

# Scales of Analyzing Migration in the Work of Marlou Schrover and Leo Lucassen

Patrick Manning

TSEG 23(1): 15–26

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52024/4v6ph584>

## Abstract

Studies of migration have expanded in recent decades, deepening the inevitable interaction of their analysis. This essay focuses on the issue of *scale* in the interpretation of migration history, where scale is geographic, temporal, and topical. The analysis compares the work of two outstanding migration historians with each other and with a wider field of migration scholars, asking: How does the interpretation and validity of an analysis in migration vary with the scale of its structure? What are the conclusions on patterns of migrant behavior and migrant reception at each scale? Marlou Schrover and Leo Lucassen have each published at multiple scales, especially on migration within the Netherlands and Europe, but have also published at community, national, continental, and global scopes. In community and national studies, they are able to rely on well-organized empirical data. Is their global analysis carried out as an extension of national analysis, or are there distinctive data, hypotheses or conclusions at global or extra-European levels? This review suggests that, for these scholars, studies at extra-European and global scales combine national-level approaches with global-level innovations, so that the full array of migration studies shows changing patterns of migration at varying scales of aggregation. Thus, the overall discipline of migration studies may be evolving toward developing interpretations that vary at different scales.

Marlou Schrover and Leo Lucassen, in the course of their careers, have contributed significantly to the analysis and interpretation of social history, focusing especially on the subfield of migration history, along with additional specialization on labor history, gender, ethnicity, economic change, and ideology. Within the past several decades, scholars

have given increasingly explicit attention to various scales of data and analysis in social history. For a selection of the authors' numerous publications in migration history, this study characterizes them by scale: principally by spatial scale but also by temporal scales and topical foci. Each of these three scales is complex and subdivided. For migration studies in particular, the spatial scales of mobility range from individual experience through the scales of family, community, labor force, urban population, ethnicity, monarchical states and modern nations, up through continental and global analysis. The temporal scale can portray a narrative scale of events, comparison of periods, an author's life course, or a historiographical scale of changing scholarly interpretations. Topical scales may include empirical or theoretical approaches, the perspectives of migrant and settled groups, and literature reviews or migratory narratives. This essay organizes these numerous interpretive scales chronologically, into four periods of roughly a decade each.

## 1990–1999

Leo Lucassen completed his PhD in history at Leiden in 1990; Marlou Schrover completed her PhD at Utrecht in 1991. Both scholars started their historical publications with studies of phenomena that had undergone sharp change in the nineteenth century. The first decade of publication by each author included both Dutch-based empirical studies and reviews of sections of historical and social science literatures. Indeed, the strategy of each author, in empirical studies and literature reviews, appears to have included the cross-disciplinary linking of historical and social science analyses.

Leo began his scholarship with Roma, traveling people, and thus explicitly with their migratory displacement. His initial study traced Roma, their in-migration, and their labeling during their nineteenth-century return to the Netherlands.<sup>1</sup> He then expanded the scope of his analysis to Roma settlement in much of Western Europe.<sup>2</sup> He also

1 Leo Lucassen, 'The power of definition. Stigmatisation, minoritisation and ethnicity illustrated by the history of gypsies in the Netherlands', *Netherlands Journal of Sociology* 27:2 (1991) 80-91; Wim Willems and Leo Lucassen, 'A silent war. Foreign gypsies and the Dutch government policy, 1969-1989', *Immigrants and Minorities* 11:1 (1992) 81-101.

2 Leo Lucassen, 'A blind spot. Migratory and traveling groups in Western European historiography', *International Review of Social History* 38:2 (1993) 209-235; Leo Lucassen, 'The domination of the national category. A review of some recent studies on (im)migration and nation-building', *Immigrants and Minorities* 14:3 (1995) 319-331.

completed broad and retrospective reviews of migration literature, including the Chicago School of the 1920s.<sup>3</sup> He completed over ten articles on Roma migration and corresponding state policies governing them, including a co-authored book on Roma and other itinerant groups in Western Europe.<sup>4</sup> Then he expanded his spatial and topical study of migration, joining with Jan Lucassen in directing an edited collection of modern-era migration studies, including a co-authored historiographical introduction.<sup>5</sup>

Marlou began her publication on industrial employment in the Netherlands, especially the expansion of women's work in the production of margarine.<sup>6</sup> She soon published a co-edited book on women workers and technological change, in which she wrote two chapters and co-authored the introduction.<sup>7</sup> She then turned to demographic studies of Dutch women workers.<sup>8</sup> Her accompanying exploration of social-historical and sociology literature brought to light many terms applied to workers and especially migrants, terms that categorized them in often derogatory fashion. These descriptive terms, constructed from perspectives of workers, employers, and state officials, became a topic of Marlou's scholarly concern throughout her career.<sup>9</sup>

Throughout the first decade of their scholarly output, Marlou and Leo explored ethnic and gendered groups in the Dutch nation but also expanded their spatial analysis across European borders and their temporal analysis from the nineteenth into the twentieth centuries. Both composed literature reviews in aspects of social history. Leo focused almost entirely on migration history; Marlou emphasized women's labor history, though her research gradually led her to women's migration.

