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**Introduction**

By the interwar period, a variety of forms of social insurance relating to old age, invalidity, illness or unemployment had already been established in Austria.\textsuperscript{2} Yet these new forms of social support excluded many people who relied on poor relief and often on precarious and highly disputed means of finding a livelihood. Besides job flexibility, geographic mobility was a basic feature of many such forms of earning one’s bread. We might regard this mobility as merely compelled by poverty.\textsuperscript{3} Yet in contemporary perceptions, these practices appeared to be quite ambiguous. There was a broad range of ways of being mobile in finding a livelihood, different institutional and legal contexts as well as different collective or individual representations. Indeed, we can find somewhat positive aspects of being on the road in the most surprising contexts, such as the following letter from an unemployed wayfarer in 1932:

The provincial government! Beyond all pardoning. I want to address some lines to you. At Christmas I asked for the extension of entitlement to the Herbergen [relief stations for destitute wayfarers]. So I went around in
Carinthia and Styria. 15 months I was wandering. That’s enduring a lot! Sometimes you’re too early, sometimes too late to stay overnight. Then the police asks for papers: ‘Go back to your hometown’. Should you go where you’ve been made poor? (If I could only stay somewhere else later on.) A lot of people are having to work for longer, unemployment benefits – or wander. After a short-term job, the wayfarer hits the road again. And when you’re not married. Have gone along the whole time with the war. If you are older, wandering is not so easy ... Clothes full of lice and you don’t have enough of them and not enough to chew on. I went to the hospital because of very little. If I could stay at the poor house ... it would be cheaper. I want to find mercy. Prefer the unemployment benefit. I was interested in checking out different regions.

This last remark is surprising yet not uncommon. Being on the move was doubtless hard, yet it still could be interesting. The mobility of young and skilled unemployed craftsmen in particular might show some relation to the traditional journeymen’s years of wandering. That this tradition persisted into the twentieth-century was disputed and doubted by some contemporaries. Tramping in search of employment did not seem clearly distinguishable from being a ‘work-shy’ vagrant or beggar; at the same time it was also not clearly distinguishable from tramping for leisure or in search of adventure and experience. By re-establishing Herbergen (relief stations for unemployed male wayfarers willing and able to work) in the 1920s, the government aimed to institutionalise distinctions among wayfarers. Even within the context of an economic crisis and an increasingly strict policy against vagrants and beggars in the 1930s, the consensus was not to stop this tramping of the unemployed but rather to organise and control it more rigidly.

Another established form of mobility in search of livelihood was officially designated for the almost unemployable, that is older (and often sick or frail) people with greatly reduced employability: peddling. Of course, this does not mean that all who peddled were old and unemployable; this activity was actually not always clearly distinguishable from other trades or unemployment drifting. Yet, in the eyes of the police peddling was suspected of being a disguised form of begging and vagrancy, especially if the goods offered for sale were worthless or if the person did not have legal permission to trade. Indeed, legal regulations, bureaucracy, occupational organisations and various individuals tended towards the creation of a group with distinct features and a distinct image. Within the context of peddling (but also other sales occupations), one hardly finds any official and explicit references to the virtue of mobility – not in the context of the more respectable salesmen, market traders and the like and especially not in the context of peddling. Those who defend peddlers did so primarily by arguing for its necessity. That is, mobility appears as something imposed by the requirements of survival, such that peddlers seem to prove the
“sedentarist” assumption that people did not move until forced to do so. However, we cannot deduce from images produced by political debates and collective representations that individuals experienced the practice in such ways or with such motivations. Unlike others on the move, peddlers seldom left behind autobiographical accounts. Those individual statements and self-descriptions available to us – in trade records, petitions or court cases – were produced in official contexts where it made perfect sense for an individual to present and justify his/her activity as a response to economic necessity. Peddling was of course part of an economy of makeshifts and often perceived not only as a beggarly profession but as a disguised form of begging. It was, however, also discussed in reference to ‘real work’ and to trades regarded as more valuable for the national economy. Nor was it clearly separated from ‘decent trade’.

