



MEDZINÁRODNÉ VZŤAHY

SLOVAK JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava
2022, Volume XX., Issue 1, Pages 34 – 57

ISSN 1336-1562 (print), ISSN 1339-2751 (online)

Submitted: 19. 11. 2021 | Accepted: 10. 3. 2022 | Published 15. 3. 2022

HISTORICKÝ VÝVOJ HLAVNÝCH MIGRAČNÝCH TOKOV **THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MAIN MIGRATORY FLOWS**

Irah Kučerová¹

Migrácia je širokospektrálny, interdisciplinárny fenomén medzinárodných vzťahov s dôsledkami na mnohých úrovniach. Cieľom historického prehľadu migrácie je nájsť spoločné charakteristiky jednotlivých migračných vln, ich hlavné príčiny. Pri analýze príčin migrácie zvažujeme zábery push a pull faktorov. Dominantným teoretickým rámcom tohto kvalitatívneho výskumu je neoklasická teória. Minimálne od konca 19. storočia bola medzinárodná migrácia vnímaná ako páľčivý spoločenský či politický problém, preto treba migráciu regulovať. Výsledkom analýzy je, že vo väčšine prípadov sa motívy migrácie opakujú.²

Kľúčové slová: migrácia v historickom pohľade, push-pull faktory, neoklasická teória migrácie, utečenec, vyhnanstvo

Migration exists on a broad spectrum as an interdisciplinary phenomenon of international relations with its consequences permeating through many levels. The aim of this historical overview of migration is to identify the common characteristics of individual migratory waves, alongside their main causes. In the analysis of the causes of migration, we shall consider the consequences of push and pull factors. The dominant theoretical framework of this qualitative research is a neoclassical one. At least since the late 19th century, international migration has been perceived as a burning social or political problem and, therefore, migration must be regulated. As a result of the analysis, in most cases the motives for migration are repeated.

Key words: migration in historical view, push-pull factors, neo-classical theory of migration, refugee, exile

JEL: F22, J61, O15

¹ PhDr. Irah Kučerová, PhD., Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University Prague, Pekařská 16, 158 00 Praha 5, e-mail: irah.kucerova@fsv.cuni.cz

² This paper was created within the project TAČR-ÉTA. Migrace z oblasti Blízkého východu. Geopolitické a bezpečnostní souvislosti (Migration from the Middle East. Geopolitical and security contexts). Project registration number TL01000432, N. 90; Cooperatio Program, research area Political Sciences, FSV UK.

1 INTRODUCTION

Migration is an immanent manifestation of human development, especially in the context of perpetual movement, including the search for new territories at distances that exceeded the lives of several generations (Shah 2020). Only in modern times do we hear of temporary migration, often of the work type. Migratory research must be interdisciplinary, considering the geographic, demographic, social, economic and political aspects (Jansen 1969, p. 60).

This remains despite the fact that the definition of migration is extremely straightforward, the temporary or permanent abandonment of home (Lee 1966, p. 49), which does not refer to the serious consequences of migration. But we also consider the intentions of both legal, illegal and irregular migration, especially that since the 1980s, when the notion of the necessity to regulate immigration came to the fore (King 2002, pp. 93-94).

In recent years, there has been talk of a migratory crisis, especially within Europe, which is, in some ways, misleading, as the US and Australia are facing a similar intensity of immigration. There are two developing trends, namely migration and refugees. We therefore have to outline the differences between the typical migrant and refugee.

While a traditional migrant is perceived as having voluntarily left their homeland in search of an improved way of life, a refugee is one who has fled involuntarily from traumatic circumstances and endangerment due to religious, racial, national or political factors (UN Refugee Status Convention, 1951). Of course, it is also impossible to abstract the causes associated with natural disasters, alongside the current, rapidly deteriorating natural environment which is severely limiting the livelihoods of many. The refugee is motivated by the fear of losing their freedom or even life in their home country, therefore complicating any return; they are often severely mentally scarred (Jelínková 2000, p. 2). The coordination of aid to refugees has been handled by the Office of the High Commissioner (UNHRA) at the UN since 1950. A year later, the Geneva Convention lay down minimum standards for the protection of refugees, further supplemented in 1967 by the New York Protocol.

An exile is a specific form of refugee, people involuntarily leaving their homeland, yet planning their departure, as compared to the refugee who often takes the first opportunity to escape. Both forms of leaving the home country are based around the idea of return once the situation calms down. This is perceived as "temporary" exile. "The exile, as opposed to the emigrant, cannot simply return home unless substantial changes take place in the homeland" (Pithart, 2003). Originally, migration was mainly for political reasons, when people sought protection from persecution abroad (Mráz 2019, p. 155). Exiles occur, not for economic or social reasons, but for political and religious ones, which is another differentiating element between refugees

and classic migrants. The fundamental difference between an exile and a refugee is the urgency of time.

Nor, may we omit the specific example of the exile, namely the one in the true sense of the word, a person deprived of citizenship of their home country. This violent migration is historically associated primarily with the slave caste in both antiquity and the early Middle Ages; yet the early modern transatlantic slave trade of African descent to serve the needs of the American continents, on a scale of approximately 10 million forced migrants (Cohen 2019, p. 42), corresponds to a huge wave of migration during 17th – 19th centuries. Constrained migration is also associated with the 20th century, for example, the expulsion of ethnic Germans after World War II from Central and Eastern Europe. Or in the exceptional circumstances of the emigration of political opponents abroad. This happened, for example, in connection with the struggle against the communist regime in Czechoslovakia in late 1970s, when, as part of the so-called, Personal Decontamination Action, some uncomfortable opponents of the regime were forcibly evicted and their Czechoslovak citizenship was revoked.

Unlike the definition of a refugee, there is no internationally legal definition of a migrant. Amnesty International defines a migrant as a person residing outside their home country for more than a year (AI, 2019), although this is not entirely accurate, as it does not address the issue of those sent on work secondments lasting more than a year. In any case, a migrant is a person who leaves their country in which they tend to be bound by family ties.

The theoretical framework for comparing the causes and consequences of migratory waves in history will be a neoclassical theory working on push-pull factors, despite there being a wide variety of other theories of migration.

Hypothesis: *Human migration always possesses general features common to the various causes of migration.*

Research question 1: Is it possible to detect the analogous causes among monitored historical cases of migratory push-pull factors?

Research question 2: Is it possible to identify the general consequences of the observed migratory waves?

It is said that history repeats itself. The aim of this reflection on the development of human migration is to find a common denominator within the individual historical waves. What are the main causes of migration?

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the historical focus of research on migration waves, the use of neoclassical theory, resp. push-pull theory, proves the most appropriate as it offers a more general framework applicable to any historical period. However, it is also worth noting that this theory fails to answer all the questions of migration, so it is not a universal one. Although the neoclassical theory of migration is sometimes referred to

as being separate to the push-pull factor theory, both have a common basis. Both are founded on measuring the costs and benefits of migration (Kučerová 2020, p. 507).

The neoclassical theory of migration was developed mainly in the 1960s (Lee 1966, Jansen 1969), when the reverberations of the Second World War faded, yet the world was gripped by the Cold War so, on the one hand, the liberalization of people in peace and rising living standards was complemented by the migration of people from behind the Iron Curtain, or in connection with the decolonization process. However, Lee himself is based on his analysis of Ravenstein's migration and his postulated seven laws of migration caused by the industrial revolution (Ravenstein 1885). It seems that Ravenstein's patterns of migration can be verified in many historical cases, as each migratory flow creates its reverse counterpart; most movements are across shorter distances, so-called, gradual migratory steps where migrants prefer larger cities as destinations, which, after all, grow by immigration rather than by their own birth rate; the rural population is more prone to migration than the urban population; fewer families migrate, the majority tend to be single individuals and most are adults (Ravenstein 1885, 1889).

