Mobility and belonging

A printer in nineteenth-century Northern Europe

Levke Harders

Introduction

»It was only now that I felt […] the rather vigorous need […] to possess a fatherland, to become a citizen of a town« declared the typesetter Franz Huber in 1842 after long years as a journeyman.[1] Huber was probably tired of migration, which was often a time of not-belonging. Like many craftsmen, seasonal workers, and others he had covered long distances within Europe, mostly by foot. Mobility was triggered by structural factors, such as changes in »rural landholding, employment, demographics, and capital holdings« (Moch 1992, 13). While around 16 percent of Europeans had migrated before 1800, by the early nineteenth century one-fifth of the population had already left their home region, turning migration into a characteristic feature of European societies (Lucassen and Lucassen 2009, 370). These migrants were seasonal workers, servants, craftsmen, peddlers, traders, and vagrants, but also clergymen, soldiers or physicians who often travelled within a region as well as long distances. Even in the preindustrial society, mobility was a Europe-wide phenomenon in urban and rural areas (Oberpenning and Steidl 2001, 9). Hence the perception

---

1   Franz Huber to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842, 3; »Jetzt erst fühlte ich […] recht lebhaft das Bedürfniß […] ein Vaterland zu besitzen, Bürger einer Stadt zu werden […].« All quoted documents on Franz Huber can be found in Schleswig-Holstein's state archives (Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein, LASH), Abt. 65.2, Nr. 189ᴵᴵ, Indigenatsrecht. All translations by the author unless otherwise noted.

of migrants as strangers was a relevant social classification in early modern societies and remained so throughout the long nineteenth century.[2]

In early modern Europe, people were seen as foreign or alien if they spoke another language or had a different faith or an uncommon cultural background. For them, as for other social groups, from the sixteenth century onwards the issue of belonging to a community became increasingly important, because it was connected to questions of residency or citizenship, welfare rights, social networks, and the like. The emergence of territorial states with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 gave rise to »three (discrete or overlapping, depending on period, country or region) settlement systems, each linked to the wider status of ›citizen‹ in complex ways: Work-based, residence-based, or birth-based« (Innes, King, and Winter 2013, 9–10). Since all three were difficult to realize, settlement and belonging were organized through hybrid and adaptable systems that reacted to »national statute, local law, bilateral international agreements and accumulated practice« (ibid., 11). After the French Revolution and the foundation of nation-states, residence-based systems became dominant in Western Europe. This led to formal citizenship, defined as »groups entitled to particular rights, with the focus initially on particular types of property and economic activity,« while »[a]lternative membership categories remained important for longer than is generally recognized« (Fahrmeir 2007a, 2–3) such as rights acquired through long-term settlement. The idea of citizenship—based on either *ius sanguinis* or *ius soli*—does not take into account the fact that people migrate and, consequently, societies change (ibid., 7). Therefore, mobility was increasingly controlled in the first half of the nineteenth century, mainly to prevent desertion (from conscription) as well as to stem political and social unrest (Fahrmeir 2007b).

As many scholars have argued, the formation of nation-states throughout the nineteenth century was linked to both legal regulation of and political debates on alterity and mobility (e.g., Althammer 2014). The invention of citizenship (Brubaker 1992; Fahrmeir 2007a) and of new instruments such as the passport (Torpey 2000) enabled states to expand migration control. In 1851, these reforms culminated in the Gotha Convention with its »multilateral principles of removal or compensation« (Gestrich 2013, 264). Thus governmental policies and practices defined who was to be seen as a stranger, but migrants and locals also participated in this process. Because they lived and worked together, normative ideals often differed from daily experience (Raphael 2013, 148).

In this »mobile age« (Moch 1992, 158) the notion of the stranger as a relevant social category began to change. Since by this time neither ethnicity/race nor nationality were the central paradigms of inclusion and exclusion within Europe, belonging can be understood as a socially constructed category and thereby a central technique of othering. But how was belonging constructed in this era as a means of power? How were inclusion and exclusion practiced before either citizenship or nationality had become fully developed concepts? Who could or could not belong to a region and why? How did masculinity shape belonging? And who were the agents in these processes?

A closer look at one migrant and the region he lived in aims to answer some of these questions. While migration control was a dominant topic all over Europe, questions of belonging were probably particularly am-biguous in the German-Danish borderlands, where »nationalization« had just gained a foothold in elite discourses of the 1830s. I therefore discuss questions of migration and belonging based on a case study from this area, Schleswig-Holstein. I will firstly introduce some main developments regarding mobility and its regulation in this region, especially in Flensburg, where the Austro-Bavarian typesetter Franz Huber had settled. His life course and his rather remarkable belonging to this town's community are presented in the second section. Thirdly, based on a theoretical con-ceptualization of belonging, I will analyze the strategies used by the government, the local townspeople, and Huber himself to construct

(not-)belonging, factoring in its different facets—mainly class, gender, and profession. This biography illustrates the conclusion that belonging was not so much based on concepts of nationality or ethnicity, but defined in a more pluralistic manner, revealing discrepancies between the politics and discourse of the state, the interest of local communities, and the migrants' desire to belong.

Mobility in the German-Danish borderlands in the 1840s

The region we know today as Schleswig-Holstein is located north of Hamburg and the river Elbe. In early modern Europe, it was a territorially fragmented area under shifting reigns, but generally speaking, it was part of the Danish crown. During the eighteenth century, the territory became more coherent and stable as a region, but after the Napoleonic Wars Denmark lost Norway as well as other territories and the Danish state went bankrupt. The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were governed by the Royal (or German) Chancery in Copenhagen with regional administrations.[3] With around 850,000 inhabitants in 1840 (Commission 1842, VI) it was a farming region that exhibited rather late industrialization processes, but had a flourishing maritime trade, especially in Flensburg and Altona (a Danish and later Prussian city that only became a borough of Hamburg in 1938). Even though Denmark had implemented agrarian and political reforms in the Age of Enlightenment, it failed to modernize the state and its administration in the early nineteenth century. The political debate on a constitution that began in the 1830s increasingly involved questions of national unity within Denmark and of Danish as official language for all parts of the country. Within the duchies, German was spoken predominantly in the southern areas (Holstein and Lauenburg), while Danish was more prevalent in the north (Schleswig), alongside North Friesian, Low German, South Jutish, and local dialects. Like the composite state Denmark, the duchies were multilingual (Havinga and Langer 2015). Using language pragmatically, many people spoke more than one idiom (Graw-Teebken 2008, 25–26) and the administration of

---

3   Though the duchies were both part of the Danish monarchy, Holstein was
     a member of the German Federation while Schleswig was not.

the duchies communicated mainly in German well into the nineteenth century.[4] As Steen Bo Frandsen points out, the »duchies were geographically in between, and this position was reflected in identities that were neither Danish nor German. […] Unambiguous nationalities and national identities in a modern sense simply did not exist« (Frandsen 2009, 5). Political conflicts came to a head during the revolution of 1848/49 and again in the war of 1863/64. In 1864, Denmark lost Schleswig-Holstein, which subsequently became a Prussian province in 1867 (Bohn 2006, 86–94).