Against this backdrop, the current chapter analyses letters written in order to obtain official permission to seek a livelihood as a peddler. The very existence of such letters challenges common assumptions that itinerant trades such as peddling declined in the late nineteenth century and disappeared with World War I. Indeed, the assumption stands, as we will see, in striking contradiction to contemporaneous debates on the issue of migrant labour and to the abundance of records to be found in various regional archives of Austria. The first part of the chapter deals with legal regulation of peddling, particularly an act of 1922 regulating how licenses were to be issued and which generated the sources used in the chapter. The following section explores the rich documentation on a single peddler and demonstrates the intertwining of the economic fragility of the family economy, sickness and compromised employability as reasons for peddling, as well as the potentially harsh reactions of communities to the practice. The case also pinpoints the essence of the problems in using narratives: what was a truthful statement? How was information contestable? What part should competing priorities (the law, customs of manhood, disability, sickness) play in decision-making? And what was the genealogy of the language used by the various participants in each case? The final section of the chapter attempts to generalize aspects of the single-case-study, highlighting the considerable variability in narrative form and structure adopted by applicants in different circumstances and the frequent intertwining of narratives of poverty, sickness and under-employment in ways that have considerable resonance with narratives in England, Sweden or Denmark.

**The legal regulation of peddling**

Peddling was a contentious nineteenth-century practice. After World War I, it was legally defined as unnecessary and anachronistic and the aim of a law of 1922 was to decisively restrict access to the trade. From this date, peddling licences were only supposed to be given to Austrian citizens over
the age of 30 who could prove a particular need and an inability to earn a living in other ways. These licences were preferably to be given to destitute war invalids and war dependents. As in other trades, a good reputation (but also a certificate by a public health officer) was required. Proof was also needed of a restricted employability and that the applicant had no noxious or contagious diseases. Peddling should serve as a substitute for a pension or for sufficient poor relief, and indeed trade regulations aimed to restrict the economic efficiency of this trade to a very small, not to say residual, income. Using carts or employing help required special permission from the provincial government. The licence had to be renewed once a year and the application was reviewed by the Trade Office and the Chambers of Commerce and of Labour. The available records on peddlers are thus often extraordinarily rich, since they will include a number of different perspectives on a single case. Furthermore, they contain context-bound self-descriptions by applicants for licences, that is, by people who were otherwise almost exclusively described by others. An application for a licence could be made in person at the trade office in the district where a person lived. In many cases, though, people sent in a letter written by themselves or others.

Dealing with a certain stock of records in the archives, we should not make the epistemological mistake of regarding the peddlers documented here – or people in other itinerate trades – as a clearly separated or homogeneous population. These are records of persons who successfully or unsuccessfully applied for a licence. Yet much peddling was conducted without permission or with other kinds of sales permissions. In contrast to the legal definitions, a variety of selling practices could be regarded as peddling, often in a derogatory or defamatory perspective. In addition, holders of a peddling licence could conduct their trade in different ways and with varying dimensions. Records of those who applied for or received a peddling licence reveal quite a range of careers and situations. Any analysis must therefore examine this variety and the differences involved instead of aiming at describing a given population or the ‘typical’ peddler. The problems of interpretation, as well as the potentialities for history from below, represented by these trade records can be exemplified with a specific case from Salzburg.

The records on Karl Hasch

Thus, according to records, Karl Hasch was born in Vienna as an illegitimate child in 1878. His mother was a German national and died soon after his birth. Hasch was then foster-parented by two different travelling families in Hungary, both of them carneys. Travelling with them, he did not get a regular school education and later he would have his own licences as a carney and a peddler. On the occasion of his military draft in 1903, it transpired that he had lost
his German nationality due to his extended travels abroad. However, he served with the Austrian armed forces, took part in World War I and was severely injured, giving us a sense of how casual employment, poverty and sickness could intertwine. This is the (not unquestioned) background story told by Hasch, who became the subject of a trade file in Salzburg in 1920, in the context of a complaint that reported

A certain Karl Hasch is peddling within the city as a so-called ‘Gottscheer’ in the inns and brings candies into circulation by gambling. Hasch is said to have lived earlier from begging; he pretends to be disabled war veteran, but he is not a war invalid. Presumably his licence was obtained by fraud.

In turn, the complaint reflected the fact that peddling had been forbidden in the city of Salzburg since 1897; it was prohibited within an increasing number of cities and smaller communities during the interwar period. At the time he had a peddling licence issued from the city of Graz in 1921 but his permission for peddling within the city of Salzburg was apparently the result of a bureaucratic error. In the following inquiry, the organisation of war invalids supported the applicant

Comrade Hasch, who has been working in an altruistic way at the secretary of our organisation and beyond that is severely invalid, deserves from us just the best reputation. We therefore ask the right honourable municipality to benevolently approach the case and let Hasch, who is father of three underage children, keep his livelihood.

