

Inclusion and Exclusion of Migrants in the Multicultural Realm of the Habsburg “State of Many Peoples”

SYLVIA HAHN*

Immigration by foreign workers, entrepreneurs, master craftsmen and tradesmen, journeymen and merchants, as well as seasonal regional labour migration within individual states and across national borders, has been a tradition that goes far back into the Early Modern Era. Artisans, journeymen, and apprentices, a particularly mobile group, formed the major part of the foreigners in Vienna in the pre-industrial era. Aside from this artisanal migration during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Habsburg Monarchy recruited labourers from other areas of the empire or from abroad, particularly those skilled in luxury crafts and textile production. Over the course of the nineteenth century, these were followed by industrial pioneers and workers. Migration was not only concentrated on Vienna, but extended to smaller towns and villages of the newly developed industrial regions of the Habsburg Monarchy. Integration into the “new” society was no easy matter, for labourers or entrepreneurs. Immigrant women and men were kept under close scrutiny by municipal authorities and faced discrimination from local laws and native-born residents. A change of residence clearly led to one’s sense of being a foreigner, both in one’s own perception and that of the “others”, but evidence shows that the concept of “foreignness” is a variable construct that changes according to the political, economic, and social situation.

L’immigration de travailleurs, d’entrepreneurs, de maîtres artisans, d’ouvriers spécialisés, de compagnons et de marchands étrangers de même que la migration régionale saisonnière de la main-d’oeuvre au sein des États et par-delà les frontières nationales sont une tradition qui remontent aux lointains débuts de l’ère moderne. Les artisans, compagnons et apprentis, un groupe particulièrement mobile, formaient la majeure partie des étrangers de Vienne de l’ère préindustrielle. Aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles, outre ces artisans migrants, la monarchie des Habsbourg recrutait des ouvriers d’autres régions de l’empire ou de l’étranger; en particulier ceux doués pour l’artisanat de luxe et la production textile. Leur succédèrent au

* Sylvia Hahn is professor in the department of history at the University of Salzburg. Her main subjects of research include social history of the nineteenth century, urban and labour history, and gender history.

XIX^e siècle les pionniers et les travailleurs du secteur industriel. La migration n'était pas concentrée qu'à Vienne, s'étendant aux petites villes et aux villages des nouvelles régions industrielles de la monarchie des Habsbourg. L'intégration en une « nouvelle » société n'a pas été une sinécure pour les ouvriers ou les entrepreneurs. Les autorités locales surveillaient étroitement les immigrants et les immigrantes, à qui les lois locales et les résidents de souche réservaient un traitement discriminatoire. Qui changeait de lieu de résidence avait clairement l'impression d'être un étranger, tant à ses propres yeux qu'à ceux des « autres », mais les données révèlent que le concept d'« étranger » est un construct variable qui change au gré des situations politiques, économiques et sociales.

I'm a typical old-Austrian-Hungarian mixture: Madjar, Croatian, German, Czech. (*Ödön von Horváth*)

ONE MAIN THEME of travel or fiction books of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries dealing with Vienna is that the city was crowded with foreigners. In 1784, for example, Johann Pezzl — a German writer of the Enlightenment era who lived most of his life in Vienna — noticed that “every day people from all nationalities, languages and religions come together in this city”.¹ In the early nineteenth century, when the German musician and critic Johann Friedrich Reichardt visited Vienna, he wrote that he found it “full to bursting with foreigners”.² Even at the numerous social events that revolved around the city's artistic circles he repeatedly met fellow Germans as well as many other men and women from foreign countries. About 50 years later, in the 1860s, the Viennese essayist Friedrich Schlögl pointed out, “Vienna doesn't belong to the Viennese people any longer.”³

Although all these writings helped to create a special myth about Vienna — the “grand old dame” of European metropolises — as a multicultural centre, it was not entirely a myth. Until the end of World War I, Vienna was not only the capital city and imperial residence of the Habsburg Monarchy, the “pearl of Austria” as it was poetically called in verse and popular songs; it was also *the* city to which migrants streamed from far and wide, one that people held dear in their thoughts no matter how far away they were. Or, as the novelist Manes Sperber put it: “The one-syllable name of the capital and imperial residence always had a rousing effect, even in the furthest, most isolated corner of the Monarchy.”⁴

Migration, especially labour migration *per se*, was not only focused on the

1 Johann Pezzl, “Marokkanische Briefe”, in Edith Rosenstrauch-Königsberg, ed., *Literatur der Aufklärung 1765–1800* (Vienna, Cologne, Graz: Böhlau, 1988), p. 234.

2 Johann Friedrich Reichardt, *Vertraute Briefe geschrieben auf einer Reise nach Wien und den Österreichischen Staaten zu Ende des Jahres 1808 und zu Anfang 1809*, introduction and commentary by Gustav Gugitz, 2 vols. (Munich: Georg Müller, 1915), vol. 1, p. 208.

3 Friedrich Schlögl, *Wiener Luft*, 2 vols. (Vienna, Pest, Leipzig: A. Hartleben, 1893), p. 16.

4 Manes Sperber, *Die Wasserträger Gottes* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1984), p. 90.

so-called *Reichs-*, *Haupt-* and *Residenzstadt* Vienna, however. In his study about migration in nineteenth-century Germany, Steve Hochstadt questioned the dominance of large cities. From his point of view, “movement to large cities was not typical of German migrants” and therefore “urban migration structures can represent only one part of German mobility”.⁵ For Austria in the second half of the nineteenth century, he suggests, “rural people were more mobile than urbanites”.⁶ Generally, scholarly research on migration history in Austria and on the Habsburg Empire is dominated by studies of large urban centres. Therefore one main goal of this study is to shift the focus away from the main centres “down” to the arenas of migration in smaller cities and villages. The central question is: How and why are individuals or groups of people, or labour migrants, made to be foreigners and so perceived? Generally, we can suggest that a change of residence — as a journeyman, a labour migrant, or a refugee — led to a person’s sense of being a “foreigner” (*ein Fremder*), both in one’s own perception and in those of the “others”. Furthermore, I suggest that “foreignness” (*Fremdheit*) is not a strictly established quality of individuals and groups, but rather a historically variable social and cultural construct which changes according to the political, economic, and social situation. That is, foreignness is produced by discourses of difference that distinguish between “native” and “foreign”, between “us” and “them”.⁷

Labour Migrants ...