But in the early 1840s, the moment Franz Huber, living in Flensburg, longed for a fatherland, the »national question« did not yet dominate the daily lives of most people, who shared a dynastic understanding of the state (Frandsen 2009, 11). At the time of his application, Flensburg had more than 15,000 residents and was the second-largest city in the duchies (Commission 1842, 11), growing steadily because of both new industries and incorporation of nearby municipalities. As a member of the Hanseatic League, it had a prosperous trade reaching from the Baltic Sea to as far as the Danish colonies in the West Indies. Its lively urban community consisted of merchants, seafarers, artisans, workers, etc. The economic revival of the city can be traced in various indicators, such as the beginning industrialization. In 1835, 1.6 per cent of Flensburg's inhabitants worked in rum distilleries, sugar refineries or tobacco and other industries (Albrecht 1993, 208). Foreign, mostly German-speaking, journeymen had been coming to the city in higher numbers as early as the 1820s and were welcomed as a useful supplement to the workforce (Vaagt 1983, 253). In 1845, almost half of Flensburg's adults had not been born in the city (Bande and Hvidtfeldt 1955, 167). Moreover, between 1830 and 1847 almost 1,700 men were—upon application—included in the township as burghers (many of them journeymen like Huber) (Vaagt 1983, 267). Migratory movements in this era included mainly newcomers from the surrounding areas and some from the Danish kingdom, from German-

---

4   For example, the archival sources used for this article were all written in High German.

speaking countries or elsewhere.[5] This setting is comparable to other regions in Western Europe (e.g., Lehnert and Vogel 2011; Oltmer 2016; Tabili 2011). Huber was only one of numerous migrants to seaports like Flensburg, but as a long-distance migrant he was exceptional.[6]

Regional mobility of men and women alike was already high in the eighteenth century and increased during the following century, causing a population growth in the duchies as well as in other German states (Brockstedt 1979, 71). Even before many rural poor people began to emigrate to North America in the following decades, people in Schleswig-Holstein were already quite mobile, migrating mostly to farming areas. Servants and farmhands usually changed their employers annually, while craftsmen like Huber targeted destinations and travelled to cities (Rößler 1995, 90–93). As in other European countries, the state and communities reacted to this increasing mobility by instituting different regulations and practices that aimed at residency status. In general, migrants in Schleswig-Holstein could gain a residence permit—the so-called *Heimatrecht*—after staying (working) successfully in one village or town for three years, but they were only eligible for welfare after 15 years of settlement, as stated in the poor laws of 1829 and 1841 (Sievers and Zimmermann 1994, 49, 116). In many Western European countries, the right of residence was a

---

5   In 1845, 51.4 per cent of Flensburg's residents were born in town, 29.3 per cent in Schleswig, 4.7 per cent in Holstein, 5.2 per cent in Denmark, 3.8 per cent in German states and 0.8 per cent in other foreign countries with 4.8 per cent unaccounted for (Bande and Hvidtfeldt 1955, 167).

6   Except for »foreign religious affiliations« (*fremde Religionsverwandte*) neither the published census nor other contemporary studies on the development of Schleswig-Holstein's populace mentioned foreigners or migrants, but explained the population growth in the main with »natural« causes such as higher birth rates (Commission 1842; Gudme 1833, 86–88). Only later, the (printed) census differentiated between native citizens and foreigners. In 1871, Flensburg had almost 22,000 residents, of whom nearly half were not born in the city, while 480 were not Prussian citizens (Kgl. Pr. Stat. Bureau 1874, 16–17). This data illustrates that local migration as well as rural-urban migration were (still) important during this era, and that long-distance migration to Schleswig-Holstein often originated in states that later became Prussian or German.

complex system of rights and duties characterizing the relation of each individual to the parish they lived in. It was therefore more an element of communal than of federal policies. *Heimatbescheinigungen* certifying the belonging to a specific municipality were of utmost importance for mobile workers to legitimize their access to poor relief.[7] Communities, too, were politically and financially concerned with the right of settlement and enforced strict welfare regimes, expelling poor foreigners or other people in need.

Whereas from the sixteenth century *Heimatrecht* had defined protection against persecution and entitlement to welfare benefits in a community (Zimmermann 1991, 77–83), naturalization mainly described the legal aspect of belonging to a state. Already in 1776, Denmark had passed a citizenship law stating that foreigners could be naturalized based on their landholdings or financial funds, if they worked as a university teacher or missionary, or if their skills were needed as manufacturers, traders, or master craftsmen (»Indigenatrecht« [1776] 1798). In her study on German immigrants in Copenhagen, Gesa Snell interprets this citizenship law as reacting to conflicts within the composite state by privileging native-born subjects. Second generation immigrants also counted as Danish (Snell 1999, 71). With the growing migratory movements, both the *Indigenatrecht* and the various municipal regulations on poor relief became increasingly difficult to manage, since many migrants did not fit into the existing categories. Denmark therefore enacted a new law on settlement of and welfare for foreigners (*Patent, betr. die Niederlassung und Versorgung von Ausländern*). In 1841, this decree specified existing regulations and defined more precisely communal welfare duties. Strangers/foreigners had to verify their ability to support themselves and their families in order to settle in Schleswig-Holstein (§ 2). Moreover, migrants had to prove that their native parish would accept their return (i.e. grant poor relief; § 4) and that they were not (any longer) liable to military service (§ 3). Foreigners could be evicted if they lacked the relevant documents or in

---

7   See, for example, the requests for certificates of settlement in LASH, Abt. 80, Nr. 2797, Auswärtige Verhältnisse im Armenwesen.

case of poverty (§ 8) (»Patent« 1842). The question of military service was of high concern for both emigration and immigration control in Europe (Fahrmeir 2007b). With this new decree, the administration of foreigners and governmental deliberation on individual cases had become structured by this law.

