Editorial:

On New Ways, in Every Direction

Migrations are multifaceted and multidimensional social phenomena and the foundation of human societies, as Leslie Page Moch and Dirk Hoerder wrote at the end of the twentieth century.[i] Colin Pooley sees human beings as "naturally restless creatures"[ii]; but given the differences between their movements – and the relative sedentarism of others – "migration" is a term that is conceptually rather difficult to grasp. Migrants move over shorter or longer distances, cross administrative, geographical and cultural borders, move between rural and/or urban regions, travel to neighbouring countries or transverse oceans. Migration can refer to a single move from the place of origin to a new environment, or to temporarily limited, circular and recurrent movements, even across national borders.

From the perspective of migrating people, a single move from one country to another can consist of several temporarily limited stays in regions between. In this sense, places can become stopovers where migrants remain over the course of different time spans or places of reference for seasonal migration. Stopovers, initially planned to be temporary, can become permanent, while "movements" that were meant to be long-term might turn out to be temporary. If their hopes of a decent or merely sufficient livelihood, of security, self-determination or relations to other people do not come true at the new place, many migrants move on.

At any rate, migrants themselves consider and negotiate of whether to stay or go – while with refugees these processes are more strongly externally imposed. Often, relations with previous places remain: networks with relatives, friends and acquaintances as well as cultural, economic and social practices create transregional and transcultural spaces. Migration frequently goes hand in hand with a complex relationship between existing and newly created references and ties to specific places. In this context, different types of spatial movement can be distinguished according to purpose, distances, duration of stay and, first and foremost, scope of action of the people involved. Migrations in all their different facets were and are ubiquitous, be it in historical or recent societies, and contributed and still contribute to their development.

Classifying, labelling, distinguishing

As rich as spatial mobility is in variation, as diverse are the labels used for mobile individuals or groups of people, which exist, apparently without contradiction, alongside the often one-dimensional image of mobile people as immigrants. Migrants are settlers when they settle down long-term, seasonal workers when they try to earn a living in rural regions during harvest time, urban immigrants when they move into cities, commuters when their workplaces and residences are far apart and return migrants when they move back to their regions of origin. Labour migrants, recruited by many Western European states during the second half of the twentieth century, are called "guest workers" ("Gastarbeiter") in Germany, and young people who move to different places for educational purposes are career migrants or exchange students. Nation states draft mostly young men – and by now also women – who as soldiers move within a certain space.[iii]

States and their administrations classify and categorize the spatial movements of people. They grouped and still group people into collective entities, and, in doing so, legitimize the application of different rights and thus discriminatory treatment of the categorized people. During the formation of modern nation states, in the early modern period, numerous men and women wandered the streets of Europe, who were increasingly criminalized because they were mobile and not sedentary. "Beggars", "vagrants", "tramps", "rumdrums", "slackers", "gypsies", "hobos" and, more recently, "homeless people" are certainly not the only labels for people who try to earn a living while being mobile.[iv] For centuries, Roma and Sinti in Europe have not only been equated with a nomadic lifestyle but also stigmatized and criminalized, depending on the type of society.[v]

In the Habsburg Monarchy, the "Heimatrecht" ("right of domicile") determined affiliations and distinguished people into locals and foreigners. Regardless of their citizenship, the latter, in the event they fell into poverty or committed an offence, could be deported into the communities where they had a right of domicile, if necessary, even within the monarchy.[vi] Today in the EU, asylum seekers can be granted refugee status based on the Geneva Convention of Refugees. People who cannot prove that they are persecuted according to the Convention become "illegals" or "economic refugees". Few other people are granted subsidiary protection.[vii]

Blind spots and recent research

Recently, Maren Möhring has argued that "migration should not simply be understood as a given phenomenon, but as a societal classification of human movement, and thus as a specific, historically variable form of mobility."[viii] For decades, social scientists and historians throughout the world have been concerned with the phenomenon of migration and its demographic, socio-economical and cultural dimensions from different perspectives. However, for a long time (and still today) this research has been marked by several dichotomies, such as the differentiation between voluntary and forced migrations, the classification of internal and international migrations[ix] and the focus on either regional or global patterns of migration. Added to this constrained research foci are restrictions including the one-dimensional view of rural-urban migration and the omission of women's spatial mobility or their migration strategies.[x]