Immigration by foreign workers, entrepreneurs, master craftsmen and tradesmen, journeymen and merchants, as well as an often seasonal regional labour migration within individual states and across national borders, has a tradition that goes far back into the Early Modern Era.⁸ Generally, as Dirk

5 Steve Hochstadt, *Mobility and Modernity: Migration in Germany, 1820–1989* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), p. 114.

6 Steve Hochstadt, “Migration and Industrialization in Germany, 1815–1977”, *Social Science History*, vol. 5, no. 4 (1981), p. 459.

7 Because of the migration that occurred in Austria after the political events of 1989, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research launched a social science research project entitled “Xenophobia: Research, Explanation, Countermeasures” in the autumn of 1995. This paper is part of the research project entitled *Multifaceted and Complex Strangeness: Historical Interpretive Scenarios*. For an overview of the project, see Josef Ehmer and Sylvia Hahn, “Multifaceted and Complex Strangeness: Historical Interpretive Scenarios” (paper presented at the conference “Creating the Other: The Causes and Dynamics of Nationalism, Ethnic Enmity, and Racism in Central and Eastern Europe”, Minnesota, 1999).

8 See, generally, Leslie Page Moch, *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe Since 1650* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992); Jan Lucassen, *Migrant Labour in Europe, 1600–1900: The Drift to the North Sea* (London: Croom Helm, 1987); Gerhard Jaritz and Albert Müller, eds., *Migration in der Feudalgesellschaft* (Frankfurt/Main: Campus, 1988); P. Clark and D. Souden, eds., *Migration and Society in Early Modern England* (London: Hutchinson, 1987); François Etienne, ed., *Immigration et société urbaine en Europe occidentale, XVI^e–XX^e siècle* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1985); Steve Hochstadt, “Migration in Preindustrial Germany”, *Central European History*, vol. 16 (1983), pp. 195–224.

Hoerder has suggested, migration before the age of the Enlightenment can be divided into four types.⁹ First was the rural-urban (labour) migration of women and men escaping from serfdom and looking for a living in the cities or towns. Second, the migration of teachers and scholars produced the “circulation of elites” which was important for the exchange of knowledge and experience, and the travels of merchants facilitated international trade long before the age of communication and technology in the nineteenth century. Third, there was the group of religious refugees, like the Austrian Protestants or Bohemian dissenters. Fourth was the migration of journeymen artisans throughout Europe. This last group of migrants — artisans, journeymen, and apprentices — formed the major part of the foreigners in Vienna in the pre-industrial era. In 1742, for example, only 1,160 (24 per cent) of the 4,773 guild masters of Vienna had been born in the city. Another 20 per cent came from Lower Austria, 20 per cent from other provinces of the Monarchy, and 36 per cent (1,699) from foreign countries. In most of the other trades scarcely more than 5 per cent of the urban journeymen originated from the city.¹⁰ According to the studies of Josef Ehmer, the places of origin of eighteenth-century Viennese artisans have shown the importance of Germany for the recruitment of masters and journeymen. A migratory system linked the area from the Upper Rhine to Vienna, stretching over 700 kilometres from west to east. In addition to this trans-regional migratory system, artisans and journeymen also came from another group of regions, such as the Central German states of Hesse and Saxony, the Czech lands, and Hungary.¹¹ This high mobility was mainly the result of the tradition requiring a journeyman to spend a number of years on the tramp in order to qualify to become a master. Moreover, tramping by journeymen served the furtherance of commerce and the transfer of technology and was, in this respect, highly desirable and accorded preferential treatment.¹² Therefore artisans were an extremely mobile group or, as Ehmer noticed, they “belonged to the most mobile groups in pre-industrial European societies as well as in late 19th century industrializing Europe”.¹³ Even after tramping ceased to be a requirement in the nineteenth century, the majority of crafts and trades journeymen carried

9 Dirk Hoerder, “Metropolitan Migration in the Past: Labour Markets, Commerce, and Cultural Interaction in Europe, 1600–1914”, *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2000), pp. 42ff.

10 Josef Ehmer, “Migration of Journeymen as Nineteenth-Century Mass Migration”, in René Leboutte, ed., *Migrations et migrants dans une perspective historique. Permanences et innovations / Migrations and Migrants in Historical Perspective. Permanencies and Innovations. International Conference Proceedings, European Forum, 1997–8, EUI, Florence 1997* (Brussels: P.I.E.-Lang, Series “Multiple Europe” no. 12, 2000), p. 100.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 101.

12 Reinhold Reith, “Arbeitsmigration und Technologietransfer in der Habsburgermonarchie in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts — die Gesellenwanderung aus der Sicht der Kommerzienskonseesse”, *Blätter für Technikgeschichte*, vol. 56 (1994), pp. 9–23.

13 Ehmer, “Migration of Journeymen”, p. 99.

on this tradition.¹⁴ They “constituted a highly flexible, supra-regional workforce which provided an indispensable complement to the relatively fixed labour potential of guild masters”.¹⁵

... Invited ...

Aside from this artisanal migration during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the state pursued an intentional recruitment and resettlement of labourers from other areas of the Habsburg Monarchy or from abroad. As early as the seventeenth century (1666), the *Collegium Commerciorum*, the first administrative authority responsible for commerce and trade, attempted to entice specialists in textile production from Italy, France, and the Netherlands to Vienna.¹⁶ Due to the efforts made by the imperial house, a tremendous influx of foreign workers took place over the course of the eighteenth century. Comb-makers from Italy, watchmakers from Geneva, men from Würzburg specialized in plating copper with gold and silver, metal and fashion jewellery workers from England, and ribbon weavers and specialized silk workers from France, Italy, Switzerland, and Germany came to Vienna.¹⁷ In return for certain financial supports, they obligated themselves “to work to the satisfaction of the public”, to sell “their wares at prices below those of foreign suppliers”, and, above all, “to employ the local workforce to as great an extent as possible” and to provide them with training.¹⁸ At the same time, strict measures were enacted to prevent the emigration of the domestic population, since it was precisely this group who was to receive “instruction” and training from the “foreigners” in the new modes and methods of production.

The recruitment of these entrepreneurs served mainly to build up the luxury crafts and trades; in some of these, virtually all of the practitioners were masters from abroad. This intentional recruitment was an essential aspect of the mercantilist economic policy,¹⁹ the fundamental principles of which included encouragement of the monarchy’s economic standard — and not

14 Sigrid Wadauer, “Der Gebrauch der Fremde. Wanderschaft in der Autobiographik von Handwerkern”, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, vol. 2 (1998), pp. 159–187.