A southern migrant in Northern Europe

It was against this background that the Austro-Bavarian typesetter Franz Huber wrote to Christian VIII, king of Denmark. While he was a highly skilled craftsman with employment in Flensburg and had already lived more than five years up North, he faced deportation, partly due to a missing certificate of settlement. But Huber wanted to stay and tried to belong by applying for legal equality with Danish subjects. From the late eighteenth century to the 1860s, at least 400 people in the duchies, mostly men, petitioned for naturalization, and some of these biographies, with their attendant migrant problems of belonging, are reflected in Huber's situation. At the same time, this example is noteworthy because it generated dozens of administrative reports and various explanatory letters by the petitioner. Its more than 70 pages overall allow a glimpse into his own and the administrative decision-making processes, as well as into his supporters' strategies of creating belonging.

Together with the printer and publisher Asmus Kastrup, his employer, Huber testified that his life had been as follows: In the early 1810s, Huber's family had emigrated from the archbishopric of Salzburg (a state of the Holy Roman Empire)[8] to Bavaria where his (step-)father worked as a teacher in Höhenkirchen. From the age of 12 to the age of 16 or 17, when his (step-)father died, Franz Huber went to grammar school (*Gymnasium*) in Munich. He then started his four-year apprenticeship as a typesetter; hence he had both a humanistic and a crafts education. He

---

8   After secularization in 1803, different sovereigns reigned over the (former) archbishopric of Salzburg before the region became part of Bavaria in 1809/10, and later of Austria in 1816. Thus the Huber family migrated exactly during these shifting territorial and political rules, which could partly explain the ambiguity of their citizenship.

also registered with the army, only to find out that the Bavarian authorities defined him as an alien because his (step-)father had failed to become a Bavarian subject.[9] As a result of his missing birth certificate, he had thus become a »legally homeless person,« belonging nowhere.[10] As a journeyman, he travelled for more than a decade through Prussia, Saxony, and Switzerland, and later to Hamburg and Altona. Huber's adoption of the term »homeless« referred to the legal discourse of his time, i.e. to settlement regulations and access to poor relief. He obviously had lived north of the Elbe for quite some time without having encountered difficulty proving his identity.[11] In 1841, Kastrup met Huber in Hamburg and hired him for his printing business in Flensburg. When he arrived in the town, the local police noticed his missing papers and asked him to supply certificates within a fortnight.[12] As in Hamburg and Altona, Huber not only worked as a typesetter, but also wrote articles for the *Flensburger Zeitung, ein Blatt für Handel, Gewerbe und gemeinnützige Mittheilungen*, founded in 1840 by Kastrup. Moreover, he planned to marry.[13]

---

9   Police report, Flensburg, 23 Oct. 1842; Asmus Kastrup to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842; Franz Huber to the king, 26 Oct. 1842. Concerning his conscription, Huber told different stories: He once reported that he had been exempted due to a lung disease (*Brustschwund*); excerpt from the police records, Flensburg, 29 Oct. 1841. A year later, he implied he had been granted permanent leave after six years of service; Franz Huber to the king, 26 Oct. 1842, 2. He presumably never served due to his health, but was drafted and then put on leave. Most documents repeat that his (step-)father had illegally entered Bavaria and not obtained citizenship, only one letter suggests that he had been naturalized (ibid., 3).

10   Franz Huber to the king, 10 Aug. 1843, 1 verso; »[…] rechtlich heimatloser Mensch«. Moreover, in most countries »a continued absence of more than ten years definitely meant loss of citizenship« (Fahrmeir 2007b, 181).

11   Statement (draft) of the Royal Chancery, Copenhagen [?], 07 [01?] Apr. 1843, 2.

12   Excerpt from the police records, Flensburg, 29 Oct. 1841. In 1841, a fortnight was an unrealistic period to obtain documents from abroad.

13   Franz Huber to the king, 26 Oct. 1842, 3. I have found no other information on Huber's bride-to-be. There might be a hint in the census of

As Huber could not or did not deliver legal files verifying his date of birth (in Salzburg) or his citizenship (in Austria or Bavaria), he and his employer wrote to the king. Emphasizing Huber's typesetting skills as well as his commitment to Flensburg's newspaper, Kastrup concluded that Huber had become an irreplaceable mainstay of his business.[14] Alongside this endorsement, Huber's request contained a statement by the local police[15] and a petition by four Flensburg citizens on behalf of Huber: Peter Nielsen, Christian Esmarch, J. W. H. Jochimsen, and H. P. Schmidt Jr. They all confirmed that they knew Huber to be a versatile, educated man whose talents were useful (for the community).[16] Huber called attention to various positive certificates of former employers and to this testimonial by the »most reputable local men« confirming his moral conduct.[17] Though this was not an uncommon procedure in cases of missing written credentials, Huber's support was noteworthy inasmuch as he (with Kastrup) was able to win over the financial, political, and social elite of the town.

1855 (AKVZ 2013) mentioning the widow Anna Maria Huber, born in 1817 in Flensburg, working as a laundress, with her son, Franz Heinr. Christ. Huber, born in 1846. In 1860, Franz Heinr. Christ. Huber lived with the carpenter Johann Georg Emmertz and his wife Anna Marie (born in 1818), so that Anna Maria Huber had probably remarried; taking into account the inaccuracy of recorded names or dates of birth in census data. This data could imply that Huber had married and a child in the 1840s, but then had died (before 1855).

14   Asmus Kastrup to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842, 1.

15   Police report, Flensburg, 23 Oct. 1842.

16   Testimonial by Peter Nielsen, C[hristian] Esmarch, J. W. H. Jochimsen, and H. P. Schmidt Jr., Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842.

17   Franz Huber to the king, 10 Aug. 1843, 2; »Mögen E[ure] Königliche Majestät die mir von meinen verschiedenen Lehrherren ausgestellten vortheilhaften Atteste, so wie das von vier der angesehensten hiesigen Männer mir ertheilte Zeugniß über meinen Lebenswandel […] berücksichtigen […].«

Receiving this rather extensive application for naturalization, the government of Schleswig-Holstein (nowadays part of the city of Schleswig) requested a report by the municipal authorities and a case study by the regional administration in Gottorf.[18] The government's summary of Huber's life included some skeptical opinions: Hamburg's police reported that although Huber was law-abiding, he was perceived as a swindler. They were also critical of his writerly ambitions,[19] similar to Flensburg's magistrate, which assessed his newspaper articles as (politically) questionable, though they found his poetry to represent a »certain education and lyrical talent.«[20] The mayor and council of Flensburg had to admit that Huber's behavior had not caused any complaints, but they still had reservations against his naturalization.[21] These suspicions are consistent with the administrative distrust against journalists and printers who were habitually seen as—undesirable—political agitators (see e.g., Cöppicus-Wex 2001).

