The Determination of Nationality in Selected European Countries up to 1938

Dan Gawrecki

KEY WORDS:
European History — Nationalism — Cisleithania — Ethnicity

The topic of this study[1] was chosen in the knowledge that the assessment and evaluation of census practices in Cisleithania and in post-1918 Czechoslovakia[2] necessarily requires comparison at least with practices in neighbouring countries. The determination of respondents' nationality was always associated with various polemics which became part of the political struggle, and the census data was frequently called into doubt. Here I attempt to summarize various opinions on the relevance and credibility of census practices — opinions expressed by journalists and historiographers, both at the time of the censuses and also at a later date. Attention will primarily be focused on Germany and Poland — firstly due to the sizeable German and Polish minorities in the Czechoslovak Republic, and secondly because the main criterion for nationality in these two countries was language; nationality was generally not equated with citizenship of a state. The findings presented here are based on statistical data, supported by other sources and numerous scholarly studies of the subject. I trace how the concept of nationality gradually shifted under specific historical conditions, and I observe the changing criteria that were used as a basis for the determination of nationality from the time of the first censuses to contemporary approaches and evaluations. Only marginal attention is paid to the evaluation of Czechoslovak census practices in foreign literature; this is dealt with only in cases when it forms part of the wider general or comparative context.

This study draws to a large extent on existing scholarly literature exploring the subject. In recent decades, research on the issue has achieved some noteworthy results, especially in the United States;[3] the strengths of this research include its geographical distance from the events and the considerable length of time that has elapsed since their occurrence; this enables a detached appraisal of previous research. The main strengths of the work of Central European authors — both more and less recent — lie firstly in their ability to describe general tendencies in approaches

1 This study was produced as part of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) grant no. 13-00790S Národnost ve sčítáních lidu v českých zemích 1880–1930 (spory, polemiky, konflikty) [Nationality in Censuses in the Czech Lands 1880–1930 (Disputes, Polemics, Conflicts)].

2 Pavel Kladiwa, Etnická klasifikace a institucionální zakotvení národnosti v českých zemích 1880–1914, Moderní dějiny 22, 2014, no. 1, pp. 7–33.

3 This article draws on excerptions conducted by Pavel Kladiwa.

to the issue, and secondly in these authors' greater degree of personal engagement; though this engagement may be problematic, associated with emotional or one-sided views, it nevertheless offers a valuable source of material for comparison.

Censuses, unlike sociological surveys, attempt to cover an entire population, and they are conducted by state institutions. They have existed since ancient times, serving various purposes including taxation and military use. A more modern development, with a much shorter history, is the attempt to register respondents' cultural identities — including the determination of their language based on their own declarations; this is to a considerable degree connected with respondents' nationality.

The determination of respondents' identities has historically been associated with a number of problems. Census organizers created particular categories, and respondents had to fit into one or another of these categories. Such creation of categories was based on ideas of how a particular phenomenon was structured, and it was also influenced by the interests and needs of the state authorities. The use of such categories on the one hand made for clearer results, but on the other hand it forced the respondents to choose one of the options on offer. This helped to define — and sometimes in fact to shape — their group cultural identities, distinguishing them from other groups. Efforts to achieve "objective measurements of subjective identities" on the one hand helped to promote "state dominance", yet on the other hand they also helped to strengthen the ideological and political movements opposing such dominance.[4]

Opinions have been expressed that a census is not genuinely a "scientific enterprise", but more of a "political battleground";[5] that the definition of ethnicity in censuses reveals more about the construction of ethnic categories as part of political ideologies than about the realities of ethnic structures[6];that a census is essentially a political instrument because the choice of categories is the result of a political choice[7]; and even that in some cases censuses may in fact create nations.[8]

The first census of languages was held in Belgium in 1846 (individuals were asked about their language of daily use, a practice that was later recommended by the 1853 International Statistical Congress in Brussels, which also proposed rules for the unification of census practices). Later censuses of a similar type took place in Austria 1848 (language — data was given not by individual respondents but by administrative

4 David I. Kertzer — Dominique Arel, Censuses, identity formation and the struggle for political power. In: David I. Kertzer — Dominique Arel, (eds.): Census and Identity. The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses, Cambridge University Press 2002, pp. 1–42, here pp. 5–6, 20.

5 Jacqueline Urla, Cultural Politics in an Age of Statistics: Numbers, Nations, and the Making of Basque Identity, American Ethnologist 20, 1993, pp. 818–843, here p. 837.

6 Calvin Goldscheider, Ethnic categorizations in censuses: comparative observations from Israel, Canada, and the United States. In: David I. Kertzer — Dominique Arel (eds.), Census and Identity …, pp. 71–91, here p. 72.

7 Dominique Arel, Language categories in censuses: backward — or forward-looking?, In: David I. Kertzer –Arel, Dominique (eds.), Census and Identity …, pp. 92–120, here p. 115.

8 Tomasz Kamusella, The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe, New York 2009, p. 49.

institutions), Hungary 1850 (nationality), England 1851, the Kingdom of Sardinia 1857 (most frequently used language), Hungary 1869 (mother tongue), Austria and Finland 1880 (language of daily use).[9]

Data on nationality or language can be found in nationwide censuses as early as the first half of the 19th century. The statistical congress held in St Petersburg in 1872 was intended to provide an impulse for the standardization of practices in various countries. The congress recommended that censuses should not determine nationality, as it was an overly subjective category which would not enable international comparisons to be made; it was argued that in situations where there was a low level or a complete absence of national awareness, respondents could be subjected to various pressures — by the authorities or other agents. The congress recommended that censuses should determine language, specifically spoken language (*langue parlée*), but this did not standardize the approach to language. In Cisleithania the original plan was to collect data on the language used within the family (*Familiensprache*), but officially all censuses from 1880 onwards instead focused on the language of daily use (*Umgangssprache*, *język potoczny* or *język towarzyski*). In Germany censuses usually focused on mother tongue (or tongues), defined in various ways, while Switzerland also focused on mother tongue. The practice was different in Western European countries, where nationality was equated with state citizenship; respondents in Belgium, Scotland and Ireland could give more than one spoken language; French censuses did not include data on ethnicity, language or religion on the grounds that this would constitute illegal discrimination and a breach of human freedoms.[10] Further changes occurred after the First World War.

Up to the outbreak of the war, nationality as such was not officially determined in any country; instead, censuses focused on respondents' language or languages, in various forms. However, the language data was frequently used as a basis for political administration and also in the nationality-related policies implemented by ruling (and other) nations as a criterion indicating citizens' nationality. After the First World War several countries proclaimed that they wanted to determine respondents' nationality, but in reality the declaration of nationality was far from free, as it was subject to various conditions. A typical practice was the use, "in the interests of the state", of data collection methods which would ensure the best possible results for the dominant language — knowledge of which was usually necessary for individuals to achieve social advancement.[11]

9 Heinz Kloss, Sprache, Nationalität, Volk und andere ethnostatistische Begriffe im Lichte der Kontaktlinguistik. In: Per Sture Ureland (ed.), Entstehung von Sprachen und Völkern, Tübingen 1985, pp. 209–218, here p. 212.

10 Ulrike von Hirschhausen, People that Count. The Imperial Census in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Europe and India. In: Jörn Leonhard — Ulrike von Hirschhausen (eds.), Comparing Empires. Encounters and Transfers in the Long Nineteenth Century, Göttingen 2011, pp. 145–170, here pp. 148, 152, 154–156; David I. Kertzer — Dominique Arel: Censuses, identity …, pp. 9, 24–25; Cyril Horáček, Národnostní statistika. In: Československý statistický věstník, I, 1920, pp. 184–193, here pp. 184–188; Statistische Monatschrift 17, 1891, pp. 657, 660–661 etc.

11 Dominique Arel, Language categories …, p. 100.

The concepts of language and nationality (membership of a nation) were understood in various ways. In the case of objective definitions of nationality, the decisive criterion was the determination of an individual's mother tongue — a phenomenon which was considered to be static and unchanging. This was essential a primordialistic approach, which adjudged any changes in nationality to be at the very least a form of unethical behaviour. However, in some countries where mother tongue data was collected (e.g. in Prussia), the authorities took into account the possibility that an individual's mother tongue could change, or that an individual may have two mother tongues. Others emphasized the criterion of spoken language of daily use — i.e. the language which the respondent spoke in public; on the basis of this declaration, respondents were assigned to categories which were not officially described as nationality, but were *de facto* perceived as such. Respondents could — and, according to some definitions of census criteria, should — consider themselves members of a different nation than that of their language of daily use. Nevertheless, respondents' language of daily use generally became their language of thought (*Denksprache*), and thus their mother tongue. Some groups considered themselves to be members of a nation whose language they did not speak, or spoke only inadequately, and they did not align themselves with the language (or dialect) that was their actual mother tongue; instead they declared that they belonged culturally to a more educated or more civilized nation. Members of such a "more civilized" nation frequently rejected these "new arrivals"; other times they offered them the opportunity for complete assimilation in the future (though not all groups were treated equally, and their members usually had to meet certain conditions to be considered fully assimilated), or they used special terms to categorize them, e.g. "eigensprachige Kulturdeutsche" (culturally Germans, though speakers of their own language, i.e. a language other than German). Those who were considered an intermediate class (*Zwischenschicht*) or a mixed nation (*Mischvolk*) generally did not reject the possibility of future assimilation. However, there were also groups with different ethnic identities, often associated with the region in which they lived (imagined non-communities), which did not "fit" into predetermined statistical categories. Referring to such cases, some authors write of "neutral identities", while others consider such a designation to be inadequate, as these groups too had their own identities, albeit different from those identities that were set out in the statistical categories. If census organizers considered it beneficial, they would create new categories, but generally respondents were persuaded that they should choose one of the existing categories.[12] In general terms (though the situation was highly complex, as this article

