

Introduction

Bridging the Past and Present in Assessing Migration

BRENDA J. BAKER AND TAKEYUKI TSUDA

Migration has been integral to the development of human societies since the emergence of our species and has continually reshaped the economic, ethnic, and political dynamics of various societies over time. Despite the importance of migration throughout human history, little dialogue has occurred between scholars examining contemporary and past migrations. This temporal division has led to seemingly disparate views of migration, creating a conceptual gulf between those who focus on modern migration and those who study it in the past. Modern migration scholars have only studied recent population movements and have shown no interest in ancient migrations. They have been interested mainly in the socioeconomic and political causes of migration, migrant labor markets, gender relationships and migrant families, transnationalism and diasporas, and attitudes toward migrants in receiving societies (Tsuda 2011:315). In contrast, scholars investigating migration in the past have focused on documenting migratory flows to explain changes in material culture or settlement and subsistence patterns, the origins and composition of specific peoples and their biological relationships, as well as the development and collapse of states (see critiques of this focus by Adams et al. 1978; Anthony 1990; Burmeister 2000; Cabana 2011; and Cabana and Clark 2011a:3–4, among others). Such studies usually emphasize natural or social disruptions (e.g., climate change, conquest, socioeconomic collapse) as a primary cause of migration.

The tacit assumption is that current migratory patterns differ radically from those in the distant past and, therefore, are not comparable. Some

archaeologists, in fact, have previously questioned or even rejected the relevance of modern migration to ancient migration (e.g., Clark 1994; Rouse 1986:161–163). Because people have always migrated, however, there is no distinct temporal or conceptual break between the past and present. Although “migration after the Industrial Revolution has been structured by capitalist wage-labor systems, modern nation-states and their immigration policies, as well as advanced transportation and communications technologies, none of which existed in antiquity” (Tsuda 2011:313; see also Anthony 1990:898; Beekman and Christensen 2003:115; Duff 1998:32; Rouse 1986:162), sufficient similarities and continuities exist to identify common patterns and dynamics involved in both past and present migration (O’Rourke 2012; Tsuda 2011).

According to world historian Patrick Manning (2006:48), contemporary migration is an acceleration of ancient processes rather than the development of entirely new ones. Similarly, two biological anthropologists, Ben Campbell and Michael Crawford (2012:2), state that, “while the scale and scope of migration has changed over time, its fundamental causes have not.” In fact, an increasing number of archaeologists, bioarchaeologists, and biological anthropologists now argue that certain aspects of current population movements resemble those from the distant past and that studies of modern migration can be used to provide a better understanding of ancient migrations (Anthony 1990:898, 1997; Burmeister 2000:543; Cabana and Clark 2011a:4; Cameron 1995; Chapman 1997; Duff 1998:32; O’Rourke 2012).

The central conviction of this book is that scholars of recent and ancient migrations can benefit considerably by sharing their knowledge and learning from each other. Such dialogue is especially important because archaeologists and biological anthropologists are increasingly interested in investigating why people migrate and understanding migration as a dynamic *process* (e.g., Anthony 1990:895–896; Beekman and Christensen 2003:113–114; Clark 2011; Duff 1998; O’Rourke 2012) rather than a simple *explanation* for change or discontinuities found in the material record or the biological composition of past peoples. As Tsuda (2011:315) has noted, some archaeologists have, therefore, used modern migration theories (e.g., Anthony 1990, 1997; Burmeister 2000; Duff 1998). In fact, migration research has experienced a recent resurgence among archaeologists, bioarchaeologists, and biological anthropologists, an interest that never waned among scholars of contemporary migration. Additionally, as noted by O’Rourke (2012:528), “the ecological forces that motivate human migration also af-

fect the genetic structure of human populations,” so that “migration as a process links the natural and social sciences.” The evolutionary perspective in biological anthropology provides a window into assessing how gene flow associated with migration affects skeletal morphology and the genetic composition of populations (see Bolnick 2011 for a recent overview). Although better methods are being used to detect and track past migration, including sourcing of raw materials, biogeochemical analyses of human bones and teeth, and ancient DNA analysis, it is still difficult to study the actual migratory process using the fragmentary material and skeletal record.

Unlike investigators of ancient migrations, modern migration scholars can observe migration directly as it occurs and can rely on a wealth of informant accounts, written documents, statistics, and mass media sources to analyze its complex social dynamics. However, they can also benefit from an intellectual collaboration with scholars studying migration in the past because their research covers a very limited time period (usually one or two years, in the case of ethnographic fieldwork). They cannot trace long-term changes in migratory patterns or their consequences, as archaeologists, bioarchaeologists, or many biological anthropologists do. Given the intensive and detailed ethnographic method that sociocultural anthropologists use, they must focus on community-level migrations, which makes it difficult to understand the broader structural impact of large migratory flows. The greater time depth and broader scope provided by studies of past migration can help modern migration specialists understand the common processes that operate in both the past and present and help project patterns of migration into the future.