It is still the more visible international movements of a large number of people that attract the greatest research interest.[xi] Far too little attention has been paid to the much more frequent, small-scale and mostly local movements within political territories, which were part of everyday life for many people in Europe.[xii] Often without the impact of any external factors and in search of sufficient means to earn a living, people moved from one place to another. Some of them travelled across great distances in the short or long term. Most recent historical migration research points to several overlaps and connections between local and global patterns of migration.[xiii] They increasingly criticize presuppositions of previous migration research and call into question common notions and simplistic (dichotomous) categorizations. They place previous omissions centre-stage and develop new research perspectives and programmes.[xiv]

Addressing Complexity

This volume's point of departure is the diversity of migrations. It is our aim to contrast common narratives of research on migration with a more complex picture and, in doing so, expand them. Although social scientists, particularly in recent times, have increasingly concerned themselves with return migration, temporary or circular migrations,[xv] research in general is still dominated by a view of migration as movements from a place of origin to a destination where migrants settle for good.

This picture has also influenced public debates, which, for example, often focus on "immigrants" moving into a "host" or "immigration country", but hardly ever mention non-citizens merely living in these countries temporarily.

As Regina Wonisch critically argues in this volume, museums have for a long time largely ignored migration in general. Indeed, thanks to activists of migration, several special exhibits have addressed so-called "guest labour" since the 2000s. Migration and spatial mobility, however, have hardly ever been subject of recent permanent exhibitions. Wonisch states that current museum accounts rely, to a certain extent, on stereotypes, while movements other than the 1960s and 1970s labour migration to Austria, have been disregarded. In doing so, museums also reduce various migration patterns to very specific movements.

In contrast to this, the contributions in this volume focus on manifold directions of migration, there and back, there and further, commuting and circulating. They consider movements from A to B as just one variation of migration alongside many others, which can often only be understood in the context of one another. According to the structural, political and cultural conditions in the respective research context, ten authors present migration in some of its different forms and examine courses and scopes of action as well as migrants' agency. They address their subject through the lens of different disciplines – history, sociology, social anthropology and social work research –, using a wide range of source materials and methodological approaches according to their research interest.

The interdisciplinary approach to spatial movements of people in different historical contexts is one of the objectives of the research association Migration (2016-2018) of the Research Network for Interdisciplinary Regional Studies ("first"), funded by the state of Lower Austria. In their contributions, some authors (Auer-Voigtländer, Bacher, Löffler, Richter, Unterwurzacher) present the results of their research studies conducted in this context, which some of them continue with third-party funded follow-up projects. Together with the other authors of this volume, they have discussed their insights and jointly developed research questions based on their studies presented at a workshop organized by "first" in November 2018.

The contributions with a focus on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are complemented by two studies on the seventeenth and the twenty-first centuries respectively. In addition, the already mentioned chapter by Regina Wonisch critically addresses museum representations of migration since the 1990s. In geographic terms, the contributions cover areas including the western Habsburg Monarchy, or respectively, today's Austria, as well as Saxony, Bavaria, the Ottoman Empire and the United States of America. Instead of addressing continuities and changes in migration over centuries in large geographical territories, the spatial and temporal focus of this volume is rather narrow. Indeed, this certainly suits the concerns of this volume, as it is crucial "consequently historicize" migration, as Sigrid Wadauer has put it. Migration in its respective context and the ascribed meaning of practices of spatial mobility was and is historically variable.

> Does, therefore, research in general run the risk of creating an anachronism when talking about the 'phenomenon migration' and, in so doing, evoking something that always remains the same, regardless of very different contexts and forms? Often, (historical) research on migration contributes to creating what it describes […].'[xvi]

In order to avoid this, the contributions of this volume thoroughly analyse migrations in specific historical contexts. They adopt different perspectives on the examined societies and base their line of reasoning on different spatial references: while some authors present in-depth case studies, others place institutional structures centre-stage. Contributions on urban regions are complemented by those on rural areas.

The analyses deal with movements in (early) modern central and southeast European societies. This includes, for example, societal political conditions, power relations or forms of political participation which, in turn, were connected with specific hierarchizations, in- and exclusions, pressures or possibilities. In the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, migrations were shaped by the emergence and establishment of nation and welfare states, which were the basis for new migration regimes. How certain people moved, stayed in one place or went along was also closely linked to their social position in their places of origin and their new residences. The contributions examine these and other questions and also contribute to some current discussions of (historical) migration research, which we will briefly outline in following sections.

Migration or/and mobility?