12 The literature on this issue is extensive; the following list is a selection of works (in addition to those already cited): Tara Zahra, Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis, Slavic Review 69, 2010, no. 1, pp. 93–119; Ladislav Pallas, Jazyková otázka a podmínky vytváření národního vědomí ve Slezsku, Ostrava 1970; Ladislav Pallas, Úloha jazyka při vzniku a vývoji teorií a hnutí tzv. wasserpoláctví, šlonzáctví a moravectví, Slezský sborník 63, 1965, pp. 471–479; Krystyna M. Wiśniewska, Kontrowersje dotyczące problemu określenia struktury narodowościowej Górnego Śląska w okresie międzywojennym, In: Śląskie Studia Historyczne, 3, Katowice 1977, pp. 113–150; Tomasz Kamusella, Schlonzsko, Horní Slezsko. Oberschlesien. Górny Śląsk. Esej o regionie

will show) we can observe a shift from the "objective" determination of nationality to a more "subjective" determination, i.e. one based on the respondent's free declaration, without evaluating (or, in most cases, rejecting) the motives for that declaration.[13] In the most recent Czech censuses it has been possible to make no choice of nationality at all; this concept of nation comes close to Renan's famous dictum that a nation is a daily plebiscite (un plébiscite de tous les jours).[14]

Initially, censuses in Germany were conducted in different states using different methods. From 1834 to 1867 the collection of statistical data was organized by the German Customs Association. Censuses were conducted every three years by completing census forms for all inhabitants present, household by household. The first all-German census was held in 1871, the second in 1875, and subsequently once every five years. Census methods were unified, but individual states were free to add certain categories, including data on respondents' mother tongue, their ability to read and write, etc. In 1900 mother tongue was an obligatory criterion, and again in 1910; from 1933 the censuses determined respondents' nationality (Volkszugehörigkeit) and race. From 1925, censuses collected data not only on respondents who were physically present, but also on those registered as resident at a particular address.[15]

The Prussian censuses began to monitor the ethnic composition of the Upper Silesian population more systematically in 1828. The Prussian data from 1861, and the statistics of the North German Confederation (1867), determined respondents' family language (Familiensprache or Haussprache).[16] Mother tongue was determined by later censuses conducted on an all-German basis. All of these censuses show a predominance of Polish in Upper Silesia — though this dominance was gradually weakening. For example, in 1867 a total of 59.2% of the population were Polish-speakers, while by 1910 this figure had fallen to 53.0%, plus 4.0% bilingual inhabitants — essentially Poles who had learned to speak German. The most recent Polish studies of the issue acknowledge that the data in fact pertained to respondents' language, which — in the case of Upper Silesia — was not the same as their national self-identification.[17]

i mieszkańcach. Schlonzsko — Upper Silesia. Horní Slezsko. Oberschlesien. Górny Śląsk. An Essay on the Region and Its Inhabitans, Wydanie II poprawione 2006–2013 (Wydanie drugi roz i zôznaczōne do porzōdku.) Narodowa Oficyna Śląska (Ślōnsko Nacyjowo Ôficyno) 2006–2013. Made in Silesia (Zônaczōno na Ślōnsku) and many other publications by this proponent of a distinctive Silesian national identity.

13 Józef Chlebowczyk, On Small and Young Nations in Europe: Nation-forming Processes in Ethnic Borderlands in East-Central Europe, Wroclaw 1980; Józef Chlebowczyk, Procesy narodotwórcze we wschodniej Europie Środkowej w dobie kapitalizmu (od schylku XVIII do początku XX wieku), Warszawa-Kraków 1975, pp. 182–194.

14 Ernest Renan, Qu›est-ce qu›une nation? Conferénce faite en Sorbonne le 11 mars 1882, Paris 1882, p. 27.

15 For more details seeHarald Michel, Volkszählungen in Deutschland. Die Erfassung des Bevölkerungsstandes von 1816 bis 1933, Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte 26, 1985, no. 2, pp. 72–92.

16 Paul Weber, Die Polen in Oberschlesien. Eine statistische Untersuchung, Berlin 1914, p. 70.

17 A pioneering work on this issue is: Józef Chlebowczyk, Procesy narodotwórcze we wschodniej Europie Środkowej w dobie kapitalizmu (od schylku XVIII do początku XX wie-

The most recent German literature states that Polish studies have viewed the decline in the province's Polish population as a result of statistical manipulation; they acknowledge that the introduction of the "bilingual" category helped to boost the numbers of German-speakers, but they also interpret the data as evidence of the spread of the German language. These studies point out that the successful spread of German — associated with the process of Germanization — was also noted by Polish observers at the time. Language became a political issue; Germans cast doubt upon the extent to which Polish-speakers felt themselves to be members of the Polish nation, while Poles attempted to use language as a basis for arguments as part of their national struggle.[18]

Philipp Ther, today a Professor at the University of Vienna, views the shifts in nationality as a consequence of social interaction in specific historical conditions, accelerated by the attractiveness of the available identification. In his opinion, the decisive factor for Upper Silesians, in view of their long-term "pragmatic assimilation", was the prospect of the upward social mobility that was conditional upon their acceptance of German language and culture.[19]

Now let us turn to the main aim of this study and examine how the Prussian censuses were critically evaluated at the time when they were conducted. Understandably, the strongest objections were raised by Polish journalists, though the first comprehensive critical analysis was produced by German authors — primarily Ludwig Bernhard, a Professor at Berlin University, in his preface to Paul Weber's 1914 publication on the statistical survey of Poles in Upper Silesia.[20] Bernhard focused explicitly on the problematic aspects of the census. He acknowledged that the German public, and many deputies in the Reichstag, expected the non-German nationalities to shrink in numbers due to the interests of the state, but that the statistics are in fact far from convincing in this regard (p. III).On the one hand Bernhard disagreed with the claims of the Polish press that the statistics authority was guided

ku), Warszawa-Kraków 1975, especially pp. 182–194; Piotr Greiner — Ryszard Kaczmarek, Niemcy na Górnym Śląsku w XIX i XX wieku. In: M. Szczepański (ed.), Górny Śląsk na moście Europy, Katowice 1994, pp. 45–66; Ryszard Kaczmarek, Ludzie — stosunki demograficzne, struktura społeczna, podziały wyznaniowe, etniczne i narodowościowe. In: Joachim Bahlcke — Dan Gawrecki — Ryszard Kaczmarek (eds.), Historia Górnego Śląska. Polityka, gospodarka i kultura europejskiego regionu, Gliwice 2011, pp. 39–56, here pp. 52–53 (Referring to Jerzy Pabisz, Wyniki wyborów do paralamentu Związku Północnoniemieckiego i parlamentu Rzeszy niemieckiej na terenie Śląska w latach1867–1918. In: Adam Galos, Kazimierz Popiołek (eds.), Studia i Materiały z dziejów Śląska, 7, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1966, pp. 274–302.

18 Roland Gehrke, Od Wiosny Ludów do I wojny światowej (1848–1918), In: Historia Górnego Śląska ..., pp. 193–218, here pp. 202–205.

19 Philipp Ther, Die Grenzen des Nationalismus. Der Wandel von Identitäten in Oberschlesien in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1939. In: U. von Hirschhausen. — J. Leonhard (eds.), Nationalismen in Europa: West- und Osteuropa im Vergleich., Göttingen 2001, pp. 322–346, pp. 344, 337.

20 Ludwig Bernhard, Die Fehlerquellen in der Statistik der Nationalitäten. In: Paul Weber, Die Polen in Oberschlesien. Eine statistische Untersuchung, Berlin 1914, pp. III–XXI.

by political considerations, but on the other hand he noted that such consideration were nevertheless reflected in the statistics. He identified inconsistency in the "bilingualism" category; in 1905 respondents were instructed to give German as their language if they spoke it "perfectly" ("vollkommen"),[21] whereas in 1910 the word "vollkommen" was no longer present; Bernhard attributed this change to political motivations (pp.IV-V). He stated that the political significance of the census was augmented when legislation was being implemented, and that many Poles did not state German as their second language, arguing that they did not speak it perfectly (p. VI). Furthermore, Bernhard responded to the polemic concerning the categories of the Kashubian and Masurian languages; "Polish leaders" objected to these categories, arguing that Bavarians, for example, were not counted in this way, and they called upon Masurians and Kashubians to state their language as Polish (p. VII). In 1900 no such disputes existed; the Masurians and Kashubians declared themselves as Poles. However, in 1905 the authorities apparently persuaded the Kashubians and Masurians that they were not in fact Poles, and the number of Poles in the statistics fell. In 1910, thanks to successful Polish agitation in the matter, the number of Kashubians and Masurians fell, and the authorities launched a renewed campaign of persuasion ahead of the next census.[22] According to the principles used in pre-war German censuses, it was possible for a respondent's "mother tongue" to differ from their "native language".[23] In his statistical survey, Weber criticized the "bilingual" category, arguing that the ignorant rural masses completed their census forms with the help of gendarmes, and that the pressure exerted on them by the authorities cast doubt upon the published results.[24]

One of the reasons why I have given a detailed characterization of Bernhard's study is that the arguments presented in it were repeated in later literature —

21 In addition to German, respondents could opt for Dutch, Frisian, Danish, Walloon, Polish, Masurian, Kashubian, Lusatian Serbian (Wendish), Moravian, Czech and Lithuanian. For more on bilingualism: Karl Keller, Die fremdsprachige Bevölkerung im Freistaate Preußen. In: Zeitschrift des Preußischen Statistischen Landesamtes 65, 1926, 1. und 2. Abt., Tab. 2, 4, 6.).

22 Here Bernhard refers to Waldemar Mitscherlich, Die Ausbreitung der Polen in Preussen, Leipzig 1913. It should be mentioned that the Polish authorities continued to recognize Kashubian as one of the Slavic languages after 1990. With regard to Masurians: emigrants from Warmia to the Rhineland often protested that they were viewed as Poles; they emphasized that they were in fact Masurians, and that therefore — unlike Poles — they were loyal to the state. The Masurian population of the Rhineland was around 150 000 — out of more than half a million immigrants from the eastern regions of Germany. They were quicker to integrate than the Poles and displayed greater mobility. For more on this see e.g.: Klaus J. Bade, Evropa v pohybu. Evropské migrace dvou století, Praha 2004, pp. 75–76, 194; Jochen Oltmer, Migration im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, Band 68.), München, Oldenbourg 2010, 2. Aufl. 2013, pp. 33–34.