In April 1843, the government rejected Huber's request, despite the positive statements from Flensburg, focusing instead on his missing birth certificate and doubtful residency (*Heimatbescheinigung*).[22] The adverse decision was based on the new law mentioned above on settlement of

---

18   Municipal: Mayor and Council of Flensburg to the Royal Government of Schleswig-Holstein, Flensburg, 13 Feb. 1843, as well as police report, Flensburg, 23 Oct. 1842. Flensburg's police had already contacted the police stations in Hamburg and Altona as well as in Salzburg and Ebersberg (Bavaria) for more information on Huber. Regional: Report by the Government of Schleswig-Holstein, Gottorf, 10 Mar. 1843.

19   Statement (draft) of the Royal Chancery, Copenhagen [?], 07 [01?] Apr. 1843, 2.

20   The administration wrote that Huber had not always spared public figures in his articles (ibid., 5.). On Huber's poetry see Mayor and Council of Flensburg to the Royal Government of Schleswig-Holstein, Flensburg, 13 Feb. 1843, 3.

21   Ibid.; »Seine hiesige Aufführung hat zu keinen weiteren Beschwerden [außer über einige Kritiken oder Verse] Veranlaßung gegeben.«

22   Verdict (draft) of the Royal Chancery, Copenhagen [?], 11 Apr. 1843, 1.

foreigners.[23] Although the different administrative institutions cited this recent decree, they never questioned Huber's financial resources, so that the law did not fully apply to his situation. Besides, his exemption from conscription in Bavaria could have simplified his petition for settlement in Flensburg. The critical view of journalism seems to have been one obstacle, another were the missing papers.[24] His own explanation of why he was unable to hand in a birth certificate remained short and vague, even if he underlined that he could not be held responsible.[25] Huber petitioned again in August of the same year, stressing his economic stability—consistent with the new settlement law. It would be painful to leave Flensburg, wrote Huber, while naturalization would be all the more pleasant and important because he now was able to work at his trade and to make a living.[26] Since the archival files do not contain any more information, it is uncertain whether he had to leave Flensburg or whether he managed to stay and probably married.[27]

---

23 Statement (draft) of the Royal Chancery, Copenhagen [?], 07 [01?] Apr. 1843, 6–8. The regional government argued similarly: Report by the Government of Schleswig-Holstein, Gottorf, 10 Mar. 1843.

24 Articles: ibid., 3. I have as yet been unable to compare these suspicions with the content of articles he might have published. Missing papers: ibid., 6.

25 At the same time, the administrations in Bavaria and Salzburg might not have been very interested in confirming Huber's origin given that this verification would have made them responsible for poor relief or for the costs of his expulsion from Denmark.

26 Franz Huber to the king, Flensburg, 10 Aug. 1843, 3 (emphasis in the original); »Die Entfernung vom hiesigen Orte würde mir aber gerade jetzt um so schmerzlicher, und die Erlangung des Indigenates mir gerade jetzt um so erfreulicher und wichtiger sein, als mir bereits zur Treibung meines bürgerlichen Gewerbes hieselbst Aussicht und Gelegenheit dargeboten ist, und ich mir sonach durch einen festen Nahrungszweig meinen Lebensunterhalt auf die Dauer zu erwerben in Stand gesetzt bin.«

27 See footnote 13.

»Belonging« in the making

In Huber's as in other cases, different actors negotiated whether a stranger belonged or not—state institutions, local citizens, and the migrants themselves. The European deregulation of mobility began in the 1860s with new laws on the freedom of movement and the freedom of trade. At the same time, the understanding of citizenship was increasingly shaped by national, ethnocultural, and racist definitions, with the objective of creating a homogenous people, or—as Benedict Anderson has put it—an imagined community (Anderson 2006). This construction of territorial, social, and cultural boundaries is therefore closely linked to (not-)belonging. Belonging as a relational and constructed category is based on categories of difference (see also the introduction to this issue). As an analytical category, belonging helps to distinguish between concurrent processes of inclusion and exclusion since it is based on a set of historically and territorially specific values that operate as a power relation by means of social inequalities. Sociologist Nira Yuval-Davis defines belonging as »an emotional (or even ontological) attachment« that »tends to be naturalized« (Yuval-Davis 2011, 10). It is transformed into a politics of belonging when it becomes endangered. Politics of belonging aim at »constructing belonging to particular collectivity/ies which are themselves being constructed […] in very specific boundaries,« for example fixing social and territorial limitations within ideas of citizenship (ibid.). Belonging as a dynamic process is constructed through three interrelated factors:

> The first facet concerns social locations; the second relates to people's identifications and emotional attachments to various collectivities and groupings; and the third relates to ethical and political value systems with which people judge their own and others' belonging. (Ibid., 12)

These practices, as well as both belonging and politics of belonging, become visible in this case. It allows us to consider belonging from different perspectives: 1) the view of the Danish government in Copenhagen and of the regional administration in Gottorf; 2) the local community's perspective in Flensburg; and 3) the migrant's interpretation. Huber's as

well as the administrative and local narratives are instructive both in what they tell and in what they conceal.

To begin with, the administrative papers clearly show that the Danish government had no particular interest in turning a foreigner into a subject of the Danish crown. Looking not only at Huber's but at other petitions in the first half of the nineteenth century, no organized migration policy (yet) evolves out of these decision-making processes. Migrants' arguments, for example their feeling of belonging to the region, seemingly mattered as little as economic or social benefits for the community. The government neither considered the labor market and its likely need of a skilled workforce, nor did it entertain the idea of making concessions to the local residents (who wished for Huber to stay). In this regard, Denmark differed from states that tended toward utilitarian or functional decisions on immigration or expulsion (Oltmer 2016; Schubert 2016). As Huber's case discloses, the Danish policies were only partially appropriate for the administration of an increasingly mobile society. The government was not interested in the underlying cause of his application, quite the reverse: it classified Huber as an alien subject. He would have had to remain so under the law even if the administration had decided that he needed the naturalization in order to stay in employment. In addition to his missing birth certificate, Huber's public activities were most likely seen as a reason not to grant naturalization. Making someone belong— or, as in this case, not belong—emerges as an administrative procedure based on legal grounds and political suspicions rather than a question of nationality based on language, »ethnicity« or religion. In light of that, »national identity« was not the main political paradigm. Moreover, Copenhagen did not try to win over local elites by approving their demand or by a prospect of civic participation—in contradiction to the historiography of the nation-state, which has emphasized the importance of winning over the elites and middle-classes for the national project.

