2004; Klausen 2005 and Laurence and Vaisse 2006.

<sup>8</sup> Cunningham 1897; Foner 2000; Gerstle and Mollenkopf 2001; Zolberg 2006.

between the West and Islam, and more particularly European reactions to Muslim immigrants.<sup>9</sup>

The same holds true for the moral panic that accompanied the massive internal migrations in Western Europe during the Industrial Revolution,<sup>10</sup> and the fear for unskilled and defective pauper immigrants in the United States before World War I, leading to a surge of eugenic ideas, both from the right and the (progressive) left.<sup>11</sup> Re-reading the historical record can provide an important temporal comparison for our own times, and thus put in perspective the recurring moral panic.<sup>12</sup> Historians have a particular role in the contemporary debate on migration and settlement issues. Being able to analyse continuity and change, they can not only correct widespread misconceptions, but also help understand general conditions under which migration processes occur and the factors that influence the ensuing acculturation processes.

In short, we argue that the basis of contemporary optimism or pessimism regarding migration movements and settlement processes has been built on a weak understanding of the past, and thereby of the nature of these phenomena. This is explained by the fact that—as historians tend to stress—much of their research is neglected by the general public and policy makers, but also by a lack of systematic historical knowledge on global connections and processes as such. A concerted effort is therefore necessary to redefine the field of migration history and to formulate new and promising questions that move away from the national focus centered on European and Atlantic regions and towards a more global perspective.

#### WHY DOES GLOBAL MIGRATION MATTER FOR HISTORY WRITING?

If historians can be useful for contemporary debates about global migration, then it follows that global migration should also be of concern to most nation-based historians. Except for states that explicitly defined themselves as immigration countries, such as the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia,<sup>13</sup> until recently most national histories

<sup>9</sup> Zolberg 2006: 434.

<sup>10</sup> As described in Chevalier 1973 and Jones 1971.

<sup>11</sup> Leonard 2005; Zolberg 2006; Stromquist 2006; Fahrmeir 2007: 156–162.

<sup>12</sup> As argued in Lucassen 2005 and Lucassen, Feldman and Oltmer 2006.

<sup>13</sup> As well as Caribbean and South American countries and South Africa.

seemed to have had no need to incorporate migration into their narratives. In Europe, migration history was the field of a handful of specialists largely providing footnotes to economic and social histories. In other parts of the world the available knowledge was spread among manifold specialists in the arts and the humanities and also in the social sciences who predominantly addressed academic audiences in their own areas but failed to build a bridge to specialists in migration history, thus deepening the splendid isolation of migration history.<sup>14</sup>

Meanwhile, the lack of attention by historians to migration is changing quickly and increasingly shows how fundamental and structural this phenomenon is for human civilizations. First, the importance of migration in the political and social debate worldwide has also aroused interest in its historical aspects in countries outside of the white settler colonies.<sup>15</sup> This concerns especially Western and Northern European countries which were once the source of massive emigration to the Americas and other parts of the world. Many of these, however, have experienced significant immigration, as well as massive internal migrations, both in the early modern and modern period,<sup>16</sup> long before the well known post World War II colonial, labor and refugee migrations. Secondly, the spectacular growth of World History has given rise to comparisons and approaches that go well beyond Atlantic perspectives. This applies not only to the 1846–1940 period<sup>17</sup> but also to the history of the slave trade in early modern history, which has largely ignored massive slave migrations in Asia, also before the advent of Europeans.<sup>18</sup> Thirdly, many scholars, especially in the sub-field of family history, have argued that only detailed and local studies in a global comparative framework can explain why and how people migrate.<sup>19</sup> In this book we argue that global migration history needs to link all of these levels, from the local to the regional, national and global perspectives.

<sup>14</sup> As argued by Morawska already in 1990.

<sup>15</sup> Good examples are: on the national level Noiriël 1988; Lucassen and Penninx 1997; N.L. Green 2002 and Bade 1992. On the European level, see: Bade 2003; Moch 2003a; Lucassen 2005 and Bade et al. 2007.

<sup>16</sup> Moch 1983; Lucassen 1987; Pooley and Turnbull 1998; Hochstadt 1999; Moch 2003a.

<sup>17</sup> McKeown 2004; Bosma 2007; Mohapatra 2007.

<sup>18</sup> McKeown 2004; Vink 2007; Vink 2003. For an earlier attempt at linking migration in Asia to global history, see Gungwu 1997 and 2000.

<sup>19</sup> Van Poppel et al. 2004; Engelen and Wolf 2005; Ying-Chang and Wolf 2006; and Moch 2007. See also the chapter by Ian Kok in this volume.

### THE STATE OF THE ART

In the 1990s it seemed appropriate to take stock of the achievements of migration history.<sup>20</sup> On the one hand, it was clear that this field had grown from a narrow Atlantic focus, strongly based in the United States, the self-professed immigration country *par excellence*, into a sub-discipline of history in other parts of the world. The large-scale immigration of guest-workers and the arrival of millions of colonial migrants in Western Europe certainly contributed to that continent beginning to appreciate its migration roots. This awareness was to extend far beyond the well known westbound emigration past when in the 19th century tens of millions of Europeans crossed the ocean to the Americas.<sup>21</sup> A first summary, and major achievement, was provided by Leslie Page Moch in 1992, in her analysis of both internal and international migrations *within* Western Europe since the middle of the 17th century. Moch successfully bridged the fields of local and temporary mobility and (international) migration, making use of insights in the fields of historical demography and family history.<sup>22</sup> In the same year Pieter Emmer and Magnus Mörner published their systematic overview—covering the period 1500–1970—of both Europeans moving to other parts of the world and the role of Europeans (Dutch, Portuguese, English) in the (forced and indentured) migration of Asians and Africans to other continents, especially South America and the Caribbean.<sup>23</sup> A few years later the volume edited by Nicholas Canny enlarged and deepened the intra-European picture by adding the emigration of Europeans both within Europe (Scots to Poland) and to other parts of the world (predominantly in the Americas), both as free and indentured migrants in the early modern period.<sup>24</sup>

Attempts to go beyond Europe and the Atlantic are scarce.<sup>25</sup> The first serious attempt was the volume *Human Migration* edited by the founder

<sup>20</sup> Lucassen and Lucassen 1997a. This book was the result of a workshop held at the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS) in Wassenaar in 1993.

<sup>21</sup> Nugent 1992; Williamson and Hatton 1994; Hoerder 2002.

<sup>22</sup> Lucassen 1987 (on seasonal migrations in Europe); Moch 2003 (on permanent migration), which conceptually built on insights developed by Tilly 1978. See also Kok's chapter in this book.

<sup>23</sup> Emmer and Mörner 1992.

<sup>24</sup> Canny 1994. See also Curtin 1989; Steinfeld 1991; Northrup 1995; Woekel 1999.

<sup>25</sup> With the exception of Treadgold (1957) who pointed out that some 10 million Europeans went eastbound to Siberia. See also Hoerder 2002.

of world history, William McNeill, who in 1978, together with Ruth Adams, published an interesting collection of essays which explicitly tried to offer a global overview and to link the past with the present. Notwithstanding historical chapters by Charles Tilly (on Europe) and James Lee (on China), the bulk of the book was devoted to the present.<sup>26</sup> This attempt at a global approach was followed by Lydia Potts' and Robin Cohen's overviews of the world's labor market, which had a clear eye for the historical dimension, but which were largely restricted to unfree and indentured labor migrations in the last two centuries.<sup>27</sup>

Nevertheless, the field of migration history is still far from unified, due to the tendency to make fundamental distinctions between different types of migration, which transcends a purely typological functionality. The most important is the difference between free versus unfree migration. Some, like Potts, focus on forms of unfree migration, especially when it concerns non-Europeans transported by Europeans;<sup>28</sup> others exclude unfree or involuntary migrations from their definition, like the transportation of slaves, convicts or prisoners of war. Those who do include these kinds of forced migrations are often very selective. Forced migrations under Hitler are nearly always present in their narratives, under Stalin sometimes present and under Mao the millions of forced migrants have attracted almost no attention from migration scholars.<sup>29</sup> Scholars working on Asia and Africa, on the other hand, seem to focus solely on forced moves, depicting migration chiefly in terms of forced recruitment, chattel slavery, coolie labor and state promoted relocations, especially in Russia and China.

