

rather than as culturally constructed meanings. In the final essay in the volume, "Queen Victoria, the Monarchy and Gender", however, Thompson examines the significance of gender meanings in the Queen Caroline agitation, and in the possibility that Queen Victoria's gender "disarmed radical republicanism". This essay raises a number of questions that Thompson does not address, for example, how both class and imperialism were implicated in this gendering of royalism. However, it suggests her creative use of gender as a cultural construct, and leads one to suspect that if she were to use such an approach to rethink her Chartist materials, it might inspire her to new insights adding to or perhaps modifying those presented here.

Finally, although Thompson insists that class is central to the history of this period, she does not attempt the admittedly difficult task of defining it. Refusing to essentialize class she argues that historians need to use the word descriptively if not analytically, because nineteenth-century sources are riddled with its use. Scholars who are tackling the crucial analytical problem of how to link the social and economic levels of analysis to the political could benefit from Dorothy Thompson's keen historical sensibilities, but they must then draw out their theoretical implications.

Sonya O. Rose

MOCH, LESLIE PAGE. *Moving Europeans. Migration in Western Europe since 1650.* [Interdisciplinary Studies in History.] Indiana University Press, Bloomington [etc.] 1992. xii, 257 pp. Maps. \$35.00.

Migration has slowly but surely become a popular subject within the field of social and economic history. An important source for this growing interest was the unrelenting stream of publications on immigration to the United States which have appeared since the 1970s and in which much attention was paid to the (supposed) exceptional, spectacular and heroic elements of a mass migration that had an enormous appeal to the imagination and fitted well the national image of the U.S. as a country of immigrants. During the past few years this attention has shifted somewhat to the "normal" instead of the "exceptional" character of migration. Both Tilly and Morawska have pointed to the considerable degree of continuity between the Old World and the New.¹ This trend has been continued in the collection of essays by Vecoli and Sinke in which Dirk Hoerder argues that the phenomenon of migration was essentially related to the general development of the labour market.²

Despite fundamental theoretical progress, the emphasis on the United States and on the recent period means the scope of this has been limited. Theories of migration have been applied to other parts of the world, but again often

¹ See their contributions to Virginia Yans-McLaughlin (ed.), *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics* (New York etc., 1990).

² Dirk Hoerder, "International labor markets and community building by migrant workers in the Atlantic economies", in Rudolph J. Vecoli and Susanne M. Sinke (eds), *A Century of European Migrations, 1830-1930* (Urbana and Chicago, 1991), pp. 78-110. See also his latest publication, *People on the move. Migration, acculturation, and ethnic interaction in Europe and North-America* (German Historical Institute Washington D.C. Annual Lecture Series no. 6) (Providence/Oxford, 1993).

within narrow national frameworks. The collection of essays by Pooley and Whyte is a good example: despite its broad-sounding title, it is almost exclusively devoted to the United Kingdom.³

In contrast to what has been said above, the American historian Leslie Page Moch more than fulfils the promise of her book's title, *Migration in Western Europe since 1650*. In it Moch systematically develops several ideas already advanced in her 1983 study *Paths to the City: Regional Migration to 19th century France*. She was one of the first scholars to show that the simple framework in which migration is portrayed as the consequence of industrialization and consists simply of a one-directional flow from the countryside to the city, with all the symptoms associated with uprooting that entailed, was unconvincing. Instead of this she presented an interpretative framework which was not only much more nuanced but also fundamentally different, one in which (labour) migration is conceived of as a conscious familial strategy aimed at social mobility. Likewise, there was virtually no evidence of a "flight" to the city: many migrants in fact regularly returned to the countryside and, in so far as they moved to the city permanently, they continued to maintain close links for a long time with those they left behind.

In her most recent book Moch has considerably expanded these insights both in terms of time and geography. Based on an impressive synthesis of the secondary literature, she has examined the role migration played in the socio-economic development of Western Europe since 1650. In this she pays systematic attention to local, circular, chain, and career migration and also to the special position of women. Moch makes a distinction between the following periods. Firstly, the pre-industrial period 1650–1750, during which migration was predominantly a local phenomenon. There were many "movements" of migrants, but they were largely restricted to local, circular (seasonal) migration, and chain migration to the cities.

The second period distinguished by Moch is 1750–1815. This transitional period was characterized by the emergence of rural industry, proletarianization, and a considerable increase in the size of the population. The putting-out system prevented this growing population from moving and thereby acted as a brake on migration. In contrast, areas without rural industry became more reliant on seasonal migration.

The period 1815–1914, a period of urbanization and industrialization, merely saw a change in the type of migration. Although rural industry slowly but surely disappeared and migration to the city increased, the transition was by no means as mechanical as has long been assumed. Cities were not a magnet: many people continued to move between the city and countryside for a long time. The same was true of industry. Certainly, in the first phase of industrialization opportunities for factory employment were very variable (the same was true of commercial agriculture), which meant many workers constantly had to change jobs and migration between cities and between the city and rural areas increased enormously. It was only later that workers became more tied to capital and went to live permanently in cities. Finally, this was also the century of transatlantic emigration. Between 1860 and 1914 around fifty-two million people left the Old World; around three-quarters of them ended up in North America.

³ Colin Pooley and Ian D. Whyte (eds), *Migrants, Emigrants and Immigrants: A Social History of Migration* (London and New York, 1991).