There are still very different and controversial approaches on how to conceptualize migration research. Recent studies particularly focus on the relation between migration and mobility.[xvii] While migration is usually described as a change in residency by moving from one country to another, it is irrelevant for the definition of mobility whether or not borders are crossed.[xviii] Mobility is more comprehensive and refers to any spatial movement of individuals, objects, capital, and ideas, independent of a global or local and day-to-day move.[xix] When following mobility studies, the question that often arises is which movements are being perceived and problematized as migration at a certain point of time. The postulate to link different forms of mobility draws attention to migration as a specific legal-political shaping of mobility.[xx]

What is considered to be migration at a certain point in time, always implies a specific idea of sedentariness and other forms of mobility. Given the diversity of everyday practices and experiences, migration and sedentariness merely represent two opposite poles of a continuum, as Katrin Lehnert and Barbara Lemberger argue.[xxi] They point out that by simplistically juxtaposing migration and sedentariness, research on migration runs the risk of reproducing the (difference) category migrant/non-migrant and thus naturalizing cultural attributions linked with them.[xxii] More often, however, the contours between migration and mobility are blurred and overlapping. Distinguishing them from each other is difficult, not only in theoretical but also in empirical terms: Tourists can become labour migrants and refugees can turn into "guest" or seasonal workers.

Several chapters in this volume address the relations between migration and mobility. Katrin Lehnert visualizes a plethora of mobile, specifically rural (everyday) practices in the nineteenth-century Saxon-Bohemian borderland of Upper Lusatia, which can be described as a permanent circulation rather than a single change of location. Moreover, according to Lehnert, mobility and sedentariness were not mutually exclusive but, in some instances, could complement one another, for example in the case of house-owning home-working weavers who sold their products as travelling traders. The author shows that most historians widely ignore forms of

rural (everyday-) mobility as they were scarcely reflected in statistics and only left few traces in archives.

Evguenia Davidova's contribution is concerned with two hitherto scarcely researched groups of nineteenth-century Central Balkans, namely the assistants of traders and domestic servants. She investigates whether their mobile occupation resulted in social advancement, identifying, among others, gender specific differences among them: while for traders a mobile lifestyle and occupation could contribute to upward mobility and wealth, chances of social advancement were rather limited for female domestic servants.

Eleonora Naxidou focuses on another mobile "group" in the nineteenth-century Balkans region: she analyses the biographies of two revolutionary intellectuals whose continuous mobility substantially contributed to the development of their personalities and worldviews. They encountered nationalist, liberal and federalist ideas at their various long- and short-term places of residence. As teachers, authors or newspaper editors, they committed themselves to end Ottoman rule and sought refuge from repressions by Ottoman authorities in other places. The author demonstrates how and in which ways the mobility of people and circulation of ideas were interrelated.

The contributions suggest to better account for the diversity of (everyday-) practices and not to a priori exclude specific movements due to presuppositions of migration research. They call in question a simplistic juxtaposition of migration and sedentariness, challenge common categories of analysis and thus add to a more reflexive research on migration.

The narrow scope of migration research

Overcoming presuppositions that impede unbiased and open-ended approaches are also needed for other reasons. Until today, research follows categorizations made by nation state administrations. Social scientists in particular equate migration, implicitly or explicitly, with cross-border movements, while they scarcely look at domestic migration or the interrelation between international and internal movements. Older historical studies also distinguish between international and internal migration. The differentiation of spatial mobility into the categories of internal and international, however, is closely linked to the emergence of nation states and modern bureaucracy,

which needed an administrative categorization practice to classify, register and count migrants in a clear-cut fashion – in order to ultimately administrate them.[xxiii] From this perspective, it is states that produce "genuine" migrants[xxiv] and state apparatuses appear to be the precondition for migration.

History demonstrates that people have been spatially mobile long before states started to count them. In this volume, Josef Löffler examines migration during the period of Counter-Reformation – and thus before the formation of nation states – using the expatriate Ester von Starhemberg as an example. Löffler analyses her efforts to maintain an aristocratic lifestyle in exile and the habits she had grown fond of as well as the necessary objects, benefits and connections to do so.