Historians working on slavery, however, are so preoccupied with their topic, that their speciality has become isolated from mainstream migration history. The problem resulting from this academic balkanisation is that the continuum from chattel slavery via serfdom and debt peonage to free labor is given up, although it has become clear that *a priori* distinctions between free and unfree migration are untenable.<sup>30</sup> The same holds true for the policy driven and more recent distinction between 'legal' and 'illegal' or 'irregular' migrants, in which the latter,

<sup>26</sup> Tilly 1978.

<sup>27</sup> Potts 1986 and 1990. See also Cohen 1987.

<sup>28</sup> For a criticism see McKeown 2004.

<sup>29</sup> Potts (1990), but also Hoerder devote little attention to forced migrations in Communist China. See for Russia Polian 2004 and Hellie 2007.

<sup>30</sup> Steinfeld 1991; Gabaccia 1997; and Eltis 1997.

especially women, are often depicted as unfree, as victims of smugglers and traffickers. As many scholars have shown, however, this dichotomy masks the complexities of the situation migrants find themselves in, often denies their agency and oversimplifies the separation of voluntary and involuntary processes of migration.<sup>31</sup>

A similar problem arises with respect to the opposition labor migrants versus refugees. As the causes for migration are different, many argue that treating both groups as migrants is not very helpful and only complicates the analysis. At first sight this may seem a truism. When applied to the unruly reality, however, such an approach very soon leads to massive analytical headaches. To start with, the term refugee is not neutral, but determined and socially constructed by states, which often have their own ideological agenda. A good example are the 'Aussiedler' in Germany, millions of whom have migrated from Eastern Europe since the 1950s (but the bulk after 1989) and who are defined by the German state as refugees. In fact, many of them mainly utilise this ethnic definition in order to settle in a rich Western European country, whereas many have no or only remote genealogical and cultural links with erstwhile German settlers in Eastern Europe. From the mid 1980s onwards this migration basically resulted from economic motives rather than from persecution.<sup>32</sup> Nevertheless they are defined as (a sort of) refugees. For many Jews who were able to leave the USSR after the mid 1970s the same holds true. Their major incentive was not ethnic discrimination but the prospect of building a better existence in the United States or Israel.<sup>33</sup>

Looking at the early modern period, the label refugee poses historians with even greater problems. Although during the religious wars in the 16th and 17th centuries many people chose to move to states that guaranteed their freedom of religion (Protestants, Catholics, Jews and Muslims), most of them also had clear economic motives and chose destinations where they could market their skills and human capital, as is illustrated by textile workers from the Southern Netherlands who fled to the Protestant Dutch Republic and England.<sup>34</sup> A more general observation pertaining to refugees is that these migrants tend to be highly selective not only with respect to the choice of destination, but also in

<sup>31</sup> Schrover et al. 2008; Augustins 2007; and Davies 2007.

<sup>32</sup> Dietz 2006; See also Bade 1997; and Joppke 2005: 182-188.

<sup>33</sup> Zaslavsky and Brym 1983.

<sup>34</sup> Lucassen and De Vries 2001; Vigne and Littleton 2001; and Esser 2007.

who leaves. Mostly it is the young, able and better educated, showing that economic motivations clearly play an important role as well. Just like labor migrants, refugees base their decision on expectations and information about work and opportunities from their respective networks. In fact, all refugees combine political with economic motives.<sup>35</sup> We therefore fully endorse the statement of Anthony Richmond that all movement is restrained.<sup>36</sup>

Surveying the field in 2008 a lot of progress can be recorded, due to the following three developments within the historical discipline: To start with, the breakthrough of world, or global history, institutionalised by two quality journals,<sup>37</sup> has opened up the Europe-centered Atlantic world and shown the profits to be gained from comparing migration patterns in what we will loosely call 'The Atlantic' and the rest of the world, especially bordering the Indian Ocean and the Pacific.<sup>38</sup> Secondly, (historical) gender studies in a global context have enriched the field considerably, showing not only that migration patterns of men and women often differ, but also by laying bare the gendered mechanisms at the micro-level within the household, which determines who is to leave and who is to stay. This is often institutionalised and backed up by wider societal stakeholders, including the state.<sup>39</sup> Finally, we mention the development of global labor history, which explicitly uses a global, or transnational, comparative framework in order to understand the influence of specific state and societal structures on citizenship, political mobilization and labor recruitment, including migration.<sup>40</sup>

The influence of this progress can be illustrated by a number of recent studies in the field of migration history. David Eltis has tried to overcome the unproductive free-unfree dichotomy in the collaborative volume on coerced and free migration,<sup>41</sup> stating—as Richmond did—that most migration has both voluntary and coercive elements, which are difficult if not impossible to disentangle. This does not imply that typologies and distinctions are useless, quite the contrary. As Eltis explains, it does make

<sup>35</sup> Lucassen and Lucassen 1997b: 16.

<sup>36</sup> Richmond 1988: 17.

<sup>37</sup> The *Journal of World History* (1989–) and the *Journal of Global History* (2006–).

<sup>38</sup> Key works in this breakthrough are: Wong 2000; Pomeranz 2001). For a good overview of the field, including migration studies, see Patrick Manning 2003.

<sup>39</sup> Brettell 1986; Moch 1992; Parrenas 2001; Sharpe 2001; Reeder 2003; Moya 2007; and Schrover et al. 2008. For the micro level see the overview by Moch (2007).

<sup>40</sup> Hanagan 2004; Lucassen 2006.

<sup>41</sup> Eltis 2002.

a difference whether one has no choice to leave, for ecological, political or social reasons, or whether one has the option to stay. It also matters whether one is compelled to move against one's own interest (slaves) or whether migrants have some sort of choice over the decision, as was the case with indentured labor.<sup>42</sup> Such typologies only become unproductive when they develop into exclusive dichotomies, in which such distinctions are treated as *sui generis*, that makes comparisons irrelevant, thus obstructing the tracing of possible similarities, as well as uncovering what *is* indeed different.<sup>43</sup> The book edited by Eltis is therefore a major step forward, because it truly compares the whole range of migrations on the continuum free-unfree. Nevertheless most chapters still deal with the Atlantic world, with the exceptions of two, highly interesting, contributions on Russia from the Middle Ages onwards.<sup>44</sup>

The jump to a truly global approach was made by Dirk Hoerder who published his magnum opus *Cultures in Contact* in the same year as Eltis' collection. Hoerder's book has a much wider scope, looking at the past 1000 years and covering the entire globe. Never before had such a rigorous attempt been made at global migration history with a clear gendered angle. Moreover, Hoerder explicitly aimed at getting away from a Euro-centered, or Atlanto-centered perspective by focusing on migrations (and the contact between migrants and the people they encountered) within and between other parts of the world. Apparently, however, it was very difficult to reach these goals. Given the Europe-centeredness of most studies on non-West migration, treating the moves of Asians and Africans mainly as a consequence of European expansion since the 15th century, *Cultures in Contact* could not entirely live up to the author's high global ambitions.<sup>45</sup> One of the missing links in Hoerder's study is the rich harvest produced in the field of world history, most of which probably arrived too late on the market to be digested.<sup>46</sup> Had this perspective been included, the emphasis on Europe and migrations provoked by Europeans would have been pruned considerably.

Apart from the attempt to offer a more balanced and less Euro-centered account of migration history by McNeill and Adams, mentioned

<sup>42</sup> Eltis 2002: 5–6.

<sup>43</sup> As argued in Lucassen and Lucassen 1997a.