3 Leo Lucassen, 'The gulf between long term and short term approaches in immigration studies. A reassessment of the Chicago School's assimilation concept', *IMIS-Beiträge* 5 (1997) 5-23.

4 Leo Lucassen and Wim Willems, *Gypsies and other itinerant groups. A socio-historical approach* (London 1998).

5 Jan Lucassen and Leo Lucassen, *Migration, migration history, history. Old paradigms and new perspectives* (Bern 1997).

6 Marlou Schrover, 'Labour relations in the Dutch margarine industry', *History Workshop Journal* 30:1 (1990) 53-62.

7 Marlou Schrover and Gertjan Groot, 'General introduction', in: Marlou Schrover and Gertjan Groot (eds), *Women workers and technological change in Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries* (London/New York 1995) 1-16.

8 Marlou Schrover, 'The demographic consequences of changing employment opportunities. Women in the Dutch Meierij in the nineteenth century', *History of the Family* 2:4 (1997) 451-480.

9 Marlou Schrover, 'Potverkopers, vijlenkappers, stukadoors en winkeliers. Nichevorming onder Duitse migranten in de negentiende-eeuwse stad Utrecht', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 26:4 (2000) 281-305.

## 2000–2008

Marlou's publications turned in 2000 to the study of German women workers who settled in the Netherlands, especially as she coded individual-level data on German-immigrant women from registration documents of Utrecht, 1850-1912. She was able to correct the mis-coding of birthplace in Utrecht documents for almost a third of the women, for whom Dutch birthplaces were given instead of their actual but similarly-named German birthplaces.<sup>10</sup> She corrected these errors by referring to supplementary documents on the individuals. She thus gained a strong sense of individual experience and archival records in her early empirical work and was led into study of migratory processes for the women. Marlou then moved on to "long-distance trade migration" among female German migrants of the nineteenth century,<sup>11</sup> followed by details on their living together and working together.<sup>12</sup>

Marlou and Leo collaborated with each other and Clé Lesger in an article in *Annales de Démographie Historique* calling for "a more balanced migration typology".<sup>13</sup> Especially for Marlou, this appeal reflected the start of her work on the "labeling" of migrants. Marlou later pursued in qualitative detail the numerous and often derogatory terms for migrants that were used in administrative, public, and even academic discourse, which was related to tracing occupational specialization among immigrant women, including such "hidden professions" as female "placers" of domestic servants.<sup>14</sup> She sustained her ties to labor history with an article on gender in niches and labor-market segmentation.<sup>15</sup>

10 Marlou Schrover, 'German communities in nineteenth-century Utrecht. Factors influencing the settlement process', *IMIS-Beiträge* 14 (2000) 45-74.

11 Marlou Schrover, 'Women and long distance trade migration in the nineteenth-century Netherlands', in: Pamela Sharpe (ed.) *Women, gender and labour migration* (London/New York 2001) 85-107.

12 Marlou Schrover, 'Living together, working together. Concentrations amongst German immigrants in the Netherlands in the nineteenth century', *Continuity and Change* 18:2 (2003) 263-285.

13 Clé Lesger, Leo Lucassen and Marlou Schrover, 'Is there life outside the migrant network? German immigrants in 19<sup>th</sup> century Netherlands and the need for a more balanced migration typology', *Annales de Démographie Historique* 104:2 (2002) 29.

14 Marlou Schrover, 'Hidden professions? Female 'placers' of domestic servants in nineteenth-century Dutch cities', in: Robert Beachy, Beatrice Craig and Alastair Owens (eds), *Women, business and finance in nineteenth-century Europe. Rethinking separate spheres* (Oxford 2005) 167-181.

15 Marlou Schrover, Joanne van der Leun and Chris Quispel, 'Niches, labour market segregation and gender', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33:4 (2007) 529-540.