Other recent historical research has shown that people from countries and regions with high emigration rates were also spatially mobile within the administrative borders to a great extent. Almost 60 million Europeans left the continent during the long nineteenth century; the number of those who migrated within Europe, mostly over shorter distances, is, however, much higher.[xxv] Even national borders, which many studies take as a given, were (and are) the product and subject of historical conflicts and negotiation processes. They emerge, vanish and are drawn between people; they are mobile and by no means static. The political history of twentieth-century Europe provides numerous examples of such territorial changes, including the collapse of great empires after 1918 or the formation of new nation states after the Yugoslav Wars in the late twentieth century. Thousands of Slovene-speaking workers, who travelled hundreds of kilometres within the Habsburg Monarchy to find work, became foreigners after 1918, while Poles, who commuted from the region around Cracow to the nearby Katowice in Germany, became internal migrants in the wake of the foundation of the Polish nation state.[xxvi]

In practice, both administrations and migrants did not always notice these changes, even though the emergence of new nation states in the early twentieth century increased the significance of national borders. Thus, within migration research the question whether it made a difference for mobile people to either migrate within a state or travel to a neighbouring village on the other side of the national border gains in importance.[xxvii] Katrin Lehnert, for example, shows in this volume that the introduction of controls did not stop people from crossing borders in the context

of their everyday mobility in close proximity. She emphasizes that learning and recognizing borders was a protracted process hampered by strong resistance that reached far into the twentieth century.

A similar constellation is the point of departure in Jessica Richter's study. After the collapse of the Habsburg Empire in the wake of the First World War, new borders crossed the routes of seasonal agricultural workers. During the interwar-period, Austrian authorities made efforts to control and direct the employment of non-citizens according to their assessment of the labour market – and, at the same time, regulate employment and geographical mobility of Austrians within the state territory. These ambitions were difficult to put into practice and often counteracted. However, in the process, the authorities not only differentiated between the mobile working population into citizens and non-citizens but also placed them in relation to each other, with privileging Austrians over other job seekers.

In contrast, Josef Löffler adopts an approach that focuses on the transnationally organized lifestyle of an individual female actor from the seventeenth century. The concept of transnationality/transregionality brings social spaces created and used by migrants to the fore. They generated networks that overcame borders and distances. Josef Löffler examines the significance of the transfer of objects and the usage of services for establishing the transregional social space and emphasizes the importance of family networks for this development.

Other contributions also stress the crucial role of social networks for the process of migration. Evguenia Davidova shows that the Tanzimat reforms in the Ottoman Empire enabled non-Muslim traders to participate in multiethnic networks that coordinated the circulation of money, goods and people, including their employees. Davidova emphasizes that temporary and circular forms of mobility in different directions were much more dynamic than in the (nationalized) successor states of the Empire, with their fixed borders and enhanced state control mechanisms towards mobile people.

In her contribution, Anne Unterwurzacher explores businesses that tapped into transnational networks of "guest workers" to recruit new employees. At the same time, migrants used these networks to realize their own migration projects, for

instance, when they wanted to migrate further, to Germany, and therefore asked for invitation letters of fellow nationals who already lived there.

Eleonora Naxidou refers to the transnationality of nineteenth-century nationalization processes: the intellectuals who she examines intended to define and organize the autonomy of South Slav Christians from the Ottoman Empire across territorial borders, together with diaspora parishes in different places with which they maintained relations. Michael G. Esch points out the irony that in the wake of nineteenth-century nationalization bridge building practices across borders "resulted in a deepening of difference, in a more clear-cut differentiation between the one from the other, in a consolidation of borders and, even further, to a regulation of the passages across these borders."[xxviii]

In their studies, all these authors show the reductionism of a migration research that one-dimensionally focuses on cross-border migration, overlooking both movements within administrative borders and transnational/transregional social spaces. Regina Wonisch argues that this narrow scope is also reflected in the representation of migration in the context of the museum. According to her, national and regional museums have contributed to constructing a "we" identity by dissociating it from "the others", however these "others" are defined. The perspective of migrants on their history, practices and experiences, on the other hand, has no place in public memory spaces. Manifold transnational references across official national borders are also often ignored.

Regulation, negotiation, agency

The nation state perspective is also reflected in migration research. In methodological terms, it has long been impacted by a state-centred position according to which states enable, limit or prevent migration. This view often overestimates the effectiveness of legal and administrative regulations and ignores strategies, tactics and everyday struggles of (potential) migrants. Current approaches, on the other hand, try to incorporate the perspectives of a multitude of actors into theory building and outline the interplay between practices of mobility and attempts to regulate them. Practices of different actors are understood to be reciprocally related to one another without reducing the relation between regulatory authorities and migrants to a one-dimensional subject-object relation.[xxix]

Several contributions address a range of topics including regulation, arenas where actors negotiate spatial movement, and wilful practices. Specific power constellations and webs of interests constitute practices and conflicts between different actors. Christopher Birkett in his chapter on the "Great Migration" covers a wide range of subjects from politics, state institutions to democratic participation, describing the migration of Afro-Americans from the rural South to the Northern States of America between 1917 and the 1960s. He links their racist suppression to political conflicts about US-American federalism in the late nineteenth century and relates northward migration to the African American civil rights movement and the shift of democratic majorities after the Second World War.