<sup>44</sup> Hellie 2002; Moon 2002.

<sup>45</sup> Hoerder 2002. For a critique see Manning 2004 and Lucassen 2004.

<sup>46</sup> Recall that Wong (2000) and Pomeranz (2001) published their books only one and two years before *Cultures in Contact*.

earlier, not much happened until specialists on Chinese history, such as Bin Wong and Pomeranz, also known as 'the California School', entered the scene, with a serious attempt to redress the, in their eyes, one-sided interpretation of the 'Rise of the West', stressing that China until 1800 did not lag behind Western Europe and that the 'Great Divergence', as Pomeranz called it, started around that time. Only thanks to 'coal and colonies' was England, and in its wake other European nations, able to take the lead.<sup>47</sup> It is not the purpose of this introduction to take a position in this debate, but for our argument it is highly relevant that the work by the 'California School' once again showed the magnitude of internal Chinese migrations, from a very early time onwards, with an important role of the Chinese state.<sup>48</sup>

The great escape from the Euro-centered deadlock in migration history in the modern period came recently with the publication of an article by Adam McKeown, in which he argued that in the period 1850–1940 apart from the well known Atlantic migration system, involving some 60 million people, at least two other systems had emerged in Asia, absorbing similar numbers (45 to 50 million) of migrants: one in North Asia (Manchuria, Siberia, Central Asia, Japan) and one in Southeast Asia (Indian Ocean Rim, South Pacific).<sup>49</sup> McKeown criticises Potts and Hoerder for only having eyes for forced labor migration in Asia (coolies, indentured labour), predominantly triggered by European colonial and imperial interventions. In fact, he argues, these were only a small minority of the total migration volume within Asia. The bulk were more or less free migrants who moved to the two centers of capital concentration mentioned above, very similar to the Atlantic core in the Western part of the globe. This new interpretation of global migration patterns in the recent past has redressed the balance considerably. Nevertheless it has not remained unchallenged.

Although he broadly supports McKeown's paradigm, the Indian labor historian Prabhu Mohapatra stresses that most of the 30 million

<sup>47</sup> Wong 2000; Pomeranz 2001. Their work has sparked much debate. See for example: Vries 2001; and Broadberry and Gupta 2006.

<sup>48</sup> Poo 2005; Crossley et al. 2006; Isett 2007. The early migrations, starting at least as early as 700 BCE and increasing dramatically during the 13th to 15th centuries were already mentioned by Lee 1978: 24. For the millions of internal migrants in the 17th and 18th centuries, see Pomeranz 2001: 84.

<sup>49</sup> McKeown 2004. For critical reactions see the discussion dossier in the *International Review of Social History*, no. 1, 2007. Similar conclusions were drawn by Huff and Caggiano (2007) for South East Asia.

Indian migrants who went to the plantations in Burma, Malaysia and Sri Lanka were circular migrants (whereas the majority in the Atlantic stayed at destination) and that although formally free, they were subjected to harsh and coercive conditions once they started working at the plantations.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, most of these plantations in the Southeast were within the European colonial sphere of influence. Equally interesting and important is Leslie Moch's critique pertaining to the Northern Asian system, based on her reading of recent comparative micro-level studies on Chinese migration,<sup>51</sup> stressing the differences with Western Europe with respect to family and inheritance systems (a topic covered in this volume by Jan Kok), with far reaching gendered consequences for who could migrate and under what conditions. To give only one example: in Western Europe already from the late Middle Ages onwards children were relatively independent from their parents due to the early spread of wage labor<sup>52</sup> and in North Western Europe a woman traditionally did not get a dowry upon marriage but inherited after her parents died. This gave considerable freedom to women, and explains the high mobility of women before marriage.<sup>53</sup> In China women were subjected to the Confucian principle of lineage, which became especially strong after the Song dynasty (960–1279), when the Mongolians made the household the basis for taxation. As the men were held responsible for the household, it became vital to have enough potential male successors, lest the household would run out. This principle was enforced by the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), which made the position of women even weaker. With respect to migration this meant that after—and sometimes even before—marriage women automatically moved to the household of her parents-in-law and had very few opportunities to engage in wage labor.<sup>54</sup>

The Eurasian comparative literature in the field of family history that has emerged since James Lee and Wang Feng's seminal *One Quarter of Humanity*,<sup>55</sup> has so far only scarcely been picked up in the mainstream migration history field, yet it is crucial to understanding the diverse

<sup>50</sup> Mohapatra 2007.

<sup>51</sup> Among others: Ying-Chang and Wolf 2006; Lee and Wang Feng 1999; Van Poppel, Oris and Lee 2004; and Waltner and Maynes 2001. Other important contributions are: Birge 2003. And Eastman 1988.

<sup>52</sup> Van Bavel and Van Zanden 2004; and Van Bavel 2006.

<sup>53</sup> Therborn 2004; see also Goody 1976.

<sup>54</sup> Lee and Feng 1999; Therborn 2004; Moch 2007.

<sup>55</sup> Lee and Feng 1999.

migration regimes around the globe and their developments through time. Especially the role of institutions, both at the macro (state) level, the meso (civil society) and at the micro (family) level is now emerging as a key to explaining the systemic differences in time and space.

Notwithstanding the growing interest in global migration history, there are five major impediments on the road to an integrated field of study: 1) Many historians still tend to focus on one country (nation state), with systematic comparisons being the exception; 2) The relatively few spatial comparisons available tend to be restricted to Western Europe, the Atlantic world or, eventually, the white settler colonies;<sup>56</sup> 3) The very few attempts at global comparisons, such as the pioneering work of Dirk Hoerder, still pay much more attention to European or European-induced migrations (colonial migration, slave trade, indentured labor) than to equally important migration movements within other continents, as McKeown has shown. As a result, especially Asia, Africa, China and the non-European pre-colonial world are greatly understudied.<sup>57</sup> 4) Area specialists of Africa, the Pacific, Asia and South America who study migration and acculturation are often not on the radar screen of European and Atlantic migration history specialists and vice-versa; and 5) the period under study is seldom longer than 500 years, which to a large extent explains the gap between historians and scientists working on migration issues on a much longer time scale, which prevents the accumulation of conceptual and theoretical knowledge.

These obstacles have systematically been identified by Patrick Manning in his book *Migration in World History*, an attempt at capturing human migrations in the last 80 millennia, which for the moment can be considered the linchpin of the exciting recent developments within the field of migration history.<sup>58</sup> The book argues that although all species migrate, only humans migrate to other communities, because different groups of humans, distinguished by their unique language capacity, developed cultures of their own. This cultural proliferation (from technology to value systems) explains the advance of civilizations and clarifies why it was profitable for people, unlike animals, to migrate to other groups. Manning divides these 'cross community' migrants

<sup>56</sup> See for example Richards 2004.

<sup>57</sup> Manning 2004; Lucassen 2004.

<sup>58</sup> Manning 2005.

into four basic types: settlers, sojourners, itinerants and invaders.<sup>59</sup> A second strand in the book is that from very early on, migration is of utmost importance in connecting the various parts of the world, with the exception of the Americas who were largely isolated from the rest of the world until, in October 1492, Cristoforo Columbus stumbled upon an island he named San Salvador, part of what became known as the Bahamas.<sup>60</sup>

Manning's stress on 'connections', however, is not shared by everyone, as the discussion among economic historians on the starting point of the globalisation process and the role of migration therein shows. In the discussion on the impact of global migration patterns two different definitions of globalization, with their own periodization, are *en vogue*.<sup>61</sup> The restricted one is applied by economic historians, like Jeffrey Williamson,<sup>62</sup> who define globalization in terms of market integration and price convergence, and therefore consider the period 1820–1914, also the era of intercontinental mass migrations, as the first phase of globalization. World historians, like Manning, stressing the importance of economic, social and cultural *connections* between various parts of the world, argue that globalization started much earlier—at least with the 'Columbian exchange' at the end of the 16th century, when migrants (traders, priests, soldiers and workers) established a world wide web.<sup>63</sup> By lack of quantification such a broad definition of globalization, however, lends itself badly to a formal test, whereas the market oriented approach of economic historians is rather one-dimensional. A way out is offered by the differentiated globalization approach of Held *cum suis*, who distinguish between intensity, extensity, impact and velocity.<sup>64</sup>

When we apply these criteria to the last six centuries, the period of 'early globalization'<sup>65</sup> (1400–1820) stands out as one of *thin globalization*. Migrations link all parts of the world, but are at most *extensive*, whereas the *impact* on some continents, especially the America's (the dramatic

<sup>59</sup> Ibid: 8–9. See also Manning 2006a and Manning 2006b.

