

History 180/Ethnic Studies 134
Immigration, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in Recent American History
Spring 2019—University of California, San Diego

Professor David G. Gutiérrez
Office Hours: Thursdays, 3 to 5pm and by appointment, HSS 6012
dggutierrez@ucsd.edu

The issues of globalization, transnational migration, ethnic group formation, and the politics of citizenship are among the most provocative and controversial areas of social science and humanities research today. This intensive upper-division reading/discussion course is designed to provide a thematic interdisciplinary overview of the history of these issues and related questions by exploring recent interpretations of developments in the history of migration and citizenship in the United States over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Course Requirements: This is an intensive upper-division interdisciplinary course in which students are expected to come well prepared to discuss readings each week. Individual students will lead discussion of individual readings and participation in class will account for 50 percent of the final grade. Students are also expected to write a 20-25 page term paper based either on a synthetic review of course readings or on one of the topical areas addressed in the course (e.g. changing paradigms in migration studies; the debate over globalization; problems of the “second generation” and general issues of immigrant adaptation; economic and/or labor dimensions of transnational migration; gendered dimensions of transnational migration; the politics of ethnicity and citizenship; etc.). Students may also choose other topics after consultation with the instructor. The term paper will account for the remaining 50 percent of the final course grade. Papers will be due during final exam week.

All required reading will be available online through the course website on TritonEd.

Week 1 (April 4)—Course Introduction and Overview

Week 2 (April 11)—The Contours of the Current Immigration Debate

READ: Nancy Foner, “The Uses and Abuses of History: Understanding Contemporary U.S. Immigration,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (1) (2019): 4-20.

In-Class Film Discussion: *The State of Arizona*

Week 3 (April 18)—Capitalism, Economic Development, and Global Migration

American comprehension of the history of immigration, ethnicity, and citizenship has always been colored by deeply rooted assumptions that are often empirically untested, much less considered critically for their ideological underpinnings. This week’s readings engage some of those basic assumptions by placing the phenomenon of immigration to

the United States in a larger global context that attends to the history of capitalism and global economic development. The assigned readings focus in particular on the question of how these massive social forces helped to stimulate the transnational and transregional movement of peoples around the globe.

READ: June Mei, “Socioeconomic Origins of Emigration: Guangdong to California, 1850-1882,” *Modern China* 5 (4) (Oct. 1979): 463-501; Benjamin Narváez, “Abolition, Chinese Indentured Labor, and the State: Cuba, Peru, and the United States during the Mid-Nineteenth Century,” *The Americas* 76 (1) (January 2019): 5-40; Charles Hirschman and Elizabeth Mogford, “Immigration and the Industrial Revolution from 1880 to 1920,” *Social Science Research* 38 (4) (December 2009): 899-920; Joon K. Kim, “California’s Agribusiness and the Farm Labor Question: The Transition from Asian to Mexican Labor, 1919-1939,” *Aztlán* 37 (2) (Fall 2012): 43-72; and Mark Reisler, “Always the Laborer, Never the Citizen: Anglo Perceptions of the Mexican Immigrant during the 1920s,” *Pacific Historical Review* 45 (2) (May 1976): 231-54.

Week 4 (April 25)—Race, Reaction, and Restriction

The movement of millions of people from places of origin to places of new settlement contributed to a rapid intensification of social tensions and strains in settler societies such as the United States (and other immigrant-receiving areas of the world including Canada, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Southeast Asia, and some parts of Europe). Largely as a result, a movement emerged in many nations to restrict and control the process of transnational population movement—and to manage transnational migrants themselves. This week’s readings explore the evolution and significance of the impulse to restrict and control immigration in different parts of the world and thus help to provide the historical context for understanding the origins of the contemporary debate over issues of immigration and national citizenship law and policy in the United States.

READ: Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos, “Building Walls, Building Nations: Migration and Exclusion in Canada and Germany, 1870-1939,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 17 (4) (2004): 385-427; Catherine Lee, “‘Where the Danger Lies’: Race, Gender, and Chinese and Japanese Exclusion in the United States,” *Sociological Forum* 25 (2) (June 2010): 248-71; Kristofer Allerfeldt, “‘And We Got Here First’: Albert Johnson, National Origins, and Self-Interest in the Immigration Debate of the 1920s,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 45 (1) (January 2010): 7-26; Stephanie Hinnert, “Demanding an ‘Adequate Solution’: The American Legion, the Immigration Act of 1924, and the Politics of Exclusion,” *Immigrants and Minorities* 34 (1) (March 2016): 1-21; and Natalia Molina, “‘In a Race All of their Own’: The Quest to Make Mexicans Ineligible for U.S. Citizenship,” *Pacific Historical Review* 72 (2) (May 2010): 167-201.