The fourth period Moch distinguishes is 1914–1992. World War One meant a definitive break with the past. For the first time, countries imposed restrictions on migration and tried to control international migration. At the same time, unlike in the nineteenth century, countries in Western Europe made efforts to attract labour (from Eastern and Southern Europe and later the Near East and North Africa), while the character of foreign labour also changed. Seasonal migration became less and less significant, and was gradually replaced by chain migration and permanent settlement. These changes, coupled with the development of modern forms of government and the advance of proletarianization, meant countries became increasingly interested in controlling (labour) migration and restricting the influx of undesirable migrants, as the history of Polish workers in Germany demonstrates.

One of Moch's most significant conclusions is that migration has been an essential component of Western Europe's history since the Middle Ages and that it was certainly not restricted to periods of urbanization and industrialization. By focusing on the "invisible and permanent" forms of migration rather than the spectacular forms of migration as a consequence of war, religious conflicts and famines which have tended to attract the attention of scholars, she convincingly demonstrates how widespread the phenomenon was and how closely it was connected to general socio-economic changes. The book is thus a "must" not only for scholars interested in migration; those interested more generally in socio-economic developments will find it offers much of value. That Moch treats migration not as an isolated phenomenon but as a fundamental feature of social and economic history is perhaps her greatest virtue. In doing so she associates herself closely with the work of Jan Lucassen, who is frequently cited by Moch and who had already suggested a similar perspective in relation to seasonal migration.⁴

Moch's consistently sustained analytical framework has its limitations, however. First, her explanation of migration patterns fails where it concerns the emergence of a specific aliens policy after 1914. She correctly notes that there was a change in the pattern of labour migration (from temporary to permanent) and that new sources of immigrants emerged, but this does not explain *why* such a change prompted the state to impose greater controls on migration. Moreover, she fails to take adequate account of earlier attempts at such control, particularly in France and Germany. More socio-political factors needed to be considered here. The recent studies by Noiriël and Brubaker⁵ show that the call for controls on immigration in France and Germany in the last few decades of the nineteenth century were closely connected with the emergence of the labour movement and, partly in reaction to this, the establishment of a limited system of social welfare. Because all sorts of advantages were tied to citizenship, the way was

⁴ Jan Lucassen, *Migrant Labour in Europe 1600–1900: The Drift to the North Sea* (London etc., 1987).

⁵ Gérard Noiriël, *La tyrannie du national. Le droit d'asile en Europe 1793–1993* (Paris, 1991) and Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1992). For a more extensive discussion see Leo Lucassen, "Het onontkoombare nationaliteitsbeginsel. Een bespreking van enige recente literatuur over (im)migratie en natievorming", *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis*, 4 (1993), pp. 489–505.

thereby paved for aliens to be excluded and for the extension of a bureaucratic apparatus to ensure this.

In order to understand the origins of this, we have to go back even further. Even in the first half of the nineteenth century itinerant aliens were regarded as undesirable, and considerable energy was expended by the still modest police apparatus to bar them. A tempting explanation for this is to be found in Brubaker's study, which notes that when the Prussian state took over from the cities responsibility for providing for the poor, the state found itself forced to define who had Prussian citizenship. The codification of citizenship in 1842 speeded up this process and the economic liberalization and the freedom of movement (*Freizügigkeit*) suddenly made the nationality issue acute. Now that responsibility lay with the state, conflicts between the municipalities over who had responsibility for the poor became less important.⁶

A second limitation of Moch's perspective is her somewhat stereotypical description of the new, non-European immigrant groups in the twentieth century. This limitation is most apparent in her attempt to explain the formation of minorities in post-war Western Europe. In her account she concentrates on the religious, linguistic and cultural characteristics of the groups themselves. Although she is aware of government immigration policies, Moch argues that it is principally the deviant cultures of immigrants that have made the Turks in Germany and the Algerians in France, for example, into a minority. I do not want to deny that culture has played a role (and still does), but culture is certainly not the only factor and probably not the most decisive one either.⁷ Studies of the attitudes of those societies to which immigrants have moved, the attitudes of government, people, employers, social groups and trade unions, have shown that the categorization and, in extreme cases, the stigmatization of aliens can be essential in making "culturally deviant characteristics" apparent.

None the less, these critical remarks do not detract from my great admiration for Moch's achievement. Her book is balanced, clearly organized and well written. I can do no more than wholeheartedly agree with Charles Tilly's comment reproduced on the cover of the book: "by far the best general book on its subject [. . .], [it] will remain a standard reference for some time to come".

Leo Lucassen

SMYTH, JIM. *The Men of No Property. Irish Radicals and Popular Politics in the Late Eighteenth Century*. Gill and Macmillan, Dublin 1992. xi, 251 pp. £12.99.

Rejecting the revisionist fashion in Irish history, Jim Smyth offers a return to a more heroic mode, celebrating the participation of the propertyless, the poor

⁶ Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood*, p. 34.

⁷ A shrewd analysis of the German situation which emphasizes the attitude of the state and society is offered in Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Thomas Schmid, *Heimat Babylon. Das Wagnis der multikulturellen Demokratie* (Hamburg, 1993). Among other things, they refute the idea that foreigners are so different from the indigenous population and they show that the preparedness of, for example, Turkish immigrants to adjust is much greater than is generally assumed (see, for example, pp. 163–175).