

Review Article

Friends and Foes: Aliens and Migrants in the Era of the Great War*

Selena Daly

University College London

By conservative estimates, in 1910 there were over 33 million people around the world living outside the nation of their birth.¹ In the Euro-American imagination, the transatlantic mass migrations that began in the late nineteenth century loom largest, numbering some 36 million crossings from Europe between 1870 and 1915, although this does not take into account the high rates of return migration.² It was not only Europeans, however, who were on the move during this period. Similar concentrations of migratory movement have been identified originating in India and southern China bound for Southeast Asia, the Indian

* The books reviewed in this essay are Daniela L. Caglioti, *War and Citizenship: Enemy Aliens and National Belonging from the French Revolution to the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. xvi+460, \$39.99 (cloth), \$32.00 (e-book); Stacy D. Fahrenthold, *Between the Ottomans and the Entente: The First World War in the Syrian and Lebanese Diaspora, 1908–1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. xx+304, \$82.00 (cloth); Anja Huber, *Fremdsein im Krieg: Die Schweiz als Ausgangs- und Zielort von Migration, 1914–1918* (Zürich: Chronos, 2018), pp. 336, €58.00 (cloth), free (e-book); Richard N. Juliani, *Little Italy in the Great War: Philadelphia's Italians on the Battlefield and Home Front* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2019), pp. 342, \$109.50 (cloth), \$37.95 (paper), \$37.95 (e-book); Stefan Rinke, *Latin America and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 312, \$89.99 (cloth), \$27.99 (paper), \$22.00 (e-book); Jan Schmidt and Katja Schmidtpott, eds., *The East Asian Dimension of the First World War: Global Entanglements and Japan, China and Korea, 1914–1919* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2019), pp. 360, \$49.00 (cloth); Matthew Stibbe, *Civilian Internment during the First World War: A European and Global History, 1914–1920* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), pp. xi+335, £100.00 (cloth), £80.00 (e-book); Ross J. Wilson, *New York and the First World War: Shaping an American City* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014; Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), pp. 274, £104.00 (cloth), £29.59 (paper), £29.59 (e-book).

¹ International Labour Office (League of Nations), *World Statistics of Aliens: A Comparative Study of Census Returns, 1910–1920–1930* (London, 1936), 28.

² The figure for the one-way crossings comes from Walter Nugent, *Crossings: The Great Transatlantic Migrations, 1870–1914* (Bloomington, IN, 1992), 12. Mark Wyman estimated that between one-quarter and one-third of all European immigrants to the United States returned home between 1880 and 1930. See Wyman, *Round-Trip to America: The Immigrants Return to Europe, 1880–1930* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), 6.

The Journal of Modern History, volume 95, number 1, March 2023.

© 2023 The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. Published by The University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.1086/723415>

Ocean, and the Pacific Rim and originating in Manchuria, Siberia, Central Asia, and Japan bound for Northeastern Asia and Russia. Although transatlantic crossings peaked in 1913 at some 2.1 million journeys, migration to Southeast and Northern Asia nonetheless averaged a sizable 1.1 million journeys per annum between 1911 and 1913.³ Thus, on the eve of the outbreak of global war in 1914, large parts of the world had been transformed by these migration flows, and when war began, states—both belligerent and neutral—would have to reckon with their foreign-born populations in new ways. And yet, despite this convergence of global war and unprecedented levels of global mobility in 1914, there has been surprisingly little scholarship undertaken to date on the role migrants played in the war, how they experienced it, and its consequences for their transnational lives.

In beginning to consider the field of migration and its relation to the years of the First World War, it is first of all necessary to distinguish between different forms of migration and to specify which ones are under examination here. Crudely speaking, migration may be categorized according to the voluntariness and involuntariness of the movement involved, although the use of this binary distinction has long been cautioned against.⁴ Most scholars today consider the question of voluntariness as existing along a continuum rather than as a clearly defined dichotomy, acknowledging that “most migration has voluntary and coercive elements.”⁵ While all choices are constrained to a greater or lesser degree, a scholarly consensus exists that acknowledges a discernible difference between the refugee who is compelled to leave his/her homeplace in wartime and the individual who decides to leave his/her country of origin—perhaps due to poverty or unemployment but not persecution—to seek labor opportunities abroad in peacetime. Over the past twenty years, even a cursory review of the field reveals

³ Adam McKeown, “Global Migration, 1846–1940,” *Journal of World History* 15, no. 2 (2004): 155–89, here 156 and 167. Alongside these migration circuits should be added the case of intra-European migration, mainly from rural to urban locations, and the phenomenon of Chinese and Japanese migration across the Pacific. See Dirk Hoerder, “Metropolitan Migration in the Past: Labour Markets, Commerce, and Cultural Interaction in Europe, 1600–1914,” *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 1, no. 1 (2000): 39–58; Daniel M. Masterson with Sayaka Funada-Classen, *The Japanese in Latin America* (Urbana, IL, 2004), 4–111; and Elliott Young, *Alien Nation: Chinese Migration in the Americas from the Coolie Era through World War II* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2014).

⁴ Anthony H. Richmond, “Sociological Theories of International Migration: The Case of Refugees,” *Current Sociology* 36, no. 2 (1988): 7–25, here 8.

⁵ David Eltis, “Introduction: Migration and Agency in Global History,” in *Coerced and Free Migration: Global Perspectives*, ed. Eltis (Stanford, CT, 2002), 1–32, here 5. See also Elizabeth Fussell, “Space, Time, and Volition: Dimensions of Migration Theory,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, ed. Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor (New York, 2012), 25–52, and Marta Bivand Erdal and Ceri Oeppen, “Forced to Leave? The Discursive and Analytical Significance of Describing Migration as Forced and Voluntary,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44, no. 6 (2018): 981–98.

that First World War historiography has been particularly receptive to analyses of the forms of migration that exist on the “forced” end of the free–coerced spectrum, with groundbreaking work having been undertaken not only on refugees but also on the involuntary displacement and mobility of colonial troops.⁶

However, alongside this interest in forms of coerced mobility, the fates of voluntary migrants who had departed their home nations prior to 1914 have not been afforded the same attention, and little research has been carried out on how global migration flows and migrant communities were impacted by the unfolding conflict. The historiography of the First World War, extensive as it is, has failed to consider migration as a framework within which to understand the conflict’s global and transnational dimensions. While there does exist a scant and fragmented body of scholarship that has examined aspects of migrant lives and experiences during the years of the Great War, this is mostly contained in stand-alone article-length studies and cannot be said to form a coherent body of scholarly endeavor.⁷

⁶ Among a vast literature, on refugees see Peter Gatrell, *A Whole Empire Walking: Refugees in Russia during World War I* (Bloomington, IN, 1999); Philippe Nivet, *Les réfugiés français de la Grande Guerre (1914–1920)* (Paris, 2004); Michaël Amara, *Des Belges à l’épreuve de l’Exil: Les réfugiés de la Première Guerre mondiale. France, Grande-Bretagne, Pays-Bas, 1914–1918* (Brussels, 2008); and Daniele Ceschin, *Gli esuli di Caporetto: I profughi in Italia durante la Grande Guerra* (Rome, 2014). On colonial troop mobility, see Richard S. Fogarty, *Race and War in France: Colonial Subjects in the French Army, 1914–1918* (Baltimore, 2008); Christian Koller, “The Recruitment of Colonial Troops in Africa and Asia and Their Deployment in Europe during the First World War,” *Immigrants and Minorities* 26, nos. 1–2 (2008): 111–33; Mohammed Bekraoui, *Les Marocains dans la Grande Guerre 1914–1919* (Rabat, 2009); Santanu Das, ed., *Race, Empire, and First World War Writing* (Cambridge, 2011); and George Morton-Jack, *The Indian Army on the Western Front: India’s Expeditionary Force to France and Belgium in the First World War* (Cambridge, 2014).

