



UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS PRESS

Immigration & Ethnic
History Society

A Part and Apart: Asian American and Immigration History Author(s): Erika Lee

Source: *Journal of American Ethnic History*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer 2015), pp. 28-42

Published by: University of Illinois Press on behalf of the Immigration & Ethnic History Society

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/jamerethnhist.34.4.0028>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

University of Illinois Press and Immigration & Ethnic History Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of American Ethnic History*

A Part and Apart: Asian American and Immigration History

ERIKA LEE

THE FIRST TIME I PARTICIPATED in a state-of-the-field panel sponsored by the Immigration and Ethnic History Society was in January of 1998 at the American Historical Association (AHA) meeting in Seattle. I was on the job market, writing the final chapters of my dissertation, and was by far the most junior scholar on the panel. Joining me were George Sanchez, Jon Gjerde, Rudi Vecoli, and Donna Gabaccia. It was an unforgettable experience, not only because I sat at the table with some of the field's greatest immigration historians and ethnic studies scholars (including Rudi, on staff at the University of Minnesota, where I would be interviewing some weeks later), but also because the conversations that took place on the panel and the essays that followed in the special issue of the *Journal of American Ethnic History* articulated what seemed to be an intractable division in the field that hit right at the heart of the kind of scholar I aimed to be—an Asian Americanist *and* an immigration historian.¹

The greatest gap existed between George Sanchez and Rudi Vecoli. Sanchez, then an Associate Professor in the Department of History and the Program in American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California, identified a “crossroads” in the field: “one in which Latinos and Asians [were] viewed only as the latest of American immigrant groups, albeit colored differently, versus oppressed racial minorities with longstanding histories in this country, something similar but not equal to African Americans.” This predicament framed the “ambivalent position of scholars of these groups in relation to the field of immigration history.” There was, he explained, a “bifurcation of perspectives between those who study nineteenth and early twentieth-century European immigrants and those who concentrate on the immigrations, in the past and present, of people of color.” He pointedly asked: “Is there a way to break past the impasse in which one set of scholars simply expands the old categories which were made for European immigrants while another group firmly rejects the insights of immigration history in favor of separate paths framed by racial discourse?” The bulk of his comments, and later his essay, called for scholars to incorporate

insights on race, nation, and culture—frameworks that he identified as being developed outside of the field of immigration history—into the future of immigration history.²

In his commentary, Vecoli, Professor of History at the University of Minnesota and Director of the Immigration History Research Center (IHRC), took offense at the suggestion that the field was at an impasse, found Sanchez's description of immigration history a "caricature," and forcefully rejected the premise that the experiences of non-European immigrants differed "en masse in all respects" from that of European immigrants. "To do so would be to deny the possibility of a holistic conception of the field," he forcefully argued. Sanchez placed too much weight on equating the founding models of immigration history with a current definition of the field, Vecoli continued. Immigration historians of the 1960s and 1970s had, in fact, challenged earlier immigration paradigms of assimilation and uprootedness in favor of transplantation and ethnicity, and had brought long-neglected voices of immigrants to the forefront of American history. Vecoli also bristled at the suggestion that race should subsume the field of immigration history. "While I willingly grant the centrality of race in American history, I insist on the centrality of ethnicity," he concluded.³

Even if Sanchez and Vecoli represented what might have been extreme positions in this debate, their different perspectives on the field articulated a problem that many of us grappled with: What was my generation of scholars to make of this public dispute over the present status and future of the field? How could we reconcile both the European-based historiography of immigration history with the interdisciplinary ethnic studies scholarship on African Americans, American Indians, Chicano/Latinos, and Asian Americans that had been formed out of activist struggle? Would we draw more from past immigration history scholarship (as Vecoli suggested) or from theoretical frameworks drawn from other disciplines like critical ethnic studies; anthropology; sociology; and gender, women's, and sexuality studies (as Sanchez advocated)?

At the time, and certainly as voices grew louder and some nasty comments were uttered, my reaction was to keep my head down and stick to the script. My own paper on the importance of immigration law and policy as a new emerging subject in the field did not explicitly address these divergent views but did emphasize the role of race in immigration and naturalization law. An underlying goal was to show how laws affecting Asian immigrants were different from those affecting Europeans, but not "tangential" to immigration history as earlier generations of immigration historians had claimed.