These theories focus on the reasons for leaving their homeland (push factors), as well as, on those that attract potential migrants to leave (pull factors). On the side of noticeably problematic causes of migration (push factors) there are up to sixteen reasons, including e.g. a low standard of living, lack of work, population boom (overpopulation), natural disasters, political repression, ethnic and religious instability, etc. In contrast, the attractiveness of reasons for leaving home is listed by nine factors such as land availability (especially in the past), employment, improved living conditions, liberty, simply put, these are incentives that multiply the life chances of the actors (Dahrendorf, 1990).

According to Lee and Jansen, migration occurs only at a certain level of perceived difficulty, yet there are always other pros and cons to be considered as migration always affects only a part of the population, so it is not a mass phenomenon. The decision about migration is always selective, migrants are not a random sample of the population (Lee 1966, p. 56). We can identify four basic categories relating to the causes of migration from a historical perspective, namely, economic, security, cultural incl. religious, and environmental. Although it is not part of the neoclassical theory, I consider it important to draw attention to two American authors who had already in 1918, highlighted the fact that migration changes people's life strategies and goals (Thomas and Znaniecki, 2018). In my opinion, neoclassical theory follows this finding, especially in the later period, when, in addition to macroeconomic analyses of migration, research focuses in detail on labour markets and extends to institutional aspects – see Massey (1993, 1998) e.g. Migration is examined mainly in terms of job opportunities or wage levels (Massey, 1993), decision-making on migration at the level of whole families or communities in connection with expected remittances, i.e. as

a strategic behaviour (Massey, 1998). Neo-classical theory, including the push-pull model, focuses predominantly, yet not only, on issues related to labour markets, wages and societal aspects (Nestorowicz and Anacka 2019, p. 295).

The original push-pull migration theory has branched out into a wider range of related concepts, but for the purposes of this article, the original causes of migration will be at the fore.

3 METHODOLOGY: SELECTED ANALYSIS CRITERIA

Migration research in the last century has been on the periphery of social or scientific disciplines (Zapata-Barrero and Yalaz 2018, p. 9), but is now gaining prominence as part of multidisciplinary research involving both international relations, political economy, geography, and social studies. The study of migration needs an interdisciplinary approach connecting demography, history, psychology, law, political science and urbanism (Drbohlav and Uherek, 2007), we can talk about the re-orientation of migration studies to multidisciplinary and diversity (Jansen 1969, Pisarevskaya et al. 2019).

This article will use a qualitative analysis of migration within historical developmental trends. Its advantage is that the phenomena or processes in question are examined, as far as possible, in their entirety. It allows us to capture many interrelationships and connections, which is essential for an interdisciplinary approach. The method used will be the interpretive method, searching for topics and regularity in narrative data (Hendl, 2016). The aim is to locate connecting elements in the monitoring of historical migratory waves, which qualitative research enables. The downside to qualitative research is that its results cannot be generalized or transferred to another environment, which in this case means strongly limiting possibilities to use historical experience (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Nevertheless, a knowledge of history eases our ability to solve current problems.

It concerns the identification of shared features in individual migration waves, namely by an inductive method, i.e. by estimating, at the beginning of the research, the initial causes of the migration, such as territorial expansion enabled by military force, incl. settlement in new regions, or the opposite effect, namely an escape from an enslaved country or homeland. It proves to be two sides of the same coin.

The criterion of this analysis is to identify the general features of migration in relation to its various causes.

4 DEFINITION OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL (INTERNATIONAL) MIGRATION

Population migration should not be perceived as solely a geographical relocation of people, but instead, in a broader context as a complex process of economic, social, demographic, political, and security factors in a geographical context (Jansen 1969, Castles and Miller 1998).

We tend to distinguish migration, in accordance with geographical contours, as internal and external i.e. international migration. Most often, however, internal migration is associated with the search for improved livelihoods in more favourable places of settlement (Drbohlav 2001, King 2002, Kučerová 2015), which tend to be cities in general, the larger ones having a greater guarantee of securing employment. This indicates that, along with migration, urbanization is intensifying, with the amount of people living in conglomerations that have been increasing in recent centuries, compared to within the traditional countryside. Urbanization is not only a logical consequence of the concentration of resources such as labour forces, but may also possibly occur due to failed economic policies, which might then lead to a diversity between urban and rural areas. This correlates with worsening social, economic, transport, energy and environmental difficulties (Kučerová 2011, p. 56). While in 1800, there were only 45 cities in the world with a population of over 100,000, by 1950, this had increased to 880 cities with 50 possessing over 1 million inhabitants. Yet, by 1990, the number of cities reaching the million marks had increased to 250 (Maryas, 2004), and, by 2015, the figure was 550 (Robbins 2014, p. 162). We refer to such a concentrated growth rate as metropolitanization. While in developed countries, this is accompanied by a deconcentration, suburbanization or migration from centres, alongside an emergence of satellite cities, in developing countries this is not the case and, conversely, their urban centres are expanding to the expense of the quality of life their inhabitants. To take, for example, Turkey which highlights a noticeable development, in 1950 20% of the population lived in urban settlements, thirty years later, in 1980, this had more than doubled (44%), in 2000 it had reached 65%, and in 2010, they reported that 75% of Turkish citizens live in an urban environment! (World Bank, 2018). By analogy, in Cairo alone, where 18 million out of a total population of 97.5 million live today (World Bank, 2018).

Although urbanization is a natural accompanying phenomenon of civilization development, there are both positive and negative effects. The relocation of an impoverished population to cities offers many the opportunity for an improved lifestyle, but, on the other hand, problems tend to concentrate in cities (see below), so a so-called urbanization of poverty occurs. There is a lack of technical infrastructure (drinking water, sewerage, road and energy network), institutional (educational, health, social services, legal networks).

As the pressure on the labour market increases, so unemployment rises, and the original benefits of city life disappear. After all, the static standard of living, alongside a growing population, leads to so-called demographic overpressure, which increases tensions within societies, as, for example, the events that led to the Arab Spring Uprising in December 2010, resp. then 2011. An inability to provide for one's family, to find employment, combined with the effects of the authoritarian regimes of the Middle East countries created an explosive powder keg for revolts.

In general, urbanization increases the concentration of the population, and alongside it, a concentration of negative accompanying phenomena of civilization development. Especially in built-up areas, there is a higher pressure on the intake of resources, access to work, public services and demands for educational needs, health care, etc.

In regards to the development of urbanization, a UN forecast in 2002 predicted that more than half of the world's population would live in cities, actual developments support this: 56 per cent of people in the world since 2015 are estimated to live in urban settlements (UN, 2003). This had already occurred roughly three years before in 2012. The metropolitan population, i.e., from half a million to 10 million, had more than tripled between 1990 and 2008, with a further forecast that the share of rural settlements would fall by a further 11 million by 2030 (WUP 2018, p. 56).

International migration can be defined as the movement of persons who leave their country of origin or country of residence to settle permanently or temporarily in another country so, therefore, borders are crossed (IOM 2019, p. 41).