⁷ The case of enemy aliens constitutes a partial exception to the lack of attention identified here, see below and n. 15. Some of the most important studies specifically focused on migration are John Home, “Immigrant Workers in France during World War I,” *French Historical Studies* 14, no. 1 (1985): 57–88; Michèle Langfield, “Recruiting Immigrants: The First World War and Australian Immigration,” *Journal of Australian Studies* 23, no. 60 (1999): 55–65; and the work of María Inés Tato, including “El llamado de la patria: Británicos e italianos residentes en la Argentina frente a la Primera Guerra Mundial,” *Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos* 71 (2011): 1–18; “Germanófilos versus aliadófilos: La colonia española de Buenos Aires frente a las polarizaciones de la Gran Guerra,” in *Las grandes guerras del siglo XX y la comunidad española de Buenos Aires*, ed. Nadia Andrea De Cristóforis and Tato (Buenos Aires, 2014); and “Identities in Tension: Immigrant Communities in Argentina and the Challenge of the Great War,” *National Identities* 24, no. 1 (2020): 39–54. Among the very few monographs, see Nancy Gentile Ford, *Americans All! Foreign-Born Soldiers in World War I* (College Station, TX, 2001); Christopher M. Serba, *Good Americans: Italian and Jewish Immigrants during the First World War* (New York, 2003); Álvaro Cuenca, *La colonia británica de Montevideo y la Gran Guerra* (Montevideo, 2006); and Panikos Panayi, ed., *Germans as Minorities during the First World*

So why is it that migration during the years of the Great War has been so comparatively neglected in scholarship to date? It can be attributed, I believe, on the one hand to the historic dominance of nation-centered approaches in First World War scholarship, and on the other to the classic periodization adopted by scholars of migration history. That the nation has dominated historical writing is hardly a novel statement. Over the past twenty years, however, there has been a notable shift in First World War historiography toward transnational and global approaches that have sought to move beyond Western-Front-centric narratives of the war, to decenter Europe, and to “globalize” the field.⁸ Nonetheless, much still remains to be done in this regard, as numerous scholars highlighted in the lead-up to and during the years of the centenary.⁹ Although the study of diasporas has occasionally been identified as one neglected avenue through which a global history of the war could be written (alongside topics such as natural resources, scientific activity, and the arts),¹⁰ to date, this call has not been heeded by scholars in any significant, coherent, and sustained way, and migration has not been established as a valuable prism through which to examine complex cross-border entanglements and protagonists. As has been highlighted by leading migration scholars, aside from countries that explicitly define themselves as nations of immigrants (the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand), “until recently most national histories seemed to have had no need to incorporate migration into their narratives,” and this proves still to be the case for Great War scholarship.¹¹ For example, even in the authoritative three-volume transnational study of the First World War published in 2014 and edited by Jay Winter—one of the field’s most important chroniclers—the issue

War: A Global Comparative Perspective (Burlington, VT, 2014). The volume edited by Hannah Ewence and Tim Grady, *Minorities and the First World War: From War to Peace* (Basingstoke, 2017), includes some focus on migrants under the broader umbrella term of “minorities,” which also includes refugees, internal enemies, and religious minority groups.

⁸ Central to this shift in perspective have been Hew Strachan, *The First World War, 1: To Arms* (Oxford, 2001); Jean-Jacques Becker and Stéphane Audoin Rouzeau, eds., *Encyclopédie de la Grande Guerre* (Paris, 2004); Michael Neiberg, *Fighting the Great War: A Global History* (Cambridge, 2005); John Horne, ed., *A Companion to World War I* (Oxford, 2010); Robert Gerwarth and Erez Manela, eds., *Empires at War, 1911–1923* (Oxford, 2014); and Guoqi Xu, *Asia and the Great War: A Shared History* (Oxford, 2016).

⁹ Heather Jones, “As the Centenary Approaches: The Regeneration of First World War Historiography,” *Historical Journal* 56, no. 3 (2013): 857–78; Alan Kramer, “Recent Historiography of the First World War, Part 1,” *Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 1 (2014): 5–27; and Olivier Compagnon and Pierre Purseigle, “Geographies of Mobilization and Territories of Belligerence during the First World War,” *Annales HSS* (English ed.) 71, no. 1 (2016): 37–60.

¹⁰ Compagnon and Purseigle, “Geographies of Mobilization,” 40.

¹¹ Jan Lucassen, Leo Lucassen, and Patrick Manning, “Migration History: Multidisciplinary Approaches,” in *Migration History in World History: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, ed. Lucassen, Lucassen, and Manning (Leiden, 2010), 3–35, here 5–6.

of migration is addressed in fewer than two pages.¹² Meanwhile, within migration history, the First World War has long been considered the major watershed in the modern era and as an endpoint for the large-scale nineteenth-century free flows of people.¹³ Countless studies of migration thus conclude precisely in 1914, meaning that the years of the war themselves have tended to fade into the background.¹⁴

As this brief overview makes clear, migration has not been at the center of First World War studies, nor has the First World War been deemed particularly significant to scholars of migration. It is the intention of this review article to highlight a body of recent scholarship that examines aspects of migration during the Great War period to build up a picture of existing areas of concentration and areas in which much further research is still required. The best-studied aspect of migration is the case of enemy aliens, whose experiences have been quite extensively explored in an array of scholarship in various languages over the last number of years. The first section of this review will highlight two recent monographs, by Matthew Stibbe and Daniela L. Caglioti, that push forward this subfield in innovative ways. While the focus on enemy aliens encompasses one aspect of migrant wartime experience, it is at best partial. A focus on enemy aliens precludes analysis of those migrants who found themselves in allied or neutral countries during the war years, whose fates may have been less dramatic than the internment experienced by their counterparts in enemy states but are no less worthy of attention. There is no distinct subfield of scholarship that considers this aspect, so it is necessary to delve into works ostensibly not about migration in order to uncover the details of migrants in countries that were allies or neutral for some or all of the conflict or that were physically distant from the fighting. This will form the basis for the second section of this review, focusing on a volume by Ross Wilson on New York, one by Stefan Rinke on Latin America, and one edited by Jan Schmidt and Katja Schmidtpott on East Asia, all locations often deemed relatively marginal to the history of the war, and yet profoundly shaped by it. The third and final section considers a small number of

¹² Jay Winter, ed., *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 1, *Global War*, vol. 2, *The State*, and vol. 3, *Civil Society* (Cambridge, 2014).

¹³ Leo Lucassen, "The Great War and the Origins of Migration Control in Western Europe and the United States (1880–1920)," in *Regulation of Migration: International Experiences*, ed. Anita Böcker (Amsterdam, 1998), 45–72.

¹⁴ Among many examples, see Michael M. Hall, *The Origins of Mass Immigration in Brazil, 1871–1914* (New York, 1972); Walter Nugent, *Crossings: The Great Transatlantic Migrations, 1870–1914* (Bloomington, IN, 1992); Panayi Panikos, *German Immigrants in Britain during the 19th Century, 1815–1914* (Providence, RI, 1995); Samuel L. Baily, *Immigrants in the Lands of Promise: Italians in Buenos Aires and New York City, 1871–1914* (Ithaca, NY, 1999); Farley Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America, 1709–1914* (Abingdon, 2011); and John R. Davis, Stefan Manz, and Margrit Schulte Beerbuhl, eds., *Transnational Networks: German Migrants in the British Empire, 1670–1914* (Leiden, 2012).

very recently published works by Anja Huber, Richard N. Juliani, and Stacy D. Fahrenthold that, unusually, do adopt diaspora and migrant communities as their explicit and primary focuses. These volumes point to a burgeoning interest in this area, which is ripe for further analysis and consideration.