<sup>60</sup> Theories of pre-Columbian contact are quite popular, but so far have produced mostly unconvincing if not pretty wild theories. Menzies (2003), for example claimed that the Chinese admiral Zheng He arrived in America in 1421. His ideas were severely criticized by Finlay (2004).

<sup>61</sup> On periodization see also McKeown 2007.

<sup>62</sup> O'Rourke and Williamson 2002.

<sup>63</sup> Manning 2005: 112. Flynn and Giráldez 2004. See also McNeil and McNeill 2003.

<sup>64</sup> Held, McGrew and Perraton 1999.

<sup>65</sup> For a recent discussion see: McKeown 2007: 221–223.



mortality among the native population, exposed to European diseases), was huge from a demographic perspective. The scale of intercontinental migrations, however, was rather modest in the early modern period. That changed from the 19th century onwards, when the transport revolution (from sail to steam and the role of railroads) dramatically increased the *intensity and velocity*.<sup>66</sup> The big *impact*, however, applies especially to the contacts between Europe and the Americas, as well as Oceania, but much less to intercontinental migrations to and from Asia and Africa. Due to the exclusion of Asian migrants from the powerful Atlantic and white settler colonies like Australia, from 1870 onwards Chinese and Indians basically remained within Asia,<sup>67</sup> whereas the end of the slave transports from Africa rather decreased the overall *extensity* worldwide. This changed after World War II, first of all due to decolonization which brought considerable numbers of migrants to Western Europe.<sup>68</sup> More important, however, is the lifting, in 1965, of the American quota act of 1921 and the Johnson-Reed immigration act of 1924, which sparked a truly global migration stream to North America. Compared to the first round of globalization in the 19th century, the poorest countries were now drawn into this global migration network too.<sup>69</sup>

Notwithstanding the rather undifferentiated use of 'connections' as a concept, the added value of Manning's study, apart from giving a balanced global overview building on the advances in world history, is that it opens up the traditional field of migration history and offers a much more structural and universal migration typology. It is the first overview that engages with sciences, which are very remote to mainstream migration scholars: population genetics, paleo-archaeology and historical linguistics: all working in the 'deep past', long before written records appear. This book aims to continue along this interdisciplinary frontier, not only by mapping these foreign and largely unknown lands, but also by explaining what insights into the sciences have to offer to mainstream migration historians who work on more recent periods and thus to our understanding of migratory processes in the present. It is our intention too to develop a research agenda for further explorations and continuous interdisciplinary collaboration.

<sup>66</sup> Keeling 1999; Lee 2005; Keeling 2005; Cohn 2005.

<sup>67</sup> McKeown 2004. See also: McKeown 2008.

<sup>68</sup> Including European settlers and their descendants: Cross and Entzinger 1988; Smith 2003; Joppke 2005; Bosma 2007.

<sup>69</sup> Gozzini 2006: 321–322.

We do acknowledge that the universalizing approach put forward in this book is not the only way of reaching a more interdisciplinary approach in migration history. In the last decades huge literatures have been developed within cultural studies, ethnic and regional studies, gender and post-colonial studies.<sup>70</sup> These, collectively, constitute an equally interdisciplinary alternative approach which shares several of the goals of this volume. As this alternative approach does not address the long term developments that are central in this book, we decided not to include these in our discussion.

#### DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO MIGRATION

In this book we distinguish three areas which, until now, have dominated migration studies, each with their distinctive time periods, territories, subfields, and questions: *Sociological approaches* analyze migration in the contemporary era through the disciplinary optics of sociology, economics, demography and policy-oriented studies. *Historical approaches* provide narratives of migration in literate societies, as recently as the early 20th century and as far back as classical antiquity. *Anthropological approaches* to migration center on early and non-literate societies with multidisciplinary tools—including ethnology, physical and cultural anthropology, archaeology, and linguistics—increasingly cooperating with and dependent on such natural-science approaches as genetics and climatology. Of course all three of these arenas of migration studies are social-scientific in the most general sense. In theoretical and empirical terms, however, these three bodies of literature have maintained considerable distance from each other.

The foremost perspective of this book is to improve communication between the historical and anthropological segments of migration studies, by introducing to historians the approaches of linguistics, archaeology, cultural anthropology, and human biology, especially genetics.<sup>71</sup> The exploration of this range of "anthropological" disciplines has led us to treat the scope of "human migration history" as including the full range of human experience, rather than limit the study to periods and

<sup>70</sup> See for example Stoler 2002; Brettell 2003 and Gabaccia 2006.

<sup>71</sup> We have left for a later stage in our project 'Setting the agenda for a long-term world migration history' the communication of historical and sociological approaches.

places for which we have written documents. Of course, the patterns of migration have changed along with modifications in technology, social organization, and ideology. Yet historical analysis should permit the reconstruction of migration as the underlying human impulse to move is modified by each of these changes. Put differently, our presumption is that migration in different social situations can be interpreted more clearly through a framework encompassing a long time period, wide geographical range, and a variety of disciplinary outlooks.

The development of historical studies over the past half century helps to explain why historians should increasingly be reaching beyond the limits of their own training to learn about the approaches of neighboring disciplines to migration.<sup>72</sup> Within European history, the interest in Viking, German, and classical-era migration sparked off interest among archaeologists and population geneticists. Historical area-studies, that developed in the years of decolonization following World War II, stimulated the interest in the displacement of Amerindian populations, the Atlantic slave trade, the early migration and settlement of African populations, the oceanic migrations in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and the continuing controversy about Aryan migrations into North India. In each of these instances, historians delved increasingly into the methods we have labeled as “anthropological.”

As historians expanded their studies of migration, however, they did so in a segmented fashion. Historical studies of migration have developed as a series of distinct literatures separated by regional, temporal, and topical frontiers. The possibility of an encompassing discussion of past human migration is widely understood, but in practice what we have seen are only occasional links of sub-fields in migration history. The largest sub-field has addressed Atlantic migrations of Europeans (c. 1840–1940), with domestic or continental migration in Europe and North America following as significant sub-fields. Additional sub-fields address the Atlantic slave trade (17th to 19th centuries) and early modern European migrations (16th to 18th centuries). Still smaller historical literatures address Asian migrations of the 19th and early 20th centuries and earlier migrations, usually European-linked. A distinct social-science literature, centered in sociology, demography, and

<sup>72</sup> Again, here we are primarily interested in interdisciplinarity which bridges different historical periods.

economics, is devoted to migration since 1950, notably European and North American instances.

Our purpose in this volume is to display and explicate the “anthropological” disciplines that have analyzed migration and on which migration historians have drawn, both to encourage wider application of these valuable methods and to overcome the segmentation of the literatures on migration history. As the chapters in this volume demonstrate, these disciplines can add new data, new analytical questions, and new interpretations to our understanding of migration. Attention to these and other general principles will help migration historians to incorporate and debate the results and methods of other scholars, and join in the multidisciplinary interpretation of migration.<sup>73</sup>

The authors of the chapters in this book introduce their disciplines—genetics, chemistry, historical linguistics, archaeology, and anthropology—and show how they identify central issues linked to migration, gather and analyze data, and interpret migratory patterns. Each discipline has its defined subject matter; the basic questions it seeks to answer; its analytical framework, assumptions, and theory; the data on which it relies; its analytical procedures; and the interpretations that result from the analysis.