23 See e.g. the already-cited work by K. Wiśniewska, pp. 134–135.

24 See Marek Stanisław Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona mniejszości na tle stosunków narodowościowych, Katowice 1938, pp. 16–17; on p. 15 Korowicz writes that many did not understand the German forms.

mainly from Poland — though sometimes with a somewhat different interpretation. Despite minor objections, Polish historiographers consider the German census of 1910 (unlike the censuses conducted between the world wars) to have been relatively objective.[25]

Even before Bernhard's criticisms, the change in the concept of mother tongue in the census — and the accusation that this change was due to Polish agitation — was criticized by the renowned statistician Richard Böckh (1824–1907).[26] Böckh published a book on Germans living in other European countries, in which he emphasized the primarily Polish character of Upper Silesia.[27] The fact that Poles were underrepresented in the census results was also pointed out by a member of the Prussian Statistical Commission in his preface to a statistical survey of primary schools in Prussia; the survey revealed that the number of children attending schools using Polish as the medium of instruction was higher than the number of Polish-speaking children given in the 1910 census.[28]

The claims made by Bernhard and Weber were vehemently rejected by Wilhelm Volz, the Director of the Geographical Institute in Breslau (Wrocław). Volz stated that language in Upper Silesia was nothing to do with nationality, and that many people were "Deutschpolen" — formerly Poles, now merely "Zwischenvolk der Oberschlesier".[29] An even more vehement response came from the geographer Walter Geisler, who attacked Jakob Spett's map of nationalities in the eastern provinces of the German Reich, based on data from the 1910 census.[30] Geisler criticized the conflation of language and nationality, stating that the only two nationalities in Upper Silesia were Germans and Upper Silesians. Similar arguments were made when criticizing Paul Langhans's nationality map of Silesia, published in 1906.[31]However, these objections to pre-war maps were not published until after the First World War; in 1938 Geisler and his colleagues published an Atlas of Upper Silesia which was in accordance with Nazi ideology.[32]

25 The most extensive Polish treatment of this is the already-cited 1938 publication by Korowicz, as well as K. Wiśniwska's study, which focuses mainly on an analysis of controversies during the inter-war period.

26 Richard Böckh, Die Verschiebung der Sprachverhältnisse in Posen und Westpreussen, Preussische Jahrbücher 77, 1891, p. 125 etc.

27 Richard Böckh, Der Deutschen Volkszahl und Sprachgebiet in den europäischen Staaten. Eine statistische Untersuchung, Berlin 1869; p. 16.

28 Alwin Petersilie, Das niedere Schulwesen in Preussen, Berlin 1911, Part I; a comparison of both sets of statistics was also carried out by M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona..., pp. 18–21.

29 Wilhelm Volz, Oberschlesien und oberschlesische Frage, Breslau 1922, p. 48 etc.

30 Jakob Spett, Nationalitätenkarte der östlichen Provinzen des Deutschen Reichs nach Ergebnissen der amtlichen Volkszählung vom Jahre 1910.

31 Paul Langhans, Nationalitätenkarte der Provinz Schlesien auf Grund amtlicher Angaben, Gotha 1906.

32 Walter Geisler, Oberschlesien-Atlas. Unter Mitarbeit zahlreicher Fachgenossen, Volk und Reich Verlag, Berlin 1938.

Before the First World War, the results of censuses gave rise to fears of possible Polish expansion in Silesia — e.g. in works by two Breslau-based professors of history (Manfred Laubert) and geography (Joseph Partsch).[33]

The renowned Polish geographer Eugeniusz Romer, a participant at the Paris Peace Conference, wrote a book about the Poles in Pomerania and Masuria[34] in which he agreed with Bernhard's and Weber's criticism of the "bilingual" category; he concurred that only Poles were bilingual, pointing out that when the category was introduced it was only intended to apply to infants and mute members of mixed families, though later there were regions in which up to 50% of the inhabitants were categorized as bilingual. Romer disputed the status of Masurian and Kashubian as separate languages. He devoted a special analysis to Kashubian, demonstrating that it was a dialect of Polish — an opinion that had already been voiced by the German cartographer Heinrich Berghaus (+1884). He considered the introduction of these two categories to be an example of the falsification of statistical data; in his view, the only way to rectify this was to incorporate the Kashubian and Masurian respondents into the category of Poles. He compiled his own statistics for Pomerania and Warmia, in which the number of Poles was roughly ten percent higher than in the official statistics.[35]

At the end of the 19th century, Kashubian was considered by many scholars of Slavic languages (some of them Poles) to be a separate language. It was of course closer to Polish than to German, but the Prussian authorities — arguing that Kashubian was not a Polish dialect — began to replace Polish-language teaching with German-language teaching in the region where the Kashubians lived; Polish remained solely as the language of religious instruction.[36]

In 1915, working in Vienna, Eugeniusz Romer completed his Geographical-Statistical Atlas of Poland (*Geograficzno-statystyczny Atlas Polski*), which was used by the Polish delegation at the Peace Conference to support their arguments. His adjustments to the census statistics — which formed the basis of the atlas — were published in a propaganda brochure entitled "Ilu nas jest?" ("How many of us are there?"), published in Krakow in 1917. The adjustments to the data for the eastern Polish territories were based on the religious composition of the population; Romer considered the censuses conducted in Austrian Silesia to have been falsifications because they showed the Polish population shrinking between 1900 and 1910, despite large-scale immigration and a rise in national sentiment. One interesting finding concerned the language stated by Jewish respondents in various regions where there was a majority Polish population (in 1910 a total of 92.5% Jews in Galicia stated Polish as their

33 E.g. Joseph Partsch, Schlesien. Eine Landeskunde für das deutsche Volk auf wissenschaftliche Grundlage, Breslau 1896. For more details see: M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona..., pp. 25–26.

34 Eugeniusz Romer, Polacy na kresach Pomorskich i Pojeziernych, Lwów 1919 (especially pp. 6–20, 126).

35 See also Wacław Łypacewicz, Liczba Niemców v Polsce i Polaków w Niemczech, Warszawa 1927, p. 4.

36 Ladislav Pallas, Jazyková otázka, pp. 27–28, analysis of literature on p. 112, footnotes 80–86.

language, whereas in the Kingdom of Poland the figure was just 3.5%, in the Poznań region 0.1%, and in the Bydgoszcz region 0%). Romer's adjustments to the Russian statistics were not significant; for example, in 1913 Poles officially made up 72.4% of the total population of the Kingdom of Poland, whereas Romer gave the figure as 76.3%. He concluded that the Poles ranked among the largest European nations in numerical terms, but that in the current situation they had a lesser influence than some much smaller nations; this was due to their lack of complete independence, which was an essential requirement for the development of creative strength.[37]

A similar approach to the census was taken by Romer's younger Lwów colleague Adam Duziński in his study of Poles in Silesia. He categorized all bilinguals as Poles, and he considered the greatest distortions in the statistics to be concentrated in the mixed areas of Teschen/Těšín/Cieszyn Silesia, where Czechs had gained a predominant position in many formerly Polish municipalities. The decrease in the Polish population in Upper Silesia and Teschen/Těšín/Cieszyn Silesia was even greater according to the official statistics than it was in reality. Duziński used the age structure of the population to calculate the estimated "natural" birthrate among the Polish population. He rejected Weber's opinion that the declining number of Poles in Upper Silesia was caused by emigration to the Ruhr basin, and he also considered the statistics to be false because the survey of children in Polish-language primary schools was at odds with the official census data.[38]

Many authors reached the conclusion that the results of the censuses should be adjusted in the interests of objectivity. I have already mentioned some of the ways in which such adjustments were made (based on school surveys and estimates of birthrates). There were also attempts to revise the statistics based on the results of elections to the Reichstag (which were the only elections with full male suffrage before 1914). The most comprehensive attempt at a correction of the official statistics was made by Korowicz in 1938; his calculations were based on the parliamentary election results of 1903–1912. He concluded that the Polish population was even more predominant in Upper Silesia than the statistics showed. In Korowicz's view, the Polish position was represented not only by Wojciech Korfanty and other Polish deputies essentially belonging to the national democratic camp, who in 1903 proclaimed the slogan *Precz z Centrum!* ("Away from the Centre!"); they rejected cooperation with the Catholic Centre Party (Deutsche Zentrumspartei), which enjoyed the support of all politically active Poles up to 1903). It was also represented by the Poles who stood for election under the banner of the Centre Party, as well as by Polish socialists, who preferred to cooperate with their German comrades rather than becoming closely involved in the Polish national movement.[39]

On 19 January 1919 — three months after the end of the First World War, and before the eventual partition of Upper Silesia — elections to the Reichstag were held,

37 Eugeniusz Romer, Ilu nas jest?, Kraków 1917, conclusion on pp. 31–32.

38 Adam Dudziński, Polacy na Śląsku, Lwów 1919 (p. 4 — bilingualism, pp. 10, 21 — Teschen/Těšín/Cieszyn region, p. 13 — emigration to the Rhineland, p. 13 — school statistics and censuses, pp. 21, 26 — estimated birthrate).

39 M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp. 23–27.

which were boycotted by Polish organizations. Local elections — where there was also universal male suffrage — were held in Upper Silesia on 9 November 1919. The Polish candidates won a large majority of the available seats in the districts and municipalities where they stood for election. This outcome was used as an argument by the Polish delegations at international talks, who harboured hopes that the election results would eventually form the basis for a plebiscite. When the spring 1921 plebiscite failed to meet Polish expectations, it was claimed that the real plebiscite was actually the local elections, which showed the desire of the Upper Silesian Poles to become part of Poland. The plebiscite demonstrated that the census data on respondents' mother tongue did not necessarily coincide with their wish to live in a particular state. According to the 1910 statistics, Poland received 32% of the territory covered by the plebiscite, in which 74% of the respondents had stated Polish as their mother tongue. Germany received the remainder of the territory, where 61% of respondents had stated Polish as their mother tongue. According to the 1911 school survey, each part of the territory was home to roughly 10% more Poles than was indicated by the official statistics.[40] By contrast, German authors stated that the results of the plebiscite demonstrated the same tendency found in later censuses conducted during the inter-war period.[41]

An even greater disproportion between the census data on mother tongue and the wish to live in one or another state was revealed in the East Prussian plebiscite held in Warmia, Masuria and Powiśle on 11 July 1920. Poland only received 8 municipalities from the entire territory under review.[42] Polish activists had already expressed their doubts as to the probable results of the vote, stating that the Masurians themselves did not know whether they were Prussians, Germans or Poles.[43]

Greater success was enjoyed by the Danes in the Schleswig plebiscite held in February and March 1920. Two plebiscite zones were delineated, based on the results of the last pre-war census. In the northern zone (zone I) three quarters of the votes were cast by those who supported incorporation into Denmark; in the southern zone (zone II) four fifths of voters wanted to remain part of Germany. There was no voting in the southernmost part of the province, as Germans formed a large majority there. With a certain degree of simplification, it can be stated that the linguistic boundary became the international frontier. Before the First World War there were around 140

40 Marek Masnyk, Prowincja górnośląska (1919–1922), In: Historia Górnego Śląska, pp. 219–237; Encyklopedia powstań śląskich, Opole 1982, pp. 617–619, 397–400, Aneks 1; Karol Firich, Polskość Górnego Śląska według urzędowych źródeł pruskich, a wyniki plebiscytu, Warszawa 1921; M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp.31–35; the famous socialist journalist Bolesław Limanowski also believed in the success of the plebiscite on the basis of Polish activities in Upper Silesia: Odrodzenie i Rozwój Narodowości Polskiej na Śląsku. Wydanie trzecie, Warszawa 1921, p. 64.