I

Beginning in the 1980s but gaining real traction only in the twenty-first century, the experiences of enemy aliens in the years of the First World War have been the subject of a number of monographic studies, including works on German, Russian, British, Brazilian, and Australian practices.¹⁵ A subfield within this area relates to the question of internment, with the lion's share of attention being devoted to military internment rather than to its civilian counterpart, although this state of affairs has begun to be corrected in recent years.¹⁶ The scholarship on both enemy aliens and civilian internment has tended overwhelmingly to consist of examinations of individual national groups in a particular foreign locale, however, rather than engaging in any broader comparative analysis. Thus, the monographs by Stibbe and Caglioti, both of whom adopt global and transnational approaches in their analyses of civilian internment and enemy aliens, respectively, offer rich new perspectives that build significantly on the existing scholarship.

¹⁵ Frederick C. Luebke, *Germans in Brazil: A Comparative History of Cultural Conflict during World War I* (London, 1987); Gerhard Fischer, *Enemy Aliens: Internment and the Home Front Experience in Australia, 1914–1920* (St. Lucia, Queensland, 1989); Eric Lohr, *Nationalizing the Russian Empire: The Campaign against Enemy Aliens during World War I* (Cambridge, MA, 2003); Andrew Francis, *“To be truly British, we must be anti-German”: New Zealand, Enemy Aliens, and the Great War Experience, 1914–1919* (Oxford, 2012); and Bruna Bianchi, *Nella terra di nessuno: Uomini e donne di nazionalità nemica nella Grande Guerra* (Rome, 2017).

¹⁶ On military internment and POWs, see Uta Hinz, *Gefangen im Grossen Krieg: Kriegsgefangenschaft in Deutschland 1914–1921* (Essen, 2006); Jochen Oltmer, ed., *Kriegsgefangene im Europa des Ersten Weltkriegs* (Paderborn, 2006); Heather Jones, *Violence against Prisoners of War in the First World War: Britain, France, and Germany, 1914–1920* (Cambridge, 2011); and, more recently, Oliver Wilkinson, *British Prisoners of War in First World War Germany* (Cambridge, 2017), and Mahon Murphy, *Colonial Captivity during the First World War: Internment and the Fall of the German Empire, 1914–1919* (Cambridge, 2018). On civilian internment, see Christoph Jahr, “Zivilisten als Kriegsgefangene: Die Internierung von «Feindstaaten-Ausländern» in Deutschland während des Ersten Weltkrieges am Beispiel des «Engländerlagers» in Ruhleben,” in *In der Hand des Feindes: Kriegsgefangenschaft von der Antike bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*, ed. Rüdiger Overmans (Cologne, 1999), 297–321; Matthew Stibbe, *British Civilian Internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914–1918* (Manchester, 2008); Panikos Panayi, *Prisoners of Britain: German and Civilian Internees during the First World War* (Manchester, 2013); and Stefan Manz and Panikos Panayi, *Enemies in the Empire: Civilian Internment in the British Empire during the First World War* (Oxford, 2020).

Stibbe's volume is ambitious, but ultimately very successful, in seeking to write both a European and a global history of civilian internment, placing the better-documented cases of Britain and Germany alongside contexts that have been almost entirely neglected, including France, Austria-Hungary, Portugal, the Balkan states, the Ottoman Empire, Russia, Brazil, and parts of Central America as well as Siam and China. As he points out in the first sentence, the numbers affected by this practice were significant: between the years 1914 and 1920, some 800,000 civilians were interned in camps across Europe and a further 50,000–100,000 in the rest of the world (1). Although one of the book's key arguments is that the First World War constituted the crucial turning point in the "rise of the internment camp as a twentieth-century global phenomenon" (7), Stibbe also wishes to emphasize the role of civilian internment within our understandings of the First World War as a global war that prompted "new transnational ways of thinking about the politics of citizenship, migration and border control [as well as] medicine, humanitarian and international law" (5). Unlike many previous volumes on civilian internment, Stibbe shifts his attention away from the experiences of internees and camp conditions, favoring instead the more neglected perspectives of policymakers and non-state actors who oversaw the development of the camps into "imagined political spaces" (293). Of central importance for this review article is Stibbe's argument that "internment in the years 1914–20 was a migration-led process" (4), a point he highlights again in the conclusion when he rightly states that "internment was predicated on wartime mobility and migration, across land borders, continents and oceans, and by foot, train and steamship" (293). Nonetheless, in chapter 2 and throughout the book, Stibbe is keen to differentiate between groups of internees and to underline the fact that nationality "was not a stable instrument whose uncontested meaning belligerent and neutral states and international bodies could automatically take for granted" (62). For example, internment could be extended to include internal enemies, ethnic minorities, or prostitutes; be restricted to only certain types of enemy aliens, such as German reservists and merchant sailors, as occurred in Brazil from 1917; or be modified so that Armenians, Syrian Christians, and Ottoman Greeks could be deemed "friendly aliens" in France and Britain, despite being subjects of the enemy Ottoman Empire.

The third chapter continues this line of argument, exploring practices in France, Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire. Stibbe emphasizes that although the detention of enemy aliens was a key component of war governance for all of these belligerent states, there was "no single, globally applicable model for internment" (77). Rather, the war years established internment as a valuable method to control various groups deemed hostile to the state. The following two chapters explore different facets of how internment policy functioned in practice, considering first its relationship with international law and second the role and success of international activism and humanitarian campaigners. The

penultimate chapter shifts to the postwar period, arguing that “the failure to end war and the failure to end civilian captivity in November 1918 were mutually inter-dependent” (239). Of crucial importance here, though, is the fact that efforts to reduce the numbers of interned civilians were already underway before the armistices, whether the release of Belgian and British civilians in German East Africa in 1916, the (theoretical) release of all internees from Central Powers states in Russia after the November 1917 revolution, or the significant waves of repatriations between Germany and France, Britain and Germany, and Austria and Italy underway from summer 1918. These efforts notwithstanding, many internees would remain captive well into 1919 and even 1920. Stibbe ably unpicks the various barriers to bringing a prompt end to internment practices and the different timelines experienced by the former belligerents, emphasizing important divergences in the way Western European powers and states in the Americas handled their foreign-born populations from 1918. On the one hand, facing a range of measures from denaturalization to so-called voluntary repatriation and expulsion, British residents of German origin fell from over 55,000 in 1914 to just over 22,000 five years later (265). Meanwhile, in the United States and Brazil, both countries with very large German diaspora communities, mass expulsion and repatriation would have been both unfeasible and undesirable, so policies of forced assimilation were adopted, resulting in the repression of German-language education and the closure of German businesses and associations, among other measures (275).

In this volume, Stibbe does an admirable job of exploring the global entanglements of First World War civilian internment. He also documents how the conflict brought about innovations in the practice of internment in terms of scale, duration, and its deployment not just against enemy aliens but also against other groups deemed suspicious or problematic by individual states. His conclusion, which briefly explores the history of civilian captivity in the twenty-first century, detailing its use in the “war on terror,” the ongoing Chinese detention of Uighers, and the contemporary detention of refugees and migrants across Africa and Europe, serves to underline the continued relevance of this topic today and the importance of understanding its historical origins.