How is the migration historian to approach the presentation of these disciplines? Historians have thrived as generalists, drawing together evidence from many fields of study without becoming too deeply drawn into the specifics of one discipline or another. In short, historians have tended to accept the interpretations of other disciplines—without much investigation of their data, framework, or analytical procedures—and integrate them into historical narratives and syntheses. The interdisciplinary approach to migration history, as presented in this volume, challenges that tradition, yet makes no attempt to renounce it. Instead, we call for an adjustment of the balance between historical generality and disciplinary specialization. We urge migration historians to learn more about the disciplines of genetics, linguistics, archaeology, and anthropology, without necessarily going so far as to become specialists. Conversely, historians working on more recent periods and using written sources (roughly from 3000 BCE onwards) have a lot to offer

<sup>73</sup> One may argue, further, that the phenomenon of migration, because it connects multiple points through human movement, is not only best studied through multidisciplinary approaches, but also provides an advantageous topic for historians to address the contemporary challenge to advance cross-disciplinary studies more generally.

with respect to forms, typologies and mechanisms of migration at the micro and meso level that can be observed empirically and theorised, at least for the last millennia. Their observations and insights are based on actual human behavior which is largely hidden for those who work on the 'deep past' and may produce useful and fruitful hypotheses for the latter.

In particular, it is the specialists in genetics and linguistics who prepare the data, conduct the analysis, and interpret the results. But historical generalists can read the results, assess the methods, identify the implications of the analyses, and can find inconsistencies in the methods or the interpretations of analysts working in different disciplines or on different historical situations.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY THIS VOLUME'S CHAPTERS

The chapters in this book present both analytical methods and the historical conclusions that arise from applying them. The authors have given varying emphases: some have privileged methods, and others have privileged interpretive results. But all have shown the interplay of method and interpretation. Each author has presented a disciplinary framework and one or more analytical procedures, and then has discussed and interpreted the data for about a half dozen cases. In each case, two types of lessons are displayed for the migration historian: the methods of analyzing data relevant to migration, and the interpretive conclusion on patterns of migration. While it may be tempting to grasp the conclusion and let the rest go, only by learning, debating, and applying at least part of the methodology can the migration historian become a full participant in the interdisciplinary discourse on migration.

As this volume shows, of course it depends partly on the period under study. Paleontologists can compare *Homo sapiens* to earlier species; population geneticists trace the human record as far back as 200,000 years ago; linguists and scholars using chemical methods tend to focus on the last 12,000 years (roughly from the beginning of agriculture), though sometimes on earlier periods. Studies by historical anthropologists, finally, who concentrate on the family, largely rely on the last few thousand, and mostly the last few hundred, years, but a number of their findings may be projected back into time.

Genetic analysis explores characteristics of the human genome—the complete set of genetic material, encoded in DNA—through sequencing

of the nucleotides (amino acids) that form DNA. The degree of difference in the DNA of individuals today reveals the time distance in separation of their common ancestors. The initial key work has been conducted on sex-linked genetics: mitochondrial DNA for females and Y chromosome DNA for males. These analyses document two of the many lines of descent of any individual.

Tracing genetic ancestry focuses on *polymorphisms*—literally, multiple forms of genetic materials—at a given site in the genome. Peter de Knijff's chapter focuses on two types of polymorphism: First, *single-nucleotide polymorphisms* (SNPs) on Y chromosomes are rare, and can give indications of changes long ago. Second, repeated sequences of nucleotides or *short tandem repeats* (STRs) are more common and can give indications of more recent changes. Mapping the polymorphisms within populations can yield *gene trees*—family trees of ancestry with a particular genetic form, or of more complex groupings of genetic characteristics. Within the gene trees, the branches of similar genetic types are known as *haplogroups*.

De Knijff summarizes several results on human migration drawn from these analytical tools. His first example traces the main Y chromosome SNPs in early human males, which give indications of migrations from 100,000 years ago to 20,000 years ago. De Knijff, starting with a simplified "theoretical" version and then turning to a more complex version with real data, argues that there were two main migrations out of Africa, both moving especially along the Indian Ocean coastline.<sup>74</sup>

His second example shows how Y chromosome data can also clarify patterns at micro levels. For a modern village in northern Ghana, genetic data reveal the importance of clan membership in male residence. In parallel examples, he describes how mitochondrial DNA data suggest that Africans 70,000 years ago lived in small matrilineal groups and how STR data indicate that traces remain of Christian Crusaders in Lebanon.

Third, De Knijff goes beyond mitochondrial DNA and Y chromosome analysis to summarize work done on *autosomal* (non-sex-linked) genetic patterns. He asks: given the high level of human diversity, do clear genetic clusters exist or are we restricted to gradual clines or gradations

<sup>74</sup> The genetic data, in giving increasing attention to migration routes along the Indian Ocean coast, are parallel to a recent argument using linguistic evidence to trace early human migration: Manning 2006b.

among populations?<sup>75</sup> Large-scale analysis of the Human Genome Diversity Project reveals that within-population diversity accounts for 95% of the variety, and among-population diversity accounts for the remaining 5%. Still, within the 5%, distinct regional groups of human population are revealed, on continental and sub-continental lines. Human diversity is thus a mix of clines and clusters.

Fourth, De Knijff applies genetic analysis to the issue of biological mixing within the past 400 years. Combining mitochondrial DNA analysis and Y chromosome analysis for five Brazilian populations, and distinguishing males and females identifying themselves as "white" or "black", one learns about the complexity of "racial" mixing. For females now known as "black" the great majority of their female ancestors were African; a few were European and rather more were Amerindian. For females now known as "white," their female ancestors were dominantly white, yet large minorities of their female ancestors were Amerindian or African. For black males, over half of their male ancestors were European, less than half were African and a small number were Amerindian. For white males, virtually all of their male ancestors were European, and a very few were Amerindian. Overall, the results show that European males had numerous children with women of all origins; some African males had children with some of the African women; and Native American males had few children.

Chemical analysis of human skeletal remains, while almost as laborious as genetic analysis of living persons, can give surprisingly strong information on migration. Shomarka Keita's chapter links geochemical methods to biological anthropology, and provides remarkably precise information on migration of individuals, although these results are limited to the rare cases where relevant information is available and analyzed. As he demonstrates, chemical analysis of teeth and bones of human remains can sometimes provide detailed information on the migration of individuals and even on the time of life at which individuals moved from one region to another. The key to the analysis comes from the presence of strontium (Sr), a chemical element similar to calcium, in human teeth and bones. Strontium, as a relatively heavy element, has several stable isotopes (with the same chemical character but varying slightly in weight). Geochemists have found that the ratio of Sr 87 to

<sup>75</sup> In biology, a *cline* is a gradual change of phenotype (trait, character or feature) in a species over a geographical area, often as a result of environmental heterogeneity.

Sr 86 is specific to the region of the earth, and it can therefore give a clear indication of where an individual lived. In addition, biological anthropologists have found that the chemical composition of teeth is determined early in life and remains unchanged, while the chemical composition of long bones (as in legs) changes so that it reflects the current or recent location and consumption. As a result, a "skeletal biography" of an individual can be reconstructed from that person's teeth and long bones: the ratio of Sr 87 to Sr 86 in the teeth can be matched to that of the region in which the person was age 7–10, and the same ratio in the long bones can be related to that of the region in which the person has lived for the last 7–10 years of life.