For Leo, the collaborative article on “a more balanced migration typology” led him in a different direction, toward structured and large-scale migration studies. By 2003, Leo had expanded the geographical frame of his research from Netherlands to Europe-wide national studies. He published a transcontinental comparison of Roma in Europe, the Ottoman Empire, and India;<sup>16</sup> he followed it up in 2006 with a study of Poles and Turks in the German Ruhr.<sup>17</sup> At much the same time, Leo opened his arguments for analysis of global migration history.<sup>18</sup> One version of his global analysis contrasted American with European migrant relations. That is, *The Immigrant Threat*<sup>19</sup> assembled data from national scales and identified a growing fear that an American experience of hostile ethnic relations would be replicated in Europe. Furthermore, Leo published an initial article on migration in world history.<sup>20</sup>

This second decade of publication led Marlou into demographic and social studies of women’s migration, to terminology on migration, and to illegal migration, while Leo published steadily broader comparisons of national migration patterns and addressed illegal migration from that perspective. Both scholars incrementally opened analyses at global scales. As of 2008, Marlou and Leo rejoined to work with two other collaborators in editing a book on the rising issue of “illegal” migrants.<sup>21</sup> It gathered multiple perspectives on the many variations in terminology and encouraged years of study on migration terms.

16 Leo Lucassen and Wim Willems, ‘The weakness of well ordered societies. Gypsies in Europe, the Ottoman empire and India 1400-1914’, *Review. A Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems and Civilizations* XXVI:3 (2003) 283-313.

17 Leo Lucassen, ‘Poles and Turks in the German Ruhr area. Similarities and differences’, in: David Feldman, Leo Lucassen and Jochen Oltmer (eds), *Paths of integration. Migrants in Western Europe 1880-2004* (Amsterdam 2006) 27-45.

18 Leo Lucassen, ‘Where do we go from here? New perspectives on global migration history’, *International Review of Social History* 49:3 (2004) 505-510.

19 Leo Lucassen, *The immigrant threat. The integration of old and new migrants in Western Europe since 1850* (Urbana (IL) 2005).

20 Leo Lucassen, ‘Migration and world history. Reaching a new frontier’, *International Review of Social History* 52:1 (2007) 89-96.

21 Marlou Schrover, Joanne van der Leun, Leo Lucassen and Chris Quispel, ‘Introduction: Illegal migration and gender in a global and historical perspective’, in: Marlou Schrover, Joanne van der Leun, Leo Lucassen and Chris Quispel (eds), *Illegal migration and gender in a global and historical perspective* (Amsterdam 2008) 9-37.

## 2009–2017

Marlou, following up the 2008 volume on illegal migrants, expanded her studies of Dutch migration at the family and community levels, addressing “essentialist ideas” tied to such terms as vulnerability, pillarization, multiculturalism, and cultural freezing.<sup>22</sup> Then in a co-authored book on gender and migration,<sup>23</sup> this logic was expanded to Europe in the past two centuries, focusing on the (emerging) state policy. The Schrover and Yeo volume opened the door to a series of studies in categorization, especially by state and public agencies. Schrover and Schinkel<sup>24</sup> added inclusionism and exclusionism to the study of immigration and integration, while Schrover<sup>25</sup> explored feminization and proletarianization of European and colonial migrants during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Summarizing these studies at book length, Moloney and Schrover<sup>26</sup> expanded the discussion of gender, migration, and categorization to postwar Europe.

In a broad historiographical review, Marlou surveyed nineteenth- and twentieth-century Dutch migration history, in which she showed the changing scales and topics of research across four periods.<sup>27</sup> Her term “moving forward”, conveying both progress and recurrence in lines of argument, was to characterize her approach in later literature reviews. An essay on chain migration<sup>28</sup> was followed by studies of family and refugee rights among gay migrants in the Netherlands.<sup>29</sup> Marlou’s series of war-related studies of 2015 included deportation of Germans

22 Marlou Schrover, ‘Pillarization, multiculturalism and cultural freezing, Dutch migration history and the enforcement of essentialist ideas’, *BMGN: Low Countries Historical Review* 125:2/3 (2010) 329–354.

23 Marlou Schrover and Eileen Janes Yeo, *Gender, migration and the public sphere 1850–2005* (New York 2010).

24 Willem Schinkel and Marlou Schrover (eds), *The language of inclusion and exclusion in immigration and integration* (New York 2014).

25 Mariëlle Kleijn and Marlou Schrover, ‘The Dutch state as a pimp. Policies regarding a brothel on Curaçao (1945–1956)’, *TSEG- The Low Countries Journal of Social and Economic History* 10:3 (2013) 33–54.

