



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Monitoring migrations: the Habsburg-Ottoman border in the eighteenth century

Pesalj, J.

Citation

Pesalj, J. (2019, March 27). *Monitoring migrations: the Habsburg-Ottoman border in the eighteenth century*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/70437>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/70437>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/70437>

Author: Pešalj, J.

Title: Monitoring migrations: the Habsburg-Ottoman border in the eighteenth century

Issue Date: 2019-03-27

Stellingen behorend bij het proefschrift getiteld “Monitoring Migrations: The Habsburg-Ottoman Border in the Eighteenth Century,” Jovan Pešalj:

1. Demarcated borders and clearly territorially separated jurisdictions appeared in Eastern and Southeastern Europe much earlier than in other parts of the continent and their origins are more heterogeneous than usually accepted.
2. Despite the small size of its central government, the Habsburg Monarchy was able to mobilize enough resources to create a successful and comprehensive long-term supervision system.
3. The Habsburg Monarchy used migration controls not to curb, but to facilitate traffic and to selectively encourage immigration.
4. Not only a hierarchy of confessions, but also a hierarchy of ethnicities affected colonization and business networks in the Habsburg Monarchy.
5. Many Habsburg reforms attributed to Maria Theresa were in fact initiated during the rule of her father Charles VI.
6. Images of an empire in long decline permeate the historical portrayal of the Ottoman Empire, but some of the Sultan’s administrative practices were imitated in the West at least until the eighteenth century.
7. What matters most in past and present migration policies is the regulation of residence and naturalization, not border controls.
8. Historical maps of the pre-modern world with colored state territories present a simplified and distorted image of authority. The coats of arms and flags on selected settlements on some early maps present traditional jurisdictional sovereignty better.
9. We can learn more about the present and the past from a mammoth than from a crocodile. In our attempts to understand better the present through our research of the past, we tend to focus too much on survivors. However, the research of the institutions and states that failed and disappeared can often offer a better understanding of both the present and the past.
10. Some expertise on closer inspection appears to be misguided and difficult-to-challenge ideology, as the eighteenth- and the nineteenth-century refusal to accept germ theory shows, for example.
11. No government can rely solely on the administrative apparatus and technology to rule effectively. As experience shows, some cooperation of the governed is indispensable.
12. Despite the consensus that multidisciplinary research is important, in reality narrow specialization still wins the day.
13. If we believe in the idea of European integration, the accession of Russia to EU should be the next logical goal of the EU foreign policy.