The intervention did not apparently help. In March 1921 Hasch received the final decision on the second appeal to the provincial government. It stated that his permission was not to be renewed. In any event, Hasch kept applying for a peddling licence in the city as a Gottscheer. He argued that as an invalid he had no other way to earn his daily bread. He intended ‘nothing other’ than to sell his candies and thereby earn his keep. Due to his prosthesis, he felt unable to walk with dry goods and draperies in the countryside and therefore asked for an exception from the law. Moreover, Hasch argued that the ban on peddling in the city had not always existed. There had always been exceptions made, and 15 to 20 Gottscheers had been working in the city before the war. Because these Gottscheers were no longer there, he asked to have the ban suspended with respect to his person. Furthermore, he had given up on a pension. Enclosed in the file is a letter from a local bakery confirming that he bought all his goods from them.

The Chamber of Commerce rejected this renewed application and stated ‘that there is no reason to renew today the privilege which had been granted for political reasons to a small circle of Austrian citizens with the lowest
cultural status. Beside the economic reasons, the Stadtmagistrat also gave ethical ones against the approval of Hasch’s request. The Chamber feared that many others would then demand similar privileges. Hasch’s situation was, as the Chamber writes, doubtlessly lamentable, but there was no proof that he actually was a war invalid. Even the Chamber of Labour, which usually supported these applicants, hesitated in this case and complained about lacking information. Not only was the origin of Hasch’s invalidity in doubt – maybe it was obtained in his former occupation as a circus artist? – but ‘indisputable’ witnesses had also seen him ‘running’. The public health officer confirmed his stiff leg, but stated that since Hasch was not exclusively able to earn his bread as a peddler an occupation that permitted him to sit would be more convenient.

In 1921 Hasch was heimatlos (‘homeless’ in the sense of stateless). He had no right of residence, and his nationality was unclear. Reports on Hasch’s crime record also varied. The local police reported initially that nothing negative could be found. The central criminal records unit in Vienna, on the other hand, reported that a Karl Hasch, a circus artist, was registered with three convictions: fraud in Vienna 1904, theft in Laibach (Ljubljana/Slovenia) 1906 and personal injury in an affray in Klagenfurt/Carinthia 1911. There was, however, another person with a similar name – ‘Carlo Has.’, labourer – registered for a violation against the vagrancy act in Capodistria (Koper/Slovenia) in 1907. The issue of identity remained unclear.

Numerous requests and appeals were filed with the various authorities, right up to the Ministry of Trade and Commerce. Although Hasch was represented by a lawyer from 1923 onwards, he had no further success. In its decision of 1923, the Federal Ministry for Trade and Commerce stated that it was also bound to its own regulations and thus could not grant the exceptional permission requested. Meanwhile, Hasch had registered as a travelling marketer, apparently without any problems. His crime record, frequently held against him, was no obstacle here. In the same year, 1923, he received a further licence to sell roasted chestnuts in the streets of Salzburg. Another application addressed by his lawyer completely lacks the emphasis of need: ‘I intend now – since it is a common thing in Vienna, Linz, Graz and Innsbruck – to sell hot sausages in the evening; hence, as one would say it in Vienna, I wish to establish myself as a Würstlmann [sausage man]’. This application was rejected because of ‘insufficient local demand’ and met stiff opposition of the innkeepers’ official representation. They claimed that they feared not only ‘real economic damage’ to their business but also that passers-by would be annoyed. Finally, they also wrote if the ‘honourable municipality’ did in fact acknowledge a local demand, there were still other more deserving citizens. Hasch kept trying to obtain a peddling licence but now his other trades created a new obstacle, since peddling was not to be combined with any other licence. His later applications added that he not only had to make a living for himself but also for his wife, who was also severely
ill. In 1925, he received his Heimatrecht (right of residence) in Salzburg. A certificate from the police department in Vienna finally substantiated his military service from 1914 to 1918 and his battlefield injuries. A two-page file of a police interrogation presented further information on his identity and biography. A local police officer confirmed the credibility of Hasch’s statements and his war invalidity. By describing the course of events, Hasch convinced him that he too had taken part in battle in Gródek/Galicia.