From a second perspective and in contrast to their government, the local people (or at least their spokespersons) had several convincing reasons to include Huber. In the letters by his fellow citizens and even in the local police reports, Huber emerges not as a foreigner, but as an integral

part of the community. The correspondence does not indicate whether he spoke Danish or whether he had a strong southern German accent, because language was as insignificant as his—most likely—Catholic faith, at least in the existing sources. Not one document remarks on Huber's religion, even though Salzburg, Austria and southern Bavaria were mostly Catholic whereas Denmark was predominantly Protestant.[28] In 1840, for example, Flensburg had a total of 48 non-Protestant inhabitants, of whom 27 were Catholic (Commission 1842, 210). Aspects that were mentioned included his craftsmanship, his activities for the local newspaper, and his educational background. His schooling in a *Gymnasium* made him part of the »middle class«; as a journeyman he would have found his place in the lower classes.[29] Nevertheless, he quickly established close connections to reputable townspeople. At this time, Flensburg had only two printers with five employees and apprentices (ibid., 79), so that Huber's profession was possibly a desired competence. His participation in Flensburg's community almost certainly allowed him a higher social position than most journeymen usually held. The petition by well-respected citizens shows Huber's inclusion in the local bourgeoisie, given that Nielsen and Schmidt were senate members, Jochimsen was a merchant, and Esmarch was a Councilor of Justice (*Justizrat*) and a physician, i.e. all of them belonged to Flensburg's elite. Huber's skills—and probably his

---

28   On the one hand, Huber perhaps avoided mentioning his faith because he feared it could hinder his naturalization. For the authorities, on the other hand, his Catholic belief could have been an implicit reason to refuse his application. But even when Huber was drafted, the military authorities did not fill in the column »Religious Denomination.« See: Certified copy by the Royal Bavarian district court in Ebersberg, undated (probably copied before 1842). Since the Protestants had already been forced to leave Salzburg in the 1730s, Huber's family was almost certainly Catholic.

29   In the time and region studied here, class began to replace status (*Stand*). While class was »based on economic criteria« status was shaped by »issues of prestige and esteem.« »However, as both were aspects of social stratification, it was frequently the case that the distinctions became blurred. Status considerations could reinforce class distinctions […] or could cut across them […]« (Morgan 2005, 173).

transnational experience—made him attractive for the economic and political dynamics of the rising bourgeoisie.

A closer look at Nielsen, Schmidt, and Jochimsen, who vouched for Huber, reveals an interesting detail: All of them were members—and at some point leaders—of a local association, called the *Bürgerverein* (in German) or *Borgerforeningen* (in Danish), a liberal, *schleswig-holsteinisch* and later Danish-leaning society (Bram et al. 2010).[30] In the same vein, Nielsen argued for a Danish-oriented economic policy during those years (Vaagt 1983, 287–91). It is important to notice that this »new regionalism—Schleswig-Holsteinism—[…] did not begin as a separatist movement« (Frandsen 2009, 15). Some years after Huber's letter to the king, Christian VIII of Denmark visited the club twice. In a multilingual region, disputed in a so-called battle of nationalities from the 1840s to the twentieth century, the residents of Flensburg upheld a local/regional identity and saw themselves variously as »Danish,« as »German,« or as both. Born in Salzburg, Austria and raised in Bavaria, Huber was not only included in this northern European community. More precisely, he was accepted by burghers who defined themselves (at least to a certain extent) as *schleswig-holsteinisch* and later as Danish.[31] Moreover, the *Flensburger Zeitung* was considered a conservative paper loyal to the Danish king. It was backed by the city's trade association (*Handelsverein*), i.e. by the

---

30   Jochimsen chaired this organization in 1838, Nielsen in 1844. In the 1850s, the association had about 400 members according to the website www.borgerforeningen-flensborg.de/om-foreningen (accessed June 8, 2016). Miroslav Hroch emphasizes the different social origins of the Danish and of the German patriotic movements in the Schleswig region in 1840s: While the former had a strong peasant element the latter emerged from a bourgeois milieu (Hroch 1985, 117–24). This cannot be said for the *Bürgerverein / Borgerforeningen*.

31   The sources do not contain information on Huber's access to this group though it is rather unusual for a migrant to be included in a local community as rapidly as Huber, who had just arrived in October 1841. I assume that Kastrup, whose family seems to have been »Danish,« had probably introduced Huber to the local elite. Huber's work for Flensburg's newspaper could have been another reason.

economic and cultural elite. At least one of Huber's supporters (Nielsen) had also supported Kastrup's petitions to the king to establish the newspaper (Cöppicus-Wex 2001, 137–39, 182–83).

Interestingly enough, none of these aspects were mentioned in the petition although they probably could have furthered Huber's application. Why did neither Huber nor the members of the *Bürgerverein* indicate their close ties to the Danish state? One explanation could be that all involved were certain that these facts were known (even to the king in Copenhagen). Another reason might be that a »national feeling« was irrelevant to belonging. Huber's belonging was constructed along the axes of social status, education, skills, political and public commitment, and gender (as I will argue below). By ignoring citizenship, language, or religion as features of alterity, Flensburg's community evaded the authorities' definition and thereby his exclusion as a stranger. The heterogeneous environment of a port city, where mobile people were a part of daily life, may have been another relevant factor. For (a group of) the townspeople, Huber was not a foreigner, but belonged to them, especially in the social and political meaning of a burgher. All these factors combined facilitated his belonging; his social and economic location (Yuval-Davis 2011, 12).

On the individual level, thirdly, belonging in this case was also shaped through Huber's narrative of being a local (ibid., 14). He wrote several long letters to the king, retelling his story in detail, but never referring to himself as an Austrian or Bavarian subject. He reported that the Bavarian administration had defined him as an alien, through which he had lost Bavaria as his homeland.[32] According to Huber's application, his perception of belonging was related neither to his place of birth nor to a state (nation, kingdom), but he had created a new sense of belonging in Flensburg. Like regular peddlers, who belonged to different places at the same time (Oberpenning 1996), Huber had multiple belongings. In his petition he focused on this specific belonging—»to become a citizen of a town«—explaining the path of his life and his loss of citizenship at great

---

32   Franz Huber to the king, Flensburg, 10 Aug., 1843, 2; »[…] unschul-
      digerweise meiner Heimat Baiern nun verlustig gegangen.«

length, because they had led to his desire »to possess a fatherland.«[33] He pleaded consideration of his miserable situation and closed his petition with a request that the king deign to include him among his faithful subjects.[34] He also emphasized his schooling and financial solidity, while he kept quiet about his journalism and writing.[35] The government proved uninterested in these facts, but then again, it did not expect tales of national belonging.