41 Richard Breyer, Das Deutsche Reich und Polen 1932–1939. Aussenpolitik und Volksgruppenfrage, Würzburg 1955, p. 42.

42 Encyklopedia, p. 400; Wojciech Wrzesiński, Plebiscyty na Warmii i Mazurach oraz Powiślu w 1920 roku, Olsztyn 1974.

43 W. Wrzesiński, Plebiscyty, pp. 67–68.

000 Danes living in Germany, not all of whom lived in the plebiscite zones. A total of 88 231 voters in both zones voted for Denmark, with 76 071 voting for Germany. (Today Germany is home to a Danish minority of around 50 000.)[44]

An interesting relationship between the language spoken by the population and international frontiers was demonstrated in the territory which after the First World War acquired the name Burgenland. Historically this area had been part of Hungary, but the Treaty of Trianon assigned it to Austria. After unrest in the region, a particular territory was delineated for a plebiscite, which was held on 11–13 November 1921. The largest town in the disputed area (Sopron, the former capital of the Hungarian county of the same name), plus eight municipalities around the town, went to Hungary — although Hungarian census data (using mother tongue as the criterion) showed that German-speakers were in a slight majority in the town. Within the plebiscite zone a total of 65.1% votes were cast in favour of Hungary, and the remainder for Austria.[45]

The Carinthian plebiscite held on 19 October 1920 brought a different result. In zone A of the territory (where census data showed a large majority of Slovenians) 59% of voters chose to remain part of Austria; this would indicate that around 12 000 Slovenian-speakers voted for Austria.[46] The lack of votes for Slovenia cannot be interpreted merely as a manifestation of national indifference; it must be taken into account that many voters were not particularly enthusiastic about the prospect of becoming part of a Yugoslav state.

All these plebiscites took place in a climate of tension — including those in Burgenland and Schleswig. In Burgenland, supporters of the Austrian side alleged acts of Hungarian terrorism, while in Schleswig there was a split within the leadership of the Danish camp, which criticized Copenhagen for its inaction. The Polish plebiscites also brought a range of complaints — for instance, that locally born people were allowed to vote even if they had emigrated to the Ruhr many years before. However, here I am not primarily concerned with the reasons underlying the various successes and failures; my aim has merely been to point out the complexity of the relationship between census respondents' declaration of language, their national sentiments,

44 Wiesław Lesiuk, Dänisch-deutsche Erfahrungen in der Lösung von ethnisch-nationalen Problemen in Grenzgebiet. Eine Darstellung aus polnischer Sicht, Opole 1997; Walter Reimers — Gösta Toft, Daten der Grenzregion, Schleswig 1979; Sven Tägil, Deutschland und die deutsche Minderheit in Nordschleswig. Eine Studie zur deutschen Grenzpolitik, Stockholm 1970, pp. 6–7.

45 A magyar szent korona országainak 1910. evi népsámlálása, Budapest 1912, p. 22; Miroslav Michela, Pod heslom integrity. Slovenská otázka v politike Maďarska 1918–1921, Bratislava 2009, pp. 203–206; Karl R. Stadler, Hypothek auf die Zukunft. Die Entsteheung der österreichischen Republik 1918–1921, Wien-Frankfurt-Zürich 1968, p. 171 etc.; Wilhelm Wohlauf, Deutsch-Westungarn nach dem Friedensvertrag. Verglichen mit dem gesamten deutschen Sprachgebiet Westungarns auf Grund der ungarischen Volkszählung 1910, Wien 1919.

46 Österreich-Lexikon, Wien 2004; Kärtner Abwehrkampf — Volksabstimmung am 10. Oktober 1920, Völkermarkt 1984.

and their wish to live in one or another state if such a decision was offered to them in a plebiscite. Naturally, the majority of regions offered no opportunity for their inhabitants to declare their preference to live in one or another state, and in many places it was not possible to draw borders along linguistic lines. Those who had lost the war could hardly demand an enlargement of their state's territory (e.g. the German-speaking border areas of the Czech lands, or the Hungarian regions of Slovakia and Romania). Nor was this possible in those places where the victors laid claim to "regained territory" on the basis of appeals to "historical justice" (Alsace and parts of Lorraine).

Let us now return to German territory, which we left at the point when Upper Silesia was partitioned in 1921 following the plebiscite. Processes of assimilation in parts of Germany with a Polish minority population became considerably more rapid after the partition; this process was increasingly reflected in the census data from 1925, 1933 and 1939.

In this period, the differences between Polish authors (emphasizing the "objective" concept of nation) and mainly German authors (emphasizing the "subjective" concept) became entrenched. The German organizer of the plebiscite, Otto Ulitz — latera deputy in the assembly of the Silesian Voivodeship in Poland — declared that in Silesia, a province subject to German colonization, nationality was not determined by language, but instead by Articles 27 and 7 of the Upper Silesian Convention, which had been signed after the partition of Upper Silesia; the Convention stated that Poles were to be defined as former German citizens who as of 1 August 1921 were able to prove the "Polishness" of their attitudes — and that in the case of orphans the father's attitudes were to be taken as decisive, or the mother's attitudes if the father was deceased. Ulitz deduced from this that the decisive factor was the personal wish of each individual.[47] A similar view was taken by the lawyer Paulus van Husen, writing under the pseudonym J. P. Wanderholt (during the Second World War he was a member of the anti-Nazi Kreisauer Kreis group). Van Husen acknowledged the importance of language, but considered a more important factor to be historically formed feelings of loyalty.[48] Ewald Ammende, who became the Secretary-General of the European Congress of Nationalities in 1925 and won renown for his work organizing humanitarian aid to people in Soviet Russia, took the view that "Die Sprache des Oberschlesiers ist nicht das Kriterium nationaler Zugehörigkeit."[49] Even the famous Silesian bibliographer Karl Kaisig did not consider language to be a decisive criterion for determining nationality; in his opinion, religion was a much more important indicator of national-

47 Otto Ulitz, Von Vergangenheit zur Gegenwart, In: Das Deutschtum in Polnisch Schlesien, Plauen 1932, pp. 253–282.

48 J. P Wanderholt, Das Minderheitenrecht in Oberschlesien. Die Stellungnahmen der Präsidenten der Gemischten Kommission in der Zeit von Juni 1921 bis Juni 1929, Berlin 1930, pp. 29, 14; see M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, p. 79.

49 Die Nationalitäten in den Staaten Europas — Sammlung von Lageberichten. Herausgegeben im Auftrage des Europäischen Nationalitäten-Kongresses unter Redaktion Dr. Ewald Ammende, Wien-Leipzig 1931, p. 95.

ity among Upper Silesians.[50] The lawyer Karl Keller acknowledged that language did indeed play a certain role in distinguishing among nations, but nevertheless held that "Eine Nation ist ihrem innersten Kern eine Kulturgemeinschaft."[51] These and other views have been analyzed in the above-mentioned book about the protection of minorities in Upper Silesia written by Marek Stanisław Korowicz, a leading Polish expert on international law. Korowicz and other Polish authors were adherents of the "objective" concept of the nation, and they interpreted Article 27 of the Upper Silesian Convention (or the Geneva Convention, as it was generally known) as essentially corresponding with the "objective" view which held that the only necessary indicator of "Polishness" was the fact that Polish was spoken in the family.[52] Polish authors were in favour of determining nationality (except for Jews) on the basis of mother tongue; this was considered to correspond with the approach taken by the International Court of Justice, which prioritized the "situation in fact" over the will of the population.[53]

Understandably, these authors had no time for the extreme "objective" approach, which held that a nationwas a community of race and blood; this is exemplified by the Nazi lawyer H. Nicolai, who stated that the Polish race was heavily mixed with the Mongol race, that it was the element of the lowest value, and that it risked despoiling the German race.[54]

In Germany too there were some adherents of the objective approach, who claimed that language and religion were the best criteria for determining nationality, and that nationality should not be changed (Wecks), or that language was a more important factor than state citizenship when determining nationality (Guttmann). Polish authors of the time were sympathetic to the views espoused by the philologist Georg Schmidt-Rohr in his works written in 1932–1933, where he claimed that a nation was formed by its language, and that the concept of nation was essentially that of a linguistic community; Schmidt-Rohr equated the struggle for "Germanness" with the struggle for language, stating that the boundaries of a nation lay along the boundaries of its language, or that parents who had their child educated in a foreign language were in fact donating the child to a foreign nation, or that the fate of a nation was the fate of its language — and so on.[55]

50 Karl Kaisig, Die polnische politische Propaganda in Oberschlesien und die deutsche Abwehr, Gleiwitz 1924, p. 25.

51 Karl Keller, Die fremdsprachige Bevölkerung im Preussischen Staate, In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Statistischen Landesamts 1926, pp. 144–188.

52 M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, p. 78.

53 Ibid, p. 74 etc.

54 Helmut Nicolai, Oberschlesien im Ringen der Völker, Breslau 1930, p. 92 etc.; M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp. 80–81.

55 Helmut Wecks, Die Zugehörigkeit des deutschen Schulkindes in Ostoberschlesien zur deutscher Minderheit, ihre Bestimmung und Geltendmachung, Wertheim a. M. 1932; Viktor Guttmann, Minderheitenpolitik und Minderheitenrecht, Budapest 1931; Georg Schmidt-Rohr, Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker, Jena 1932 — second ed. of this book entitled Muttersprache — Vom Amt der Sprache bei der Volkswerdung, Jena 1933. See M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp. 81–83.