Week 5 (May 2) Modes of Resistance/Modes of Accommodation

The global movement to restrict and control migration flows between and among nations and regions placed huge strains on the populations against whom these policies and practices were targeted. As a result, members of these increasingly dense and complex transnational social networks were compelled to devise innovative social, economic, and political strategies to help them cope with and survive attempts to control their freedom

of movement and material success. This week's readings explore different historical examples in which members of different immigrant and ethnic groups attempted to devise and implement different coping mechanisms and strategies of accommodation and resistance to efforts to constrain their activities.

READ: Ron Soodalter, "By Soil or By Blood," *American History* 50 (6) (Feb. 2016): 56-63; Yuji Ichioka, "The Early Japanese Immigrant's Quest for Citizenship: The Background of the 1922 *Ozawa Case*," *Amerasia Journal* 4 (2) (1977): 1-22; Jonathan Zimmerman, "'Each Race Could Have Its Heroes Sung': Ethnicity and the Historical Wars of the 1920s," *Journal of American History* 87 (1) (June 2000): 92-111; Mark Overmyer-Velásquez, "Good Neighbors and White Mexicans: Constructing Race and Nation on the Mexico-U.S. Border," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 33 (1) (Fall 2013): 5-34; and Benjamin C. Montoya, "'A Grave Offence of Significant Consequences': Mexican Perspectives on U.S. Immigration Restriction during the Late 1920s," *Pacific Historical Review* 87 (2) (May 2018): 333-55.

Week 6 (May 9)—The 1965 INA and the Coming Demographic Revolution

After a long period in which immigration from most of the world was tightly restricted, the passage of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments (INA) abolished the National Origins Quota system that had been in place in different forms since 1921 and implemented a new policy regime in the areas of immigration, naturalization, and citizenship. Although long portrayed as part of the civil rights struggle that was raging at the time, historical scholars have since come to question the supposed liberal underpinnings of the law. This week's readings explore the INA's anticipated and unanticipated effects—and its impact in at least partially creating the conditions for the eventual demographic transformation of the population of the United States.

READ: Maddalena Marinari, "'Americans Must Show Justice in Immigration Policies Too': The Passage of the 1965 Immigration Act," *Journal of Policy History* 26 (2) (2014): 219-45; Eithne Luibheid, "The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act: An 'End' to Exclusion?" *Positions* 5 (2) (Fall 1997): 501-22; David Reimers, "More Liberal Than We Thought: A Note on Immediate Family Member Immigrants of U.S. Citizens," *Journal of Policy History* 25 (2) (April 2013): 288-98; Douglas Massey and Karen Pren, "Unintended Consequences of U.S. Immigration Policy: Explaining the Post-1965 Surge from Latin America," *Population and Development Review* 38 (1) (March 2012): 1-29; and Jeffrey Passel, "Demography of Immigrant Youth: Past, Present, and Future," *Future of Children* 21 (1) (Spring 2011): 19-41.

Week 7 (May 16)—Capitalism and the Economic Dynamics of Migration

If the Great Age of Migration that followed the Industrial Revolution marked the first period of what is now commonly referred to as "globalization," the period following the Second World War—and especially the period since the early 1970s—surely marks a second great era of globalization. A key feature of the current historical moment of globalization is the pronounced economic reordering of the world under principles that economists and economic historians have dubbed "neoliberalism." This week's readings explore the phenomenon of neoliberal economic restructuring, focusing in particular on

the many profound ways structural economic change has impinged on human migration and on both formal and informal systems of social membership in modern economies and societies.

READ: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, “Foreign-Born Workers: Labor Force Characteristics—2017,” (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, May 2018); Brookings Institution, “Immigrant Workers in the U.S. Labor Force,” (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2017); Katherine M. Donato and Douglas Massey, “Twenty-First Century Globalization and Illegal Migration,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 666 (1) (July 2016): 7-26; B. Lindsay Lowell, “A Long View of America’s Immigration Policy and the Supply of Foreign-Born STEM Workers in the United States,” *American Behavioral Scientist* 53 (7) (March 2010): 1029-44; Frank D. Bean, et al., “Luxury, Necessity, and Anachronistic Workers: Does the United States Need Unskilled Immigrant Labor?” *American Behavioral Scientist* 56 (8) (August 2012): 1008-28; Barbara Franz, Guest Workers and American Immigration Reform: The Rise of a New Feudalism in America?” *New Political Science* 29 (3) (September 2007): 349-68; and David R. Romero and Antonieta Mercado, “Cleaning San Diego: Migration, Geography, Exclusion, and Resistance,” *Ethnicities* 18 (6) (December 2018): 825-42.