From the point of view of research on international migration, an important methodological criterion is the geographical determination of the source countries (Zapata-Barrero and Yalaz 2018, p. 11), as well as the destinations of migrants.

5 HISTORY OF MAJOR MIGRATORY WAVES

Probably the first real wave of migration, according to archaeological findings, was the *flow of Africans* heading through the Middle East to Europe and Asia 10,000-20,000 years ago. As part of this migratory flow, the first humans crossed today's Bering Strait into North America (Robbins 2014, p. 156) to reach the southern tip of South America (Cohen 2019, p. 12). This is a classic example of the natural search for new livelihoods.

One of the most historically, respectively religious and culturally significant cases of migration is mentioned in the *biblical exodus of the 13th century BC*, specifically in 1220 (Dorazil 1997, p. 27). The biblical portrayal of "bringing Jews out of Egyptian captivity" by Moses became a symbol of escaping poor living conditions to seek a better future for the nation (see the essence of emigration). The reality was probably far different. By no means were the Jews captive in Egypt, on the contrary, they enjoyed a relatively decent social and economic status, but later narration adjusted this. An interesting explanation is how the Red Sea parted so that Moses could guide his people to the other side and the Promised Land. The catalyst for change were natural causes, the results of a storm led to a rise in mud which allowed passage across the waters. This narrative corresponds to the classical theory of migration for reasons of improved living conditions.

A significant, historically demonstrable wave of migration was the so-called *movement of nations during the 4th to 6th centuries AD*, specifically in period of 375-

568 in the area of Eurasia and North Africa. The weakening Roman Empire as displayed by an inability to control the entire territory militarily, the dysfunction of its state structures, and a growing economic crisis with rising inflation made it easier for new tribes to enter its territory (Hora 1985, pp. 87-88). Then the total collapse of the Roman Empire in 395, respectively its division into Western and Eastern parts and its subsequent development was another sufficient reason for increased migration. The main causes of the “movement of nations” were climate change and a booming population resulting in the need to seek livelihoods elsewhere and in new manners. Therefore, the result was the settlement of many hitherto nomadic tribes, a fundamental change in their lifestyle. The main direction of the migratory wave was from East to West or South, from Asia to Europe, led in 375 mainly by nomadic Huns from the Central Asian steppes. However, the migration of Germanic and Slavic tribes between the 4th and 7th centuries, a period referred to as the first wave of the movement of nations, is often considered to be the core of migration (Bednaříková, 2017). In the middle of the 5th century, tribes of Angles and Saxons arrived to the British Isles and gradually displaced the native Celts. The billiard ball effect is referred to here as it indicates the interaction of migrating tribes. The second phase of the movement of nations is connected with migratory trends during the 6th to 8th centuries, when the Slavs came to Central Europe and the Balkans and settled there. In the early Middle Ages, Central Europe thus became a crossroads of migration within the movement of nations, as there was plenty of vacant space with abundant forests and highly fertile land (Kučerová 2015, p. 20). The early medieval wave of this migration of people corresponds to the motive of searching for new living grounds for a growing population. The classic reason for migration.

The *Arab expansion in the 7th-8th centuries* was provoked after the Prophet's death by contradictions in the conception of Islam, which still retains a fundamental schism between the Sunnis and the Shiites, leading to bloody clashes even to this day. While the Sunnis profess, in addition to the Qur'an, to the so-called path (sunna) of the development of Islam, which was indicated by the Prophet, and later by any religious authority who has been able to convince others of their importance; Shiites, on the other hand, recognize authority derived only from the descendants of the Prophet himself, and the only canon remains the Qur'an (Dorazil 1997, p. 190). This wave of migration spread the influence of Islam east, through Asia, and on to the Chinese border, as well as, West to North Africa and the Pyrenees, where Arab tribes (known as the Moors) ruled part of the mainland for seven centuries. The cause of this migration was therefore primarily religious reasons accompanied by logical economic interests, too.

A significant migratory impulse was the so-called *Ostsiedlung (Eastern Settlement)* process, i.e., the settlement of the Eastern regions in a long-stretching period between the 10th and 19th centuries. It was the colonization of Eastern Europe

by Germanic tribes, even in the Middle Ages, supported by Slavic rulers, as the arrival of new tribes was perceived as a factor of economic development within an area which, until then, consisted of large uninhabited territories. But it is also true that the medieval Ostsiedlung has transformed since the 18th century into the so-called Drang nach Osten, meaning the invasion of the East, or the policy of expansion and forcible Germanization. The predominant cause was demographic overpressure by the Germans, accompanied by the idea of civilizational superiority over the Slavic nations (Kučerová 2015, p. 38). In any case, the Ostsiedlung was a nine-century supported migratory flow, relatively huge in scale, which came to the end by the waters of the Black Sea. The original natural expansion into free territory turned into a violent process of colonization and Germanization which logically met with resistance, so it was necessary to strengthen military support of these movements. Ostsiedlung is an often-cited example of the quest to find new lands and territories in a bid to improve livelihoods. It is also recognised as the period when the influence of the German monarchs began.

A further undeniably significant wave of in the 13th century was the *Mongol expansion*, during which the Mongol Empire spread from the East Asian steppes into Middle Europe. With the unification of numerous tribes by Genghis Khan in 1206, a powerful, and generally successful campaign by the Mongols to the west was initiated, which also headed south and east (Japan proved unsuccessful). The advance of the Mongol warriors created an empire spanning about 22 per cent of the Earth's surface and controlling about a third of the world's population: 27.7 per cent, or 100 million of the then 360 million total. The success probably lay in a combination of three factors – an accomplished military, effective trade and agricultural support (Cohen 2019, p. 31) i.e. offensive power, the ability to interact and use comparative advantages and ensure basic products, and self-sufficiency. In any case, the Mongolian expansion led to the largest waves of migration overall during the 13th century. The motive was obviously a desire to expand influence under any circumstances, so it was a violent expansive migration across half of Eurasia.

Another milestone in the development of international migration was the *fall of the Byzantine Empire in 1453*, and the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans. Constantinople was the seat of Orthodox Christians, the Eastern branch of Christianity which was laid out to prevent any further penetration of Islam into Europe. This proved successful for quite some time, but the Ottoman Turks were Muslims, and, with the downfall of this bastion, the spread of Islam accelerated rapidly, partly because the victorious Sultan of Constantinople converted it into the seat of the Ottoman Empire (Dorazil 1997, p. 177). On the other hand, the Ottomans did not expel the Christians, they only strategically taxed them higher, so, while many families remained, others left for economic and security reasons. The conquest of Constantinople was a powerful impetus for the wave of migration, with further Ottoman Sultanate tribes coming from

parts of Asia, while an exodus of mainly scholars and Christian craftsmen left Byzantium to seek asylum in the heart of Christianity, in Rome or other such city-states along the Apennine Peninsula. This allegedly contributed to the onset of the Renaissance (Vojáček, 2015) as an artistic movement, although hardly to the Renaissance lifestyle. The effect was rising migration due to the fear of further persecution, although in fact the Ottomans did not, on the whole, pursue this course of action with their ideological opponents. There is a combination of ideological, religious and economic reasons responsible for this migratory wave.