Authors' sympathies for the Nazi regime did not depend on whether they happened to be proponents of the objective or subjective approaches to nationhood. Schmidt-Rohr declared that he intended his work to help Hitler's efforts to unite all the Germans in a single state — efforts previously undertaken by Bismarck; he later recanted on his previous views, declared himself an adherent of the racial theory of nations, and made a career for himself in the research institutions of the SS.[56]

The statistics from the individual censuses in the German part of Upper Silesia (Provinz Oberschlesien) show a rapid decline in the number of respondents declaring Polish as their sole mother tongue, coupled with a rise in both the number of bilinguals and an overall decline in the number of those stating that they could speak Polish. The data is given in the following table:

census year	monolingual	bilingual	total
1910	578 658	51 103	629 761
1925	151 162	384 572	535 734
1933	99 193	266 375	356 668
1939[57]	3 731	?	?

TABLE 1: Number of Poles in Provinz Oberschlesien 1910–1939
Source: M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp.89; in 1925 in the German part of Upper Silesia, 59.6% (out of 1 360 814 people) declared German as their mother tongue; in 1933 the figure was 74.5% (out of 1 456364 people).

After the First World War, certain changes were made in the census data collection methods. The instructions in the census form read: "German or a different mother tongue. If not German, does the respondent understand German?" The explanatory text gave more details: "In section 9/10, state the mother tongue of all family members. Essentially each person has one mother tongue — the language in which they think and in which they prefer to speak with family members because it is the language which they know best. The children of parents with different languages may be recorded as having two mother tongues, i.e. as bilingual. ... Dialects, e.g. North German, are not separate mother tongues. Masurian must be considered a separate language, not a form of Polish." This census no longer included a list of languages from which the respondent could choose. The question ascertaining whether the respondent understood German was newly added.[58]

56 Gerd Simon, Wissenschaft und Wende 1933. Zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und Politik am Beispiel des Sprachwissenschaftlers Georg Schmidt-Rohr, http://homepages.uni-tuebingen.de/gerd.simon/wende1933.pdf

57 Henryk Zieliński, Z problematyki narodowościowej na pograniczu polsko-niemieckim w dobie międzywojennej, Przegląd Zachodni 1949, p. 257.

58 K. Keller, Die fremdsprachige, p. 8; Winkler, pp. 38, 41; K. M. Wiśniewska, Kontrowersje dotyczące, p. 135.

The 1933 census no longer asked whether respondents understood German. There was only one language-related section, and it asked about respondents' mother tongue; the explanatory notes stated that respondents had to give the mother tongue of all family members who were present at the time of the census, and mother tongue was defined in the same was as before, including the notes on dialects and Masurian. There was some debate on whether to include *Wasserpolnisch* (the Upper Silesian dialect) among the languages in the form, but eventually this option was rejected due to opposition from the *Związek Polaków w Niemczech* (Association of Poles in Germany), whose existence was guaranteed by the post-war Upper Silesian Convention even after Hitler came to power. The explanatory notes in the 1930s censuses strongly recommended that respondents should state two mother tongues and confirm their knowledge of German, which was considered highly advisable.[59] After the Upper Silesian Convention became defunct in 1937, it was written about the next planned census that the language of the Polish Upper Silesians not only differed significantly from standard Polish in dialect terms, but that the Polish Upper Silesians were moreover under the cultural influence of Germany, as they had confirmed in the 1921 plebiscite.[60] In 1939 the census categories were entirely different. One section concerned state citizenship, another nationality (Volkszugehörigkeit). The explanatory notes on nationality stated that respondents should state the nation with which they felt connected, and of which they felt themselves to be members. The notes stated that respondents were free to state their citizenship as they wished (even if they were not in fact legally citizens of the given state), and that respondents' nationality may differ from their mother tongue.[61] The census of 19 May 1939 collected data on the Jewish population according to the racial laws of the Third Reich, dividing them into full Jews and various groups of mixed Jewish race.[62]

German journalists differed in their opinions of the results of the census, though a large majority accepted the data. Among the authors mentioned above, Nicolai declared himself pleased that there was no longer any threat from the Poles, and that in

59 For more details see K. M. Wiśniewska, Kontrowersje dotyczące, pp. 135–136 (including references to other literature).

60 „Sie sprechen nicht nur einen von Hochpolnischen erheblich abweichendes Dialekt, des sogen. „Wasserpolnisch", sondern stehen auch vollständig unter deutschem Kultureinfluss und sind in der überwiegenden Mehrheit, wie die Abstimmung im Jahre 1921 und die politischen Wahlen hinreichend gezeigt haben, mit dem deutschen Volk fest verbunden." Statistik des Deutschen Reiches, Vol. 451 (1937), Part 4, p. 44. (See the polemic in Sprawy narodowościowe 1937, nr. 1–2, pp. 133–140). M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona..., p. 88 estimated the actual number of Poles in German Upper Silesia at around 700 000.

61 K. M. Wiśniewska, Kontrowersje dotyczące, pp. 135–136.

62 Jutta Wietog, Volkszählungen unter dem Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation zur Bevölkerungsstatistik im Dritten Reich, Berlin 2001; Die Juden und jüdischen Mischlinge im Deutschen Reich, In: Volkszählung. Die Bevölkerung des Deutschen Reiches nach den Ergebnissen der Volkszählung 1939. Statistik des Deutschen Reiches, Vol. 552, Part 4, Berlin 1944, pp. 40, 246.

fifty years there would be no more *Wasserpolnisch*. However, others pointed out that plenty of children still attended Polish-language schools; one exceptional opinion was that bilinguals should really consider themselves to be Poles.[63]

Polish journalists took a critical view of the census results in *Provinz Oberschlesien*, and their calculations gave different results than the official German statistics. One of their arguments rested on the (already discussed) results of the 1919 local elections, while others cited attendance figures at Polish-language primary schools (there was only one Polish-language secondary school in Germany — at Beuthen [Bytom], which was active from 1932 to 1939) as well as data on the language used in Catholic worship. Election results were not (by contrast to the pre-war period) considered a valid basis for estimating the numerical strength of nationalities.

Today, Polish accounts of the issue generally state that neither Germans nor Poles paid much attention to the census data when determining nationalities in the region; they estimate that around 600 000 people of Polish origin lived in the province — this would have represented a majority of over 60%, including those who lacked a strong national awareness and declared themselves as Silesians ("Schlonsaken").[64]

The Polish literature dating from immediately after the Second World War gives far higher figures (up to 800 000). The most important source of information on which such figures were based were Church documents on the language used in worship, at christenings, weddings and so on. Documents of this type from the period 1925–1938 survived in the confidential archives of the Nazi organization the *Bund Deutscher Osten*, and they were made public after the Second World War by Professor Stefan Golachowski from Poznań University, who stated that the German censuses from the inter-war period were lacking in scholarly value.[65] However, the data on participation in worship and other Church-related events had already been used during the inter-war period by Heinz Rogmann,[66] who concluded that the number of participants at Polish Church services corresponded with the number of Poles as determined in the censuses; he estimated the number at 550 000.

When Polish historiographers began to work with the benefit of hindsight, exploring the differences between ethnic origin, language and national sentiment, they took a more cautious approach to the Church statistics, acknowledging that these figures did not reveal how many people actually considered themselves to be Poles because participation in Polish-language worship did not necessarily indicate nationality, but also reflected tradition, ethnic considerations, and so on. The Church did have an effect on the preservation of Polish ethnicity and (especially) the Polish language — and it was essentially the only major institution which respected them —

63 M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp. 83–91 etc.

64 Marek Masnyk, Prowincja górnośląska (1919–1922), In: Historia Górnego Śląska, pp. 219–237.

65 Stefan Golachowski, Materiały do statystyki narodowościowej Śląska opolskiego z lat 1910–1938, Poznań-Wrocław 1950 (this author previously published a note on methodology: Od statystyki do problematyki narodowościowej Śląska, In: Zaranie Śląskie 19, 1946, pp. 27–29); Aloizy Targ, Liczba Niemców na Śląsku do 1930 roku, Biulletyn ŚIN Katowice, nr. 30, 1961.

66 Der Sprachengebrauch bei dem Gottesdienst in Oberschlesien, Breslau 1935, 1937.

but a critical approach should be taken to the statistics, using a range of other materials and applying the methods of appropriate disciplines.[67]

This standpoint — expressed in a study by Krystyna Wiśniewska — was developed in greater detail by the Opole historian Wiesław Lesiuk, who compared the data on the numbers of Upper Silesian Poles determined using statistical-historical methods with the data determined using socio-historical methods; Lesiuk advocated a comprehensive interdisciplinary analysis and made a number of proposals which, though highly inspirational, would be very difficult to implement in practice. Nevertheless, they are very valuable ideas, and they should certainly be taken into account in future research on related topics.[68]

According to the German census of 1925, there was a rapid fall in the numbers of Poles in other parts of the Weimar Republic. In eight districts of Masuria — in the southern part of East Prussia — the percentage of Germans rose from 52% to 82.9%.[69] The number of Poles in the Ruhr basin fell to almost a sixth of its former level.[70]

The first census in post-war Poland was conducted on 30 September 1921. It was organized on the basis of a decision by the Council of Ministers on 9 June 1921, and it included both those people who were present during the night of 30 September and those who were temporarily absent from their homes.[71] The census was accompanied by a wide-ranging information campaign including brochures, newspaper articles, and press conferences held to promote the census. The data collection involved around 70 000 census officials (15% of them women), a large number of state officials and local military garrisons. The preliminary results were published during the first half of the 1920s, and the definitive results for the entire state and the individual voivodeships were issued between 1926 and 1932.[72]

The 1921 census did not take place in the Silesian Voivodeship or in the territory known as Central Lithuania (Litwa Środkowa), which were not yet officially parts of Poland. In the case of Central Lithuania, the government used (e.g. when deciding on the establishment of minority schools) data on nationality that had been collected in December 1919 by the Polish civilian authorities in those parts of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania that had been occupied by Polish forces in 1919–1920.[73] The

67 K. M. Wiśniewska, Kontrowersje dotyczące, pp. 145–148 etc.

68 Wiesław Lesiuk, Układ sił narodowościowych na Górnym Śląsku do 1945 r., In: Materiały i Studia Opolskie, XXVI, Vol. 54, Opole 1984, pp. 11–39.