With these impediments removed, from 1926 to 1930 Hasch received a peddling licence, despite the objections of the peddlers’ organisation which maintained that Hasch illegally worked as a Gottscheer and did not really peddle. The Chamber of Commerce still pointed to his criminal record and his other options for making a livelihood, but it had no more objections after 1929 and there is no evidence of Hasch’s activities for some years hence. The next record derives from 1935, when Hasch tried to renew his licence. According to his statements and correspondence, he had been ill and ‘needed a change of air.’ He had spent the previous years in Italy with his sister-in-law, working in a different occupation, as the holder of a musician’s licence. He indicated that his situation was ‘now really in every respect sad’. The application was rejected due to new restrictions on peddling (imposed since 1934) stating that it was not legally possible to accept new requests or applications which had not been renewed in time (and without any interruption).

In November 1935 Privy Council Dr. A. Morsey, head of the Österreichischer Heimatschutz, wrote to Landeshauptmann Dr. Ernst Rehrl on Hasch’s behalf to say

> The severely invalid Karl Hasch, who is highly recommended by Prince Franz-Josef Windisch-Graetz, adjutant of the Bundesführer, has asked the office of the Bundesführer, to support his petition for award of the Gottscheer-right for Salzburg at best. I warmly approve this application and thank you in advance for your friendly endeavours.

In his answer Landeshauptmann Rehrl regretted that renewing the licence would be against the law, though he did at least give Hasch 16 Schillings in December 1936.

In a petition to Federal Chancellor Schuschnigg dated 1936, Hasch asked for an act of mercy to regain his permission as a Gottscheer (Gottscheer-Legitimation) which – as he wrote – he had possessed from 1919 to 1930. He cited his war injuries and described himself as 75 per cent unemployable, but ‘as a citizen and respected person’ he wanted to make a living in his trade without burdening city or state. He hoped not to have approached the chancellor in vain. A further appeal addressed to the Federal Chancellor dates from April 1937. In this document, Hasch pointed out that he received no pension and the 17 Schillings of poor-relief granted by his hometown of Salzburg were not enough to survive on. The letter includes a request for an audience, the chance to present his reasons in person.
Enclosed in this file is a letter of recommendation by the Vaterländische Front (an organisation funded 1933 by the Austro-Fascist regime) confirming his details. The last available correspondence dates from December 1937: a letter to the Landeshauptmann of Salzburg, in which Hasch asked for a short private audience; he hoped it would be granted because it was about the existence of a sick businessmen. He would, recorded the reply, receive notice when the Landeshauptmann was available again to hear his appeal.

Problems of interpretation

This file represents a considerable effort to obtain a single peddler’s licence! On the one hand, it seems amazing how much we can learn about one peddler; on the other, what we learn is frustratingly little. Hasch is a bureaucratic case not a person, and the story tells us about a bureaucratic process and not a life. Everything we can learn derives from an official context and the records in question stick to bureaucratic priorities. The authorities involved primarily gathered information relevant for their decisions. They expressed their opinions and conclusions according to conventions and legal requirements. But whether the applicant fulfilled the requirements of the law was still a matter for interpretation. What did a good reputation consist of? How long were previous convictions relevant and what kind of violations of the law really counted? How was poverty to be defined and to what degree was the applicant no longer employable? How much should sickness and disability of the applicant or his family count in the decision? Much that might be relevant for an actual bureaucratic decision, such as the impression made in a face-to-face-encounter, was not usually mentioned.

On the other hand, the applicant statements were also not the result of ‘authentic’ self-expression, but rather Hasch’s more or less adequate sense of arguments and practices that would be useful for achieving the aims in that context. Indeed, and rather more widely than this particular case, the applicants’ arguments were well adapted and indicate that people were familiar with the requirements for such a licence. Even the letters written were thus somehow standardized.