While also focusing on the treatment of enemy aliens in the First World War, Caglioti’s volume, *War and Citizenship: Enemy Aliens and National Belonging from the French Revolution to the First World War*, differs from Stibbe’s in a number of significant ways. Although there is some consideration of internment as one of the practices employed by belligerent states to control their foreign populations, Caglioti’s focus is much wider, emphasizing the changes to legal frameworks underpinning states’ decision making and the wide range of methods adopted in addition to internment, including expulsion, deportation, denaturalization, sequestration and confiscation of property and assets, the violation of freedom of speech and of travel, and restrictions on access to welfare (3). Much

like Stibbe's, Caglioti's approach is a "global, comparative, transnational and transimperial" one (11), but it differs in its aim to "restore international law to its eminent and crucial position" in writing the history of enemy aliens (9). This is a multifaceted account of how civilians of foreign enemy extraction became embroiled in the war and how their relationships with the states in which they were resident evolved over the period. The central tension explored throughout is that between protecting national security on the one hand and civil liberties and individual rights on the other. As Caglioti demonstrates over the span of some 300-plus pages, in all cases, the former won out over the latter (326).

Another significant innovation in this volume is the extended temporal focus indicated in the title. The first three chapters provide welcome background to the policies introduced during the First World War to control enemy alien populations, contextualization that has never been included in studies to date. Aside from the French Revolution itself, the author considers the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71), the Russo-Ottoman War (1877–78), the Sino-Japanese War (1894–95), the Russo-Japanese War (1904–5), the Italian-Ottoman War (1911–12), and the Balkan Wars (1912–13). This broad coverage of enemy alien treatment prior to 1914 notwithstanding, it must be noted that this is still primarily a book about the First World War and its aftermath with seven of the eleven chapters devoted to the period 1914–27.

The remaining chapters proceed chronologically, first tracing the initial process of convergence between states in their treatment of enemy aliens before greater policy divergence manifested itself (chaps. 4–5). Caglioti is particularly interested in the issue of property rights and economic sanctions against enemy aliens, an aspect that has received far too little attention in studies of enemy aliens to date and is one of Caglioti's major contributions to this field of research. This theme is picked up again in chapter 7, which describes how the intensification of the economic war between 1915 and 1917 led to the sequestration and liquidation of enemy property in many belligerent states. Chapters 6 and 8 are concerned with how new entrants into the war approached the enemy aliens question, focusing first on Italy, Bulgaria, Portugal, and Romania, and then further broadening the scope to those states that joined the conflict from 1917 onward, including the United States, Brazil, Cuba, China, and Siam as well as various Central American countries, offering an impressive global account of the phenomenon that is complementary to Stibbe's focus on global internment. Chapters 9 and 10 crucially highlight the continuation of restrictions on enemy aliens that extended well beyond the armistices of 1918. While summer 1920 can be identified as marking the endpoint of civilian internment (as indicated by the concluding date of Stibbe's volume), as Caglioti demonstrates, the end of internment did not mark the end of the difficulties faced by citizens of former enemy nationalities (292). Among many other examples, the sequestration of German assets in Belgium began only in November 1918, while regulations

on the property of former enemy aliens were introduced in China in 1919 and the liquidation of German assets in Japan was instituted in the same year. Britain deported former enemy aliens from 1919, and many other states, such as Canada, Denmark, and Switzerland, restricted freedom of movement for those from countries with which they had formerly been at war. Many restrictions would remain in place until at least 1925. As Caglioti declares in her conclusion, “war . . . put citizenship to the test” (325), and she emphasizes how the years of the First World War constitute a new departure in the treatment of populations of foreign origin. States had established that “enemy nationals could be deemed collectively responsible for the war waged by their countries, and had to pay for the damage suffered by the victors” (329). In fact, the regulation of the treatment of enemy civilians in wartime would not be resolved until the Geneva Convention of 1949.

Both Stibbe’s and Caglioti’s works break substantial new ground in their respective areas, particularly with regard to their global coverage of the treatment of enemy aliens. Each will surely become required reading for any scholar of the First World War. Both historians have carried out extensive archival research in multiple locations and languages, although in both cases this focused on European and North American institutions only. One must wonder what archives in South America, Japan, China, or other parts of Asia might hold that would shed further light on the fates of populations of foreign origins in addition to the findings uncovered in these volumes. Playing devil’s advocate, despite the admirable global perspective, one could identify a certain narrowness of scope in Stibbe’s volume through his exclusive focus on internment practices. He himself acknowledges that future scholarship in this area should expand its horizons to consider other forms of violence directed at civilians during the war, from genocide to hostage taking, deportations, denaturalization, and surveillance, rather than “reduc[ing] the question of state- or military-led targeting of civilians to one of these dimensions only” (308). In many ways, Caglioti’s tour-de-force can be considered an answer to Stibbe’s call in her magisterial exploration of measures meted out against enemy aliens that go far beyond the phenomenon of internment.

II

In his seminal work *Minorities in Wartime*, Panikos Panayi outlined three categories of minority groups, namely, enemy aliens; groups who found themselves a minority following an invasion or occupation; and “friendly” or neutral minorities, noting that it is this last grouping whose relationship with their host state is the most complex.¹⁷ These communities have been by and large overlooked in

¹⁷ Panikos Panayi, “Dominant Societies and Minorities in the Two World Wars,” in *Minorities in Wartime: National and Racial Groupings in Europe, North America, and Australia during the Two World Wars*, ed. Panayi (Providence, RI, 1993), 3–23, here 6.

scholarship in favor of focusing on their “enemy” counterparts, as has been observed above. Large communities of these “friendly” aliens found themselves in 1914 residing in countries that were neutral for some or all of the conflict, often in locations that were distant from the unfolding of actual fighting, particularly the Americas. The volumes by Rinke and Wilson focus on two such locations. While neither book is explicitly about migrants, immigrant experiences are central to the arguments of each volume as both Latin America and New York were on the receiving end of mass immigration in the years immediately prior to the outbreak of war. Meanwhile the collection on East Asia edited by Schmidt and Schmidpott features just a few chapters about migrants but points toward how much remains to be explored when it comes to East Asian involvement in the war.

Stefan Rinke’s extraordinarily comprehensive *Latin America and the First World War* (originally published in German as *Im Sog der Katastrophe: Lateinamerika und der Erste Weltkrieg*) is undoubtedly set to become the standard work on this topic. While Rinke’s is not a monograph about diaspora communities per se, these groups are a constant presence throughout the work and are a central component of the author’s core thesis that the war years marked a crucial turning point for the continent’s various nations, bringing about the end of its isolation from previous pre-1914 European conflicts (3). The perspectives and experiences of immigrant groups are woven through Rinke’s chronicling of the economic war and naval blockade and the transition of many nations from neutrality to belligerence, followed by the disillusionment of the postwar period and the rise of new nationalist groups. Setting out to challenge the stubborn Eurocentrism of much First World War historiography, he argues that Latin America was far from being a “passive and uninteresting” sideshow to the war’s main events (9). Thus, his overarching aim is to “analyze the global dimension of the history of the First World War from the perspective of a continent, which may have existed at the margins from the European standpoint, but nonetheless experiences lasting changes due to the conflagration in Europe” (10).