Week 8 (May 23)—The Rise and Decline of the Immigrants’ Rights Movement

As we have already seen, non-citizen immigrants (and their citizen allies) have a long history of protesting their treatment in the United States, whether in the workplace, in the courts, or in the streets. Since the debate over California’s controversial Proposition 187 in the 1990s, the immigrants’ rights movement has grown in size, scale, and intensity. However, the emergence and growing visibility of this movement has created a backlash that in some ways came to fruition with the results of the 2016 presidential election. This week’s readings provide brief exposure to some of the debates about the history and future of the immigrants’ rights movement in the United States.

READ: Marcel Paret and Guadalupe Aguilera, “Golden State Uprising: Migrant Protest in California, 1990-2000,” *Citizenship Studies* 20 (3/4) (June 2016): 359-78; Walter Nichols, “Politicizing Undocumented Immigrants One Corner at a Time: How Day Laborers Became a Politically Contentious Group,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40 (2) (Mar. 2016): 299-320; Gabriela Marquez-Benitez and Amalia Pallares, “Not One More: Linking Civil Disobedience and Public Anti-Deportation Campaigns,” *North American Dialogue* 19 (1) (Spring 2016): 13-22; Ala Sirriyeh, “‘Felons Are also Our Family’: Citizenship and Solidarity in the Undocumented Youth Movement in the United States,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (1) (January 2019): 133-50; and Alan Colburn and S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, “Citizens of California: How the Golden State Went from Worst to First in Immigration Rights,” *New Political Science* 40 (2) (2018): 353-67.

Week 9 (May 30)—Contours of the Contemporary Debate

As we know, largely due to inaction in the Congress of the United States, immigration law and policy has struggled to cope with recent trends including the massive growth of the foreign-born population, millions of children of different citizenship and nationality

statuses, and a resident population of officially unauthorized persons that is currently estimated to be at least eleven million people—and perhaps many more. This week’s readings explore some of the many issues that have arisen as a consequence of the confluence of these trends.

READ: Jonathan Hiskey et al., “Leaving the Devil You Know: Crime Victimization, U.S. Deterrence Policy, and the Emigration Decision in Central America,” *Latin American Research Review* 53 (3) (2018): 429-47; Benjamin Roth et al., “Detached and Afraid: U.S. Immigration Policy and the Practice of Forcibly Separating Parents and Young Children at the Border,” *Child Welfare* 96 (5) (2018): 29-49; Jane Lilly López, “‘Impossible Families’: Mixed-Citizenship Status Couples and the Law,” *Law and Policy* 37 (1/2) (January 2015): 93-118; Michele Norris, “The Rising Anxiety of White America,” *National Geographic* (April 2018): 78-99; Matthew Ward, “Opportunity, Resources, and Threat; Explaining Local Nativist Organizing in the United States,” *Social Perspectives* 60 (3) (June 2017): 459-78; and Josiah Heyman, “U.S. Immigration Officers of Mexican Ancestry as Mexican Americans, Citizens, and Immigration Police,” *Current Anthropology* 43 (3) (June 2002): 479-507.

Week 10 (June 6) Citizenship and Its Futures

One of the first laws passed by the first Congress of the United States in 1790 established that access to U.S. citizenship would be restricted to free white adult males, a system of formal membership that remained largely in place until the Civil War. However, after the Civil War, the system of national citizenship was radically transformed by the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Henceforth, “all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof,” would be considered “citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.” In recent years, the explosive growth of the unauthorized immigrant population of the nation has led to calls to abolish birthright citizenship and devise a new system of national membership. This week’s readings explore some important dimensions of that highly contentious debate.

READ: Peter H. Schuck and Rogers M. Smith, “The Question of Birthright Citizenship,” *National Affairs* 36 (Summer 2018): 50-67; Shannon Auvil, “In Defense of Birthright Citizenship,” *DePaul Journal for Social Justice* 10 (1) (Winter 2017): 1-10; Joon Kim, Ernesto Sagás, and Karina Cespedes, “Genderacing Immigrant Subjects: ‘Anchor Babies’ and the Politics of Birthright Citizenship,” *Social Identities* 24 (3) (May 2018): 312-26; Sean F. Wang, “Birthright Citizenship, Reproductive Futurism, and the ‘Panic’ over Chinese Birth Tourism in Southern California,” *Environment and Planning—D* 35 (2) (April 2017): 263-80; and Tiffany F. Virgin, “Parallel Citizenships: Southern California Latino Gangs and the Concept of Citizenship,” *Atlantic Review of Latin American Studies* 1 (1) (Jan.-June 2017): 97-116.