There were, however, different attitudes towards approaching the authorities and providing reasons for one’s situation. Some arguments and attitudes appear to be inappropriate, irrational or even nonsensical in this context. A person’s attitudes, as Hasch’s records indicate, might also vary according not only to personal situation but also to the kind of licence one sought. Furthermore, who actually spoke or wrote as an applicant? Are we really reading the language of the poor? The handwriting of Hasch’s letters varied and differed from his signature, which also varied on occasion. For a time, he had a lawyer, and on some occasions the letter was typewritten. His statements made verbally at the trade office were written down by a clerk.
This was not very likely done word-for-word and probably not with the same words the applicant used. And even if the clerk wrote them down, the question remains of where the applicants’ arguments came from. Were these the statements made in front of a clerk when they were influenced by advice on what to say? Moreover, even barely legible handwriting or correctly recorded stammering do not allow us to observe feelings or thoughts. There is no way to empirically demonstrate the interrelation of representation, thinking and feelings, nor the extent of coherence or dissent. There is also no way to decide what is true, adequate, overdrawn, a mistake or even a lie. Obviously, the records do not report unquestionable facts or describe a set reality. Data given by Hasch, but also by the authorities involved, vary and change over the years. Some data seem to have been accepted without question, such as for example the sex of the applicant. Other ‘facts’ – such as the three children alleged here – are not matter of dispute. For several years, however, the administration was not able to provide reliable information on Hasch’s identity, nationality, military service, crime records and invalidity, matters crucial for obtaining a licence. Information finally acknowledged as truth was the result of dispute.

These problems should not, of course, be a reason to dismiss such records as source material, but to reconsider what they actually reveal. It seems more precise and adequate to regard them as evidence about interrelated practices of an applicant, all who supported him and all others involved (clerks, various authorities and institutions, associations, witnesses, etc.) in a certain situation that is not created by mere interaction but also by a broader historical context. The records represent the struggle of how to earn one’s keep legally, often in the face of sickness and disability, as well as what peddling officially should be and who should have access to it. In order to understand these activities – the normal or extraordinary character of a particular case – it is necessary to compare it with other narratives, and this is the function of the rest of the chapter.

Generalizing the case

Hasch’s persistence might seem surprising. After all, asking took an effort and usually one had to pay a small fee for each application and appeal (unless one could prove destitution). Hasch, however, did not give up when his requests were rejected. Although he was on the move most of his life, there is no evidence indicating he was ‘uprooted’. He made good use of the opportunities and contacts available in Salzburg, producing letters of recommendation from the organisation of war invalids and later on by the Vaterländische Front. A local bakery confirmed that he bought his goods there. Like a few other peddlers from Salzburg, he was represented by a lawyer (presumably by an Armenanwalt, i.e., an attorney for the poor who worked pro bono). The peddlers’ organisation, however, which aimed to
protect its members from the competition of illegal and foreign workers, opposed his request. Under interrogation by a police officer – a rather extraordinary document in this context – he managed to make his story plausible. Clearly, Hasch’s mobile life caused troubles for the bureaucracy and made it difficult to provide reliable information on him. The effort made (and hence the volume of these records) was extensive; it was no easy case but then only a few people got such licences without problems. Indeed, the persistence demonstrated by Hasch was not uncommon. Numerous similar appeals addressed to provincial governments and the Federal Trade Ministry can be found. Many other applicants, however, tried once and then disappeared from the records. It is not possible to reconstruct why one person gave up and others did not, or which methods those unsuccessful applicants used to find a livelihood when they could not obtain another kind of licence to work.

Clearly there was a restrictive trade policy in Austria at the time. Yet access to different – but in many respects similar – forms of itinerate trade was highly varied. Working as a travelling marketer, for example, was a ‘free’ trade and less encumbered, but one had to visit more remote marketplaces at certain times instead of offering goods door-to-door. Unlike peddling, such marketers were not favoured with respect to taxes. As with Hasch, many of those rejected applied for other sales licences until they were able to obtain a peddlers’ licence. Peddling without a licence was very common (in contemporary complaints at least), but such practice did violate trade law and this could subsequently create an obstacle in legalising one’s activities. By the same token, illegal peddling was not a violation of the vagrancy act (unlike begging) and was therefore punished with a fine and not with imprisonment.