In fact, I argued that Asian exclusion laws had helped set in motion a whole transformation of the United States into a “gatekeeping” nation that would affect all immigrants. In this way, I and many others took an approach that sought to place Asian immigration at the center of immigration history in order to raise new questions, not simply to add them to a growing list of groups to study.⁴

I was certainly aware of the divide between the two fields. I was finishing up my PhD in History at UC Berkeley under Jon Gjerde but was also working closely with scholars in ethnic studies. I had chosen Berkeley for my graduate work because it was one of the few research universities with both history and ethnic studies departments. But the reality of working with faculty from both units proved challenging due to the competition for resources on campus and other issues. I, and many other graduate students, had to cobble together our training in both fields with some delicacy and flexibility. Still, we could be considered lucky. My generation was among the first that could be fully trained as Asian Americanists. Previous generations had had to concentrate in Asian history, African history, African American studies, and other related fields. It was only because there was a critical mass of self-proclaimed Asian Americanists tenured at research institutions like Berkeley that my generation could receive the training that it needed.

Under Gjerde, I read the classics in immigration history: Marcus Lee Hansen, Frank Thistlewaite, William Isaac Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, Oscar Handlin, Rudi Vecoli, and John Bodnar. But in my other courses, I also read Michael Omi and Howard Winant on racial formation theory, Edward Said on Orientalism, and Michel Foucault on governmentality. And the graduate students taught each other. Madeline Hsu, visiting one semester to do research in the Bay Area, was the first person to introduce me to the concept of transnationalism through the work of Peggy Levitt, Nina Glick-Schiller, Cristina Szanton Blanc.

The present and the future of immigration history and its relationship to ethnic studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century were, in fact, not so dire or divisive as the AHA panel might indicate. Jon Gjerde, the third invited paper on that AHA panel and in the *JAEH* issue, and Donna Gabaccia, the chair of the panel, offered compromise and productive positions.

Gjerde, one of Rudi Vecoli’s former advisees at Minnesota, was best known for his scholarship and expertise on Norwegian and Scandinavian immigrants, the homeland conditions that shaped their migration to the United States, and the identities that they formed in relationship to both homeland ties and new surroundings. One of his contributions to the field

was the characterization of immigrants' "complementary identities" in which European immigrants and their children could "simultaneously—in a complementary, self-reinforcing fashion—maintain allegiances to the United States and to their former identities outside its borders."⁵ But he spent his career far from the Upper Midwest, at UC Berkeley, where he was a Professor in the Department of History. There, most of his advisees researched non-European immigrants, and his undergraduate classes were filled with students with last names like Park, Nguyen, Ramirez, and Lopez. I have to think that his particular location in California—one of the most diverse states in the country that was being remade by contemporary immigration—affected his understanding of the field.

In his AHA paper and *JAEH* article, Gjerde rejected the notion that the field of immigration history was experiencing a crisis. Research was expanding in new and exciting ways, and the diversity of subjects honored by the Saloutos Book Award in recent years was a sign that the field considered scholarship on both "old" and "new" immigrants part of the same exciting field. His position was that immigration historians needed to view contemporary immigrants (as well as earlier generations of Asian and Latino immigrants) as peoples whose identities and status had been shaped by *both* the experiences of migration and racial prejudice. No archetypal narrative of immigration or ethnicity in the United States—and certainly not Handlin's "immigrant paradigm"—was necessary or even fitting to explain the diversity of immigrant experiences in and immigration patterns to the United States. (Here, he seemed to differ from Vecoli who advocated for a "holistic conception of the field.") Unlike Sanchez, Gjerde did find much value in the earliest immigration historians, whom he called the "Ethnic Turnerians," immigrant-descended students of frontier historian Frederick Jackson Turner, such as Theodore Blegen, Carl Wittke, and Marcus Lee Hansen. They introduced terms like "grassroots" history and "history from the bottom up" while exploring the connections between immigrants and their homelands. These first immigration historians, Gjerde argued, pointed to a much broader conceptualization of immigration history than had previously been acknowledged and could be drawn from to shape the future of the field: comparative analyses of immigration and interaction amongst diverse peoples as well as transnational studies that retold "world history with a migrational perspective."⁶

In her comment, Donna Gabaccia, then at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, questioned the rigid definitions and boundaries of immigration history used by both Sanchez and Vecoli. She also echoed Gjerde's

suggestions to bridge the gap between ethnic studies and immigration history. Ethnic studies had “co-existed in a symbiotic but sometimes ambivalent embrace within immigration history,” she observed. Like Gjerde, she was optimistic about the future of both fields.⁷

