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In the decades before World War I, it was not only millions of Italians – primarily from the Mezzogiorno – who traveled to the New World. What came along with them were the stereotypes and discourses about them that had been originally elaborated in the Old World.¹ Many of these stereotypes and discourses concerned the “south,” on the one hand, and the “Mediterranean,” on the other, two categories that often overlapped and interacted with one another. One hopes that on another occasion the complex story of how American social scientists, writers, journalists, politicians, immigration officials, and others reworked and redeployed these stereotypes and discourses will be told in greater detail. Such an investigation would need to situate the categories of the “south” and “Mediterranean” within a rich discursive field of other racial and ethnic categories used at the time, both with respect to Italians and to other immigrant groups.² Here, in this brief and somewhat hasty note, I offer a preliminary reflection, considering the special relevance of the categories of the “Mediterranean” and, above all, the “south,” to the cultural representation of the Italian immigrants who came to America during the years of la grande emigrazione.

Beginning in the early 1890s, the numbers of immigrants arriving in the United States from Italy and other parts of Southern and Eastern Europe increased dramatically. American social observers were keenly aware that these peoples represented a new type of immigrant. In an article published in 1904, titled, “The Immigration Problem,” Harvard professor Robert DeCourcy Ward voiced a widely held perception:

No one who notices, even in the most casual way, the faces of the people he sees on the streets and in the cars need be told that a most striking and fundamental change has taken place in the nationalities of our immigrants. A few years ago practically all of our immigrants were from northern and western Europe, that is, they were more or less closely allied to us racially, historically, socially, industrially and politically. They were largely the same elements which had recently made up the English race . . . Now however, the majority of the newcomers are from southern and eastern Europe, and they are coming in rapidly increasing numbers from Asia. These people are alien to us, in race . . . in language, in social, political and industrial ideas and inheritances.³

The Italians were the most visible face of this influx of alien peoples. They were, to begin, the single largest ethnic group among the “new immigrants” that were inundating America's shores.

¹ This article is dedicated to the memory of Peter D’Agostino. At the outset, I wish to acknowledge my debt here to his article, “Craniums, Criminals, and the ‘Cursed Race’: Italian Anthropology in American Racial Thought, 1861-1924,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 44 (2002): 319-44. A more extended examination of the issues I discuss here can be found in my essay, “Il padrino, la Mafia e l’America,” in Traffici criminali. Camorra, mafie e reti internazionali della illegalità, ed. Gabriella Gribaudi (Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2009), 325-51.
² To name a few, Teutonic, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Aryan, Latin, Italic, Iberic, etc.
³ Charities (February 6, 1904): 138-40.
The tens and sometimes hundreds of thousands of Italians that arrived each year significantly altered the demographic composition of the country, especially in the large urban centers on the East Coast where most of them settled.

The vast size of the Italian immigrant population was not, however, its only distinguishing feature: the ethnic composition of the Italian diaspora was homogeneous in comparison to many other immigrant groups. The overwhelming majority of Italian immigrants to the United States came from the Mezzogiorno, and this “southerness” was one of the key categories that American social scientists employed with increasing insistence in the decades before World War I to “explain” the inferiority and undesirability of the “new immigrants” and of the Italians in particular. Often drawing on the work of racial anthropologists of the Lombrosian school, Alfredo Niceforo in particular, American scholars and social observers frequently connected the notion of the south and southern peoples to that of a Mediterranean (or, alternatively, “Italic” or “Iberic”) “race” that was inferior to the European races to the north, variously called “Teutonic,” “Aryan,” “Celtic.”

In 1899, William Ripley of Columbia University published his massive study, *The Races of Europe*, which divided the continent into three “racial types”: the Teutonic, Alpine, and Mediterranean. He left little room for doubt about the superiority of the former over the latter. Of equal importance was his division between Southern and Northern Italians. Italians as a whole belonged to the Mediterranean race, but whereas Northern Italy contained a mixture of the Alpine and Mediterranean types, in the South – below the Tiber River – “the transition to a purely Mediterranean race is at last fully accomplished.”

Scientific disquisitions on racial types during these decades informed discussions within the federal government and American immigration policy itself. In the same year that Ripley’s study appeared, the U.S. Commissioner General of Immigration introduced a distinction between immigrants from the North and South of Italy that would remain in force for the next two decades. The passenger lists (*registri di bordo*) drawn up by the shipping companies who ferried immigrants from Italian and other European ports to Ellis Island provide a graphic illustration of this new classification. Next to the name of the passenger and his or her nationality was written either an "N" (signifying "Italians of the north") or an "S" (signifying "Italians of the South"). It is important to note that the Italians were the only immigrant group to be divided into two different “races or peoples” in this way. In 1911, this distinction was further legitimized by the authors of the final report of the congressional commission charged with investigating the effects of immigration in the United States. The Dillingham Report, whose recommendations lay the foundations for the immigration restriction acts of the early 1920s, endorsed the U.S. Bureau of Immigration’s division of Italians into Northerners and Southerners, different from one other “in language, physique, and character, as well as in geographical distribution.”