Applicants may have worked in a broad range of occupations before they tried to get a peddlers’ licence, but among them the narrative archive reveals a considerable proportion of former itinerate traders, salesmen, marketers, rag-and-bone collectors, and so forth. Working as a travelling artist, marketer, peddler and musician, Hasch seems to represent what might be called a modern type of ‘nomad’. Not all who tried to obtain a licence for itinerant trade show the same degree of mobility throughout their lives; some appear quite sedentary and did not change their place of residence that often. Indeed, working as peddler could include mobility in various respects, ranging from daily commuting within the surrounding of one’s place of residence to seasonal or more enduring travel. Even in the case of Hasch, his desire to legally sell subtropical fruits in an itinerant way was co-terminus with his desire to work and live in Salzburg. For obvious reasons, Hasch did not refer to his roots in a city as others in the narrative archive do. Instead, he pointed out his alleged ethnicity as a Gottscheer and that group’s traditional privilege of peddling within the city. He asked for a licence ‘as a Gottscheer’, ‘like a Gottscheer’ or ‘like the former Gottscheer’. Gottscheer referred both to a certain way of peddling and a German speaking minority.
Belonging to this minority could mean something different than belonging to other ethnic or religious minorities with a traditionally high share of itinerate traders, like Jews, ‘gypsies’, Karrner or Jenische. Indeed, there were still some nostalgic depictions of street sellers, as somehow exotic figures who vanished with ‘good old days’ of the Monarchy. German-speaking minorities outside the territory of Austria and Germany were also an object of political concern. And, in fact, unlike other foreign nationalities Gottscheers managed to get a peddler’s licence once the trade agreement was made with the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. In this framework, it made sense to stress one’s belonging to this minority, yet it could still be a reason for defamation, as the pejorative statement of the Chamber of Commerce in relation to Hasch illustrates.

In general, arguments for continuity or tradition in this context could be effective, since in some respect the authorities accepted rights to trade granted earlier. For example, people who had a peddling licence since 1914 were not subject to the new restrictions and usually acquired their licence without much fuss. Once obtained, licences for selling certain goods could also remain valid. Trade in lemons, for example, was permitted within the Monarchy, because lemons were regarded as native products. In the Republic, these fruits were excluded from hawking as foreign products unless somebody already held a permission to sell them. Family tradition, however, was not acknowledged here. Unlike in other trades, a peddler’s licence could not be transferred to a widow(er) or a child. Nevertheless, such a family tradition was emphasised by some applicants, as an argument for exceptional permissions as in the case of Franziska B., a rag-and-bone-collector born in 1900. She repeatedly tried to obtain a peddler’s licence in Salzburg between 1933 and 1936, arguing that she could not any longer make a living from her trade. Yet she was without success, writing in 1936

In our family, peddling has been a tradition for decades and so we didn’t learn anything else from our father who had the peddler’s licence, and we were only interested in peddling. After the death of my father, the licence was taken away from us and despite our requests not re-approved. This peddler’s licence was for us – like for all other small businesspeople – a trade existence, for maintaining our whole family (and not just our parents). Because in this case it would be only a transfer from father to daughter, it is – in legal terms – only a transfer or signing over, not a new licence, and the statute of the law would not apply here. In addition, a negative decision affects the livelihood of our family (with many children), and one has to consider, in these economically hard times, whether I as a woman should not find a livelihood to support my family, that my request should be eliminated due to a rigid paragraph since as a good, patriotic [vaterländisch] woman I certainly don’t deserve this. The business community will not be harmed by permitting the transfer of the licence; only the opposite can occur. Because the same goods from
the merchants will be offered in the most remote places and homes where there are not any stores. In addition, the state earns through sales taxes ... and here the opposite is true: my family and I need support ... 

The general political aim of restricting and reducing the incidence of peddling was often highlighted in the decisions rendered. Exceptions to the law were not made, whatever arguments were produced by applicants speaking in favour of them. If there was any official reason for a more favourable interpretation of a person’s situation, it was primarily related to participation in World War I, as Hasch’s case has already illustrated.

The crucial issues frequently under discussion in the wider sample of narratives were economic necessity and a lack of alternatives. Being out of work and poor through no fault of one’s own was not, however, sufficient. This situation was common enough at the time. The decisive point was to make the addressee actually believe that such a licence was one’s sole way to make a living. Applicants had to prove that they were more or less unemployable. A higher degree of employability or the slight chance of making a living in other ways could be a reason for rejection, complaint or defamation, which is why applicants often highlighted their own or family sickness in their documentation. Thus, when Thekla Pru applied for a renewal of her peddler’s licence in 1924, she stated that she was poor and had to care for her disabled husband, a request that had been accepted by the local trade association in 1923. She had lost two sons in the war. The local physician confirmed the disability. The local trade association wrote to the Chamber of Commerce in 1924 that a very meticulous investigation had revealed that

Mrs. Pru is a healthy person, almost powerful. Was an innkeeper in 1919 ..., marches great distances on foot and carries a heavy packet of textiles around all day long. I personally made an effort to check this distance on bicycle, 14 kilometres to 20 kilometres, almost every day. Well, one can’t speak of unemployability. We can only say that Mr. Pru is a victim of inflation.