26 Deirdre Moloney and Marlou Schrover (eds), *Gender, migration and categorization. Making distinctions between migrants in western countries, 1945–2010* (London 2013).

27 Marlou Schrover, ‘Dutch migration history. Looking back and moving forward’, *TSEG- The Low Countries Journal of Social and Economic History* 11:2 (2014) 199–218.

28 Marlou Schrover, ‘Chain migration (network migration)’, in: J. Stone, R.M. Dennis, P.S. Rizova, A.D. Smith and X. Hou (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of race, ethnicity, and nationalism* (Hoboken NJ) 2016).

29 Marlou Schrover, *Intertwining of family rights and refugee rights. Gay migrants in the Netherlands 1945–2000* (Montreal 2017).

from the Netherlands, 1946-52,<sup>30</sup> and a study of migration and mobility in World War I.

Leo continued, on one hand, to extend his focus on migration within Europe, with a study of migration in southeastern Europe,<sup>31</sup> plus specifics on passports in the Netherlands and Germany, more on Roma, in addition to Poles and Turks as immigrants. On the other hand, from 2007 Leo and others at IISH had founded a large-scale, empirical project, the Global Collaboratory on the History of Labor Relations, which built a typology of labor relations in which Leo and Jan both participated.<sup>32</sup> Working from this framework, Leo and Jan Lucassen specified their approach to global migration with a critique of the mobility transition model of sociologist Wilbur Zelinsky.<sup>33</sup> A subsequent article called for a historical program of comparative global migration in place of the cross-sectional model of a mobility transition.<sup>34</sup> Meanwhile, a book on cities of the Low Countries treated urban existence at a scale of life sustained by migration.<sup>35</sup>

In a broader initiative, Leo and Jan organized a conference and a cross-disciplinary book to frame world-historical methods for migration history, which became the first in a series of related books.<sup>36</sup> The introduction and essays presented migration analyses using biological, linguistic, and anthropological methods. A second book specified migration systems focusing on the early modern world, proposing membership regimes in global and historical terms for the period from 1500 to 2000.<sup>37</sup> The principal publication of the series, *Globalizing Migration History: The Eurasian Experience*,<sup>38</sup> combined theoretical

30 Marlou Schrover, 'The deportation of Germans from the Netherlands 1946-1952', *Immigrants and Minorities* 33 (2015) 1-29.

31 Leo Lucassen, 'Southeast Europe and the need for a comparative history of migration and membership', in: Konrad Helmut and Benedik Stefan (eds), *Mapping contemporary History II* (Vienna 2010) 123-144.

32 <https://iisg.amsterdam/en/research/projects/global-collaboratory-on-the-history-of-labour-relations-1500-2000>

33 Leo Lucassen and Jan Lucassen, 'The mobility transition revisited, 1500-1900. What the case of Europe can offer to global history', *Journal of Global History* 4 (2009) 347-377

34 Jan Lucassen and Leo Lucassen, 'From mobility transition to comparative global migration history', *Journal of Global History* 6:2 (2011) 299-307.

35 Leo Lucassen and Wim Willems (eds), *Living in the city. Urban institutions in the Low Countries, 1200-2010* (New York and London 2012).

36 Jan Lucassen, Leo Lucassen and Patrick Manning (eds), *Migration history in world history. Multidisciplinary approaches* (Leiden and Boston 2010).

37 Ulbe Bosma, Gijs Kessler and Leo Lucassen (eds), *Migration and membership regimes in global and historical perspective. Studies in global social history* (Leiden and Boston 2013).

38 Leo Lucassen and Jan Lucassen (eds), *Globalising migration history. The Eurasian experience (16th-21st centuries)* (Leiden and Boston 2014).

and computational developments centering on a conception of cross-cultural migration, as well as empirical results. The empirical chapters estimated population and migration for early modern Russia, China, and Japan, with partial estimates for South and Southeast Asia. The results made it possible to propose parallels in population and migration for all of Eurasia, combining these new estimates with previous European estimates. The conceptualization of this large-scale work brought interpretive conclusions on the scale of migration. The term “organizational migrants” was coined to identify migrants employed and dispatched by organizations – missionaries, soldiers, sailors, and later bureaucratic expatriates.<sup>39</sup> Broader interpretations suggested that migration connected the world of the second millennium;<sup>40</sup> revealed the global frame of labor history;<sup>41</sup> and restated the model of cross-cultural migration more fully.<sup>42</sup>

In their third decade of professional employment, these two migration scholars expanded both the scope of their publications and the level of their academic responsibilities. Both became appointees at the International Institute of Social History; Marlou became founding editor of the *Journal of Migration History* in 2015, and Leo became Research Director of the IISH in 2014. This era was a time of high productivity and growing recognition for each scholar. Each published major volumes in specific topical areas they had developed, working with collaborators. They demonstrated the ability to publish on varying spatial, temporal, and topical scales of analysis within the same time frame.