The abolition of slavery in 1865, the implementation of new laws and amendments to the constitution had promised equal civil rights and increasing equality for all US-Americans. However, many of these achievements were soon withdrawn in the Southern States where the discriminatory "racial" segregation was implemented and the structural supremacy of Americans of European descent re-established. It was precisely the growing number of African American voters in the Northern States as a consequence of the "Great Migration" that put the issue of equal civil rights back on the political agenda.

In contrast, both Katrin Lehnert and Jessica Richter explore the regulatory efforts regarding various forms of rural labour migration in different geographical spaces and time periods. Katrin Lehnert analyses nineteenth-century governmental measures to categorize, regulate and control the "floating population" of the Bohemian-Saxon borderland. According to the author, this course of action paved the way for police border and migration controls, which, despite much resistance, ultimately resulted in the ethnicization and hierarchization of mobility.

Jessica Richter addresses an equally complex situation. Focusing on agricultural employment, she examines the governmental efforts of regulating cross-border migration, or respectively, of implementing central control of the labour market against the backdrop of economic crises, high unemployment and a postulated shortage of agricultural workers. Measures of individual authorities, such as the placement of unemployed people in agriculture and the central control of seasonal employment, often conflicted with each other. They were only moderately successful,

and workers, both Austrian and non-Austrian nationals, as well as agricultural employers were opposed to them. Despite provisions to the contrary, non-Austrian seasonal workers changed positions, took up irregular occupations or crossed borders, circumventing state controls.

Apart from official politics, Anne Unterwurzacher also considers migrants as well as employers and associations as independent actors in the migration arena, whose interdependent actions and reactions impacted the migration regime at a local level. Using the example of the Glanzstoff-Fabrik St. Pölten, Austria, a manufacturer of artificial fibre, the author examines (autonomous) strategies and manoeuvring room of recruited "guest workers" in realizing their own life plans. The local level proved highly relevant to circumventing and, to a certain extent, transforming existing regulations.

In the same vein, Dieter Bacher sees foreign-language displaced persons in the Soviet Occupation Zone not exclusively as objects controlled by the Soviet authorities but explores their scope of action. The author assumes that people, who had been deployed in agriculture and privately accommodated during the war, could more easily resist repatriation efforts of the Soviet administration than those who had lived in central camps.

Katharina Auer-Voigtländer's contribution is set in the immediate past of the 2010s. She describes and analyses refugees in Austria on their way from a largely heteronomous form of accommodation and livelihood provision to a more autonomous lifestyle. She also emphasizes the importance of personal relations for the refugees' decisions on migration and their chances to settle down at the new place of residence. She has identified differences between the interviewees – all of them were officially recognized as refugees – for instance, according to their familial status: Mohammed, who had come to Austria without relatives, could by his own admission, notwithstanding all difficulties and problems, concentrate on his individual life plan. Alia in contrast stated that her striving for better housing and living conditions was mainly oriented towards the needs of her family, particularly her daughter.

A fine line between coercion and voluntariness

Today, governments in particular attempt to draw a clear-cut line between refugees and economic migrants.[xxx] Even though migration research has repeatedly emphasized that it is impossible to precisely distinguish "voluntary" from forced migration,[xxxi] labour migration and flight have evolved into two separate fields of research.[xxxii] Examples from the second half of the twentieth century illustrate the difficulties that emerge from such a dichotomous categorization. Many Spanish "guest workers" were opponents of the Franco regime. They emigrated from Spain for not only economic but also political reasons. In the same vein, from the 1960s onwards, politically persecuted people from East Turkey preferred to be recruited as workers in Western Europe rather than requesting asylum in these states. When in many host countries' recruitment stopped in the mid-1970s, Christians and Kurds from Turkey started to apply for political asylum, as chances of labour migration significantly decreased.[xxxiii] People use all channels available to them to realize their migration endeavours, so that these channels are hardly indicative of their "motives" or reasons for migration, which, at any rate, are usually multi-layered. The everyday practice of migrants shows that these categories are neither static nor mutually exclusive. The fine line between coercion and voluntariness should be researched in depth by future studies.