At Minnesota, the home of the Immigration History Research Center and the birthplace of what Gabaccia would later call the “Minnesota School of Immigration Studies,” things were also changing. Later that winter, I was hired as part of a large search in twentieth-century U.S. history. Rudi warmly welcomed me into the Minnesota and IHRC community. In our teaching, Rudi and I divided up the study of immigration history. He continued to teach his undergraduate immigration history course (titled “Immigration History: European Americans”) and I taught Comparative Race and Ethnicity, which examined both the forced migrations of African Americans and American Indians, as well as the migrations of Europeans, Latinos, and Asians. (This course was modeled after Jon Gjerde’s “Repeopling of America” course at Berkeley). Rudi taught his immigration history graduate seminar and focused almost exclusively on European immigration before 1924. I taught more interdisciplinary seminars like “The Politics of Immigration,” which covered debates and policies related to a broad cross-section of immigrants in both the past and the present. These courses and our students co-existed under a large and expanding definition of immigration history.

David Roediger, one of the leading scholars in critical whiteness studies, and a colleague of Rudi’s and mine in the History Department, became another important bridge. Roediger’s own work was crucial in suggesting how European immigrants became racialized—and actively sought to be identified—as white.⁸ He and Rudi had their differences, but together, they created a working group on Race, Ethnicity, and Migration that aimed to link the study of ethnic “whiteness” and racialized minorities and to examine how the three categories of race, ethnicity, and migration worked together. One of the results of this collaboration was a highly successful 2000 conference at the University of Minnesota, and the IHRC continues to explore these intersections through its popular Global REM series. These types of intellectual innovations translated into graduate teaching. Jennifer Guglielmo, now Chair of the History Department at Smith College, was, for example, just one of the students who benefited from the mix of perspectives at Minnesota at the time. Vecoli, Roediger, and I all served on her committee, as did Gabaccia, from Charlotte, North Carolina. Guglielmo’s book, *Living the Revolution: Italian Women’s Resistance and Radicalism in New York City, 1880–1945* (2010), went on to win the Theodore Saloutos Prize in 2010.

After Rudi Vecoli retired from the University of Minnesota in 2005, Donna Gabaccia succeeded him as Director of the Immigration History Research Center. She articulated what she called a “midlife discomfort” at the IHRC as she sought to extend the center’s global and comparative research agenda, connect the migrations of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Western Hemisphere together, and link the histories of early twentieth-century immigrants with more recent arrivals. One of the first events the IHRC organized was a series of lectures called “It’s History: Immigration since 1965,” to highlight the growing numbers of historians who now work on post-1965 immigration and immigrant communities.⁹

These changes at the University of Minnesota and the IHRC reflected larger changes in the fields of immigration history and ethnic studies. Over the past decades, both immigration history and Asian American studies have grown more closely intersected, and I believe this is because of the shared trend toward interdisciplinarity that George Sanchez highlighted in the 1998 forum as a central feature of ethnic studies scholarship, and which is now a critical part of history scholarship as well. Both fields have also placed race and colonialism at the center of new inquiries, as Sanchez advocated. But scholarship has also been transformed by incorporating new insights drawn from contemporary immigration patterns and immigrant life. Concepts and phenomena such as transnationalism, globalization, diaspora, dual citizenship, “illegal” immigration regimes, and incarceration and deportation, just to name a few, have all affected how scholars see both our contemporary and our historical worlds. As a result, scholars of Asian, Latino, European, and African migration in the past and present are increasingly studying similar topics and using similar comparative, multi-sited, multi-lingual, transnational, and global methodologies even as the fields maintain distinct trajectories.

Let me turn to a few examples. First is the ongoing reconceptualization of the very nature and consequences of human movement. Immigration has traditionally been defined as processes of “push and pull” in which individual immigrants make rational decisions to embark on one-way journeys to better lives. Even if it was the goal of many immigration historians to challenge this paradigm, it remains firmly entrenched in the U.S. “nation of immigrants” narrative.¹⁰

In the past thirty years, both Asian Americanists and immigration historians have shifted the focus to study the complex factors shaping international migration, often drawing from theories and frameworks outside of history. Scholars like Lucie Cheng, Edna Bonacich, Yong Chen, Dorothy

Fujita-Rony, and Catherine Ceniza Choy, for example, have examined the connections between capitalism, imperialism, uneven economic development, and population displacement in Asia with migration abroad. The United States' powerful reach in places like the Philippines both during its formal period of colonial rule up through today continues to shape migration patterns.¹¹ The business of migration and the culture of migration have also been emphasized as structuring and facilitating movement.