With this analytical tool, Keita provides a range of interpretations, ranging from some that are fully documented to others that are hypothetical and open to testing. As a documented case, he describes the situation in Libya some nine thousand years ago, in which pastoralism was displacing hunting and gathering. Here the results show that, with time, the diversity of families declined. That is, as the tending of herds became more important, marriage partners were selected from a narrower geographical range than had been the case earlier. The migratory pattern is clear from the evidence, although it will take some anthropological analysis to explain why this pattern developed. In another case, Keita has offered hypothetical evidence in which, through analysis of strontium in teeth, the remains of African-born people in the Americas might be traced to the African regions of their birth. With more geochemical analysis of African and American soils it will be possible to conduct such analyses. In addition to the technical advances in migration studies on which Keita reports, his chapter adds to the conceptual understanding of migration. He shows that we need to think of migration not only in terms of whole persons, but of the differential record of migration in various parts of the body. He gives attention to those who eat imported food, and notes that some people within a locality may be more affected by migration than others.

Three chapters give primacy to methods of historical linguistics in tracing migration. The authors—Christopher Ehret, Andrew Pawley, and Patrick McConvell—draw on slightly different aspects of linguistic methods, and combine linguistics with archaeology and climatology. In sum, they show the power of linguistic methodology in tracing past migratory movements. In addition, they show that linguistic methods are accessible to historians and are thus susceptible to far more widespread

application than has so far been the case. This lesson appears repeatedly in our survey of interdisciplinary approaches to migration: the adjoining specializations—genetics, linguistics, and the others—may require a high level of experience and expertise to carry out their most sophisticated analyses, but the basic principles are extremely powerful and historians can learn them with a reasonable amount of study.<sup>76</sup> Vice versa, as we stated earlier, scholars who concentrate on the very long run will undoubtedly profit from the existing mainstream historiography on migration history, not in the least pertaining to warnings against, simplistic modernization schemes and the cultural and gendered specificity of family systems and societal structures.<sup>77</sup>

Christopher Ehret begins by introducing general principles in language change, then turns to emphasize major questions centering on two quite different types of language change and analytical procedures appropriate to each. First he explores examples of the expansion of languages and their speakers through study of language classification. This is analysis *within* distinct language communities—that is, it makes use of the notion of “linguistic stratigraphy” to refer to the various stages of language change. This analysis permits the location of ancestral homelands and even migration paths of language communities. This technique is the main sort of historical linguistic analysis that has been conducted, though it could profitably be applied to many more cases. The technique, which relies on “genetic” classification of language relationships, is immensely powerful and relatively easy to apply. Categorizations of languages are widely available.<sup>78</sup> Analyzing these language classifications, migration scholars can gain insights into long-term migration histories of large and small language groups: Indo-European, Germanic, Bantu, Afroasiatic, Austronesian, Sino-Tibetan, etc. In addition, Ehret shows how other information on the past can be connected with data on language distribution to provide a rich picture of early migration.

<sup>76</sup> Ehret forthcoming.

<sup>77</sup> Hoerder 2002; Manning 2005; Lucassen and Lucassen 2009; the chapter by Jan Kok in this volume.

<sup>78</sup> For an accessible and informative source, see “Ethnologue” (<http://www.ethnologue.com/>), and in particular the language classifications within it ([http://www.ethnologue.com/family\\_index.asp](http://www.ethnologue.com/family_index.asp)). Some of the classifications are disputed, however, so that most but not all results of this analysis will be reliable. For a discussion of the inconsistencies in methods and criteria for classification of languages in various parts of the world, see Manning 2006b.

Ehret’s second major question asks about the movement of words and things from one language to another. This is analysis *across* language communities, tracing their interaction. He presents a remarkably general statement on word borrowing, showing the number of different patterns by which words are exchanged among languages, and correlates these with various social situations. To explain the methods for analyzing word borrowing, he presents four cases of historical interpretation in the past 2000 years. While determining the borrowings is specialist work, Ehret is able to display evidence of borrowings as well as summarize the results of his analysis. These results reveal the different patterns of word borrowing that can prevail over various time periods. In one case he demonstrates the process by which Semitic languages from South Arabia thrived and expanded in Ethiopia, and shows that the intruders were not farmers but merchants. In a second case he traces borrowings from Bantu into Malagasy to show that the journey of Austronesian-speakers from Borneo to Madagascar involved a stop in East Africa, and that the number of Malagasy was rather small. A third case documents gendered migration in East Africa. Luhya communities absorbed Kalenjin populations; the Kalenjin had many female Luhya immigrants. Finally, he focuses on word borrowing and long-term demic encounter, for example pastoralists migrating into other pastoral populations. Ehret’s Table 1 provides an insightful picture of the range of migratory relations, distinguishing recent arrival from long-term interaction of communities.

Andrew Pawley presents Oceania as a laboratory for migration studies, and works primarily with linguistic evidence. He describes the interplay of four major regions of Oceania, and the ecological constraints on the migration of humans and other species. He then analyzes the settlement of two major linguistic groups, which arrived in Oceania at times separated by over 35,000 years. First he relies on archaeological evidence to establish the initial settlement of people in New Guinea some 40,000 years ago. Working with the same broad community of languages, he uses linguistic classification to argue that speakers of the Trans New Guinea family of languages spread from a region in the central highlands of New Guinea across the highlands some 7–10,000 years ago, most likely as a result of their development of agriculture.

Pawley also explored the migrations of Austronesian speakers and relies on archaeological and linguistic evidence to trace six different stages of the migration that settled much of Oceania. His narrative begins

in Taiwan over 4000 years ago, traces oceanic migrations of agriculturists southward to the Philippines, then southeast to New Guinea and the Bismarck Archipelago (as well as southwest to what are now Indonesia, Malaya, and even Madagascar). The societies producing the Lapita pottery tradition of the Bismarck Archipelago began, just over 3000 years ago, a rapid seaborne expansion to islands as far east as the corridor between Tonga and Samoa. There, based on linguistic evidence, he argues that both migration and language change halted for roughly a thousand years. At the end of this interval came the most extraordinary seafaring voyages, in which migrants speaking the Polynesian subgroup of languages settled the Marquesas, the Hawaiian islands, New Zealand, and visited the coast of South America.

Patrick McConvell, working mainly with Australian examples, emphasizes patterns of migration as seen through the expansion of language groups and through language shifts and the borrowings of words. As an alternative to reliance on a "family-tree model" of language change, McConvell proposes a "punctuated equilibrium" model in which types of language change alternate in time. He distinguishes "upstream" migrations, in which language groups expand with little interruption, from "downstream" migrations, in which populations interact and exchange words and things with other populations. His terminology corresponds to the conditions of Australia, in which "upstream" migrations into the sparsely-populated interior led much more to expansion of a single group than interaction with other groups, and "downstream" migrations toward the coast brought social interaction in these more densely populated areas.

In his introduction, McConvell distinguishes migration from diffusion as mechanisms of cultural transfer. That is, he seeks to distinguish the movement of material goods from the migration of people. Later in the chapter he seeks to articulate "signatures" of various patterns of migration and diffusion, relying on social network theory. These genetic, linguistic, and archaeological patterns, McConvell argues, confirm clear distinctions between upstream and downstream migrations: for instance, cross-community marriage and language shift are common in downstream migrations, but one finds marriage only within the community and little language shift in upstream migrations. His examples focus on the Pama-Nyungan languages, which spread over most of Australia and displaced previous languages some 5000 years ago. He treats the expansion of Pama-Nyungan as an upstream spread, and the spread of Ngumpin Yapa (a subgroup of Pama-Nyungan) as a downstream

movement. In order to argue for the generality of the patterns he has identified, he offers the Athabaskan and Numic languages of western North America as evidence of upstream spreads. In addition, he uses the emergence of Australian English to argue that dialect convergence can take place in some cases. McConvell focuses particularly on marriage patterns ("casting the marriage net") in facilitating these various patterns of language change.