Pointing out that they were having to pay plenty for welfare and taxes, the trade association definitively opposed the request. The state, it argued, should not damage the trade by allowing peddling. The fact that the application was made in a district of Lower Austria (Waidhofen/Thaya) that had a privilege for peddling with textiles in the Monarchy was not up for discussion.

Although the applicants usually pointed out that they were unwilling to burden the community, local shopkeepers – also struggling with economic crisis – demanded that the city prevent harm to their business and take care of the poor. Some applicants responded, like Hasch, that they would not be
an economic threat but rather would be distributing local products. Some emphasised that they always had paid their taxes properly and certainly would do so in future. But with respect to legal requirements, peddling somehow represented a world of upside-down economics. Economic arguments of applicants were thus rather the exception in this context. A former shopkeeper from Vienna, for example, wrote

Because I have a clientele which I have acquired in almost 30 years of respectable conduct, and I only can serve them when my petition is approved; because otherwise my economic situation justifies it; because peddling intends to tickle out money from the most remote groups, thereby fulfilling its very designation as valuable asset of national wealth. It creates work and employment opportunities, which is sadly enough not appreciated adequately...76

Such arguments are also to be found in publications of the peddlers’ organisation. In the context of individual applications, however, it seemed to be more usual and also more promising to emphasise one’s narrow limits and a very poor income, rather than refer to the business potential of this trade. Peddling was something to unburden the community, not to contribute to its welfare.

The narratives also, reveal, however, another aspect of the relationship between poverty, underemployment and sickness. Hence, being unemployable was a requirement, but being too sick or disabled also appears to have been an obstacle in many cases. Applicants thus raised suspicions of actually wishing to beg instead of to trade. One could even be too disabled for a licence as a begging musician, as in the case of Paul Juraso, 59 years old, who applied in 1931. Similar to peddlers, begging musicians or buskers were discussed as a big nuisance at the time. Legal permissions were rare

In view of the fact that I've been blind since childhood and thus can’t hold down a job, I have permission to play harmonica in the courtyards. Since southern Burgenland is very inconvenient for me because of all the mountains, I ask you for a permit so I can play two or three months in your district in order for me to live a few more years. I am 59 years old and ask you politely for mercy. Almighty God shall reward you. 77

Juraso’s hometown stated that he was receiving poor relief there. His provisions were sufficient and his activities were therefore unwelcome. Because he was blind, he would need a guide and thus bother not only his but also other communities.

Usually applicants stressed their and their families’ poverty and desperation and their willingness to earn a living and fulfil their duties with respect to their relatives. Although they did not want to burden the local community,
they probably would have to in case of rejection. This logic is common to pauper narratives across Europe, as we see in the other chapters in this volume, particularly those pertaining to England. Clearly, this was not welcome in every case. However, one’s inability to earn a living otherwise in an honest way might also be regarded as a subtle threat towards the community. Few applicants made more explicit threats, for instance claiming that they would in case of rejection be forced to beg and steal. Thus, Rudolf Trie was born in 1887 in Upper Austria and was married with three children between the ages of two and six. In 1931, he lived in a caravan in Salzburg. According to his letter, he was 65 per cent invalid and had injuries to the head and his hand. In addition, he suffered from general neuropathy and was bedridden most of the time. He wrote

I am forced to reverse my Option [application for the Austrian citizenship] and don’t want to be an Austrian because here one becomes a criminal just by trying to find a living … I now insist on three points. Either this way or that way: If I do not get documents to support my family and to have income, I will abandon my family, and the community will have to support them and take care of them. Or you give me a passport for Russia or France …, I will abandon my family because I don’t want to starve in Austria where it is not beautiful enough … I can’t live without income as cripple … I expect an answer in 14 days.  

