Portes & Rumbaut reading questions Chapter 5

Briefly summarize:

-Madison Grant: (1916)

-Samuel Huntington: (1996)

-Robert Putnam: (2007)

-What was the common theme of these three?

What further example was given for the 1980s and 1990s?

How do the authors characterize the response to such efforts by the immigrant communities?

The “enforced passivity” described by the authors is descriptive of whom, and why? Explain.

What have the campaigns above accomplished, in general?

What is meant by “reactive formation”?

Page 165: early “twentieth century immigrants were in a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ position”

For the early twentieth century immigrants, attacks from the political right were about what?

Was there any evidence or basis for this view from the political right? (answer farther on…)

For the early twentieth century immigrants, attacks from the political left were\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Most early 1900s immigration did not come from the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ but rather from the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ areas.

What did Max Ascoli’s apt description 1) say, and 2) mean? Explain briefly.

Was it rural peasants or urban workers that were the most difficult to organize into labor unions? Explain why.

Thought question (not in reading) Could these observations of the previous question apply to the recent Mexican immigration?

What are target workers, as pertaining to most European migrants of early 1900s?

Why was it that these migrants tended to pay more attention to political events back home than in the United States?

Many immigrants, according to Glaser, came from nations struggling to become states. Explain, with the first group that was given, and also give two other “stateless nations” out of the list of five.

Where was the nation of Czechoslavakia “launched”?

How/where was the Cuban War of Independence launched? (list cities) What role, if any, did the US play?

What led the Norwegians and Swedes to think of themselves as Norwegians and Swedes?

Is there a similar Mexican story? Explain.

What large group left the consolidated Russian nation-state? What political affiliations did many of these immigrants make in the United States?

Around what topic did the German-American Central Alliance organize? What hard choice later did they make (about WW1)? What happened to *kultur*?

At the bottom of page 172…what is different about today’s immigrants from those of a century ago?

What technologies have served to further the emergence of transnational communities?

Think about the material of pages 174-5 for the current case of Mexico, in the light of recent political changes in the United States. What role might the President of Mexico be expected to play vis-à-vis President Trump? (proposed border wall, tax on migrant remittances sent to Mexico, etc…) What about Mexican citizens living in the United States?

As you can now see as you continue reading, there are perhaps some parallels with the situation when this book was written with that of year 2017, but also differences.

What was IRCA? Signed by a Republican president, would it be possible today?

What policy (page 176) served to increase the size of the underground Mexican population in the United States?

Post IRCA, what happened with Mexican policy toward Mexicans in the United States?

The 1996 dual nationality legislation was partly a reaction to what?

What did the 2005 legislation provide to Mexican citizens in the United States?

From what exact source/force was Mexican political transnationalism?

Exit, voice, and loyalty: explain the meaning of these from page 178.

Describe the basics of Chinese transnationalism, comparing and contrasting it with that of Mexico.

THIS IS THE END OF THE READING QUESTIONS FOR THE QUIZ OF FEB 21. WE WILL PROBABLY RESUME THIS CHAPTER FOR THE QUIZ OF FEB 28.

HERE ARE THE REST OF THE QUESTIONS FOR THE FEB 28 QUIZ

Identify and explain four factors that help explain why transnationalism tends to accelerate, rather than retard, the political integration of immigrants in the United States.

In a similar yet different vein from the previous question, list three factors that contribute to the political strength of immigrant communities.

On table 23, there are six broad source regions for immigrants listed, with data from 2002 through 2011.  Which of these regions has almost always had the largest numbers naturalize, year after year? (***Naturalize*** means become a US citizen.  Typically to naturalize an immigrant must  first gain permanent legal residence, and then must wait five years before applying to become a citizen.)

Which of these regions has consistently had the largest numbers living in the US? (read narrative)

Explain the reason(s) for the different answer for the two questions above?

Define “defensive naturalization”, and its motivation, following Massey and Pren.

To what do Portes & Rumbaut attribute the jump in North American naturalizations, and in what year was that increase particular noteworthy?

What did Bernard write in 1936 about the forces that shape acquisition of citizenship?

Discuss the degree to which Bernard’s hypotheses are still predictive of rates of naturalization in the recent few decades.  Be sure to write which regional groups fit the pattern, and why, and which groups don’t really fit the pattern, and why that is too.

Give the nationality of particularly low rates of naturalization, and why, page 190.  (list all factors, even if related to each other)

 “Reversibility” helps explain the low rates of naturalization of what other nationalities?

To which countries (list 4) does “irreversibility” explain particularly rapid naturalization statistics?  Explain.

From page 192 “…the politics of the second and successive generations pivot less around issues of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_than those tied to a common \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.