15 Josef Ehmer, “Worlds of Mobility: Migration Patterns of Viennese Artisans in the Eighteenth Century”, in Geoffrey Crossick, ed., *The Artisan and the European Town, 1500–1900* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), p. 173.

16 Peter Eigner, “Mechanismen urbaner Expansion. Am Beispiel der Wiener Stadtentwicklung 1740–1938”, in Günther Chaloupek and Peter Eigner, *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, published by Felix Czeike, vol. 4 (Vienna: Jugend & Volk, 1991), part 2, pp. 617–756; Franz Bujatti, *Die Geschichte der Seiden-Industrie Oesterreichs deren Ursprung und Entwicklung bis in die neueste Zeit* (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1893), p. 10.

17 Bujatti, *Die Geschichte der Seiden-Industrie*, p. 20; Ute Daiß, “Die Genfer Uhrenmanufaktur auf der Wieden. Ein Beispiel österreichischer Wirtschaftspolitik, 1789–1835” (bachelor’s thesis, University of Vienna, 1995).

18 Bujatti, *Die Geschichte der Seiden-Industrie*, p. 17.

19 Roman Sandgruber, *Ökonomie und Politik. Österreichische Wirtschaftsgeschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart* (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1995).

only in Austria. Such intentional recruitment was also quite common in other European cities like Frankfurt, Berlin, or St. Petersburg, for example. Frankfurt-am-Main, a flourishing commercial city, had already been experiencing strong population growth since 1550. The loss of about 16 per cent of the city's population caused by the Thirty Years War (1618–1648) was followed by a rapid recovery between 1655 and 1700, mainly through immigration. In 1700, as Hohenberg and Lees suggest, “the city of Frankfurt-am-Main boasted some 27,500 legal residents, of whom 9,000–10,000 were noncitizens.”²⁰ Among them were “several thousands of migrating journeymen artisans, 3,000 middle-class Dutch Protestant refugees, and 2,500 Jews”, accounting for more than 40 per cent of the population.²¹ In Berlin between 1680 and 1709 more than 30,000 immigrants were recorded, among them 7,000 Huguenots and hundreds of Jews, as well as artisans from Switzerland, France, the “Pfalz”, or other German regions.²² Friedrich II (1744–1797) paid 50 *Taler* to each labourer and up to 500 *Taler* per entrepreneur from abroad to come to Berlin to build up the manufacture of luxury goods there, mainly silk production, which was called the king's favourite “child”.²³ In St. Petersburg Peter I (1689–1725) recruited a work force to a great extent from central and western Europe mainly to set up luxury, paper, and ammunition production, but he also sought teachers, lawyers, and doctors from Germany, as well as servants, chimney sweeps, and clock- and jewellery makers from Finland. The 1,600 Finns present in St. Petersburg in 1743 made up about 3.2 per cent of the total population.²⁴

This was accelerated by the increasing internationalization of the economy, which quickly led to the emergence of a supra-regional labour market structure. From as early as the eighteenth century we can identify individual commercial sectors — such as export-oriented crafts and trades or the early large-scale production facilities, like textile manufactories — which intentionally recruited workers on the supra-regional labour market to some extent.

However, these labour migrants of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were to constitute only the beginning of a major migratory movement on the part of workers from abroad. In the initial phase of industrialization in the early nineteenth century, we know that “machine artists” — as these mechanic-inventors were called in the parlance of the day — migrated to the lands of the Habsburg Monarchy from western European

20 Paul M. Hohenberg and Lynn Hollen Lees, *The Making of Urban Europe, 1000–1994* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 90.

21 Dirk Hoerder, “Many-Cultured Urban Worlds: A Comparative Historical Perspective”, *Zeitschrift für Kanada-Studien* (1998), p. 95.

22 Helga Schulz, *Berlin 1650–1800. Sozialgeschichte einer Residenz* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992), p. 338.

23 *Ibid.*, pp. 188–189.

24 Clemens Zimmerman, *Die Zeit der Metropolen. Urbanisierung und Großstadtentwicklung* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 1996), p. 82.

countries, particularly from England. Many other “industrial pioneers” coming from a variety of European countries followed them over the course of the nineteenth century.²⁵ These men established factories with a production range from locomotives to paper to sugar, which ultimately led to the establishment of automobile manufacturing and the electrical industry during the last decades of the nineteenth century.

Along with the *Proponenten* and *Fundatores* of the eighteenth century and the industrial pioneers of the nineteenth, thousands upon thousands of labourers flooded into Vienna. At the time of the census taken in 1754, Vienna had approximately 175,000 inhabitants. From that year until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the city underwent a rather slow but relatively continuous population growth.²⁶ Until the middle of the century, the dynamics of this growth were intensified by the city’s economic development; between 1840 and 1880, Vienna’s population doubled from 350,000 to 700,000. As a result of administrative measures, which incorporated outlying communities into the city, Vienna reached the million mark in 1890. The population continued to climb to around two million by 1910, whereby 53 per cent of the growth was attributable to net migration (immigration minus emigration) and 47 per cent was due to the excess of births over deaths.²⁷ Two distinct changes can be identified regarding the geographic origin of the individuals making up this wave of immigration. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, migration was predominantly from the area of southern and central Germany — moving from west to east.²⁸ Over the course of the nineteenth century, however, migration to Vienna was primarily from Bohemia,²⁹ Moravia, and Silesia as well as from the eastern Habsburg lands of Galicia, Bukovina, and Hungary.³⁰ Thus the migratory current shifted in the nineteenth century to a north-south and east-west flow.

25 *Die Großindustrie Österreichs. Festgabe zum glorreichen fünfzigjährigen Regierungsjubiläum seiner Majestät des Kaisers Franz Josef I., dargebracht von den Industriellen Österreichs*, 6 vols. (Vienna: L. Weiss, 1898); Matis Herbert, *Österreichs Wirtschaft 1848–1913. Konjunkturelle Dynamik und gesellschaftlicher Wandel im Zeitalter Franz Josefs I.* (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1972).

26 Eigner, “Mechanismen urbaner Expansion”, p. 636.

27 Michael John and Albert Lichtblau, *Schmelztiegel Wien — einst und jetzt. Geschichte und Gegenwart der Zuwanderung nach Wien* (Vienna and Cologne: Böhlau, 1990), pp. 13–15; Rainer Bauböck, “Nach Rasse und Sprache verschieden.” *Migrationspolitik in Österreich von der Monarchie bis heute* (Vienna: Institute for Advanced Studies, Political Science Series no. 31, 1996), p. 3.