This volume complements recent anthropological collections on migration (e.g., Cabana and Clark 2011b; Crawford and Campbell 2012). Although archaeologists and historians have commonly related migration to natural and social disruptions, those studying contemporary migration have not focused on disruption as a possible cause or consequence of migration. As a result, we decided to examine the role of disruption in migration. Contributors were asked to focus on this specific, but frequently invoked, aspect of migration and to consider two substantive questions in their own research areas:

1. To what extent have environmental and social disruptions been a cause of migration over time?
2. Did migratory flows lead to disruptive consequences for the societies that received them?

Each chapter articulates with a common, comprehensive framework developed by a working group of bioarchaeologists, archaeologists, and socio-cultural anthropologists, which is delineated in chapter 1. Chapter authors, thus, aim to develop our understanding of the relationship between disruptions and population displacements to form a cohesive volume that bridges past and present.

Late Lessons from Early History

This book is the culmination of a project led by the editors that was part of a School of Human Evolution and Social Change (SHESC) initiative, Late Lessons from Early History (LLEH), at Arizona State University (ASU). The goal of the LLEH initiative, as promulgated by SHESC's then director, Sander Van der Leeuw, was to develop research projects to explore the past, present, and future by crosscutting traditional academic boundaries and promote intellectual fusion within the nascent school and beyond it. A group of bioarchaeologists, archaeologists, and sociocultural anthropologists coalesced through a series of meetings organized around the central concept of disruptions and their relationship to population movements throughout human history. The main goals initially were to investigate how environmental and social disruptions may cause human migration over time and the ways in which migrants themselves may produce environmental or social disruptions in various host societies. As our thinking progressed, these goals were refined to address the extent to which disruptions relate to migration, recognizing that not all disruptions may produce migration since local populations can choose to stay rather than leave despite an interruption of their normal lifeways. To develop a common approach to this issue, we held meetings to discuss relevant readings on migration and present our ongoing research related to the project. Faculty from other disciplines at ASU (e.g., historian Dirk Hoerder) and scholars from other universities (David Anthony, Patrick Manning, and Bartholomew Dean) also visited to present their research and discuss our project. We also employed graduate research assistants Charisse Carver, Kent Johnson, Claire Smith, and Skaidra Smith-Heisters to produce an annotated bibliography of both past and present migration literature.

During the 2010–2011 academic year, the ASU group drafted an integrative intellectual framework that could be used to analyze migration from prehistory to the present. This conceptual and analytical framework was also used to generate interest among international scholars who wished to

develop the premises in collaboration with the ASU group. With funding from the Wenner-Gren Anthropological Research Foundation (Gr. CONF-573) and the ASU Late Lessons from Early History initiative, an international workshop, “Disruptions as a Cause and Consequence of Migrations in Human History,” was held May 3–5, 2012, at a rustic lodge on Saguaro Lake, on the outskirts of Mesa, Arizona. An effort was made to recruit scholars from many disciplines whose research spanned prehistoric to modern periods. Although historians were invited, none of them was able to attend the workshop. Participants ultimately included the ASU faculty group and seven non-ASU scholars (three archaeologists, a bioarchaeologist, two sociocultural anthropologists, and one international development scholar who conducts ethnographic fieldwork). The composition of the group left an unintended gap of about 600 years in our coverage of ancient and modern migrations. The workshop consisted of general sessions, which were devoted to discussion of relevant themes and the project’s intellectual framework, and more specific sessions for the discussion of case study papers submitted in advance by workshop participants. Our many lively discussions were highly successful and were very helpful in revising our project framework. After the workshop, the editors provided extensive comments to participants to help guide revisions of papers and promote articulation with the project’s intellectual framework. These papers, using different and sometimes multiple lines of evidence to address disruptive aspects of migration, are collected in this volume.

Organization of the Volume

The volume is divided into three parts. The first part provides the intellectual foundation on which the volume rests. The conceptual framework developed by the ASU group is presented in chapter 1. This chapter lays out the unifying themes and analytical framework discussed and developed over the course of this project to guide the contributors. Articulation with this conceptual framework was a key component of the May 2012 workshop presentations and subsequent discussion and revision of the chapters presented in this volume. The rest of the book is divided into two relatively equal parts consisting of chapters that investigate migration in past societies and those that examine contemporary population movements. Chapter authors were asked to stress connections between their work and those of others in both past and present settings.

Part II includes five chapters on migration and its relation to disrupt-