69 Leo Wittschell, Das Ergebnis der Sprachenzählung von 1925 im südlichen Ostpreußen, Hamburg 1926.

70 The number of Poles in Westphalia was reported as having dropped from 297008 to 53145. Wacław Łypacewicz, Liczba Niemców v Polsce i Polaków w Niemczech, Warszawa 1927.

71 Dziennik Ustaw Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej 1921 Nr 58, fn. 368, pp. 983–989.

72 Rocznik Statystyki Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej 1924, Warszawa 1925, p. 12 etc.; Pierwszy Powszechny Spis Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 30 września 1921 r. Statystyka Polski, Vol. XI—XXXVI, Główny Urząd Statystyczny, 1926–1928, 1930–1932.

73 The occupied territory was divided into three districts: Wilno (Vilnius), Brześć Litewski (Brest Litovski) and Minsk. For more details see Eugeniusz Romer, Spis ludności na terenach administrowanych przez Zarząd Cywilny Ziem Wschodnich (grudzień 1919), Lwów —

December 1919 census was conducted by Polish paramilitary organizations (Polska Organizacja Wojskowa, Towarzystwo Straży Kresowej), whose members made up the majority of the census officials. The aim of the census was clearly articulated by Józef Piłsudski — to achieve the highest possible numbers of people declaring themselves to be Poles. The General Commissar for the Eastern Provinces, Jerzy Osmołowski, confirmed this objective in his memoirs. The task of demonstrating the Polish character of the territory was facilitated by the fact that a large number of its inhabitants had no clear sense of nationality; even the Polish socialists striving for national rights apparently said about these people (known as *Poleszucy* or *Poliszczucy* — they later referred to themselves as *tutejsi*, meaning essentially "locals"), living in remote marshland areas, "existed on the same low level as black or Australian tribes".[74] The method of data collection was criticized, but a comparison of the results from 1919 and 1921 does not reveal significant differences with regard to respondents' declarations of nationality or religion; in some areas the number of Belarusians was actually higher in 1919 than in 1921.

The 1921 census form contained two questions on nationality. The first was formulated in the same way as in 1919: "To which nationality does the respondent belong?" The second concerned respondents' mother tongue. Census officials were instructed to record nationality according to the respondent's preference; mother tongue was considered to be the language used by respondents from their early youth.[75]

However, the data on mother tongue were never published. There were evidently disputes within the Central Office of Statistics, whose eventual decision seems to have been based on the opinion that the state's interests would be better served by publishing the nationality data instead.[76] Other literature states that in the 1921 census there were cases in which census forms were falsified, with Polish given as the mother tongue instead of Belarusian or Ukrainian, and similar falsifications of nationality. The "deceptions" ("kłamstwa") are alleged to have been even greater in the 1931 census than in 1921.[77]

More recent Polish authors take the opinion that the local people in the eastern parts of the country did not declare Belarusian or Ukrainian nationality because they

Warszawa 1920; Joanna Gierowska-Kałłaur, Zarząd cywilny ziem wschodnich, Warszawa 2003.

74 Jerzy Marcin Osmołowski, Wspomnienia z lat 1914–1921, Vol. III, p. 650 (manuscript — Biblioteka Narodowa, Warszawa); According to: Marian Siemakowicz, Spisy ludności a zagadnienie narodowościowe z uwzględnieniem spraw szkolnictwa dla mniejszości białoruskiej w II Rzeczypospolitej, In: Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne, nr. 10. Many data concerning Polesie and the eastern parts of Poland are taken from here.

75 Rajmund Buławski, Projekt drugiego polskiego spisu powszechnego na tle doświadczeń spisu z 1921 r., In: Kwartalnik Statystyczny 1930, z. 1, p. 60.

76 Ryszard Wroczyński, Marian Falski i reformy szkolne w Rzeczypospolitej, Warszawa 1988, p. 751.

77 Jerzy Tomaszewski, Ojczyzna nie tylko Polaków. Mniejszości narodowe w Polsce w latach 1918–1939, Warszawa 1985, p. 95; Edward Szturm de Sztrem, Prawdziwa statystyka, In: Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1973, nr. 3, p. 644, 666.

feared reprisals from the authorities, and instead declared that their nationality was "local" ("tutejsza" or "miejscowa"). For this reason it is particularly difficult to determine the real situation with regard to nationality; the respondents were evidently aware of the ethnic or linguistic differences between them and the Poles or Russians, and many equated nationality with citizenship of a state.[78] The Polish critics of the 1921 census also pointed out the significant rise in the number of Poles declaring themselves as adherents of the Orthodox religion, and the near-disappearance of Catholic Belarusians (who had made up around 20% of the Belarusian respondents in 1918).[79] The 1921 census data shows 1.06 million Belarusians living in Poland; the literature estimates their real numbers to be between 1.3 and 1.73 million.

The census conducted on 9 December 1931 provoked fewer suspicions than the previous one. The situation was more stable than in the immediate aftermath of the war, and the programme of repatriations had also been completed. The data collection methods were set out in a ruling by the Council of Ministers dated 2 September 1931.[80] The definitive results were published in the official statistical bulletin "Statystyka Polski" between 1936 and 1939 in 39 separate parts; most of the registers could not be published due to the outbreak of the Second World War. This time the census forms did not specifically determine respondents' nationality, but only their mother tongue. The Commissioner-General for the census Rajmund Buławski was convinced that this would prevent misunderstandings in the case of people with a low degree of national sentiment. Nevertheless, over 700 000 respondents from the Polesie Voivodeship declared that their language was "local" ("tutejsi" or "miejscowy").[81]

The census officials collecting the data were mainly Polish teachers, sparking protests from the Belarusian and Lithuanian press.[82] There were also private censuses, conducted by Belarusian peasants' and workers' organizations and the Metropolitan Curia in Wilno (Vilnius).[83] According to the official census, the number of Belarusians was the same as it had been ten years previously (1.06 million), despite the fact that around 300 000 people had been repatriated to Polish territory since the 1921 census. The literature estimates the real number of Belarusians at between 1.5 and 2.14 million.[84]

78 J. Tomaszewski, Ojczyzna, pp. 38–39.

79 Literature is given by Siemakowicz in the cited study.

80 Dziennik Urzędowy 1931, nr. 80, fn.. 629, pp. 1375–1377.

81 Kwestia narodowościowa w programie drugiego powszechnego spisu ludności Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej. Wywiad z Generalnym Komisarzem spisowym p. Dr Rajmundem Buławskim, Sprawy Narodowościowe 1932, nr. 1, pp. 1–2; Józef Zaremba, Stosunki narodowościowe w województwie nowogródzkim z uwzględnieniem tła socjalnego, Warszawa 1939, p. 105; Jerzy Tomaszewski, Białorusini robotnicy w latach 1918–1919 w Polsce, In: Acta Baltico-Slavica 1967, p. 94; O. Kisielewska, Po ridnomu kraju, Kołomyja 1935, p. 11.

82 E.g. Po spisie. In: Przegląd Wileński, 1932, nr. 1–2.

83 Spis ludności ziem północno-wschodnich według wyznania i narodowości przeprowadzony przez Białoruską Hromadę przy pomocy „hurtków" — zestawienie powiatami; Spis ludności przeprowadzony w r. 1935 dekanatami według wyznania i narodowości przez Kurię Metropolitalną w Wilnie. Materials from both private censuses were used by Józef Zaremba, op. cit.

84 M Siemakowicz, Spisy ludności.

Although the changes in the nationality figures for Poland's eastern territories were significant to the point of stretching credibility to its limits, the European public paid far more attention to the decline in the number of Germans in post-war Poland and the decline in the Polish population of Germany. One of the first authors to conduct a scholarly examination of this issue was Wacław Łypacewicz, whose study was published in the periodical *Sprawynarodowościowe* and appeared separately in 1927.[85] Łypacewicz intended this publication to improve the level of mutual understanding between Germans and Poles, which required an accurate knowledge of the size of minority populations in both states. It was his opinion that both sides suffered from a remarkable degree of ignorance concerning this matter — even among the elite echelons of society; he cited the example of the Polish senator Erwin Hasbach, the leader of the German national movement within Poland, who claimed that the country's German population was 1.7 million — of whom 800 000 lived in the former Prussian territories, and the remainder in other voivodeships.[86] Łypacewicz also rejected Jerzy Kurnatowski's estimate that 1398 000 Poles were living in Germany.[87] His own opinion was that the Polish statistics from 1921 were essentially accurate, and that the main cause of the decline in the number of Germans was their emigration to Germany, while the decline in the number of Poles in Germany was due to three main factors: the fact that the German statistical data underestimated the real numbers, the emigration of many Poles from the Ruhr to France after the war,[88] and the fact that Poles were quicker to assimilate in Germany than vice versa. Łypacewicz estimated that in the mid-1920s there were around 850000 Germans living in Poland, and between 1 and 1.25 million Poles living in Germany. The estimates of the number of Germans were unable to make use of data from the Silesian Voivodeship — formerly part of Prussian Silesia, which became part of Poland after the plebiscite and the third Silesian uprising — because the census had not been conducted in this territory. Łypacewicz estimated that this voivodeship (including the formerly Czech territories of the Těšín/Cieszyn region now annexed by Poland) was home to around 300 000 Germans.

Around the same time, different estimates of these numbers were published by Zygmunt Stoliński from the Institute for the Research of Nationality Issues (Instytut Badań Spraw Narodowościowych).[89] Stoliński's estimate of the number of Germans in Poland (884 105) is similar to that given by Łypacewicz. However, his approach

85 Wacław Łypacewicz, Liczba Niemców v Polsce i Polaków w Niemczech, Warszawa 1927.

86 Erwin Hasbach, in the periodical Nation 1927, January, February.

87 Georges Kurnatowski, Les polonais en Allemagne et les allemands en Pologne, Warszawa 1927.

88 After the war, 100 000 people returned to the newly independent Poland, while others left for northern and north-western France. This accelerated the process of integration among those who remained. — J. Oltmer, Migration, pp. 27–28, 81–83; K. J. Bade, Evropa, pp. 149, 90, 71–73.