Both immigration historians and Asian Americanists are also adopting more flexible definitions and frameworks of migration and mobility to refer to the multiple ways in which people move. Christiane Harzig and Dirk Hoerder explain, for example, that migration can be many-directional and multiple, temporary or long-term, voluntary or forced. Migrants negotiate their options and constraints and sometimes change directions to keep on the move or return to where they began. This broader framework allows scholars to look at “both ends of mobility;” to examine how migration affects both the sending and receiving societies. Donna Gabaccia has called on immigration historians to pay more attention to the “continuous, multidirectional, and circular character of migrations” rather than relying upon the older “immigrant paradigm and its well-worn paths of immigration and adaptation to the United States.” Similarly, Madeline Hsu has argued for a transnational, “ambulatory” approach that recognizes migrants’ “complicated sets of negotiations, multilayered realities, and multidirectional orientations.”¹²

Here, a long and global history of Asian migration is helpful. It includes a great variety of different types of movement—free and indentured migration, colonial migrations, transnational movements and networks, circular migration, undocumented migration, secondary migration, and return migration—as well as a great diversity of migrant subjects, including unskilled laborers, professionals, indentured laborers, slaves, students, merchants, refugees, adoptees, families, undocumented immigrants, and so forth. Examining these varied and multiple migrations help us to better understand complicated migration histories and how they connect to larger historical patterns.

The earliest Asians to the Americas, for example, came as part of Spain's Pacific Empire that connected its colony in the Philippines to New Spain (colonial Mexico). Asian sailors, servants, and slaves traversed the Pacific on massive trading vessels called Manila galleons. They landed in Acapulco as part of global trade routes that connected Asia and the Americas together for the first time beginning in 1565, and transformed both the local communities they inhabited and the global world they were helping to expand.

Studies of these earliest Asians—mostly from the fields of Asian history and Latin American history—connect to new scholarship in early American history that places the movement of settlers, servants, and slaves within the transatlantic world of settler colonialism, contact with and dispossession of indigenous peoples, the African slave trade, and the formation of multiracial societies and racial hierarchies.¹³

The migration of these early Asians to the Americas was followed by 250,000 indentured Chinese laborers heading to Cuba and Peru and another 419,000 South Asians heading to the British West Indies. These “coolies” were coerced, kidnapped, and hoodwinked into lives of indentured labor, and for the Chinese in Cuba, new kinds of slavery. The most recent scholarship on these migrations embeds them within the historiography of African slavery and the making of modern societies.¹⁴

The migrations of Asians to the United States beginning in the mid-nineteenth century were connected to both the movement of Asian indentured laborers to Latin America as well as to the great migrations of Europeans to the United States. Again, multiple types of migrating Asians illuminate broader patterns that are instructive to immigration history more generally. Many Asians were part of large, extended migration chains that extended across generations and were made up of transnational split-family households that spanned the Pacific.¹⁵ Some moved permanently to the United States or to other parts of North America and South America. Others came for only a short time or moved multiple times back and forth across the Pacific as well as within the Americas as the search for employment, land, family, and freedom from persecution pushed them to stay on the move. Scholarship that has explored these multiple types of Asian migration dovetails nicely with recent work on the Italian diaspora, for example, by Donna Gabaccia and others, studies on return migration by Mark Wyman, and analyses of European immigrants in Latin America, such as that by Samuel Baily.¹⁶

Post-World War II Asian immigration to the United States is clearly tied to the United States’ growing presence in Asia, new Cold War realignments, and changing attitudes and policies toward Asia and Asians. Refugees, war brides, and adoptees all reflect the impact of U.S. foreign policy on Asian immigration, and recent work on these subjects intersects particularly well with new attention on the relationship between international relations and international migration more broadly.¹⁷

If the multiplicity of migration patterns constitutes one way in which Asian American studies intersects with immigration history, another theme

relates to how Asian Americans have “become American.” This has sometimes meant the type of ethnic history that Rudi Vecoli and others helped pioneer. Recent scholarship has explored the forging of Japanese American identity through festivals in Japantown, Chinese American identity through Chinese New Year parades and beauty pageants, the preservation of Stockton’s Little Manila, and the invention of two competing Hmong New Year celebrations in the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.¹⁸

But Asian American ethnic identity not only was formed through the experiences of migration and adjustment to a new land. As scholars of critical race studies have made clear, it was also tied to experiences of racial discrimination and the international position of their homelands vis-à-vis the United States. Becoming “American” has also meant living in a highly unequal society in which one’s race, class, gender, ability, and sexual orientation still matter in material ways.