28 This migration, largely of artisans, declined over the course of the nineteenth century with the end of the required journeyman stage of artisan training and then the collapse of the artisan system as Germany industrialized.

29 About Bohemians in Vienna, see in detail Monika Glettler, *Die Wiener Tschechen um 1900. Strukturanalyse einer nationalen Minderheit in der Großstadt* (Munich and Vienna: R. Oldenbourg, 1972).

30 This new migration pattern resulted from an increasing population and declining economic prospects in these areas, combined with the improvement of transportation and the rising demand for labour in the industrializing regions of Vienna and Lower Austria. See Heinz Fassmann, “A Survey of Patterns of Migration in Austria, 1850–1900”, in Dirk Hoerder, ed., *Labour Migrations in the Atlantic Economies: The European and North American Working Class During the Period of Industrialisation* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985), pp. 69–94.

Migration was not only concentrated on the capital city of Vienna. The paths of labour migrants also led them into the small towns and villages of the newly developed industrial regions of the Habsburg Monarchy, particularly to the so-called Viennese Basin just south of Vienna,³¹ to Styria and Upper Austria, or to Vorarlberg, the most western country of the Monarchy at the border to Switzerland. As in many other western and central European countries, the industrial development of these regions had begun with the establishment of textile production, primarily silk and cotton spinning and weaving mills. In 1835, for instance, a contemporary topographer, describing the Vienna Basin, wrote that “parts of it were covered with an almost uninterrupted series of factories, almost like what one finds in certain areas of England”.³² During the period from 1800 to 1840, about 40 cotton spinning or weaving factories were founded in this region alone, making up 25 per cent of all existing cotton spinning factories within the Habsburg Monarchy and thereby initiating the process of industrial mass production.

The establishment of these factories also had an enormous impact upon the demographic development of these communities. The immigration of factory labourers led to a doubling of the population of some villages within a period of five to ten years. In Felixdorf,³³ a small village located in the Vienna Basin, about 40 kilometers south of Vienna, the population almost doubled from 160 to 311 inhabitants just within five years (1826 to 1831).³⁴ The reason for this increase was the establishment of two cotton spinning mills and the immigration of their work force. After a further expansion of the factories in the 1870s, the population rose from 899 in 1869 to 1,727 in 1880, and 74 per cent of the village’s working population was employed in the textile industry. Only 19.5 per cent of the population in 1869 and just 8 per cent in 1880 had been born in Felixdorf. In 1869 about 56 per cent of the

31 Sylvia Hahn, “Das Industrieviertel”, in Gesellschaft für Wirtschaftsdokumentation, ed., *Niederösterreichische Wirtschaftschronik* (Vienna: Gesellschaft für Wirtschaftsdokumentationen, 1994), pp. 73–94.

32 Quoted from Wolfgang Häusler, “Industrialisierung und gesellschaftlicher Strukturwandel im Viertel unter dem Wienerwald”, in Karl Flanner, *Die Revolution von 1848 in Wiener Neustadt* (Vienna: Europaverlag, 1978), p. vii.

33 The sources that served as the basis for my research for Felixdorf and Wiener Neustadt are statistical materials available in printed form and my own data collected from manuscript census returns that were compiled in the city in 1857, 1869, and 1880. The original census questionnaires have been recompiled and evaluated by computer and also a “record linkage” was performed. Sylvia Hahn and Gerald Sprengnagel, “Nominative Record Linkage aus Massenquellen des 19. Jahrhunderts. Aufbau und Dokumentation der Datenbank ‘Wiener Neustadt im Maschinenzeitalter’”, in Friedrich Hausmann, Reinhard Härtel, Ingo H. Kropac, and Peter Becker, eds., *Data Networks for the Historical Disciplines? Problems and Feasibilities in Standardization and Exchange of Machine Readable Data* (Graz: Leykam, 1987), pp. 113–128.

34 For more detail, see Sylvia Hahn, “Standort von Fabriken — Wanderung von Arbeitern”, *Beiträge zur historischen Sozialkunde*, vol. 4 (1992), pp. 121–126.

migrants were short-distance migrants, 40 per cent of them coming from villages and towns of the surrounding area, the Vienna Basin, other regions of Lower Austria, and Vienna, while 16 per cent came from adjacent districts of Hungary. Long-distance migrants from Bohemia made up 14 per cent, and those from Moravia 3 per cent. In 1880 the situation changed insofar as the percentage of Bohemian and Moravian migrants increased to a total of 40 per cent (Bohemia 34 per cent, Moravia 6 per cent).

On the whole, we can suggest that during the first half of the nineteenth century, when these plants were being established, textile mill workers in the Vienna Basin were for the most part recruited from the surrounding communities of Lower Austria; during the second half of the nineteenth century, the majority of the work force moved to this industrialized region as part of a process of long-distance and chain migration. The recruitment of these long-distance migrants was often organized systematically and concentrated primarily upon regions with traditional domestic textile production such as southern and northern Bohemia. For example, in the 1870s, when he was 31 years old, Johann Ettl, born in Hohenelbe in northern Bohemia, moved to Felixdorf with his wife and daughters and got a job in the cotton spinning mill. At the same time, his brother Anton Ettl, age 28, along with his family and his unmarried 24-year-old brother-in-law Johann Hartmann, also moved to Felixdorf. These “pioneer migrants” very often were followed by additional relatives and acquaintances in a chain migration process. These “family migrations” are especially characteristic of the textile industry and were above all a consequence of labour opportunities in the cotton spinning and weaving industry, which drew upon all members of the family.

Furthermore, there was also a high turnover among the various textile mills as a result of generally prevailing poor working conditions and low wages. We can get an idea of this labour migration within the region from census lists in which textile workers specified the places of birth of their children. Thus, for instance, the birthplaces of the four children of Franz and Theresia Braun, both of whom originally came from Neuhaus in Bohemia, clearly indicate the route of the couple’s labour migration, beginning in Bohemia and proceeding from one textile town to another across the Vienna Basin: the first child was born in Neuhaus in Bohemia, the second in Marienthal in the northern part of the Vienna Basin, the third in Erlach in the south of the Vienna Basin, and the fourth in Ebergassing, which is situated in the middle of the Vienna Basin. In the early 1880s, the Brauns worked in the knitting mill in Felixdorf.