This volume is impressive in its scope, covering nineteen nations from Mexico to Chile. Rinke is keen to stress, though, that his primary intention is to document “Latin America’s shared history during World War 1” and transnational connections rather than provide nineteen individual case studies (5). This transnational rather than comparative or single-nation approach is one that sets Rinke’s volume apart from previous scholarship on the war, as does his desire to examine not only the diplomatic and economic aspects of the war but also its impact on the ordinary residents of the continent, many of them first-, second-, or third-generation immigrants.¹⁸

¹⁸ See Bill Albert, *South America and the First World War: The Impact of the War on Brazil, Argentina, Peru, and Chile* (Cambridge, 1988); Beatriz Rosario Solveira, *Argentina*

Despite all Latin American countries quickly declaring their neutrality in 1914, their large immigrant populations, mostly hailing from nations now at war, meant that the continent was immediately catapulted into the fallout of the European conflict. Immigration, however, was not distributed evenly across the continent: Central American and North Andean countries had not experienced mass immigration from Europe, although immigrants, even in small numbers, had a significant impact in all societies in which they settled. The countries with the largest immigrant populations, hailing mainly from Italy, Spain, and Portugal, were Argentina (5.5 million), Brazil (4.5 million), and Uruguay (0.5 million), although significant numbers of Spaniards and Germans had settled in Cuba and Chile, respectively. There were also smaller communities in Argentina and Brazil of French and British settlers, while immigration from Japan had become especially important to Brazil, Peru, and Mexico after 1900 (31–32).

Following a chronological structure, Rinke argues that pure neutrality in the face of global war was impossible. He charts how Latin American countries became embroiled in the First World War, not least through the need to manage their multiethnic societies and to dampen down tensions between groups now at war with one another in Europe. Rinke highlights the mobilization of immigrant communities from August 1914 as French and Germans demonstrated in favor of the war in the streets of Buenos Aires, São Paulo, and Porto Alegre while the consulates of these states, as well as those of Great Britain and later Italy, made concerted efforts to recruit or conscript immigrants for the war effort back home (43–46). As well as detailing the economic impacts of the war, Rinke analyses the intense propaganda war that filled the pages of both the native-language and immigrant press, stressing that although “the major battlefields may have been far away . . . they also cast their long shadows on Latin America” (106). The year 1917 would mark a turning point for the continent as Brazil entered the war against Germany, followed by seven Central American nations in 1917–18. Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Uruguay would sever relations with Germany but stopped short of entering the war alongside the Allies. As a result, the position of German settlers became more fraught, much as it already had in Europe. Regulations curtailing German-language education, church services, and associations came into force, and German nationals were centrally registered (133–36). However, German-born communities “showed, in economic terms, an amazing knack for surviving” and were less affected than in Europe, a state of affairs “due not least to the fact that Germans . . . controlled economically

y la primera guerra mundial (Córdoba, 1994); Phillip Dehne, *On the Far Western Front: Britain's First World War in South America* (Manchester, 2009); Olivier Compagnon, *América Latina y la Gran Guerra: El Adiós a Europa (Argentina y Brasil, 1914–1939)* (Buenos Aires, 2014); and Francisco Luiz Teixeira Vinhosa, *O Brasil e a Primeira Guerra Mundial* (Rio de Janeiro, 2015).

important areas in many Latin American countries, were highly respected, and networked well” (172). As Rinke concludes in this volume, the war encouraged residents of Latin America to develop a much “stronger sense of the entanglements and the various dependencies that impacted their region of the world” (195), resulting in the continent becoming much more closely intertwined with Europe than had previously been the case, with immigrant communities playing a large part in this scenario.

Although focused on a single city rather than a continent, Wilson’s *New York and the First World War: Shaping an American City* shares many of the same aims as Rinke’s work. Choosing to situate the volume within the rich seam of urban histories of the First World War,¹⁹ Wilson seeks to “demonstrate how the urban experience of the war was not a European phenomenon” (15). When the city in question is New York, this means that the experiences of immigrant communities are of necessity at the center of the narrative and analysis. By 1900, New York was already home to 1.1 million residents of European extraction (alongside 6,000 of Chinese origin) and a mere 20 percent of the city’s inhabitants were native speakers of English. Numbers of foreign-born residents would only continue to rise in the years leading up to the outbreak of war (34).

Despite the centrality of immigrants to Wilson’s arguments, as shall be seen below, the fact that the volume is not explicitly related to the historiography of migration is indicative of the way in which migration has been neglected as a subfield of research within First World War studies. Nonetheless, Wilson’s aim is to chart and explore the efforts made to transform New York from an “immigrant city” into an “American city” during the war years, arguing that “the city became American through the process of war” (15). Wilson rightly emphasizes that, to date, the immigrant perspective has largely been lacking from accounts of America’s war experience and that in the few cases when it has been considered, the focus has been on immigrants who were drafted into the US Army rather than on other residents of foreign birth or with immigration backgrounds (6).²⁰ Just as was the case in many Latin American countries, despite the neutral status of the United States until 1917, the huge numbers of mainly southern and eastern European immigrants in New York meant the city was undoubtedly already at war from 1914, as foreign-born residents engaged in protests, demonstrations, and mobilization drives alongside acceding to top-down demands for shows

¹⁹ See, among others, Jay Winter and Jean-Louis Robert, eds., *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin, 1914–1918*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1999–2007); Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I* (Cambridge, 2004); and Roger Chickering, *The Great War and Urban Life in Germany: Freiburg, 1914–1918* (Cambridge, 2007).

²⁰ Ford, *Americans All!*; Sterba, *Good Americans*; and Christopher Capozzola, *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen* (Oxford, 2008).

of loyalty to the United States by participating in voluntary initiatives and programs focused on integration.

Following the introduction, chapter 2 examines the culture and demographics of prewar New York, which boasted more residents born abroad than born within the city limits and distinct areas of the city that were associated with different immigrant groups, primarily German, Jewish, Irish, and Italian. This unique configuration “ensured that [the city] faced the conditions wrought by war in a manner quite unlike any other metropolis” (38), a fate that is then explored in the subsequent chapters. As was the case in Brazil and Argentina, the outbreak of the war in 1914 mobilized immigrant populations, although the larger presence of German and Irish immigrants in New York (the latter often hostile to Britain) brought about greater tensions with those residents from Allied nations. After mapping these initial dynamics in chapter 3, Wilson goes on to examine the economic impact of the war on New York and the growing pressure up to the summer of 1916 for “hyphenated Americans” to definitively declare their loyalty to the United States. Already by August 6, 1914, New York’s mayor had ordered that only the US flag could be publicly displayed and had prohibited processions in favor of combatant nations (86). Increasingly in the years that followed “any deviation beyond the prescribed boundaries of this evocative, powerful but nevertheless ill-defined concept of an ‘American’ identity was policed and punished” (120). Chapters 5 and 6 develop this exploration of questions of identity and citizenship among the city’s immigrant populations and detail the increased surveillance suffered by those of German origin following the US entry into the war in April 1917. Loyalty of all immigrant groups could be affirmed, however, in a variety of tangible ways, from service in the US Army and women’s war work to contributions to the Liberty Loan schemes and participation in patriotic demonstrations and parades, so that the city “was now home to those who were American by action and deed” (203–4). The war had offered the city a mechanism to overcome the stark religious, ethnic, and national divides among its immigrant groups, providing, so Wilson argues, “a solution to the problem of assimilation that had seemingly beset the city at the beginning of the twentieth century” (204). Furthermore, the end of the war, considered in chapter 7, highlights how processes of commemoration sidelined memorial practices that were deemed likely to “encourage and perpetuate ethnic, cultural or religious enclaves within society” in favor of actions and sites that would affirm “one hundred per cent Americanism” (212).