One way in which race has mattered for Asian Americans has been that despite their diverse origins, Asian immigrants have been consistently lumped together and treated as one monolithic group. Their Asian heritage plays into persistent cultural beliefs about the dangerous, inferior, and opposite nature of the “East” (Asia) as opposed to the “West” (Europe and the Americas), American versions of Edward Said’s theories of Orientalism.¹⁹ As a result, Asian immigrants have been alternately welcomed into and excluded from the United States, but are still fully recognized as “American.” Beginning in the nineteenth century and continuing to the present day, Asian Americans have been the focus of some of the most divisive debates over immigration, race, national identity, and international security. In these ways, the history of Asian immigration and exclusion intersects well with scholarship related to contemporary debates over immigration, border security, and citizenship, almost all of it focused on undocumented immigration from Mexico and other parts of Latin America.

But the racial position of Asian Americans has also been tied to international events and U.S.-Asian relations. Before World War II, their Asian-ness was seen as an obstacle to Americanness. After World War II, certain “ethnic traits”—often tied to a culturally essentialist version of “Asian” culture defined by filial piety, hard work, and respect for authority—have been celebrated because they complemented so-called “American” traits and served larger political purposes in the United States. The domestic and internationalized racialization of Asian Americans was best seen during World War II and the Cold War. Following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Japanese Americans were labeled as members of an “enemy race”

and forcibly removed and incarcerated, while Chinese, Filipino, and Indian Americans were held up as “good Asians,” whose homelands were U.S. allies.²⁰

The Cold War was the catalyst for further transformations in both the U.S. entanglements with Asia and new U.S. attitudes about Asians. Japan became, as Naoko Shibusawa has shown, “America’s geisha ally,” a feminized nation eager to be tutored (and protected) by the United States as long as it continued to perform its important capitalist and anti-Communist role.²¹ Ellen Wu has recently demonstrated how Cold War-era discourses of Asian Americans as “model minorities” were popular and significant because they upheld two dominant lines of Cold War-era thinking. The first was the “valorization of the nuclear family.” The second was anti-Communism. Chinese American nuclear families—successful, domesticated, and assimilated—were held up as an example of the American way of life but also as a modern manifestation of Confucian tradition (not new Communist social engineering under Mao Zedong).²²

More recent examples point to how Asian Americans continue to be unstably included in the United States—what some scholars have called “probationary Americans” due to both their racial and internationalized positions.²³ “Tiger Mom” Amy Chua’s claim that strict “Chinese” parenting is the key to children’s success (as compared to lax, individualist Western parenting) created a firestorm of both praise and recriminations. The reaction belied an anxiety tied to shifting U.S. racial demographics and the changing position and faltering hegemony of the United States in the world, especially in relation to the rise of a powerful and threatening China.²⁴

For some Asian Americans, ethnic identity in the United States has also been tied unalterably to anti-colonialist struggles in their homeland. European, U.S., and Japanese imperialism in Asia beginning in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries resulted in unequal treaties, loss of national sovereignty, and colonial policies of subjugation. Some of the migrants who came to the United States came as self-proclaimed refugees fleeing colonial oppression at home. We see this most clearly amongst Korean and Indian immigrants whose early twentieth century struggles to free their homelands from foreign domination (the British in India and the Japanese in Korea) became an integral part of being Indian or Korean in America. Indians in North America, for example, helped form the Gadar Party (Urdu for “revolution”) to overthrow British rule in India. For many, the Gadar movement represented hope not only for an independent India, but also for equal treatment in the United States and Canada. Gadar leader Gobind Behari Lal explained

that “it [is] no use to talk about the Asiatic Exclusion Act, immigration, and citizenship. [We have] to strike at the British because they [are] responsible for the way Indians [are] being treated in America.”²⁵ This appeal struck a chord in many South Asian farmers and laborers in the United States and Canada. Within a short period of time, a majority of South Asians along the West Coast subscribed to the revolutionary ideology of the Gadar Party.