Gender, migration, and belonging

All three levels—state, local community, individual migrant—and narrative strategies have however one aspect in common: They all refer to ideas of masculinity, especially the difference between settled and mobile men. Gender research on the nineteenth century has shown how civil society was defined as masculine with a close connection of professional, political as well as sexual identities (e.g., Kessel 2003, 2–3). Not only were ideas of masculinity used to negotiate social positioning, but homosocial net- works, like political associations, played an important role in gaining a status of belonging. At the same time, masculinity often did not need to even be mentioned, because it operated as a norm (Dudink and Hagemann 2004, 4). Although none of the documents directly reflects on the prevail- ing gender order, Huber's (mobile) life course was highly gendered. In general, only boys and men received a grammar school education or learned a trade (as typesetter) and practiced it during long years as a journeyman. Participation in local politics and culture, too, were based on gender-specific connotations. Moreover, migration was linked to par- ticular images of masculinity. The idea of sedentary masculinity was interconnected with concepts of nation, citizenship, race, and class as Todd DePastino has discussed in his study on homelessness (DePastino

---

33   Franz Huber to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842, 3.

34   Ibid.; »[…] unter die Zahl Ihrer getreuen Unterthanen auch mich aufzunehmen geruhen.«

35   Huber also published poems on the occasion of the fourth centenary of the invention of printing, but a contemporary reviewer criticized the poor quality of his poetry (Review 1844; anon.).

2003). The question of who belonged (to a state) or not was also governed according to concepts of heteronormativity (Canaday 2009).

Historical (as well as contemporary) debates on male migrants often concentrate on young, single, unemployed, and poor men as a presumed threat of law and order (e.g., Scheibelhofer 2011). But in fact, many male migrants either had specific skills, valuable goods, functioning networks, or some money. In her analysis of the social construction of masculinities, Raewyn Connell explains that social inequalities are not only constitutive for relations between men and women, but also for relations between men and men, as different masculinities are related to, or are an effect of, different social positionings (Connell 1995). In the nineteenth century, public agencies and migrant men themselves referred to shifting notions of masculinity inasmuch as migrant masculinity was conceived as a marginalized or precarious masculinity that differed from a hegemonic bourgeois masculinity. Both arguments—masculinity as a resource versus masculinity as a disadvantage or even danger—were topoi of this era's discourse with its distinction between »proper« and »inadequate« men. In 1838, for example, German policy makers discussed new rules for residence permits:

> It happens often enough that a respectable man, the head of a family, who had tried to legally supply himself and his family with income and food, is expelled like a suspicious vagrant because he is not able to acquire a residence permit […]. The fate of such a homeless man is lamentable and does not seem to be in accord with federal law.[36]

---

36   Proceedings of the German Federal Convention, 11th meeting, 15 June 1838, § 147, 364–66, Prussian Secret State Archives (Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, GStA), I. HA Rep. 77, 226, Nr. 96, Heimatscheine; »Oft soll ein unbescholtener Mann, ein Familienvater, der sich und den Seinigen auf rechtlichem Wege Erwerb und Nahrung zu verschaffen suchte, gleich einem verdächtigen Landstreicher, über die Grenze gewiesen werden, weil es ihm nicht gelingt, einen Heimathschein anzuschaffen […]. Das Schicksal eines solchen Heimathlosen ist

In its opposition of the »respectable man« with the »suspicious vagrant,« the text (re-)produces (new) patterns of masculinity. The officials clarified that a mobile, but poor individual could still be a decent man. In Huber's case, the authorities painted an ambivalent picture of the migrant as a suspicious writer, a mobile journeyman who had brought himself into the position of supplicant. The officials reported that Huber had been documented sufficiently and acted inconspicuously in Hamburg. In Flensburg, he was entirely unknown and had to be reminded several times to present the missing papers. The denial of settlement, concluded the administration, was his own fault.[37] The repeated suggestion that Huber might be a swindler—combined with his journalism—made him appear rather dubious. In this way he symbolized a marginalized migrant masculinity.[38]

In contrast, Huber's own narration of his life course and of his social position in Flensburg made use of existing patterns of a bourgeois masculinity—as a strategy to reach his goal. He and his local supporters tried to portray the migrant as an honorable man who represented a hegemonic role model. Kastrup, for example, praised Huber's character and attitude, referring to his service for the public good, which had won him recognition by the locals.[39] Huber himself not only described his education and apprenticeship as a bourgeois profession, he also depicted his decade on the move as an opportunity to go out into the big, wide world as well as to serve the people.[40] He described himself as innocent

---

beklangenswerth und scheint mit den Bundesgesetzen nicht im Einklange zu stehen.«

37   Statement (draft) of the Royal Chancery, Copenhagen [?], 07 [01?] Apr. 1843.

38   See footnotes 19 and 20.

39   Asmus Kastrup to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842; »[…] gemeinnützige Tätigkeiten.«

40   Franz Huber to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842, 2; »[…] ein bürgerliches Geschäft zu erlernen und die Wanderschaft zu ergreifen. Dies stimmte auch völlig zu meinen Absichten[?] und […] dem lebhaften

and faithful.[41] Huber then referred to his standing within a civic industry (*bürgerliches Gewerbe*), that is to say to his livelihood. With these terms he referenced burghers' rights as a member of the township as a political organization, even though he probably never formally gained the *Bürgerrecht*.[42] Right before Huber closed his petition with his wish for settlement, he denoted his meeting with Kastrup as »a fortunate coincidence« and mentioned his acquaintance with a young woman with whom he fell in love.[43] Both his financial and professional solidity as well as his plans to marry corresponded with the ideal of a bourgeois masculinity. His cultural and economic capital influenced Huber's belonging as much as his migrant, but »honorable« masculinity.

Conclusion

In the first half of the nineteenth century, questions of belonging were increasingly negotiated along lines of mobility, causing varying dynamics. First, state and regional administrations established new patterns and practices of controlling migration as well as of (not) granting settlement. In this case, the government did not take Huber's economic and cultural assets into consideration. This macro level reflects ruling discourses, policies, and structures which were closely linked to questions of power. Second, belonging was as much an element of daily life as it was a

---

Trieb; [sic] Gottes schöne weite Welt […] kennen zu lernen und im praktischen Leben der Menschheit nützlich zu werden.«

41   See footnotes 26, 32, and 33.

42   Huber is not mentioned in Flensburg's registry of burghers during the years 1840 to 1846 (Kraack 1999). Foreigners applying for Bürgerrecht either had to present a certificate of residence of their home parish or had to deposit a bond to cover the eventual expenses of poor relief (Vaagt 1983, 266).