Forty years after the fall of Byzantium, a counterflow of migration began, when, according to the *Edict of the Alhambra of March 1492*, the Moorish kingdom and the last Islamic state in the Iberian Peninsula was overcome after the conquest of Granada. The Spanish couple, Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon expelled all "heretics", especially the Jews who conservative Catholicism treated far more radically, and the Muslims, who had lived there for generations spanning seven hundred years. They all then left for North Africa, often to the east, under the protective wing of the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. The ***"reconquest of the Iberian Empire"*** completed by Ferdinand and Isabella, amplified by the Inquisition, led to a large migration of 700,000-900,000 people and forced the religious conversion of the remaining Sephardic Jews or Muslim Moors. Unequivocally, an example of religious migration.

However, the year 1492 is a major turning point in world history for another reason, namely the *arrival of Christopher Columbus in the Western Hemisphere*. Discovery, resp. the rediscovery (the Western Hemisphere was first discovered by the Vikings in the 10th century - another wave of migration not to be deemed negligible in human history) of America initiated a massive wave of European migration which lasted the next 450 years. The settlement of the New World as a continuous process lasted from the beginning of the 16th century until the middle of the 20th. The colonization of new territories discovered by European sailors changed the nature of migration (Castel, Haas and Miller 2014, p. 23). The reasons for going overseas were numerous, both economic, consisting mainly of land grabbing, gold mining, and religious, with many Protestants emigrating, especially during the Catholic Counter-Reformation. Furthermore, there were political, as well as, natural factors (Europe went through a minor ice age when temperatures in the humid climate dropped significantly causing crop failure, followed by famine, and this became a recurring phenomenon). Very soon after Columbus's arrival in the Bahamas, waves of migration from Europe spread into South America, which was dominated by the Spanish - during the 16th century alone, 250,000 Spaniards had settled there (King, 2008), with an overall population consisting of over 8% Spanish, the Portuguese, while the French and English began colonising North America. Thus a continuous emigration to America took place, when, from approximately 1495 to 1950, hundreds of millions of

people emigrated from Europe. An especially large migratory flow occurred in the 19th century, caused by the availability of agricultural land along with repeated famine in Ireland during 1822-1844. As a result, half of the Irish population died, and a further quarter chose to emigrate, mainly to the United States. Another motive for leaving to the USA during the 19th century was the supply of work in industrialized regions. Between 1870 and 1920, 28 million Europeans arrived in the United States. It should be added that this was aided by the development of transport, steam ocean liners and railways, which both facilitated and reduced the cost of travel (Robbins 2014, p. 156). The search for improved living conditions, land acquisition, and the opportunity to seek one's fortune proved the main motives for migration to America.

Forwarding to a time after the European colonization of America, another influx of millions of people into America concerns the involuntary, respectively *forced, malevolent migration of early modern slavery*, when, as early as 1619, the first slave ships from Africa landed on American shores, and when, even after 1808 and the banning of the import of slaves, up to 10 million Africans were illegally transported to the USA for slave labour. However, estimates refer to almost double the number of victims of this transatlantic trade, as many Africans did not survive the passage and died on route (about 25%), the majority of these had not been properly registered. However, the import of slaves continued illegally involving 300,000 people after the ban, which posed an even higher risk for Africans, as shipowners preferred to throw them offboard alive when facing inspections at sea, with a further loss of life of around 20 per cent (King, 2008). Captives were taken mainly from West Africa to both North and South America (Robbins 2014, p. 156). Upon arrival, the colonizers immediately began to cultivate the land and opened mines, mainly for gold. But they needed manpower to manage this, and, as the native tribes turned out to be too physically weak and less resilient to diseases introduced by Europeans (smallpox, tuberculosis, etc.), the solution was to import slaves from elsewhere. This is the dark side of migratory history, when the goal is solely financial enrichment, but in no way harmonious to the new lands, but at the expense of others, the slaves. The clear motive for this violent wave of migration was labour shortages, the desire for wealth at the expense of others, including maximizing profits while minimizing costs. It existed purely of economic calculations while completely ignoring the human cost and suffering.

Every war leads to increased migration, so even the *Thirty Years' War in Europe* from 1618-1648 proved no exception. In this case, it was not only the extraordinary length of a conflict that involved numerous European nations in oft-times bilateral clashes, but, even more importantly were the nature of the disputes. Predominately, it was a rivalry of various European ruling families for power, therefore it was a quest for territorial and forceful gain. At the same time, the primary motive was a re-Catholicization promoted especially by the Habsburgs after the

recognition of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 on the basis of the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* i. e. whose territory, that religion. Due to the strength of the Habsburgs, who ruled the Spanish, Dutch and Austrian thrones (as well as, the Czech and Hungarian), Protestant states from Germany and Scandinavia opposed them. The end of the war, with the signing of the Peace of Westphalia, only entrenched this principle of choosing the religion according to the sovereign authority, and this in turn led to the establishment of absolutism. From the point of view of analysing migration as a movement of people, this era of war, which lasted for three decades, led to significant population movements across Europe. However, in addition to the high mortality rate (the population of Europeans fell by at least 30 %) both as a result of the war itself and the recurring plagues, malnutrition became another reason for migration. Protestants in particular, whether Evangelicals, Lutherans or Calvinists, went into exile. Due to the result of the Peace of Westphalia, when conditions in the field of religion tightened, these exiles became permanent. The power struggle is shrouded in religious differences, i. e. clear ideological reasons for migrants, supplemented by existential ones.

The driving force and impetus of migration became economic development in general, the expansion of trade, to which the developments in arts and crafts were tied. All this is connected with the *process of urbanization* that took place from the Late Middle Ages; however, the major instigation came with colonial expansion from the beginning of the 16th century and the growing might and prosperity of metropolises. However, the world experienced a complete and significant about-turn in labour migration in the 19th century following industrialization, with approximately 50 million people becoming migrants between 1870 and 1914 within Europe alone (King, 2008). Timewise, it was mostly a permanent migration. The effects were mostly assessed as positive for both sides. For migrant workers it was an improvement in their standard of living, including for the families they had left at home, because remittances were already being paid in the 19th century (as a transfer of part of earnings sent from abroad to the family). Even then, these contributions made it possible to support the family's needs and enable the children to attend school, e.g. On the part of the recipient country, the influx of workers stimulated the economic development of that particular sector and of the economy as a whole. It worked in the 19th century for Europeans or Chinese in America, it also still functions for those from the developing world heading to wealthier regions, whether in Europe, the US, Canada or Australia. Or also in other countries officially classified as developing but highly prosperous economically, such as the countries of the Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, etc. These prove examples of natural, economically motivated migration, as a result of the growing demand for labour and a corresponding supply.

The modern age, along with the 20th century, was to be a time of reason and prosperity. Unfortunately, the words uttered by the Roman playwright Titus Plautus

around 200 BC, so famously replicated by Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan* in 1651, were confirmed, *homo homini lupus*, man to man by a wolf. Two world wars in the course of thirty years led to a migration unprecedented in history.