Due to their critical and rebellious activities against the regime, the mobile biographies of the two Bulgarian intellectuals, analysed by Eleonora Naxidou, are marked by phases of self-initiated movements as well as persecution and expulsion. Despite recurrent threats, these experiences strengthened their decision to fight for their ideas, which were, to some extent, shaped by their movements.

Christopher Birkett's and Katharina Auer-Voigtländer's contributions demonstrate how difficult a clear-cut categorization of migration is. The more than six million African Americans, who experienced exploitation and economic hardship in the Southern States, not only wanted to improve their living conditions but also fled state-legitimized discrimination based on skin colour and racist acts of violence by moving to the North, as Birkett emphasizes. One of Katharina Auer Voigtländer's interviewees fled directly from Syria to Austria, thus corresponding with the image of a typical refugee. Another individual, however, fled in several stages. After prolonged

stays in refugee camps in Jordan and Turkey, he grasped the opportunity that opened up with the short-term suspension of the Dublin regulation in September 2015 and migrated to Austria. He explained this active and self-chosen migration decision with the precarious situation of refugees in Turkey, hoping for better conditions to realize his life plans in Western Europe.

The situation of non-German-speaking displaced persons in Lower Austria, as examined by Dieter Bacher, was completely different. Deported or prevented from returning to their home countries by the Nazis after an initially "voluntary" stay, they faced new challenges and opportunities after the end of the war. Back home, Soviet citizens were suspected to be collaborators with the Nazi regime. They faced punishment, surveillance and/or persecution in their regions of origin. Thus, many of them tried to evade repatriation. This was not an easy task in the Soviet occupation zone. Those who had been deployed in agriculture and privately accommodated during the Nazi period were more easily able to remain in Austria or even migrate to a third country.

Outlook

The contributions of this volume demonstrate the difficulty of conceptualizing the different forms and possibilities of spatial movement and the need to historicize the terms to describe this phenomenon. People were not only mobile in the sense of immigrating into a different social and cultural context on a one-time basis. Their movements also included permanent, recurrent or re-migrations. Moreover, "migration" cannot be reduced to cross-border movements or examined separately from short-distance or regional migrations. In the same sense, sedentariness cannot be considered the opposite of "migration", given the biographies of people who sometimes moved and sometimes stayed.

The authors draw on debates among social scientists and historians, which demand a more reflexive migration research. In particular, they criticize approaches that carelessly adopt and thus reproduce categories of difference created by state authorities. As a result, diverse social practices fade into the background or even become invisible. According to Isabelle Lorey, research is supposed to undermine such categorial normalization and concern itself, in an unbiased manner, with those actors, who are not inclined to bow to the established order.[xxxiv]

[i] Leslie Page Moch, 'Introduction', in Dirk Hoerder and Laslie Page Moch (eds), *European Migrants: Global and Local Perspectives* (Boston, 1996), 3-19, here 3; Dirk Hoerder, *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millenium* (Durham, 2002), xix.

[ii] Colin G. Pooley, *Mobility, Migration and Transport: Historical Perspectives* (London, 2017), 3.

[iii] On the migration of soldiers see Jan Lusassen/Leo Lucassen, 'Measuring and Quantifying Cross-Cultural Migrations: An Introduction', in Lucassen/Lucassen (eds.), *Globalising Migration History. The Eurasian Experience (16th-21st Centuries)* (Leiden, 2014), 3-54.

[iv] Gerhard Ammerer, *Heimat Straße: Vaganten im Österreich des Ancien Regime* (Munich/Vienna, 2003); Sigrid Wadauer, 'Establishing Distinctions: Unemployment versus Vagrancy in Austria from the Late Nineteenth Century to 1938', *International Review of Social History* 56/1 (2011): 31–70; Sigrid Wadauer, 'Tramping in Search of Work. Practices of Wayfarers and of Authorities, Austria 1880–1938', in id./Thomas Buchner/Alexander Mejstrik (eds.), *The History of Labour Intermediation: Institutions and Finding Employment in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (New York/Oxford, 2015), 286–333.

[v] Leo Lucassen, Zigeuner: *Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland 1700–1945* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, 1996).