43   Franz Huber to the king, Flensburg, 26 Oct. 1842, 3; »Ein glücklicher Zufall ließ mich die Bekanntschaft des Buchdruckers A. S. Kastrup in Flensburg machen […]. […] ja zuletzt sogar eine Jungfrau in den Weg führte, die sich enschließen konnte, den Verliebten auf seinem einsamen Lebenswege zu begleiten.«

practice—for the local residents, so-called strangers belonged to the community. Huber's local inclusion worked through social status and gender, so that this micro-level, too, acted as a power structure. Third, being elements and agents of transcultural processes, migrants themselves developed strategies of belonging. This enabled Huber to belong on a local level, even if he was excluded on the state level. Through such constructions of belonging, some migrants were able to participate and to gain privileges.

This migrant biography allows some insights in the mechanisms of belonging and yet it in itself is not conclusive. More work needs to be done in migration history to study belonging and its various (historical) factors (social locations, attachment, discourses). Migration and transcultural life courses can demonstrate that social differences in this era were structured through conflicting politics and practices of belonging. Even though most European countries had begun to establish a regime of migration control, the transformation towards a system of a national citizenship was not yet enforced. Local communities (at least to a degree) still determined whether foreigners were allowed to stay. Social, political, and economic membership claims and rights differed on the state and local level. Despite the fact that Huber, the citizens of Flensburg, and the government had different reasons for and strategies of creating positions of belonging, none of them drew on the nation as a valid concept. At the same time, the invention of belonging by Flensburg's residents and Huber himself functioned along the axes of class, education/profession, and gender.

Like Huber, many migrants sought permission to stay in their new region of residence. Naturalization files reflect the constant intersection of socio-economic interests, labor market forces, the political context, opposing concepts of citizenship, and common perceptions of migration and migrant masculinities. This is especially evident in regions where economic networks, politics, language, and religion transcended state borders as in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Practices and narrative strategies of both administrations and migrants reference ideas of belonging and of alterity as influential elements of social organization. The power of »making belong« was not only shaped by government

institutions or political discourses, but also by local communities and (migrant) individuals.

References

Albrecht, Ulrike. 1993. *Das Gewerbe Flensburgs von 1770 bis 1870: Eine wirtschaftsge-schichtliche Untersuchung auf der Grundlage von Fabrikberichten.* Neumünster: Wachholtz.

Althammer, Beate. 2014. »Verfassungsstaat und bürgerliches Recht: Die Stellung von Fremden im Europa des langen 19. Jahrhunderts (1789–1914).« In *Fremd und rechtlos? Zugehörigkeitsrechte Fremder von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart; Ein Handbuch*, edited by Altay Coşkun and Lutz Raphael, 301–30. Cologne: Böhlau.

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Arbeitskreis Volkszahl Register (AKVZ). 2013. »Personendaten Norddeutschland.« Database. Accessed November 01, 2016. www.akvz.de.

Bande, Åge, and Johan Hvidtfeldt. 1955. »Befolkningen 1720–1848.« In *Flensborg Bys Historie.* Vol. 2, *Tiden Efter 1720*, edited by Grænseforeningen og Historisk Samfund for Sønderjylland, 149–68. Copenhagen: Hagerup.

Bohn, Robert. 2006. *Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins.* Munich: C. H. Beck.

Bram, Eskild, Ejnar Ramsing Lorenz, Bruno Uldall, and Iver H. Ottosen, eds. 2010. *Klog skæmt er alvors tale: Borgerforeningen i Flensborg 1835–2010.* Flensburg: Borgerforeningen.

Brockstedt, Jürgen. 1979. »Regionale Mobilität in Schleswig-Holstein im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert.« In *Regionale Mobilität in Schleswig-Holstein 1600–1900: Theorien, Fallstudien, Quellenkunde, Bibliographie*, edited by Jürgen Brockstedt, 63–88. Neumünster: Wachholtz.

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canaday, Margot. 2009. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Commission für das statistische Tabellenwerk. 1842. *Statistisches Tabellen-Werk: Erstes Heft, enthaltend eine detaillirte Darstellung der Volkszahl in den Herzogthümern Schleswig, Holstein und Lauenburg am 1sten Februar 1840 […].* Copenhagen: Luno.

Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cöppicus-Wex, Bärbel. 2001. *Die dänisch-deutsche Presse 1789–1848: Presselandschaft zwischen Ancien Régime und Revolution*. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte.

DePastino, Todd. 2003. *Citizen Hobo: How a Century of Homelessness Shaped America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dudink, Stefan, and Karen Hagemann. 2004. »Masculinity in Politics and War in the Age of Democratic Revolutions, 1750–1850.« In *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, edited by Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh, 3–21. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Fahrmeir, Andreas. 2007a. *Citizenship: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Concept*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

—— 2007b. »From Economics to Ethnicity and Back: Reflections on Emigration Control in Germany, 1800–2000.« In *Citizenship and Those Who Leave: The Politics of Emigration and Expatriation*, edited by Nancy L. Green, 176–96. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Frandsen, Steen Bo. 2009. »The Breakup of a Composite State and the Construction of a National Conflict: Denmark and the Duchies in the 19th Century.« *JEMIE—Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 8 (1): 1–20.

Gestrich, Andreas. 2013. »Trajectories of German Settlement Regulations: The Prussian Rhine Province, 1815–1914.« In *Migration, Settlement and Belonging in Europe, 1500-1930s: Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Steven King and Anne Winter, 250–68. New York: Berghahn.

Graw-Teebken, Andrea. 2008. *Nationalisierte Grenzräume: Eine Untersuchung nationaler Diskurse in Ostfriesland und Schleswig, 1815–1867*. Aalborg: SPIRIT.

Gudme, Andreas Christopher. 1833. *Schleswig-Holstein: Eine statistisch-geographisch-topographische Darstellung dieser Herzogthümer*. Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung.