While a number of our chapters provide references to archaeological results, Jon Erlandson focuses frontally on archaeology as a discipline for locating and synthesizing information on human migration. He begins with a general overview of the place of migration in studies of archaeology, noting that "migration" and "diffusion" have been conflated in the past, and showing how changing theories and academic fashion sometimes give great attention to migration and at other times reject it as a factor for social change. Erlandson then summarizes four major cases of life at the water's edge in human history, focusing specifically on seafaring. His first case is the maritime migration along the Indian Ocean coast roughly 50–60,000 years ago. This migration is not known in any detail, though supporting evidence comes from the records of intensive aquatic foraging along the South African coast in earlier times, the confirmed arrival of humans in Australia and New Guinea 50,000 years ago, and also the DNA analysis of peoples of the Indian Ocean coast. Shell middens, the remains of human consumption of shellfish, have been located and dated to confirm early human occupation of the Indonesian archipelago. These records suggest that maritime technology was a consistent part of the toolkit at the time of human migration out of Africa.

Erlandson's second case comes from the Ryukyu islands, including Okinawa, where human bones have been dated to about 35,000 years ago. Discovery in Japan of obsidian found only on Kozushima Island—50 kilometers offshore—in sites dated at least 20,000 years ago further confirms the regular use of watercraft. In addition, such navigation of cool North Pacific waters indicates that humans had the capacity to migrate by sea along the Pacific coast all the way to the Americas, and to do so well before the end of the last Glacial Maximum some 15,000 years ago. In other publications, Erlandson has hypothesized that a "kelp highway" of dense biological communities in offshore Pacific vegetation provided nourishment for humans as well. This may be the explanation of the Monte Verde archaeological site near the coast of Chile, dated to 14,500 years ago.

In a third case, Erlandson traces the migration of Austronesian-speakers from the Southeast Asian mainland into Indonesian islands. Archaeological records show the migration of two groups some 3,500 years ago—north to the many islands of Melanesia, and northeast to New Guinea, the Bismarck Archipelago, and the Solomon Islands. The Lapita culture, known for its characteristic pottery, linked these and more distant islands. A thousand years later, Polynesian peoples emerged out of this ancestry: they conducted voyages and established settlements throughout the eastern, northern, and southern Pacific, including the Pacific coast of South America. Finally, the Vikings of Scandinavia were a group of similar maritime agriculturists who expanded in the 9th century and raided, traded, and settled across a span from Central Asia to North America, and into the Mediterranean. In addition to a rich archaeological record, the Vikings also left oral and written documents of their exploits. Summarizing this review, Erlandson suggests that there may have been periods of technological improvement in watercraft in about 70,000, 30,000, and 4000 years ago, each leading to longer and more dependable voyages. There remain serious difficulties in early marine archaeology, not least because the oceans have risen some 300 meters over the past 10,000 years; consequently many early sites are under water.

In our final methodological exploration, Jan Kok presents migration in terms of the study of family structure. He traces the intersection of two typologies—one on types of family and the other on types of migration—to suggest the recurring patterns of migration and their results in each of the family types described. Among the types of migration he distinguishes are the patterns of generations and inheritance, local migration, circular migration, and chain migration. The typology of family structure, drawn especially from the work of the French social scientist Emmanuel Todd,<sup>79</sup> labels families as various sorts of nuclear, authoritarian, and community families, based on rules of marriage, residence, and inheritance. In this typology the densest variety of family systems is found in Europe, while other regions are categorized as having more uniform systems. Following the introductory section, the three main sections of the chapter each discuss a different level of migration behavior as seen in all six of the systems of family structure that are taken

<sup>79</sup> We realize that Todd's typology has been criticized by various sides, but as long as other useful typologies are lacking it remains a useful point of departure.

to encompass the world. The first section discusses migration at the most immediate level: inheritance, marriage migration, gender differences, and life cycle migration. The second section addresses both local migration and circular migration, where local migration includes leaving home and circular migration includes the movement of sojourners. Finally, the section on chain migration addresses long-distance migration, with particular attention to family and ethnic networks, especially studied by family historians in European countries since the early modern period, but increasingly so in East Asia (especially China) as well.<sup>80</sup>

#### WHAT CAN MIGRATION HISTORIANS DO WITH THESE NEW INSIGHTS?

At first sight the ground-breaking results of the research of historical linguistics, archaeology, physical and cultural anthropology, and population genetics presented here seem to be confined to the earlier parts of human history, so that they may not matter to the general historian or even migration historian. This is only partially true, however. It goes without saying that a better understanding of earlier periods of human history enables us to distinguish long-term continuities and discontinuities linking our own times to the past. Furthermore, methods currently applied mainly to the analysis of long-term processes in remote periods of time are not restricted to these. The most obvious cases are the ubiquitous DNA-specialists these days. They can be found from forensic research to the excavation pits of the archaeologists, but also linguistics as we encounter it in this book has relevance for recent history. In fact, at closer scrutiny, all of the disciplines presented here play or can play a role in modern migration history.

Three general lessons stand out in this multidisciplinary exploration. First, the notion of migration needs to be broadened. That is, migration is more than just the movement of individuals from one place to another, and more than the movement of families and societies. Other aspects of migration include the movement of human genetic material, chemical constituents, individual words and whole languages, material culture, and ideas—including ideas about migration. Analyses of migration need to be specific about what, precisely, is in movement.

<sup>80</sup> For the historiography see the chapter by Jan Kok.

Second, the time frame of migration studies needs to be extended. Human migration history extends to the full scope of human history, some 150–200,000 years. Within that time frame, various disciplines enable us to explore migration over long and short time periods. Genetic analysis easily encompasses the full time frame of human and even hominid existence. Paleontology and archaeology analyze human physical remains and remains of human material culture and environment. Human language has existed for perhaps 70,000 years, and evidence of the original human language and major change in language surely survives today. This addresses slow change over time. Within that long time frame, these same disciplines also provide evidence of more rapid changes that took place at varying times in the past. Of course, most studies of migration will continue to be restricted to certain regions within certain periods, but attention to the larger and more general patterns of human migration will help clarify which patterns, for instance, in industrial-era migration, are newly developed, and which are continuities of earlier migratory patterns. Attention to a long timeframe has the advantage that it makes clear what is specific and what can be regarded as the universal human pattern.

Third, the types of documentation of migration need to be broadened. For historians, the usual types of data on migration include testimonies, censuses, commercial data, and government reports. In addition, however, words, material remains, myths, and the chemical and genetic composition of human bodies provide valuable information on migration. Linkage of these various types of evidence may yield far more nuanced and convincing interpretations of past migrations. At the very least, they should not be neglected.

While the “anthropological” disciplines as a group offer suggestions for reconsidering migration, the individual disciplines each have their specific angles. Genetics, for instance, draws its evidence mostly from persons now living, and can show links of these individuals to their immediate relatives. Yet this same genetic evidence, depending on the basis of comparison to evidence from other persons, can be used to trace migrations and interrelationships among groups of people for many thousands of years. Chemical analysis of migration, as in the analysis of strontium content of bones and teeth, works with individual-level data, and can be made applicable for all the times for which we have relevant human remains. Linguistic analysis is necessarily the study of communities, since language is a property of communities more than of individuals. Linguists have shown that a basic vocabulary of some

200 words highly depends on revealing linguistic relationships. All three linguistics chapters, plus the archaeology chapter, tend to argue that migratory patterns for hunter-gatherer and farming populations are not fundamentally different. Linguistic analysis works in the present and also in the past, and many historical linguists are comfortable with arguments that go back as far as 8–10,000 years. Beyond that time, analysis becomes more problematic, so new techniques and even theories may need to be developed. Moreover, while the overall theory of language change is generally accepted, the linguists of various regions do not agree on the criteria for identifying a relationship among language groups, so that there remain major debates on world language classification. Archaeology, itself an interdisciplinary field, includes the handling of multiple and independent lines of evidence. Techniques of dating are improving, so that archaeological techniques may be used for the full span of human history. Family history is mostly restricted to a shorter period of time, in that its study requires genealogy, and hence written or oral records. On the other hand, linguistic, archaeological and even genetic evidence may provide useful fragments of evidence on family history, and these might be applicable over long periods of time.