The Dillingham Report thus sanctioned the view that the Southern Italians, who constituted the largest “new” immigrant group in the United States, were an alien and inferior people.

---


5 William Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1899): 270. It is worth noting the language Ripley uses to characterize the difference between northern and southern Italy in his introduction to the passage just cited: “The Tiber River really marks the boundary between competitive Italy and isolated Italy, so to speak” (269).

What we see, then, is that the north-south distinction, which had been elaborated over the
course of the nineteenth century both in Italy and Europe more broadly, was transplanted and
redeployed in the geographically distant and culturally different environment of the United
States. How can we explain this? Certainly the special receptivity of American intellectual and
political culture to the discourses and theories of the Lombrosians played an important role in
this. But what must be stressed, at the same time, is the “supply” side of the equation: namely
the extraordinary force of the discourses and representations of the north-south division in Italian
culture, which the Lombrosians had inherited and then re-elaborated with renewed intensity at
the fin-de-siècle. Thus, both due to the “facts on the ground” – the great number of dark-skinned
Italian immigrants from the Mediterranean arriving in America – and to the power of southernist
discourse itself, the Southern Question was transplanted into the culture of the United States,
where the graft “took well,” informing and shaping a racialist discourse on immigration within
scholarly, political and administrative discourse. The effects of this transplant were significant
indeed, for the anthropological discourses on north-south difference, which, as noted above,
informed the 1911 Dillingham report, would also play a role in the formulation of immigration
restriction acts that would finally close the doors of America to Italians and other “alien” peoples
in 1924.

Concepts and the different paths they travel

In this note I have paid relatively little attention to the “Mediterranean” as a concept, and to the
specific ways it interacted with “south” in American intellectual culture during this period. This
is a task that remains for another occasion. In conclusion, I want to shift focus from America
back to Italy, calling attention to a striking and thus far unexplored discrepancy between the
history of the concept of the Mediterranean in the United States, on the one hand, and in Italy, on
the other, during these decades. If in the United States the “Mediterranean” had a primarily
negative value in scholarly and public discourse, in Italy, instead, there were intellectuals – even
among the so-called Lombrosians – that sought to valorize it. This was the case, above all, with
Giuseppe Sergi, who, as Fabrizio De Donno argues in his essay in this volume, linked the
Mediterranean to the idea of regenerating the Italian and Latin people. Mediterraneanism also
played a significant role in Italian colonial and Fascist discourse. Thus, on the one hand,
racist discourses on the Mediterranean were reformulated by American intellectuals in a
predominantly negative sense. This is what they “took” from the Lombrosians. On the other
hand, racist discourses in Italy were more variegated in their articulation of the Mediterranean.
If, in the work of Alfredo Niceforo, the Mediterranean is integral to his conceptualization of the
inferiority of Southern Italians, in certain writings of Giuseppe Sergi the Mediterranean is,
instead, central to a broader project of cultural renewal of Latin peoples, in opposition to

---

7 See my The View from Vesuvius: Italian Culture and the Southern Question (Berkeley and Los Angeles:
University of California Press, 2002).
8 An additional factor which merits exploration is the extent to which discourses on the north-south difference in the
United States may have interacted and overlapped with those on the north-south difference in Italy (thus
contributing to American intellectuals’ receptivity to such a dualistic vision of the “New Immigrant” peoples at the
fin-de-siècle). An essential source for this line of inquiry is Don H. Doyle’s Nations Divided: America, Italy, and the
9 See, to begin, Fabrizio De Donno, “La Razza Ario-Mediterranea: Ideas of Race and Citizenship in Colonial and
Fascist Italy, 1885-1941,” Interventions 8:3 (2006): 394-412; and, with reference to the Futurists, Claudio Fogu,
Aryanism. What my observations here suggest, then, is that research on such geographical imaginings as the “south” and the “Mediterranean” can benefit from a dual, transatlantic perspective. In the first place, we need to take into account how such concepts travel, how intellectual currents are translated and transplanted into new contexts. In short, how in the case discussed here, Italian and American intellectual history are interconnected. But, at the same time, we need to consider the divergence between these histories and the way such concepts travel in quite different directions, playing different roles in different cultural and political histories.
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