The *First World War* marked a major breakthrough in migration policy, from a hitherto completely liberal approach in Europe (compared to the USA, where they began to control immigration after 1850) individual states approached the regulation of migration and actively supported the repatriation of people from other regions. As a result of the First World War, which changed the political map of Europe, numerous population movements occurred. These newly formed states gave rise to the departure of some habitants, in the least due to political, civic, linguistic or property changes. The most damaging reasons for migration were the political ones, perhaps the most horrific example took place in newly formed Turkey rising from the ruins of the Ottoman Empire as migration caused by the Armenian genocide of 1915-1918, when the Ottomans slaughtered 1.5 million Armenians on ethnic, non-religious grounds, while a further 600,000 fled and, therefore, migrated. Or after 1919, when 1.3 million Greeks were displaced from the Turkish Republic, even though they had lived there for centuries (Mazower 1998, Řoutil, Košťálová and Novák 2017). The Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, which ended the war between Greece and Turkey, also addressed the exchange of population on the basis of religious affiliation, forcing approximately half a million Turks to leave Greek territory. However, not only did mass migration occur, as in the Pontic Greeks, but further genocide continued when 1.2 million Greeks were massacred on May 19, 1919 by the new regime of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, (Řoutil et al. 2017). This provides an example of the composite reasons for migration namely, political, ethnic, religious, economic. All mainly occurring at an unprecedented extent.

Another dark case of emigration for political reasons is Russia after the revolution of 1917. In the *interwar period*, the international system did not return to a completely liberal immigration policy, which meant significant complications for refugees from the new dictatorships of Soviet Russia or later from Germany as the main source countries of migration. In connection with the revolutions in Russia since 1905, and centring around 1917, up to 3,000,000 Russians emigrated or were directly expelled from Russia in the first wave alone. These consisted mostly of members of the economic, scientific, cultural and, for logical reasons, noble classes (Racyn, 2017). The vast majority went to France, Switzerland, Germany, but also Czechoslovakia.

In the *case of Germany*, migration was linguistically or culturally more straightforward, thanks to tightknit German minorities in Central Europe, German acting as a unifying language and a shared institutional environment that had existed for centuries (Kučerová 2015, pp. 57-59, 80). The flow of migration from Germany intensified after Hitler took office as chancellor, when mainly Jews, liberal intellectuals and communists fled. From the second half of the 1930s, however, the

regime of their adopted countries gradually became more problematic. The milestone and tightening of conditions for refugees culminated in the Anschluss of Austria on March 12, 1938, then the Munich Agreement of September 30, 1938 and the Crystal Night on November 9, 1938. Emigration, an escape from Nazi Germany concerned mainly Jews, only about 425,000 of them went into exile outside Europe, and about 117,000 others found asylum within the continent (Cohen 2019, pp. 78-79). More than 170,000 exiles had to leave the Sudetenland occupied by the Empire. In Europe, as a whole, we are talking about a refugee wave of up to a million people just before the war broke out. The reasons for migration were purely ideological, political, racial, but later became matters of security.

Second World War brought about population movements of many forms, mainly though they were violent and forceful. During the actual years of conflict 1939-1945, about 60 million people relocated. The last year of the war 1945, recorded perhaps the largest population shift in history (Applebaum 2014, p. 19). During the post-war turmoil, another significant wave of migration took place, when ethnic Germans had to "return" from Eastern and Central Europe to Germany as part of displacement policies. In total, 9.4 million ethnic Germans, many from the third or fourth generations of the original colonizers of the Eastern European were forced to return (Kučerová 2015, pp. 143-144). Second World War contained all the possible reasons for migration, it was comprehensive in this respect.

The tragic fate of many Palestinians, who were displaced or left in connection with the *influx of Jews into Palestine* before and after Second World War, cannot be overlooked. As a result of the proclamation of the state of Israel in 1948, about 750,000 Palestinians emigrated to surrounding Arabic countries. Unfortunately, recurring Arab-Israeli conflicts have left 5 million descendants of these original refugees in displacement camps themselves. The events of May 2021, with rocket attacks, prove the insolvability of this conflict. There are both national and religious reasons for Palestinian emigration.

While Second World War was over, others, especially civil wars which quickly flared up, were unfortunately not. *The Cold War*, the bipolar break up of international relations, led to many further conflicts, many being internal. The Chinese conflict between Mao Zedong and the Communist Party on the one hand and Chiang Kai-shek of the Kuomintang on the other in 1946-1949; the Yugoslav conflict at the same time as the Greek Civil War, where the Communists fought on one side, though failing to win in Greece alone. In the case of Greece, the result was forced emigration for political reasons: 80,000 Greeks had to leave their homes and their property fell to the state; originally temporary, later permanent asylum was found in the states of the Eastern bloc, in Czechoslovakia alone it was around 20,000 occurring in several waves (Víšek, 2016). Although no civil war broke out in Czechoslovakia, the Communists took firm control and, as a result of their dictatorship and terror, up to 200,000 people

emigrated (1948-1989). After February 1948, about 40,000 fled, immediately after the occupation of 1968, this then doubled, and later a further total of another 150,000 people in 1969-1989 emigrated (Kurillová, 2013). As in other states belonging to the Soviet camp, 300,000 people emigrated from Hungary alone after the revolution in the autumn of 1956. Emigration from Poland developed similarly, with waves of migration from behind the Iron Curtain, especially after the strikes in Poznan in 1956, but also after events in 1970 and 1981 (Walczak 2010, p. 4). In these cases, political, ideological, but also economic reasons for migration prevailed.

A major breakthrough in the development of international relations is the period *after Second World War*, when, in terms of migration, it became a source region in Asia, later Africa and Latin America. In the case of the latter, a fundamental change took place when, until the 1960s, it was a destination for many emigrants for a variety of reasons. Among other things, including criminals who were granted asylum by several South American countries after World War II, amongst them many who were part of the Nazi regime in Europe. The main difference was in the orientation of the migrants, while 1.8 million immigrants came to South America in the 1960s, by the 1980s that same number were looking for other places to live. Therefore, in two decades, immigration balanced out with emigration (Robbins 2014, p. 158). The difference was in the economic circumstances of the migrants, people who arrived financially solvent, while the poor left and politicians were persecuted. Migration, emigration and exile were clearly dominated by political and ideological reasons, then later, economic ones. But these economic ones were never the predominant factors.

By contrast, during the second half of the 20th century, Europe gradually became a continent for targeted immigration, a destination for migration. In the 1980s, there was a significant *wave coming from Africa* and estimated at 10 million people. This partly involves the departure of those from the Maghreb (the northern coast of Africa, originally the western extent of the Arab Empire) to Europe, to the countries of the former metropolises, France, Italy, or Spain. It should be added that a significant share of migration was also from the south to North Africa, fuelled mainly by transitions from a nomadic to a sedentary existence, and intensified by crop failures and armed conflicts (Krejčí, 2016). Economic, resp. demographic reasons dominated here.

The *Collapse of the Soviet Union*, otherwise known as, the *Fall of the Iron Curtain* opened the borders, and thus the floodgates, to migration. Already, during Perestroika 1985-89, the figure reached around a quarter of a million on average, culminating at 1.2 million Soviet citizens a year before the fall of the Iron Curtain (Robbins 2014, p. 158). After the collapse of the USSR in 1991, there were significant relocations of ethnic groups in post-Soviet regions, often returning to their ancestral lands, as at least a third of Russians lived and worked under Stalin's national policy in every USSR state, in order to keep violently annexed territories, and any potential

development, under control. And it was not only people ethnically belonging to an area, as, for example, ethnic Germans held by force in Kazakhstan or Ukraine left for Germany, between the years 1992-2007 causing more than 1.7 million emigrants (Cohen 2019, p. 98). This also applied to the numerous Russian military garrisons expelled from the periphery of the socialist camp back to Russia (Cohen, 1991). Migration processes can become so entrenched and resistant to government control that new political forms emerge (Castles and Miller 1998, p. 1). The fall of the Iron Curtain was a fundamental systemic change in international relations after the end of the Cold War. Freedom of movement became a major demonstration against the previous regime. However, more than 80 % were tourists, not long-term migrants.