Japanese colonization of Korea between 1910 and 1945 turned Koreans abroad into stateless exiles. They were united in a shared goal to rid Korea of Japanese control, and they formed a cohesive community around Korean nationalism. “We are not sojourners . . . and we are not laborers,” the *Sinhan Minbo* newspaper declared in 1910, “but political wanderers . . . and righteous army soldiers.”²⁶ Korean immigrant nationalist activities took place at the international level, on the streets, and in the backrooms of stores and church basements. Although there were sizable Korean communities in Manchuria, Siberia, China, Europe, Mexico, and Cuba, Koreans in the United States played especially important roles in the global Korean independence movement.

The last theme that has connected the fields of immigration history and Asian American studies more closely together is transnationalism. Since the passage of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act fifty years ago, immigration from Asia has grown exponentially. In 1960, the total Asian American population in the United States was just under one million people, or one percent of the total U.S. population. In 2010, twenty-eight percent of all foreign-born peoples in the country were born in Asia, and the total Asian American population, including foreign-born (fifty-nine percent) and U.S.-born (forty-one percent), is over 18 million, or almost six percent of the total U.S. population.²⁷ Following the aftermath of the wars in Southeast Asia, refugees have also come in search of new homes. From 1975 to 2010, 1.2 million Vietnamese, Lao, Hmong, and Cambodian peoples came to the United States.²⁸ Recent Asian immigrants and refugees are both similar and different from Asian immigrants who arrived prior to World War II, and comparisons of Asian Americans then and now can complement comparative studies of immigration to the United States at the end of the nineteenth century and at the end of the twentieth century.²⁹

For example, the question of immigrant transnationalism—in the form of transnational identities and connections, homeland and diasporic politics, and flexible citizenship—has been the focus of Asian American studies in both the present and the past. Contemporary immigrants of color, we are told, are creating new, multilayered identities. They are simultaneously racial

minorities within nations, transnational immigrants who engage in two or more homelands or homes, and diasporic citizens making connections across borders. Like many contemporary immigrants around the world, they “don’t trade in their home country membership card for an American one,” as anthropologist Peggy Levitt explains. Rather, they “belong to several communities at once,” while becoming part of the United States and staying connected to their ancestral homes at the same time. Their children may be growing up “American,” but they still send money back home to elderly parents. Asian immigrants might shop at Costco for paper towels, but they might also go to the local Indian grocery store for lentils and spices. (Or they might purchase the same lentils and spices in bulk quantities at Costco, a phenomenon that is becoming increasingly common in cities with large ethnic communities.) Like many other immigrants who are part of this latest era of globalization, Asian immigrants are paving the way toward new ways of “becoming American” and of becoming “global” by figuring out how to situate themselves in a changing world. In challenging the dichotomy of “remaining Asian” or “becoming American,” these insights on contemporary communities have become instrumental to how Asian American historians now understand earlier generations of Asian immigrants. For example, recent work by Madeline Hsu, Eiichiro Azuma, Richard S. Kim, Grace Peña Delgado, and Julia María Camacho Schiavone underscores how important these frameworks have been in understanding earlier migrations of Asians.³⁰ The trend in comparing immigrant transnationalism across different eras of migration is similar for other groups as well.³¹

Returning back to where I started: if my first state-of-the-field experience left me ducking for cover, I am pleased to be returning today to this state-of-the-field panel to remark on how the “intractable divide” seems to be no more. There remain important and productive distinctions. But there is also a lot more conversation, cross-fertilization, and connection underway. Immigration history, broadly defined, is more like Asian American studies (and vice versa) than ever before because we have integrated more insights from a broad range of fields, including ethnic studies, into our work to ask new questions, take on new approaches, and make connections (across groups and between past and present) where before we might have only seen divisions.

Every field experiences growing pains. The 1998 state of the field panel was a reflection of one such moment. But even if the divide between ethnic studies scholars and immigration historians seemed wide at the time, there were already people who could see the benefits of both approaches and

who employed them both in their work. One needs to look no further than the new books and articles being published today in a wide variety of fields to see how much we have learned from each other. As we look forward to recognizing in 2015 the fiftieth anniversary of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, which has allowed the latest generation of immigrants to enter the United States, as well as the fiftieth anniversaries of the IEHS and the IHRC, two of the field's important institutions, understanding these differences and connections will be even more important as we consider what immigration history will look like in the next fifty years.

NOTES

1. The special issue was published in the *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1999).

2. George J. Sanchez, "Race, Nation, and Culture in Recent Immigration Studies," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1999): 66–84, esp. 67–68, 74.

3. Rudolph J. Vecoli, "Comment: We Study the Present to Understand the Past," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1999): 115–25, esp. 118, 121–22.