[vi] Harald Wendelin, 'Schub und Heimatrecht', in Waltraud Heindl/Edith Saurer (eds.), *Grenze und Staat. Paßwesen, Staatsbürgerschaft, Heimatrecht und Fremdengesetzgebung in der österreichischen Monarchie 1750–1867* (Vienna, 2000), 173–343.

[vii] Marlou Schrover/Deirdre Moloney, 'Introduction. Making a Difference', in id. (eds.), *Gender, Migration and Categorization. Making Distinctions between Migrants in Western Countries, 1945–2010* (Amsterdam, 2013), 7–54, here 8f.

[viii] Maren Möhring, 'Jenseits des Integrationsparadigmas? Aktuelle Konzepte und Ansätze in der Migrationsforschung', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 58 (2018): 305–30, here 305.

[ix] Cf. Russell King/Ronald Skeldon/Julie Vullnetari, 'Internal and International Migration: Bridging the Theoretical Divide', Paper prepared for the IMISCOE 'Theories of Migration and Social Change Conference' , St. Anne's College, Oxford, 1–3 July 2008, https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/377323/ (20.12.2019), 2; Bruno Ramirez, 'Leaving Canada Behind: Continental and Intercontinental Migrations in the North Atlantic Economy, 1900–1930', in René Leboutte (ed.), *Migrations et Migrants dans une Perspective Historique – Migrations and Migrants in Historical Perspective* (New York, 2000), 141–163.

[x] Sylvia Hahn, 'Wie Frauen in der Migrationsgeschichte verloren gingen', in Karl Husa/Christof Parnreiter/Irene Stacher (eds.), *Internationale Migration. Die globale Herausforderung des 21. Jahrhunderts?* (Vienna, 2000), 77–96.

[xi] For a critical view of traditional approaches of historical migration research see Jan Lucassen/Leo Lucassen, 'Migration, Migration History, History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives', in id. (eds.), *Migration, Migration History, History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives* (Bern, 1997), 9–38; Jan Lucassen/Leo Lucassen/Patrick Manning, 'Migration History: Multidisciplinary Approaches', in id. (eds.), *Migration History in World History: Multidisciplinary Approaches* (Leiden, 2010), 3–37; Pooley, *Mobility*, 2017, 24.

[xii] Josef Ehmer, 'Migration in der historischen Forschung – Themen und Perspektiven', in Heinz Faßmann/ Julia Dahlvik (eds.), *Migrations- und Integrationsforschung – multidisziplinäre Perspektiven* (Göttingen, 2011), 89–102; Rita Garstenauer/Anne Unterwurzacher, 'Einleitung: Aufbrechen, Arbeiten, Ankommen: Mobilität und Migration im ländlichen Raum seit 1945', in id. (eds.), *Aufbrechen, Arbeiten, Ankommen. Mobilität und Migration im ländlichen Raum seit 1945* (Innsbruck/Vienna/Bozen, 2015), 7–18, here 8; Annemarie Steidl, 'Ein ewiges Hin und Her. Kontinentale, transatlantische und lokale Migrationsrouten in der Spätphase der Habsburgermonarchie', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften (OeZG)* 19/1 (2008): 15–42, here 17f.; Sigrid Wadauer, 'Historische Migrationsforschung. Überlegungen zu Möglichkeiten und Hindernissen', *OeZG* 19/1 (2008): 6–14, here 8f.

[xiii] Annemarie Steidl, *On Many Routes: Internal, European, and Transatlantic Migration in the Late Habsburg Empire* (West Lafayette IN), in print.

[xiv] See the overview articles by Möhring, 'Jenseits'; Anne Friedrichs, 'Placing Migration in Perspective. Neue Wege einer relationalen Geschichtsschreibung', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 44 (2018): 167–195; Maria Alexopoulo, 'Vom Nationalen zum Lokalen und zurück? Zur Geschichtsschreibung in Einwanderungsgesellschaften', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 56 (2016): 463–484.

[xv] Cf. for example Anna Triandafyllidou (ed.), *Circular Migration between Europe and its Neighbourhood: Choice or Necessity?* (Oxford, 2013); Thierry Rinaldetti, 'Italian Migrants in the Atlantic Economies: From the Circular Migrations of the Birds of Passage to the Rise of a Dispersed Community', *Journal of American Ethnic History* 34/1 (2014): 5–30; Xosé-Manoel Núñez, 'Überseeische Rückwanderung und sozialer Wandel in Spanien und Portugal, 1830–1970: eine Forschungsbilanz', *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie* 61/1 (2013): 62–83.