By opening the borders, which proved, let it be noted, the main message of the democratization of the system and the freedom actually gained, it is not only impossible to place an exact figure on the number of migrants this involved, it is in fact difficult to even estimate the total. Accordingly, the vast majority, in addition to the tourist stream, migrated for personal reasons, and soon after also for employment. This democratization of life led to a natural development of migration that former Soviet Bloc citizens had been waiting so long for. However, due to improved conditions, human rights guarantees and the desire to return home, the re-emigration of many exiles prevailed in some Central European countries. On the other hand, the number of people traveling for medium- or longer-term periods was constantly growing (students, guest workers, posted workers by companies operating abroad etc.).

An undeniable impetus for increased migration was the so-called *Eastern enlargement of the EU in 2004*, when three existing EU member states opened their borders to labour migration from ten new member states. E. g. the British labour market opened to migrants from the new member states without restriction, causing opponents of British EU membership to claim that the process has been abused and that migrants are taking the jobs of UK workers. Although Britain's agricultural sector or services cannot do without migrant workers, because the British consider these jobs to be inferior. And it's not just unskilled work, Britain doesn't have enough of its own doctors, so a significant proportion of professionally qualified hospital staff are immigrants from the new member states. Nevertheless, paradoxically, migrants from Commonwealth countries are generally better accepted in Britain (Kučerová 2018, pp. 871-874), Pakistanis are not perceived as a problem, Poles or Romanians are. It should be added that a language barrier may have contributed to this as European migrant working in lower-paid jobs in Britain, especially those from the new EU member states, generally possessed poorer English language skills, unlike Indians or Pakistanis. The inability of "Eastern European" migrants to communicate sufficiently in English is said to have contributed to the rejection of many Britons in the previously referred to Brexit referendum. So, also a cultural barrier formed. Therefore, increased migration conditioned by economics.

Following the Allied *invasion into Iraq in 2003*, this is one of the largest migratory movements in the whole of the Middle Eastern region, even when compared to Israel's 1948 enactment, the 1967 Six-Day War or Lebanon's long-running war in "former Middle East Switzerland" unfortunately continues to these days. It has actually been perceived by the international community as a purely regional problem. Surprisingly, migration was not caused directly by the military intervention itself, but by the failure of the security forces to protect lives, when sectarianism, insurgents and criminal groups began to terrorize the population. An estimated 5 million Iraqis fled their homeland, despite a re-emigration in 2005 of about 350,000 people (Murad 2010, pp. 119-123). Security aspects in migration have clearly dominated this situation.

The *Arab Spring* was ignited in December 2010 by the unfortunate self-immolation of a bullied vegetable seller in Tunis, who was not authorized to do business, an astounding victory for bureaucracy over the interests of livelihoods. This revolutionary movement engulfed most of the MENA countries and became so violent and vast that Europe is now perhaps facing the largest wave of migrants and refugees in its history. But not only Europe, but also countries in the west of Asia have become destinations. The so-called, European migration crisis of 2014-2016, culminating in 2015, when 1.5-1.8 million refugees arrived in Europe (FRONTEX, 2019), led to disputes between EU member states over potential resolutions. The ethnicity (that is, the original source) of the refugees was as follows: over 362,000 Syrians (9%), 178,000 Pakistanis (14%), 121,000 Iraqis (10%). One third of all asylum seekers or refugees came from these three countries of MENAP region, countries of politically unstable or experiencing armed conflict, respectively (Eurostat 2016). To this we must add economic migrants from other countries in Africa or Asia, often disguised as war refugees. On the other hand, it must be emphasized that Turkey has received more than 2 million Syrian refugees in recent years. So it is Turkey, in fact, which carries the largest burden for sheltering and caring for war refugees in Europe.

In the case of African migration, we associate its causes with demographic development, when the number of Africans has multiplied since the middle of the 20th century. We are talking about overpopulation leading, among other things, to the predominance of young people in society (60% of Africans are under the age of 25) and the so-called youthquake, which will trigger further waves of thousands upon thousands of migrants to Europe (Paice, 2021).

The refugee crisis has more or less passed since 2017, should we take into account that, while there were 1.5 million refugees in 2015, this figure had fallen to "only" 205 thousand in 2017, and by the following year to 150 thousand (Eurostat, 2019) It is interesting to note that 60% of these refugees are sheltered in only 10 countries, the vast majority of them being in Europe. Although migration from the MENAP region has weakened, it will continue to be a source. The causes of migration

in connection with the Arab Spring are mostly demographic, economic, but political and security motives have come to the fore.

Another recent migration crisis is the exodus of the *Rohingya from Burma*, which began in 2012, but intensified particularly in 2017 and continues to this day (2022). The Rohingya are a predominantly Muslim ethnic group in a predominantly Buddhist Burma, they hold no civil rights there and have been a classic case of apatrites for generations. These are indigenous refugees from predominantly Muslim Bangladesh. The exodus has affected about 700,000 Rohingya, or about 50-70% of their total population in Burma (Shah 2020). The unfortunate role of the leader of the Burmese opposition, Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Peace Prize winner for fighting to democratize her country which spent more than 20 years under persecution, seems reluctant to come to the aid of the Rohingya, or perhaps is she in fact unable to help? The reasons for this migration are therefore obvious, being both religious and openly racist, even in the 21st century, unfortunately.

However, after two years of partial economic lockdown due to the SARS-COVID-19 pandemic, immigration to Europe across the Mediterranean intensified in May 2021, with two Spanish enclaves in West Africa coming under attack by more than 5,000 refugees in just one day. Migration reduced significantly during 2020, but is now once again on the rise. The causes of this remain the same, in addition to the effects of conflicts, i.e. security, they are demographic and economic.

6 EVALUATION OF HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF MIGRATORY WAVES

Based on qualitative analyses of selected historical waves of population migration, the appropriate theoretical framework was chosen, namely a neoclassical theory connected with the push-pull factors of migration. A hypothesis was formulated from the chosen theoretical concept, namely *(H1) The migration of the population always possesses general features common to various causes*.

Two research questions were set for its verification or falsification:

Research question 1 (*RQ 1*): Is it possible to detect the analogous causes among monitored historical cases of migratory push-pull factors?

Research question 2 (*RQ 2*): Is it possible to identify the general consequences of the observed migratory waves?

The historical analysis of individual migratory waves has obviously confirmed this hypothesis, as there are still recurring causes of migration. Their purpose hinges mainly around finding new habitation, securing new sources of livelihood, but also fleeing from politically or religiously unstable communities. On the side of the causes of migration, there are various push factors that lead to rational decisions to abandon home and seek better lives elsewhere. There is a total of up to sixteen push factors, of which we have repeatedly identified several. In practicality, in all such cases of migration, the main push factors can be identified, namely, a lack of land for

cultivation, low standards of living, a shortage of employment, population booms (and overpopulation), natural disasters, climate change, political oppression, ethnic and religious instability, and armed conflicts. Regarding pull factors (i.e. those that drag migrants to specific destinations), it is true that in the analysis of migratory waves, on which I do not explicitly focus much attention, the implicit pull factors of the target territories are mainly as follows, economic benefits, social stability, political, and geographical accessibility. And not only in the past, but also now, religious tolerance plays an important role on the pull side, which may be seen, among other cases, in the so-called European migratory crisis. RQ 1 was thus answered.