## 2018–2024

From 2018, Marlou increasingly characterized her studies in global and European terms, though she maintained discussion of the multi-scale portrayals of migrants from her earlier work. Balancing the two, an

39 Leo Lucassen and Aniek Smit, ‘The repugnant other. Soldiers, missionaries and aid workers as organizational migrants’, *Journal of World History* 26 (2015) 1-39.

40 Leo Lucassen, ‘Connecting the world. Migration and globalization in the second millennium’, in: C. Antunes and K. Fatah-Black (eds), *Explorations in history and globalization* (London and New York 2016) 19-46.

41 Leo Lucassen, ‘Working together. New directions in global labour history’, *Journal of Global History* 11 (2016) 66-87.

42 Leo Lucassen, ‘Theorizing cross-cultural migrations. The case of Eurasia since 1500’, *Social Science History* 41:3 (2017) 445-475.

urban dimension of migration gained specific emphasis.<sup>43</sup> She returned to wartime/postwar issues with a study of displaced persons in the Netherlands.<sup>44</sup> At a larger scale, she offered a new level of summary in “Moving on Migration and Gender”,<sup>45</sup> pointing toward both progress in analysis and reconsideration of earlier views. Then colonial and postcolonial migration in British, Dutch, and French Caribbean lands.<sup>46</sup> In another “moving on” essay, she explored dimensions of intersectionality for migration, now including global levels;<sup>47</sup> then one on trans-migrants and permanent migrants in Rotterdam;<sup>48</sup> a further review of migrant illegalities since 1800;<sup>49</sup> and debates on migrant marriage.<sup>50</sup> In a co-edited book with Deirdre Moloney, Marlou surveyed gender, migration, categorization, and the distinctions made among migrants in Western countries since 1945.

Leo’s publications after 2018 included a mix of large-scale interpretations and smaller-scale studies emerging from the concurrent large-scale work. He expanded his system of migration regimes, in part by reconsidering the European regime, both within the global system,<sup>51</sup> and also with a paradigm-shifting study on soldiers and sailors as migrants.<sup>52</sup> In work on new topics, Leo wrote “Peeling an onion”, a reasoned historical perspective for the “refugee crisis”, given the alarm

43 Marlou Schrover, ‘Urban migration histories’, in: T. Caponio, P. Scholten and B.P. Zapata (eds) *The Routledge handbook of the governance of migration and diversity in cities* (New York and London 2018) 22-38.

44 Marlou Schrover and Tycho Walaardt, ‘Displaced persons, returnees and ‘unsuitables’. The Dutch selection of DPs (1945-1951)’, *Continuity and Change* 33:3 (2018) 413-440.

45 Marlou Schrover, ‘Moving on migration and gender’, *Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 40 (2021) 29-34.

46 Marlou Schrover, ‘Colonial and postcolonial transatlantic migrations in the British, Dutch, and French Caribbean’, in: J.C. Moya (ed.), *Atlantic crossroads webs of migration, culture and politics between Europe, Africa and the Americas, 1800-2020* (London 2021) 279-298.

47 Marlou Schrover, ‘Moving on. Perspectives on migration and intersectionality (Keynote lecture at the Conference on Diversity in Nicosia, 27/04/2022).

48 Marlou Schrover, ‘Shipping and shopping, delousing and control. Trans-migrants and permanent migrations in Rotterdam (1849-1939)’, in: H. Klemann (ed.), *A comparative reflection about the Yangtze River and the Rhine II* (Shanghai 2022) 191-221.

49 Marlou Schrover, ‘Invisible, vulnerable, heroic and criminal. A gendered history of migration labelling’, in: I. van Liempt, J. Schapendonk and A. Campos-Delgado (eds), *Research handbook on irregular migration. Elgar Handbooks in Migration* (Northampton 2023) 25-35.

50 M. Jonker and M. Schrover, ‘I want to marry her, but I won’t. Civil society protest against a migrant marriage income bar in the Netherlands 1984’, *Journal of Migration History* 10 (2024) 223-246.