89 Zygmunt Stoliński, Liczba i rozmieszczenie Niemców w Polsce, In: Sprawy narodowościowe 1924, nr. 4, pp. 361–380. (The text was also published separately.) The study also cites figures from German authors' estimates.

to the data from individual voivodeships is much more detailed; for example, when verifying the numbers of Germans in the Pomeranian and Poznań voivoideships he adjusted the official data by factoring in the data for religion and school attendance. In the case of the central voivodeships (Warsaw and Łódź), he acknowledged that many Polonized Germans had declared themselves as Poles, which is at odds with the statistics for school attendance up to age 13 and the results of local elections. He estimated the number of Germans in the Silesian Voivodeship (including the part of the Těšín/Cieszyn region annexed by Poland) as 257 885.

However, the next census showed that the 1920s estimates for the Silesian Voivodeship had been very wide of the mark, and this required explanations. In 1910 the part of Upper Silesia which was later to become the Silesian Voivodeship had 263 950 people speaking German as their mother tongue. Łypacewicz and Stoliński estimated that the number of Germans in the entire voivodeship (including the annexed part of the Těšín/Cieszyn region) in 1927 was approximately between 257 000 and 300 000. However, the data from 9 December 1931 showed only 68 735 German mother tongue speakers in the former Prussian Upper Silesia, and 91 207 in the entire voivodeship (including Těšín/Cieszyn). In Katowice, which in 1910 had a slim German minority, there were only 13.4% Germans in 1931. Korowicz, an expert on minorities in Upper Silesia, published a study in 1938 stating his opinion that this decrease was due to the fact that around 100 000 Germans had emigrated to Germany soon after the war; 28 574 people had opted for Germany in the plebiscite and were permitted to remain within Polish territory until the expiry of the Upper Silesian Convention in 1937, but by 1931 just 4 000 of them still remained. In addition, Korowicz stated that a further 50 000 people had left Polish Upper Silesia for Germany during the same period. He claimed that even among those who gave German as their mother tongue there were many Germans whose mother tongue was actually Polish ("polnisch sprechende Deutsche"), and that developments had in fact confirmed that the territory was Polish; he estimated the number of Germans in 1938 as less than 63 000. Korowicz did not consider the election results and the figures on school attendance to be suitable sources of data for adjusting the census statistics; he also rejected the idea of a nationality map based on election results, which had been proposed by the leader of the Upper Silesian Germans Otto Ulitz.[90]

German literature during the inter-war period claimed that the number of Germans in the Silesian Voivodeship was far higher than the Polish statistics suggested. The main arguments for this claim rested on the plebiscite[91] and election results. In 1922, German parties received 103 539 votes in elections to the Silesian Assembly; in 1930, in the first of the two elections to the Silesian Assembly held in that year (on 11 May), these parties received as many as 205 795 votes.[92] In a 2002 study, Philipp Ther

90 M. S. Korowicz, Górnośląska ochrona, pp. 85–88.

91 E.g. Richard Breyer, Das Deutsche Reich und Polen 1932–1939. Aussenpolitik und Volksgruppenfrage, Würzburg 1955, p. 42.

92 Viktor Kauder (ed.). Die Deutschen in Polnisch-Schlesien. Ein Handbuch über Land und Leute, Plauen i. V. 1932 — according to Otto Heike, Das Deutschtum in Polen 1918–1939, Bonn 1955, p. 83.

states that 42% of votes in the 1926 local elections within the Silesian Voivodeship went to German parties.[93]

Some Polish studies published soon after the Second World War cast doubt on the results of the 1931 census.[94] Zygmunt Izdebski suggested that the number of Germans in Upper Silesia should be increased by 30%, and the Opole historian Andrzej Brożek likewise stated that the real number of Germans was far higher than that given by the Polish statistics. Aloizy Targ estimated the number of Germans in the Silesian Voivodeship at 170 000. Today, Polish scholars' estimates range between 130 000 and 230 000.[95]

Other regions of inter-war Poland with large German populations were the Poznań and Pomeranian voivodeships. The 1910 census showed that these two voivodeships were home to 1 100 372 people speaking German as their mother tongue. According to the 1921 census this number had fallen to 503 617 (Poznań 327 846, Pomerania 175 771), and the German private census of 1926 showed 341 505 Germans living in these regions. In the second Polish national census (1931) there were 193 044 mother-tongue German speakers in the Poznań Voivodeship and 104 992 in Pomerania — a total of 298 036. These changes were evidently not due to the data collection methods used, but were primarily a consequence of international relations.

After the end of the First World War, in 1919–1921, a large number of Germans left the Poznań and Pomeranian voivodeships on the recommendation of the German government. The German government urged German teachers, officials and railway workers to leave Polish territory, despite the fact that the Polish authorities had asked them to remain as residents for at least another five years. On 1 April 1920 there was a major exodus when a total of 200 000 Germans from the former Prussian territories left Poland. The main reason for the emigration of Germans who had received Polish citizenship was their unwillingness to serve in the Polish Army, which at the time was fighting against Bolshevik Russia. On 30 August 1925, following a German complaint lodged at the League of Nations, the Vienna Convention stipulated a timetable for German emigration from Poland. However, by that time the German government had already re-evaluated its tactics, deciding that it would actually be in Germany's strategic interests for as many Germans as possible to remain in the Polish border regions. Nevertheless, the Polish authorities insisted that the Germans must leave Poland, and remained unmoved by the German government's requests;

93 Philipp Ther, Schlesisch, deutsch oder polnisch? Identitätenwandel in Oberschlesien 1921–1956. In: Kai Struwe — Philipp Ther (eds.), Die Grenzen der Nationen. Identitätenwandel in Obeschlesien in der Neuzeit, Marburg 2002, pp. 169–201, here p. 183.

94 See K. M. Wiśniewska, Kontrowersje dotyczące, pp. 119–122; Zygmunt Izdebski, Niemiecka lista narodowa na Górnym Śląsku, Katowice 1946, p. 25; Andrzej Brożek, Niemcy na ziemiach polskich przed II wojną światową. Próba rachunku liczbowego, Zeszyty Naukowe WSP. Ekonomia I, Opole 1965; Andrzej Brożek, Zur Statistik der deutschen Bevölkerung in Polen seit 1930. In: Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der UdSSR und Volksdemokratischen Ländern Europas 7, 1963, pp. 477–480; A. Targ, Liczba Niemców.

95 Piotr Greiner — Ryszard Kaczmarek, Leksykon mniejszości niemieckiej w województwie śląskim w latach 1922–1939. Zarys dziejów. Organizacje. Działacze, Katowice 2002, pp. 19–20.

the Poles argued that the Vienna Convention had been incorporated into Polish law and therefore it could not be breached. There were no major disputes on the actual numbers of Germans in the Poznań and Pomeranian voivodeships (in contrast to the situation in Silesia).[96]

A relatively large number of Germans also lived in the central voivodeships of Warsaw and Łódź as well as in the Polish part of Volhynia (Wołyń). According to a Russian census conducted on the former territory of the Kingdom of Poland (with the exception of small areas which came under Lithuanian control), there were 381 400 Germans and 385 750 Lutherans; the vast majority of the Lutherans would have been Germans.[97] The Polish census of 1921 put the number of Germans in this territory at 196 450, while the 1931 census showed 368 000 Germans; a German estimate was 415 000. Even taking into account various movements of population in the post-war years (such as the return of German colonists to Volhynia), the official Polish statistics seem scarcely credible.

Here I will briefly outline — with a considerable degree of simplification — the problems that occurred in connection with the census in East Galicia; under the Second Polish Republic, this territory, administered from its capital Lwów, became known as "Eastern Lesser Poland" (Małopolska Wschodnia). My account of these problems will use the term "Ukrainians", which has provoked often strongly negative reactions among many Polish authors (e.g. Kierski); some of the Ukrainians considered themselves Russians, others Ukrainians, and others Ruthenians, while many did not specify their "nationality" at all. In 1910, when the territory was part of the Habsburg Monarchy, the census in East Galicia determined the population's language of daily use (Umgangssprache) as follows: 3 791 000 Ruthenians (71.1%) and 770 000 Poles (14.4%), plus 660 000Jews (12.4%; Jews were counted according to their religion, though their language of daily use was most frequently Polish). With regard to religion, 61.7% of the population were Greek Catholics, 25.3% Roman Catholics, and 12.4% Jews.

In 1931 a total of 1860 000 people were Polish-speakers (39.1%); 2 495 000 were Ukrainian/Russian-speakers (52.75%); and 337 300 people spoke the "Jewish" language (i.e. Yiddish or Hebrew; 7.13%). Roman Catholics made up 28.56% of the total population, Greek Catholics 60.21%, and Jews 7.13%. It would be possible to list other figures which prove (contrary to the claims of the Polish government) that the percentage of Polish-speakers is not the same as the percentage of Roman Catholics.[98]

96 In addition to the above-cited studies by Łypacewicz and Stoliński — Roman Lutman, Emigracja Niemców z Pomorza w okresie powojennym, In: Stan posiadania ziemi na Pomorzu, Toruń 1933; Kazimierz Kierski, Prawa mniejszości niemieckiej w Polsce, Poznań 1923; Przemysław Hauser, Mniejszość niemiecka w Województwie Pomorskim w latach 1920–1939, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk-Lódź 1981.

97 O. Heike, Das Deutschtum, p. 29; Heike also repeated the data he collected in a later, expanded version: Die deutsche Minderheit in Polen bis 1939. Ihr Leben und Wirken — kulturell, gesellschaftlich, politisch, Leverkusen 1985; Walter Kuhn, Zahl und Bevölkerungsbewegung der Deutschen Kongrespolens, In: Deutsche Wirtschaftliche Zeitschrift in Polen 1935, p. 486.