Regarding the answer to RQ 2, it is appropriate to admit that such waves of migration were selected, having been caused by historical events and which, to a large extent, have shaped international relations and current events. Therefore, I estimate that the general consequences of each of the migratory waves can be identified. While in the past, the migration of the population was associated with the discovery of new territories, often very distant indeed, it contributed to the expansion of the Earth's population, to a higher utilization of natural resources and eventually to population growth due to improved living conditions. However, human migration also has a reverse face, the devastation of the environment, increased pressure on selected destinations and the severance of social ties. In the case of forced emigration, there are also economic losses. Yes, even in the case of RQ 2 we can talk about its verification.

Although the topic of migration is a multi-layered phenomenon, common causes, their accompanying developmental features and possibly the consequences of migration can be found.

7 CONCLUSION

Migration is a natural part of human life, as people move from place to place due to the result of both demographic and climate change, alongside the development of production and trade, all of which have always been part of human history, as has the formation of nations and the rise of states and empires, political conflicts and war (Castles - Miller 1998, pp. 48, 283). However, migration is eternal, it has accompanied humanity throughout its existence. "The decision to migrate, therefore, is never completely rational, and for some persons the rational component is far less than the irrational." (Lee 1966, p. 51).

According to the General Declaration of Human Rights, No. 13, UN General Assembly 1948, everyone has the right to move without boundaries, choose their place freely, or leave and return to their own country. The right to leave one's country and to seek refuge in another, is certainly a natural human right, but not the duty of states to accept anyone, anywhere, anytime. Therefore, seeking more favourable circumstances for living and relocation is acceptable and should not involve people forcing themselves on a specifically targeted destination without urgent need. This has been

somewhat forgotten recently in connection with the refugee crisis in Europe 2014-2017. What can be described as an industry of migration (Castle and Miller 1998, p. 284) is actually an abuse of the international system for refugee protection, as the activities of smuggling gangs, especially from the MENAP area, but also from other areas such as the Mexican-American border, flood recipient countries with overwhelming numbers of migrants. Therefore, in some cases it is also necessary to regulate immigration.

Another subject of research will be, among other things, the economics of immigration and the effects of migration, economically, socially and culturally. Theoretical research models will be a further area of research.

REFERENCES:

1. APPLEBAUM, A. (2014): *Železná opona. Podrobení východní Evropy 1944-1956*. Praha: Beta, 2014. 512 pp. ISBN: 978-80-7306-664-2.
2. BEDNAŘÍKOVÁ, J. (2017): *Stěhování národů a sever Evropy. Vikingové na mořích i na pevnině*. Praha: Vyšehrad, 280 pp. ISBN 978-80-74297-441.
3. CASTLES, S. – MILLER, M. J. (1998): *The Age of Migration, International Population Movements in the Modern World*. London: Palgrave, 1998. 350 pp. ISBN 978-14-6251-3116.
4. CASTLE, S. – DE HAAS, H. – MILLER, M. (2014): *The Age of Migration, International Population Movements in the Modern World*. London: Palgrave, 2017. 401 pp. ISBN 978-1462513116.
5. DAHRENDORF, R. (1990). *The modern social conflict: An essay on the politics of liberty*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990. 219 pp. ISBN 9780520068612.
6. COHEN, R. (2019): *Migration: The Movement of Humankind from Prehistory to the Present*. London: André Deutch Ltd., 2019. 224 pp. ISBN 978-0233005973.
7. DORAZIL, O. (1997): *Světové dějiny v kostce*. Vimperk: Papyrus, 1997. 534 pp. ISBN 80-85776-73-1.
8. HENDL, J. (2016): *Kvalitativní výzkum: základní teorie, metody a aplikace*. Praha: Portál, 2016. 408 pp. ISBN 978-80-7367-485-4.
9. HORA, P. (1985): *Toulky českou minulostí*. Praha: Práce, 1985. 279 pp. ISBN 24-052-85.
10. KING, R. (2008): *Atlas lidské migrace*. Praha: Mladá fronta, 449 pp. ISBN 978-80-204-1706-0.
11. KUČEROVÁ, I. (2010): *Hospodářské politiky v kontextu vývoje Evropské unie*. Praha: Karolinum, 2010. 367 pp. ISBN 978-80-246-1628-5.
12. KUČEROVÁ, I. (2011): *Mezinárodní ekonomické vztahy – Repetitorium*. Praha: MUP, 2011. 128 pp. ISBN 978-80-86855-69-1.

13. KUČEROVÁ, I. (2015): *Střední Evropa. Komparace vývoje středoevropských států*. Praha: Karolinum, 2015. 232 pp. ISBN 978-80-246-3067-0.
14. MASSEY, D. S. et al. (1998): *Worlds in motion: Understanding international migration at the end of the millennium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. 362 pp. ISBN 0198294425.
15. MARYÁŠ, J. – VYSTOUPIL, J. (2004): *Ekonomická geografie*. Brno: ESF MU, 2004. 156 pp. ISBN 80-210-2595-6.
16. MAZOWER, M. (1998): *The Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*. London: Allen Lane, 1998. 495 pp. ISBN 0713991593.
17. PAICE, E. (2021): *Youthquake: Why African Demography Should Matter to the World*. New York: Apollo, 2021. 432 pp. ISBN: 978-180024158.
18. ROBBINS, R. H. (2014): *Global Problems and Culture of Capitalism*. London: Pearson Publishing and Prentice Hall, 2014. 432 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0205917655.
19. ŘOUIL, M. – KOŠŤÁLOVÁ, P. – NOVÁK, P. (2017): *Katastrofa křesťanů: Likvidace Arménů, Asyřanů a Řeků v Osmanské říši v letech 1914-1923*. Hradec Králové: Pavel Mervart, 2017. 744 pp. ISBN 978-80-7465-254-7.
20. SHAH, S. (2020): *The Next Great Migration: The Beauty and Terror of Life on the Move*. London: Bloomsbury, 2020. 400 pp. ISBN 978-1635571998.
21. STRAUSS, A. – CORBIN, J. (1990): *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, 1990. 270 pp. ISBN 978-0803932517.
22. THOMAS, W. I. – ZNANIECKI, F. (1918): *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America: Monograph of an Immigrant Group*. Boston: The Gorham Press, 1918. 366 pp.
23. RANETA, L. – KUNYCHKA, M. – DZIURA, B. (2020): Migration Impact on the Economy of the Republic Moldava. In: *International Conference. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on European Integration 2020*. Ostrava: VŠB - Technical University of Ostrava, 2020. pp. 723-730. ISBN 978-80-248-4455-8.
24. AI (AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL CZECH REPUBLIC) (2019): Terminologie. In: *Amnesty International*, 2019. [Cited 9.9.2019] Available online: <<https://www.amnesty.cz/migrace/terminologie>>.
25. ALCZAK, B. (2010): Pracovní migrace a systémy sociálního zabezpečení: Polsko. [Online.] In: *Migrace online*, 2010. [Cited 10.3.2022.] Available online: <<https://migraceonline.cz/cz/e-knihovna/pracovni-migrace-a-systemy-socialni-ochrany-zprava-o-polsku>>.
26. COHEN, R. (1991): *East-West and European Migration in a global context*. In: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1991, 18, 1, pp. 9-26.
27. DRBOHLAV, D. (2001): Evropa a proces mezinárodní migrace. In: *Integrace*, 2001, 1, pp. 5-10.