Generally Felixdorf can be regarded as a typical “single factory village” where textile mills and their work force dominated and essentially characterized the community well into the twentieth century. But Felixdorf was only one single-factory village out of many that arose in this region — as well as in Vorarlberg and Bohemia during the first half of the nineteenth century. In contrast to those in Felixdorf, the migrants (and textile workers) in Vorarlberg came mainly from the eastern part of Switzerland or from regions situ-

ated in the south of Tyrol and the northern part of Italy, like Trentino.³⁵ This migration wave from Trentino to Vorarlberg lasted until the beginning of the First World War. At the turn of the century Italian speakers made up about 25 per cent of the population in some of these textile villages.³⁶

From the 1830s and 1840s some regions of the Monarchy, like the southern part of the Vienna Basin, the northern regions of Styria, or the southeastern area of Upper Austria, experienced a further round of industrialization with the inauguration of the epoch of iron, steel, and coal. This second thrust of industrial development was closely linked with the beginning of railway construction in the Habsburg Monarchy. The establishment of these factories also had an important impact upon the demographic development of the communities of these regions. As in the textile regions, here, too, the immigration of labourers led to an enormous increase of the population. Whereas migration of entire families predominated in the textile industry as a result of its processes of production, a somewhat different immigration pattern appeared in the cities and towns with metal, iron, and machinery production. Since the production process in the metal and machinery industry was based almost entirely on highly skilled and exclusively male labourers, the majority of the migrants were single men. For example, in Wiener Neustadt,³⁷ a small city about 50 kilometres south of Vienna and a main centre of the metal and machinery industry, in the 1870s and 1880s about 80 per cent of the metalworkers were immigrants and more than half (54 per cent) were single. The average age of the metalworkers was 29 in 1869 and 32 in 1880 and one-third of them lived as so-called *Bettgeher* (subtenants). There was also a high proportion of single female immigrants to these cities and towns — mainly working in domestic service, but with increasing numbers in some factory industries like garment making, munitions, or electrical fixtures. In many of these cities the industrial upswing and the accompanying population growth also benefitted small-retail trade, as well as restaurants and hotels. Generally the service sector was expanding in the nineteenth century with a demand for labour ranging from transportation experts, finance spe-

35 For Vorarlberg, see Karl Heinz Burmeister and Robert Rollinger, eds., *Auswanderung aus dem Trentino — Einwanderung nach Vorarlberg. Die Geschichte einer Migrationsbewegung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit von 1870/80 bis 1919* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1995); Reinhard Johler, *Mir parlen Italiano und spreggen Dütsch piano. Italienische Arbeiter in Vorarlberg 1870–1914* (Feldkirch: Rheticus-Gesellschaft, 1989); Peter Gutschner, “Aspekte von Fremdheit im Rahmen der Industrialisierung in Vorarlberg im 19. Jahrhundert”, in Josef Ehmer, Ingrid Bauer, and Sylvia Hahn, “Vielfältige und schwierige Fremdheit” (unpublished research project, Salzburg, 1999), pp. 97–190.

36 For bilingualism in Vorarlberg and other parts of the Monarchy like Lower Styria, Carinthia, or Hungary, see also Michael John, “National Movements and Imperial Ethnic Hegemonies in Austria 1867–1918” (paper given at the ENCS conference “Recasting European and Canadian History”, Bremen, 2000).

37 Sylvia Hahn and Karl Flanner, eds., “*Die Wienerische Neustadt.*” *Handwerk, Handel und Militär in der Steinfeldstadt* (Vienna, Cologne, Wiemar: Böhlau, 1994).

cialists, and medical and educational personnel down to female domestic servants and unskilled hands. On the whole, the possibilities of gainful employment in industrialized cities grew tremendously.

... But Not Really Welcomed

One result of the immigration to these cities and towns as well as to single-factory villages was a continuous shift of the proportion between native-born inhabitants and the immigrants or “foreigners”, as they — regardless of their place of origin — were generally called by the contemporary native society. During these days “foreigners” were not only the labour migrants and entrepreneurs from abroad, but also all those men and women from the Habsburg’s own crown lands who migrated to other cities or villages. The legal instrument for defining the position of being native born or a foreigner within a city’s society was the *Heimatrecht* enacted in 1754.³⁸ The *Heimatrecht* was given to all citizens and their family members who had lived and worked in a city or village for more than 10 years. Furthermore, it gave an individual the assurance of permanent residence in a community as well as the right to take advantage of the community’s public services such as welfare payments or care for the elderly.³⁹ During the first half of the nineteenth century and in the context of the early mass migration within the Habsburg lands, this law underwent several changes, getting more and more rigid in withholding the *Heimatrecht* from newcomers or immigrants. The peak was reached with changes made to the law in December 1863.⁴⁰ From these days until its reform at the turn of the century, only government clerks and property owners could gain the *Heimatrecht* in a city or village to which they had moved.

Moreover, the administration of this law on the provincial, district, and community levels was often completely arbitrary.⁴¹ The process of dealing with foreigners in general and labour migrants in particular — including

38 The legal aspect of the issue of native born and foreign had been assigned increased significance on the part of the state since the political discourse of the eighteenth century at the latest. Governmental activities in the areas of social and economic policies and the efforts of the state to control and discipline the population contributed to defining these categories more strictly. The legal instruments for that purpose were the passport, the *Meldezettel* (or *Meldewesen*) — which was the requirement to register upon entering a town — and the *Heimatrecht*. For these aspects, see Waltraud Heindl and Edith Saurer, eds., *Grenze und Staat. Paßwesen, Staatsbürgerschaft, Heimatrecht, und Fremden-gesetzgebung in der österreichischen Monarchie (1750–1867)* (Vienna, Cologne, Weimar: Böhlau, 2000).

39 Harald Wendelin, “Schub und Heimatrecht”, in Heindl and Saurer, eds., *Grenze und Staat*, pp. 173–343; Johann Jegierek, *Das Heimatrecht, dann das Aufenthalts-beziehungsweise Abschaffungsrecht, die Armenversorgungspflicht und der Verpflegs-, Transport- und Beerdigungskosten-Ersatz in Österreich* (Vienna: M. Perles, 1886); Heinrich Rauchberg, “Die Heimatsverhältnisse der Bevölkerung Oesterreichs nach den Ergebnissen der Volkszählung vom 31. December 1890”, *Statistische Monats-schrift*, Jg. 18 (1892), pp. 345–401.