Both Rinke and Wilson provide persuasive accounts of the crucial roles played by immigrant communities in shaping how Latin America and New York experienced the conflict. Despite the wildly different scales of analysis employed by each author, the breadth in the treatment of their chosen context, whether city or continent, is among the most impressive aspects of their works. Wilson not only extensively mines New York’s immigrant press to investigate

the largest communities of Germans, Irish, and Italians but also draws from publications in lesser-studied languages such as Croatian and Yiddish in order to fully reflect the city's multiethnic environment. This focus also points to just how much more remains to be revealed about how less prominent migrant groups were impacted by the war. Rinke's volume, as befits his continental remit, features archival research carried out in ten Latin American countries, in addition to Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Certainly, one of the book's greatest strengths is the fact that its analysis extends beyond the major players of Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico to incorporate the experiences of generally neglected nations such as Chile, Colombia, and Peru, providing a rich and nuanced portrait of the region's manifold engagements with the war.

Much as Rinke argues, Schmidt and Schmidt-pott, editors of *The East Asian Dimension of the First World War: Global Entanglements and Japan, China and Korea, 1914–1919*, assert that the war's East Asian dimensions should not be considered "marginalia of history" (12) and remind readers that Japan ended the war as one of the five major powers at the Paris Peace Conference.²¹ This volume brings together fifteen scholars, thirteen of whom are based in universities in Japan, China, and Taiwan and whose scholarship has, regrettably, often not been available to Anglophone audiences until now. Their chapters challenge much long-standing historiography and argue that "feelings of participation" in the region were "much more extensive than has long been assumed" (18). In the English-speaking world, given the seminal recent contributions of Guoqi Xu regarding Asian involvement in the First World War, some progress has certainly already been made in this arena, although Schmidt and Schmidt-pott's volume highlights just how much remains to be explored.²² Much like the volumes by Rinke and Wilson, this collection is not solely about migration or diasporas, although in their framing of the work as an effort to explore "the manifold entanglements of East Asia and East Asians with the First World War" (12), the editors' awareness of the importance of considering the experiences and actions of those East Asians living and working outside their nation's borders is made apparent. Nestled among the contributions are a number of chapters of relevance to the current discussion, focusing on Japanese officers' study visits to Europe, Japanese civilians in Germany, and the recruitment of the Chinese Labour Corps. However, the fact that one must look to an overview volume of East Asia as a geographical region to find examinations of migrant experiences in this region serves to indicate the paucity of research in this area.

²¹ Michelle Moyd has made a similar argument about African involvement in the war. See "Centring a Sideshow: Local Experiences of the First World War in Africa," *First World War Studies* 7, no. 2 (2016): 111–30.

²² Guoqi Xu, *China and the Great War: China's Pursuit of a New National Identity and Internationalization* (Cambridge, 2011), and *Asia and the Great War: A Shared History* (Oxford, 2016).

“Japanese Army Artillery and Engineering Officers’ Study Visits to Europe and the ‘Japanese-German War’” by Suzuki Jun explores the mobility of Japanese army officers in the years preceding the Great War, drawing attention to the importance of prewar intercontinental military cooperation. Overall, prior to 1914, 32.4 percent of Japanese army general officers had studied abroad (318). The most popular destination was Germany although some also worked in France, Great Britain, and Austria-Hungary. The majority of the Japanese officers studied abroad for more than two years; some worked as military aides at embassies, others as instructors in military academies, while some were attached to German military regiments (315–22). Offering another side to the story of Japanese mobility in the war years is the chapter by Naraoka Sochi, “Japanese Civilians in Germany at the Outbreak of the First World War.” Sochi notes that in 1914 there were approximately 500–600 Japanese civilians in Germany, the vast majority of them settled residents. Only Britain boasted a larger Japanese community at the outbreak of the war (366–67). While these numbers obviously pale in comparison to those of intra-European or transatlantic migrants, they are significant in drawing attention to the migration flows between East Asia and Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which for too long have been ignored in favor of a solely Euro-Atlantic focus. Sochi paints a colorful portrait of the Japanese who found themselves in Germany in August 1914, a group that included doctors and businesspeople alongside circus performers such as acrobats and jugglers. Although most of them fled Germany and were promptly evacuated via the Netherlands to Britain, the German government decided to intern those remaining from mid-August. Their internment experience was to be short-lived: all had been released by the end of 1914 in acknowledgment of the fact that German civilians were not being interned in Japan (375). Despite its brief duration, this is an important episode in the history of First World War treatment of enemy aliens and one that “deserves more scholarly attention as part of a global history of internment experiences” (384), as Sochi rightly points out. The final chapter concerning migration is that by Zhang Yan entitled “The British Recruitment Campaign for the Chinese Labour Corps during the First World War and the Shandong Workers’ Motives to Enroll.” This contribution adds to the existing scholarship on the Chinese Labour Corps by focusing on the 80,000 workers from Shandong who worked in France and Belgium during the war.²³ What sets this research apart from previous work is its methodological approach. As is so often the case in migration histories, the motivations

²³ See Sanjing Chen, *Huagong yu Ouzhan (Chinese Labourers and the European War)* (Taipei, 1986); Guoqi Xu, *Strangers on the Western Front: Chinese Workers in the Great War* (Cambridge, MA, 2011); Li Ma, *Les travailleurs chinois en France dans la Première Guerre mondiale* (Paris, 2012); and James Gregory, *The Chinese Labour Corps (1916–1920)* (Hong Kong, 2013).

of migrants themselves remain obscure. To counteract this state of affairs, Yan mined journals and memoirs of the recruits and carried out dozens of oral history interviews with their descendants, which revealed fascinating details of individual motivations. Examples include Yen Shih-cheng, who was forbidden from traveling to join his brother abroad and so slipped away when he was supposed to be collecting cow dung, or Wu Li-chung, who needed the labour corps salary to redeem his eight-year-old brother, who his family had been forced to sell (402). In adopting this bottom-up approach, Yan adds valuable nuance to a story that has been told elsewhere in different contexts and significantly challenges some of the post-hoc narratives about the recruits' motivations, their "political instrumentalization," and their exploitation by elites as symbols of "national salvation [and] civilizational interaction" (407).

III

Dissimilarly from the three volumes considered in the previous section, Huber, Juliani, and Fahrenthold adopt expressly migrant-centered perspectives in their volumes on Switzerland, Italian immigrants in Philadelphia, and the Syrian and Lebanese diasporas in the Americas, respectively. These three volumes thus represent an exciting new development in research on the First World War, although in terms of ambition and success they differ quite considerably. This small coterie of studies also serves to highlight the relative dearth of innovative scholarship on diaspora and migrant communities during this period and points to the enormous scope for aspiring PhD students, and indeed established scholars, to carry out in-depth archival studies on other migrant groups and contexts.

Based on her PhD thesis, Anja Huber's *Fremdsein im Krieg: Die Schweiz als Ausgangs- und Zielort von Migration, 1914–1918* argues that the years of the war "significantly changed the Swiss migration landscape" (12). A short introductory chapter and two further chapters offer an overview of migration theory and detail on prewar migration to/from Switzerland. The core of the book is composed of four chapters, each analyzing both foreigners in Switzerland and Swiss abroad and each focused on a different type of migrant and migration, namely, labor migrants, military migrants, refugees, and arrest and internment practices. This typology works well, although there is some overlap between categories, notably the ways in which labor migrants settled in Switzerland could become draft evaders by not answering their nation's call to arms.