Havinga, Anna D., and Nils Langer. 2015. »Invisible Languages in Historical Sociolinguistics: A Conceptual Outline, with Examples from the German-Danish Borderlands.« In *Invisible Languages in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Anna D. Havinga and Nils Langer, 1–34. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Hroch, Miroslav. 1985. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

»Indigenatrecht, wodurch der Zugang zu Aemtern in den Königlichen Staaten den eingebohrnen Unterthanen, oder denen, die ihnen gleich zu achten sind, allein vorbehalten wird (January 05, 1776).« 1798. In *Chronologische Sammlung der im Jahre 1776 ergangenen Verordnungen und Verfügungen für die Herzogthümer Schleswig und Holstein, die Herrschaft Pinneberg, Grafschaft Ranzau und Stadt Altona*, 1–7. Kiel: Königliche Schulbuchhandlung.

Innes, Joanna, Steven King, and Anne Winter. 2013. »Settlement and Belonging in Europe, 1500–1930s: Structures, Negotiations and Experiences.« In *Migration, Settlement and Belonging in Europe, 1500–1930s: Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Steven King and Anne Winter, 1–28. New York: Berghahn.

Kessel, Martina. 2003. »The ›Whole Man‹: The Longing for a Masculine World in Germany in the Nineteenth Century.« *Gender & History* 15 (1): 1–31.

Königlich Preußisches Statistisches Bureau. 1874. *Die Gemeinden und Gutsbezirke des Preussischen Staates und ihre Bevölkerung: Nach den Urmaterialien der allgemeinen Volkszählung vom 1. December 1871.* Vol. 7, *Die Gemeinden und Gutsbezirke der Provinz Schleswig-Holstein und ihre Bevölkerung.* Berlin: Verlag des Königlich Statistischen Bureaus.

Kraack, Gerhard. 1999. *Bürgerbuch der Stadt Flensburg: Verzeichnis der Neubürger von 1558 bis 1869.* 3 vols. Flensburg: Gesellschaft für Flensburger Stadtgeschichte.

Lehnert, Katrin, and Lutz Vogel, eds. 2011. *Transregionale Perspektiven: Kleinräumige Mobilität und Grenzwahrnehmung im 19. Jahrhundert.* Dresden: Thelem.

Lucassen, Jan, and Leo Lucassen. 2009. »The Mobility Transition Revisited, 1500–1900: What the Case of Europe Can Offer to Global History.« *Journal of Global History* 4 (3): 347–77.

Moch, Leslie Page. 1992. *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Morgan, David. 2005. »Class and Masculinity.« In *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, edited by Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn and R. W. Connell, 165–77. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Oberpenning, Hannelore. 1996. *Migration und Fernhandel im »Tödden-System«: Wanderhändler aus dem nördlichen Münsterland im mittleren und nördlichen Europa des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts.* Osnabrück: Rasch.

Oberpenning, Hannelore, and Annemarie Steidl. 2001. »Einführung: Kleinräumige Wanderungen in historischer Perspektive.« In *Kleinräumige Wanderungen in historischer Perspektive*, edited by Hannelore Oberpenning and Annemarie Steidl, 7–18. Osnabrück: IMIS.

Oltmer, Jochen, ed. 2016. *Handbuch Staat und Migration in Deutschland seit dem 17. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg.

»Patent, betr. die Niederlassung und Versorgung von Ausländern (November 05, 1841).« 1842. In *Chronologische Sammlung der im Jahre 1841 ergangenen Gesetze, Verordnungen und Verfügungen für die Herzogthümer Schleswig und Holstein*, 243–49. Kiel: Königliche Schulbuchhandlung.

Raphael, Lutz. 2013. »Grenzen von Inklusion und Exklusion: Sozialräumliche Regulierung von Fremdheit und Armut im Europa der Neuzeit.« *Journal of Modern European History* 11 (2): 147–67.

Review of *Lebensbilder: I*, by Franz Huber. 1844. *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, no. 362, 1446.

Rößler, Horst. 1995. »»Mit der Auswanderung nach drüben ist hier eine Völkerwanderung entstanden‹: Migrationen im ländlichen Schleswig-Holstein (ca. 1870–1900), Teil I.« In *»Es zieht eben einer den anderen nach«: Wanderungen und ihre Wirkung auf ausgewählte Gebiete Schleswig-Holsteins und Ostelbiens*, edited by Horst Rößler, 23–94. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae.

Scheibelhofer, Paul. 2011. »Intersektionalität, Männlichkeit und Migration.« In *Intersektionalität revisited: Empirische, theoretische und methodische Erkundungen*, edited by Sabine Hess, Nikola Langreiter, and Elisabeth Timm, 149–72. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Schubert, Michael. 2016. »Die Konstruktion des Illegalen: Regime illegaler Migration in Deutschland in historischer Perspektive.« In *Migration und Integration: Akzeptanz und Widerstand im transnationalen Nationalstaat; Deutsche und internationale Perspektiven*, edited by Sandra Kostner, 85–108. Münster: LIT.

Sievers, Kai Detlev, and Harm-Peer Zimmermann. 1994. *Das disziplinierte Elend: Zur Geschichte der sozialen Fürsorge in schleswig-holsteinischen Städten 1542–1914*. Neumünster: Wachholtz.

Snell, Gesa. 1999. *Deutsche Immigranten in Kopenhagen 1800–1870: Eine Minderheit zwischen Akzeptanz und Ablehnung.* Münster: Waxmann.

Tabili, Laura. 2011. *Global Migrants, Local Culture: Natives and Newcomers in Provincial England, 1841–1939.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Torpey, John C. 2000. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vaagt, Gerd. 1983. »Kriegsjahre und liberale Strömungen.« In *Flensburg: Geschichte einer Grenzstadt*, edited by Gesellschaft für Flensburger Stadtgeschichte, 235–300. Flensburg: Gesellschaft für Flensburger Stadtgeschichte.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011. *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations.* London: Sage.

Zimmermann, Harm-Peer. 1991. »Das Heimatrecht im System der Gemeindeangehörigkeit am Beispiel Schleswig-Holsteins 1542 bis 1864: Ein Beitrag zur rechtlichen Volkskunde.« *Kieler Blätter zur Volkskunde* 23:67–101.

Sources

Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStA), Berlin. I. HA Rep. 77, 226, Nr. 96, Heimatscheine.

Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein (LASH), Schleswig. Abt. 65.2 Nr. 189[II], Indigenatsrecht.

Landesarchiv Schleswig-Holstein (LASH), Schleswig. Abt. 80 Nr. 2797, Auswärtige Verhältnisse im Armenwesen.

***

Dr. Levke Harders, Faculty of History, Philosophy and Theology, Bielefeld University: levke.harders@uni-bielefeld.de.