40 Rauchberg, “Die Heimatsverhältnisse”, p. 355.

41 Wendelin, “Schub und Heimatrecht”, pp. 209ff.

those from other Habsburg crown lands as well as from abroad — was thus always highly discordant and mainly depended on social and gender-related status. On one hand, labourers were intentionally recruited and often granted special privileges, financial support, or exemptions from certain requirements. On the other, the authorities tolerated, supported, or expedited a rigid system of repression, including the humiliation of individuals by means of interrogation, forced detention, imprisonment, or deportation to the community responsible for them, to workhouses, or to the army.

The *Heimatrecht* itself seemed to foster a sort of artificial foreignness, one that divided the population of a locality into different categories, the first being those whose families had possessed *Heimatrecht* for several generations and therefore considered themselves to be the “old natives” and “true citizens”. Knowing the local authorities, they also could take much easier advantage of certain social benefits or legal aspects and somehow strengthen their sense of who they were, compared to the “others”, the “newcomers”, who had to wait for years to get the *Heimatrecht*. Even after “newcomers” had eventually gained the *Heimatrecht*, for a long time they continued to belong to the “others” from the point of view of the “old” and established part of the society. Finally there were those who did not get the right of domicile even after staying there for decades and one or two generations. This group of “others” could be expelled — “banished” — from the village or city at any time if, for example, they became unemployed or destitute.

Most frequently in areas that had received large numbers of recent immigrants, communities did not wish to be burdened with additional welfare responsibilities and therefore, over the course of the nineteenth century, became increasingly rigid in granting the *Heimatrecht* to new residents. Heinrich Rauchberg, one of the main contemporary statisticians of the nineteenth-century Habsburg Monarchy, wrote several critical articles about the social effect and result of this rigid *Heimatrecht*, which, as he noticed, made the mobile part of the population “homeless” in the eyes of the law.⁴²

As we can see from Table 1, the decreasing proportion of the population possessing the *Heimatrecht* continued to sink in the main cities and in middle-sized and smaller towns during the second half of the nineteenth century. First and foremost the percentage of the population with *Heimatrecht* was very low in the main administrative and trade centres like Vienna, Prague, Graz, Linz, Innsbruck, Bozen, or Laibach. The percentage was also low in smaller cities (with a population between 10,000 and 40,000) which played a main role as centres of industrialization, like Wiener Neustadt or Waidhofen/Ybbs in Lower Austria, Steyr in Upper Austria, or Reichenberg in Bohemia. The percentage of people with *Heimatrecht* was considerably high in cities situated at the “periphery” of the Monarchy, like Lemberg (52.4 per cent in 1900) or Czernowitz (44.6 per cent in 1900). Interesting is the fact that in Vienna, as the main capital centre of the Monarchy, the percentage was

42 Rauchberg, “Die Heimatsverhältnisse”, p. 355.

Table 1 Percentage of People with *Heimatrecht* in Cities of the Habsburg Monarchy 1869–1910

	1869	1880	1890	1900	1910
Vienna	44.5	34.5	34.9	38.0	55.2
Graz	42.6	29.2	21.8	19.2	40.7
Linz	42.5	31.7	26.8	23.7	44.6
Salzburg	45.6	35.2	30.0	29.3	42.8
Innsbruck	52.5	37.6	28.5	24.2	35.4
Klagenfurt	43.6	31.7	28.5	23.5	32.2
Wiener Neustadt	40.8	31.7	24.7	21.8	36.8
Steyr	44.3	32.1	22.1	26.0	49.5
Waidhofen/Ybbs	51.7	38.1	32.1	26.4	42.1
Prague	35.7	27.9	25.3	20.7	43.0
Reichenberg	60.0	48.6	41.9	36.5	47.6
Triest	50.5	40.1	45.6	41.7	53.6
Bozen	43.4	29.7	22.9	17.2	30.1
Laibach	45.6	31.5	24.2	24.3	42.1
Lemberg	66.1	55.9	43.3	52.4	
Czernowitz	72.3	56.9	49.3	44.6	

Source: *Bevölkerung und Viehstand der im Reichsrathe vertretenen Königreiche und Länder*, ed. by k.k. statistischen Central-Commission, Vienna 1869ff.

higher than in some of the smaller cities. Perhaps we should take this aspect as an indication that the importance of Vienna as a magnet of migration — according to the population of the city on the whole — was and is in some ways overestimated as a result of its position as the capital city of the Monarchy and its accompanying “myth”. On the whole, at the turn of the century, in most cities, persons with *Heimatrecht* were already in the minority, and the immigrant foreigners had attained from two-thirds to three-quarters of the population. An increase in the number of persons with *Heimatrecht* took place only after the turn of the century because reform of the law made obtaining this status considerably easier. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the *Heimatrecht* was obtained as a result of “prescription”, a legal term referring to the individual’s decades-long presence in the city.⁴³ During these years, the proportion of the population with *Heimatrecht* — as Table 1 clearly shows — rose enormously in all cities. The majority of new permanent residents was comprised of persons who had been living in the towns for decades, in many cases second- or third-generation residents.⁴⁴

43 See *Die gesetzlichen Bestimmungen über die Erlangung der Zuständigkeit in österreichischen Gemeinden für In- und Ausländer* (Vienna: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung Ignaz Brand, 1900).

44 In Wiener Neustadt, for example, the children of immigrant metalworkers who had been born in the city comprised already 15% of the “native-born” population in 1880, though the majority of them did

Natives or “Foreigners”?

These legal background conditions became increasingly important as criteria of differentiation over the course of the nineteenth century. According to the studies of Michael John, they were also not unimportant for erasing national conflicts.⁴⁵ Aside from the legal, religious, and linguistic differences, I suggest that the social factor of being a foreigner also constituted an essential criterion of “being different” on the part of labour migrants in the Habsburg Monarchy. Being a foreigner — perceiving oneself to be one as well as being perceived as such by others — was strongly dependent upon the social circumstances that accompanied immigration and the process of getting established in the new neighbourhood, particularly upon social status and gender-related factors. The various relationships with foreigners could in many cases be expressed in gradual and subtle differences, which were not always immediately and clearly recognizable.

Generally, these labour migrants seemed to have an “estranging” effect upon the local populace not only as a result of their region of origin, but also due to their social position as wage labourers working in factories.⁴⁶ The contemporary press — ranging from newspapers orientated towards party politics to those representing the church — as well as literary works of the day were full of clichés and prejudicial stereotypes. For the most part, these immigrants were depicted as displaying attributes such as coarseness and sexual wantonness, or, to use common formulations of the day, as (foreign) “riffraff”, as “rogues”, or as a “plague”.⁴⁷ In this context it is interesting that these terms were very similar to the ones commonly used to discriminate the Jews.⁴⁸ Papers and literary works of the second half of the nineteenth century reveal something like a “triangle” of the hatred of others: the (mobile)

not possess the *Heimatsrecht* and — from the legal point of view — were still foreigners. Michel Oris once pointed out that the contribution of migrants to the population development of a city’s “native-born locals” has, in many respects, been underestimated until now. Michel Oris, “Fertility and Migration in the Heart of the Industrial Revolution”, *The History of the Family*, vol. 2 (1996), pp. 169–182.