51 Leo Lucassen, ‘The rise of the European migration regime and its paradoxes (1945-2020)’, *International Review of Social History* 64 (2019) 515-531.

52 Leo Lucassen, ‘Soldiers and sailors as migrants’, in: M. Borges and M.Y. Hsu (eds), *The Cambridge history of global migrations* (Cambridge 2023) 201-219.

of European political figures at the rise of asylum seekers since 2014.<sup>53</sup> Although he was occupied by the role of Director of the IISH from 2020, he continued to publish such new works as an analysis, in global terms, of mob violence directed at migrants<sup>54</sup> and a sketch of the global history of immigration and workers accounting for recent research.<sup>55</sup>

As senior historians, Leo and Marlou pursued their distinct but related approaches to migration. Each worked increasingly on global scales but continued their research at local scales. Marlou's writing emphasizes state influence on categorization of migrants, yet provides reminders of the long-term continuities in the flows of migration at macro and micro levels, regardless of short-term policy. Leo continued his work on structures of migration at regional and global levels. Both, in their own ways, have continued to explore the role of ideology and ideological conflict as inherent aspects of migration processes rather than as factors external to migration.

## Conclusion

The literature on migration in English and Dutch languages has grown immensely through the work of Marlou and Leo alone, and far more so from scholars generally. To their credit, it is much easier today to trace and compare migrations than it was four decades ago.

In spatial analysis, Leo and Marlou each began their academic careers with localized studies within the Netherlands and expanded the spatial scale of their work to global interpretive essays on migration, continent-wide and sometimes worldwide. Yet it was not a linear expansion in scale: small-scale issues were important in later work. Their temporal organization of migratory studies began with short time-frames, then led to lengthened time-frames for primary research and for broad comparisons. Their analyses conveyed hints of cycles in migration patterns and cycles in historiographical approaches. Concerning topics of migration, migration may begin with the mobility

53 Leo Lucassen, 'Peeling an onion. The 'refugee crisis' from a historical perspective', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41:3 (2018) 383-410.

54 Leo Lucassen, 'Mob violence against free labour migrants in the age of the nation state. How can the Atlantic experience help to find global patterns?', *International Review of Social History* 67:3 (2022) 487-511.

55 Leo Lucassen, 'Workers of the world unite'. Unions and immigration, a global history', in: A. Pécoud and H. Thiollet (eds), *Research handbook on the institutions of global migration governance* (Cheltenham 2023) 170-185.

of people, but these authors show that migration necessarily generates ideological representation of movement: Marlou in the labels applied to migrants by bureaucratic and state agencies, Leo on the labels applied by nativist social movements. Both authors remind us that migrants generally survived the discrimination, though at a cost.

As authors, Marlou and Leo have learned to write for audiences at national levels and then at global levels. Their readers, in turn, have had to learn how to separate and combine arguments framed locally and globally, short-term and long-term, and to trace links of topics to one another throughout this matrix. Out of this expanding literature comes a discourse that still relies on migratory facts yet more commonly emphasizes the shifts and interactions of perspectives. As these complexities grow, both authors and readers will need to develop ways to navigate the complexities but also to simplify and draw out major trends – each from a given perspective.

Should the migration historians of coming generations try to follow the paths of Marlou and Leo, starting from national studies and building out? Or should they start with recently-established global and multidisciplinary literatures? I think that new doctoral students should gain an introductory sense of the many aspects of migration history but should specialize initially in perhaps two or three fields, so as to gain core strength, experience with disciplinary interaction, and a balance of perspectives. I emphasize the value of the Posthumus Institute in enabling PhD students to review literature and methods of Dutch and Flemish scholars but also scholarship worldwide. As it is, Marlou and Leo have opened major new distinctions in the study of migration and have achieved advances both in theory and in the practical nuances of research. And they have produced excellent archives on the evolution of their research.

## About the author

**Patrick Manning** is Andrew Mellon Professor of World History, emeritus, at the University of Pittsburgh, where he directed the World History Center from 2008 to 2015. His works on migration history include *Slavery and African Life* (1990); *Migration in Modern World History CD-ROM* (2000); *Migration in World History* (3rd ed., 2020); *The African Diaspora* (2009); “Frontiers of Family Life” (2014); “Settlement and Resettlement in Asia” (2015); “Counting and Categorizing African Migrants, 1980–2020” (2022); “Networks in the World History of Human Evolution” (2025); and “Language Origins and Group Behavior” (2026).

E-mail: [Pmanning@pitt.edu](mailto:Pmanning@pitt.edu)