The protocol reported more moderately that the war invalid Rudolf T. could not survive on his 19.50 Schilling pension and asked for urgent assistance. His repeated requests were rejected because, due to his criminal record, he did not meet the legal requirements.

Most letters were like Hesch’s, rather straight and formal. He did not describe his situation in great detail. Nor did he explicitly and obediently ask for mercy. He did not utter threats. However, as pointed out above, style and arguments varied according to the situation, the kind of licence, and the level of the appeal. Other applicants delivered more ‘poetic’ accounts of their situation. Josef Hub, for example, born in 1876, wrote in 1932

This is my first petition I have written in my life and the gentlemen may forgive me in advance if it is not written according to the rules of art. I am a green grocer, already without money and thus not able to survive. I therefore request the high gentlemen to award the peddling trade to me so that I may find a livelihood. Because I have to start something. I am not getting work because younger workers are preferred. I am ashamed to beg and I can’t steal. What can I do? I have tried every possible thing to get back on my feet. Five times a week I went to the countryside to obtain goods and came home again to deliver them, and so on. I did this for years. Sometimes I thought I was making a little progress, but one
setback followed another and I was poorer than before ... I live today a life like a
dog – whom I envy when I see it eating a bowl of soup ... This plea is written with
the blood of my heart ... 79

Doubtless the vast majority of applicants were in very difficult situations. However, it
would be wrong exclusively to see the desperation described in the last letter in all
such attempts to find a livelihood. A decent wage or unemployment benefits or a
sufficient pension would have been preferable, but peddling was nonetheless not just
a subsistence vehicle. Some people, particularly perhaps the sick and disabled, wished
to peddle rather than revert to other possibilities such as different trades, begging or
the poor house. 80 Peddling within legal restrictions likely did not provide an outlook
of prosperity, but it promised more income than poor relief, which according to the
applicants was seldom regarded as sufficient. 81 As described above, efforts to achieve
this particular possibility were often remarkable. Hence, these records should not be
seen not as mere manifestations of poverty and distress but also as active attempts to
deal with the situation. These cases reveal more or less creativity in doing so, that is
in finding adequate arguments and support in to deal with legal requirements or
attempt to bend the rules.

Conclusion

The range of activities highlighted in this chapter ought to cast doubt on the image
of the unemployed as apathetic, depressed or passive, as depicted in the famous
contemporary study of those unemployed in Marienthal from Jahoda, Lazarsfeld and
Zeisl. 82 Inquiring why unemployment did not seem to have a revolutionary effect on
a community of former factory workers, their study had little regard for activities that
did not fit into the image of a politically-conscious, organised working class. 85
Attempts to simply organise one’s daily life by legal or illegal means were merely seen
as undesirable effects of unemployment. They did not fit into a narrow picture of
work as waged labour.

Beggarly forms of self-employment, particularly for the sick, seem instead to fit
more into common images of the ‘underclass’ 84, the ‘Lumpenproletariat’, than those
of the respectable working-class even before the economic crisis. 85 Many of the
people making these attempts do not fit into the category of the unemployed as
defined by social insurance and labour market policy or even in the broader sense
found in political debates. 86 They had lost – or in many cases never had – entitlement
to unemployment benefits. They were simply without income or means and more or
less unemployable. Particularly at this time of high unemployment and at times of
sickness, the chances of finding waged labour seemed minimal. As we have seen
here, the character and role of alternative economic activities was highly disputed,
and narratives
coalescing around peddling reveal a struggle about the official character of work and the right (and obligation) to work.

Applicants for a peddling licence faced a somewhat paradoxical situation. The poor laws, the vagrancy law and also unemployment benefits all postulated a willingness to work and earn a living if possible. Precarious forms of self-employment could be an option, particularly if one had no financial means, no vocational training and no opportunity to get and hold a regular job. In this context, peddling appears as the very last career, an occupation with the lowest reputation. Access was highly restricted since this trade was regarded as a disguised form of begging and a threat to sedentary trades. Although it could unburden the local community from paying poor relief, it was regarded as of no value for the national economy and also as a threat to security. Peddling was an activity in between work and what nineteenth-century scholars called ‘negative work’. The administration contributed to this ambiguity. In the context of fundamental (yet for so many, particularly the sick and disabled, unavailable) social rights and in the context of new concepts of labour and vocation, the character of these occupations was even more disputed.
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