⁴⁵ John, “National Movements”.

⁴⁶ For this aspect, see the reports of the vicars to the archbishop about the labour force of the factories in rural areas, cited in Michael Mitterauer, *Ledige Mütter. Zur Geschichte unehelicher Geburten in Europa* (Munich: Beck, 1983), p. 136.

⁴⁷ Discriminating pictures and images about the labour migrants were widespread in the contemporary public and clerical press as well as in literary accounts of the nineteenth century. See, for example, Erika Weinzierl, “Österreichs Klerus und die Arbeiterschaft. Ihr Verhältnis im 19. Jahrhundert nach den Quellen”, *Wort und Wahrheit*, vol. 12 (1957), pp. 613–620.

⁴⁸ Regarding this aspect, see the article of Albert Lichtblau, “The Jews’ Search for *Zugehörigkeit* in Austria up to 1938”, in this volume. For a broad and general overview, see Ernst Wangermann, “Historical Roots of Intolerance in Austrian Society”, in *Digestive Diseases*, vol. 17, nos. 5–6 (1999), pp. 260–266. Aside from the Jews, Gypsies were also a target of discrimination. For the persecution of Gypsies in the Habsburg Empire, see Leo Lucassen, *Zigeuner. Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffs in Deutschland 1700–1945* (Cologne, Vienna: Böhlau, 1996); Wim Willems, *In Search of the True Gypsy: From Enlightenment to Final Solution* (London: Frank Cass, 1997); Wim Willems and Leo Lucassen, “Gypsies in the Diaspora? The Pitfalls of a Biblical Concept”, in this volume.

Jews, the (migrant) labourers, and, at the top, the Jewish (mainly intellectual) members of the labour movement.

All in all, integration into the “new” society seemed to be no easy matter, neither for the labourers nor for the entrepreneurs. The numerous police protocols available for the nineteenth century clearly show that immigrant women and men were kept under close scrutiny by municipal control mechanisms and offer a picture of strict supervision of those arriving from the “outside” on the part of municipal authorities. The separation and distance maintained by the “locals” could generally be felt by the “foreigners” both in their everyday lives and in their dealings with each other, as well as in various ways and with different levels of intensity. This correlated strongly with social status, occupation, and gender.

Above all, single women were the targets of the locals’ reproach, rejection, and mistrust. Here, supervision and control by the authorities did not stop short of encroachment into the private sphere.⁴⁹ The famous Austrian author Karl Kraus described the particularly precarious situation of women as the object of state and municipal surveillance in an essay entitled “Der Meldezettel” (registration form) in 1907. He wrote: “The state harasses women and girls not only on the street but pursues them even into their residences ..., desires to know whether the lady already has a child, when it was born, whether the father is circumcised, etc.”⁵⁰ Along with literary illustrations of this sort, the arrests and interrogations of female “strangers” were also often carried out in a seemingly arbitrary fashion. The grounds were invariably suspicion of prostitution, illegal peddling, failure to register subtenants, or vagrancy and homelessness. The subsequently imposed sentences and forms of punishment seem in many cases unjustifiably cruel in relation to the often rather trivial misdemeanours: several days, weeks, or months of imprisonment, made more severe by additional measures meant to contribute to the “moral” improvement of the prisoner. A final consequence, above all in the case of vagrancy or destitution, which very often applied particularly to women, was banishment from the city.⁵¹

Experiences of this kind were also part of the everyday reality of immigrant men, although the typical grounds for arrest and interrogation were somewhat different. Men were most frequently arrested for drunkenness, brawling, suspicion of robbery, or, with increasing frequency in 1870 and thereafter, political suspicion of possible left-wing, socialist, or anarchist activities.⁵² Highly detailed dossiers were maintained on all these individu-

49 Stadtarchiv Wiener Neustadt (hereafter STAWN), prä. 564, March 1, 1798.

50 Karl Kraus, “Der Meldezettel”, in Kraus, *Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1987), p. 278.

51 STAWN prä. 1966/443, August 8, 1797; prä. 712/158, March 17, 1798; prä. 1198/267, May 5, 1798. In general, see Josef Mayer, *Geschichte von Wiener Neustadt*, 4 vols. (Wiener Neustadt: Selbstverlag des Magistrats Wiener Neustadt, 1924–1928).

52 The persecution of political suspects has a very long tradition within the Habsburg Monarchy and reached a first high peak during the years following the French Revolution as well as the years after

als and their activities. In connection with this, nightly searches were increasingly conducted in the houses of families whose members were suspected of being politically active in the labour movement.

That these persons spoke a different language or were members of a different faith was not infrequently brought into play as a factor of discrimination. Thus, for example, the children of Bohemian immigrants in Lower Austria were gladly excused from school to work in the factories. The typical rationale was that these children could not understand German anyway. As we can glean from the sources, though, it was in many cases pressure from the local population that led to these children being excused from school; villagers expressed their distaste that “their” children were to receive instruction together with the “other” children, and put the teachers more or less under pressure to comply with their demands.⁵³ The Italian-speaking immigrants in Vorarlberg⁵⁴ or the Bohemians in Vienna were confronted with similar events.⁵⁵

This partial exclusion and stigmatization on the part of the long-established native society, governmental authorities, and bureaucratic officials caused labour immigrants to establish their own networks of neighbours and relatives. For many, their new environment could also mean the arena of an expanded marriage market. Marriage and the establishment of a family and household were common occurrences — although usually among the immigrants themselves and not with locals. This was one way in which they created their own “new” paths and structures which enabled them to survive and to get along in the “strange” environment. In many cases there emerged a “tightly-woven network” which was maintained over the course of generations.⁵⁶

Although most labour migrants still had not yet acquired *Heimatrecht* even after ten or more years, they nevertheless considered themselves to be

1848. For this aspect, see in detail Ernst Wangermann, *Von Joseph II. zu den Jakobinerprozessen* (Vienna: Europaverlag, 1966), p. 75; Ernst Violand, *Die soziale Geschichte der Revolution in Österreich 1848*, edited by Wolfgang Häusler (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1984), p. 79; Wolfgang Häusler, *Von der Massenarmut zur Arbeiterbewegung. Demokratie und soziale Frage in der Wiener Revolution von 1848* (Vienna: Jugend & Volk, 1979). In the second half of the nineteenth century the supervision and persecution reached a new high point after the formation of the labour movement during the 1870s. The so-called *Ausnahmestand* or *Sozialistengesetz* (anti-socialist law) was one result of the efforts of the state to suppress the rising labour movement. See in detail Sylvia Hahn, “Eifrige Demokraten und organisierte Arbeiter. Wiener Neustadt und die Frühphase der österreichischen Arbeiterbewegung” in Wolfgang Maderthaler, ed. *Sozialdemokratie und Habsburgerstaat* (Vienna: Löcker, 1988), pp. 7–24.