4. Erika Lee, "Immigrants and Immigration Law: A State of the Field Assessment," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1999): 85–114.

5. Jon Gjerde, *From Peasants to Farmers: The Migration from Balestrand, Norway, to the Upper Middle West* (New York, 1985); Gjerde, *The Minds of the West: Ethnocultural Evolution in the Rural Midwest, 1830–1917* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1997). On "complementary identity," see Gjerde, *Minds of the West*, 59–60.

6. Jon Gjerde, "New Growth on Old Vines—The State of the Field: The Social History of Immigration to and Ethnicity in the United States," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1999): 40–65.

7. Donna Gabaccia, "Comment: Ins and Outs: Who Is an Immigration Historian?" *Journal of American Ethnic History* 26, no. 4 (Summer 2006): 126–35, esp. 126.

8. See, for example, David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York, 1991); Roediger, *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness* (New York, 1994); Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs* (New York, 2005); Roediger, *How Race Survived U.S. History: From Settlement and Slavery to the Obama Phenomenon* (New York, 2010).

9. Donna Gabaccia, "The Immigration History Research Center: Out of the Past, a Promising Future," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 25, no. 4 (Summer 2006): 60–67.

10. Donna R. Gabaccia, "Do We Still Need Immigration History?," *Polish American Studies* 55, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 45–68.

11. Lucie Cheng and Edna Bonacich, *Labor Immigration under Capitalism: Asian Workers in the United States* (Berkeley, CA, 1984); Yong Chen, *Chinese San Francisco, 1850–1943: A Trans-Pacific Community* (Stanford, CA, 2000); Dorothy Fujita-Rony, *American Workers, Colonial Power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West, 1919–1941* (Berkeley, CA, 2002), 19; Catherine Ceniza Choy, *Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino*

American History (Durham, NC, 2003). See also Gary Okihiro, *The Columbia Guide to Asian American History* (New York, 2013), 71–74.

12. Christiane Harzig, and Dirk Hoerder, with Donna R. Gabaccia, *What Is Migration History?* (Cambridge, UK, 2009), 3; Donna R. Gabaccia, “Is Everywhere Nowhere?: Nomads, Nations, and the Immigrant Paradigm of United States History,” *Journal of American History* 86, no. 3 (December 1999): 1116; Madeline Hsu, “Transnationalism and Asian American Studies as a Migration-Centered Project,” *Journal of Asian American Studies* 11, no. 2 (June 2008): 185.

13. Edward R. Slack, Jr., “Los Chinos in New Spain: A Corrective Lens for a Distorted Image,” *Journal of World History* 20, no. 1 (2009): 35–67; Slack, “Sinifying New Spain: Cathay’s Influence on Colonial Mexico via the Nao de China,” in *The Chinese in Latin America and the Caribbean*, ed. Walton Look Lai and Chee Beng Tan (Leiden, Netherlands, 2010), 7–34. Examples from early American history include Tracy Neal Leavelle, “Geographies of Encounter: Religion and Contested Spaces in Colonial North America,” *American Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (December 2004): 913–43; Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA, 1999).

14. Lisa Yun, *The Coolie Speaks: Chinese Indentured Laborers and African Slaves in Cuba* (Philadelphia, PA, 2008); Kathleen M. López, *Chinese Cubans: A Transnational History* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2013); Moon-Ho Jung, *Coolies and Cane: Race, Labor, and Sugar in the Age of Emancipation* (Baltimore, MD, 2008); Walton Look Lai, *Indentured Labor, Caribbean Sugar: Chinese and Indian Migrants to the British West Indies, 1838–1918* (Baltimore, MD, 1993).

15. Evelyn Nakano Glenn, “Split Household, Small Producer, and Dual Wage Earner: An Analysis of Chinese-American Family Strategies,” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 45, no. 1 (February 1983): 35–46; Madeline Hsu, *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home: Transnationalism and Migration between the United States and South China, 1882–1943* (Stanford, CA, 2000).

16. Donna R. Gabaccia, *Italy’s Many Diasporas* (New York, 2000); Donna R. Gabaccia and Fraser Ottanelli, eds., *Italian Workers of the World: Labor Migration and the Formation of Multiethnic States* (Urbana, IL, 2001); Donna R. Gabaccia and Franca Iacovetta, eds., *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives: Italian Workers of the World* (Toronto, 2002); Mark Wyman, *Round-Trip to America: The Immigrants Return to Europe, 1880–1930* (Ithaca, NY, 1993); Samuel L. Baily, *Immigrants in the Lands of Promise: Italians in Buenos Aires and New York, 1870–1914* (Ithaca, NY, 1999).