98 The data were published by e.g.: Tadeusz Dąbkowski, Ukraiński ruch narodowy 1912–1923 w Galicji Wschodniej, Warszawa 1985; Ryszard Torzecki, Kwestia ukraińska w Polsce w la-

An important piece in Poland's multinational mosaic was the Jewish population, who were often the dominant minority group. In 1937 Poland was home to 3.5 million Jews, representing 29.8% of all Jews in the world. As far as can be determined, there were no major controversies regarding the census in connection with the Jewish population. However, this group did display certain distinguishing features. The most important was the Jews' relationship with religion. As Wojciech Jaworski puts it: "several nations can thank religion for their survival, but the Jews were in fact formed by religion". In 1921, when both mother tongue and nationality were determined, 73% of Jews declared their mother tongue to be the "Jewish" language (i.e. Yiddish and Hebrew), 25.5% Polish, and just 0.4% German. In 1931, 87.7% of Jews declared themselves to be speakers of the "Jewish" language. More Jews living in the Silesian Voivodeship gave their mother tongue as German than in other parts of Poland.[99]

The overall tone of Polish journalism when writing about the census (and other nationality-related issues) was undoubtedly influenced by the rise in international tensions during the 1930s. This was reflected in the choice of arguments and the claims made in polemical articles. In his work on the protection of minorities in Poland, the leading Polish expert on international law Kazimierz Kierski stated that Poland did not want to remove Germans' nationality, and that the state granted them the same rights as other Polish citizens — but that they were not entitled to special privileges. Other arguments included the following: minorities cannot be allowed to cause the breakup of states of which they are citizens; the influence of German culture on the Poles has always tended to be negative; after the war they gave us only part of the territory which should be ours, but now the Germans want Pomerania and then they plan to destroy Poland entirely; the Poles do no lay claims to foreign territory, and they comply with their international obligations towards minorities; what would the Germans say if we demanded the whole of Silesia, Warmia, or the Duchy of Prussia?; the Germans want a new war and are planning further robbery.[100]

Although this article has focused primarily on the censuses in Germany and Poland (because these are of particular relevance for comparisons with the Czech lands), it would be useful to at least briefly mention several other countries — especially with regard to certain specific features, though the general principles are very similar.

After the First World War, censuses in the successor states determined both language and nationality.[101] However, definitions of nationality for this purpose differed;

tach 1923–1929, Kraków 1989; Grzegorz Hryciuk, Przemiany narodowościowe i ludnościowe w Galicji Wschodniej i na Wołyniu w latach 1931–1948, Toruń 2005.

99 Szyja Bronsztejn, Ludność żydowska w Polsce w okresie międzywojennym. Studium statystyczne, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1963, pp. 20–21, 27; Wojciech Jaworski, Ludność żydowska w Województwie śląskim w latach 1922–1939, Katowice 1997, pp. 7–8 (the source of the citation), 166.

100 Kazimierz Kierski, Ochrona prawna mniejszości v Polsce, Poznań 1933, pp. 76–87.

101 Heinz Kloss, Sprache, Nationalität, Volk und andere ethnostatistische Begriffe im Lichte der Kontaktlinguistik, In: Per Sture Ureland (ed.), Entstehung von Sprachen und Völkern, Tübingen 1985, pp. 209–218, here pp. 212–213.

in some cases it was an entirely free declaration by the respondent, while in others it was subject to some restrictions. A specific case of a clash between the subjective and objective conceptions of nationality occurred in Estonia. Estonia was the first state to recognize the right of national minorities to cultural self-government, in a law passed on 5 February 1925. A "nationality cadastre" was compiled, recording Estonian citizens belonging to minorities with over 3000 members; respondents were free to declare their nationality at will, and this declared nationality was recorded in their official personal documents. Those who were not registered in the nationality cadastre were automatically considered to be Estonians. Children up to the age of 18 were listed under their parents' (or their father's) nationality. In 1928 the Estonian Supreme Court ruled that each citizen over the age of 18 had the right to change the nationality recorded in his/her identity document. However, the options for self-identification were subject to considerable limitations. Applicants requesting a change of nationality had to submit "sufficient evidence": it was not possible to change nationality if one's parents were Estonian or even if one simply had an Estonian surname, nor was it possible to opt for a nationality if the applicant could not speak its language.[102]

Censuses were conducted in Austria in 1923 and 1934, and again in 1939 after the "Anschluss" to the Third Reich. The first two censuses determined language of daily use (Umgangssprache); the Nazi census determined mother tongue (though it omitted Jews). The results of these censuses must be interpreted in the light of the situation in which they took place. The number of Czechs determined in 1923 was affected by post-war re-emigration. The 1934 census was conducted on 22 March, after the February "civil war" in Austria; in the opinion of some writers, Austrian Czechs were reluctant to become involved in protests or prominent activities, as they mostly belonged to the defeated socialist camp. In 1939 there were 42% more Czechs in Vienna (using the criterion of mother tongue) than in 1934 (using language of daily use); this result could have been influenced by the change in the criterion used, though in the Nazi census — which determined not only mother tongue but also nationality (Volkszugehörigkeit) — only 35.3% of Czech-speakers declared themselves to be of Czech nationality (among Slovenes the figure was 26.4%, among Croats 22.6%).[103]

Although French censuses did not collect data on respondents' language, ethnicity or religion — citing the principle of human freedom and the necessity to main national (i.e. state) cohesion — this practice was heavily criticized, for various reasons.[104] It would certainly be incorrect to assume that this practice prevented internal problems related to language or ethnicity. Even during the French Revolution, many viewed France's linguistic diversity as a political issue. In the National Convention, one of the main representatives of the Jacobins, Bertrand Barère, railed against the centrifugal forces which he equated with other languages: "Federalism and prejudice

102 Wolfgang Steinacker, Der Begriff der Volkszugehörigkeit im altösterreichischen Nationalitätrecht. In: Schriften des Instituts für Sozialforschung in Alpenländern an der Universität Innsbruck, 9. Folge 1932, p. 63; Georg H. J. Erler, Das Recht der nationalen Minderheiten, In: Deutschtum in Ausland, Vol. 37/38, Münster 1931, p. 277 etc.

103 Karl M. Brousek, Wien und seine Tschechen, München 1980, pp. 33–35, 92–93.

104 D. I. Kertzer — D. Arel: Censuses, identity, p. 24–25.

speak Breton, emigration and hatred for the Republic speak German, contra-revolution speaks Italian, and fanaticism speaks Basque."[105]

Even after the failure of the Revolution, French politics viewed the country's linguistic diversity as a hindrance to national unity — especially in Alsace, where a German dialect was predominant. In the 1840s a schoolteacher from Mulhouse — a city which became part of France after one of the first plebiscites (1791) — declared: "Many people in Alsace think that their mother tongue is German, but that is untrue. The mother tongue is the language of the mother country"[106] When Alsace was part of France, Alsatians saw themselves as French, though their desire for a degree of self-determination had more chance of being realized when the province (along with part of Lorraine) belonged to Germany, between 1871 and 1918. After the First World War, France considered its reacquisition of Alsace as an act of historical justice; it rejected the idea of any kind of plebiscite, and the French delegation refused to sign a treaty on the rights of minorities, arguing that there were no minorities in France. After the war the population of the regained territories was assessed and divided into four categories depending on their supposed degree of loyalty; around 200 000 people had to leave the country.

Here we can agree with an observation by Tara Zahra of the University of Chicago, who stated that the main difference between French and Czechoslovak policy towards Germans living on the respective states' territory was that the French authorities attempted to exclude "Germans" from the French nation, while the Czechoslovak authorities attempted to persuade many Germans to declare themselves as Czechs, in order to create the impression of a large Czechoslovak majority.[107]

It is hard to arrive at clear and unambiguous conclusions by comparing the course and results of censuses, even when our focus is restricted to the determination of language and nationality. In order to do so, it would be necessary to design a study differently, examining the issues in thematic terms rather than according to individual countries or territories; such an approach is undoubtedly an attractive proposition, but it has not been a priority in the present study. Nevertheless, even bearing in mind the huge extent of discrepancies in data and the large number of methodological problems, it would not be justified to conclude that modern censuses are incapable of offering any insights at all.

However, censuses clearly do not offer the kind of simple answers that the public tends to expect. Even the key concepts themselves — language, nation, nationality, and so on — have always been (and will always be) subject to differing interpretations, and a different approach would be necessary if we were to take all these inter-

105 Andrzej Walicki, Idea narodu w polskiej myśli oświeceniowej, Warszawa 2000, p. 92.

106 Ryszard Kaczmarek — Maciej Kucharski — Adrian Cybula, Alzacja/Lotaryngia a Górny Śląsk. Dwa regiony pogranicza. Polityka, gospodarka i kultura europejskiego regionu, Katowice 2001, p. 31. Unless stated otherwise, the facts on Alsace and Lorraine are taken from this publication.

107 Tara Zahra, The 'Minority Problem' and National Classification in the French and Czechoslovak Borderlands, Contemporary European History 17, 2008, no. 2, pp. 137–165, here p. 145.

pretations into account. The views that predominate today cannot simply be applied to the past as an evaluative template. We can only attempt to understand why the organizers of censuses (and the census respondents) took the stances that they took. We can trace the developing opinions of contemporary commentators and later historiographers; we can describe and understand polemic viewpoints. Census materials — despite all their problematic aspects — represent an excellent source of insights into the composition of populations in terms of nationality. Of course, such insights require us to be sensitive to all the specific circumstances in which the census took place — economic, social, political and so on — both from the general perspective and from the perspective of a particular region with its own specific features. It is an illusion to imagine that it would be possible to arrive at a corrective adjustment of the final census data that would satisfy all parties — partly because everybody (organizers, respondents and those interpreting the data) would have to share the same opinion, which is of course impossible. Not only is it impossible, it is in fact for the best; after all, if everybody took the same view, research would be superfluous.

This exploration of censuses in various countries and at various times has provided a number of stimuli for comparisons with the censuses conducted in Cisleithania and the Czech lands. It has shown that the organizers of censuses always had specific aims, which were frequently political in nature, and that the discrepancies in the data continued to grow during the period under investigation. These discrepancies appear to have been more marked in Poland and Germany than in inter-war Czechoslovakia. It was not important to the organizers whether the census applied "subjective" or "objective" conceptions of nationhood, or viewed nations as having their roots in languages or in states; everything was interpreted in accordance with the goals which the particular census was aiming to achieve. It is also clear that similar terms ("tutejsi", "miejscowi", "Schlonsaken" and so on) were used for various purposes, and that respondents' reluctance to assign themselves to one or another category need not have been solely due to their national indifference or lack of civilization. It is always unwise to apply central criteria and perspectives to situations in more remote regions — and after all, this is not only true of censuses.