53 STAWN 1671/1873; Gerhard Wanner, *Kinderarbeit in Vorarlberger Fabriken im 19. Jahrhundert* (Feldkirch: Arbeiterkammer Feldkirch, 1976), p. 15; Peter Gutschner, ed., “Ja, was wissen denn die Großen...” *Arbeiterkindheit in Stadt und Land* (Vienna, Cologne, Weimar: Böhlau, 1998).

54 Gutschner, “Aspekte von Fremdheit”.

55 Hoerder, “Metropolitan Migration”, p. 48.

56 Sylvia Hahn, “Different Ways — Common Experiences: Labour Migration in 19th Century Austria”, in Dietrich Ebeling and Steve King, *Community, Locality and Life Cycle: Migration Strategies in Modern and Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Berghahn, forthcoming).

“locals” and quickly began to differentiate themselves from the “others” such as newly arrived “greenhorns”, unskilled labourers, or foremen and plant managers who had not been promoted up through the ranks. Such forms of demarcation and resentment within the work force broke out on a massive scale during times of economic crisis. When unemployment was high, labour migrants who, according to the law, did not qualify as locals vehemently demanded the “right to work”, based on the argument that they were natives. Working-class newspapers also adopted a position clearly opposed to the “others” — Hungarian or Italian immigrants as well as female workers, who they feared would constitute “cheap” competition.⁵⁷ For example, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Lower Austria, polemicists vituperated constantly against labour migrants from neighbouring Hungary, referred to as “Krowoten” in common parlance. Similarly, workers rejected foremen and plant managers who were not recruited from their own ranks but rather had been brought in from “outside” — from Switzerland, Germany, or America.⁵⁸ The upshot of such refusal to accept these “others” was often physical attack and violent conflict, which ultimately became matters for the local courts.⁵⁹

Furthermore, male immigrants in particular found a “new identity” in their membership in the trade union or political party. First and foremost among the “others” in their own ranks were the women, who were permitted only a very limited degree of participation in the male-dominated political scene. Women were welcomed as comrades on Sunday outings or for distributing flyers. For a long time they were excluded from political life and political functions, and the labour movement remained a confederation of men until well into the twentieth century. Aside from women, the “others” also included those who did not reside in the proletarian quarter or at the working place or who were not among the qualified workers or party members — the list could go on.

We can suggest that, all in all, it was very hard for outsiders to break down the wall within the working class. A contemporary observer, a boy from a poor family who came to Wiener Neustadt as a child at the turn of the cen-

57 See, for example, the reports of the labour press *Gleichheit*, July 26, 1902, p. 4; August 2, 1902, pp. 3–4; February 7, 1913; June 6, 1913.

58 For a similar position towards immigrants and the ideological difficulties for the British Labour Party and German Social Democrats, see Stefan Berger’s contribution to this volume, “Class vs. Nation, Class and the Nation, Between Class and Nation? Labour’s Response to the National Question, c. 1970–1939, with Special Reference to Britain and Germany”; Stefan Berger and Angel Smith, eds., *Nationalism, Labour and Ethnicity 1870–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999). For Austria, see Hans Mommsen, *Die Sozialdemokratie und die Nationalitätenfrage im Habsburgischen Vielvölkerstaat* (Vienna: Europa Verlag, 1963).

59 A very good American example of violent conflicts between “local” and immigrant workers (from Europe and especially Habsburg crown lands) is the study of Paul Krause about the steelworkers in Pittsburgh, entitled *The Battle for Homestead, 1880–1892: Politics, Culture and Steel* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 1992).

ture, sought acceptance and integration into the political youth movement. He described this step taken on May 1 in the early 1920s:

I came to the fence of the workers['] meeting house and suddenly I was inside. I don't know how I got in. Something drew me. The garden was full of people, they gathered together in small groups, carrying all kinds of flags and placards. No one seemed to notice me but from the corner of my eyes I saw that they were watching me. Everyone knew each other, and was on personal terms. Finally I recognized two familiar faces.... Finally somebody with whom I could talk. I approached them but stopped a few paces away. Their facial expressions were embarrassed, rebuffing. ... I didn't belong to this group — I was one of the "others".⁶⁰

Somehow these lines of conflict within the labour movement, the mutual mistrust that extended to spying on and betraying each other, intensified after the turn of the century, which can probably be regarded as one of the reasons for the failure of the labour movement in the face of emerging fascism.⁶¹

Thus it can be seen that the images of "foreigners", of the "others", can undergo changes according to the political, economic, and social situation. One aspect that seems important is that being a foreigner was (and still is) by no means a geographic magnitude that can be identified or established in measurable distances. What can certainly be said is that a change of residence — as a journeyman or labour migrant — always led to one's sense of being a foreigner in one's own perception and in that of the "others". Indeed, from both perspectives, there existed a wide range of variations and possibilities that were, in turn, closely connected to the respective economic, political, legal, social, and ethnic situation as well as gender-specific factors. The parameters of language, religion, and nationality played an important, but not an exclusive, role. The mechanisms and the process by which temporally and spatially differing images of the "other" emerged and were passed on are much harder to grasp because they have always been subject to continual change. In past and present societies, proximity and distance have always been a process in flux, accompanied by numerous contradictions and discontinuities. In other words, yesterday's distance can be tomorrow's closeness and vice-versa.

60 Otto Spranger, *Steinige Straßen. Ein österreichischer Roman* (Vienna: Schlager, 1980), p. 118.

61 See, for example, Helmut Konrad and Wolfgang Neugebauer, eds., *Arbeiterbewegung — Faschismus — Nationalbewußtsein* (Vienna, Zürich: Europa Verlag, 1983).