As Huber demonstrates, the war fundamentally altered Swiss migration flows. The outbreak of war immediately brought about an increase in border controls and eventually in 1917 the wresting of border control away from the cantons and the full centralization of immigration within the newly formed Eidgenössische Fremdenpolizei (Federal Immigration Authority) (71–74), which would remain in place after the war's end. Although in 1913 approximately 600,000 foreigners

were resident in Switzerland, during the war over 100,000 of these labor migrants would return to their home countries, primarily Italy, Germany, and France. As these figures indicate, though, the majority of migrants remained in response to strong demand for foreign, and especially Italian, labor in construction industries (107). Meanwhile, although Switzerland had always been a haven for those seeking to avoid conscription in their own countries (including one Benito Mussolini in 1909), this dimension of migration became far more pronounced during the war years, numbering some 10,714 in 1917, almost half of them Italian, and almost 26,000 in 1919, as many remained in Switzerland, fearing the punishments they might face on returning home (121, 151). On the other hand, of the 400,000 Swiss living abroad at the start of the war, only 20,000 to 25,000 of them returned, primarily from various European countries as well as Algeria, the United States, Canada, and Mexico; these were predominantly military-aged men responding to conscription orders (130). Chapter 6 focuses on refugees and exiles seeking refuge within the state's borders. Although in comparison to the Second World War the period 1914–18 witnessed relatively few civilian refugees, as Huber highlights, Switzerland did become a significant transit point for some, such as Italians fleeing Germany and France in 1914 (159–65), and a destination for others, such as Serbs (167–69). Huber also draws attention to Switzerland as a home to political refugees, including Lenin and Trotsky as well as pacifist intellectuals such as the avant-garde Dadaists based in Zurich (170–78). The final substantial chapter considers practices of internment in Switzerland consisting of the humanitarian care of injured POWs from Germany, France, Britain, and the British Dominions. In the second half of the chapter, Huber examines the diverse fates of the Swiss abroad, which depended on both mother tongue and country of residence. German-speaking Swiss fared worse than others, facing arrest and imprisonment under suspicion of espionage in France and elsewhere; bundled together as enemy aliens alongside Germans and Austrians; interned in countries such as Great Britain, Russia, and Canada; or expelled for reasons of internal security (230–45). As indicated above, in this volume Huber adopts a somewhat unusual dual focus examining both the experiences of migrants in and to Switzerland before and during the war as well as the wartime fates of Swiss emigrants around the world. This all-encompassing treatment is welcome in its ambition, although of necessity certain aspects, particularly of the latter category, remain somewhat cursorily explored. Nonetheless, this is an effective treatment of the subject that adds a vital new dimension to our understandings of Swiss neutrality and war experience.

Richard N. Juliani's *Little Italy in the Great War: Philadelphia's Italians on the Battlefield and Home Front* is one of very few books to explicitly examine diaspora experiences during the First World War, and for this he is to be commended. Juliani is certainly correct in his stipulations that "while diversity as a dimension of modern war needs to be more fully explored, it remains especially germane as an aspect of America's participation in the Great War" (3) and that

the First World War home front “remains to be fully explored, especially in specific local settings, and even more so as an aspect of immigrant community life” (40). The book’s overarching aim is to explore the Philadelphia community of Italian immigrants—the second largest in the United States—during the war years as they navigated national identities and ties to the country of their or their parents’ birth on the one hand and increasing pressures to assimilate as Americans on the other. Unfortunately, however, this volume has some shortcomings both in scope and approach that prevent Juliani from delivering a fully convincing account.

On the one hand, Juliani’s scope is admirably broad, covering the mobilization of Italian immigrants in both the Italian and US Armies, the service experience of those in the US Army, immigrant experiences on the home front (chap. 12 on the experiences of women and children is especially welcome), and some detail on US-Italian diplomatic relations. On the other, the decision to focus on one immigrant community in one location is typical of an earlier period in scholarship on Italian-American experiences, which favored regionally delineated perspectives. The most exciting recent scholarship in the field has concentrated instead on transnational connections between Italian communities in different locales and on key themes of activism, gender, race, and consumer cultures.²⁴ Juliani’s overall conclusion is certainly solid, namely, that “by their willingness to accept military service, to work in defense industries, and to join in public celebration, Italians had not only demonstrated their loyalty in ways that had not been previously available but enabled themselves to become active participants in their own assimilation as Americans” (259). However, the question remains as to the extent to which Juliani is pushing forward scholarship on Italian immigrant experiences of the First World War rather than merely adding some local color to well-made earlier arguments by scholars such as Nancy Gentile Ford, Christopher Sterba, and Christopher Capozzola.²⁵

²⁴ In terms of older scholarship, see Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, *Family and Community: Italian Immigrants in Buffalo, 1880–1930* (Ithaca, NY, 1977); William M. DeMarco, *Ethnics and Enclaves: Boston’s Italian North End* (Boston, 1981); and John E. Zucchi, *Italians in Toronto: Development of a National Identity, 1875–1935* (Montreal, 1990). In terms of more recent scholarship, see Jennifer Guglielmo and Salvatore Salerno, eds., *Are Italians White?: How Race Is Made in America* (Abingdon, 2004); Donna R. Gabaccia and Fraser M. Ottanelli, eds., *Italian Workers of the World: Labor Migration and the Formation of Multiethnic States* (Urbana, IL, 2005); Mark I. Choate, *Emigrant Nation: The Making of Italy Abroad* (Cambridge, MA, 2008); Peter G. Vellon, *A Great Conspiracy against Our Race: Italian Immigrant Newspapers and the Construction of Whiteness in the early 20th Century* (New York, 2014); Donna R. Gabaccia and Franca Iacovetta, eds., *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives: Italian Workers of the World* (Toronto, 2016); and Elizabeth Zanoni, *Migrant Marketplaces: Food and Italians in North and South America* (Urbana, IL, 2018).

²⁵ See n. 20 above.

While the decision to include consideration of Italian immigrants who returned to serve in the Italian Army is welcome, and as Juliani rightly highlights this is an area that “remains to be more fully examined” (253), his own treatment of the subject is unfortunately patchy. In describing the reservists’ journeys back to Italy, he argues that these men were “very American” (38) and that service in Italy “enabled them to reconnect with their origins as Italians” (34). He is seemingly unaware of the fact that significant numbers of these men had only arrived in the United States within the previous five years, leaving wives and children back in Italy, so that their feelings of “Americanism” were weaker than Juliani believes. He further argues that their service “would not serve to make them more American but only to restore and strengthen their Italianità” (49). In fact, although it might appear paradoxical, service with the Italian Army frequently had the opposite effect, as emigrant soldiers condemned the Italian Army and state for the harsh conditions they experienced and expressed their desire to return abroad again as soon as the war had ended. He later claims that those of Italian descent born in the United States “faced no dilemma as they waited for their government in Washington, not Rome, to summon them” (163), which overlooks the fact that many of those who opted to return to serve in the Italian Army had either been born in the United States and had never set foot in Italy or had been brought across the Atlantic as babies and had never returned.²⁶

Juliani’s source base is primarily made up of the predominantly English-language sister titles the *Evening Ledger* and the *Public Ledger*. He almost entirely neglects the vibrant Italian-language press active in Philadelphia since the late nineteenth century, such as *La libera parola*, *Il Momento*, and *L’opinione*, which would have offered a more nuanced insight into the community’s self-perceptions and concerns. In addition, the vast majority of the secondary-source base is in English, meaning that Juliani does not engage with much of the most significant scholarship on related topics by researchers such as Emilio Franzina. Another unfortunate consequence of Juliani’s decision to engage almost exclusively with newspapers is the inclusion of often speculative conclusions or assertions that could easily have been confirmed through wider secondary reading, engagement with publications of the Commissariato Generale dell’Emigrazione, or additional archival research. For example, Juliani expresses amazement that the Italian men departing Philadelphia to join the Italian Army, who he erroneously identifies as “volunteers,” were “somehow already trained” (17), seemingly unaware that the majority of them were reservists who had completed two years of conscripted military service prior to emigration. Juliani also later claims that “without systematic data or even personal memoirs, the self-perception of Italians remains unknown”

²⁶ I explore this subject in my forthcoming monograph, Selena Daly, *Emigrant Empire: The Italian Diaspora in the First World War and Beyond* (Cambridge, 2024).