28. DRBOHLAV, D. – UHEREK, Z. (2007): Reflexe migračných teórií. In: *Geografie*, 2007, 112, 2, pp. 125-141.
29. IOM (2019): *Glossary of Migration*. [Online.] In: IOM, 2019. [Cited 10.3.2022.] Available online: <<https://publications.iom.int/books/international-migration-law-ndeg34-glossary-migration>>.
30. KING, R. (2002): Towards a new map of European migration. In: *International Journal of Population Geography*, 2002, 8, pp. 89-106.
31. KUČEROVÁ, I. (2013): Moderní pojetí občanství: kompetence, závazky. In: *Dimenze Občianstva Európskej Unie*. Banská Bystrica: Belanium, 2013. pp. 8-19.
32. LEE, E. S. (1966): A theory of migration. In: *Demography*, 1966, 3, pp. 47-57.
33. MASSEY, D. S. et al. (1993): Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. In: *Population and Development Review*, 1993, 19, 3, pp. 431-466.
34. MRÁZ, S. (2019): Niektoré problémy migračnej politiky v Európskej Únii. In: *Medzinárodné vzťahy*, 2019, 17, 2, pp. 146-157.
35. NESTOROWICZ, J. – ANACKA, M. (2019): Mind the Gap? Quantifying Interlikages between Two traditions in Migration Literature. In: *International Migration Review*, 2019, 53, 1, pp. 283-307.
36. RAVENSTEIN, E. G. (1885): The Laws of Migration. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1885, 48, 2, pp. 167-235.
37. RAVENSTEIN, E. G. (1889): *The Laws of Migration*. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Vol., 52, pp. 241-305.
38. VAN DIJK, T. A. (2018). *Discourse and Migration*, In Zapata-Barrero, R., Yalaz, E. *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies*, Springer Open, Cham, pp. 227-246, 306 pp.
39. ZAPATA-BARRERO, R., YALAZ, E. (2018): *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies*, Springer Open, Cham, 306 pp.
40. JANSEN, C. (1969): *Some Sociological Aspects of Migration*, In Jackson, J. A. (ed), *Migration Sociological Study 2*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 60-73, ISBN: 978-0521135689.
41. KUČEROVÁ, I. (2018): *The Political Economy of Brexit*, In: *International Conference. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on European Integration 2018*. Ostrava: VŠB - Technical University of Ostrava, 2018., pp. 868-875.
42. KUČEROVÁ, I. (2020): *Analysis of the Causes of International Migration – Theoretical Approaches to the European Migration Crisis*, In: *International Conference. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on European Integration 2020*. Ostrava: VŠB - Technical University of Ostrava, 2020., pp. 506-513, ISBN 978-80-248-4455-8.

43. MURAD, M. (2010): *Irák a migrace v kontextu událostí po roce 2003*, In BUREŠ, O.- ŠMÍD, T. *Globální bezpečnost v Obamově éře*, Praha: MUP, pp. 119-133, ISBN 978-80-86855-58-5.
44. *WORLD POPULATION PROSPECTS. The 2002 Revision* (2003): UN New York, ESA/P/WP. 180.
45. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL CZECH REPUBLIC (2019): Terminologie. [Online] In: *Amnesty International*, 2019. [Cited 9.9.2019] Available online: <<https://www.amnesty.cz/migrace/terminologie>>.
46. DRBOHLAV, D. (2001): *Mezinárodní migrace obyvatelstva – pohyb i pobyt (Alenky v říši divů)* [Cited 25. 1. 2019] Available online: <https://aa.ecn.cz/img_upload/9e9f2072be82f3d69e3265f41fe9f28e/Pohyb_a_pobyt>.
47. EUROSTAT (2016): *Record Number of over 1.2 Million First Time Asylum Seekers Registered in 2015.* Luxembourg, [Cited 9.7.2017] Available online at: <<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/7203832/3-04032016-AP-EN.pdf/790eba01-381c-4163-bcd2-a54959b99ed6>>.
48. EUROSTAT (2019): *Acquisition of citizenship statistics*, [Cited 12. 06. 2019] Available online: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Acquisition_of_citizenship_statistics>.
49. FRONTEX (2019): *Migratory Map*, [Cited 20.7.2020] Available online: <<https://frontex.europa.eu/along-eu-borders/migratory-map/>>.
50. JELÍNKOVÁ, R. (2000): *Právní postavení uprchlíků v České republice*, [Cited 20.10.2012] Available online: <http://aa.ecn.cz/img_upload/213998dd557a6ecf241d80d7748bd811/postaveni_uprchliku.pdf>.
51. KREJČÍ, V. (2016): *Migrace z Afriky do Evropy*, [Cited 25.11.2016] Available online: <<https://www.clovekvtisni.cz/vaclav-krejci-migrace-z-afriky-do-evropy-3303gp>>.
52. KURILLOVÁ, H. (2013): *Emigrace z Československa a exil*, Moderní dějiny, [Cited 13. 7. 2014] Available online: <<http://www.moderni-dejiny.cz/clanek/emigrace-z-ceskoslovenska-a-exil/>> ,
53. PITHART, P. (2003): *Exil a emigrace odchody a návraty*, [Cited 15. 6. 2017] Available online: <<http://muzeumexil.cz/pages/exil/pithart.htm>>.
54. PISAREVSKAYA, A. - LEVY, N. - SCHOLTEN, P. - JANSEN JOOST (2019): *Mapping migration studies: An empirical analysis of the coming of age of a research field*, Migration studies, 7(2), [Cited 10. 12. 2020] Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz031>>.
55. RACYN, M. (2017): *Ruská meziválečná emigrace*, In Encyklopedie migrace, [Cited 18. 8. 2019] Available online: <<https://www.encyclopediaofmigration.org/ruska-mezivalecna-emigrace/>>.
56. UN Refugee Status Convention (1951): *Convention relating to the Status of Refugees*, [Cited 18. 12. 2018] Available online: <<https://www.un.org>>.

57. UN Refugee Status Convention (1967): *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*, [Cited 18. 12. 2018] Available online: <<https://www.unhcr.org/protection/basic/3b66c2aa10/convention-protocol-relating-status-refugees.html>>.
58. UN (2018): *The Global Compact on Refugees*, [Cited 18. 12. 2018] Available online: <<https://www.unhcr.org/the-global-compact-on-refugees.html>>.
59. UN (2003): *World Population Prospects: The 2002 Revision*, New York, ST/ESA/SER.A/223, [Cited 10. 9. 2019] Available online: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/files/documents/2020/Jan/un_2002_world_population_prospects-2002_revision_volume-ii.pdf>.
60. VÍŠEK, Z. (2016): *Když k nám prchali Řekové*, Listy 2/2016 [Cited 3. 8. 2018] Available online: <<http://www.listy.cz/archiv.php?cislo=162&clanek=021618>>.
61. VOJÁČEK, L. (2015): *Sedm největších migračních vln historie. Odvěká honba ze lepší budoucnosti*, [Cited 10. 7. 2016] Available online: <<https://epochaplus.cz/7-nejvetsich-migracnich-vln-v-historii-odveka-honba-za-lepsi-budoucnosti/>>.
62. WORLD BANK: *URBANIZATION PROSPECTS: The 2018 Revision* (2019): UN New York, [Cited 18. 8. 2019] Available online: <<https://population.un.org/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2018-Report.pdf>>.