17. Donna R. Gabaccia, *Foreign Relations: American Immigration in Global Perspective* (Princeton, NJ, 2012); Yèn Lê Espiritu, “Toward a Critical Refugee Study: The Vietnamese Refugee Subject in U.S. Scholarship,” *Journal of Vietnamese Studies* 1, nos. 1–2 (2006): 410–33; Naoko Shibusawa, *America’s Geisha Ally: Reimagining the Japanese Enemy* (Cambridge, MA, 2010); Chia Youyee Vang, *Hmong America: Reconstructing Community in Diaspora* (Urbana, IL, 2010); Ji-Yeon Yuh, *Beyond the Shadow of Camptown: Korean Military Brides in America* (New York, 2002); Catherine Ceniza Choy, *Global Families: A History of Asian International Adoption in America* (New York, 2013).

18. Lon Kurashige, *Japanese American Celebration and Conflict: A History of Ethnic Identity and Festival, 1934–1990* (Berkeley, CA, 2001); Shirley Lim, *A Feeling of Belonging: Asian American Women’s Public Culture, 1930–1960* (New York, 2005); Dawn Bohulano Mabalon, *Little Manila Is in the Heart: The Making of the Filipina/o American Community*

in Stockton, California (Durham, NC, 2013); Chia Vang, *Hmong America: Reconstructing Community in Diaspora* (Urbana, IL, 2010).

19. Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham, NC, 1996).

20. Kevin Scott Wong, *Americans First: Chinese Americans and the Second World War* (Cambridge, MA, 2005); Mabalon, *Little Manila*.

21. Shibusawa, *America's Geisha Ally*.

22. Ellen Wu, *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority* (Princeton, NJ, 2013).

23. John S. W. Park and Edward J. W. Park, *Probationary Americans: Contemporary Immigration Policies and the Shaping of Asian American Communities* (New York, 2006).

24. Amy Chua, "Why Chinese Mothers Are Superior," *Wall Street Journal*, January 8, 2011, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052748704111504576059713528698754>. See also commentary from Jeff Yang, "Mother, Superior?," *SFGate*, January 13, 2001, <http://www.sfgate.com/entertainment/article/Mother-superior-2383957.php#src=fb>; Mitchell James Chang, "Battle Hymn of the Model Minority Myth," *Amerasia* 37, no. 2 (2011): 137–43.

25. Mark Juergensmeyer, "The Ghadar Syndrome: Nationalism in an Immigrant Community," *Punjab Journal of Politics* 1, no. 1 (October 1977): 1–22, esp. 8.

26. Richard S. Kim, *The Quest for Statehood: Korean Immigrant Nationalism and U.S. Sovereignty, 1905–1945* (New York, 2011), 26.

27. Elizabeth M. Grieco et al., "The Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2010," U.S. Census Bureau, May 2012, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2012pubs/acs-19.pdf>; Pew Research Center, "The Rise of Asian Americans," April 4, 2013, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans/>; Nathan P. Walters and Edward N. Trevelyan, "The Newly Arrived Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 2010," U.S. Census Bureau, November 2011, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-16.pdf>.

28. These figures include 145,230 Cambodians (Khmer, Cham, Khmer Loeu), 257,587 Lao (Hmong, Iu Mien, Khmu, Tai Dam, Tai Leu, and Lao), and 771,834 Vietnamese (Vietnamese, Khmer Kampuchea Krom, Montagnards). Southeast Asia Resource Action Center, "Southeast Asian Americans at a Glance: Statistics on Southeast Asians Adapted from the American Community Survey," January 19, 2011, <http://www.searac.org/sites/default/files/SEAAAtAGlanceJan2011.pdf>.

29. For a history of Asian Americans across the span of U.S. history, see Erika Lee, *The Making of Asian America: A History* (New York, 2015). For a comparison of immigration at the beginning and end of the twentieth century, see Nancy Foner, *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's Two Great Waves of Immigration* (New Haven, CT, 2000).

30. Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York, 2005); Hsu, *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home*; Kim, *Quest for Statehood*; Grace Peña Delgado, *Making the Chinese Mexican: Global Migration, Localism, and Exclusion in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands* (Stanford, CA, 2012).

31. Peggy Levitt, *God Needs No Passport: Immigrants and the Changing American Religious Landscape* (New York, 2007), 2, 12, 26, 37.