The authors of the chapters in this book have gone far beyond an abstract presentation of their methods, and have emphasized the presentation of major interpretative statements. In particular, they have given us substantial accounts of the migration history of Oceania, Australia, Africa and North America. Each of these regions is at some distance from the European and Atlantic regions that have gained prime attention in historical studies so far. The authors write on these regions not only to add novelty and fresh issues, but to suggest that lessons on migration in these regions are important in the understanding of the human migratory experience overall. Furthermore, they suggest that advances in migration studies centered in one area of the world can and should be applied to other regions. Thus, even within the chapters of this book, it is possible to develop comparisons of the making of Bantu-speaking and Austronesian-speaking peoples, and comparisons of migrants in the South Pacific and in the North Pacific. Concepts developed in one study of migration can be applied to others. Thus, McConwell's notion of “upstream” and “downstream” migrations, developed in the context of Australian migrations, can be applied to the interplay of Luhya and Kalenjin populations (as described by Ehret) and the spread of Trans New Guinea languages (as described by Pawley).



Interdisciplinary approaches to migration elicit ideas not only about the specific methods and conceptions of each discipline, but also about the general philosophy of analyzing migration. One key philosophical issue is whether to treat each human population as a specific and unique society or as one more grouping of a common humanity. In the chapters to follow we will see the difference between the chapters on genetics and chemistry, which apply methods assumed to be universal in application, and the chapter on family history, which sets out the notion of six continental systems of family structure and migration. The former emphasizes human commonality, while the latter emphasizes societal specificity.<sup>81</sup>

Although migration historians have done a good job at criticizing ahistorical and often simplistic social scientist interpretations of both current and past migrations,<sup>82</sup> many migration scholars, among whom also historians, have gone too far in accommodating the notion that migration patterns are culturally and socially specific. The ready assumption of cultural specificity has led to the treatment of migrations in different time periods and different regions as distinct so that, by and large, specialized temporal subfields with substantially different frames of reference have developed.

Consideration of migration in a broader frame of reference—with a more general notion of migration, a longer timeframe of analysis, and a wider range of evidence—will make it easier to identify the general and underlying characteristics of human migration. As has been argued in one recent analysis the distinctive character of human migration is that it sends young adults from one language-based community to another, and in the process engenders linguistic and cultural learning both for the migrants and the receiving communities, thus creating a social mechanism for the creation and sharing of new knowledge.<sup>83</sup> This thesis and others on the species-level patterns of human migration can be considered as part of the global history of human movement.

To develop experience with a broad frame of reference, historians should use models for migratory behavior, and then critique the limitations of models as well as add individual specificity to general models. Conducting comparisons and applying frameworks widely will help us to get a sense of the degree to which migration is a universal pattern.

<sup>81</sup> The two are not necessarily inconsistent, as the former is a presumption in method and the latter is an interpretation of data.

<sup>82</sup> Lucassen and Lucassen 1997b; Hoerder 2002; Foner 2000; Lucassen 2005.

<sup>83</sup> Manning 2006a and 2006b.

At many points, surely, we will encounter cultural specificity in migration patterns. But the overall interpretation will be quite different and more general when we can put the specific characteristics of Atlantic slave migrants or today's migrant domestic workers into a more clearly understood pattern of a mix of voluntary and involuntary migration that has accompanied human life from the beginning.

But there is a limit to how far historians can go in moving away from social uniqueness, into common patterns. Jan Kok's "social networks," emphasizing the regional and ethnic characteristics of family structures, represent the other pole of this discussion of human commonalities vs. social specificities in migration patterns. The details of his text identify the ways in which patterns of migration are determined not simply by economic incentives but also by the specifics of migrants' social situations. The analysis emphasizes cross-sectional differences among social systems rather than temporal change in migration. In several ways, therefore, Kok's chapter serves as a bridge from the "anthropological" approach of the earlier chapters to the "historical" and "sociological" approaches to migration. That is, in its geographic and temporal focus, Kok's analysis addresses the societies and time periods that have been scrutinized most thoroughly in the historical literature. In addition, in its reliance on typology and sociological theory—as well as its cross-sectional and global scope—it is close to the "sociological" approach most commonly applied to contemporary migration.

A productive way to pursue the discussion is to seek links and comparisons of families as portrayed by Kok with family as portrayed by Pawley, Erlandson, McConvell, Ehret, and Keita. For instance, Kok's description of family systems could be extended by reference to the anthropological descriptions of systems of kinship terminology (most of them based on native North American patterns). On the other hand, one may consider the widespread violations of societal rules and patterns. In particular, during the past five centuries of human interaction, the normal rules of society have been broken through enslavement and forced migration, and much in the way of biological reproduction and family relations has been illicit, according to the contemporary observer. The multidisciplinary analysis of migration, drawing on the full range of frameworks and analyses, should lead to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of both the general patterns and specific cases in migration history.

Having said this, a caveat is in place requiring historians to always question whether perceived developments pertain to hours, weeks, months, years, generations, centuries or millennia. To give one concrete example: if we write that man migrated from Northeast Africa via the shores of Arabia, Persia, India and Indonesia as far as Australia, what does it mean for the individuals involved? Of course none of them has seen both Africa and Australia in one single life. In fact, this movement took as much as some 50,000 years (between 100,000 and 50,000 BCE). Suppose that the whole coastal "trip"—10,000 kilometers as the crow flies—actually meant a migration of on average not 200 meters but, say, 1 kilometer per annum, what was its impact on the short-lived life of most of our ancestors? A similar question can be posed regarding the first emigration from the tropical areas of Africa, Asia and Oceania resulting in the peopling of the northern regions between 40,000 and 30,000 BCE. This is particularly interesting because it resulted in phenotypical changes which we tend to consider as very important for our identity: the emergence of human beings with lighter skins, narrow noses and mouths and straight hair of different colours. Do we have to conceive this as a process that actually has been noticed by those concerned—before cross-cultural migration later on did so unavoidably?

As a model for the possible response to these questions, we may turn to the case of the "Bantu migrations" in Africa, where linguistic evidence demonstrated by 1950 that Bantu languages had spread, over several thousand years, from a corner of southeast Nigeria to occupy virtually the entire southern third of the African continent. The early explanations of the migratory process were vague and simplified. Nearly two generations of research have now provided a rather detailed picture of the many pieces of this great migration, ranging from slow advance along an agricultural frontier in some cases to rapid movements along rivers or occupation of new territories along with mobile herds in others.<sup>84</sup> For another model, we can turn to the spread of the English language over the past four centuries, which we know to be a complex mix of physical migration and cultural conversion, and which may also be broken down into a number of distinct migratory movements.

<sup>84</sup> Confirmation of the regional origins of Bantu languages came in Greenberg 1963. For a summary of current knowledge of the migrations, see Ehret 2001a and 2001b.

If this book simultaneously opens many venues to any migration historian and raises many more questions, our aim has been achieved. After all, this presupposes the willingness to take cognizance of the work of scholars in different fields. After this optimistic note, we would like to end with a note of caution, however.

As always, misinterpretations lie in wait. In particular a new racism, based on the results of genetics, may emerge from a one-sided identification of contemporary human beings with archaeological remains and the soil in which they are found. Take for instance a recent Dutch experiment where DNA from one thousand year old bones in the town of Vlaardingen has been linked to a dentist who lives today in the nearby city of Rotterdam. He had been selected, along with a number of other people, from a group whose genealogy could be reliably traced back to a forefather in 16th century Vlaardingen. In this case the press reports suggested a direct line between these two individuals, separated by one millennium, and most likely rightly so.<sup>85</sup> They forgot to mention, however, that roughly 30 to 40 generations lie in between, which means that we now know something about one out of millions of forefathers of this dentist. Imagine that this is not about Vlaardingen and Rotterdam, but about parts of the world which are contested between different generations of immigrants, and everybody can see the possibility of unintentional and intentional misinterpretations of migration history.

<sup>85</sup> <http://www.blikopnieuws.nl/bericht/53301> (consulted on September 30, 2009).