[xvi] Wadauer, 'Migrationsforschung': 9.

[xvii] Cf. for example Möhring, 'Jenseits'.

[xviii] Katrin Lehnert/Barbara Lemberger, 'Mit Mobilität aus der Sackgasse der Migrationsforschung? Mobilitätskonzepte und ihr Beitrag zu einer kritischen Gesellschaftsforschung', in: Labor Migration (ed.), *Vom Rand ins Zentrum. Perspektiven einer kritischen Migrationsforschung* (Berlin, 2014), 45–61, here 46f.

[xix] Ibid.

[xx] Möhring, 'Jenseits', 307.

[xxi] Katrin Lehnert/Barbara Lemberger, 'Un-Ordnung denken – Probleme der Kategorisierung von "Migration" und Fragen an eine europäisch ethnologische Migrationsforschung', in Matthias Glückmann/Felicia Sparacio (eds.), *Spektrum Migration. Zugänge zur Vielfalt des Alltags* (Tübingen, 2015), 91–110, here 91.

[xxii] On this see Janine Dahinden, 'Migration im Fokus? Plädoyer für eine reflexive Migrationsforschung', in Jennifer Carvill Schellenbacher/Julia Dahlvik/Heinz Faßmann/Christoph Reinprecht (eds.), *Migration und Integration: Wissenschaftliche Perspektiven aus Österreich*, Jahrbuch 3 (Vienna, 2016), 1–20.

[xxiii] Ulf Brunnbauer, *Globalizing Southeastern Europe. Emigrants, America, and the State since the Late Nineteenth Century* (Lanham MD, 2016), 9.

[xxiv] Lucassen/Lucassen, 'Cross-Cultural Migrations', 2014, 6.

[xxv] On this see Steidl, *Routes*, inprint.

[xxvi] A prime example for examining the emergence of national borders and their control is the research project headed by Josef Ehmer: 'The Control of Mobility of Ottoman Migrants in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1739–1791. The Rise of the Modern State?'; on this see also Jovan Pešalj/Josef Ehmer/Sabine Sütterlütti, 'The First Modern Border? The Ottoman-Habsburg Military Border', in Jovan Pešalj/Leo Lucassen/Annemarie Steidl/Josef Ehmer (eds.), *Borders and Mobility Control in and between Empires and Nation-States* (Leiden/Boston), in print.

[xxvii] Andreas Gestrich/Marita Krauss (eds.), *Migration und Grenze* (Stuttgart, 1998); Wolfgang Schmale/Reinhard Stauber (eds.), *Menschen und Grenzen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1998); Heindl/Saurer (eds.), *Grenze*; Etienne François/Jörg Seifarth/Bernhard Struck (eds.), *Die Grenze als Raum, Erfahrung und Konstruktion: Deutschland, Frankreich und Polen vom 17. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/Main, 2007).

[xxviii] Michael G. Esch, 'Migration: Transnationale Praktiken, Wirkungen und Paradigmen', in Frank Hadler/ Matthias Middell (eds.), *Handbuch einer transnationalen Geschichte Ostmitteleuropas*, vol. I: Von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum 1. Weltkrieg (Göttingen, 2017), 131–187, here 131.

[xxix] See for example Serhat Karakayali/Vassilis Tsianos, 'Mapping the Order of New Migration. Undokumentierte Arbeit und die Autonomie der Migration', *Peripherie* 25/97–98 (2005): 35–64.

[xxx] The differentiation between refugees and migrants became common from the 1950s onwards; see Katy Long, 'When Refugees Stopped Being Migrants. Movement, Labour and Humanitarian Protection', *Migration Studies* 1/1 (2013): 4–26.

[xxxi] See for example Oliver Bakewell, 'Conceptualising Displacement and Migration', in Khalid Koser/Susan Martin (eds.), *The Migration-Displacement-Nexus: Patterns, Processes, and Policies* (Oxford, 2011), 14–28.

[xxxii] Schrover/Moloney, 'Introduction', 8.

[xxxiii] Ibid.

[xxxiv] Isabelle Lorey, 'Von den Kämpfen aus. Eine Problematisierung grundlegender Kategorien', in Sabine Hess/Nikola Langreiter/Elisabeth Timm (eds.), *Intersektionalität Revisited. Empirische, theoretische und methodische Erkundigungen* (Bielefeld, 2011), 101–116.