(262, n. 6). However, such testimony does exist, although not generally in the pages of the newspapers on which Juliani relies, rendering this claim about the unknowability of immigrants' own views somewhat shaky.

When contemplating the direction in which future studies of migration and the First World War should progress, scholars would do well to look to Stacy D. Fahrenthold's *Between the Ottomans and the Entente: The First World War in the Syrian and Lebanese Diaspora, 1908–1925* as a model. As I have pointed out earlier in this review with regard to migration in general, Fahrenthold argues that the Syrian and Lebanese *mahjar* (diaspora) has, to date, existed in a state of "historical ellipsis" (3), marooned between two fields that do not tend to converse with one another, namely, migration history and "national" histories, in this case of the Ottoman empire. To date, those living beyond the empire's borders have not been included in narratives of the Ottoman war effort in any substantive way (4), and much as I have outlined earlier in this review, Fahrenthold confirms that part of the novelty of her approach is its explicit focus on migrants rather than refugees, the latter group having already been the subject of various studies.

This rich and elegantly written volume explores how these diaspora communities experienced the war and how the Ottoman view of the *mahjar* shifted during this period from being understood as "source of economic development . . . a useful population to be groomed and reclaimed through diplomacy to a site for sedition . . . and collusion with the empire's enemies" (3). It is also the account of how the war compelled migrants to consider issues of national belonging and loyalties for the first time. The approach is a global and transnational one, primarily focused on the largest concentrations of Syrian and Lebanese migrants in the United States, Brazil, and Argentina (each with a population of approximately 100,000), alongside smaller communities in Canada, Mexico, Chile, Cuba, and Haiti to comprise a total diaspora numbering some half a million people (6). By employing this transnational perspective, the connections between the geographically scattered communities are effectively traced to explore the cross-border networks and activism that sustained them. Fahrenthold's extended chronology from 1908 to 1925 reflects the "Greater War" paradigm and allows for vital contextualization of these diaspora communities both before and after the war years.²⁷ In a most welcome departure, Fahrenthold's work, unlike others under review here, is one that places the individual at the center of the analysis, as she seeks to reclaim the history of the migrant from its relegation to the sidelines of history (9). As she succinctly summarizes in her conclusion: "The histories of

²⁷ See Robert Gerwarth and John Horne, eds., *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War* (Oxford, 2013), and the "Greater War" series edited by Gerwarth for Oxford University Press.

people who move are often retrofitted into the territorial narratives, rather than situated within their own lived social geographies” (166). To counteract this tendency, she has employed a wider range of sources than has been observed in many of the other studies under discussion here, using private papers, diaries, personal correspondence, and memoirs as well as newspapers, literary sources, and diplomatic sources to great effect.

Chapter 1 explores the history of Syrian and Lebanese migration from the nineteenth century and how, after 1908, the Committee of Union and Progress sought to bring emigrants into the imperial fold. However, as recounted in the following chapter, growing tensions between the diaspora and the Young Turk movement led many in the *mahjar* to use the outbreak of war to highlight dissent with the Ottoman state, fueled by reports of famine, epidemics, and political repression. The third chapter examines the transnational networks of military recruiters who funneled 10,000 Syrians into the Entente armies, networks that would constitute “enduring conduits for diasporic nationalist activism” (58) that would come into their own during negotiations of the Syrian Question at the Paris Peace Conference. This postwar emigrant activism is analyzed in detail in chapter 4 as the *mahjar* sought to take advantage of the Wilsonian moment to establish independent Arab states in the former Ottoman territories, only to see their efforts thwarted by competing British and French interests. Fahrenthold persuasively presents the case that the Conference engaged in a “significant legal fiction” that the *mahjar* collaborated with and supported the French Mandate system while the reality was “closer to a forceful pacification of a transnational frontier” (87). Chapters 5 and 6 examine post-Ottoman identity politics and the difficulties encountered within the diaspora regarding the right to travel, repatriate, or obtain citizenship from the French Mandate as well as the 1921 census of Lebanon that would include some 130,000 emigrants in order to ensure that a Christian majority would be recorded. Throughout the book, Fahrenthold reveals the numerous ways that Syrians and Lebanese assisted the Entente war effort—through smuggling of information, fundraising, and mobilization in their armies. While they had hoped that the “armistice would yield the liberation and independence of the Arab Middle East” (165), in fact, as Fahrenthold concludes, the *mahjar* would come to see the Mandate as “a thinly veiled colonial project, both in intention and execution” (161).

IV

In their own ways, each of the volumes reviewed here contributes to our understanding of how migration processes shaped the global experience of the First World War, while also highlighting that there is a great deal that remains to be explored. By way of conclusion, therefore, I propose to outline a couple of key directions for future studies in this area, focusing on both scope and methodology.

As has been observed in many of the volumes cited here, German migrant communities have received by far the most attention to date, owing to the large numbers of German subjects who found themselves living in enemy states either immediately in 1914 or from 1917 onward. The experiences of smaller diaspora communities have tended to be overlooked; for example, Rinke devoted little attention to the subjects of the Ottoman Empire residing in Latin America during the war years. Thankfully, Fahrenthold's volume more than makes up for this partial lack. Indeed, Fahrenthold makes a particularly strong case for the importance of the Syrian diaspora in Brazil and Argentina despite their small numbers compared to these countries' far larger communities of Italian or German immigrants. It would be most welcome to see more studies carried out on the experiences of smaller migrant groups, such as southern Slavs, Greeks, Armenians, and Scandinavians. While Wilson throws much-needed light on the fates of some of these groups in New York, his work also emphasizes how little research has been undertaken on them in other locales. In addition, diasporas of non-European origin, such as Japanese and Chinese communities in the Americas, Indian communities in Africa, and African and West Indian communities in Britain, have been neglected and are ripe for further historical examination. The richest insights are likely to originate in studies that explicitly adopt transnational and comparative approaches, such as studying the interactions between multiple migrant communities in particular locations, as Wilson and Rinke do, or studying the diverse experiences of the same diaspora in different locations, as per Huber and Fahrenthold.²⁸ As scholars may begin to consider these groups, the question of sources and perspectives needs also to be raised. Given the quite ample exploration of the experiences of enemy aliens in internment camps, the decision by Stibbe and Caglioti to focus on the perspectives of policymakers rather than that of aliens and internees is justified. However, too often in migration histories, the voice of the migrant is not heard, and their agency is ignored.²⁹ This state of affairs can, in part, be traced to one of the preferred sources of evidence employed by many historians of migration, namely newspapers. The native and immigrant press feature heavily in a number of the studies examined here, notably Wilson, Rinke, Juliani, and Fahrenthold. Although immensely rich as a source base, it is problematic when the views of the migrants are only accessed through these highly mediated channels or not at all. Recovering the migrant perspective must therefore be at the forefront of future scholarship.

²⁸ Nancy L. Green, "The Comparative Method and Poststructural Structuralism: New Perspectives for Migration Studies," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 13, no. 4 (1994): 3–22.

²⁹ See Selena Daly, "Emigrant Draft Evasion in the First World War: Decision-Making and Emotional Consequences in the Transatlantic Italian Family," *European History Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (2021): 170–88, here 174–75.

Thus, as demonstrated over these pages, the study of diaspora and migration constitutes a significant lacuna in our understanding of the Great War and a fertile seam for further research. This field offers immense possibility to write a new history of the First World War, which establishes migrants as key transnational actors in the conflict, tracing the breadth and significance of their impact both on their countries of origin and on their adopted homelands.